

Durham E-Theses

A study of KAINH KTIEIE and its ethical implications in Pauline theology

Friedemann Büttel

How to cite:

Büttel, Friedemann (1992) A study of KAINH KTIEIE and its ethical implications in Pauline theology. Masters 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/6015/> 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.

ABSTRACT of:

Friedemann Büttel, *New Creation and New Life. A Study of ΚΑΙΝΗ ΚΤΙΣΙΣ and Its Ethical Implications in Pauline Theology*, submitted to the University of Durham, Faculty of Arts, for the qualification of the degree of M.Theol., 1992

The conception of *καινή κτίσις* (2Cor 5.17; Gal 6,15) has often been regarded as one of the most significant ideas within Pauline theology. Yet, it is not of Pauline origin. Paul derived the term from early Jewish eschatology (rooted in Deutero-Isaiah) and introduced it into early Christian theology in order to defend and to clarify his own position against Jewish Christian opponents. Thereby *καινή κτίσις* received its specific Pauline anthropological (individual and ecclesiological) and present eschatological meaning which is without analogy in early Judaism: God's new creation, the great exodus from the slavery of sin and death, must no longer be expected from the future, but in the atoning Christ event at the cross it has already become a present reality. In Christ's death as inclusive representative for all a new order of soteriological equality of all mankind has been established. What counts is neither to belong to the Jewish nation nor to the Gentiles but to participate - by faith and baptism and through the Spirit - in the new humanity of the *καινή κτίσις* in Christ. This new reality will be made visible in the eschatological future in which also the whole non-human cosmos will be transformed.

The *καινή κτίσις* is a creation of Christ's love for all humanity (2Cor 5.14f). This love continues to be the driving and directing force of the participants in the *καινή κτίσις* evoking their love for Christ and for one another. So, love is the inevitable ethical implication for those who live in the *καινή κτίσις*. The new reality necessarily calls forth a new life, a new conduct according to the *καινή κτίσις* in which the old classifications of superiority and inferiority, Jew and Greek, slave and free, male and female have lost their validity.

NEW CREATION AND NEW LIFE

A Study of ΚΑΙΝΗ ΚΤΙΣΙΣ and Its Ethical Implications in Pauline Theology

by

Friedemann Büttel

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.

Submitted to the University of Durham
Department of Theology
for the degree of a
Master of Theology

1992



16 APR 1993

TO
MY PARENTS

PREFACE

It was a NT seminar of Prof. Peter Stuhlmacher in Tübingen on 'Baptism in the New Testament' that first aroused my interest in the Pauline conception of *καινή κτίσις*. I soon realized that this conception has its place right at the heart of Paul's theology and since I was studying NT ethics at that time anyway I began to wonder whether *καινή κτίσις* involves the ethical question, the new life, and if so which concrete form it would take. But, unfortunately, for the time being I could not trace this interesting path for various reasons. Therefore, I was all the more happy to have the opportunity to spend a year of post-graduate research studies on that topic at the University of Durham, the result of which is put together in this thesis submitted for the degree of a 'Master of Theology'.

I am greatly indebted to all those who made this year possible through their support, encouragement and advice. In particular I would like to mention my aunt Marta Rentschler whose help enabled me to stay for the full academic year in Durham. I am also most grateful to Prof. J.D.G.Dunn who never seemed to get tired of sorting out the administrative problems which were involved with my sojourn in Durham. Moreover, a warm 'Thank you!' goes to Mateen Ellass for his friendship and the stimulating exchange of ideas during that year, to my friend Götz Häuser with whom I walked through the heights and the depths of writing a dissertation, and also to Rene who always made my brain relax with her humour. But above all my warmest thanks are due to Dr. A.J.M.Wedderburn who was much more than a good supervisor. With his stimulating and constructive critique, always expressed in his friendly unobtrusive fashion, he provided the ideal climate in which my thesis could grow.

Erlangen, Germany

Friedemann Büttel

ABBREVIATIONS

In general this study follows the conventions given in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988), 579-596. Supplementary abbreviations are taken from S. Schwertner's *Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete*, Berlin-New York 1978.

In addition the following have been used:

- BA = W.Bauer/K.+B.Aland, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin-New York 1986⁶.
- BR = E.Bornemann/E.Risch, *Griechische Grammatik*, Frankfurt-Berlin-München 1978².
- CK = H.Cremer/J.Kögel, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Stuttgart-Gotha 1923¹¹.
- DSS = Dead Sea Scrolls
- GLRB = E.A.Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, 2 Vols., New York without year.
- TanchB* = Tanchuma (ed. M.Buber)

CONTENTS

PREFACE	ii
ABBREVIATIONS	iii
CONTENTS	iv

§ 1) Introduction	1
-------------------------	---

PART I: KAINH KTIΣIΣ - A TRADITION-HISTORICAL SURVEY

§ 2) Tradition-historical approaches to καινή κτίσις - an evaluation	4
2.1) Ulrich Mell's tradition-historical approach	5
2.1.1) Description.....	5
2.1.2) Critique.....	10
2.2) Survey of the tradition-historical approaches.....	13
2.2.1) The Rabbinic model.....	13
2.2.2) The conversion model.....	15
2.2.3) The Qumran model.....	16
2.2.4) The apocalyptic model.....	20
2.3) Conclusion.....	26

PART II: NEW CREATION IN PAUL

§ 3) Introduction to 2Cor and Gal	28
3.1) The second letter to the church in Corinth.....	28
3.1.1) Authorship, character, and date	28
3.1.2) Occasion and purpose	29
3.1.3) The opponents.....	30
3.2) The letter to the churches in Galatia.....	32

3.2.1) Authorship, addressees, and date.....	32
3.2.2) Occasion	33
3.2.3.) The opponents and Paul's response.....	33
3.3) Conclusion.....	35
§ 4) Paul's understanding of <i>καινή κτίσις</i> in 2Cor 5.11-21	38
4.1) Translation	38
4.2) Notes on structure, grammar, and semantics	39
Excursus: The origin of the Pauline thought of reconciliation	45
Excursus: The Pauline usage of <i>ἐν Χριστῷ</i>	52
4.3) Comment.....	55
4.4) Summary and evaluation	77
§ 5) Paul's understanding of <i>καινή κτίσις</i> in Gal 6.11-16.....	80
5.1) Translation	80
5.2) Notes on structure, grammar and semantics	80
5.3) Comment.....	84
5.4) Summary and evaluation	94
§ 6) Participation in the <i>καινή κτίσις</i>	96
6.1) The inclusive Christ event	96
6.2) The gospel of the inclusive Christ event	97
6.2.1) The proclamation of the inclusive Christ event.....	97
6.2.2) Faith in Christ, the inclusive representative.....	98
6.2.3) Baptism into Christ, the inclusive representative.....	100
6.3) The Spirit.....	101

PART III: NEW CREATION AND NEW LIFE

§ 7) Ethical implications of καινή κτίσις	104
7.1) 2Cor 5.11-21	104
7.2) Gal 6.11-16	106
7.3) Parallels to Gal 6.15.....	107
7.3.1) Gal 5.6.....	107
7.3.2) Gal 3.28.....	109
§ 8) Summary and conclusion.....	116

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or any other university.

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.

§ 1) Introduction

In 2Cor 5.17 Paul writes: 'If anyone is in Christ, he has become a new creation; the old has gone, behold, new things have come to be.' Undoubtedly, this statement about the *καινή κτίσις* is one of the best known verses of the whole NT and more than once exegetes have strongly emphasized its immense theological significance. It is considered the most powerful thing that Paul knows to say about the work of Christ¹ and Stuhlmacher² holds that in the technical term *καινή κτίσις* all essential topics of Pauline theology interlace. Or Aymer³ comes to the conclusion that *καινή κτίσις* 'fully expresses Paul's gospel and comprehensively includes all the major themes of Paul's theology.' These remarks on the importance of the Pauline conception of *καινή κτίσις* make one expect to find a vast number of essays or monographs on that topic. But surprisingly, there are only a few⁴ and all of them come to more or less different interpretations:

Examining the role and the meaning of *καινή κτίσις* in Pauline theology Schneider reaches the conclusion that Paul uses *καινή κτίσις* basically in an *anthropological* sense: *καινή κτίσις* means eschatological new creation of *man* through baptism into Christ in whom the *καινή κτίσις* has been inaugurated,⁵ i.e. Paul speaks about the moral-religious new creation of man.⁶ But this new creation of man will finally result in the new creation of the non-human creation. Hence, for Schneider *καινή κτίσις* has also a *cosmological* connotation.⁷

The purpose of Stuhlmacher's essay is to demonstrate the *ontological* character of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul. Accordingly, *καινή κτίσις* is a new being, a new world

¹ Windisch, *2Kor*, 184.

² 'Erwägungen,' 1; cf. also Schneider, 'Idee,' 257: 'Die Idee der Neuschöpfung ist grundlegend für die Theologie des Paulus.'

³ *Understanding*, 181.

⁴ W.Schweitzer, *Gotteskindschaft, Wiedergeburt und Erneuerung im Neuen Testament und in seiner Umwelt* (unpublished dissertation), Tübingen 1944; G.Schneider, *KAINH KTIΣIΣ. Die Idee der Neuschöpfung beim Apostel Paulus und ihr religionsgeschichtlicher Hintergrund* (unpublished dissertation), Trier 1959; Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen' (1967); Aymer, *Understanding* (1983); Mell, *Schöpfung* (1989). Unfortunately the study of Schweitzer was not available to us, nor the dissertation of Schneider. But the latter published the paper he read on the occasion of his graduation ('Idee') which provides a summary of his dissertation and makes his position sufficiently clear.

⁵ 'Idee,' 265f.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 269f.

⁷ But he has to admit, 'Idee,' 268: 'Immerhin ist zu beachten, daß Paulus dieses Ereignis der letzten Gottestat nicht ausdrücklich Neuschöpfung nennt. Er spricht auch nicht - wie 2 Petr 3,13 und Apk 21,1 - von einem neuen Himmel und einer neuen Erde. Die bereits angebrochene Neue Schöpfung steht bei Paulus in hellerem Licht. Die Endvollendung wird dadurch zur letzten Konsequenz des bereits verwirklichten Anbruchs der Neuen Schöpfung.' For more on Schneider's position see below § 2 n.36.

which has been inaugurated through the advent of God's creative word in Christ⁸ '[das] sich proleptisch in die Verkündigung des Apostels hinein ereignet.'⁹ The apostolic gospel is therefore nothing else than the apocalyptic *prolepsis* of God's creative word that grants a new being in the power of the Spirit. Influenced by Käsemann¹⁰ Stuhlmacher emphasizes that καινή κτίσις must not be understood exclusively anthropologically. Rather we have to recognize the *cosmological* and *ecclesiological-collective* horizon in which καινή κτίσις stands: καινή κτίσις is 'die erwählungsgeschichtlich und kosmologisch orientierte nota creaturae der Endzeit, das eschatologische Grundgesetz des Christenstandes als Kirche'.¹¹

For Aymer, however, καινή κτίσις does not describe the new being or the new nature of the Christian existence but the entire eschatological reality in Christ¹² which includes both humanity and nature.¹³ Therefore, καινή κτίσις is an *anthropological* and a *cosmological* conception. It is not an 'individual experience of salvation but a participation by believers in the future eschatological age already made possible'¹⁴ through Christ. Hence, καινή κτίσις in Paul has a *present* and a *future dimension*.¹⁵

Finally, we have to mention Mell's learned study. According to his interpretation καινή κτίσις in Paul does not imply an ontological transformation of man,¹⁶ nor is it characterized by a proleptic structure: καινή κτίσις does not anticipate the future cosmological new creation.¹⁷ Rather, it is primarily a *soteriological* term¹⁸ which is essentially linked with theological *anthropology*. The new creation, inaugurated *in* Christ - the Christ event is the turn of time - and a present-eschatological reality *since* Christ, is the new soteriological order of creation that (in baptism¹⁹) creates the one new humanity of Jews and Gentiles. So, καινή

⁸ 'Erwägungen,' 29.

⁹ Ibid., 32.

¹⁰ Cf. esp. Käsemann's essay 'Zur paulinischen Anthropologie'. One of his basic conclusions is that anthropology in Paul is *eo ipso* cosmology (ibid., 46).

¹¹ Ibid., 8.

¹² *Understanding*, 115.

¹³ Ibid., 83,175,180.

¹⁴ Ibid., 180.

¹⁵ This is no contradiction for Aymer 'because the new creation is an eschatological reality and in that reality present and future are not lineal concepts along a time span but are different aspects from which the same one eschatological time may be viewed' (ibid., 180).

¹⁶ *Schöpfung*, 392.

¹⁷ Ibid., 392.

¹⁸ Cf. already the subtitle of Mell's study *Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie*.

¹⁹ Ibid., 390.

κτίσις has an *anthropological-ecclesiological* focus but on the other hand it also is a ‘*Verhältnisbegriff*’:²⁰ Whoever is in Christ *belongs* to that new creation.

Different as they are, all those interpretation agree in that they recognize the non-Pauline origin of the term *καινή κτίσις*. Therefore, they all try to shed some light on its traditional background.²¹ But again, the conclusions they reach can hardly be reconciled.²²

As to the ethical implications of *καινή κτίσις* none of those studies shows a major interest in that question. Therefore, their explanations concerning the ethical implications of *καινή κτίσις* remain fragmentary and often on a more general level.²³

With these introductory remarks the stage for our study is set. Since Paul himself relates *καινή κτίσις* in 2Cor 5.17b with Deutero-Isaiah’s theology we would agree with those scholars who regard *καινή κτίσις* in Paul as being a traditional element which Paul had taken over from his Jewish heritage. Therefore, the first part of this study will be a concise evaluation of the different tradition-historical approaches that are offered by NT scholarship. This tradition-historical survey will be followed by the main part, an exegetical examination of the two *καινή-κτίσις*-passages in Paul, 2Cor 5.17 and Gal 6.15. Our goal is to perceive, to understand and to define the meaning of *καινή κτίσις* within its Pauline context²⁴ and then to clarify how we can participate in that *καινή κτίσις*.²⁵ The result of our exegesis will either approve or disapprove of the interpretations offered by the scholars cited above. After this rather detailed exegesis we will try to provide a concise answer to the question whether or not *καινή κτίσις* bears ethical implications and if so which concrete shape these implications take. This is all the more interesting since this question, as far as we can see, has not yet been thoroughly thought through.²⁶

²⁰ Ibid., 396.

²¹ This is particularly the pronounced purpose of Mell’s study.

²² See below § 2.

²³ Cf. e.g. Aymer, *Understanding*, 119: ‘It is in the light of the presence of the new creation that Pauline ethics must be understood.’

²⁴ Our primary interest is to understand both verses within the framework of 2Cor or Gal and then, if helpful or necessary, to see them in the light of the wider context of the *Corpus Paulinum* as a whole. However, we restricted ourselves to the undoubtedly Pauline letters. Therefore, we did not take into consideration the so-called ‘Deutero-Paulines’ and the Pastorals.

²⁵ Since the (legitimate) question as to our participation in the *καινή κτίσις* is not Paul’s explicit concern either in 2Cor or in Gal we can restrict ourselves to some basic remarks. Otherwise, we may run the risk of overinterpreting Paul.

²⁶ A glance at modern outlines of NT ethics confirms this impression: if there is a reference to *καινή κτίσις* at all then it is only in a rather general sense: cf. Gerhardsson, *Ethos*, 66; Lohse, *Ethik*, 66,70; Sanders, *Ethics*, 54; no reference in Schrage, *Ethik*; Schulz, *Ethik*, 384f. Merk is the only one who, compared to the others, relatively frequently points to the significance of *καινή κτίσις* for Pauline et-

PART I: ΚΑΙΝΗ ΚΤΙΣΙΣ - A TRADITION-HISTORICAL SURVEY

§ 2) Tradition-historical approaches to καινή κτίσις - an evaluation

In contemporary exegesis it is widely agreed that Paul took over the concept of καινή κτίσις or at least the term from the Jewish heritage. It is difficult to find a modern scientific commentary on Gal or 2Cor without a reference to OT, Pseudepigraphal, Qumran, or Rabbinic traditions in the exegesis of the καινή-κτίσις-passages (Gal 6.15; 2Cor 5.17).¹ And for the few monographs/essays on καινή κτίσις² the tradition-historical approach is essential even if the results may be rather different.

But the assumption that Paul referred to non-biblical traditions in his statements about the καινή κτίσις was made much earlier: in a list of canonical and non-canonical quotations in Paul Euthalios (about 4th cent. AD) notes Gal 6.15 as a reference to a Μωϋσέως ἀπόκρυφον.³ Whether or not we can rely on this note,⁴ it is obvious that even in a pre-critical period the possibility of a non-Pauline origin of καινή κτίσις was taken into consideration.

Though NT scholars have nearly reached a consensus in deriving καινή κτίσις from Jewish traditions, the question to which actual sources Paul refers and to what extent has found quite different answers. And those answers are often not very precise, particularly in the commentaries, where the interested reader frequently finds just short notes on the tradition-historical question. In this situation we are particularly indebted to Ulrich Mell for trying to shed new light on the conception of καινή κτίσις in Paul and its tradition-historical background. Undoubtedly his dissertation *Neue Schöpfung*, published in 1989, is the most scholarly examination of this subject up to now. He set, as it were, the standard for any future study of it. This may be reason enough to have a closer look at his work and position right at the outset of our review.

hics (cf. *Handeln*, 5,16,19,20,235).

¹ An exception is Fung's commentary on Galatians (1988) which regards καινή κτίσις as original in Paul (306).

² See § 1 n.3.

³ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 9.

⁴ The evidence is not strong enough to confirm it, cf. Burton, *Gal*, 356 n. *; Lietzmann, *Gal*, 44; Mell, *Schöpfung*, 9; with theological arguments Lightfoot, *Gal*, 224; Oepke, *Gal*, 204.

2.1) Ulrich Mell's tradition-historical approach

2.1.1) Description

The subtitle *Eine traditions-geschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie* already reveals the outline of Mell's dissertation: It consists of two main parts. Part A provides a study in the tradition-historical background of the term *καινή κτίσις*, whereas Part B examines the meaning and the function of *καινή κτίσις* in Pauline theology.

The starting point of Part A is a review of literature dealing with the tradition-historical background of *καινή κτίσις*.⁵ Mell distinguishes four different models of a tradition-historical derivation, which, however, are not to be understood as exclusive: 1) "Neue Schöpfung" - ein rabbinischer Schulbegriff?,⁶ 2) "Neue Schöpfung" - eine Metapher aus der jüdischen Proselytentheologie?,⁷ 3) "Neue Schöpfung" - göttliche Vorausverwirklichung endzeitlicher Neuschöpfung in der eschatologischen Heilsgemeinde?,⁸ 4) "Neue Schöpfung" - apokalyptischer Fachbegriff kosmologisch-jenseitiger Zukunftsspekulation?.⁹ But Mell's discussion of these approaches does not provide him with a satisfying answer. There are too many misinterpretations and wrong conclusions. For this reason he reexamines precisely the new creation passages in the various Jewish scriptures with special attention to the question whether Paul - as seems most likely - directly or indirectly took over 'new creation' from Jewish apocalyptic sources. At the end of his review Mell is inclined to regard early Jewish scriptures with an *eschatologisch-endzeitlichen Prägung* (see below) as the background for *καινή κτίσις* in Paul.

Before Mell begins his own tradition-historical examination he gives a clear account of his methodological procedure.¹⁰ First of all he considers 'die bei einer religionsgeschichtlichen Analyse grundsätzlich vorstellbaren Möglichkeiten einer traditions-geschichtlichen Bezugnahme'¹¹ and distinguishes four possibilities: a) *καινή κτίσις* is a *terminus technicus* in pre-Pauline literature with a clearly defined content. b) *καινή κτίσις* is of Pauline origin. c) The idea of a new creation was

⁵ *Schöpfung*, 9-32.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 32-45.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 33.

performed in the tradition without *καινή κτίσις* as a *terminus technicus*. d) The Pauline *καινή κτίσις* is a radical transformation of the tradition.

Mell's second methodological consideration concerns formal criteria for the selection of the material. 'Um ein uferloses Sammeln von religionsgeschichtlichem Vergleichsmaterial unter dem Stichwort wie "menschliche Neuheitserfahrung" bzw. "kosmische Neuheitsvorstellungen" zu vermeiden, müssen bei Paulus selbst die Vorgaben genommen werden.'¹² The guideline therefore is the semantic structure of the term *καινή κτίσις* in Paul.

Thirdly Mell defines internal criteria for the selection of the material, which also have to be derived from Paul himself. a) Since Paul explains *καινή κτίσις* in 2Cor 5.17b with DtIsa 43.18,19a we do not only have to ask whether the term *καινή κτίσις* occurs in the Jewish tradition but also if there is a reference to Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy of a new creation. b) In Paul *καινή κτίσις* has an eschatological setting with God as the active subject. Therefore we have to look for references in the early Jewish literature to God's eschatological renewing work.

Finally Mell clarifies the mode of his tradition-historical procedure by quoting A.Vögtle: "Die einzelnen in Betracht kommenden Belegstellen sind zunächst für sich genommen zu analysieren und unter Berücksichtigung ihres unmittelbaren Kontextes wie ihres Gesamtkontextes (der betreffenden Schrift oder Schriften-Gruppe), ihrer literarischen Art und ihres historischen Ortes auf ihre Aussageintention zu prüfen".¹³

With a few exceptions the *terminus ad quem* for texts to be taken into consideration is the 1st century AD. It is not the purpose of Mell's study to cover all variations of the conception of new creation throughout the Jewish tradition but to present an appropriate contribution to the understanding of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul from a tradition-historical perspective.

Mell concludes this chapter by explaining two hermeneutical premises:

1) 'Annahme eines konsequent überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Modells'¹⁴ as a living process of actualization of tradition.¹⁵ Even the NT is part of this process, 'nicht ohne in einem kritischen Auswahlprozeß das Überkommene am Maß einer Hermeneutik Jesu Christi zu messen.'¹⁶ 2) The biblical concept of a 'new creation'

¹² Ibid., 36.

¹³ Ibid., 42.

¹⁴ Ibid., 44.

¹⁵ Ibid., 44: 'Bei aller Vielfalt der Bearbeitungen des Neuschöpfungsthemas im Frühjudentum läßt sich als ihre theologische Mitte bestimmen, daß die Einzeltexte Dokumente des Bemühens Israels sind, Zeugnis für die Offenbarung Gottes zu sein.' Mell refers here particularly to H.Gese, 'Tradition,' 91.

¹⁶ Ibid., 44f.

is part of a religious language which is genuinely Jewish. Even in Early Judaism this biblical language is preferred. Influences of non-biblical conceptions of renewal on the development of the early Jewish/early Christian idea of a new creation are very slight.¹⁷ Therefore we have to listen carefully to this biblical language. ‘Der Akt des hörenden Vernehmens auf die biblische Sprache möchte (...) der erste und wichtigste Grundsatz dieser traditionsgeschichtlichen Arbeit sein.’¹⁸

Mell starts his actual tradition-historical work in the OT. The concept of a new creation is first found in Deutero-Isaiah 43.16-21 (esp. 19a), an eschatological interpretation of the history of Israel: God keeps his promises to his people and as ‘Herr der Welt/Schöpfung ist Jahwe alleiniger Herr der Geschichte und führt alle neue Zukunft (...) nach dem Hiatus der Geschichte, dem Exil, in Souveränität herbei.’¹⁹ God, the creator, is acting in history for the salvation of his people (second exodus). Thus new creation in Deutero-Isaiah is a transforming and renewing act of God confined, however, to Israel as the people of God.

Since this second exodus failed to appear soon it was already Trito-Isaiah who interpreted this hope for a second exodus in a new way (65.17a): he transcends Deutero-Isaiah’s eschatological interpretation of new creation and speaks about the cosmological completion of the world in the end, beyond history and no longer bound to a national eschatology.²⁰ With the final redaction of Isa an apocalyptic interpretation of this theme began (Isa 66.17-24), which infers the idea of the immortality of the eschatological community of salvation from a combination of Isa 48.13 and 65.17a. This implies a realistic understanding of the renewal of the world.

The same process of an adopting and adapting interpretation of tradition can be found within the scriptures of early Judaism. ‘Dabei kann eine sich an Dtjes orientierende **endzeitlich-eschatologische** von einer an Trjes sich anlehnenen **apokalyptisch-visionären** Rezeptionslinie unterschieden werden.’²¹ The first line is represented in Qumran (1QS 4.25; cf. 1QH 13.11f) and in literature close to its thinking (*1Enoch* 72.1; cf. *Jub.* 1.29).²² It is within this line that the term ‘new crea-

¹⁷ This points to the close connection between ‘Sprache und Daseinsauslegung des Menschen. Eine Untersuchung zur Neuschöpfungsvorstellung ist darum immer zugleich eine Einführung in das Verstehen jüd.-atl. und jüd.-urchristlicher Glaubensexistenz.’ (ibid., 45).

¹⁸ Ibid., 45.

¹⁹ Ibid., 66.

²⁰ Ibid., 67: ‘Tritojesaja stellt damit eine entscheidende Marke auf dem Weg zur Transzendentalisierung des Heils im Geschichts dualismus der apokalyptischen Bewegung dar.’

²¹ Ibid., 254 (bold original).

²² Ibid., 254 (bold original): ‘Auffällig ist hier, daß theologische Gelehrsamkeit der endzeitliche-eschatologischen Neuschöpfungsaussage immer eine Aussage über die Verfasstheit der creatio origi-

tion' has been coined. As *Jub.* shows, 'new creation' is open 'für eine kosmologische, priesterliche, astronomisch-weisheitliche und bundestheologische Soteriologie. Deshalb darf er als Minimalkonsens asidäischer Theologie über das eschatologische Endheil gelten.'²³ However, it cannot be confirmed that in the community of Qumran the eschatological hope of a new creation is anticipated by the member of the community at his conversion. Moreover, the present-eschatological salvation consists of the abolition of the convert's lowly status as a creature and is realized in constant sanctification and renewal. Paul's usage of *καινή κτίσις* is clearly along the lines of this first strand of tradition.

The other line is represented by texts of an apocalyptic esotericism (*1Enoch* 91.16; *Rev* 21.1; also *2Pet* 3.13): In a visionary prolepsis the seer anticipates the divine 'Endzeitgeschichte'²⁴ which is already existent in the heavenly world. This motif of an eschatological renewal of the world in the end is also preserved in the later doctrine of the two ages (*4Ezra* 7.74; *2Apoc.Bar.* 32.6; 57.2; *Bib.Ant.* 16.3; and others) but under the impact of the destruction of the temple the imminent expectation of this renewal which is so characteristic for *DtIsa* recedes into the background. 'In den Mittelpunkt rückt eine individuelle Entscheidungstheologie (...), die den immer gleichen Abstand aller Juden, egal in welcher geschichtlichen Zeit sie leben, zum Eschaton behauptet'.²⁵ Later, in the Rabbinate, the future renewal of the world and the participation in it is bound to the individual's obedience to the Torah. 'Die dialektische, die Naherwartung bewahrende Geschichtsdeutung der Apokalyptik entwickelt sich im Rabbinat zur zeitlosen Mahnung, ein Leben nach der Thora zu führen, da es eine heilvolle Zukunftsperspektive besitzt.'²⁶ But undoubtedly this is a post-Pauline stage of development. In this connection it cannot be confirmed, that the Pauline term *καινή κτίσις* derives from the Rabbinic *בריה חדשה*, because the earliest evidence of *בריה חדשה* is in the 4th century AD.

Within the Jewish theology of conversion the proselyte is compared with a newborn baby in a very uneschatological way in order to demonstrate the situation of the new beginning. Nowhere is the proselyte himself called a new creation. Strikingly eschatological, however, is the background of *Jos.As.* where even more clearly the future-cosmological eschatology is replaced by an individual-postmortal: The conversion of Aseneth, the gentile daughter of a priest, is

nalis voranstellt.'

²³ *Ibid.*, 254.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 255.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 176.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 255.

regarded as the prototypical story of all converts, which brings about the participation in eternal life in the future. 'Zu beachten ist, daß das theologische Konzept von JosAs einer Überblendung von Schöpfung und Erlösung im Ereignis der singulären Konversion eines Proselyten nur **uneigentlich** als "Neubelebung/Neuschöpfung" zu bezeichnen ist. Betont wird in JosAs nicht der Neuheitsaspekt einer die verdorbene, alte, erste Schöpfung überwindenden **neuen** Schöpfung, sondern betont wird die **Erfüllung** der nur vom heidnischen Menschen nachzuholenden Umkehr zum wahren Gottesglauben, so daß ursprüngliche Geschöpflichkeit in der inspirativen Begabung des Menschen mit Gottesgeist geschieht.'²⁷

'Summa: Der paulinische Begriff *καινή κτίσις* erweist sich als vorpaulinischer Konsensbegriff frühjüdischer Eschatologie für das Gottes Initiative vorbehaltene überwältigend-wundervolle futurische Endheil. Der abstrakte Begriff ist in der frühjüdischen Theologie nicht einseitig, z.B. kosmologisch, festgelegt, sondern offen für eine soteriologische Füllung. Eine anthropologische und präsentisch-eschatologische Verwendung des Begriffes wie des Motivs der neuen Schöpfung konnte in der frühjüdischen Literatur nicht nachgewiesen werden.'²⁸

In Part B²⁹ Mell argues for Paul having taken over Gal 6.15 from Hellenistic early Christianity in order to gain his opponents' agreement for his bold soteriological inferences from the cross of Christ. Gal 6.15 proclaims the 'Überwindung der erwählungstheologischen Differenzierung der Menschheit in zwei soteriologisch negativ und positiv bewertete Gruppen' and presupposes 'eine thoraunabhängige Neukonzeption einer universalen Erwählungstheologie'³⁰ particularly represented by the Hellenistic early Christianity which shaped Paul's thought. This Hellenistic theology, which can with care be extracted primarily from the traditional Christian material in 1Thess and Gal, is characterized by a peculiar relationship of continuity and discontinuity with Judaism. This relationship can be analysed in four complementary ways: 1) as polemical appropriation of the synagogal claim of salvation (Gal 3.7,29; 4.7,28,31), 2) as continuation and completion in fulfilling the will of God (1Thess 4.3,8-10) in love, the new 'Leitprinzip "antiochenischer" Frömmigkeit' (Gal 5.6,22),³¹ 3) as confirmation of the place of the new Christian community in the divine economy (1Thess 1.4f; 2.12f; 4.15-17; 5.9,23f), 4) as development of a new normative principle that constitutes the new

²⁷ Ibid., 251.

²⁸ Ibid., 257.

²⁹ See particularly *ibid.*, 298-315.

³⁰ Ibid., 300.

³¹ Ibid., 302. It seems to Mell that the term *καινή κτίσις* with its ontological connotations does not fit into this new primarily ethical-juridical 'Antiochenic' conception.

community - the Christ-event (1Cor 12.13; Gal 3.27f). But for Mell this Hellenistic theology cannot provide a satisfactory framework for the interpretation of the creation-theological expression of *καινή κτίσις*. Therefore, Mell tries to clarify, 'auf welche Weise das hell. Urchristentum mit dem Begriff "neue Schöpfung" an der Traditionsbildung des Frühjudentums partizipiert'.³² But since there is no occurrence of *καινή κτίσις* in 1Thess he can only refer to Gal 6.15 as an expression of Hellenistic theology and that means that he simply presupposes a non-Pauline origin of this statement about the *καινή κτίσις*. He, then, discovers a nearly congruous use of *καινή κτίσις* in Hellenistic theology (= Gal 6.15) and in Asidaic early Judaism.³³ Both have in common the antithetical usage of *καινή κτίσις*,³⁴ the cosmic dimension, the eschatological emphasis, the soteriological adjustment, and the non-metaphorical use. The only difference is the radical present setting of *καινή κτίσις* in the Hellenistic theology. This makes it strikingly clear for Mell that the Hellenistic Christianity preceding or contemporary to Paul took over the concept of *καινή κτίσις* from early Judaism. The hellenistic theology abolishes the creation-theological distinction of early Judaism between Jew and Gentile. This old soteriological order of creation is displaced by the new, the *καινή κτίσις*, and all that for the benefit of the one church of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Here we have the background against which Paul's use of *καινή κτίσις* is to be understood and from which he took over the idea of *καινή κτίσις*.

2.1.2) Critique

First of all we have to acknowledge the structural and methodological clarity of Mell's dissertation,³⁵ which far surpasses all previous studies of *καινή κτίσις*. His observations and his exegesis of the relevant Jewish texts in Part A are scholarly and, as far as we can see, mostly precise and correct. Therefore, we will take his results of Part A as the tradition-historical basis for our study, acknowledging that

³² Ibid., 303.

³³ Ibid., 304 n. 84 (bold original): 'Aufgrund begrifflicher Prägung von *καινή κτίσις* im Frühjudentum ist auszuschließen, daß die apokalyptische Offenbarungsvision himmlischer Welt (äthHen 91,16; Apk 21,1; vgl. LibAnt 3,10; Trjes 65,17; 66,22) als traditionsgeschichtliches Belegmaterial zu Gal 6,15 in Frage kommt.'

³⁴ The 'until' in *Jub.* 1.29; *1Enoch* 72.1; 1QS 4.25; 11QTemple 29.9; Gal 6.15: ἄλλά.

³⁵ Unfortunately this structural clarity is not always accompanied by a corresponding clarity of language.

the Pauline *καινή κτίσις* stands in the tradition of an eschatological concept of new creation which developed from the theology of Deutero-Isaiah.³⁶

But this positive valuation of Mell's study should not be allowed to cover up some decisive weaknesses, particularly in Part B. According to Mell Paul tries to gain the agreement of his opponents by referring to a common Christian tradition (Gal 6.15).³⁷ This, however, seems very unlikely to us. Firstly, because Paul does not write his letter to his opponents but to the church, 'his' church, in Galatia and his primary purpose is to gain his *ἀδελφοί* back from the false gospel of his opponents to the true gospel of Christ crucified (e.g. Gal 1.6-9; 3.1-5; 4.12,19). He does not argue with his *opponents* but with his 'brethren'. Instead, his opponents are treated with a harsh polemic (cf. Gal 1.8f; 5.12; 6.12f). Paul does not seek the agreement of his opponents but of the Galatians. Secondly, if the intruders in Galatia are to be recognized as Christian Judaists, as Mell himself does,³⁸ how then could Paul seriously expect to convince them by arguing with a pronounced *Hellenistic* Christian expression without showing any sign of compromise with regard to his gospel and its abolition of the soteriological distinction between Jews and gentiles? Again, it is much more likely that he did not want to convince them at all. His concern was for the Galatians.

Closely linked to this is the other question whether Paul, as Mell assumes, has actually got the term *καινή κτίσις* from the Hellenistic theology. In section 2.6.2.2 Mell argues with good reason for Gal 6.15 as deriving from pre-Pauline early Christian theology but he does not find an appropriate framework to interpret *καινή κτίσις* in this context satisfactorily. Therefore, in order to solve this

³⁶ At the same time we want to reject Schneider's interpretation as far as it is shown in his essay in *TTZ* 68 (1959): 'Die Idee der Neuschöpfung beim Apostel Paulus und ihr religionsgeschichtlicher Hintergrund'. He fails to recognize that Paul himself uses Deutero-Isaiah as an interpretation of his statement about the new creation in 2Cor 5.17b. Instead, he regards Jer 31.21f and Ezek 36.26f (new heart, new Spirit) as the background out of which Paul's understanding of *καινή κτίσις* emerged. 'Das Spätjudentum dachte in seiner apokalyptischen Denkrichtung vor allem an die kosmische Neuschöpfung oder gar an nationalen Triumph'(269) and in the community of Qumran he finds an anthropological use of new creation. 'Bei Paulus aber hat die Idee der Neuschöpfung (...) durchaus christologisches Gepräge. Das geschichtliche Ereignis des Heilstodes Christi leitet die Neue Schöpfung ein. Das ist die neue Prägung der Neuschöpfungsidee bei Paulus. Der Apostel steht aber dabei in der Nachfolge der Propheten Jeremias und Ezechiel, die die Neuschöpfung des Menschen in seinem Inneren verkündigt haben. Paulus redet von der sittlich-religiösen Neuschöpfung des Menschen.'(269f) This might well be an important aspect of Paul's teaching of the new creation, but it is to be doubted whether it can function as a satisfactory explanation of all aspects of it. Moreover, the crucial question, how he would describe the relationship between Paul's christological interpretation of the new creation and this moral-religious renewal of men, remains disquietingly unanswered.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 298: 'Mit einer traditionellen christlichen Formel wirbt Paulus bei seinen Kontrahenten um Zustimmung (Gal 6,15) zu seiner gewagten soteriologischen Konsequenz aus dem eschatologischen Verständnis des Christusereignisses.'

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 285ff. With the question of Paul's opponents see below 3.2.3.

problem, Mell tries to clarify in the following section 'auf welche Weise das hell. Urchristentum mit dem Begriff "neue Schöpfung" an der Traditionsbildung des Frühjudentums partizipiert'.³⁹ This procedure calls for some critical comments. To begin with, what Mell has actually shown in section 2.6.2.2 is that the abolition of the soteriological distinction between Jews and gentiles was part of the Hellenistic theology of early Christianity (cf. e.g. Gal 3.28) and we can agree with that. However, what he has *not* shown is, that *καινή κτίσις* too is part of this theology. He simply - illegitimately - presupposes it and regards Gal 6.15 in its present form (including *καινή κτίσις*) as traditional Christian material. We, however, would rather see a strong case for Paul having introduced *καινή κτίσις* into the early Christian language and theology: Firstly, with the exception of 2Cor 5.17 *καινή κτίσις* occurs nowhere else in the NT.⁴⁰ Secondly, it looks much more likely that the traditional formula in Gal 6.15 does not include the term *καινή κτίσις*, since it can be found elsewhere without *καινή κτίσις* but connected with *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη* (Gal 5.6) and *τήρησις ἐντολῶν θεοῦ* (1Cor 7.19).⁴¹

To sum up: Though we may go along with Mell's tradition-historical examination in his Part A, we cannot confirm his assumption that Paul took over *καινή κτίσις* from a Hellenistic Christian theology. Rather, it seems more likely that Paul himself introduced the eschatological early Jewish concept of *καινή κτίσις* into the Christian theology,⁴² reinterpreting and redefining it in the light of the Christ event. Therefore, the Pauline context has to be the decisive impetus for the interpretation and the understanding of *καινή κτίσις* in Gal 6.15 and 2Cor 5.17. The tradition-historical results of Part A of Mell's study may serve as a foil to a clearer recognition of the peculiar shape of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul.

³⁹ Ibid., 303.

⁴⁰ Baumgarten, *Paulus*, 165: 'Angesichts des Fehlens von Quellen kann man nichts über einen eventuellen Sitz des Motivs in der vorpaulinischen urchristlichen Apokalyptik ausmachen.'

⁴¹ This, however, is not to rule out the possibility that the 'neither Jew nor Greek' expression in Hellenistic theology could be linked to a creation-theological statement, see e.g. Gal 3.28, where 'neither Jew nor Greek' is paralleled with 'neither male nor female'. But even if the unit Gal 3.26ff as a whole is regarded as a pre-Pauline baptismal formula it still remains a moot question 'who first may have introduced such a statement into baptismal parenthesis - it may perfectly well have been Paul himself.' (Meeks, 'Image,' 181f).

⁴² With Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen,' 4; Furnish, *2Cor*, 314ff; cf. Barrett, *2Cor*, 173ff.

2.2) Survey of the tradition-historical approaches⁴³

2.2.1) The Rabbinic model

According to Mell⁴⁴ it was Adolf von Harnack who with his essay 'Die Terminologie der Wiedergeburt und verwandter Erlebnisse in der ältesten Kirche' effectively revived the discussion of 'new creation'. Harnack made the uncontested assumption of a non-Pauline origin of *καινή κτίσις* more specific by deriving this formula from the Rabbinic theology of conversion. However, he did not concede 'new creation' an independent existence but regarded it, along with other terms, as subordinate to the theme of rebirth.

Harnack was particularly followed by Billerbeck and Sjöberg. Billerbeck⁴⁵ distinguished three possible uses of *καινή κτίσις* (= *בריה חדשה*): 1) as healing of sickness and other diseases (*Exod.Rab.* 3 [70^b] to *Exod.* 4.12), 2) as forgiveness of sins (*Midr.Ps.* 18 § 6 [69^a]), 3) as an abolition of needs and dangers (*Gen.Rab.* 39 [24^a] to *Gen.* 12.2; cf. *Num.Rab.* 11 [162^c]). In other words, *בריה חדשה* is regarded as a physical renewal, or a relational one, or an renewal of one's situation. Only in the first case does *בריה חדשה* have a concrete meaning as a renewal of (the health etc. of) a man and it is always God who is the active, renewing one. Nowhere, however, does *בריה חדשה* imply a moral renewal which still remains for the future to bring (outpouring of the Spirit; the gift of the new heart).

In his important essay 'Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palästinischen Judentum'⁴⁶ Sjöberg did the actual tradition-historical work in a scholarly examination of the Rabbinic material. He came to similar conclusions to Billerbeck in stating four different uses for *בריה חדשה*: as a description 1) of the alteration

⁴³ For the sake of clarity the following distinction is based on Mell. We are well aware 1) that there are other possible ways to present the material (e.g. in its historical development) and 2) that the different presentations all have their own weaknesses (e.g. Mell's second model could partially function as a subsection of model one and also the connection between the conversion and the Qumran model is quite obvious). But referring to Mell's distinction we want to emphasize - as he perhaps should have spelt out more explicitly - that these models are not to be understood exclusively. The names given to the four models in this survey are to be regarded as abbreviating paraphrases of the full titles used by Mell (see above).

⁴⁴ *Schöpfung*, 11ff.

⁴⁵ Strack/Billerbeck, 3, 519; id., 2, 420-423. Of particular interest is to note his dependence on Harnack's earlier decision to subordinate 'new creation' to 'rebirth': All references concerning 'new creation' are attached to John 3.3 with its concept of a 'birth from above' (*γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*). With Harnack Billerbeck assumes a close kinship between 'to become a new creation' and 'to be like a newborn baby'.

⁴⁶ 'Wiedergeburt,' 44-85.

of the situation of the proselyte⁴⁷ (*Gen.Rab.* 39 [378f]; *Cant.Rab.* 1.3 § 3), 2) of the salvation from danger and need (*Cant.Rab.* 8.5; *Lev.Rab.* 30.3; *Pesiq.R.* 31 Friedm. 146^b [similar *Midr.Ps.* 2 § 9 Bub. 14b]), 3) for the forgiveness of sins (*Pesiq.R.* 155^b; *Lev.Rab.* 29.12; *Pesiq.R.* 40 Friedm. 169^a; *Midr.Ps.* 18 § 6 Bub. 69^a), 4) for the resurrection of the righteous in the end⁴⁸ (*TanchB* ח נ § 12 Bub. 18^b/19^a). Nowhere is *בריה חדשה* used to describe an inner, religious, or ethical renewal. Nevertheless a man could be called a *בריה חדשה*, a ‘new creature’,⁴⁹ because in all cases the whole situation of life has changed. ‘Der rabbinische Neuschöpfungsgedanke kann durch das paulinische Wort "Das Alte ist vergangen, etwas Neues ist gekommen" [2Cor 5.17b] treffend ausgedrückt werden,’⁵⁰ though, as Sjöberg has to admit, the eschatological setting of Paul’s statement is often missing in the Rabbinic concept of ‘new creation’.

There are some commentators who follow the line of interpretation given by Billerbeck and Sjöberg. But none of them regards the Rabbinic concept(s) of ‘new creation’ as sufficient for the interpretation of Paul’s use of *καινή κτίσις*. According to Lietzmann⁵¹ Paul possibly knew the term *καινή κτίσις* from the Rabbinic tradition (*בריה חדשה*), but it is now to be understood in the light of his teaching on the Spirit. Wolff and Schlier see Paul’s concept of *καινή κτίσις* against a wider background: not just the Rabbinic sources but also the Jewish apocalyptic material is the basis for the interpretation of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul.⁵²

However, for several reasons the assumption of a Rabbinic origin of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul is very unlikely. First of all we have to notice that none of the Rabbinic *בריה-חדשה*-passages is older than the 4th century. It would be methodologically illegitimate to interpret Paul in the light of post-Pauline evidence.

⁴⁷ ‘Diese ist so radikal, daß sie mit der Schöpfung des Menschen verglichen werden kann (...). Es wird in der rabbinischen Literatur niemals ausdrücklich gesagt, dass der Proselyt selbst ein neues Geschöpf ist.’ (ibid., 54) Cf. however Foerster, *κτιζω κτλ.*, 1022: ‘Neu, eine neue Schöpfung, ist der Mensch, wo das Verhältnis zwischen Gott und ihm ein neues geworden ist.’ But ‘der Ausdruck Schöpfung ist (...) nicht eigentlich zu fassen, zeigt aber doch, daß das at.lische Wort von der Vergeltung nicht ganz leer geblieben ist.’

⁴⁸ ‘Die Auferstehung von dem Tode ist eine wirkliche Neuschöpfung, sie kann nicht nur mit einer Neuschöpfung verglichen werden.’ (ibid., 60)

⁴⁹ Cf. Sjöberg, ‘Wiedergeburt,’ 62: Though *בריה חדשה* means ‘new creation’ as well as ‘new creature’ in the Rabbinic literature the latter meaning is intended.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 62.

⁵¹ *Gal*, 44f.

⁵² Cf. Wolff, *2Kor*, 127f; Schlier, *Gal*, 282: The ‘Vorstellung von einer neuen Schöpfung gehört in den Bereich der mannigfachen eschatologischen Erörterungen über die messianische Erneuerung der Welt,’ such as we can frequently find in Rabbinic and Jewish apocalyptic traditions. Cf. Sjöberg, ‘Wiedergeburt,’ 56f.

Secondly, the fluctuating Rabbinic usage of *בריה חדשה* speaks against a direct derivation. Of particular significance is to note that the eschatological use of *בריה חדשה* in the Rabbinic sources is just one possibility among many others, whereas *καινή ατίσις* in Paul is strictly eschatological, as we shall see.

Thirdly, *בריה חדשה/καινή ατίσις* means the act of creating as well as the result. Both meanings can be found in Paul - not however in the Rabbis, where almost always the second meaning is intended.⁵³

To conclude: It is not and cannot be possible to prove a direct dependence of Paul on the Rabbinic concept of *בריה חדשה*.⁵⁴ 'So sicher die rabbinischen Belege in einen Gesamtüberblick zur jüd. Neuschöpfungstradition gehören, um so deutlicher wird, daß sie den Endpunkt einer Entwicklung nach Paulus markieren.'⁵⁵

2.2.2) The conversion model

The basis for this model is twofold: On the one hand Rabbinic sentences like 'The proselyte is like a newborn babe' (*Yebam.* 48^b; *Ter. Gerim* 2) give the grounds for a tradition-historical approach aimed at interpreting *καινή ατίσις* in Paul.⁵⁶ Besides this, on the other hand, scholars point to the theology of the Jewish-Hellenistic synagoge of the diaspora,⁵⁷ particularly as reflected in *Jos.As.* The terminology used to describe the conversion of Aseneth (cf. 8.9; 15.4f) led to the assumption of a very real concept of new creation.⁵⁸ Aseneth's conversion, initiated by the Spirit of God (12.2; 19.11),⁵⁹ is based on an individual-anthropological concept of new creation with a clear present-eschatological emphasis.⁶⁰ This can easily be regarded as a close analogy to the Pauline statements about new creation.

In a more general way this model is supported for instance by Lightfoot, Plummer, Hengel, and Daube.⁶¹

⁵³ Sjöberg, 'Wiedergeburt,' 62.

⁵⁴ So Mell, *Schöpfung*, 17ff; Chilton, 'Galatians 6.15,' 311-313; Barrett, *2Cor*, 173.

⁵⁵ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 21.

⁵⁶ Davies, *Paul*, 119; Jeremias, *Kindertaufe*, 43.

⁵⁷ See literature given in Mell, *Schöpfung*, 22 n.8.

⁵⁸ Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen,' 17f.

⁵⁹ The Spirit is not just 'die überwältigende Macht und Präsenz des Göttlichen. Er ist hier vielmehr (...) eine seinshafte, seinsstürzende und zugleich auf den Weg der Erneuerung (...) stellende Segensmacht' (Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen,' 19).

⁶⁰ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 23; Macho, *Apocrifos*, 220: 'Son textos de escatología realizada'. Schneider, 'Idee,' 261 regards the idea of conversion in *Jos.As.* as an anticipation of the total new creation in the end.

⁶¹ Lightfoot, *Gal*, 224: *בריה חדשה* is 'a common expression in Jewish writers for one brought to the knowledge of the true God.' Similar Plummer, *2Cor*, 180; Hengel, 'Kreuzestod,' 72; Daube, *New Te-*

There are, however, difficulties in deriving *καινή κτίσις* from the Jewish theology of conversion. Firstly, nowhere in the Rabbinic literature is the proselyte himself called a new creation,⁶² but he or she is *compared* to a new creation. Therefore, realizing this problem, Davies has to interpret the event of conversion metaphorically in order to find an individual concept of a new creation as an analogy to Paul. In contrast, Paul definitely and unmetaphorically calls the person *ἐν Χριστῷ* a *καινή κτίσις* (2Cor 5.17).

Secondly, if *καινή κτίσις* in Paul is regarded as a *terminus technicus*, the supporters of the conversion model have the problem of explaining the fact that this term cannot be found in *Jos.As.* *Jos.As.* uses other words to describe the conversion of Aseneth.⁶³

For these reasons interpreting *καινή κτίσις* in Paul one should be very careful about assuming that Paul is referring to the Jewish theology of conversion.

2.2.3) The Qumran model

In his essay 'Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament' (1950), published 3 years after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, K.G.Kuhn presents a first account of the spiritual world of the community of Qumran. According to him this spiritual world is characterized by a strong anthropological dualism: On the one hand the 'community' (קִהָל) or the 'covenant of God' (ברית אל) - on the other hand the entire cosmos, which also includes the Jewish people. The community of Qumran is the new and exclusive people of salvation chosen by God's predestination. To become a member of the community means to receive the life-giving Spirit. Moreover, in 1QH 3.20f K.G.Kuhn finds

statement, 137.

⁶² Sjöberg, 'Wiedergeburt,' 55.

⁶³ Cf. *Jos.As.* 15.4: 'From to-day you will be made new [ἀνακαινισθήση], and refashioned [ἀναπλασθήση], and given new life [ἀναζωοποιηθήση]; and you shall eat the bread of life and drink the cup of immortality, and be anointed with the unction of incorruption' (Sparks, *AOT*, 488).

Note also the difference: 'in der rabbinischen Kasuistik ist der Vergleich eines Proselyten mit einem neugeborenen Kind gebräuchlich, im hell. Judentum hingegen spricht man von der Konversion als Erhöhungsgeschehen (Vorsilbe: ἀνα-).' (Mell, *Schöpfung*, 23; bold original) This, however, does not mean that Mell excludes the aspect of repetition in the syllable 'ἀνα-' (cf. his translation of *Jos.As.* 15.5, *ibid.*, 232, and his quotation of Liddell/Scott, *ibid.*, 235 n.37: "from the notion throughout (E), comes that of repetition and improvement, as in ἀνα-βλαστάνω, -βιόω, -γεννάω.").

even the thought of a new creation: 'I thank Thee, O Lord, for Thou hast redeemed my soul from the Pit, and from the hell of Abbadon Thou hast raised me up to everlasting height. I walk on limitless level ground, and I know there is hope for him whom Thou hast shaped [יצר] from dust for the everlasting Council [סוד עולם].'⁶⁴ 'Es ist zu beachten, daß hier mit dem Wort יצר nicht von der Schöpfung des Menschen die Rede ist, sondern gewissermaßen von einer Neuschöpfung, nämlich der Zugehörigkeit zu der Gemeinde'.⁶⁵

This interpretation of 1QH 3.20f was soon confirmed by Sjöberg,⁶⁶ who corrected his own view stated in his earlier essay.⁶⁷ He saw the renewal characterized firstly by the gift of knowledge and secondly by the gift of the Spirit. Both together overcome the weakness of man, resulting in a new creation, which brings about a real alteration, not just of the situation, but also of the nature of man.⁶⁸

Some years later H.W.Kuhn wanted to prove in his dissertation (*Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*), that in Qumran 'neben der Beibehaltung der üblichen futurischen Enderwartung das Bewußtsein vorhanden war, daß in der Gemeinde das eschatologische Heil schon in die Gegenwart hineinreicht.'⁶⁹ His scholarly exegesis of 1 QH 3.19-36; 11.3-14; 11.15ff; 15 led him to the conclusion that the only appropriate description of the eschatology of the *Hodayot* is that of a 'Ineinander von Gegenwart und Zukunft'⁷⁰ in the community of Qumran. Becoming a member of the community implies the reliable guarantee of the participation in the new world to come, 'weil sie [= the new world] hier schon an *diesem* Ort, nämlich in der Gemeinde, begonnen hat sich zu verwirklichen.'⁷¹ H.W.Kuhn discovered the same proleptic concept of eschatology, foreign to all other Jewish eschatology, in Rom 8.24: τῆ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν⁷² but also in Paul's statements about the καινὴ κτίσις (2Cor 5.17; Gal 6.15).⁷³ But despite these parallels H.W.Kuhn emphasized

⁶⁴ Vermes, *DSS*, 172f.

⁶⁵ K.G.Kuhn, 'Die hebräischen Texte,' 201 n.7.

⁶⁶ 'Neuschöpfung in den Toten-Meer-Rollen,' *ST 9* (1956), 131-136. 'Es handelt sich (...) um die Neuschöpfung beim Eintritt in die Sekte, nicht um die ursprüngliche Schöpfung des Menschen.' (133)

⁶⁷ 'Wiedergeburt,' 78-81.

⁶⁸ 'Neuschöpfung,' 136.

⁶⁹ *Enderwartung*, 11.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 178.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 179 (emphases original). As an example for this eschatological tension Kuhn points to 1 QH 3.20f: "es gibt eine *Hoffnung* (diese Gewißheit besteht, und zwar) für den, den du (mit dem Eintritt in die Gemeinde bereits *neu-*)*geschaffen hast*" (179, emphases original). Cf. also Schneider, 'Idee,' 261, who, referring to the same text, comes to the same conclusion that it speaks about the 'bereits erfolgte Neuschöpfung des Menschen'.

⁷² *Enderwartung*, 180.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 50. In order to confirm this interpretation Kuhn refers particularly to the works of G.Schneider (see p. 50 n.2). Cf. also Mell's discussion of G.Schneider in *Schöpfung*, 25f.

strongly that early Christian eschatology is something totally different in so far as and because it has an christological foundation.⁷⁴

Stuhlmacher's considerations concerning the concept of a new creation in Qumran lead in the same direction. He states that 'die weitaus gewichtigsten Belege'⁷⁵ for a apocalyptic theology of new creation can be found in Qumran. The community of Qumran was clearly expecting a cosmic-anthropological new creation. However, as he points out, this new creation is not just a future expectation but at the same time it is proleptically realized in the community of Qumran.⁷⁶ In the *Hodayot* (1QH 3.19-22⁷⁷ and 11.10-14,⁷⁸ cf. also 1Q 34) Stuhlmacher finds the confirmation of his view: they speak of the conversion to the community of Qumran as a new creation already realized by the Holy Spirit.⁷⁹

Though Stuhlmacher does not assume a direct tradition-historical dependence of Paul on Qumran he regards the new creation passages in the Qumran texts with their proleptic structure as the closest parallels to Paul's concept of a new creation.⁸⁰

The commentators are very reluctant in assuming a dependence of Paul on Qumran. Most of them do not refer to the Qumran texts at all in their exegesis of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul⁸¹ and if they do, then either not as the only source (Becker,

⁷⁴ Ibid., 204.

⁷⁵ 'Erwägungen,' 12. So also Aymer, *Understanding*, 69-71, however, unlike Stuhlmacher, he does not find a clear expression of new creation in the *Hodayot*. Rather, he regards the apocalyptic idea of God's visitation to restore the Adamic glory stated in the Rule of the Community (1QS) as closest to the new creation motif in Paul, for they are both eschatological ideas.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 13: 'Die Neuschöpfung ist (...) keine bloß zukünftige kosmologische Erwartung, sondern sie ist zugleich im Umkreis des Bundes vorausverwirklicht.' Similar Aymer, *Understanding*, 74.

⁷⁷ See quotation above.

⁷⁸ 'For the sake of Thy glory Thou hast purified man of sin that he may be made holy for Thee, with no abominable uncleanness and no guilty wickedness; that he may be one [with] the children of Thy truth and partake of the lot of Thy Holy Ones; that bodies gnawed by worms may be raised from the dust to the counsel [of Thy truth], and that the perverse spirit (may be lifted) to the understanding [which comes from Thee]; that he may stand before Thee with the everlasting host and with [Thy] spirits [of holiness], to be renewed [שְׁתַּחֲוֶה יְהוָה] together with all the living and to rejoice together with them that know' (Vermes, *DSS*, 195).

⁷⁹ Stuhlmacher's (and H.W.Kuhn's) proleptic interpretation is sharply criticised by Baumgarten, *Paulus*, 164f. For him 1QS 4.25 is the only possible text to refer to. 'Zwängt man die dunklen Stellen 1QH 3,19-22; 11,10-14 und 1QH 13.11ff nicht in einen vorgefaßten Verstehenshorizont, dann ergibt sich eindeutig, daß sich 1QS 4,25 glatt in die apokalyptischen Traditionen einfügt, die Jub 4,26; äthHen 72,1; 4Esr 7,75; und ApkBar(syr) 32,6; 44,12 repräsentieren.'(165)

⁸⁰ 'Erwägungen,' 20.

⁸¹ Without any reference to Qumran Bruce, *Cor*, 209 can plead for a proleptic understanding of *καινή κτίσις*: The man 'in Christ' 'anticipates by faith the "new heaven and the new earth" of which the prophet spoke (Isa. 65.17; 66.22)'.

Furnish)⁸² or in order to criticize a relationship of Paul to Qumran as being unlikely (Barrett; cf. also Braun).⁸³

If the proleptic interpretation of *καινή κτίσις* at Qumran could be proved correct, it could be an interesting parallel to the NT teaching: 'durch den Eintritt in eine eschatologische Gemeinde (...) findet eine Neuschöpfung des Menschen statt.'⁸⁴ Though Sjöberg after his first reluctance became convinced of the accuracy of the proleptic interpretation of new creation in Qumran, there are still some problems remaining. 1) The term '*καινή κτίσις*' does not occur in those texts, i.e. members of the community are not called a 'new creation'. It is at least methodologically problematic to infer the concept of a new creation as a present reality from a verbal formulation in the perfect tense (*יצרתה*, 1QH 3.21). This leads to the other question, 2) whether Schneider's, H.W.Kuhn's, and Stuhlmacher's proleptic interpretation of the Qumran texts is right. And it is not only Baumgarten⁸⁵ who opposes it but also Mell in a very comprehensive critique.⁸⁶ 3) 'Würde sich die Neuschöpfungsprolepse im qumranischen Schrifttum nachweisen lassen, so wäre für die Interpretation von "neuer Schöpfung" bei Paulus wiederum zu fragen, ob ein Antizipationsmodell in seiner Aussage intendiert ist. Soweit aber sichtbar, verwendet Paulus weder Erneuerungs-, noch Schöpfungs-terminologie im Zusammenhang seiner futurischen Endzeithoffnung.'⁸⁷ To conclude: The evidence is too weak as to give unrestricted support to the *Neuschöpfungsprolepse* in Qumran.

Rather, the eschatological new creation in Qumran still remains a future expectation⁸⁸ which, however, is guaranteed for the member of the Community. At his initiation God cleansed the new member from sin and lifted him up from his old status as 'lowly' creature (1QH 11.14) to the new soteriological status of a

⁸² Becker, *Gal*, 83f quotes 1QS 4.25 alongside with 4Ezra 7.30ff; *1Enoch*; *Sib.Or.* 4.178ff; etc (but no reference to the *Hodayot*!) as general references to Jewish apocalyptic writings. So also Furnish, *2Cor*, 332f, who looks at the Qumran texts (including the *Hodayot*) in the wider context of apocalyptic Judaism which has its roots in Isa 65.17-25. His conclusion is that in contrast to the Jewish apocalyptic writings the concept of new creation in Paul is different: a present reality. Obviously, he either must have interpreted 1QH 11.10-14 differently from H.W.Kuhn and Stuhlmacher (though he quite frequently points to Stuhlmacher's essay) or he did not interpret it at all.

⁸³ Barrett, *2Cor*, 173; Braun, 'Qumran,' 220: '*καινή κτίσις*' has in Qumran only a limited analogy.

⁸⁴ Sjöberg, 'Wiedergeburt,' 80.

⁸⁵ See above n.79.

⁸⁶ *Schöpfung*, 27f; 110ff.

⁸⁷ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 28.

⁸⁸ The concept of a new creation occurs three times in the Qumran literature, however not as a technical term but in different formulations (verbal: 1QH 13.11f; 1QS 4.25; nominal: 11QTemple 29.9), cf.. Mell, *Schöpfung*, 97ff.

'clean' creature which is, however, still part of the 'old' creation (1QH 3.21: צר' not בר' (!); 15.17a). 'Ist er mit dem Eintritt in die Tempel-Gemeinde von Qumran in den "Raum" göttlicher Gnade eingetreten (...), so erhält der Qumranfromme sein Heil (Geistbesitz, vollkommener Thora-Wandel, die zukünftige Hoffnung) in der täglichen Reinigung, die seine zur Sünde neigende Geschöpflichkeit rigoros bekämpft. Im täglichen Gottesdienst erfüllt er durch das Rezitieren von Hodajot-Psalmen die existenzielle Aufgabe des Geschöpfes, seinen Schöpfer zu loben.'⁸⁹ After all, nowhere in the *Hodayot* is the present salvation described as new creation⁹⁰ nor anywhere else in the Qumran literature. Therefore, NT exegesis cannot interpret the Pauline statements about the new creation in analogy to the eschatology in Qumran.⁹¹

2.2.4) The apocalyptic model

Beyond any doubt this is the most preferred model. NT scholars have nearly reached a consensus in deriving the term 'καινή κτίσις' in Paul - directly or indirectly - from Jewish apocalyptic.⁹² But the question whether Paul is to be seen in continuity or in discontinuity to Jewish apocalyptic is still matter of controversy.

In 1950 Sjöberg showed that the eschatological new creation was the oldest form of the Jewish thought of a new creation.⁹³ 'Sie findet sich schon im A.T. Bei der eschatologischen Neuschöpfung sollen auch das Herz und der Geist des Menschen verwandelt werden. Was in diesem Zeitalter nicht geschieht und nicht zu geschehen braucht, das wird dann verwirklicht [cf. Ezek 36.26f with *Jub.* 1.21ff]. Zugleich wird diese Neuschöpfung des Menschen in den weiteren Zusammenhang der Neuschöpfung des gesamten Kosmos eingeordnet'⁹⁴ (cf. Isa 65.17; 66.22; 51.6). The concept of a renewal of the world is also found in 4Ezra and 2*Apoc.Bar.*⁹⁵.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 111.

⁹⁰ Thus, it is by no means a necessity to understand the initiation in the *Hodayot* as a new creation. Sjöberg's statement ('Neuschöpfung,' 132) that this interpretation is 'die einzig mögliche' cannot stand.

⁹¹ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 111.

⁹² Texts often referred to: *Jub.* 1.29; 4.26; 5.12; 19.25; *1Enoch* 72.1; 4 Ezra 7.75; *2Apoc.Bar.* 32.6; 44.12; 57.2; 1QS 4.25; 1QH 13.11f. The roots of these texts are often seen in Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, particularly Isa 42.9; 43.18f; 48.6; 65.17; 66.22.

⁹³ 'Wiedergeburt,' 70-74.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 70. This act of new creation can either be regarded as a replacement of the old world (after its destruction) or as its renewal. There is no real distinction to be made. Both have in common the concept of a total renewal and change of the cosmos through God's own creating act (see *ibid.*, 71).

⁹⁵ 4Ezra 7.75; 6.16; *2Apoc.Bar.* 32.1,6; 44.12; 49.3; 51.3; 57.2.

Though the term 'new creation' is missing, 4Ezra 7.30f (the new/messianic age) and *1Enoch* 91.16f reflect the same thought. Explicitly and as a defined term 'new creation' occurs in *1Enoch* 72.1 and *Jub.* 4.26. 'Schon um 100 v.Chr. war also nicht nur die Vorstellung von der eschatologischen Neuschöpfung, sondern auch der Ausdruck "die neue Schöpfung" - mit eschatologischem Inhalt - im Judentum wohl bekannt.'⁹⁶ After his analysis of the Jewish apocalyptic and Rabbinic texts Sjöberg concludes, 'dass die neutestamentlichen Vorstellungen von der Neuschöpfung sich von jüdischen Voraussetzungen her gut erklären lassen.'⁹⁷ In other words, he considers the NT concepts of new creation (including Paul's) as standing in a basic continuity with Judaism.

Stuhlmacher⁹⁸ comes more or less to the same conclusion. For him *καινή κτίσις* is definitely derived from Jewish apocalyptic. But the roots of this apocalyptic term lie in Deutero-Isaiah's salvation-historical cosmological concept of 'old - new', 'Urzeit und Endzeit'⁹⁹ (Isa 42.9; 43.19; 48.6) and Trito-Isaiah's promise of a new heaven and a new earth (Isa 65.17; 66.22).¹⁰⁰ Together with Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's promise of a new heart (Jer 31.33f; Ezek 36.26f) these texts mark the starting point for the development of the apocalyptic theology of the new creation.

This development led to 'new creation' as a technical term describing 'die kosmische, endzeitliche Wandlung und Verwandlung der Welt'¹⁰¹ (*Jub.* 1.29; 4.26; *1Enoch* 72.1; *2Apoc.Bar.* 32.6; 44.12). However, the hope and the concept behind it is by no means restricted to these passages, even if the term itself does not appear.¹⁰² The passages given above refer particularly to the tradition of Trito-Isaiah with its cosmological emphasis. In the course of time the cosmological horizon of 'new creation' disappeared more and more into the background in favour of a individual-anthropological understanding (conversion; cf. Qumran, the Rabbinic, and Hellenistic Judaism)

Καινή κτίσις in Paul is a technical term; 'er steht in kosmologischem und zugleich erwählungsgeschichtlichem Horizont und ist zugleich von der korporativen

⁹⁶ Sjöberg, 'Wiedergeburt,' 74.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 84. Sjöberg continues: 'Sowohl formal als inhaltlich bietet das Judentum die gesuchten Parallelen. Die Neuschöpfungsvorstellungen lagen im Judentum bereit und konnten vom Urchristentum übernommen und verwertet werden.'

⁹⁸ 'Erwägungen,' 3-35; cf. esp. 10-14; 19-26. .

⁹⁹ Ibid., 12.

¹⁰⁰ In this connection Stuhlmacher, *ibid.*, 12, puts particular weight 'auf die gerade für Deuterjesaja typische Identifikation von Schöpferhandeln Jahwes und heilsgeschichtlichem Erwählungshandeln an Israel'.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 12.

¹⁰² Stuhlmacher, *ibid.*, 12 n.38 points to passages like *Jub.* 5.12; 19.15(?); 23.26ff; *1Enoch* 45.4ff; 62.13ff; 71.15; 91.16f; 92.5; 100.5; 107; 4Ezra 7.75; *T.Levi* 18.

Adam-Christus-Typologie her ekklesiologisch-kollektiv bestimmt. Hält man sich dies vor Augen, so ist der Schluß zwingend, daß Paulus im Zusammenhang der apokalyptischen Tradition gesehen werden muß.¹⁰³

According to Davies¹⁰⁴ Paul's Jewish contemporaries were familiar with the term and the idea of a *καινή κτίσις*. However, the roots of the thought of a new creation go back to the cosmological terminology of the two ages (Isa 11.6; 65.25).¹⁰⁵ But within Judaism cosmological speculations were suspect (cf. Qoh 3.21f). Finally, it was the interest in the doctrine of the Fall of Adam that made the cosmological orientation within Messianic speculation in Judaism inevitable (e.g. *Jub.* 3.28-29: the consequences of Adam's Fall for other creatures): The Messianic Age was conceived as of undoing the evil consequences of the Fall, including all creation, corresponding to the beginning of all things (4Ezra 7.29,32).¹⁰⁶ So the Messiah has to be a figure of cosmic significance, the master of man and nature as well, and the appearance of Jesus Christ on earth could be seen as a new creation corresponding to the first.¹⁰⁷ From this the transition to Christ as the Second Adam was not difficult to realize: 'Once Paul had become convinced that Jesus was the Messiah it was natural that he should have assigned to him cosmic functions'.¹⁰⁸ Christ's redeeming work has consequences for the whole world. So the conclusion is inevitable that "the Christian conception of Redemption is the counterpart of the Jewish conception of Creation".¹⁰⁹ In Christ the new age and the new creation is already a present fact. This is the fundamental difference from the conception of Jewish apocalyptic tradition.

Baumgarten¹¹⁰ emphasizes the discontinuity between Paul and Jewish apocalyptic, admitting, however, that the motif of *καινή κτίσις* was scarcely formed by Paul himself. Rather, the allusion to Isa 43.18f and 65.17 in 2Cor 5.17 points to a wide field of tradition as the background for the formation of *καινή κτίσις*, ranging from the antithesis 'old - new' (cf. Isa 42.9; 43.19; 48.6), through the doctrine of the two ages and the conceptions of a new creation in late-Israelitic apocalyptic writings to the concept of a new heaven and a new earth (2Pet 3.12f;

¹⁰³ Ibid., 20 (spaced out original). Cf. also Furnish, *2Cor*, 332f who points quite frequently to Stuhlman's essay as a source of his own interpretation.

¹⁰⁴ *Paul*, 37ff.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Martin, *2Cor*, 134ff; Martyn, 'Epistemology,' 274; Strachan, *2Cor*, 113; Windisch, *2Cor*, 189f.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 39.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. e.g. Schlier, *Gal*, 282f. Hays, *Echoes*, 159: The new creation in Paul 'is an allusion to Isa 65:17-25, a pointer to the hope of God's eschatological restoration of the fallen creation and of Israel'.

¹⁰⁸ Schlier, *Gal*, 39.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 39 quoting C.H.Dodd.

¹¹⁰ *Paulus*, 162-170.

Rev 21.1).¹¹¹ But in the interpretation of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul one should only refer to texts that are comparable in a stricter sense: *Jub.* 1.29; 4.26; *1Enoch* 72.1; 4*Ezra* 7.75; *2Apoc.Bar.* 32.6; 44.12.¹¹² To sum up: It is very likely that Paul took over the motif of *καινή κτίσις* from the Jewish apocalyptic tradition but he reinterpreted it. 'Dabei *entkosmologisiert* er das Motiv und faßt es radikal *präsen-tisch*.'¹¹³ So, in Baumgarten's view, *καινή κτίσις* is not a cosmological-universal but an anthropological-ecclesiological term.

With this Baumgarten has marked the generally dominant alternative in interpreting the relation between Paul and Jewish apocalyptic: 'Entweder versteht man die Rezeption des apokalyptischen Begriffs durch Paulus als Ausdruck seiner durch das Christusevangelium am Individuum ausgerichteten Theologie, in radikaler Diskontinuität zur Apokalyptik das kosmologische Zukunftsheil auf die Soteriologie des Menschen einzugrenzen, oder man versucht im Gegenschlag dazu, Paulus betontermaßen von der apokalyptischen Tradition her zu interpretieren, und meint, daß Paulus eine individualistische Soteriologie mit der Orientierung an einer kosmologisch-universal denkenden Schöpfungstheologie korrigiere.'¹¹⁴

In his dissertation *Paul's Understanding of KAINH KTISIΣ: Continuity and Discontinuity in Pauline Eschatology* Aymer, however, wants to avoid this alternative. His study, therefore, 'will insist that each of these categories [i.e. continuity and discontinuity] must be held together.'¹¹⁵ This he does in his tradition-historical chapter by combining the cosmological-universal idea of *new creation* with the more anthropological concept of *renewal* in Qumran under the common roof of apocalyptic.¹¹⁶ He also sees the roots of the term new creation in the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah (esp. 43.6-7), which shows the soteriological significance of creation (40.12-31; 45.9-13; 48.12-13).¹¹⁷ Later, 'Trito-Isaiah was the first to express belief that redemption has both anthropological and cosmological significance.'¹¹⁸

¹¹¹ Ibid., 164.

¹¹² Ibid., 164: 'Entgegen dem Vorgehen *P.Stuhlmachers* und *W.Foersters*, die selbst Belege für kosmische Veränderungen im weitesten Sinne (...), die Erlösung der Schöpfung (...) sowie das Verschwinden der Sünde am Ende der Zeiten bzw. mit Beginn des neuen Äons (...) heranziehen, sollte man sich zunächst auf die Belege im engeren Sinne konzentrieren, ohne daß damit in Abrede gestellt werden soll, daß andere Motive in den weiteren Umkreis des Motivs der *καινή κτίσις* gehören.'

¹¹³ Ibid., 169.

¹¹⁴ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 30f. On the one hand we find basically Bultmann and his school, on the other hand Käsemann and his followers.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 1.

¹¹⁶ See chap. III 'The New Creation Idea in Paul's World,' *ibid.*, 46ff, where he gives a survey of the available literature of Paul's time referring to scriptures of the Hellenistic religion and philosophy, to Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism and to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 60: 'Yahweh's creative activity is referred to as the basis for confidence and trust in Yahweh's ability to liberate his people.'

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 62.

As a 'proto-apocalyptic' prophet Trito-Isaiah stands between a prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology and his concept already presupposes the idea of two ages, which, then, is widely spread in the apocalyptic writings.¹¹⁹ In his survey Aymer remarks 'that the apocalyptic writers did not use the new creation expression with consistency of meaning.'¹²⁰ Nevertheless, wherever the phrase 'new creation' occurs in the OT and the apocalyptic literature it implies the 'two ages dualism, a communal rather than a personal reality, an imminent but future eschatology and the intervention of the Divine in the historical process.'¹²¹ For Aymer there is a striking similarity between this OT and Jewish apocalyptic use of the new creation motif and Qumran, with the exception that in Qumran the concept of renewal is anthropological in its scope. 'Considering that the Qumran community was a Jewish apocalyptic sect it seems to us that in the new creation motif, Paul proceeded from his Jewish religious heritage.'¹²²

In his recently published commentary Wolff, like Aymer, tries to escape the alternative of discontinuity - continuity (anthropological interpretation - cosmological interpretation) by connecting the Rabbinic concept of new creation to that of Jewish apocalyptic¹²³ thus raising the question whether this is a real alternative or not rather an expression of certain theological presuppositions superimposed upon the exegesis of Paul.¹²⁴

And indeed, the question raised by Wolff hits the heart of the problems given with this model, even if his assumption of a connection between the anthropological use of new creation in the Rabbis and the cosmological use in the Jewish apocalyptic writings is to be criticized.¹²⁵ We cannot fully restrain our suspicion that in many cases the theology of each exegete predetermines his exegesis.

¹¹⁹ *Jub.* 1.29; *1Enoch* 91.15f; cf. 45.4; 72.1; *2Apoc.Bar.* 74 and others.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 73.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 74.

¹²³ Wolff, *2Kor*, 127: 'καὶνὴ ἀτίσις ist eine in der jüdischen Apokalyptik und bei den Rabbinen (hier vor allem im Zusammenhang von Vergebung und Bekehrung) begegnende Vorstellung und Wendung (בְּרִיאַת הַעוֹלָם הַבָּרִיאָה). Paulus verbindet wohl beide Gedankenkreise miteinander: Der Glaubende gehört bereits zur neuen Schöpfung Gottes.'

Most of the other commentaries just refer generally to Jewish apocalyptic as the source for the Pauline statements of καὶνὴ ἀτίσις (cf. Hughes, *2Cor*, 201-204; Lang, *Kor*, 300; Martin, *2Cor*, 134ff.152; and others).

¹²⁴ There are many other commentators who generally assume a dependence of Paul on Jewish apocalyptic writings and thinking, cf. e.g. Becker, *Gal*, 83f; Bruce, *Cor*, 208ff; Furnish, *2Cor*, 314ff; Martin, *2Cor*, 134ff; Schlier, *Gal*, 282f; Strachan, *2Cor*, 113f; Windisch, *2Kor*, 189f.

¹²⁵ This connection is quite unlikely, because the anthropological concept of a בְּרִיאַת הַעוֹלָם הַבָּרִיאָה does not occur in Rabbinic literature before the 3rd century.

Stuhlmacher, for instance, obviously wants to maintain continuity between (cosmological) Jewish apocalyptic thinking and Paul.¹²⁶ Consequently, he has to solve the problem that Paul's use of *καινή κτίσις* is basically anthropological. Therefore he looks for a corresponding use in the Jewish apocalyptic scriptures which would give support to an anthropological understanding as a proleptic realization of the future cosmological new creation - and he finds it particularly in the *Hodayot* of Qumran. On the other hand, Baumgarten would rather see discontinuity between Jewish apocalyptic and Paul. Therefore he argues for a *Ent-Kosmologisierung* of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul and tries to falsify Stuhlmacher's exegesis of the *Hodayot* in order to put forward his own anthropological-ecclesiological interpretation of Paul's concept.

- Another reason for many problems is the confusion in the usage of the term 'apocalyptic'. NT exegesis is still far away from reaching a consensus in this matter. So, with regard to the tradition-history of new creation, the consequence is that scholars refer to different sources according to their understanding of 'apocalyptic'. This involves a methodological problem too: How do we find the criteria for determining to which Jewish writings we can actually refer for a tradition-historical understanding of *καινή κτίσις*? Baumgarten is surely right when he states: 'In der Abgrenzung des Materials, das als echtes Vergleichsmaterial in Frage kommen kann, liegt bereits eine Vorentscheidung über die Interpretation des Motivs bei Paulus.'¹²⁷ The problem with approaches which take into consideration a wider spectrum of texts is that they frequently fail to give new creation an independent existence apart from other ideas of newness and renewal.¹²⁸ Therefore, again with Baumgarten, 'sollte man sich zunächst auf die Belege im engeren Sinne konzentrieren, ohne daß damit in Abrede gestellt werden soll, daß andere Motive in den weiteren Umkreis des Motivs der *καινή κτίσις* gehören.'¹²⁹

¹²⁶ See also Sjöberg quoted above, 15 n. 91. The question, however, remains, whether we have to explain the concept of new creation 'von jüdischen Voraussetzungen her' or not rather in contrast to them.

¹²⁷ Baumgarten, *Paulus*, 164.

¹²⁸ Cf. e.g. Aymer, *Understanding*, 46ff where he gives a survey of the available literature of Paul's time referring to writings of the Hellenistic religion and philosophy, to Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism and to the Dead Sea Scrolls, which all speak of very different kinds of renewals as reincarnation, rebirth, regeneration. Even if he (not surprisingly) comes to a negative result when considering a dependence of Paul on these concepts, it is at least methodologically questionable to proceed like this, to say nothing of referring to all available literature of Paul's time without due care.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 164. As we already said above Baumgarten points to *Jub.* 1,29; 4,26; *1Enoch* 72.1; 4Ezra 7,75; *2Apoc.Bar.* 32.6; 44.12 as evidence in a stricter sense. But he fails of giving a clear account of the criteria for choosing the texts. Against the background of Mell, who, with good reason, sees Paul in the line of an eschatological application of the new creation motif, we should therefore concentrate on texts belonging to this line (1QS 4.25; *1Enoch* 72.1; *Jub.* 1.29; 4.26).

Though this model as it presents itself in its various forms cannot fully convince, for it reveals too many basic problems, it can hardly be denied that there is a direct or indirect dependence of Paul on Jewish apocalyptic writings. Particularly against the background of this diffuse exegetical situation Mell's fresh approach is all the more welcome.

3) Conclusion

As we saw, the first references to a concept of new creation can be found in Deutero-Isaiah (esp. 43.16-21), who interpreted Israel's history eschatologically (second Exodus, new future, identity of God in keeping his promises). In the living process of interpretation through adoption and adaptation of earlier material Trito-Isaiah expressed this hope for a glorious future in a new way, as a cosmological completion, and with the final redaction of the book of Isa the apocalyptic interpretation of the new creation motif began.

Later, in early Jewish writings we can, as Mell convincingly showed, distinguish two main streams of understanding new creation: 1) as *endzeitlich-eschatologisch* (represented in Qumran (1QS 4.25) and in literature close to its thinking as *1Enoch* 72.1; *Jub.* 1.29; 4.26), 2) as *apokalyptisch-visionär* (represented e.g. in *1Enoch* 91.16; *Rev* 21.1; *4Ezra* 7.74; *2Apoc.Bar.* 32.6; 57.2). As a former Pharisee Paul clearly belongs to the first line from which he, then, received the motif of the new creation. 'Der paulinische Begriff *καινή κτίσις* erweist sich als vorpaulinischer Konsensbegriff frühjüdischer Eschatologie für das Gottes Initiative vorbehaltene überwältigend-wundervolle futurische Endheil. Der abstrakte Begriff ist in der frühjüdischen Theologie nicht einseitig (...) festgelegt',¹³⁰ and therefore open for a new interpretation. An anthropological and/or present-eschatological use of new creation could not be proved in the early Jewish literature and a dependence of Paul on the Rabbinate is to be rejected. To relate Paul's concept of *καινή κτίσις* generally to Jewish apocalyptic thought is quite problematic because there is still a considerable confusion in using the term 'apocalyptic'.

Though we can agree with Mell's examination of the OT and early Jewish evidence, we cannot confirm his assumption that Paul took over the motif of new

¹³⁰ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 257.

creation from the Hellenistic early Christianity. The evidence is too weak to prove his thesis.¹³¹ Rather, it is much more likely that Paul himself introduced *καινή κτίσις* into the early Christian theology. Decisive for the understanding of *καινή κτίσις* in Paul is therefore the Pauline context in which this motif appears and the tradition-history may help us to see the Pauline setting of *καινή κτίσις* more clearly in its distinctive shape.

¹³¹ So with Baumgarten, *Paulus*, 165f, who argues against the assumptions of Schneider and Stuhlmacher which are similar to Mell.

PART II: NEW CREATION IN PAUL

§ 3) Introduction to 2Cor and Gal

3.1) The second letter to the church in Corinth

3.1.1) Authorship, character, and date

With the exception of 2Cor 6.14-7.1 which often is regarded as a redactional interpolation from a source close to Qumran,¹ the Pauline authorship of 2Cor has never been seriously contested. However, the problem at issue with 2Cor is its literary integrity which frequently has been questioned since the time of J.S.Semler (1725-1791) and up to now scholarship has not yet reached a consensus on this matter.² There is a wide range of proposals, from a seven-letter hypothesis (Schmithals) to the reaffirmation of the unity of the letter (Hughes, Wolff). However, recent commentators, in particular Furnish, have pointed to the problems evoked by a more sophisticated partition theory, therefore proposing a simpler two letter hypothesis instead: letter A - 2Cor 1-9, letter B - 2Cor 10-13. But among the supporters of this theory there is still an argument whether B is written before or after A. With good reason Furnish has argued for A as the earlier letter and B as having been written by Paul after he received new bad news about the situation in Corinth.³ This sequence is confirmed by Wolff⁴ but unlike Furnish he cannot find satisfactory evidence for a partition. 'Demnach ist an der literarischen Einheitlichkeit des 2.Korintherbriefs festzuhalten, zugleich aber auch eine Situationsänderung zwischen der Abfassung von Kapitel 1-9 und Kapitel 10-13 zu veranschlagen.'⁵ We would cautiously subscribe to Wolff's proposal even if the possibility of the two-letter theory cannot be ruled out totally.⁶

¹ E.g. Gunther, *Opponents*, 308-313; Lang, *Kor*, 308-311.

² Even a glance at the commentaries shows this.

³ 2Cor, 38-41.

⁴ 2Kor, 1ff.

⁵ Wolff, 2Kor, 193f. See the detailed discussion on pp. 1-3; 190-194.

⁶ Furnish, 2Cor, 34 is surely right when he says that 'the problems which have led to the various partition hypotheses cannot be dismissed as imaginary.' But if an satisfactory solution of these problems, such as is offered by Wolff, could be found that does not involve a partition theory, it should be preferred.

2Cor was written after 1Cor,⁷ most likely in the mid fifties (55/56 AD) 'wobei man sich aber sowohl der Unsicherheiten für die zeitliche Festlegung des 1.Korintherbriefes als auch der für den 2.Korintherbrief geltenden bewußt sein muß.'⁸ The letter was very probably dispatched from Macedonia (2.13).

3.1.2) Occasion and purpose

Soon after Paul dispatched 1Cor to Corinth from Ephesus he received bad news from Timothy about the situation of the church there. Timothy's report prompted Paul to an emergency visit to Corinth (2.1) in order to solve the problems but without success. After a short stay he returned to Ephesus from where he sent the (lost⁹) 'tearful letter' (2.4) to Corinth, possibly carried by Titus. From then on he waited desperately for the return of Titus and the news he would bring from Corinth.

After serious troubles in Asia (1.8ff) Paul went to Troas 'to preach the gospel of Christ' (2.12) and to await Titus there (2.13). But since Titus did not come Paul headed for Macedonia where he eventually met Titus, who brought him essentially comforting news from Corinth (7.6f). But it seems likely that Titus told Paul also about the intruders in Corinth (cf. e.g. 2.17; 3.1; 5.12,16). That, however, did not seem too alarming to Paul since the Corinthians finally had responded positively to his 'tearful letter.' Against this background it is quite conceivable that Paul wrote 2Cor with a twofold intention. 1) His aim is to gain back the full affection of the Corinthians. Therefore, he opens his heart wide to them (6.11f), i.e. in a very personal affectionate way Paul talks about his apostolic ministry and its theological and existential foundation. 2) At the same time 2Cor is an apology of Paul's apostolate¹⁰ providing the Corinthians with an opportunity to boast on Paul's behalf, so that they have something to set against those who judge him according to fleshly standards and thus according to the external appearance and not according to the internal quality (5.12). The Corinthians ought to see that it is God who called him (1.1). It is God who 'made his light shine in our hearts to give us the

⁷ Cf. the different stages of the collection for Jerusalem in 1Cor 16.1f and 2Cor 8.10; 9.2.

⁸ Wolff, *2Kor*, 10.

⁹ Cf. Wolff, *2Kor*, 4 and others.

¹⁰ Paul's self-apology is divided into two parts: I) 2.14-5.10, II) 5.11-6.13. 2.14-17 and 5.11 correspond in their function as introduction to I and II; 3.1 and 5.12 mark the beginning of each section (συνιστάνειν).

light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ' (4.6), and it is God who gave him the ministry of the new covenant (3.6), of the Spirit (3.7) and of reconciliation (5.18). The apostolic ministry is a treasure indeed - but 'we have this treasure in jars of clay to show that this all-surpassing power is from God and not from us' (4.7). Thus, there is no room for boasting except in weakness 'so that Christ's power may rest on me' (12.9). 'For we who are alive are always being given over to death for Jesus' sake, so that his life may be revealed in our mortal body' (4.11). After all, 2Cor 'ist das persönlichste Schreiben des Paulus und zugleich das theologisch wichtigste Zeugnis vom Verständnis des Apostelamtes als eines Leidensdienstes in der Nachfolge Jesu.'¹¹

With his remarks concerning the collection for Jerusalem (chap. 8f)¹² Paul probably wanted to conclude his letter 'dessen Schlußgrüße und -wünsche,' however, 'auf Grund erneuter, unerfreulicher Nachrichten, die relativ rasch von Korinth zum Aufenthaltsort des Paulus in Mazedonien (7,5ff.; 8,1-4; 9,4) gelangen konnten und nicht eines autoritativen (und daher zu nennenden) Informanten bedurften,¹³ durch die Ausführungen von Kapitel 10-13 ersetzt wurden.'¹⁴ Obviously, it is again Paul's apostolate which is under attack and thus Paul finds himself forced to a sharp apology for his ministry.¹⁵

3.1.3) The opponents

Many attempts have been undertaken to identify the opponents of Paul in 2Cor and have led to an impressive variety of results.¹⁶ Gunther,¹⁷ for instance, counts

¹¹ Lang, *Kor*, 10.

¹² Cf. Rom 15.25ff and 1Cor 16.1-4 where Paul also refers to the collection toward the end of the letter (Wolff, *2Kor*, 193).

With 2Cor Paul wants to undermine the charge against him that he has taken advantage of the Corinthian church by the means of the collection (7.2; 12.17; 8.20; cf. Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 82f).

¹³ Though this is, admittedly, an argument *e silentio* Wolff's theory seems very plausible. Above all it has the advantage of being able to minimize the amount of hypotheses which are usually employed to put forward a partition theory.

¹⁴ Wolff, *2Kor*, 193.

¹⁵ Note however Wolff, *2Kor*, 193: 'Wenn Paulus in Kapitel 10-13 konkreter und härter auf die Kontrahenten eingeht als in Kapitel 1-9, so liegt das nicht daran, daß er jetzt erst detailliertere Nachrichten über seine Widersacher erhalten hat; vielmehr deckt er nun ihr Treiben schonungslos auf, während er es in Kapitel 1-9 überwunden glaubte und sich deshalb mit Andeutungen (z.B. 2,17; 5,12f.) begnügte.'

¹⁶ Cf. the commentaries and e.g. Barrett, 'Opponents'; Friedrich, 'Gegner'; Georgi, *Opponents*; Gunther, *Opponents*; Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 80-97; Schmithals, *Gnosis*; Sumney, *Opponents*.

¹⁷ *Opponents*, 1.

thirteen (!) different theories about the identity of the opponents.¹⁸ This alone should make us show due caution in evaluating the evidence given in 2Cor.

What we can say is a) that the opponents in 2Cor were Jewish Christian missionaries (11.22)¹⁹ who had come to Corinth with letters of recommendation (3.1; cf. 12.11f). b) They preached a different Jesus, a different Spirit, and a different gospel (11.4). It is, however, almost impossible to get a clear picture of the actual content of their teaching. c) They called themselves *διάκονοι Χριστοῦ* (11.23) and apostles (11.5,13), and boasted in their spiritual qualities (11.18,21; 12.1,11f) criticizing Paul for his lack of spiritual powers (10.1,10; 13.1-3; also 12.1-10) and of the *σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου* (12.12) in his ministry. d) They expected and received financial support from the Corinthian church (2.17; 11.5ff; 12.13), regarding 'pay as both a right of apostles and as evidence of apostolic status.'²⁰ Therefore, since Paul served the Corinthian church for nothing, they contested his apostleship (11.7-12).

Though the opponents in 2Cor differ from those in 1Cor they could find a starting-point in the Corinthian critique of Paul²¹ (cf. 1Cor 1.17ff with 2Cor 10.1,10; 11.5f and 1Cor 9.1 with 2Cor 11.7-12; 12.13-18) and its spiritual enthusiasm (cf. 1Cor 4.8; 12-14 with 2Cor 3.7-5.10).²² 'In fact, this provides a partial explanation of how it could happen at all that the external opposition could conduct such a successful agitation against Paul at the time he was writing 2 Corinthians.'²³

¹⁸ Sumney, *Opponents*, 9 correctly points out that the 'number of hypotheses itself suggests that interpreters have given insufficient attention to issues of method and demonstrates the need for a clear and consistent method for identifying Paul's opponents.' Sumney's attempt to fill in this gap is all the more welcome.

¹⁹ This, however, does not necessarily point to a Palestinian origin of these intruders. 'Alles, was sich aus dem 2.Korintherbrief erkennen läßt, spricht eher dafür, sie als *hellenistisch-judenchristliche Verkündiger* zu verstehen.' (Wolff, *2Kor*, 6; so Georgi, *Opponents*, 315ff; Friedrich, 'Gegner,' 216ff; Furnish, *2Cor*, 53; Lang, *Kor*, 358f; Sumney, *Opponents*, 184ff). 'This picture of the opponents can be filled out with greater detail only if one is willing to admit less direct and more problematic evidence, and to proceed by hypothesis and even conjecture.' (Furnish, *2Cor*, 54) Problematic is, therefore, the assumption of a connection between the opponents and Peter (Lang), the church in Jerusalem (Lüdemann), or the *Stephanuskreis* (Friedrich).

²⁰ Sumney, *Opponents*, 182.

²¹ The charge against Paul 'that his alteration of the travel plans announced in 1 Corinthians 16 betrays vacillation on his part (2 Cor.1:17)' (Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 82) is hardly a particular feature of the anti-Paulinism of the intruders.

²² Wolff, *2Kor*, 6.

²³ Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 86.

3.2) The letter to the churches in Galatia

3.2.1) Authorship, addressees, and date

There can be no serious doubt about the Pauline authorship of Gal. The difficulties, however, arise with the questions of the identity of the recipients and the date of the letter. As is well known, there are two different theories which seek to explain the meaning of 'Galatia' in Gal 1.2: the South and the North Galatia theories.²⁴ The protagonists of the first theory refer 'Galatia' to the churches of Pisidia and Lycaonia which Paul founded on his first missionary journey (Acts 13-14). The defenders of the latter would rather find the addressees in the district of Galatia (Acts 16.6) to whom Paul sent his letter probably at the end of his third missionary journey. Naturally, the supporters of the South Galatia theory tend to date Gal earlier (early 50s AD) than the others (late/mid-50s). 'The arguments used on both sides are mostly speculative,'²⁵ but the majority of exegetes is aware of this and shows due reluctance in assuming a definite decision on this matter. Nevertheless, recent scholarship appears increasingly to favour the North Galatia theory as the more probable²⁶ together with a rather late dating of the letter. Paul, therefore, directed his letter to the churches in Galatia, a region in central Asia Minor.

Although Asia Minor was by Paul's time thoroughly Hellenized²⁷ there were also Jewish communities in the main cities of *Western* Asia Minor (Ionia, Lydia, Phrygia) as Trebilco has convincingly shown.²⁸ However, Trebilco could not provide evidence that there were also Jewish communities in *Galatia*. Therefore, we would conclude that the Christians in Galatia were mainly Gentiles (cf. 4.8; 5.2f; 6.12f) who lived in a world of ethnic, religious, and philosophical pluralism in which they were formerly involved.

Going along with the majority in favouring the North Galatia theory we, then, may assume a temporal closeness of Gal and 2Cor.²⁹ Comparing Gal to 2Cor one

²⁴ Since it is not our present concern to review a lengthy debate on this matter, we can only point to the introduction literature to the NT, such as e.g. Childs, *Introduction*, 304ff; Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 256ff; Lohse, *Entstehung*, 35ff; Schweizer, *Einleitung*, 70ff. See also Robinson, *Redating*, 55; Jewett, *Dating*, 161; Hyldahl, *Chronologie*, 64ff and the commentaries on Gal.

²⁵ Betz, *Gal*, 5.

²⁶ Fung's recent commentary on Galatians (1988), supporting the South Galatia theory, may count as an exception.

²⁷ Patte, *Paul's Faith*, 35.

²⁸ Cf. in particular Trebilco's dissertation *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (1991).

²⁹ With Schweizer, *Einleitung*, 70f who finds some probability 'den Galaterbrief ungefähr gleichzeitig mit dem zweiten Korintherbrief anzusetzen,' admitting, however, that 'die Datierung keineswegs über alle Zweifel erhaben [ist]'. See also Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 273. More reluctantly Betz, *Gal*, 11.

finds an particular affinity between Gal and 2Cor 10-13.³⁰ On the other hand, theologically Gal stands undeniably close to Rom. This observation seems to justify a dating of Gal between 2Cor and Rom. Therefore, our study begins with 2Cor although it would not make any decisive difference to begin with Gal.

3.2.2) Occasion

The occasion of Gal is clear. After his foundation of the churches of Galatia and his last visit³¹ to them Paul heard about troubles in the churches caused by intruders 'who want to pervert the gospel of Christ' (1.7), to undermine the apostolic authority of Paul, and to turn away the Galatians from the true gospel (1.6). The activity of these intruders forced Paul to write Gal in response, one of his most powerful letters, making it unmistakably clear that there is no other gospel than the one he had first preached.

3.2.3.) The opponents and Paul's response

Scholarship is still far from reaching a generally acknowledged consensus in defining the identity of the preachers of 'a different gospel' (1.6).³² The main problem arises from the fact 'that we have no primary evidence with regard to the origin, thoughts, and personalities that made up the opposition. Methodically, therefore, we must reconstruct their views primarily on the basis of Galatians alone.'³³ I.e., we can see the opponents only through the spectacles of Paul's letter and that involves the problem of 'mirror reading,' 'that is, the attempt to understand the posi-

³⁰ Cf. Borse, *Standort*, 85-106.

³¹ Schweizer, *Einleitung*, 70: 'Nach 4,13 war Paulus schon zweimal bei den Adressaten. Das griechische Wort bedeutet "das erste Mal (von zweien)", kann freilich manchmal abgeschliffen für "zuvor" verwendet werden.'

³² Among others see e.g. Barclay, *Obeying*, 36-74; Betz, *Gal*, 5-9; Howard, *Paul*, xiii-xix and 1-19; Jewett, 'Agitators'; Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 97-104; Mell, *Schöpfung*, 285-293; Mußner, *Gal*, 10-30; Patte, *Paul's Faith*, 36f.

³³ Betz, *Gal*, 5. Additionally, Betz suggests that we take into account other texts such as the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline letters, Acts, James and other Jewish Christian texts (see p.6 n.27) - but only as supplementary texts.

tion of the opponents by reversing Paul's defensive statements.³⁴ These difficulties should be reason enough to show due caution in defining the identity of the opponents.

Apparently, the opponents were Jewish Christian missionaries.³⁵ They demanded circumcision (6.12f) and obedience to the law (at least to the laws concerning the observance of days, months, and years; 4.10) from the Galatians, claiming that salvation can only be achieved as a member of Israel. Thus they called into question the *identity* and the *pattern of behaviour* of the Galatian Christians (as Gentiles).³⁶ Furthermore, they presumably acknowledged the significance of Christ for salvation - but only in connection with the Jewish law. Therefore, they denied the soteriological alternative of Paul's preaching: Christ or law (5.2-4). Instead, they offered a completion: Christ *and* law.³⁷ This must necessarily run counter to the Pauline gospel of a *solus Christus*. And since it is very likely that the opponents raised questions about Paul's apostleship,³⁸ Paul found himself in a quite uncomfortable defensive position.

If we keep this in mind the vehemence and polemic of Paul's response (cf. particularly 6.12f) becomes quite understandable.³⁹ It is the truth of the gospel, the heart and the origin of Paul's theology and ministry, moreover, it is God's revelation itself (1.12,1)⁴⁰ that is at stake, and with it the salvation of the Galatians. In other words, it is the reality of the new age inaugurated through the ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1.12) that has come under attack by the opponents' theology of law-observance. But it is exactly for this new reality that salvation for Paul can no longer depend on the observance of the law, i.e. human action, although it is certainly followed by a pattern of ethics. Salvation is solely effected by God through faith (3.26).⁴¹ Therefore, in his struggling for the Galatians and with his

³⁴ Howard, *Paul*, xiii. See also the literature listed there!

³⁵ So most scholars. It is not unlikely that there is a connection between the 'false brothers' in 2.4 and the opponents. Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 97ff (esp. 101) even identifies both (cf. however Howard, *Paul*, xiv-xix).

³⁶ Barclay, *Obeying*, 73.

³⁷ Cf. Jewett, 'Agitators,' 206. This must undermine Paul's authority even if, as Jewett suggests, the opponents did not charge Paul directly.

³⁸ Cf. Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 97f.

³⁹ However, that does not mean that Paul's characterizations of his opponents and their gospel are of no value. By means of a comparison of Gal 6.12f with Phil 3.1b(or 2)-4.1(or 3),8f Mell, *Schöpfung*, 277-284 has convincingly proved the reliability of the Pauline description.

⁴⁰ Cf. Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 97f who makes a rather strong case for the connection of both verses.

⁴¹ Schweizer, *Einleitung*, 71 (italics original): 'Entscheidend ist nicht der Vollzug oder Nichtvollzug eines Ritus, sondern die Grundhaltung des Lebens, die sich darin ausdrückt. Wird das Heil davon abhängig gemacht, dann liegt es hinter dem Tun des Menschen und wird erst durch dessen Gehorsam geschaffen. Was Paulus aber in Damaskus aufgegangen ist, ist die Umkehr: das Heil liegt vor allem daraus fließenden Tun des Menschen. Es liegt also nicht im Menschen und seinem Handeln.' Note the analogy: It was God himself who made Paul an apostle (1.1). It was God himself who called him

opponents 'kann es nicht einfach darum gehen, einen Kompromiß zu finden, der ein Zusammenleben ermöglicht (...). Es geht um eine Grundentscheidung für oder gegen ein Leben im Glauben, nämlich um die Stellung zum Mosegesetz.'⁴² At stake is not only a certain doctrine of Paul's own which the Galatians as a neutral jury⁴³ either verify or falsify but the reality of a new creation (Gal 6.15) which involves the whole of existence and abolishes the old soteriological divisions.⁴⁴ Consequently, Paul does not simply oppose circumcision by proclaiming uncircumcision, for neither can help, 'weder das Pochen auf die Beschneidung noch das auf den Verzicht darauf, sondern nur die Erkenntnis, daß mit Jesus Christus eine neue Welt begonnen hat, in der "weder Beschneidung noch Nichtbeschneidung, weder Jude noch Grieche, Sklave noch Freier, Männlich noch Weiblich" entscheidend sind (3,28), sondern nur das Leben innerhalb von Christus, der alle zu einem einzigen Menschen zusammenschließt.'⁴⁵ And this is not a matter of human possibilities or mere theological/ethical convictions but it is the work of God himself transforming the whole existence of man, it is the life in the Spirit (5.25) executed through faith that is busy in love (5.6).

3) Conclusion

As we have seen both letters are the result of Paul's struggle with Jewish Christian missionaries who had penetrated into the churches in Galatia and Corinth un-

into action, i.e. to preach the gospel which, again, is given to Paul by God himself (1.12) (cf. Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 97f).

⁴² Ibid., 72.

⁴³ So Betz, *Gal*, 24 who, against the background of Roman-Greek rhetoric and epistolography, regards Gal as an 'apologetic letter' that presupposes a situation of a court of law. 'This situation makes Paul's Galatian letter a self-apology.'

⁴⁴ Therefore, Mell, *Schöpfung*, 266 rightly takes into question Betz' approach (see n.43) asking him: 'Läßt aber für Paulus, so stellt sich die Frage, das Thema "Christus-Evangelium" es zu, eine persönliche "Selbst-Apologie" an die Galater zu schreiben?' Further critique of Betz' approach is found e.g. ibid., 266 n.21 and the literature listed there; Barclay, *Obeying*, 25 (esp. n.68 and the literature listed there); Childs, *Introduction*, 301f; 302: 'Betz's rhetorical construal runs in the face of Paul's ministry and the expressed purpose of the letter. (...) In sum, in spite of much learning and some excellent detailed insights, his theory is a massive *tour de force* which largely obfuscates the reading of the canonical text.'

What we called 'divisions' Martyn, 'Antinomies,' 420 has described as 'antinomies' or 'pairs of opposites': 'It is crucial to see that the polemic is not focused on Judaism, but rather on pairs of opposites. The advent of the Spirit has brought into being a new set of oppositional columns, a new set of antinomies, so that these antinomies have in fact replaced the oppositional columns characteristic of the old cosmos.'

⁴⁵ Schweizer, *Einleitung*, 72.

dermining Paul's teaching and authority. In the case of Gal the intruders preached a gospel different from Paul, demanding circumcision and law obedience from the Gentile Christians in Galatia. This false gospel was sharply rejected by Paul. In Gal 6.11ff, the postscript, Paul summarizes and sharpens the main topics and it is within this context that *καινή κτίσις* occurs.

In the case of 2Cor Paul's apostolic ministry is under attack. The opponents discredit Paul and his ministry, pointing instead to their spiritual experiences as a demonstration of their true apostolate. This, of course, could not remain without response on the part of Paul. We recognized, however, the change of tone from chaps.1-9 to chaps.10-13: Though Paul already knows about the intruders his argumentation in 1-9 is more theological and moderate in its use of polemic, whereas in 10-13 he directly and polemically clashes with his opponents. It is worth noting, that *καινή κτίσις* - in contrast to Gal 6 - occurs in the first moderate part of his letter within a highly theological argumentation (5.11-21).

To further our understanding of *καινή κτίσις* there are two points to be made: 1) In both cases *καινή κτίσις* occurs in a polemical context, which applies particularly to Gal. This could mean that *καινή κτίσις* was part of the opponents' teaching. Paul, then, would have used this term in order to reject the false understanding of this term on the part of his opponents. But it could as well mean - which is much more likely⁴⁶ - that he used *καινή κτίσις* in order to deepen his theological argument. In other words: Paul is forced by his opponents to clarify his position. This indicates a prominent place for *καινή κτίσις* within the Pauline theology, particularly if we keep in mind that it occurs just two times in the Pauline letters. 2) Paul's opposition in both letters emerged from a Jewish Christian background (judaizing in the case of Gal, hellenistic in the case of 2Cor). This observation leads to the assumption that Paul used *καινή κτίσις*, an eschatological term of his Jewish heritage and thus probably well-known to his Jewish-Christian opponents, in order to defend his position and to underline the radical newness of what had happened on the cross: the expected new creation, 'das Gottes Initiative vorbehaltene überwältigend-wundervolle futurische Endheil'⁴⁷ has already begun in Christ. The new creation is already present! This involves a (present!) abolition of the worldly standards such as the division of mankind into circumcision and un-circumcision or the boasting in oneself and one's special spiritual experiences.

⁴⁶ There is no indication that Paul's opponents used *καινή κτίσις* either to criticize Paul or to put forward their own case.

⁴⁷ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 257.

Thus *καινή κρίσις* reveals better than anything else the wide gap between Paul and his opponents. Again, this is another pointer to the prominent theological position of this term.

§ 4) Paul's understanding of *καινή κτίσις* in 2Cor 5.11-214.1) Translation¹

(11) Since, then, we know *the fear of the Lord*, we ⟨ ⟩ persuade men *but we have been made plain to God*, and I hope also *made plain to your consciences*.

(12) *We do not commend ourselves to you again*, but *we are giving you an opportunity to boast on our behalf²*, so that you *may have something to set against those who boast in what is seen rather than what is in the heart*.

(13) If we *were out of our mind*, it was for ⟨ ⟩ God; if we are *of sound mind*, it is for you.

(14) For Christ's love *leaves open no other way for us since we reached this judgment*: one died for all, ⟨ ⟩ therefore all died.

(15) And he died for all, that those who live ⟨ ⟩ no longer live for themselves but for him who died ⟨ ⟩ and was raised ⟨ ⟩ *for them*.

(16) *It follows that from now on we know no-one according to fleshly standards*. Though we once *knew Christ according to fleshly standards*, we do so no longer.

(17) *(And) it follows that if anyone is in Christ, he has become a new creation; the old has gone, behold, new things³ have come to be!*

(18) All this, *however*, is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave us the ministry of reconciliation.

(19) *Equally (we can say)*: God was *in Christ*, reconciling the world to himself, not counting *their transgressions* against them. And he has *established in us the word⁴* of reconciliation.

¹ Again this translation is based on the NIV of the English Bible (alterations in italics; "⟨ ⟩" signify omissions).

² Some text witnesses (P⁴⁶ & B ...) read *καυχήματος ὑπὲρ ἑμῶν* instead of *καυχήματος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* but the first reading is to be preferred since it is the only one that makes sense in the context: 1) It is *Paul's* ministry that has come under attack, his apostolate that is at stake. Therefore he tries to show the Corinthians that they have reason enough to take pride in *him* (5.13) however the opponents may discredit him. 2) Paul generally opposes a boasting in oneself which makes the alternative reading unlikely. See also Furnish, *2Cor*, 307; Martin, *2Cor*, 117; Plummer, *2Cor*, 171 and others despite Barrett, *2Cor*, 162 n.1 who also prefers the reading given by Nestle-Aland²⁶.

³ Some minor witnesses read *τὰ πάντα καινά* in v.17bβ but this is probably influenced by Rev 21.5 and may be neglected.

⁴ Some witnesses read *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* (P⁴⁶) or (τοῦ) *εὐαγγελίου τὸν λόγον* (D* F G (a)) instead of *τὸν λόγον*. Although they are too weak to alter the text they can give a hint for the correct interpretation of *λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς* (cf. comment below).

(20) We are therefore⁵ Christ's ambassadors, *that is God is making his call* through us. We *entreat* ⟨⟩ on Christ's behalf: Be reconciled to God.

(21) *The one who did not know sin he made to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.*

4.2) Notes on structure, grammar, and semantics

Οὖν (v.11) marks the beginning of a new section characterizing the following as consequence of the preceding (5.1-10). This new section (particularly vv.14-21) contains a small christological excursus⁶ which ends in v.21 as 6.1 (δὲ καὶ) indicates where Paul addresses the Corinthians directly (παρακαλοῦμεν ... ὑμᾶς). Without denying the close connection to the following chapter, we may therefore limit our study to 5.11-21.

V.11. The genitive φόβος τοῦ κυρίου is objective⁷ meaning 'the awe men have of the Lord.' The phrase occurs nowhere else in Paul and the equivalent φόβος τοῦ θεοῦ only twice, in 2Cor 7.1 and Rom 3.18. However, the Pauline origin of 2Cor 6.14-7.1 is seriously contested by many scholars⁸ and Rom 3.18 is a quotation of Ps 35.2 (LXX). Φόβος τοῦ κυρίου therefore must be understood primarily against its OT background.

There it occurs particularly in sapiential texts (see e.g. Ps 111.10; Prov 1.7; 9.10; Eccl 12.13; Job 28.28; Sir 1.11ff) describing the attitude of a whole life. The basis of the fear of God is the awe of God's judgment which determines the conduct of life, 'u[nd] von da aus wird d[as] Verhalten dessen, der sich in allem durch d[ie] Rücksicht auf Gott bestimmen läßt, als Gottesfurcht bez[eichnet]'.⁹ In 2Cor 5.11 φόβος τοῦ θεοῦ has the same basis as in the OT since v.11 clearly refers back (οὖν) to v.10, where Paul talks about the judgment seat of Christ.¹⁰ If this interpretation is correct then we are presented with an interesting parallel between v.10/v.9 and v.11:

Since we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ (v.10), we make it our goal to please him (v.9).

Since we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ (v.10), i.e. since we know the fear of God, we persuade men (v.11).

⁵ Some witnesses (P⁴⁶ D* F G etc.) omit οὖν, 'therefore,' obviously because they understand v.20 as a relative clause to v.19b: D* F G etc. add the relative particle ὃν after τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς (v.19b). Even though the textual basis for this different reading is too small to alter the text, it reminds us of the close connection between v.19 and v.20.

⁶ Hengel, 'Kreuzestod,' 62.

⁷ Robertson, *Grammar*, 500.

⁸ Cf. the excellent survey of the whole discussion in Furnish, *2Cor*, 371-383.

⁹ CK, 1116.

¹⁰ It is quite mysterious how Furnish, *2Cor*, 306 can come to the conclusion that φόβος τοῦ θεοῦ 'must be understood primarily in relation to its background in the Jewish Bible and tradition,' but 'not with reference to the *judicial bench of Christ* (v.10).' (bold by F.B.; italics original).

Note that v.10 is generally speaking about all Christians (τοῦς πάντας ἡμᾶς) whereas v.11 refers solely to the apostle (πείθομεν ... ἐλπίζω).¹¹ In other words, in v.11 Paul applies to himself what he said in v.10 in a general sense. Thus, against the background of the parallel we just pointed to we can say that for Paul 'to please God' (v.10) coincides with 'to persuade men,' i.e. to be obedient to his apostolic commission to preach the gospel.

Finally, it should be noted that 'fear' here has nothing to do with 'anxiety' or 'terror' (cf. v.8!).¹²

Πείθομεν is a conative present¹³ 'signifying the incompleteness of the action'.¹⁴ Apart from this verse the only occurrence of an active form of πείθω in Paul is in Gal 1.10, where it is used in a negative way. Apparently, this negative usage has its parallel in 2Cor 5.11 as the following slightly adversative δὲ¹⁵ indicates. Thus to 'persuade people' would be a sort of concession, whereas the phrase θεῶ δὲ πεφανερῶμεθα would function as the justification of this concession.

The connective δὲ καὶ and πεφανερῶσθαι characterize the following sequence as an extension of the preceding phrase. 'Der Übergang von der ersten Person Plural (V.11a) zur ersten Person Singular,' ἐλπίζω, 'verleiht der Erwartung des Paulus eine emphatische und ganz persönliche Note'.¹⁶

Συνείδησις derives from the Greek world, not from the OT or from Judaism. Originally, it appears to have had the noetic meaning: 'das Vermögen, sich zu sich selbst und bes[onders] sich rückblickend zu der eigenen Vergangenheit zu verhalten'¹⁷ or more concrete 'das als Zeuge auftretende eigene Bewußtsein'.¹⁸

Apart from two verses in Acts, συνείδησις occurs just in Paul and the post-Pauline letters. There it is to be seen in its relation to God. It means basically the judgment of man on him-/herself concerning his/her relationship with God and its expression in his/her conduct.¹⁹ Thus, Paul can say (2Cor 1.12): 'Now this is our boast: Our conscience testifies that we have conducted ourselves in the world, and especially in our relations with you, in the holiness and sincerity that are from God.' And in 5.11 he hopes that the conscience of *each single* (cf. the plural form συνειδήσεσιν) member of the church in Corinth will testify to the sincerity of his apostolic existence as well (cf. also 2Cor 4.2).²⁰

V.12. Οὐ πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνομεν²¹ ὑμῖν, 'we do not commend ourselves to you again,' points back to 3.1.

Διδόντες is an absolute participle (cf. 7.5; 8.19,20,24; 9.11,13 and others) as a substitute for an indicative.²²

¹¹ 'We' and 'us' in vv.11-15 are meant to be apostolic.

¹² Hughes, *2Cor*, 186; Wolff, *2Kor*, 119 who in n.368 quotes H.J.Eckstein who points to Rom 8.15, "wo Paulus den φόβος in der Bedeutung von 'Furcht' und 'Angst' für die τέχνα θεοῦ unbedingt ausschließt". Therefore, it is at least misleading when BA, 1721 renders 'da wir nun wissen, welche Furcht von dem Herrn ausgeht (wegen seines Gerichts 5₁₀).'

¹³ See BDR, § 319; Robertson, *Grammar*, 880; Furnish, *2Cor*, 306; Wolff, *2Kor*, 119 n. 369.

¹⁴ Furnish, *2Cor*, 306.

¹⁵ Furnish, *2Cor*, 307.

¹⁶ Wolff, *2Kor*, 119 n. 371.

¹⁷ Hahn, *TBLNT* 1, 555 (italics original).

¹⁸ CK, 396 (emphases original); Cf. also BA, 1568-1569.

¹⁹ See CK, 398.

²⁰ On the whole topic see e.g. CK, 396-400; Hahn, *TBLNT* 1, 555-560 and the literature stated there (see also comment below).

²¹ With the composition of the form cf. BDR, § 93.1₂.

²² BDR § 486.1: 'Paulus liebt es, nach einem Verb.fin. koordinierend mit Partizipien fortzufahren'.

Ἄφορμή “means both a starting point for an operation and the resources with which an operation can be launched.”²³

Ἴνα ... explains the purpose of Paul as he gives the Corinthians an opportunity to boast in him.

The double ἐν (ἐν προσώπῳ, ἐν καρδίᾳ) is conditioned by the verb καυχᾶσθαι, ‘to boast in something.’

Apart from any legitimate pride boasting in oneself was regarded as reprehensible even in the OT. It could be considered as an expression of downright folly and ungodliness (cf Ps 52.3; 94.3). The theological reason for rejecting any boasting in oneself is that the boasting person looks at himself and not at God, his creator and saviour; he trusts in his own virtues rather than in God.²⁴ Therefore, a true boasting can only be a boasting-in-God which includes constitutively ‘die Momente des Vertrauens, der Freude und des Dankes; und das Paradoxe liegt darin, daß der sich Rühmende von sich selbst absieht, so daß sein Rühmen ein sich zu Gott Bekennen ist.’²⁵

After ἔχητε one has to add something like τι, τι λέγειν, καύχημα, or ἀφορμήν.²⁶ Thus we may translate: ‘... so that you may have something to set against those...’.

Πρόσωπον means ‘face,’ (external) appearance,’ or simply ‘what catches a eye,’ ‘what is seen’.

The ‘heart’ (καρδία) is ‘center and source of the entire inner life.’²⁷

V.13. Γάρ has an explains the ἀφορμήν (v.12b) and the (implied) τι (v.12c).

The middle ἐξίσταμαι means ‘to be beside oneself,’ ‘to be out of mind.’ But ‘the question as to what precisely Paul meant by being beside himself, or in a state of ecstasy, is one which we are not in a position to answer with assurance.’²⁸ However, what we can say is that ἐξέστημεν stands in contrast to the following σωφρονοῦμεν ‘we are of sober/sound/right mind.’ The aorist ἐξέστημεν probably points to a particular occasion or to particular occasions in the past whereas the present tense of σωφρονοῦμεν indicates the present or usual state.

Θεῷ and ὑμῖν are *dativi commodi*.²⁹ Therefore we can translate ‘for God,’ ‘for you.’

V.14. V.14ff now give the reason (γάρ) for Paul’s apostolic life as an existence for God and for the Corinthians.

Ἀγάπη is a typical biblical term and is hardly found in profane Greek. It has a very specific meaning in biblical language describing God’s love or/and the existence founded on this love.³⁰ This

²³ Hughes, *2Cor*, 188 n.6 quoting Tasker.

²⁴ Hahn, *TBLNT* 2, 1052.

²⁵ Bultmann, *TWNT* 3, 647.

²⁶ Plummer, *2Cor*, 170.

²⁷ Martin, *2Cor*, 125. Cf. BA, 818-821; Tiedtke, *TBLNT* 1, 20-22; CK, 581-588, e.g. 586 (emphases original): The heart is primarily ‘die Stätte (...), in der sich d[as] gesamte Personleben, sowohl nach seinen Zuständen, als nach seinen Äußerungen, konzentriert. (...) D[as] Herz repräsentiert deshalb d[en] eigentl[ichen] Charakter d[er] Persönlichkeit, bzw. es verbirgt ihn (...). Hierauf beruht d[ie] mögl[iche] Entgegensetzung d[es] inneren Charakters u[nd] d[er] äußeren Erscheinung’ as for instance in *2Cor* 5.12.

²⁸ Hughes, *2Cor*, 189f. Note also that ἐξίσταμαι occurs nowhere else in the Pauline literature.

²⁹ BDR § 188.2.

³⁰ Cf. Günther/Link, *TBLNT* 2, 895 and the whole article.

love elects its object with a strong will and in doing so becomes devoted to this object in self-denial and compassion.³¹

Ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ 'may be subjective genitive (...) - Christ's love for us, or objective genitive - our love for Christ. (...) The fundamental thought here must be that of Christ's love for us, since this alone can provide a suitable introduction to what follows³² - Christ's death as a proof of God's love for us (cf. Rom 5.6!). This is, however not to dismiss³³ objective interpretation entirely.³³

Συνέχω occurs just twice in the Pauline letters, once in our verse, once in Phil 1.23. Mell wants to define something like a *Sprachgebrauch* in Paul by comparing both verses with one another.³⁴ But he fails to recognize the different voice of συνέχω in both passages (active in 2Cor 5.14, passive in Phil 1.23). Therefore, Mell's conclusion is at least questionable and of no help for the understanding of συνέχει in 2Cor 5.14. We have to look at the general use of this verb in the rest of the NT.

Active forms of συνέχω occur only in the Lukan double work (Gospel, Acts). There it can mean 'to encircle,' 'to hem in,' 'to press hard' (Lk 8.45; 19.43), 'to surround in order to guard a person' (Lk 22.63), or 'to stop something' (e.g. one's ears, Acts 7.57). Significant in all these cases is 1) that the subject of συνέχω has power to press hard, to encircle etc., 2) that the object cannot or at least does not withstand this power. This understanding fits very well into 2Cor 5.14: Christ's love is in control of Paul. It has surrounded him and is now the directing force of his entire apostolic existence 'for God' and 'for you' (v.13). There is no way left to go for Paul but the way of Christ's love. Therefore we may translate v.14a: "for Christ's love leaves open no other way for us" And if this interpretation is correct, συνέχει gives support to our understanding of ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ as a subjective genitive.

The aorist participle κρίναντας describes 'gemäß seinem Aspekt des Vollzugs eine Handlung (oder einen Vorgang), die im Verhältnis zu der Handlung des übergeordneten Verbs als vorausgegangen erscheint.'³⁵ There is a temporal and at the same time a causal aspect with this participle which is best expressed by connecting it with the preceding part with 'since' (= 'since the time when we reached this judgement' and 'because we reached this judgment'). Κρίναντας as an aorist appears to point back to an event in the past when Paul reached this judgment, his conversion.

Ὅτι is probably a ὄτι-recitativum³⁶ but it may also simply be demanded by κρίνειν.³⁷

The aorists ἀπέθανεν and ἀπέθανον point to one single event in the past. The ἄρα characterizes ἀπέθανον as the consequence of ἀπέθανεν: one died, therefore, all died. Ἀπέθανεν, therefore, includes ἀπέθανον.³⁸ In other words, there must be a sort of identification of εἷς and πάντων. Consequently, the ὑπὲρ πάντων in that statement must bear an inclusive meaning.³⁹

³¹ CK, 14.

³² Barrett, *2Cor*, 167.

³³ Cf. comment below.

³⁴ *Schöpfung*, 348 n.1.

³⁵ BR § 220.3b (emphases original).

³⁶ Cf. BDR § 470.1.

³⁷ Cf. BDR § 397.2s.

³⁸ Cf. Hughes, *2Cor*, 195; Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 65: 'it seems desperately difficult to understand "all died" as a reference to anything but the moment of the death of the one.'

³⁹ This is not recognized by Aymer, *Understanding*, 94. Cf., however, his comment on ἐν Χριστῷ, *ibid.*, 98.

V.15. Καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν is a climax⁴⁰ repeating v.14b in order to make sure that the reader recognizes the importance of what follows now. As usual the climax has an intensifying function.

Ἵνα introduces a purpose clause which carries on Paul's train of thought.

The dative cases in v.15b (ἑαυτοῖς, τῷ ... ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι) are *dativi commodi* with a peculiar possessive emphasis:⁴¹ 'that we no longer live for us, i.e. as though we belonged to ourselves, but for him, i.e. to whom we actually belong, for him who died and was raised for us.'

Ἵπὲρ αὐτῶν refers back to v.15a and v.14b and what we just said about the force of ὑπὲρ πάντων applies also to ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. Moreover, it is related to ἀποθανόντι as well as to ἐγερθέντι since the article τῷ governs both participles.

V.16. Paul carries on by drawing two consequences from v.14bf, one negative (v.16) and one positive (v.17; cf. the paralleling ὥστε). The first consequence is divided into a general statement (v.16a) and its 'Spezialfall'⁴² (v.16b, εἰ καὶ). 'V.16b ist also V.16.a untergeordnet.'⁴³

Ἐκ τοῦ νῦν, 'from now on' does 'not mean from the time of writing but "from the time at which he [= Paul] saw that One had died for all"'.⁴⁴ Νῦν clearly marks a division line between once and now (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν - 'from now on,' ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι - 'but now no longer').⁴⁵ It has a soteriological connotation such as can quite frequently be found in Paul (cf. e.g. 6.2!; Rom 5.9,11; 8.1).⁴⁶

Σάρξ in the Pauline letters tends to be used in apologetic or polemic contexts.⁴⁷ It means 'flesh' as substance of the body, 'kinship,' 'human race,' or generally 'human nature.' It always bears a religious connotation since it is always seen in an indissoluble connection with sin. It is this connection that makes the weakness, the transitoriness, and the mortality of the σάρξ. That, however, does not mean that the σάρξ is sinful by nature, nor is it the principle of sin - but its dominion and its means. The σάρξ is entirely caught and entangled by sin. This is the reason why it is associated in Gal 4.21-31 'with the old aeon, slavery, the Judaizers and the law and contrasted with the "spirit" which is associated with the new aeon, freedom and the gospel.'⁴⁸ Consequently, the life according to the old aeon is a life κατὰ σάρκα, i.e. a life with a selfish and sinful orientation;⁴⁹ equally, the life according to the new aeon is called a life κατὰ πνεῦμα. But although the 'flesh' is fully involved with sin, passages such as Phil 1.22,24 show that the σάρξ - if it has come under the dominion of Christ - is not devoid of a positive meaning even if the negative connotation is not entirely absent.⁵⁰

⁴⁰ Cf. BDR § 493.3 on "Klimax".

⁴¹ BDR § 188.3.

⁴² Michel, 'Erkennen,' 119.

⁴³ Ibid., 119.

⁴⁴ Kim, *Origin*, 13ff quoting Denney.

⁴⁵ Wolff, *2Kor*, 123: 'Das (...) νῦν οὐκέτι zeigt wie das ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν in V.16a, daß Paulus so dachte, bevor der Anbruch der Heilszeit für ihn Wirklichkeit geworden war.'

Furnish, *2Cor*, 312 points to Isa 48.6 as parallel: 'Of special interest for Paul's use of the phrase [sc. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν] in the present passage is Isa 48:6, where there is a reference to "the things from now on" (*ta kaina apo tou nyn*)'.

⁴⁶ Therefore, Michel, *Erkennen*, 117 rightly translates 'seit dem Einbruch des neuen Äons'. Cf. also Luz, *Geschichtsverständnis*, 88.

⁴⁷ Cf. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 453.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 453.

⁴⁹ Wolff, *2Kor*, 122.

⁵⁰ For Paul 'being in the flesh' (v.24) stands in contrast to 'being with Christ' (v.23); i.e. even if σάρξ is

The position directly after οἶδαμεν indicates that κατὰ σάρκα, 'according to the flesh/fleshly standards,' goes with the verb and not with the noun οὐδένα. And since v.16b is a *Spezialfall* of v.16a we have to assume the same relation in v.16b: κατὰ σάρκα goes with ἐγνώκαμεν and not with Χριστόν.⁵¹

The change of the verb from v.16a (οἶδαμεν) to v.16b (ἐγνώκαμεν) is of no significance; 'Paul needs a perfect, and εἰδέναι provides none'.⁵²

Since v.16a points to a real change that has happened (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, see above) it is very likely that v.16b, a concessive clause (εἰ καὶ), reflects a fact:⁵³ Paul once knew Christ according to fleshly standards but now he does so no longer. But the stress in this statement - and this is important to note - does not lie on Paul's relation to Christ but on the fact that Paul's way of knowing any person has been turned upside down. In grammatical terms: in a concessive clause the stress does not lie on the relation between protasis and reality but on the relation between protasis (v.16ba) and apodosis (v.16bb). Therefore, it is impossible to make any inferences (neither positive nor negative) regarding Paul's relation to the so-called 'historical Christ' on the grounds of v.16b.⁵⁴

V.17. This verse is the second, the positive consequence from v.14bf (ὥστε). V.17a is a conditional clause (εἰ) dominated again by the relation between protasis (v.17aα, εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ) and apodosis (v.17aβ, καινὴ κτίσις).⁵⁵

We have to add two verbs in v.17a. In the case of v.17aα the best is probably ἔστιν since it is 1) the least adventurous possibility and 2) its omission occurs quite frequently in the NT.⁵⁶ In the case of v.17aβ we may add γέγονεν in analogy to v.17bβ (ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινά).

Ὁν ἐν Χριστῷ see excursus below.

Ὁν καινὴ κτίσις see above Part I. Κτίσις itself, like κόσμος, is an expression for the entire created world. But there is one decisive difference: κόσμος in Paul is usually synonymous with ὁ κόσμος οὗτος, i.e. the world in its involvement with sin, whereas κτίσις stands for the whole world with regard to its origin - the creating power of God. Paul, therefore, never speaks about a καινὸς κόσμος but about a καινὴ κτίσις which is exclusively the work of God. Quite consistently, κτίσις/κτίζειν κτλ. are always used with God as the agent.

The aim of God's creation is man with whom its whole existence is at stake. And since it was through man that sin, transitoriness, and death came into the world 'sind (...) alle Geschöpfe darauf angewiesen, daß Gottes Platzhalter in der Schöpfung mit Gott durch ein Eingreifen Gottes in Ord-

valued positively it still belongs to the old aeon.

On σάρξ see further BA, 1473-1475; CK, 982ff; Seebaß, *TBLNT* 1, 342ff; Schweizer, *TWNT* 7, 123-138.

⁵¹ Besides, if κατὰ σάρκα goes with a noun its position is always directly after this noun. Note, moreover, that there is no αὐτόν in v.16bb as would be expected if κατὰ σάρκα goes with Χριστόν. And above all with Wolff, *2Kor*, 125 we have to point to the context 'in dem es um die Existenz des Apostels, nicht aber um Wesensaussagen über den Christus geht.'

⁵² Barrett, *2Cor*, 170.

⁵³ BDR § 374: 'εἰ καὶ "wenn auch", "obwohl" (Einräumung einer Tatsache).'

⁵⁴ See also Furnish, *2Cor*, 330f.

⁵⁵ BDR § 371.1: 'εἰ mit Indikativ aller Tempora bezeichnet lediglich die Annahme und stellt eine logische Schlußfolgerung dar.'

⁵⁶ Cf. BDR §§ 127f in particular § 127.1.

nung gebracht wird.⁵⁷ The destiny of man cannot be separated from the destiny of the whole world (cf. particularly Rom 8.18-21).⁵⁸

V.17b is a clear allusion to Isa 43.18f (LXX)⁵⁹ and explains in its hymnic style (ἰδοὺ) v.17aβ (καινὴ κτίσις): the καινὴ κτίσις is the fulfilment the prophets promise.

V.18. Τὰ πάντα in this verse does not mean 'all being, all existence,' or 'all things' generally.⁶⁰ It rather ties up what Paul has said previously particularly in v.17:⁶¹ 'all this,' i.e. the καινὴ κτίσις in Christ implying that the old has gone and new things have come to be.

The following aorist participle construction (τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ... δόντος ...) explains how God has brought about 'all this'.

Καταλλάσσω/καταλλαγή are characteristically Pauline terms. They occur nowhere else in the NT. The basic meaning is 'to (ex)change/(ex)change, to compensate/compensation,' and then, as the result of the change/compensation, 'to reconcile/reconciliation.'⁶² Καταλλάσσω with a personal object ('to reconcile somebody to someone,' or 'to (ex)change something for something'⁶³) is unique in the NT.⁶⁴

Excursus: The origin of the Pauline thought of reconciliation

Some scholars⁶⁵ suggest that Paul has taken the concept of reconciliation from the Hellenistic background where it could be used in the context of the reconciliation between a ruler and his people or generally between enemies. But Hofius has correctly noted the decisive difference between such a concept of reconciliation and the Pauline thought: 'In den Zeugnissen der Herrscherverehrung (...) geht es um die Befriedung der in sich zerstrittenen Welt (...). Die

⁵⁷ Eßer, *TBLNT* 2, 1080.

⁵⁸ On κτίσις see e.g. Eßer, *TBLNT* 2, 1073ff; Foerster, *TWNT* 3, 999ff; Petzke, *EWNT* 2, 803ff et al.

⁵⁹ Μὴ μνημοεύετε τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα μὴ συλλογίζεσθε. ἰδοὺ ποιῶ καινὰ ἃ νῦν ἀνατελεῖ. Cf. the terminology in 2Cor 5.17: the neuter τὰ ἀρχαῖα which occurs nowhere else in the NT, ἰδοὺ followed by a verb and the neuter καινὰ (without article).

⁶⁰ In this sense we can find it quite frequently in Paul, particularly in passages with a hymnic style and often where τὰ πάντα is object (cf. e.g. Rom 8.32; 1Cor 8.6; 12.6; 15.27f; Gal 3.22; Phil 3.21).

⁶¹ Cf. the similar usage of τὰ πάντα in 4.15; 12.19 and esp. in 1Cor 11.12. Therefore, we cannot confirm Furnish's suggestion (2Cor, 316) that τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ 'echoes a doxological formula (see especially Rom 11:36 ...), apparently adopted by the early church from the Hellenistic synagogue - which had, in turn, adapted it from a formula of Stoic pantheism.' Such an interpretation would raise the question as to what we could consider to be the connective element between the thought of the preceding verse(s) and v.18a.

⁶² Cf. CK, 129f; Vorländer, *TBLNT* 2, 1307-1309.

⁶³ Cf. LSJ, 899. To take 'to change' as the basic meaning of καταλλάσσω is also confirmed by GLRB that renders 'to change' for ἀλλάσσω and expounds the prefix κατα- as strengthening or intensifying the meaning of the verb. 'Not unfrequently, κατά merely increases the sound of the word to which it is prefixed' (II, 633).

⁶⁴ Even if Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 320f is right when he says that 'nach griechischen Eheurkunden ist καταλλάσσομαι terminus technicus für die Wiederversöhnung getrennter Eheleute' and that Paul knew the word from this usage (cf 1Cor 7.11) - this cannot be the background of the active usage with personal object as we find in 2Cor 5.18f.

⁶⁵ E.g. Breytenbach, *Versöhnung*, 45ff; F.Hahn, "Siehe..."; 247; Hengel, 'Kreuzestod,' 75; Windisch, *2Kor*, 194.

entscheidende Frage ist hier: Wie kommt die in sich heillose Welt in sich selbst zum Frieden? Bei Paulus geht es um die Versöhnung der gottfeindlichen, weil sündigen Menschheit mit Gott. Und die entscheidende Frage lautet: Wie kommen die vor Gott verlorenen Menschen zum Frieden mit Gott?⁶⁶ Therefore, the origin of the term *καταλλάσσω* κτλ. in Paul might well be the Hellenistic background, but the idea of reconciliation is clearly different in Paul.⁶⁷

Neither is it a derivation from Judaism⁶⁸ which argues as follows: Sin makes God to be enemy of men. Reconciliation in this context means that God gives up his enmity and his anger as a result of atoning activities of men. But this turns Paul's argumentation upside down. In Paul it is the sinful humanity that needed the change, never God. It is surely not pure accident that Paul says that God (subject!) has reconciled us/the cosmos (object of God's reconciling activity!).

Finally, Käsemann's thesis⁶⁹ of a cosmological concept of reconciliation which Paul took over from the liturgy of the Hellenistic church must be rejected since nowhere in profane Greek do *καταλλάσσω* and its derivatives have a cosmological meaning as Bieringer has emphasized adding: 'Überall geht es um das "personale" Verhältnis von Menschen untereinander oder zwischen Gott und den Menschen.'⁷⁰

A much more convincing theory is offered by Hofius.⁷¹ According to him, 'haben wir in dem Versöhnungsgedanken eine durchaus eigenständige Konzeption zu erkennen, die Paulus unter dem prägenden Einfluß seiner Heiligen Schrift, der Septuaginta, ausgebildet hat.'⁷² Paul's conception of reconciliation has two constitutive aspects: 1) God's *act* of reconciliation in Christ's atoning death, 2) God's *word* of reconciliation. There is no parallel to such an idea within the Hellenistic world. 'Zu den^{beiden} für Paulus konstitutiven Aussagen läßt sich nur *eine einzige* Entsprechung namhaft machen: das *alttestamentliche* Zeugnis von dem Gott, der sein in Sünde verlorenes und zur Hinwendung zu ihm gänzlich unfähiges Volk durch das Wunder der Neuschöpfung (= Vergebung) aus der Verfallenheit an die Sünde befreit und ihm die damit gewährte Gottesgemeinschaft im prophetischen Heilswort gültig zuspricht.'⁷³ Hofius makes plain that this idea of reconciliation is decisively influenced by the message of Deutero-Isaiah, although he admits: 'Paulus hat von Deuterojesaja zwar nicht die Begriffe *καταλλαγή* und *καταλλάσσειν* empfangen - ihre religiöse Verwendung war ihm vielmehr im hellenistischen Judentum vorgegeben (s. etwa 2Makk 1,5; 5,20; 7,33; 8,29). Wohl aber fand er bei Deuterojesaja die *Sache* bezeugt, die er mit diesen Begriffen sachgemäß zur Sprache bringt'⁷⁴ (cf. Isa 52.13-53.12; furthermore 40.2; 43.25; 44.22; 52.6-10 and 45.22). Moreover, Hofius demonstrates⁷⁵ that reconciliation in Paul must be seen in relation to the idea of atonement as the reference to the blood of Christ in Rom 5.9f indicates: 'Since we have now been justified by his blood, how much more shall we be saved from God's wrath through him! For if, when we were God's enemies, we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son, how much more,

⁶⁶ 'Erwägungen,' 9f.

⁶⁷ Against those who argue in favour of this view Hofius' warning (ibid., 14 n.14) of confounding 'Begriffsgeschichte und Traditionsgeschichte' is well justified.

⁶⁸ Wolter, *Rechtfertigung*, 35-104.

⁶⁹ In 'Erwägungen,' 48ff.

⁷⁰ 'Versöhnung,' 321.

⁷¹ 'Erwägungen,' esp. 9-14.

⁷² Ibid., 11.

⁷³ Ibid., 14 n.14.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 11.

⁷⁵ See his essay 'Sühne und Versöhnung,' in id., *Paulusstudien*, 33ff.

having been reconciled, shall we be saved through his life.' Although this idea of atonement stands in continuity to the cultic atonement in Lev 10.17 and 17.11,⁷⁶ Hofius emphasizes⁷⁷ that we cannot ignore the decisive discontinuity: 1) In the OT men are actively involved in the atonement. In Paul God alone is active. 2) The OT atonement is a matter of repetition, the atoning sacrifice of Christ is once and for all (Rom 6.10). 3) The atonement in the OT applies only to unintentional sins, but Christ's atoning death is for *all* sins. 4) In the OT atonement is given to Israel alone, but the atoning Christ event is the reconciliation of all mankind.

The active aorist καταλλάξαντος points to a single event in the past. Διὰ Χριστοῦ supports this view since it is a synonym for Christ's death on the cross as the parallel in Rom 5.10 clearly shows.

Like διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος and διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης (3.8f) διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς refers to Paul's apostolic ministry, i.e. to proclaim the gospel. Since this ministry is not entrusted to all Christians the ἡμῶν in v.18c, and thus also the ἡμῶν of v.18b, must refer to Paul (and implicitly to all true apostles) rather than to the Corinthians.

V.19. The introduction of v.19, ὡς ὅτι, has often been regarded as a *crux interpretum*.⁷⁸ Apart from our passage it occurs in this form only two more times in the *Corpus Paulinum* but neither 2Cor 11.21 nor 2Thess 2.2 are of any use for our verse since in both cases ὡς ὅτι has the meaning 'as though' which cannot be employed in 2Cor 5.19.⁷⁹ Taken in its basic function as a comparative particle we could understand ὡς in v.19a as a comparison, or as an explicative equivalent to v.18b. Then, using ὡς Paul's intention would be to tell the reader/hearer: 'This can be compared with the following,' or 'this is equivalent to the following,' or simply 'that is.' From that it follows quite naturally to understand ὅτι as a ὅτι-*recitativum* (or better *-declarativum*) which is best 'translated' as a colon introducing the following sentence.⁸⁰ Thus ὡς ὅτι establishes a relation of equivalence between v.18b^{+c} and v.19a.⁸¹ In other words, v.19a must be seen as a parallel to v.18b^{+c}.

The major problem in v.19, however, is the ἦν and its role within the structure of the verse. Scholarship offers essentially three interpretations: 1) θεὸς is the predicate to ἦν with καταλλάσσω

⁷⁶ Apart from Hofius cf. Gese, 'Sühne,' 85ff and the important monograph of his disciple Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*.

⁷⁷ 'Sühne,' 48f.

⁷⁸ Cf. Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 299-304; Hofius, "Gott...," 20 n.21; Hughes, 2Cor, 206 n.45; Mell, *Schöpfung*, 346 n.16 and others.

⁷⁹ Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 303: 'Die Bedeutung "als ob" für ὡς kann in 2Kor 5,19 jedoch nicht vorliegen, da Paulus dort keine Aussage macht, die er als falsch bzw. nicht zutreffend charakterisieren will.'

⁸⁰ With Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 303; against BDR § 396e, § 353. Mell, *Schöpfung*, 346, following Käsemann, also argues for a ὅτι-*recitativum* that introduces an early Christian tradition. But there is no necessity to assume a traditional sentence or a Pauline self-quotation simply because v.19 is opened up by a ὅτι-*recitativum*. It could as well have a declarative sense. Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 322: 'ὅτι-*recitativum* entspricht unserem Doppelpunkt und läßt als solches die Herkunft der folgenden Aussage offen. Diese kann also sowohl vom gleichen Autor stammen als auch ein Zitat darstellen.' Apart from this observation Bieringer has shown convincingly and in a scholarly way (cf. particularly pp.312-323) that there is no real evidence (neither the usage of κόσμος, nor of καταλλάσσω) to justify our considering v.19f as being traditional.

⁸¹ Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 303 might well be right in stating that ὡς has 'zusätzlich leicht kausale Bedeutung. 5,19 hat also, insofern als es sich von 5,18 unterscheidet, "unterschwellig" begründende Funktion für die vorausgehende Aussage.'

as subject⁸² (= 'it was God who in Christ was reconciling the world to himself'),⁸³ 2) ἦν is an auxiliary verb and must be seen together with καταλλάσσων forming a *conjugatio periphrastica* with θεός being the subject (= 'God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ'),⁸⁴ 3) θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ is an independent sentence (with ἦν being the main verb) followed by a *participium conjunctum* (καταλλάσσων) (= 'God was in Christ, (when he was) reconciling the world to himself').⁸⁵ The first interpretation can be ruled out with considerable certainty since in this case we would have to expect the article with the participle.⁸⁶ The decision, however, between the second and the third interpretation is not easy. But nevertheless for several reasons we would argue in favour of the third possibility⁸⁷ taking θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ 'als Ausdruck der Seins- und Handlungseinheit zwischen Gott und Christus':⁸⁸ Firstly, the strongest argument that speaks against the periphrastic understanding is that ἦν and καταλλάσσων are significantly torn apart which is very unusual for a periphrastic construction. Secondly, in addition to the first argument we have to note that the *conjugatio periphrastica* is generally very rarely used in Paul.⁸⁹ Finally, some supporters of the periphrastic interpretation point to the parallel construction of v.18b and v.19a. But this is no argument because it is not clear which kind of parallelism is meant - a synonymous (that would indeed indicate a periphrastic construction) or a synthetic (that would speak for our interpretation). Thus, this argument cuts both ways.

Nevertheless, on the grounds of the textual evidence we would argue for a synthetic parallelism between v.18b and v.19a.⁹⁰ First of all we have to note the different tense of the participles καταλλάξαντος (aorist) and καταλλάσσων (present). With the latter Paul probably wants to emphasize the simultaneousness of the main verb and the present participle.⁹¹ The difference between v.18b (καταλλάξαντος) and v.19a (καταλλάσσων) 'besteht nun darin, daß der Aorist auf den Kreuzestod narrativ im Sinne des Ereignisses als solchen eingeht, während 5,19a Christi Tod deskriptiv darstellt, indem die Aussage das Geschehen in seiner Dauer beleuchtet.'⁹²

⁸² Cf. BDR § 353.2b₇; § 396.2e.

⁸³ Apart from BDR cf. e.g. Barrett, *2Cor*, 177; Eichholz, *Theologie*, 198f; Hengel, 'Kreuzestod,' 63,73 and others.

⁸⁴ Cf. e.g. Bultmann, *2Kor*, 162; Schlatter, *Paulus*, 566; cf. also the translations of NIV, RSV.

⁸⁵ Cf. e.g. Hofius, "Gott..."', 19 esp. n.19; Lang, *Kor*, 301f.

⁸⁶ Cf. Rom 3.11f; 2Cor 9.12; Phil 2.13; also Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 306; Hofius, "Gott..."', 19 n.19.

⁸⁷ So with Hofius, "Gott..."', 19 n.19; Lang, *Kor*, 301f; Windisch, *2Kor*, 192 and others (cf. Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 306 n.27; Luther, Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, Hughes, Stanley).

⁸⁸ Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 307. Bieringer, however, argues against such an interpretation and he is surely right in so far as he points to the improbability of an understanding of this phrase as a statement about the divine nature of Christ the man, or about the 'Perichorese von Gott und Christus' (306). He emphasizes (307), 'daß ein solches Interesse im Kontext von 5.19a überraschen würde und daß θεός bzw. ἐν Χριστῷ sich kaum zum Ausdruck solcher Gedanken eignen.' The thrust of Paul's argument is certainly different.

⁸⁹ Therefore, Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 310 has to refer to Luke in order to find an example of a periphrastic construction in which the participle does not stand directly with εἶναι (Lk 1.10). But even in Luke (in his writings we find the periphrastic construction more than anywhere else in the NT) such a construction remains unusual. Moreover, it is generally questionable to use Lukan material to argue within a Pauline context.

⁹⁰ With Hofius, "Gott..."', 20.

⁹¹ BR § 220.3 (emphases original): 'Verhältnismäßig oft [bezeichnet] (...) das Partizip des Präsens gemäß seinem Aspekt der Dauer eine Handlung (oder einen Vorgang), die im Verhältnis zu der Handlung des übergeordneten Verbs als *gleichzeitig* erscheint'.

⁹² Bieringer, 'Versöhnung,' 310. He continues: 'Das periphrastische Imperfekt bezeichnet eine unabgeschlossene Handlung in der Vergangenheit ...'. This raises two problems: 1) This and similar state-

Another difference that points to a synthetic understanding is that in v.18 God is acting διὰ Χριστοῦ, in v.19, however, ἐν Χριστῷ.⁹³ It is rather unlikely that both have exactly the same meaning.⁹⁴ Διὰ Χριστοῦ is clearly instrumental, whereas ἐν Χριστῷ, although it also bears an instrumental meaning, has basically an inclusive force.⁹⁵ Therefore, the ἐν Χριστῷ of v.19 is an extension of the διὰ Χριστοῦ of v.18 which is characteristic for a synthetic parallelism.

The last observation that speaks for a synthetic parallelism is that Paul extended the object of reconciliation from ἡμῶς⁹⁶ (v.18b) to κόσμος⁹⁷ (v.19a). Thus v.18b and v.19a are like concentric circles with v.19a as the outer circle. Or in other words, the reconciliation in its universality (v.19a) is the basis for the reconciliation of the church (v.18b). The reconciliation of the κόσμος includes the reconciliation of the church.

Thus, we could make plain that v.18 and v.19 are shaped according to the pattern of a synthetic parallelism. And this result gives support to an interpretation of καταλλάσσω as *participium conjunctum* (see above). But if we understand it that way, the conclusion is almost inevitable that we have to link ἐν Χριστῷ to θεὸς ἦν rather than to καταλλάσσω. However, since such a usage of ἐν Χριστῷ occurs nowhere else in the Pauline letters we would have a real problem - unless we could find a satisfactory understanding for such a usage within the context. And this can be done: 'God was in Christ' is the main sentence in v.19a. The following construction with the *participium conjunctum* is an 'adverbielle Nebenbestimmung' containing 'einen (...) *Begleitvorgang* zur eigentlichen Satzaussage'⁹⁸ (θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ): 'God was in Christ when he was reconciling.' I.e. ἦν and καταλλάσσω are closely linked up. In other words, the purpose of Paul's statement is not to outline a doctrine of the divine nature of Christ but to emphasize the *Seins- und Handlungseinheit* between God and Christ in reconciling the world.⁹⁹ Thus, against the background of the instrumental διὰ Χριστοῦ in v.18b Paul wants to say: It is not only that God worked *through* Christ but even more he, God himself, was present in Christ working out the reconciliation of the world. And this thought fits

ments occur in the section in which Bieringer wants to prove (he hasn't yet!) the periphrastic interpretation but he already uses it as a part within his argumentation. In other words, he argues in a circle. 2) Paul nowhere indicates something like the 'incompleteness' of reconciliation. The opposite is true (cf. v.18b καταλλάξαντος!), reconciliation is done! Therefore, if Bieringer's statement about the 'periphrastische Imperfekt' is correct (scholarship has not yet reached a consensus on this matter) it is even more striking that this would not fit into Paul's argumentation. Thus this observation strengthens our interpretation of καταλλάσσω as *participium conjunctum*.

⁹³ This can be said even if we leave the question undecided whether ἐν Χριστῷ in v.19 goes with θεὸς ἦν or with καταλλάσσω.

⁹⁴ Even if we favoured the periphrastic interpretation in v.19a the prominent and emphatic position of ἐν Χριστῷ would at least make us hesitate to assume an identity of both phrases.

⁹⁵ See excursus below. Wedderburn's understanding of the difference between διὰ Χριστοῦ and ἐν Χριστῷ goes in the same direction even though he formulates rather carefully in 'Observations,' 90: 'Perhaps the difference is that in Paul's usage ἐν *can* carry with it a sense of togetherness, association (σύν) with the agent of reconciliation, an idea that is not present in διὰ as such.'

⁹⁶ Ἡμῶς refers to the apostle(s) as the parallel ἡμῶν in v.18c makes clear: not every Christian has been given the 'ministry of reconciliation.'

⁹⁷ Κόσμος here means obviously 'mankind' (cf. αὐτοῖς in v.19b and καταλλάσσω which is only used with women/men as object!) and can be seen in parallel to πάντος in v.14b and v.15a. On the general usage of κόσμος see below notes to Gal 6.14.

⁹⁸ BR § 246.1.

⁹⁹ Cf. above n. 88.

perfectly well into the framework of a synthetic parallelism. Therefore, the singular usage of ἐν Χριστῷ cannot be held against an interpretation of καταλλάσσω as *participium conjunctum*.

The participles καταλλάσσω and λογιζόμενος¹⁰⁰ are coordinate and both are subordinated to the main verb ἦν (v.19a). But the change of the tense in the third participle θέμενος 'erfordert (...)' zwingend, in v.19c die Fortsetzung des Hauptsatzes v.19a zu erblicken':¹⁰¹ 'God was in Christ ... and established ...'.

The middle voice of τίθημι has the same meanings as the active voice, 'bezeichnet aber außerdem, daß das Subjekt die Handlung für sich od[er] zu seinen Zwecken, mit seinen Mitteln, an sich u.ä. vollbringt.'¹⁰² Note, furthermore, that τίθημι in Paul is almost always used in a, literally, fundamental sense: 'to establish something that is inviolable, basical, ultimate.' This is no wonder since τίθημι occurs frequently with God/Christ as subject (Rom 4.17; 9.33; 1Cor 3.11; 12.18,28; 15.25) or in connection with Paul's preaching of the gospel (1Cor 3.10; 9.18).

V.20. Ὑπὲρ is simply demanded by the verb πρεσβεύω (cf. Eph 6.20 the only further occurrence in the NT). Πρεσβεύω τινί/ὑπὲρ τινος means 'to be ambassador for someone.' An ambassador is someone 'who carries a message for or in some other way represents another'¹⁰³ which, in this case, is Christ. Ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ means not just 'on Christ's behalf,' nor 'in Christ's place,' 'as if he were not present. Rather, the phrase (...) must be interpreted on the basis of the verb (...): "with the full authority of Christ who has sent me"¹⁰⁴(cf. 1Cor 1.17).

Ὡς has the same comparative meaning as in v.19a establishing a relation of equivalence between v.20aα and v.20aβ¹⁰⁵ (although the subject in both parts is different ('we' in v.20aα - 'God' in v.20aβ)!): Being Christ's ambassador has its equivalent in God making his call through us.

Ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν is a comparative *genitivus absolutus*.¹⁰⁶ The basic meaning of παρακαλέω is 'to call; to appeal; to address someone.' Παρακαλέω is used "von jeder Art d[es] Zuredens, bei dem es auf eine bestimmende Einwirkung abgesehen [sc. ist]".¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁰ Λογίζομαι τὰ παραπτώματα τινί - 'to count the trespasses against someone.' Furnish, *2Cor*, 319, following Stuhlmacher, finds that 'the non-Pauline plural [sc. παραπτώματα] is one of the marks of the apostle's dependence on a traditional formulation.' But this is almost doing violence to the evidence, because this is just a *formal* observation. Had Furnish had a closer look at the character of the 10 παράπτωμα-passages in Paul he would have had to concede the questionableness of his argument: in Rom 5.15,16,17,18,(20) the singular is simply a necessity since this passage, the Adam-Christ-typology, deals with the one concrete trespass of Adam. Therefore, we have only five further occurrences left (two plural, three singular forms) which can be taken into account. Apart from the fact that there is almost a balance between singular and plural, it is more than problematic to infer a Pauline or non-Pauline usage of παράπτωμα on such a small textual basis.

¹⁰¹ Hofius, "Gott..."; 18f.

¹⁰² Menge-Güthling, 685; emphases original.

¹⁰³ Furnish, *2Cor*, 339. He continues: 'Thus, e.g., the terms were used in the Greek-speaking part of the Roman Empire for an official representative of Caesar (Latin: *legatus*):' Hence, using πρεσβεύω Paul wants to underline the public and official character of his ministry.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 339.

¹⁰⁵ Differently BDR § 425.

¹⁰⁶ BR § 246.2.f; Furnish, *2Cor*, 339.

¹⁰⁷ CK, 570 quoting v. Hofmann. On the basis of this definition CK distinguishes (579; emphases original) '1) Jem[an]d[e]n anrufen, damit er etw[as] tue, = bitten (...) 2) Jem[an]d[e]n anrufen, herbeirufen, um ihm etw[as] zu sagen, ihm zureden, u[nd] zwar freund[lich] zureden. a) ermahnen (...) b) = zureden, ermuntern, trösten'.

The first person plural in v.20 (πρεσβεύομεν, δι' ἡμῶν, δεόμεθα) refers to Paul as apostle because it is the apostle's mission (the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς, v.18b) to preach the message of reconciliation.

Δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ must be understood in analogy to ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ ... πρεσβεύομεν: Paul is ambassador for Christ and his mission as ambassador is 'to entreat for Christ.'

The phrase καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ, 'be reconciled to God,' explicates δεόμεθα. The imperative καταλλάγητε in its aorist¹⁰⁸ passive form (*passivum divinum*) is based on the fact 'that God has already acted for reconciliation'¹⁰⁹ (v.18f). So, looking back on v.20 we find an interesting parallel structure: v.20aα Paul's action, v.20aβ emphasizing God's action and, analogically, v.20ba emphasizing Paul's action, v.20bβ emphasizing God's action.

V.21. This verse is closely linked up to the preceding imperative (καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ) which gave v.21 its subject - God. Therefore, v.21 is likely to be an explication of the 'Be reconciled' in v.20b stating the result of this imperative.¹¹⁰

Here, as almost always in the Pauline letters, ἁμαρτία is used in the singular form which does not primarily signify sin as an act but sin as the nature or the quality of the act.¹¹¹ It is a 'Gattungsbegriff.'¹¹² Moreover, the singular 'sin' in Paul has always the connotation of 'power'¹¹³ (cf. Rom 3.9; 5.21; 6.6,11ff): men are either ruled by sin or by Christ, i.e. they are either sinners or Christians. No compromise is possible. So, we can say: 'Sünde ist (...) eine Größe, die den Sünder in seinem *Sein* betrifft und zeichnet. Sie ist die vom Menschen her vollzogene Zerstörung der personalen Verbundenheit mit dem ihm zugewandten Gott und als solche die fundamentale Verfehlung der Daseinsbestimmung, von Gott her und für Gott zu leben.'¹¹⁴ Therefore, the sinner, i.e. whoever¹¹⁵ is ruled by sin, has forfeited his life before God, because he cannot restore the relationship to God. Mankind is ineluctably stigmatized by sin. This is the reason for Paul's use of ἁμαρτία in v.21 as a metonymy, 'derzufolge das Abstraktum "Sünde" für das Konkretum "Sünder" steht.'¹¹⁶

Γινώσκω 'is to be interpreted as a reference to "practical knowledge" (in the Hebraic sense);'¹¹⁷ thus γινώσκειν ἁμαρτία, 'to know no sin,' means 'to have no actual experience of sin, involvement with it,'¹¹⁸ or 'to live in an intact, unspoiled relationship with God,' i.e. 'to be righteous.' The subject of the phrase τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν is Christ. So, it is Christ, the righteous one, who had nothing to do at all with sin, who was not involved with sin in any way.

¹⁰⁸ The aorist gives the imperative an urgent note. It makes the imperative stronger than the present imperative, cf. BDR §§ 335; 337.

¹⁰⁹ Furnish, *2Cor*, 339.

¹¹⁰ Note the parallel in 4.6: The imperative is followed by an explication that shows the effect the divine imperative had. In analogy to 4.6 we may therefore paraphrase 5.21: 'God, who said, "Be reconciled," made him who did not know sin to be sin for us, so that we in him might become the righteousness of God.'

¹¹¹ CK, 139.

¹¹² Ibid., 139.

¹¹³ BA, 85: Paul 'faßt d[ie] S[ünde] beinahe persönl[ich] als e[ine] herrschende Gewalt.'

¹¹⁴ Hofius, 'Sühne,' 42 (emphases original).

¹¹⁵ *De facto* - all since all are sinners (Rom 3.10-12,23; 5.12,19).

¹¹⁶ Hofius, 'Sühne,' 47.

¹¹⁷ Furnish, *2Cor*, 339. Also Wolff, *2Kor*, 132: 'γινώσκειν ist hier wie auch Röm. 3,20; 7,7 im Sinne des alttestamentlichen וָדָבָר gebraucht'.

¹¹⁸ Furnish, *2Cor*, 339.

The aorist ἐποίησεν points back to a single event in the past - the dying and rising of Christ.

Ἐπερ ἡμῶν must be seen in analogy to the ὑπερ πάντων in v.14 and v.15:¹¹⁹ on the cross God made Christ who did not know sin at all to be identified with sin for us, i.e. as our inclusive representative. Thus we can say, 'Paul is thinking (...) of Christ's identification with sinful humanity.'¹²⁰

V.21b gives account of the aim and the purpose (ἵνα) of this identification: 'so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.' In analogy to the metonymy ἁμαρτία we must understand δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as metonymy: the abstract 'righteousness' stands for the concrete 'righteous one.'

Ἐν αὐτῷ is a substitute for ἐν Χριστῷ and refers back to v.17.

Excursus: The Pauline usage of ἐν Χριστῷ

The question of how to understand the Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ has always attracted NT scholarship.¹²¹ But up to now it has not reached a consensus on this matter. Moreover there are already calls for a 'fresh monographic treatment'.¹²² Of course it is not our aim to fill in this gap nor to give account of the whole discussion at due length. But an excursus on ἐν Χριστῷ simply cannot go without some - for our purposes limited - remarks on the debate among NT scholars.

In 1957/8 F. Neugebauer published his essay on 'Das paulinische "in Christo"',¹²³ which is essentially an extract of his still influential dissertation.¹²⁴ Without going into details we can describe his basic thesis as follows: 1) the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ is decisively determined by the meaning of Χριστῷ which is always 'the resurrected crucified or the crucified resurrected'.¹²⁵ 2) From the observation, 'daß Paulus ἐν-Konstruktionen überaus häufig als adverbiale Bestimmungen, m.a.W. als Umstandsbestimmungen, verwendet'¹²⁶ he infers an equal usage for ἐν Χριστῷ. Both lead him to interpret this phrase as 'bestimmt durch das eschatologische Geschehen von Kreuz und Auferstehung, einbezogen sein in diese "Geschichte"'.¹²⁷

Recently A.J.M. Wedderburn¹²⁸ has criticized Neugebauer's definition of ἐν Χριστῷ as *Umstandsbestimmung* 'for adverbial or adjectival phrases are not "definitions of circumstances" in the sense that they are definitions by circumstances ("of circumstances" as a subjective genitive) but in the sense that they define the circumstances in which something is or happens (objective genitive) and the circumstances which are thus defined may be the time, the place, the manner, etc., in which it is or happens'.¹²⁹ But "Christ" and "Lord" are not the sort of words

¹¹⁹ Thus, ἡμῶν here is a synonym for πάντων in v.14f or/and for κόσμος in v.19.

¹²⁰ Furnish, *2Cor*, 340.

¹²¹ Cf. literature given in Neugebauer, *NTS* 4, 125 n.1 and Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit*, 107 n.3.

¹²² Wedderburn, 'Observations,' 91.

¹²³ *NTS* 4 (1957/58), 124-138.

¹²⁴ *In Christus: eine Untersuchung zum paulinischen Glaubensverständnis*, published in Göttingen (1961).

¹²⁵ *NTS* 4, 127.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 129.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 132.

¹²⁸ 'Observations,' *JSNT* 25 (1985), 83-97.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 83f.

that can be easily classified according to the categories that we have mentioned; he is not a time or a place, an abstract noun or an instrument in the normal sense of these terms.¹³⁰

For his own interpretation Wedderburn - unlike Neugebauer - starts with an description of the general usage of ἐν in Paul distinguishing eight possibilities.¹³¹ He concludes his survey saying that 'in the light of all this one might well question whether any one way of use is likely with ἐν Χριστῷ (Ἰησοῦ) and ἐν κυρίῳ'.¹³² Finally, by the means of an interpretation of Gal 3.8+14 he makes plain an instrumental or causal usage for some other passages emphasizing, however, that 'this will by no means explain all uses of "in Christ (Jesus)", but these other uses will have to be investigated anew and individually, bearing in mind the whole possible spectrum of meanings of adverbial and adjectival phrases with ἐν and without invoking as a background religio-historical parallels which in fact offer no really comparable usage'.¹³³

Wedderburn is certainly right in criticizing Neugebauer's definition of ἐν Χριστῷ as *Umstandsbezeichnung*. Christ is not an *Umstand* but a person! But Neugebauer's incorrect *definition* does not necessarily imply that his *interpretation* is wrong. Be that as it may - what can be said at any rate is that there is no way back behind Neugebauer's statement that the meaning of Χριστῷ is decisive for the understanding of ἐν Χριστῷ. Any investigation of this phrase has to bear in mind that Christ is the directing force of all of Christian's life and thus it is only natural to expect something like 'determined by Christ',¹³⁴ or to put it in Neugebauer's categories, 'bestimmt durch Christus' as basic meaning for ἐν Χριστῷ.¹³⁵ On the other hand we cannot consider Wedderburn's observations on the general usage of ἐν in Paul as being irrelevant for the understanding of the 'in Christ'-phrases. It would be hard indeed to claim for any one way of use. But this is no unreconcilable contradiction to the assumption of a basic meaning or tendency for ἐν Χριστῷ such as mentioned above. E.g. the basic meaning of 'determined by' can easily go with the instrumental/causal use that Wedderburn has convincingly shown for Gal 3.8,14 and some other passages.

To sum it up: For an interpretation of ἐν Χριστῷ in Paul we have to recognize both - that the meaning of the phrase is defined by Χριστῷ *and* by ἐν. The meaning of 'Christ' is the same in all 'in Christ'-passages whereas the meaning of 'in' can vary and with it the thrust of the phrase as a whole. In other words, it is the context in which the phrase occurs that is decisive for the understanding of ἐν Χριστῷ.

In 2Cor 5.11-21 ἐν Χριστῷ occurs three times, 1) in v.17, 2) in v.19 and 3) in v.21 (ἐν αὐτῷ).

Ad 1) V.14f speak of Christ's death for all. In Christ's death all died. It is striking that these verses reflect the idea of an inclusive representation.¹³⁶ V.17 now draws the positive consequence from v.14f and therefore we must understand the ἐν Χριστῷ in the light of the previous statement and of our considerations concerning the general meaning of 'Christ' in

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 87f.

¹³¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 84-86.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 87.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 89.

¹³⁴ Cf. Merk, *Handeln*, 16.

¹³⁵ However, Neugebauer himself is running danger of loosing this perspective of Christ as person when he defines 'in Christ' as 'bestimmt sein durch das eschatologische *Geschehen* von Kreuz und Auferstehung.' (*NTS* 4, 132; emphases F.B.) This comes close to a depersonalization of Christ. It is not primarily an event that determines a Christian's life but a person! The latter always includes the former.

¹³⁶ Cf. comment below and also § 6.1.

Paul (see above): εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, i.e. whoever is included in the crucified and resurrected Christ, the inclusive representative. Thus the ἐν in v.17 could best be described as 'inclusive' and we can paraphrase v.17 as follows: 'Whoever is included in the crucified and resurrected Christ, the inclusive representative, has become a new creation.' Therefore, the conception of καινὴ κτίσις must be seen in a close relationship to the idea of the inclusive representation that took place in the death of Christ.

Ad 2) We have already shown¹³⁷ that ἐν Χριστῷ in v.19 goes with θεὸς ἦν which is an unique usage within Paul. We came to understand Paul's statement not as outlining a doctrine of the divine nature of Christ but as emphasizing the *Seins- und Handlungseinheit* between God and Christ. God not only acted *through* Christ but he was present *in* the person of Christ working out the reconciliation of the world.

Ad 3) Quite similar to v.17 is the usage of v.21. Here we find again the idea of an inclusive representation which is now, however, related to the idea of atonement: God identified Christ with sin as such (note the singular ἁμαρτία!) and thus with the whole 'sinful humanity'¹³⁸ so that ἐν αὐτῷ 'we might become the righteousness of God' (v.21b). This identification of Christ and sin/sinful humanity, done at the cross,¹³⁹ is likely to give the ἐν αὐτῷ the same inclusive force as in v.17 but with a different emphasis: as the inclusive representative Christ has done away with sin, i.e. in his inclusive death Christ has atoned for our sin, he bore and carried away the sin of many (Isa 53.12; cf. also v.5f). We may, therefore, paraphrase: '... so that - being included in this atoning identification between Christ and sin which happened at the cross - we might become the righteousness of God.'

It is not unlikely that O.Betz is right suggesting a relationship between Isa 53 and 2Cor 5.14-21¹⁴⁰ particularly regarding the ἐν Χριστῷ: 'Sprachlich und sachlich ist dieses ἐν Χριστῷ vielleicht von Jes 53, 5 herzuleiten: Es bedeutet "in der Gemeinschaft" (בְּיַדְיָהוּ) mit dem Herrn, der für uns gestorben und auferstanden ist'.¹⁴¹ The suffering servant of God carried away the sins of 'the many' (Isa 53.11f; also vv.5,6,10). 'Sühne, das Tilgen der Sünde, und Veröhnung als Aufhebung der Feindschaft, lassen sich von Jes 53,5 her dem Tode Jesu zu schreiben'.¹⁴² Jesus Christ is the suffering servant of Isa 53, 'der am Kreuz die Weissagung Jes 53 uns zu gut erfüllt hat'.¹⁴³

The δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ 'ist Gottes Gerechtigkeit als Einheit von Gericht und Gnade, die er hat, die er handelnd erweist, indem er Gerechtigkeit herausstellt und im Freispruch als sein Urteil mitteilt, die aber ebenso als neues Leben in die Königsherrschaft hineinzieht und zum Dienst verpflichtet'.¹⁴⁴ God's righteousness is absolutely bound to Christ's atoning death on the cross. It is revealed in the gospel of the cross (Rom 1.16f) and it prevails through the preaching of this gospel which effects faith. In Christ God showed his own righteousness and at the same time applied it to sinful humanity.

¹³⁷ See above notes to v.19.

¹³⁸ Furnish, *2Cor*, 340.

¹³⁹ Cf. above notes to ἐποίησεν.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. also Hofius, 'Erwägungen,' esp. 11-14.

¹⁴¹ 'Übersetzungen,' 214.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 213.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 216. ¹⁴³ This is not to subscribe entirely to Betz' interpretation of ἐν Χριστῷ which needs some questioning. But his general observations on the parallels between ἐν Χριστῷ, particularly within the context of 2Cor 5.14-21, can hardly be denied.

¹⁴⁴ Schrenk, *TWNT* 2, 205f.

Thus δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is God's *giving* and *given* righteousness and therefore, the alternative *genitivus subjectivus* or *genitivus auctoris*¹⁴⁵ for δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ cannot be upheld. So, we may summarize with Hofius:¹⁴⁶ 'Die δικαιοσύνη ist Gottes rettende Heilsmacht und sein erlösendes Heilshandeln, die von ihm bereitete und gewährte Heilsgabe wie auch - als die den Glaubenden zwar qualifizierende, niemals aber zu seiner eigenen Qualität werdende Größe - die streng als Gottes Werk verstandene Heilsteilhabe. Als die δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ist sie zugleich die von Gott kommende, die dem Menschen im Glauben zukommende und ihn in seinem Sein vor Gott bestimmende δικαιοσύνη πίστεως.'¹⁴⁷

4.3) Comment

'We make it our goal to please the Lord, whether we are at home in the body or away from it. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive what is due to him for the things done while in the body, whether good or bad.' (2Cor 5.9f) With these emphatic words Paul has just concluded the first part of his apology of his apostolate (2.14-5.10) trying to persuade the Corinthians of the integrity of his ministry: Paul leads his apostolic life in the face of Christ's judgment seat, well aware that any impurity of his conduct as apostle will be judged by Christ severely. So there is no point in trying to deceive the Corinthians concerning his motivation. It is important to note that the judgment seat of Christ is related to the *conduct* of Paul's ministry and *not* to the ministry as such. That is to say, Paul does not preach the gospel for the fear that all people must appear before the judgment seat, but he preaches the gospel *with integrity* for the fear of the judgment seat. Christ's judgment seat has no constitutive function for Paul's apostolate.

With v.11 Paul opens up the second part of his apology (5.11-6.13) which concentrates on the nature and the contents, rather than on the conduct, of his apostolate. Paul now addresses the Corinthians directly and comments on the criticism of his opponents who apparently took offence at Paul's persuasive way of preaching the gospel. This way of preaching the gospel probably sounded too Paul-centred to the opponents. Paul, however, does not reject this reproach as such. He concedes that he is preaching in a persuasive way - but he has a decisive legitimation: he knows the φόβος τοῦ κυρίου, the awe of the Lord's judgment or in other

¹⁴⁵ Cf. in particular the positions of Käsemann, e.g. in 'Gottesgerechtigkeit,' 160ff, and Bultmann, e.g. in 'ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ,' 470ff.

¹⁴⁶ "'Rechtfertigung...,'" 125 (emphases original).

¹⁴⁷ On the whole discussion of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ cf. e.g. Kertelge, *EWNT I*, 784ff; Lührmann, (notes on literature!) *TRE* 12, 414ff; Michel, *Röm*, 157ff; Schrenk, *TWNT* 2, 205ff; Stuhlmacher, *Röm*, 30ff.

words, he is preaching persuasively because he lives in the face of the judgment seat of Christ which brings the brightest light into the remotest corner of everyone's heart. That is to say, the whole life of Paul is like an open book before God who knows that Paul's preaching, though persuasive, has been done with integrity. And Paul is hopeful that all Corinthians, if they only ask their consciences (συνειδήσεσιν), i.e. if they only ask themselves honestly in the face of God, would have to testify to this integrity.

Anticipating a possible objection Paul continues (v.12): 'No, this is not to commend ourselves to you again (cf. 3.1), but we are just giving you an opportunity to boast on our behalf, so that you may have something to set against those who boast in what is seen rather than what is in the heart.' Against the background of this description it seems likely that Paul's opponents called into question Paul's apostolic ministry because they expected the appearance of an apostle to be startling and accompanied by spiritual manifestations such as they could apparently claim for themselves but could not find with Paul. As far as we know Paul's appearance was anything else but startling (cf. 1Cor 2.1,3; 2Cor 11.30; 12.5,9,10)! For Paul, now, it is not the external appearance with or without spiritual manifestations that is decisive but 'what is in the heart' (cf. 1 Sam 16.7), i.e. decisive is what comes from the centre and the source of the human life, and that is invisible.¹⁴⁸ The legitimacy of the apostolic ministry cannot be judged on the basis of the external appearance. Moreover, as we saw in the notes on v.12 already, there is no legitimate way of boasting other than in God (cf. also 1Cor 1.31). Therefore, a boasting in oneself or in one's own virtues such as Paul's opponents apparently do is to be rejected. But one thing remains puzzling: why does Paul want the Corinthians boast on *his* behalf? Hasn't he just said that he does not commend himself to the Corinthians? Has he been caught up in a self-contradiction? At the first sight we could think so. But after a closer look at v.13f we should be able to solve this puzzle.

It is rather clear from v.12 that Paul wants the Corinthians to pick up his case against the intruders. His aim is in the following to provide an ἀφορμή, i.e. a) a starting point for their argument with the opponents and b) the resources with which this argument could be executed.¹⁴⁹ V.13, however we may interpret this dark verse, expounds this ἀφορμή: the Corinthians can boast on Paul's behalf bec-

¹⁴⁸ Findeis, *Versöhnung*, 112 might well be right to understand ἐν καρδίᾳ as a reference to 4.6: 'der wahre Apostel rühmt sich der im Herzen aufgeleuchteten Erkenntnis der Doxa Gottes ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ.'

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Hughes, *2Cor*, 188 n.6 quoting Tasker.

ause he does not live for himself for 'if we were out of our mind, it was for God; if we are of sound mind, it is for you.' No matter in which state of mind Paul was or is - his apostolic life was and is a life for God and for the church and not for himself. Again it seems appropriate to regard v.13 as another indirect reaction to the opponents in Corinth. Paul, then, would reject their demand for ecstatic experiences as signs of true apostleship. He does not, however, deny the existence of such experiences generally: they are possible and he, Paul himself, has had them. But they are not constitutive at all for the apostolic ministry. They are directed to God alone (v.13a; cf. 1Cor 14.2), therefore they are of no use for men and should be kept from the public. Thus they cannot serve the purpose of the true apostolate, i.e. to spread the gospel, since this can only be done if people come to understand which, again, demands a sound-minded preaching of the gospel. Therefore, if there is a sign of true apostleship then it is to preach the gospel in a sound state of mind so that it is intelligible for everyone. So, it is not the ecstatic experience that is a sign of the true apostleship of a person but the intelligibility of its preaching. In other words, in v.12f Paul indirectly says that his opponents boast in their external appearance (including their ecstatic experiences) because their concern is just for themselves. His concern, however, is only for the Corinthians and therefore his aim is to be as transparent as possible in his ministry as apostle.

But which is the constitutive and driving force behind Paul's existence for others? It is Christ's love (v.14). This love is constitutive in that it is the reason that Paul has come to the judgment of v.14b which happened at his conversion and it is the driving force in that it is the subject of Paul's ministry since he reached that judgment. But what is Christ's love? It is neither a feeling nor something immaterial. Christ's love means Christ himself as the one who died and was raised for us. It was Christ himself, the incarnate love, who was crucified and raised for Paul; it was Christ himself who met and called Paul on the road to Damascus and from that time on Christ himself has left open no other way for Paul than to preach Christ as the crucified and raised Lord, as the love in person who has turned his life upside down. In the self-revelation of the crucified and resurrected Lord on that road God spoke his powerful, creative word that changed Paul entirely and in doing so he committed to Paul the apostolic ministry, i.e. to preach the word that has made him anew not as 'word of men but as it actually is, the word of God' (1Thess 2.13) and as 'power of God' (1Cor 1.18). In other words, Paul met the good news in person which is Christ in his love for us. And since that time this good news determines Paul's life entirely. 'Christ's love leaves open no other way for us' (v.14a) than to preach the gospel. The gospel is - to say it with Käsemann - Paul's destiny (cf. 1Cor 9.16). 'Das Evangelium als sein Schicksal (...) "stellte ihn

zugleich in den Gehorsam und in die Liebe, weil mit ihm die Macht der Gnade in sein Leben einbrach und es in ihren Dienst nahm. Sein Schicksal ist das Evangelium, dem zu dienen Seligkeit ist."¹⁵⁰

These considerations lead us to another aspect of what is meant by 'Christ's love'. Meeting Christ's love Paul could not remain the same. The persecutor of Jesus and the Christian church (Acts 9.1-5; Gal 1.13) became the 'apostle of Jesus Christ' (2Cor 1.1) whose sole concern is for God and the church (2Cor 4.5; 5.9,13,15). Christ's love, manifested in his death and resurrection *for* all, evoked Paul's love for Christ, manifested in his apostolic existence *for* God and *for* the church. Christ's love for Paul has freed Paul to his love for Christ.¹⁵¹ Thus ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ includes both, Christ's love for Paul and Paul's love for Christ although the former has absolute priority over the latter. There is no love of Paul for Christ without Christ's love for Paul.

And at this point now we can give the answer to our puzzling observation above: Paul wants the Corinthians to boast on *his* behalf, because boasting on his behalf is nothing else but boasting in Christ who in his love is the driving power and the source of Paul's entire apostolic existence. Such a boasting, of course, would have certain significant implications for the Corinthians at which Paul has surely aimed with his invitation to boast on his behalf: first of all it includes the recognition that Christ himself has authorized Paul and appointed to him the true apostolic ministry; secondly that Paul's gospel is the only true gospel, and thirdly that the opponents are false apostles and that their claims and their teaching must be rejected.

We have already seen that Christ's love has seized Paul at his conversion driving him to preach what he has recognized at that very event as the source of his new existence: 'one died for all, therefore all died.' (v.14b) I.e., on the cross Christ died for all, therefore all died on the cross. Christ's death was not just Christ's

¹⁵⁰ Ernst Käsemann, quoted in Eichholz, *Paulus*, 40. Cf. again Käsemann quoted in *ibid.*, 40: "Für (Paulus) gilt, wie für die antike Tragödie, daß das Schicksal das Maß des Menschen ist. Allerdings ist Schicksal für ihn allein das *Evangelium*, weil er nur ihm eschatologische, nämlich Gegenwart und Zukunft bestimmende Macht, Entscheidung über ewiges Leben und ewigen Tod, Seligkeit und Verdammnis zuerkennen kann. Diese Gottesmacht drängt ihn ruhe- und schonungslos als ihren Sklaven durch die Mittelmeerwelt."

¹⁵¹ Cf. Mell, *Schöpfung*, 356: Paul expounds 'die "Liebe Christi" (V.14a) als eine Kreisbewegung (...): sie kommt anfänglich von Christus zu den Menschen, um von den Menschen wieder zu Christus zu gelangen. Als *Movens* des paulinischen Apostolats kennzeichnet die Liebe Christi dynamische Reziprozität. Mit anderen Worten, Paulus deutet vom Wesen wahrer Liebe her das Christusergebnis: Liebe ist nur dann wahre, d.h. liebevolle Liebe, wenn sie den Liebe empfangenden zur (Gegen-)Liebe desjenigen befreit, der ihm seine Liebe schenkte.' Cf. also 1Cor 13.5 where Paul describes true love as never ever self-seeking.

death but at the same time the death of all. This can only mean that in the very event on the cross an identification or an inclusion happened between the one (εἷς), Christ, and all (πάντες).¹⁵² Christ's death *is* the death of all. This has significant implications for the meaning of 'for' (ὕπερ). It cannot mean just a representation 'in the name of all,' as though those who are represented were absent; nor can it just mean a substitution 'in the place of all,' as though those who are substituted for were not present. And for the same reason an interpretation of ὕπερ as 'for the benefit of' falls short of what is meant by this particle. Rather, ὕπερ must be understood in an inclusive sense. Any interpretation that goes without that inclusive force of ὕπερ must fail. This is, however, not to claim for the total absence of the ideas offered by the interpretations of 'for' we just mentioned. The idea of representation, for instance, can easily be connected to the idea of inclusion and it is obvious that Christ's death is also for the benefit of all.¹⁵³ So, we may paraphrase v.14b: 'one died as inclusive representative for all, therefore all died because they all are inclusively represented in him.' We will see that this idea of an inclusive representation is strongly influenced by the OT theology of atonement.

But to recognize the inclusive force of that statement does not answer all questions. How can anyone possibly die the death of anybody else? In other words, in which sense was Christ's death inclusive, i.e. the death of all? It is inevitably clear that ἀπέθανον (v.14bβ) unlike ἀπέθανεν (v.14bα) cannot mean dying in the literal, physical sense. Otherwise the death of Christ would have been the depopulation of the earth. On the other hand, it would be ridiculous, not to say heretical, to hold that Christ died only figuratively. Ἀπέθανεν surely includes the physical death. But how, then, can Paul possibly see our - however we may understand that - 'figurative' death happen in the physical death of Christ on the cross? He must have seen beyond Christ's physical death another dimension of

¹⁵² One could ask whether we have to understand this identification against the background of the idea of Christ as the second Adam (cf. Rom 5.12ff; 1Cor 15.20-23,45-49). Undoubtedly there is a theological affinity particularly between Rom 5.12ff and 2Cor 5.14f. But the thrust of those passages is clearly different: in 1Cor 15 and Rom 5 Adam stands for sin and death, Christ, however, for righteousness and life whereas 2Cor 5 doesn't speak of Adam at all but of *Christ's* (not Adam's!) death for us. Therefore, it is at least problematic to link 2Cor 5.14f too closely to Rom 5.12ff and 1Cor 15.20ff,45ff and we should better be wary of interpreting 2Cor 5.14f in the light of the Adam-Christ-typology. Cf. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 348 who comes to a similar conclusion regarding the relation between the 'with Christ' language and the Adam-Christ typology.

¹⁵³ However, the idea of substitution does not quite fit into the framework of inclusion because substitution is *exclusive* by nature: substitution means to replace something by something else, i.e. there is no place anymore for the replaced thing. So, with regard to the 'for' of Christ's death we should better not speak of substitution.

death. So, when Christ died he did not just die physically but also in the sense of this second dimension. An identification, then, would have been taken place between the 'figurative' side of Christ's death and the 'figurative' death of all. These considerations, however, leave us alone with two questions: 1) What is this other 'figurative' dimension of Christ's death? 2) What about the physical side of the death of all?

Ad 1) It is the context of v.14f that leads us to the answer: it is the theological dimension. V.21 tells us that God made Christ to be sin for us. God identified Christ with sin, i.e. with the power that rules over humanity making them all sinners, and thus identified him with sinful humanity. If we now interpret v.14b in the light of v.21 we may duly formulate: the death of Christ for all was the death of sin and thus of sinful humanity. That event has had earth-shattering consequences. The power of sin has been broken, it has become powerless, because sin died at the cross. The death of Christ was, so to speak, the suicide of sin. On the cross sin executed its own sentence of death. In other words, in his sovereignty God used death, the instrument by which sin ruled over humanity (Rom 5.21), to destroy sin and its power in Christ in whose resurrection 'the saying that is written' has already 'come true: "Death has been swallowed up in victory. Where, O death, is your victory? Where, O death, is your sting?"'(1Cor 15.54f) Thus, the cross of Christ, i.e. his death *and* resurrection,¹⁵⁴ is the decisive event in God's salvation-history - it marks the turn of the ages: *ante crucem* humanity, world, and history were stigmatized by sin and death. Sin reigned through death. But now, *post crucem*, a new humanity, a new world, and a new history have come into being that stand under the sign of grace and righteousness. Grace reigns through righteousness (Rom 5.21; 6.14). In Christ the eschaton entered our world which, on the cross, did not only question our world but also created a new world with a new reality - an eschatological reality in which 'the old has gone' and 'new things have come to be' (v.17).

To conclude: the ἀπέθανεν of v.14b must be seen in its theological dimension, i.e. Christ's death is the death of sin or, as Paul himself puts it, 'the death he died, he died to sin once for all' (Rom 6.10). It is on the level of this theological dimension that an identification between ἀπέθανεν and ἀπέθανον took place: To be included in Christ's death means to enter with him a new eschatological world in which sin has lost all its power. Christ died to sin, therefore we died to sin (Rom 6.10,2,11). Note, finally, that although this is a theological statement it is neverthe-

¹⁵⁴ Both cannot be separated. Paul never speaks of Christ's death without implying his resurrection and vice versa. Death and resurrection are counted as *one* event.

less real. Christ really died to sin, so we really died to sin. Sin and death really lost their power over Christ, so sin and death really lost their power over humanity. At this point, however, the second question becomes very urgent:

Ad 2) What about the physical death? Isn't the physical death also an expression of the power of sin? But if sin really lost its power, why do people still die?

We already saw that Christ's death for us was not inclusive in the physical but in the theological sense: In Christ, the inclusive representative, we died to sin and its power. I.e. Christ did not die our physical death. Nobody can possibly die the physical death of anyone else. We still have to die our physical death. But - and that is decisive - the power that used the physical death as a destructive instrument, sin, has been destroyed in Christ's death. Therefore, death could not hold Christ. God did not leave the world in a powerless no man's land - he raised Christ from the dead, thus appointing to him all power and glory. The risen Christ is the *κύριος*. So, the new life of the risen Lord is life through death, his power through weakness, his glory through dishonour (cf. 1Cor 15.43). Now, if this is true, if sin that used the physical death as a destructive instrument has been destroyed indeed and if the risen Lord has become the new power instead, then the conclusion is inevitable that the physical death must now be an instrument of the lordship of Christ, i.e. an instrument of grace and righteousness that leads to life just as Christ's death led to life. In other words, there must be a life after death, there must be a resurrection. Death, then, should have lost its terror. And this is exactly what we find in Paul. He can say that he 'would prefer to be away from the body and at home with the Lord' (2Cor 5.8; cf. also Phil 1.21,23). For him the physical death opens the gate to eternity: 'Now we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, an eternal house in heaven, not built by human hands.' (2Cor 5.1). Moreover, Paul even emphasizes the necessity of the physical death using the picture of the seed that 'does not come to life unless it dies.' (1Cor 15.36) 'So will it be with the resurrection of the dead. The body that is sown is perishable, it is raised imperishable; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.' (1Cor 15.42-44) The physical death ('the sown body') obviously has quite a positive meaning in Paul and this positive meaning is based - how else could it be? - on the resurrection ('the raised body') of which Christ has become the firstfruit (1Cor 15.20,23). It is only against the background of the resurrection (of Christ) that death can be viewed in such a positive way, not as final destruction but as ultimate liberation.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Ebeling's powerful sentences in 'Sühnetod,' 28: 'Aus dem Todesleben wird durch "des Lebens

Finally, there is another important aspect of Christ's death. This aspect is the inevitable consequence of the fact that we always have to consider Christ's death in connection with his resurrection. We just have described Christ's death ($\alpha\pi\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$) for us in two dimensions which indissolubly belong together. The first dimension was of theological nature: Christ died to sin once for all, i.e. the power of sin resulting in death is overcome. The second dimension concerned Christ's physical death. We found that only on the level of the first dimension Christ's death was inclusive: Christ died to sin, therefore all died to sin; sin has no longer dominion over Christ, therefore sin has no longer dominion over anybody. But there is a new dominion - Christ is the new Lord, because he has been raised from the dead. And here we discover the other aspect of Christ's death: Since all died in the death of one, i.e. since in the one all died to the power of sin, they all in the one already share the eschatological life of the one who is the firstfruit of the resurrection (1Cor 15.20,23). In other words, they all live under a new eschatological dominion - under the dominion of grace which is the grace of Christ. To be included in Christ's death, to be 'in Christ,'¹⁵⁶ means at the same time to share his eschatological life in the midst of the old dying world. This is the benefit of Christ's death for all. And that benefit does not only apply to the people who lived at the time of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection but to all people at any time. It is the benefit of Christ's death that it irrevocably inaugurated the new age. With regard to the benefit of Christ's death we could, therefore, say that Christ's 'death continues on into the present.'¹⁵⁷

We may conclude now: 1) In Christ's death the power of the old age, sin and death, has been replaced by the power of the new age, grace and life. So, sin and death have lost their power over Christ - and over all, since all are included in his death. This change of powers, inaugurated in the past on the cross, is irrevocable. Therefore, it determines the past, the present, and the future of mankind and the whole world. 2) Since death has been deprived of its power Christ's physical death became the passage to new life through his resurrection. Therefore, the life of the risen Lord is life through death. We are not included in Christ's death in this physi-

Leben" [Paul Gerhardt] wahres Leben, Auferstehungsleben, das den Tod hinter sich läßt, auch wenn es ihn noch vor sich hat, ewiges Leben schon mitten in der Zeit. Irdisches Leben und Sterben sind, weil ausgerichtet auf den Herrn, ihm gehörig und deshalb ihm zu überlassen. Dadurch wird alles neu, auch wenn es mit den Lebensumständen noch weiterhin beim alten bleibt und vieles im Argen liegt. - Aus dem ~~Tode~~ hingegen wird sozusagen nichts. Der ihn für alle erlitten hat, ist des Todes Tod geworden, der "Todfresser" [Martin Luther].'

¹⁵⁶ Cf. the excursus above.

¹⁵⁷ Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 350.

cal sense. Analogously, we have not been raised with Christ physically. But just as Christ's death to sin made his physical death a passage to new life through his resurrection, so our death to sin in Christ will make our physical death a passage to new life. The powers of the old age, sin and death, already lost their power over us; therefore, through our physical death we will only gain life.¹⁵⁸ Thus, we already share Christ's eschatological life, as Paul expresses in his famous words: 'I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me.' (Gal 2.19) Nevertheless, our earthly life still stands under the sign of death (cf. 2Cor 4.10f; 6.9; 1Cor 15.31), a powerless death, however, since it liberates to life, to 'our heavenly dwelling' (2Cor 5.2,4) which is guaranteed by the Spirit whom God has given to us as a deposit (2Cor 1.22; 5.5). But there is another category that characterizes our earthly life - faith. The quotation of Gal 2.20 we just mentioned, continues: 'The life I live in the body, I live by faith in the son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.' So, it is through the Spirit and through faith that we share Christ's eschatological life. It is life in the midst of death, riches in the midst of poverty, 'power in the midst of weakness.'¹⁵⁹

In v.15 Paul explicitly points to the benefit and the purpose of Christ's death saying that 'he died for all, that those who live no longer live for themselves but for him who died and was raised for them.' But who are the ζῶντες, 'those who live'? Has Paul not just declared that 'all died' (v.14)? Are the ζῶντες 'those who are alive in the body and are still in this world'?¹⁶⁰ That, however, seems unlikely since Paul's argumentation has a theological thrust. Rather, ζῶντες 'refers to those who, having died with Christ, have been raised to new life in him'.¹⁶¹ This is almost inevitably made clear by the fact that Christ's death for all - we already mentioned that - is always and necessarily associated with his resurrection. That means, to be included in Christ's death as the inclusive representative implies at the same time to share his new eschatological life. In other words, there must be also an inclusive dimension in Christ's resurrection. And this is exactly what Paul says in v.15: 'He died and was raised ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.' It is the same inclusive ὑπὲρ that applies to Christ's death *and* to his resurrection. Note again that it does not include the physical side of either Christ's death or his resurrection. Mankind still has to die physically and the bodily resurrection is yet to come. But in Christ's death, sin and death already have lost their power over mankind and in Christ's resurrection

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 45.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 359.

¹⁶⁰ Plummer, *2Cor*, 175.

¹⁶¹ Furnish, *2Cor*, 311; cf. also Martin, *2Cor*, 132.

grace and life already have become the new dominion of all. Therefore, with regard to the meaning of ζῶντες we may conclude: Since v.14b and v.15a describe Christ's death as ὑπὲρ πάντων, we have to maintain the same meaning for the ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν in v.15c and consequently, for the ζῶντες of v.15b. So the ζῶντες are those who, in Christ's death, died to the dominion of death, and who, in Christ's resurrection, came to life under the dominion of new eschatological life. So, we can paraphrase v.15: 'And he died for all, that all, having died in Christ and thus having come to new eschatological life in Christ, no longer live for themselves but for him who died and was raised as inclusive representative for them.'

After these considerations we may describe the purpose of Christ's death as follows: Christ died as an inclusive representative for all, that all, having been transferred to the dominion of new eschatological life (= Christ's life), may lead their lives under that new eschatological dominion (cf. Rom 6.6,11,14,18). It is for the inauguration of this new eschatological dominion of life that Christ died and at the same time it is for the inauguration of all into that new eschatological dominion that he died as the inclusive representative of all. In Christ's death the new eschatological dominion has been created and his death for all has enabled all to lead a new life under that dominion. And this new life is a life *for* Christ who died and was raised for all. In other words, the sign of the new life is love for Christ. So, Paul's apostolic existence *for* God and *for* the church is the only adequate expression of the eschatological life which Christ's love has given to him. And thus, Paul's 'pro-existence' is the unmistakable pointer to his true apostleship. A life for oneself has no place in that new eschatological dominion. It belongs to the old dominion of sin which has been abolished at the cross. It is very likely that Paul stresses the negative side of the purpose of Christ's death (ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν) in order to reveal the Corinthians the true motivation of his opponents: Christ died for all, so that all no longer live - as Paul's opponents obviously do (cf. v.12f) - for themselves. So the opponents cannot possibly be true apostles since they pervert the new way of living in the new dominion (life for Christ) into the old way of living that has gone (life for oneself). I.e. they do not recognize the change of powers that has taken place at the cross. With this, Paul emphasizes the integrity of his apostolate and provides another argument for the Corinthians which they could set against the opponents (cf. v.12).

V.16 draws the first of two consequence from vv.14f. This first consequence looks back, pointing to what has been overcome by Christ's death: 'It follows that from now on we know no-one according to fleshly standards. Though we once knew Christ according to fleshly standards, we do so no longer.' Against the background of the universal validity of vv.14f the ἡμεῖς of v.16a could refer to Paul, the

Corinthians, or even to mankind. If we keep in mind the apologetic purpose of our passage, we would have to argue for the first *and* the second possibility. Then, Paul's intention with v.16a would be to draw the Corinthians on his side - against the opponents. V.16, then, would be a reproach to the address of the opponents: They claim to be true apostles and to know Christ but they still live as if the world had not been changed at all in Christ's death. They try to live in the new dominion according to standards which belong to the old dominion of sin, in short: according to fleshly standards. So, for instance, it is according to those categories if they know and recognize him, the apostle Paul, only according to his external appearance. With their behaviour *κατὰ σάρκα* they trample, as it were, upon the eschatological reality that has been inaugurated on the cross. 'But *we*, i.e. you Corinthians and me, we recognize the new reality, we do live according to this new eschatological reality, and we do not know any person according to those old, fleshly standards, do we?' The answer of the Corinthians can only be: no, we no longer know any person *κατὰ σάρκα*. But to agree with Paul on this matter bears the important implication for the Corinthians that they, unlike the opponents, also do not know and judge Paul and his apostolate according to external, fleshly standards. To conclude: V.16a is probably best understood rhetorically with the effect that Paul almost imperceptibly leads the Corinthians to recognize his apostolate and to make a common front with them towards the opponents. So, the *ἡμεῖς* of v.16a is rhetoric and associative referring to both, Paul and the Corinthians.¹⁶²

Ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν does not point to *either* the turn of the ages that has taken place in Christ's death *or* to Paul's or the Corinthians' conversion - it refers to both since for Paul both belong inextricably together,¹⁶³ even though the former has always absolute priority over the latter. Christ's death on the cross is the basis and the presupposition of Paul's conversion - and also the conversion of the Corinthians. In the eschatological Christ event and in their, i.e. in the Corinthians' and Paul's, conversion they were transferred into a new dominion receiving new life and thus receiving new standards according to which they should lead their new lives under the new dominion. And one of these new standards is that their old eyes were replaced by new eyes so that they now see everybody through different eyes, in a

¹⁶² Cf. also Breytenbach, *Versöhnung*, 130.

¹⁶³ So with Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen,' 5; cf. on the other hand Bultmann, *2Cor*, 156 for whom this phrase is no reference to Paul's conversion. Moreover, cf. what we already said about *ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ* which has the same double meaning: because of his love for all Christ died for all bringing about a new eschatological dominion. And it is the same love of Christ that evoked Paul's love for Christ from the time of his conversion.

new light. From now on, it is actually impossible to look at anybody with the old eyes or, to come back to Paul, it is impossible to know anybody *κατὰ σάρκα*.

In v.16b Paul specifies the general statement of v.16a. 'Dieser Spezialfall ist nicht ein Beispiel neben anderen, sondern die äußerste Zuspitzung des Grundsatzes V.16a.'¹⁶⁴ Again this *Spezialfall* applies basically to both, Paul and the Corinthian Christians but primarily Paul is talking about himself:¹⁶⁵ though he once even knew Christ according to fleshly standards, he does so no longer. This is clearly an allusion to Paul's conversion.¹⁶⁶ Paul once, i.e. before his conversion, knew Christ *κατὰ σάρκα*. Before the shattering event on the road to Damascus when he met with the risen Lord, Paul looked at Christ through old fleshly eyes. Therefore, Christ appeared to him in a fleshly light, as the justly crucified, the cursed one on the cross. But now, after his conversion, he knows Christ in a different way since he, meeting the new reality of Christ as the risen Lord, has been turned upside down by this new reality. 'Damaskus ist ein Stück Ostern, der Einbruch der neuen Christuswirklichkeit in das persönliche Leben des Paulus. Sein Denken stellt sich nun unter die Christusgeschichte, seine seelische und körperliche Kraft tritt jetzt in den Bann der Christusherrschaft, seine Zukunft wird ein Teil der Christuszukunft. Der ganze Paulus wird in diese Christuswirklichkeit hineingezogen.'¹⁶⁷ This new reality gave him new eyes to look at people, new categories to know a person. Therefore, he does not, more, he *cannot* know Christ according to those old, fleshly standards any more.

If our interpretation of v.16a is correct, then it is likely that v.16b is also an indirect spearhead against the opponents. They still know even Christ according to the old standards. I.e., because their categories of knowing a person are wrong they cannot know Christ as he really is. Consequently, they proclaim a false christology. So, fleshly standards and false christology are interrelated - such as new standards and the true christology. To meet Christ as he is, the risen Lord, provided Paul with new standards which enabled him now to see and to know Christ as he really is. In other words, Paul indirectly expresses his doubt whether his opponents are true Christians. But he formulates this doubt rather cautiously. Obviously, Paul is not quite sure about the nature of the teaching of his opponents.¹⁶⁸ Otherwise, he surely would not have been that cautious (cf. Gal 1.7-9).

¹⁶⁴ Michel, 'Erkennen,' 119.

¹⁶⁵ We must keep in mind that it remains questionable whether the Corinthians have known anything about Jesus before Paul's arrival. And in this case the *Spezialfall* clearly refers to Paul himself.

¹⁶⁶ So, at least on the basis of v.16b we would have to reject the view of Bultmann, *2Kor*, 156 and other scholars that v.16 is no reference to Paul's conversion.

¹⁶⁷ Michel, 'Christus,' 63f.

¹⁶⁸ Therefore, Furnish, *2Cor*, 331 justly rejects Georgi's reconstruction of the christology of the oppo-

Whereas v.16 looked back on what has been overcome by Christ's death, v.17 draws the positive consequence looking forth on what has been created in Christ: 'if anyone is in Christ,' i.e. if anyone is included in Christ's death and resurrection, 'he has become a new creation.' In Christ's inclusive death and resurrection a new creation has been inaugurated and therefore anyone who is included in Christ has been transferred to this new creation, moreover, this person has become a new creation itself. Whoever is in Christ has become a new creature in a new creation. But we have to keep in mind that this new creation is necessarily of eschatological nature since Christ's death and resurrection, the inauguration of the new creation, is of eschatological nature as well. Therefore, the same predicates must be applied to the new creation as to Christ's death:¹⁶⁹ 1) In Christ's death the power of death was replaced by new eschatological life and for all those who are included in Christ's death this new life is a already *present* reality. 2) But on the other hand this new eschatological life is at the same time still *to come* since it is life through death. Analogously, the new creation is present - but still to come. Those who are in Christ already live in and under that new eschatological reality - a reality, however, that is still to be revealed in the future. The new creation, the new age, the new life in its power has already replaced the old and it will prevail irresistibly through the death of the old.

Paul himself is well aware of this ambiguity of the new creation. In 2Cor 4.6ff he has already described his conversion and his apostolate as a creative act of God: 'For God, who said, "Let light shine out of darkness," made his light shine in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ.' But immediately he points to the other side saying that 'we have this treasure in jars of clay (...). We always carry around in our body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be revealed in our body.' And Jesus' life will surely be revealed in the mortal body, 'because we know that the one who raised the Lord Jesus from the dead will also raise us with Jesus.' It is the spirit of faith that assures Paul of the things to come: 'we believe and therefore we speak.' So, Paul already has become a new creation, believing and knowing, however, that this new reality will not be revealed in him until his physical death and resurrection. Thus the physical death is nothing else but liberation from the old 'mortal body' (4.11),

nents (cf. Georgi, *Gegner*, 254-257,290ff) saying that 'the evidence for the beliefs and particularly for the Christology of Paul's rivals is too indirect, fragmentary, and ambiguous to support Georgi's overall reconstruction (...).'

¹⁶⁹ See above comment on v.14.

the old 'earthly tent' (5.1) to a new 'heavenly dwelling' (5.2,4) in which the mortal is swallowed up by life (5.4; 1Cor 15.54f).

V.17b now gives an explanation of what is meant by *καινή κτίσις*: 'the old has gone, behold, new things have come to be!' The old with its old and fleshly standards has gone, has been replaced by completely new things, new life, new standards that cannot be derived from the old. In Christ the eschatological new creation has invaded the old. In his death and resurrection the gate to the old has been closed by his having opened the gate to the new. There is no way back. The countdown for the old creation, the old age, the old life has been set - irrevocably. In Christ on the cross Paul saw Deutero-Isaiah's eschatological prophecy (Isa 43.18f) being fulfilled.

Isa 43.16-21 belongs to the Exodus tradition which has a prominent position within the theology of Deutero-Isaiah. This tradition 'steht als das Heilsgeschehen, das Jahwe Israel zugewandt hat, derart im Zentrum, daß sich dieser Prophet auch das kommende Heilsgeschehen nur als einen Exodus vorstellen kann.'¹⁷⁰ Moreover, this idea of salvation in Deutero-Isaiah is closely linked to that of creation (which for Deutero-Isaiah includes God's acting in history!) so that we can speak of a soteriological conception of creation in Deutero-Isaiah. So, on the one hand the prophet can refer to Yahweh as the creator of the world (40.26; 42.5), on the other hand he calls him the creator of Israel (43.1,7,15; 44.2; both aspects 44.24). 'Mit dem Wort von der Erschaffung Israels meint der Prophet aber die Geschichtstaten, die die alte Exodustradition dem Gotte Israels zugeschrieben hatte, sonderlich das Schilfmeerwunder. "Schaffen" und "erlösen" (לְבַרְא) können bei Deuterocesaja geradezu synonym gebraucht werden'¹⁷¹ (cf. Isa 44.1f). Yahweh is creator and saviour in one and he creates and saves - through his word (42.9; 43.6f,12; 44.26-28; 45.23f).

Deutero-Isaiah's message is now: the coming of God, the new Exodus is at hand! Messengers will precede the second exodus and they will bring the good news (*εὐαγγελιζόμενος*; 52.7 LXX¹⁷²) that God has come to establish his kingdom: 'Your God reigns!' (52.7) There can be no doubt 'daß Deuterocesaja den Exodus der Erlösten aus Babylon als ein heilsgeschichtliches Gegenstück zu dem uralten Auszug Israels aus Ägypten versteht.'¹⁷³ But at the same time the new Exodus surpasses, transcends the old. We have to consider the tremendous implications: to proclaim a new Exodus is nothing less than to question, more, to destroy the significance of the first Exodus on which Israel's faith is based! So, Deutero-Isaiah's message is that the old, the first Exodus no longer has any power to save. 'Forget the former things,' says the prophet, 'do not dwell in the past. See, I am doing a new thing!' (43.18f) Deutero-Isaiah clearly distinguishes two phases within God's salvation history, an old and a new phase. Through the inauguration of the new phase, manifested in the new Exodus, the old phase,

¹⁷⁰ Von Rad, *Theologie 2*, 249.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 251. Cf. also Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen,' 12.

¹⁷² Ibid., 256: 'Das also ist nach dem Verständnis des Propheten ein εὐαγγελιζόμενος (...): einer, der dem Kommen des Herrn vorausseilt und den Anbruch der Königsherrschaft Gottes verkündet!'

¹⁷³ Ibid., 256.

manifested in the old Exodus, has lost its salvation-historical significance. The new Exodus, unlike the first Exodus, applies not only to Israel but also to all mankind (40.3-5): 'Wenn Jahwe sein Werk an Israel ausgerichtet hat, dann wird sich bei den Völkern eine universale Götzendämmerung ereignen, denn die Heiden werden der Ohnmacht ihrer Götter inne.'¹⁷⁴ 'They will say of me, "In the Lord alone are righteousness and strength."' (45.24)

Additionally, Mell,¹⁷⁵ following Betz,¹⁷⁶ has suggested that not only v.17b but also v.16 is influenced by Isa 43.18f: in Christ the prophetic promise of an eschatological turn of ages has been fulfilled. That is what ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν wants to express. But he also finds two significant differences between Deutero-Isaiah and Paul: 'Erstens, die Aufforderung des Propheten, sich angesichts des neuen Heilshandelns Gottes mit seinem Volk von der alten Heilsgeschichte ab- und sich der neuen Heilsgeschichte zuzuwenden (Dtjes 43,18), ist bei Paulus einer resultativen Aussage gewichen (2Kor 5.17b): Die alte Heilsgeschichte (τὰ ἀρχαῖα) ist zur vergangenen Heilsgeschichte geworden (παρῆλθεν) und es ist eine neue Heilsgeschichte (καινά) in Kraft gesetzt (γέγονεν). Zweitens, die dringliche Bitte des Propheten, die angekündigte neue Zukunft in der Gegenwart wahrzunehmen, ist bei Paulus der Auffassung gewichen, daß die bereits bestehende Wirklichkeit einer neuen Zeit eine neue Entscheidung mit sich bringt (V.16). Kurz: das neue Gotteshandeln in Christus ist das eschatologische Ereignis in der Zeit, das die Zeiten trennt und eine neue Heilszeit eingeleitet hat.'¹⁷⁷

It is striking that 2Cor 5.17 and its context is strongly influenced by Deutero-Isaiah's theology. In our passage we find the same conception of old and new, once and now, with the new surpassing and transcending the old: In the Christ event the eschatological new, the new age, the new life with new standards, has come and deprived the old of its validity, its power. Sin and death could only abdicate their throne since on the cross they proved powerless. It is Christ who reigns now! In Christ's death and resurrection God has fulfilled Deutero-Isaiah's eschatological prophecy of a second, ultimate Exodus:¹⁷⁸ mankind, not just Israel (!), has been liberated from the slavery of sin to the dominion of grace. This new Exodus is a universal event which will eventually make 'every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.' (Phil 2.11; cf. Isa 45.24) Finally, it is Deutero-Isaiah's peculiar interrelation of soteriology and the theology of creation that finds its parallel in Paul: the liberation from the slavery of sin is a new creation (v.17) to a new life (v.15) which is the result of God's mighty, creative word (cf. 4.6).

But there is one decisive difference that makes Paul's conception even more revolutionary than Deutero-Isaiah's: in Paul the new Exodus, God's ultimate salva-

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 259.

¹⁷⁵ *Schöpfung*, 364ff.

¹⁷⁶ 'Christuserkenntnis,' 176.

¹⁷⁷ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 365f.

¹⁷⁸ Against Mell, *Schöpfung*, 365 who denies a relationship between Deutero-Isaiah's thought of a second Exodus and the Christ event in Paul.

tion and proof of his covenantal faithfulness, is not to be expected from the future, is not just at hand - but it has already happened in the Christ event. Deutero-Isaiah's future eschatology has become present in Christ. World, history, and mankind does not go *towards* God's salvation but it comes *from* it. Certainly, coming from this salvation, i.e. being liberated, inaugurated into the new creation as new creature, mankind still goes towards an eschatological future. But this future will only reveal what we actually are - saved, liberated to be daughters and sons of God.¹⁷⁹ And this final revelation will also have great effects on the whole non-human creation: 'The creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed. For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God.' (Rom 8.19-21) Note, however, that Paul does nowhere call this cosmological-eschatological future 'new creation.' *Καινὴ κτίσις* in 2Cor 5.17 is a clearly anthropological term (cf. *τις* in v.17aα and the context where Paul does not speak at all about the non-human creation). The thought that Christ is also the inclusive representative for the non-human creation may be seductive and modern - but it is surely not Pauline. It is not the non-human creation for which Christ died as the inclusive representative - it is mankind that is included in his death (vv.14,15,17). Therefore, it is mankind that has been reconciled in Christ's death - not the non-human creation (vv.18,19). And finally, Christ was made to be sin for mankind - not for the non-human creation (v.21). To conclude: although *καινὴ κτίσις* is an anthropological term, it bears inevitable implications and consequences for the non-human creation: The revelation of those who have become a new creation in Christ will result in the liberation of the non-human creation from its bondage to decay that the entire creation may share the new reality of the children of God. The liberation of mankind from the bondage to sin and death will necessarily be followed by the liberation of the whole creation from the bondage of decay.

Again, v.17 is likely to have an apologetic thrust. His Jewish-Christian opponents must have felt quite well the implication of Paul expounding *καινὴ κτίσις*

¹⁷⁹ Therefore, it is problematic to speak of an 'anticipation' or a 'prolepsis' of the eschatological future with regard to Pauline soteriology (cf. Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen,' e.g. 32; see also above § 1). The life in Christ is not an anticipation of the new life that *will* be given to us in the eschatological future, but the life in Christ is the new life which *has already come* to be in Christ and in those who are included in his death and resurrection. So, the Christian life is not the anti-cipation of what is still to come, but, so to speak, the 'post-cipation' of what has already come in Christ and what will be revealed in Christ's *παρουσία*. The source of the Christian existence is the eschatological life of the crucified and risen Christ and its aim is to be revealed and completed in the eschatological future to come.

in terms of the Exodus tradition of Deutero-Isaiah. With Deutero-Isaiah (43.18) Paul urges the Corinthians: 'Forget the former things,' do not listen to the opponents and their teaching; 'do not dwell in the past' - as the opponents obviously do - since the past has lost its validity and soteriological significance! 'Do not dwell in the past,' because there is a new reality with a new universal validity and new soteriological significance that abolishes the past: the new creation which God has inaugurated in Christ. This new creation is the new eschatological Exodus, is the liberation of the slavery of sin and death - but the opponents still live as if the second Exodus, God's ultimate act of salvation, is yet to come. They close their minds to the new eschatological reality that God has created in Christ and live according to an old reality that has gone¹⁸⁰ - they live *κατὰ σάρκα*. Their boasting 'in what is seen rather than what is in the heart' (v.12) and their knowing people - including themselves - according to fleshly standards testifies to that. So, their false christology implies a false anthropology: they disregard Christ, therefore, they cannot know any person as (s)he really is. Consequently, just as with v.16, Paul launches a hidden attack against the integrity of the teaching and the conduct of his opponents. We can imagine how serious Paul's charge was, if we recognize its implication: With his attack against the christology and the anthropology of his opponents Paul does nothing less than to treat them as non-Christians. So, Paul's reference to *καινή κτίσις* is a theological *Spitzensatz* that calls the Corinthians to make up their mind and to recognize Paul as true apostle of the true gospel and to reject the apostolic claims of the opponents since the basis of their teaching and their conduct is false, is rotten and brittle, simply non-Christian.

V.18 has a central position within the passage: on the one hand it is the conclusion to the preceding verse(s) (vv.14-17) declaring God the author of 'all this,' i.e. of Christ's death and resurrection as inclusive representative, of the inauguration of the *καινή κτίσις*, of the liberation from the slavery of sin and death, in sum: of all that Paul said previously. On the other hand it presents us with a new *theological* interpretation of the Christ event (v.18a) and of Paul's apostolic ministry (v.18b). So, vv.14-17 and vv.18-21 are two sides of the same medal, two interpretations of the same event - Christ's death and resurrection - that must be held together. One is not without the other. Therefore, Paul's new theological interpretation of the Christ event, i.e. that God has 'reconciled us to himself through Christ,' must be regarded as an equivalent to *καινή κτίσις*: to be a *καινή κτίσις*

¹⁸⁰ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 384 (emphases original): 'Die eschatologische Bewertung des Christusereignisses in seiner *revolutionär-neuen* Qualität bildet demnach den entscheidenden Unterschied zwischen dem paulinischen Evangelium und dem seiner judenchristlichen Gegner in Korinth.'

means to be reconciled to God. The new age stands under the sign of reconciliation.

The emphasis of vv.18f is, now, that God himself has reconciled Paul through Christ. Christ, the crucified and resurrected inclusive representative, is God's instrument (διά) of reconciliation. Through the Christ event in the past God has achieved Paul's reconciliation (cf. the aorist καταλλάξαντος). In Christ God turned a relationship of enmity into a relationship of reconciliation and peace¹⁸¹ by doing away with the enmity which is - important to note! - *Paul's* enmity against God (Rom 5.8,10). God has not reconciled *himself* to Paul but *Paul* to himself. God is not the object of change but Paul and with Paul all humanity.

Furthermore, to be reconciled to God has another significant and inevitable implication for Paul: God entrusted to him the apostolic ministry of preaching this reconciliation, the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς. So Paul, the object of reconciliation, thus became a διάκονος of reconciliation. But although this ministry of preaching reconciliation has been given to the apostle(s) alone Paul knows quite well that the *contents* of his preaching - the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς (v.19¹⁸²), the gospel itself - does not only apply to him and the other apostles but also to all mankind (cf. the πάντες of v.14). In Christ God acted reconcilingly for the whole human world. Paul's own reconciliation is only a special case of the reconciliation of the κόσμος. The particular reconciliation of the apostle has its equivalent in the universal reconciliation, the reconciliation of the world. The latter constitutes and is the basis of the former. This is expressed in v.19 when Paul, arguing from the lesser to the greater, says: 'Equally we can say: God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not counting their transgressions against them. And he has established in us the word of reconciliation.' Note, again, the strong theological emphasis: God did not only use Christ as the instrument of reconciliation - he, God himself, in *Seins- und Handlungseinheit* with Christ has achieved the reconciliation of the world. Although God's reconciliation has been brought about through the very event of Christ's death and resurrection in the past it is at the same time a present reality because in Christ God has inaugurated a new age, the age of reconciliation that applies to all mankind throughout all times (cf. the durative force of καταλλάσσων). And it is a present reality as the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς which is preached and prevails in the present. This λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς is God's own word. Therefore, it cannot be identified with the apostolic ministry, the διακονία

¹⁸¹ Cf. Lang, *Kor*, 301.

¹⁸² The important grammatical decisions concerning this verse made in the notes (see above) are presupposed and will not be reiterated in the following.

τῆς καταλλαγῆς of v.18. Rather, God's own word constitutes the apostolic word; the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς is the presupposition of the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς. And as such, the ^{establishment of the} λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς can only mean, 'die Selbstoffenbarung des gekreuzigten und auferstandenen Kyrios in den Ostererscheinungen,'¹⁸³ in short - the gospel (cf. Gal 1.10ff; 1Cor 15.1ff).¹⁸⁴ So, when he says that God has established the word of reconciliation in us Paul clearly refers to his conversion where God has entrusted to him the gospel and with it the ministry to preach the gospel. The apostolic preaching, the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς, 'ist dann als das menschliche Wort der von Gott berufenen und autorisierten Botschafter zu bestimmen, das Gott zum Instrument seines Wortes erwählt hat und in dem *er selbst* das Erkenntnis und Glauben wirkende "Wort von der Versöhnung" laut werden läßt.'¹⁸⁵ Thus, Paul can say that *he* himself has laid the foundation of the church in Corinth (1Cor 3.10) knowing on the other hand that "no-one can lay any foundation other than the one already laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1Cor 3.11).

But we have not yet decided the question as to whether ἐν ἡμῖν refers to Paul or to the Corinthians. Do we have to interpret ἐν ἡμῖν apostolically or ecclesiologicaly ('in/amongst us, the church')? However, the alternative raised by this question is only a real alternative if one chooses the first (apostolic) possibility since Paul as Christian and apostle is included in a ecclesiological ἐν ἡμῖν¹⁸⁶ whereas the church is not included in an apostolic 'in us'. We would favour the ecclesiological meaning, firstly, because the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς, the gospel, is not only the reason and the presupposition of Paul's ministry (v.18b: διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς) but also the presupposition and the foundation of the whole church (1Cor 1.6; 3.11). Secondly, the synthetic parallelism between v.18b and v.19a¹⁸⁷ gives reason not simply to identify διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς (v.18b) and λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς (v.19b) but to assume a progress in thought between both phrases as well. And indeed, we can understand both expressions perfectly well within the framework of a synthetic parallelism (with v.19 setting the basis for v.18): God is the author of the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς. This is the basis on which the church is built (1Cor 3.11!) - and the foundation of Paul's preaching and his whole apostolic existence (2Cor 4.6; Gal 1.12). Thus the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς applies to both the church and the apostle¹⁸⁸ (he is part of the church) whereas the διακονία τῆς

¹⁸³ Hofius, "Gott ...", ' 28.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. the textual witnesses referred to in our translation of λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς which confirm our interpretation.

¹⁸⁵ Hofius, "Gott..."; ' 31.

¹⁸⁶ Paul is appointed to be an apostle within and as part of the church (1Cor 12.28)!

¹⁸⁷ Cf. notes above.

¹⁸⁸ Note the ambiguity of ἐν ἡμῖν: "among us" (= the church) and "in us" (= Paul as apostle).

καταλλαγῆς, the ministry of preaching the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς, applies to the apostle(s) alone. In other words, the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς is God's own creative word, whereas the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς, though given by God, is God's word preached by the apostle. For all this ἐν ἡμῖν is best understood ecclesiologically.¹⁸⁹

If we recapitulate our considerations concerning the Pauline conception of reconciliation we could formulate it thus: Paul expounds God's reconciliation in a twofold way: as God's act of reconciliation (v.18aβ; v.19b) and as God's word of reconciliation (v.18b; v.19c). In the Christ event in the past God effected our reconciliation and since that event he makes reconciliation prevail through his creative λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς as a always present reality. 'Beide Momente - Versöhnungstat *und* Versöhnungswort - sind in ihrem differenzierten Zusammenhang das *eine* Heilsgeschehen der rettenden Zuwendung Gottes zu dem der Sünde verfallenen, gottfeindlichen Menschen.'¹⁹⁰ A reconciliation without the word of reconciliation, without the preaching of reconciliation is an impossible thought for Paul.

On the basis of the preceding verses (v.18f) Paul continues in v.20 by characterizing his ministry: 'We are therefore Christ's ambassadors, that is: God is making his call through us. We entreat on Christ's behalf: Be reconciled to God.' Probably nowhere else is the ambiguity of Paul's ministry expressed better than in this verse: on the one hand the apostle himself is acting though on Christ's behalf (v.20aα,ba),¹⁹¹ on the other hand God himself is acting through the apostle (v.20aβ,bβ); Paul is the entreating ambassador on Christ's behalf and at the same time God himself is making his call. God has bound his λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς to the apostolic διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς. It is God himself who is speaking his mighty, creative word through the word of the apostolic ambassador on Christ's behalf bringing about what it says: Be reconciled to God! That means, God's word of reconciliation is not at the apostle's disposal. God's creative imperative is not Paul's own imperative. The apostolic ministry has to be conducted in the humble confidence that God himself makes his word audible and effective in, with, and through the word of the apostle. Therefore, the divine call and imperative does not

¹⁸⁹ So Hofius, "Gott ...", 25 (n.54), 26. However, his argumentative basis - he parallels θέμενος ... (v.19) with Ps 77.5 (LXX)(cf. pp.23-27) - is rather fragile and unnecessary to achieve an ecclesiological understanding of ἐν ἡμῖν (cf. already Furnish, 2Cor, 320 who, discussing Hofius' thesis, reaches the conclusion: 'This is not impossible, but there is little in the context (...) to support it.')

¹⁹⁰ Hofius, "Gott...", 31 (emphases original).

¹⁹¹ Hofius, 'Erwägungen,' 7: 'Das ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ meint nicht, daß die Apostel an Christi Stelle stehen und ihn vertreten; es besagt, daß der auferstandene und gegenwärtige Kyrios "durch" seine Zeugen redet, daß sie der "Mund" ihres Herrn sind.'

have its correlate in an apostolic imperative but it is clothed with the apostolic entreating. God speaks his creative word in the form of the apostolic entreating resulting in reconciliation which is - viewed from the other side - new creation. The reconciled are creatures of God's creative word. Thus, neither the λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς nor the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς is an appeal for human action or to human will.¹⁹² Both are essentially proclamation that brings about what it proclaims: reconciliation. So, the divine imperative of v.20bβ is a summarizing expression of the character of Paul's preaching¹⁹³ as proclamation and has its closest parallel in the divine creating imperative 'let there be light!' This interpretation is supported by Paul himself in 4.5f:¹⁹⁴ 'For we do not preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who said, "Let light shine out of darkness," made his light shine in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ.'

In v.21 Paul extends his thought of vv.18-20 saying that reconciliation is 1) based on justification and 2) on atonement.¹⁹⁵ Ad 1) This thought is already prefigured in v.19b where Paul argues that God reconciled the world to himself 'not counting their transgressions against them.' 'Gott, der uns mit sich versöhnt, ist immer zugleich der Gott, der uns richtet'¹⁹⁶ and God's judgment has been executed at the cross, where God made Christ to be sin for us (v.21; cf. Isa 53.5) thus not counting our transgressions against us (v.19b). On the cross God exchanged (καταλλάσσω) Christ, the righteousness in person, for sinful humanity 'so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.'(v.21) This is not an exchange 'as if' but a real one and in that glorious exchange on the cross (Martin Luther's *fröhlicher Wechsel*) God identified Christ with sin, that rebel that involved all humanity with its rebellion thus separating it from God, so that we might be identified with Christ, the righteous one who involves all with his righteousness. Hooker has rightly remarked¹⁹⁷ that this 'is not a straightforward exchange, for we

¹⁹² Therefore, the common German translation of the divine imperative (v.20bβ) "Laßt euch versöhnen mit Gott!" is misleading.

¹⁹³ Wolff, *2Kor*, 131f: 'Paulus zitiert hier nicht aus seiner Missionspredigt, sondern er faßt sie unter dem zuvor dargelegten Versöhnungsgedanken zusammen.' The missing ἡμᾶς in δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ might also point in that direction.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. also Isa 45.22ff where God's word effects what it says.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. above excursus on ἐν Χριστῷ.

¹⁹⁶ Büchsel, *TWNT* 1, 258.

¹⁹⁷ 'Interchange,' 353 (emphases original). In the following Hooker raises the question as to whether v.21 refers to Christ's crucifixion or his incarnation. Although we would generally agree with her that this might perhaps be an artificial question and that 'we should be wary of driving a wedge between incarnation and crucifixion' (ibid., 353), there can be no doubt that the emphasis of v.21 lies on the Christ event on the cross (cf. the ἐν αὐτῷ and our excursus on ἐν Χριστῷ above).

become the righteousness of God *in him*. If Christ has been made sin, he also has been made our righteousness.' But we could formulate even more emphatically that this exchange is *necessarily* not straightforward, because sin and righteousness are not of the same quality: righteousness proved more powerful than sin. Through this exchange sin lost all its power, righteousness gained full power; sin and death died, therefore righteousness and life prevailed. It is for the reality of this exchange that God and mankind came together again, because sin and death have died. And with sin the state of rebellion and enmity against God that had stigmatized mankind has been buried. Righteousness has overcome sin, life has replaced death. In Christ God has verified his covenantal faithfulness.

Ad 2) We have already mentioned that all mankind is inextricably involved with sin.¹⁹⁸ Therefore, all have forfeit their lives before God and only an atonement that includes all human beings could change that situation. 'Soll der Sünder, der seine Existenz verwirkt hat und vor Gott nicht sein und bleiben kann, dennoch dem Tod entrissen werden und zu Gott kommen, so kann dies nur *durch das Todesgericht hindurch* geschehen - nur so also, daß mit seiner Sünder-Existenz Schluß gemacht wird und er gerade darin das Leben gewinnt. *Sühne* kann deshalb nur heißen: durch den Tod hindurch sein Leben an Gott hingeben und durch solche Hingabe des Lebens an Gott "dem verdienten Tod entrissen werden".'¹⁹⁹ And this is exactly what happened on the cross: Christ was identified with sin, i.e. with sinful humanity, and as inclusive representative he gave away his life to God who raised him from the dead so that we, being included in Christ's death, might be saved from the dominion of death to lead a new life of a restored relationship to God, i.e. as righteous people. Thus, the atonement in Christ created a new situation for mankind: the power of sin and with it the destruction of the relationship between God and mankind has been overcome through Christ; in Christ's atoning death God has accomplished the reconciliation^{of} the world. Atonement and reconciliation belong indissolubly together.²⁰⁰ 'Was dabei die Vergebung der Sünden anlangt, so ist diese eingeschlossen in ein ganz umfassendes Geschehen der Heiligung, in dem sich *Neuschöpfung* ereignet: die Heraufführung eines neuen, weil in seinem *Sein* neu gewordenen Menschen.'²⁰¹

¹⁹⁸ Cf. above notes to v.21.

¹⁹⁹ Hofius, 'Sühne,' 42 citing Gese (*italics original*). This idea of atonement is rooted in the OT as Gese and Hofius have convincingly demonstrated (cf. Gese, 'Sühne,' 85ff; Hofius, 'Sühne,' esp. 39-43).

²⁰⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 43.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 43 (*italics original*). Cf. Gese, 'Sühne,' 104: 'Die kultische, heiligende Sühne ist alles andere als nur ein negativer Vorgang einfacher Sündenbeseitigung oder bloßer Buße. Es ist ein Zu-Gott-Kommen durch das Todesgericht hindurch.'

This is implied when Paul says that God has reconciled the world to himself. Reconciliation is the result of the atoning Christ event and as such it is an equivalent to *καινή κτίσις* in v.17. To be a *καινή κτίσις* means to be reconciled to God and to live in the *καινή κτίσις* means to live as righteous people in the state of reconciliation with God.

It is not unimportant to see that the exchange motif in v.21 has its closest parallel in Isa 53.5:²⁰² 'But he was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed.' So, we find the influence of Deutero-Isaiah not only on *καινή κτίσις*, Paul's first interpretation of the death of Christ, but also on reconciliation, Paul's second interpretation of the Christ event.²⁰³

4.4) Summary and evaluation

1. In 2Cor 5.11-6.13 Paul turns to the second part of the apology for his apostolate. The focal point is now the foundation and the contents of his apostolic ministry - Christ's love: a) the foundation in so far as it included Paul in its ultimate manifestation, Christ's atoning death and resurrection, and in so far as it turned Paul's whole existence upside down on the road to Damascus, evoking Paul's love for Christ and commissioning him with a new ministry. Christ's love became the directing force of Paul's existence. So, cross and conversion are indissolubly linked and both are the constitutive events of Paul's ministry; or, b) the contents in so far as it is the self-revelation of the crucified and risen Lord whom Paul is commissioned to preach. The gospel became Paul's destiny. So, we may conclude with Michel, '*die Selbstlegitimation des Apostels besteht aus Selbstzeugnissen, die gleichzeitig Existenzaussagen sind.*'²⁰⁴

²⁰² Hofius, 'Erwägungen,' 11; cf. also Hughes, 2Cor, 214.

²⁰³ Hofius, 'Erwägungen,' 12: 'Angesichts der tiefgreifenden Berührungen [sc. between 2Cor 5.18ff and Deutero-Isaiah] gewinnt nun die Beobachtung besonderes Gewicht, daß in dem soeben zitierten Bekenntnis [sc. Isa 53.5] der Sache nach von dem die Rede ist, was Paulus mit dem Begriff der "Versöhnung" zum Ausdruck bringt.' In his recent essay 'The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5-7 and Its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1,' *NTS* 35 Beale has made a rather strong case for the influence of Deutero-Isaiah on Paul. He demonstrated (ibid., 551) 'that Paul understands both "new creation" in Christ as well as "reconciliation" in Christ (2 Cor 5.17-21) as the inaugurated fulfilment of Isaiah's and the prophet's promise of a new creation in which Israel would be restored into a peaceful relationship with God'.

²⁰⁴ 'Erkennen,' 116 (italics original).

2. The love of Christ has become 'incarnate' in Christ's death and resurrection as inclusive representative for all. Paul expounds this event in terms of Deutero-Isaiah's theology: it is the eschatological turn of the ages in which the old salvation-history is replaced by a new one; it is the inauguration of the new eschatological creation, the great second Exodus promised by Deutero-Isaiah, the redemption from the slavery of sin. For Paul, just as for Deutero-Isaiah, salvation and creation are held together. Salvation is creation through God. And Christ is the firstborn of God's new creation; in him all mankind is dragged into that new reality. So, if anyone is in Christ, he has become a part of God's new eschatological creation, a *καινή κτίσις* living in a new reality. The significant difference to Deutero-Isaiah is, however, that for Paul the new creation has already become a *present* reality that determines the present and the future, his own history and the history of all mankind and of the whole world. But although it has universal cosmological consequences, *καινή κτίσις* in 2Cor 5.17 is clearly an universal anthropological term of Pauline soteriology which is based on the eschatological Christ event.

3. This is confirmed by the coordinate usage of *καινή κτίσις*, reconciliation, and justification. All three terms must be seen together since they all are consequences or descriptions of the same event - Christ's inclusive death and resurrection. To be in Christ means to be a new creation (v.17), to be reconciled to God (vv.18-20), to be justified (v.19b,21). It means that the old age and the old salvation-history have gone; that the enmity of mankind against God has been overcome; that the sins are forgiven and are not counted against us. It means that a new salvation-history has begun; that the relationship to God is restored and characterized by reconciliation and peace; that the power of sin resulting in death has been broken so that we may live under the new dominion of righteousness and grace leading to eternal life. Note that, just as *καινή κτίσις*, reconciliation and justification are anthropological-soteriological terms, Paul never speaks of a reconciliation or justification of the non-human world.

4. It is quite striking that *καινή κτίσις* in 2Cor 5.17 has an universal-individual emphasis (cf. the *τις* in v.17a). But we have to recognize the ecclesiological implication that Paul's statement about the *καινή κτίσις* has: the new creation is constituted in the *one* inclusive representative, therefore we are all one in Christ Jesus (Gal 3.28). Thus, Christ's atoning death as inclusive representative for all is not only the new creation of each single individual, but at the same time it is the constitution of the church.

5. Furthermore, we have demonstrated that *καινή κτίσις* in 2Cor 5.17, interpreted in the light of Deutero-Isaiah, has an apologetic thrust. On the one hand,

Paul launches an attack against the theology and the apostolic claims of his opponents, emphasizing in a theological *Spitzensatz* that in Christ God has changed the ages. In Christ a new eschatological creation has come to be that abolishes the salvation-historical validity of the old age. His Jewish Christian opponents, however, obviously still cling to the past, because they disregard the eschatological change that has taken place in Christ. In other words, they preach a fundamentally different gospel, because their eyes are blind for the new reality that God has created in Christ. Their teaching and their apostolic legitimation lack the existential depth of Paul's gospel and ministry.²⁰⁵ Therefore, on the other hand, the statement about the *καινή κτίσις* is an indirect appeal to the Corinthians to reject the opponents and their gospel. With Deutero-Isaiah (43.18f) Paul urges the church in Corinth: Do not equate yourself with my opponents who disregard the eschatological change in Christ. Rather, 'forget the former things;' they have lost their validity. 'Do not dwell in the past' but do live as a *καινή κτίσις* in the new eschatological present.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Michel, 'Erkennen,' 116.

§ 5) Paul's understanding of *καὶνὴ κρίσις* in Gal 6.11-16

5.1) Translation¹

(11) See what large letters I use as I write to you with my own hand!

(12) *All* those who want to make a good impression *in respect of the flesh* are trying to compel you to be circumcised - *solely in order to* avoid being persecuted for the cross of Christ.

(13) *For* not even those *circumcisers*² *themselves observe* the law, yet they want you to be circumcised that they may boast *in* your flesh.

(14) *But far be it from me to* boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world.

(15) *For* neither³ circumcision nor uncircumcision *is of any value but* a new creation.

(16) *And* peace and mercy be *upon* all *those who will be conformable to* this rule - *and upon* the Israel of God.

5.2) Notes on structure, grammar and semantics

Within Gal 6 verse 11 clearly marks the beginning of a new section: Paul himself takes the pen in order to conclude the up to now dictated letter summing up the main points of what he said previously.

¹ The following translation is based on the NIV. However, some alterations (in italics) seemed to be appropriate.

² Περιτεμνόμενοι presents us with the only main text-critical problem, i.e. whether to read περιτεμνόμενοι (⌘ A C D K P and some minor witnesses), the present participle, or περιτεμημένοι (P⁴⁶ B F (G) L Ψ and some minor witnesses), the perfect participle. It is impossible to make a decision on the basis of this external evidence. However, taking into consideration internal criteria we may give the present participle the preference (so with Nestle-Aland²⁶, Metzger, *Commentary*, 598, and most Bible translations and commentaries). The perfect participle would point to the act of circumcision which had happened in the past. The emphasis would therefore lie on the 'state of being circumcised.' But 'Paul is not concerned here with the presence of circumcised persons - like himself - in the church; he is concerned instead with those who now demand circumcision for Gentile Christians. Thus the present tense of the participle is demanded by the argumentative situation' (Jewett, 'Agitators,' 202). With the whole problem cf. Howard, *Paul*, 17ff; Jewett, 'Agitators,' 202f; Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 101ff and the literature cited there.

³ Some text witnesses (⌘ A C D et al.) read ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε instead of οὔτε γὰρ which, however, is most probably due to the influence of Gal 5.6. The shorter reading (supported by P⁴⁶ B Ψ et al) is therefore given the preference.

This summary ends with a sort of blessing (v.16). Additionally, the τοῦ λοιποῦ in v.17 indicates the introduction of a new thought. We therefore may limit our study to vv.11-16.

V.11. Ἰηλίκους γράμμασιν is dative of manner'.⁴ Therefore, the meaning is not 'a large letter (= epistle)' but 'with large letters' as Fung has correctly emphasized.⁵

Ἔγραφα 'is an "epistolary aorist" and points to 6:11-18 of the present letter'⁶ and is best translated with the present tense.

V.12. Since ὅσοι = πάντες οἱ the sentence has to be continued with οὗτοι.⁷

The verb εὐπροσωπέω is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT. There is scarcely evidence of its occurrence in profane Greek until ecclesiastical and Byzantine writers. Εὐπροσωπέω is derived from the adjective εὐπρόσωπος, 'having a good appearance/face,' which can be found quite frequently in profane Greek. There it may refer to words or to speeches sometimes in connection with the contrast between *Schein und Wirklichkeit*.⁸ Against the background of these observations we may render εὐπροσωπέω in Gal 6.12 with 'to make a good impression' (though this impression may be deceptive).

With the general usage of σάρξ in Paul see above notes on 2Cor 5.16. Ἐν σαρκί in this verse is probably an equivalent for an dative of relation⁹ and may be rendered as 'in respect to the flesh.'

Ἀναγκάζουσιν is *praesens de conatu*.¹⁰ We may therefore translate (with NIV): 'they are trying to compel.'

Μόνον cannot be taken literally since v.13b shows a second, a different motive (ἵνα) for the opponents' demand for circumcision. Rather, 'it is probably a rhetorical device for emphasis.'¹¹

Ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ is a 'metonymy for the crucifixion of Christ,'¹² i.e. it stands for Christ himself as the crucified and risen saviour.¹³ The dative τῷ σταυρῷ is a *dativus causae*.¹⁴

V.13 gives the reason (γάρ) for Paul's previous statement: The circumcisers themselves do not observe the law.

The present participle περιτεμνόμενοι is the middle rather than the passive voice as Jewett has convincingly shown¹⁵ and it may best be rendered as 'the circumcisers'¹⁶ since this translation is a

⁴ Fung, *Gal*, 300 n.2.

⁵ *ibid.*, 300.

⁶ Betz, *Gal*, 314; cf. BDR, § 334₂.

⁷ BDR, § 304₁.

⁸ CK, 807 and the textual evidence given there.

⁹ Cf. Wedderburn, 'Observations,' 85; BDR § 197.3.

¹⁰ BDR, § 319₂. 'Da das Präsens die Handlung durativ darstellt ohne Rücksicht auf den wirklichen Abschluß, so kann das Präsens selber den Sinn einer *versuchten*, nicht vollendeten Handlung annehmen' (*ibid.*, § 319; italics original).

¹¹ Fung, *Gal*, 305.

¹² Burton, *Gal*, 350.

¹³ Schlier, *Gal*, 281: σταυρὸς = 'Ideogramm für das Erlösungsgeschehen'.

¹⁴ BDR, § 196,1.

¹⁵ 'Agitators,' 202f: 'Since οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι in Gal. vi.13a specifies the subject of the verb in 13b one would expect congruity between 13a and 13b in regard to the circumcision which appears in both. So, if a passive "those who get circumcised" were intended in 13a, it would be somewhat out of keeping with the active "desire to have you circumcised" in 13b. In this verse as in vi.12, the matter under discussion is the effort on the part of the Judaizers to circumcise the Galatians, not to circumcise

proper description of the attitude of the opponents: they have the practice of circumcision and they want the Galatians to take it over.

The adversative particle ἀλλά contrasts a negative (v.13a) with a 'positive' (v.13b) characterization of the opponents: they themselves do not even observe the law *but* they want the Galatians to be circumcised.

The preposition ἐν with καυχῆσονται points to the object of boasting, i.e. the 'flesh of circumcision' as the result of circumcision.

With the meaning of καυχᾶσθαι see above notes on 2Cor 5.12. In post-OT Judaism we find an attitude that is rather congruous to the one we find in the OT (the only legitimate boasting is a boasting-in-God), 'doch tritt zu den wahrhaft rühmenswerten Größen das Gesetz hinzu, dessen sich der Gottesfürchtige freuen kann (Sir 39,8).'¹⁷ This is probably the background against which we have to see the καυχᾶσθαι of Paul's opponents in Galatia.

V.14. Δὲ and the phrase ἐμοὶ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι sharply contrast v.14 with the previous verse. 'Verneinter Optativ von γίνομαι mit Dativ-Subjekt und abhängigem Infinitiv ist eine LXX-Wendung (Gen 44,7.17; Jos 22,29; 24,16; 1Makk 9,10;13,5 z.T. in Wiedergabe von מן ל הלהלל cum infinitivo), deren Verwendung ein mögliches Handeln für die Zukunft verbindlich ausschließt.'¹⁸

Εἰ μὴ attests the exclusiveness of the καυχᾶσθαι Paul is talking about: the boasting ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This sequence which occurs nowhere else in the *Corpus Paulinum* makes it even more obvious than in v.12 that σταυρός is an abbreviation for the whole *Heilsgeschehen* in Christ: it is 'the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Κύριος is the predicate of the resurrected and exalted Christ. The crucified Christ is the resurrected and exalted Lord. He, the one who became a curse for us on the cross (3.13; cf. Deut 21.23), he is the one who has been raised by the creative power of God and has been revealed as the saviour and Lord. All this is implied when Paul speaks of the cross of Christ.

The relative clause δι' οὗ ... is more likely to refer to σταυρός than to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ¹⁹ and it 'has the effect of substantiating the preceding statement'.²⁰

The perfect ἐσταύρωται signifies 'gemäß dem Aspekt des Perfektstammes einen Zustand'²¹: the world and 'I' are in a state of being crucified.

themselves. Such congruity would be perfectly maintained if the participle were taken to be in the middle voice with causative significance: "for even those who cause to be circumcised do not themselves keep the law, but they desire to have you circumcised that they may glory in your flesh". (...) Finally, it should be noted that this translation is the only one which can retain any strict sense of present tense in the participle.' In the same line Robertson, *Grammar*, 808f; Bruce, *Gal*, 270.

¹⁶ So already Blich, *Gal*, 218; also Schlier, *Gal*, 281: 'Beschneidungsleute'.

¹⁷ Hahn, *TBLNT* 2, 1052.

¹⁸ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 276 n.8.

¹⁹ So most commentators, e.g. Betz, Fung, Lietzmann, Mussner, Oepke, Schlier. Otherwise we would rather expect ἐν (cf. Schlier, *Gal*, 281 et al.). But there is no necessity for a final decision, since for Paul the cross is always the cross of Christ and "Christ" is always the crucified redeemer Christ' (Betz, *Gal*, 318). The cross is never without Christ, and Christ is never without the cross (see also Mell, *Schöpfung*, 296 n.57).

²⁰ Fung, *Gal*, 306 n.41; cf. Schlier, *Gal*, 281.

²¹ BR, § 215.

Κόσμος means the whole of all that is created by God with men in the centre, namely: the 'universe,' the 'earth,' the 'world as the place of human life,' or - as in 2Cor 5.19 - 'humanity'.²² The entire cosmos, however, is involved with sin which had come into the world by means of men, bringing transitoriness and death. Due to the fall of men the whole world exists in the state of turning away from God. The world in its state of turning away from God is simply called κόσμος οὗτος. The destiny of the cosmos is indissolubly linked to the destiny of men. The whole of the cosmos and its centre have a common history.²³ This makes it quite understandable that κόσμος in Paul usually has a historical-anthropological colouring (however, without this aspect being all that there is to it). Finally it is worth noting that Paul nowhere calls the new, redeemed world καινὸς κόσμος but βασιλεία θεοῦ (1Cor 6.9f). This is apparently because κόσμος bears the connotation of sin too strongly. Thus Paul's usage of κόσμος seems to correspond to his use of σάρξ (see above).²⁴ Here, in Gal 6.14 κόσμος is basically regarded as a power (cf. the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου of 4.3!) or a dominion in which the unredeemed people live. Therefore, the datives κόσμῳ and ἐμοί are best understood as datives of relation: through the cross, the relation between the world, the dominion of mankind, and the paradigmatic Christian 'I',²⁵ the slave of the 'elements of the world' (4.3), is broken off.

V.15 substantiates (γάρ) what Paul said in v.13 (cf. the formal parallel οὐδὲ γάρ) and v.14: it gives the reason for Paul's rejection of the καυχῆσθαι of his opponents and the reason for his own boasting. But, as Betz pointed out,²⁶ γάρ 'is ambiguous: it indicates that v 15 is the reason for v 14 because it is presupposed there, but v 15 is at the same time the consequence of v 14.'

Περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία are abstract-collective terms²⁷ describing the status of being circumcised/uncircumcised and thus belonging either to the Jewish or the Gentile part of humanity.

On the technical term καινὴ κτίσις see above Part I, on κτίσις generally cf. above notes on 2Cor 5.17.

V.16. Καὶ links v.16 closely to v.15: it is the καινὴ κτίσις with its implications that is the κανὼν of the Christian existence. Κανὼν 'means primarily a ruler or straight edge for measuring and metaphorically a rule or standard.'²⁸

Στοιχεῖν does not mean 'to walk' or 'to follow' since it does not imply the dimension of moving. It is rather an expression of the state of conformity, 'zumal er mit einem Maßbegriff (κανὼν) verbunden ist.'²⁹ Besides, as Delling noted, 'handelt es sich [nach dem Zshg.] gar nicht um ein ethisches Ver-

²² Guhrt, *TBLNT* 2, 1383f.

²³ See Bultmann, *Theologie*, 225.

²⁴ On κόσμος see e.g. BA, 881-884; CK, 619-624; Guhrt, *TBLNT* 2, 1381-1385.

²⁵ The first person singular forms in v.14 point 'to Paul in contrast to the opponents (cf. 6:12f), and to the exemplaric "I" which stands for every Christian (cf. 2:19-21)' (Betz, *Gal*, 318).

²⁶ *Gal*, 319 n.76.

²⁷ Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen,' 3; Mell, *Schöpfung*, 299 n.68: 'Hier in 1Kor 7,19; Gal 5,6; 6.15 wird über das jeweilige Merkmal der Status eines Kollektivs bezeichnet, dessen Individuen Träger dieses Merkmals sind.'

²⁸ Fung, *Gal*, 309; cf. also Burton, *Gal*, 358.

²⁹ Mußner, *Gal*, 415. On κανὼν see also CK, 1025 and Delling, *TWNT* 7, who notes (p.668/4) that στοιχεῖν in the NT 'ständig mit dem Dativ verbunden ist, in bemerkenswertem Unterschied von den Verben, die eindeutig von wandeln im Sinne der Lebensführung reden'.

halten, sondern um das Verständnis des Heilsgeschehens.³⁰ The future tense (στοιχήσουσιν) points to the condition behind the blessing: Only those who will change their mind to (re)turn to conformity with the new rule, the καινή κτίσις, will be blessed.

Εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος is a Jewish sounding benediction³¹ that is, however, bound to a condition which is introduced by the relative clause καὶ ὅσοι κτλ. (cf. the contrasting parallel, the conditional curse in 1.8f). 'Peace' in Paul is the expression for the healed relationship between women/men and God (cf. Rom 5.1) which God has achieved through the Christ event at the cross.³² 'Mercy' stands for God's saving action for the benefit of afflicted people.³³

The force of καί after ἔλεος is still disputed.³⁴ Without the necessity of getting involved with this lengthy debate we would favour an interpretation of καί as simply copulative rather than epexegetic since "it is doubtful whether *kai* is ever used by St. Paul in so *marked* an explicative force as must be here assigned."³⁵ If this is correct, we can argue with Mell for a coordinate force of καί which avoids 'einen nochmaligen relativischen Anschluß.'³⁶ I.e., ἐπ' αὐτοὺς (= ὅσοι ...) and ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ are coordinate sequences. Thus, we could paraphrase: 'peace and mercy be upon all those who will be conformable to this rule, and peace and mercy be also upon the Israel of God.' So, Paul apparently extends his blessing to a group different to the ὅσοι/αὐτοὺς: to the Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ. Τοῦ θεοῦ in this phrase is best understood as a subjective genitive, 'der das Zugehörigkeitsverhältnis von Israel zu Gott ausdrückt'.³⁷

5.3) Comment

It was Paul's custom to dictate his letters to a scribe and to write the final greeting with his own hand (Rom 16.22; 1Cor 16.21); here in Gal 6.11, however, 'he took the pen well before the concluding greeting'³⁸ in v.18. This clearly indicates the importance of what Paul is about to say. In fact, in Gal 6.11-18 Paul gives a short and emphatic summary of the main points of the letter. This summary 'contains the interpretive clues to the understanding of Paul's major concerns in the letter as a whole and should be employed as the hermeneutical key to the intentions of the apostle.'³⁹

³⁰ Ibid., 668 n.20.

³¹ Cf. Betz, *Gal*, 321.

³² On the whole cf. Beck, 'Friede,' *TBLNT* 1, 388-394.

³³ Cf. Eßer, 'Barmherzigkeit,' *TBLNT* 1, 52-55.

³⁴ Even a glance at the commentaries shows that. In addition cf. amongst others Dahl, 'Israel,' 161ff; Richardson, *Israel*, 81ff; Schrenk, "Israel Gottes", 94ff.

³⁵ Ellcott in Fung, *Gal*, 310 (cf. also other possible interpretations listed stated there).

³⁶ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 319; cf. BDR, § 469.

³⁷ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 320. With the question as to the meaning of Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ cf. comment below.

³⁸ Fung, *Gal*, 300.

³⁹ Betz, *Gal*, 131.

First of all, Paul engages in a final blistering attack on his Judaizing opponents (vv.12f), those ‘circumcisers’ (v.13) whose preaching of circumcision and law-observance threatens Paul’s gospel of the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ (v.14) which has been given to him δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1.12). He characterizes his opponents in four ways: 1) They want to make a good impression in the flesh (v.12a). Therefore 2) they want to have the Galatians circumcised because they want to avoid being persecuted for the cross of Christ (v.12b), 3) they not even observe the law themselves (v.13a) but 4) they want the Galatians to be circumcised, so that they may boast in the Galatians’ flesh (v.13b).

Ad 1) In v.12a Paul exposes the true motivation of his opponents: Their concern is only for themselves, they only want to make a good impression in respect to the flesh. ‘Flesh’ could refer to the opponents’ flesh, i.e. their fleshly attitude, their good outward appearance, or to the flesh of the Galatians, i.e. the flesh of circumcision as in v.13b, or perhaps to both. In the last case σάρξ would mean the actual circumcised flesh of the Galatians and also the fleshly attitude of the opponents (their boasting): their demand for the ‘flesh of circumcision’ (v.13b) is an expression of their fleshly mind (v.12). So, right from the outset of the postscript, Paul makes it unmistakably clear that the position and the theology of his opponents are built on the flesh.

Ad 2) The opponents demand circumcision because they want to avoid being persecuted for the cross.⁴⁰ Or, to switch the argument, if they did not preach circumcision, they would be persecuted, or at least they would risk being persecuted since then the cross would be the only message of their preaching. Thus it would be the preaching of the soteriological exclusiveness of the cross that would cause the persecution. Therefore, we may conclude that they preached the soteriological relevance of the cross in addition to the soteriological relevance of circumcision and law-obedience. In other words, they are striving for a soteriological compromise between the gospel of the cross and circumcision and/or law-obedience. For the opponents salvation can only be attained as a member of Israel.

But for Paul any soteriological compromise between the cross and anything else is treason to the true gospel. There cannot possibly be any other gospel than the one he received ‘by revelation from Jesus Christ’ (1.12) and which he first preached to the Galatians. Therefore, the compromise for which Paul’s opponents

⁴⁰ Such a persecution could most likely come from the Jewish community (cf. Betz, *Gal*, 360; Burton, *Gal*, 349; Fung, *Gal*, 305; Schlier, *Gal*, 280) although there is no need to assume a real threat (cf. Mell, *Schöpfung*, 288) since Paul wants to emphasize ‘den Zusammenhang von Kreuz und Verfolgung (...), der sich nicht auf seinen religionspolitisch-pragmatischen Aspekt reduzieren läßt’ (Weder, *Kreuz*, 203).

strive is nothing else than a perversion of the gospel (1.6f). Either the soteriological exclusiveness of the Christ event on the cross is maintained or the soteriological relevance of the cross is entirely lost. 'Mark my words! I, Paul, tell you [sc. Galatians] that if you let yourselves be circumcised, Christ will be of no value to you at all' (5.2).

Ad 3) In v.13 Paul gives more reason for his accusation of v.12: it is quite obvious that those circumcisers just want to avoid persecution for the cross since, in fact, they not even observe the law themselves. With Mell we would argue, 'daß der atl. belegte Ausdruck νόμον φυλάσσειν ("das Gesetz befolgen, - halten")⁴¹ hier **nicht** die (erfolgreiche) Befolgung der in der Thora enthaltenen **Einzelgebote** (anders Röm 2,26: τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νομοῦ φυλάσσειν), sondern die fundamentale Entscheidung eines jeden Menschen, **den Lebensweg der jüd. Thora** zu gehen, meint (...). Da der Jude (und Judenchrist) bei der Thoratreue sich seiner Unzulänglichkeit, die göttlichen Gebote vollkommen zu erfüllen, selbstverständlich bewußt ist bzw. sich auf Gottes barmherzige Vergebung angewiesen weiß (vgl. Sir 5,5-7; 7,16f; 17,24-26; 21,1), wäre der paulinische Vorwurf völlig bedeutungslos.⁴² But for Paul anyone who preaches the soteriological relevance of circumcision is required to go the *Lebensweg* of the Jewish law (cf. 5.3). The Jewish way of circumcision and law-obedience is as exclusive as the Christian way of the cross. Therefore, any soteriological compromise between circumcision/law and cross is simply impossible. In fact, it would not only be a betrayal of the cross but also of the law. So, for Paul his opponents live in an unbearable self-contradiction: they preach circumcision and thus the exclusiveness of the way of the law - but they also preach the cross and in doing so they undermine the relevance of the law and thus they do not, more, they *cannot* walk the way of the law. And - according to Paul - the only conceivable reason that could make one live with such a dilemma is the fear of persecution for preaching the soteriological exclusiveness of the cross. But this dilemma leads on into the next:

Ad 4) The opponents have to provide evidence of their loyalty to the law. Paul relentlessly exposes that dilemma: they do not preach circumcision because they want to go the *Lebensweg* of the Jewish Torah, or because they proclaim the soteriological exclusiveness of the law - but⁴³ they preach circumcision and they

⁴¹ For evidence Mell points to the LXX: Ex 13.10; Lev 19.19,37; Deut 32.46; 1Chr 22.12; Ps 119.44,55,57,136; Prov 6.20; 28.7; 29.18; Wis 6.4; 14.16; Sir 21.11; Jer 16.11.

⁴² Mell, *Schöpfung*, 289f (bold original); cf. Jewett, 'Agitators,' 201.

⁴³ In our judgment this interpretation is the only one that is able to maintain an adversative meaning of ἀλλά. Otherwise we would have to side with Betz, *Gal*, 317 saying that 'the adversative ἀλλά makes little sense'.

want the Galatians to be circumcised because they want to avoid persecution for the cross by showing their true zeal for the law to that legalistic Jewish-Christian group which stands behind them.⁴⁴ In other words, they want to boast 'in the flesh' (v.13c) of the Galatians, i.e. in their circumcision, before that group. 'The more Gentiles they could notch up as having been circumcised at their instance, the weightier the evidence which they could adduce of their zeal for the law. This was mere scalp-hunting - or (*salva reverentia*) an apter description would be suggested by the bride-price which David paid for Michal (1 Sa. 18:25-27).'⁴⁵ Of course, this could never be a legitimate reason for Paul to boast in, because it is based on the *σάρξ*. The *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν σαρκί* of Paul's opponents is nothing else than the perversion of the only legitimate boasting, the *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν κυρίῳ* (cf. 2Cor 10.17).

In the following second part of the postscript (v.14f) Paul almost with an imprecation upon himself (*ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο*)⁴⁶ contrasts the gospel of his opponents and their boasting with his (true) gospel of the cross and the only legitimate boasting: 'Far be it from me to boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ' (v.14a). Paul's boasting is legitimate because the cross is the cross τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Therefore, it is in fact *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν κυρίῳ*. And for Paul this boasting in the cross is exclusive. The cross of Christ, the risen and exalted Lord, has destroyed the grounds for any other boasting. Boasting in the flesh, boasting in the law, boasting in circumcision - all those ways of boasting have been annulled on the cross. If we recall that boasting in God implies a confession to God⁴⁷ we could formulate that Paul says nothing less than that the cross has become the only means by which a confession to God is made possible. In other words, 'jetzt und in Zukunft (...) [kann] nur noch über das Kreuz Christi ein Gottesverhältnis konstituiert werden.'⁴⁸ Paul's gospel of the cross is the preaching of the soteriological exclusiveness of the Christ event. And this is exactly what the opponents obviously would deny. So, the matter of controversy is the christology, the heart of Paul's gospel. And the cross is the crisis of the christology.

But why can Paul speak of the cross with such high regard? Why has the cross become the only reason to boast? Because the cross has destroyed the basis for any other boasting - once and for all:⁴⁹ through the cross, i.e. the Christ event at

⁴⁴ See above ad 2).

⁴⁵ Bruce, *Gal*, 270.

⁴⁶ Luther, *Gal*, 350: 'Er will sagen: Eine so schädliche Pest ist das fleischliche Rühmen der Falschapel, daß ich wünschte, es wäre in der tiefsten Hölle begraben, denn es tut unsäglichen Schaden.'

⁴⁷ Cf. Bultmann, *TWNT* 3, 647; see above notes on 2Cor 5.12.

⁴⁸ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 293.

⁴⁹ Cf. the perfect tense of *ἐσταύρωται* in v.14.

the cross, the sinister relationship between the world and the paradigmatic Christian 'I' has been put to an end. This has a twofold implication for Paul: 1) Through the cross ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται 2) καὶ γὰρ κόσμῳ.

Ad 1) Through the cross the world, the dominion and the means of sin and death, has been crucified to me, the Christian. On the cross the enslaving power of the world has been made powerless. The cross is the destruction of the power of the world over me, so that I no longer live as a slave under the enslavement of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (4.3). On the cross, the world which determined my whole existence and the course of my history, the world on which my life rested entirely, has passed away and with it the soteriological and social divisions that were characteristic of this world such as the division between Jews and Gentiles, slaves and free people, males and females (3.28), and - in particular - the division of the law between circumcision and uncircumcision (v.15).⁵⁰ On the cross a whole world has met its death with respect to me. 'Sie stellt nichts mehr dar,'⁵¹ it lost its enslaving reality for me. In this sense, as a Christian I have become worldless through the cross of Christ.

Ad 2) Through the cross I, the slave of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, have been crucified to the world. On the cross I am snatched from the enslaving grip of the world. Since the crucifixion of Christ I am no longer part of the dominion of the world. The world can no longer get hold of me because in Christ's death on the cross I am rescued 'from the present evil age' (1.4). So, the cross is the ultimate declaration of bankruptcy of the world since it deprived and still deprives the world of its slaves. That implies that the world can no longer define the soteriological and social identity of the Christians since the relationship between the 'world' and the 'I' has been radically cut off.

If we now recall that σταυρός stands for the whole Christ event we can see easily the close parallel between v.14 and 2Cor 5.14ff: Christ's death on the cross is the death of the (old) world to me ('the old things have gone,' 2Cor 5.17b) and it is the death of me to the world ('one died for all - therefore all died,' 2Cor 5.14; cf. Rom 6.10: 'the death Christ died, he died to sin once for all'). So, Paul's statement in Gal 6.14 can only adequately be understood on the basis of the idea of Christ as the inclusive representative who died for all, although this idea is not mentioned explicitly. Christ's crucifixion is my crucifixion and the crucifixion of the old world. And just like 'death' in 2Cor 5 'crucifixion' in Gal 6.14 does not apply in a physical but in an eschatological sense. In both passages the Christ event is regarded as the

⁵⁰ On these divisions cf. in particular Martyn's essay 'Apocalyptic Antinomies'.

⁵¹ Schlier, *Gal*, 282.

eschatological turn of the ages and the eschatological death of mankind to the world, to sin, and to death. Therefore, with regard to the 'crucified world' we may conclude: 'Das Kreuzesgeschehen trennt (...) zwei "Welten", eine vorchristliche, vergangene von einer in Christus gewandelten, neuen Welt. Alle Dinge (...), die im Zusammenhang des Gottesverhältnisses des Menschen bisher eine soteriologische Qualität besaßen, haben mit der eschatologischen Wende ihren Wert verloren und müssen Neuem weichen.'⁵² And with regard to the 'crucified "I"' we can say 'daß durch das eschatologische Christusgeschehen die "Existenzwende" (H.-W. Kuhn, ...) des Menschen ausgelöst ist, die Paulus als "Herrschaftswechsel" (...) in Gal 2,19a (...) entfalten kann.'⁵³

That the cross is not just a destructive but at the same time a constructive event is made explicit in v.15: the cross replaced the old world and the old 'I' by a new creation. The new creation inaugurated on the cross is the basis (*γάρ*) for the Pauline boasting (v.14). And with regard to the peculiar controversy in Galatia Paul formulates therefore: 'Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any value but a new creation.' The reason that Paul rejects his opponents' boasting in circumcision, and the reason that he declares his own boasting in the cross the only legitimate boasting is that the cross has brought about a new creation in which the old soteriological divisions⁵⁴ are abolished. Therefore, it makes no sense at all for Jewish Christians to boast in their belonging to the Jewish nation, nor for Gentile Christians to boast in their uncircumcision (cf. Rom 11.18). 'For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any value but a new creation.' The soteriological division between circumcision and uncircumcision is replaced by the one new soteriological order - the *καινή κρίσις* in Christ on the cross that applies to all humanity. Against the soteriological particularism of his Jewish Christian opponents Paul sets - influenced and inspired by Deutero-Isaiah⁵⁵ - the traditional

⁵² Mell, *Schöpfung*, 296.

⁵³ Ibid., 296 n.54.

⁵⁴ For Barclay, *Obedying*, 102 (italics F.B.) new creation signifies 'a reordering of *social* relationships in which the "old world" of *social* divisions between "circumcised" and "uncircumcised" is abolished and a new *social* entity is created.' Undoubtedly, Barclay has made a correct point but he falls short of expressing the central meaning of new creation. For Paul has almost unmistakably made clear that the matter of controversy is the christology and not a social order of relationships. In other words, the question that is discussed in Galatia is the question as to the true soteriology. This alone is the reason why Paul launches such a blistering attack against the 'circumcisers' who hold that salvation can only be attained as a member of Israel. For Paul the division between circumcision and uncircumcision is surely not just (but also, and in so far Barclay is right) a social but primarily a soteriological division. If this is not seen the thrust of Paul's attack is totally misjudged. Barclay's social interpretation of new creation in Paul runs the risk of dissolving christology in (social) ethics. And that would be nothing less than to loose the heart of Pauline theology.

⁵⁵ Cf. above comment on 2Cor 5.17 and Part I.

Jewish idea of a new creation in which any soteriological particularism is overcome. The soteriological privilege of the synagogue, constituted by the Torah, has been abolished. The only thing that counts with regard to salvation is not to belong to the circumcision, i.e. the Jewish nation, or to the uncircumcision, i.e. to the Gentile part of humanity but to belong to the *καινή κτίσις*, i.e., . . . analogously, to belong to the one, universal people of God 'through faith in Jesus Christ' (3.26). And for God's people, the universal church, 'there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female' for they are all one in Christ Jesus (3.28). God has chosen a new people out of Jews and Gentiles. Thus new creation means the universal election and soteriological equality⁵⁶ of all mankind.

We can certainly go along with Mell who, siding with Stuhlmacher, regards *καινή κτίσις* as 'Aussage des Glaubens über den "erwählungsgeschichtlichen Grundsatz," der seit dem geschichtlichen Datum des Christuserignisses die neue eschatologische und universale Verfassung der Welt bestimmt.'⁵⁷ But the consequence he draws surely needs to be questioned: 'Nicht der Mensch heißt in Gal 6,15 "neue Schöpfung", sondern die Welt'.⁵⁸

Mell himself emphasizes explicitly that in Gal 6.15 'über das jeweilige Merkmal [= περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία] der Status eines Kollektivs bezeichnet [sc. wird], dessen Individuen Träger dieses Merkmals sind.'⁵⁹ Therefore, in analogy it is quite natural to assume the same for *καινή κτίσις*, the contrasting expression. Then, *καινή κτίσις* describes the status of a community whose members themselves have become a new creature. Thus, an anthropological-ecclesiological connotation in the Pauline conception of *καινή κτίσις* can hardly be denied.

Mell's mistake is already predetermined when he takes the 'crucified world' in v.14 for the contrasting expression to *καινή κτίσις* thereby neglecting the fact that the 'crucified world' is indissolubly linked to the 'crucified "I"'. But if the paradigmatic 'crucified "I"' is suppressed, it is only logical that an anthropological-ecclesiological side of *καινή κτίσις* is denied.

Against Mell we may therefore formulate: Not only the world is called a new creation but also the Christians. But again, we have to emphasize that the new creation is not applied in a physical but in an eschatological sense. Physically the world and its humanity is still present. But on the cross of Christ the world has ultimately been crucified, i.e. it lost its enslaving power. With regard to the world *καινή κτίσις* means that the world has come under a new eschatological dominion. Equally, the other is true: the cross of Christ is the ultimate liberation of humanity (cf. the paradigmatic 'I') from the slavery of the 'elements of the world' (4.3). Therefore, with regard to the 'I' *καινή κτίσις* means that a new humanity of new

⁵⁶ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 315.

⁵⁷ *Schöpfung*, 317.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 317.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 299 n.68.

creatures has been established on the cross. Thus, *καινή κτίσις* in Gal 6.15 has clearly two eschatological dimensions, a cosmological and an anthropological-ecclesiological dimension.⁶⁰ The new cosmic reality 'ist Voraussetzung für die neue persönliche Wirklichkeit, die Entscheidung über den Kosmos bestimmt die Entscheidung über den einzelnen Menschen.'⁶¹ 'Diese neue Wirklichkeit wird von mir nur erfaßt, wenn ich selbst von ihr ergriffen bin (Phil 3,12).'⁶² This happened to Paul on the road to Damascus. So, 'Damaskus ist kein Denkart, kein Gefühls-umschwung, kein Willensentschluß, sondern eine neue Wirklichkeit,'⁶³ a new eschatological reality. Those who have been crucified with Christ on the cross have become a new creature within a new creation; they have become members of the new eschatological people of God (3.28). On the cross the creative power of God has inaugurated a new eschatological reality and those who are included in that reality have become and are called a new creation.

So, the new creation accomplished in and through Christ at the cross is the crisis of the Christian existence: those who preach a different Christ and a perverted gospel (1.6f) place themselves under an eternal curse: 'If anybody is preaching to you a gospel other than what you accepted, let him be eternally condemned!' (1.9) But on the other hand, those who will be conformable to the gospel of the new creation in Christ will be eternally blessed with peace and mercy (v.16), i.e. their relationship to God will be healed and God's mercy will rest upon them. So, the decision between Paul's gospel of Christ and the opponents' pseudo-gospel is a matter of blessing or condemnation, of life and death, of all or nothing. And the decision upon the true gospel includes also the decision upon the true christology, the true cosmology, and the true soteriology. The problem in Galatia is not just of noetic but of existential nature and when Paul urgently calls upon the Galatians to conform to the *καινή κτίσις* he means that in an existential way: he wants the Galatians to be conformable to God's *καινή κτίσις* with all their life, with all their heart - and with their whole conduct. I.e., the decision upon the true gospel is at the same time the decision upon the true ethical conduct.⁶⁴

But who is the group to which Paul extends his blessing? Who is the *Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ*? Undoubtedly, the expression 'Israel of God' can still be regarded as a

⁶⁰ This is strongly emphasized by Minear, 'Enigma,' esp. 405-407.

⁶¹ Michel, 'Christus,' 59.

⁶² Ibid., 65.

⁶³ Ibid., 64. Cf. Luther, *Gal*, 355: 'Das sind, daß ich so sage, keine Veränderungen, die sich in Worten erschöpfen, sondern wirkliche Veränderungen, die eine neue Denkart, Willen, neue Sinne und Handlungen, auch was das Fleisch angeht, bringen'.

⁶⁴ Cf. below § 7.2.

crux interpretum.⁶⁵ It occurs neither in the OT nor in the Jewish literature nor anywhere else in the NT. It is a specifically shaped Pauline expression. 'Israel' in Paul refers always to Israel as God's chosen people, as the people of God's covenant⁶⁶ (cf. particularly Rom 9-11) who ought to conform to that divine covenant. But Paul knows that 'not all who are descended from Israel are Israel' (Rom 9.6). In other words, for Paul there is a true Israel (the remnant; Rom 11.5) within Israel. Making this observation it is only natural to take Ἰσραὴλ in Gal 6.16 as a reference to the Jewish nation, God's covenantal people. But why Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ? Betz has correctly pointed out that τοῦ θεοῦ seems to be redundant.⁶⁷ We would therefore suggest that Paul uses 'Israel of God' as an expression for the true, faithful Israel,⁶⁸ who have come to recognize Jesus as the Christ of God. In other words, he uses 'Israel of God' as an expression for the Jewish Christians and those of the Jewish nation who will become Christians in the future.⁶⁹ This suggestion, however, is not to deny a connection between the ὅσοι/αὐτούς and the Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ. True Christians, whether they are Jews or Gentiles, ought to conform to the rule of the καινὴ κτίσις in which 'neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any value' (v.15).⁷⁰ Thus, Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ functions as an extension of the blessing 'beyond the Galatian Paulinists to those Jewish Christians who approve of his κανὼν ("rule") in v.15'⁷¹ and to those who *will* approve of it.

But why does Paul extend his blessing beyond the Galatian Christians to the 'Israel of God'? If we keep in mind the argumentative context of Gal we could, although there is admittedly no proof, suggest with Betz⁷² 'that Paul took over this

⁶⁵ Cf. the commentaries and Dahl, 'Israel,' 161ff; Davies, 'Israel,' 4ff; Mell, *Schöpfung*, 318ff; Richardson, *Israel*, 81ff; Schrenk, 'Segenswunsch,' 170ff; id., "Israel Gottes", 94ff.

⁶⁶ Cf. Burton, *Gal*, 358.

⁶⁷ Betz, *Gal*, 323. But in the light of Rom 9.6 his further statement that 'it makes no sense to speak of an Israel which is not "of God"' is rather questionable.

⁶⁸ Or as Burton, *Gal*, 358 puts it: '... the pious Israel, the remnant according to the election of grace (Rom 11.5), including even those who had not seen the truth as Paul saw it, and so could not be included in ὅσοι ... στοιχ.'

⁶⁹ In analogy to the future στοιχήσουσιν (v.16b) we could also assume a future connotation in v.16c: 'Israel' is not just the Jewish Christians, but it is also those who are still to believe. Cf. Richardson, *Israel*, 82 who, however, finds in the 'Israel of God' *only* those who are still to believe. Bruce, *Gal*, 275 goes along with our interpretation and referring to Müßner, he says: 'F.Müssner (...) probably indicates the true sense when he identifies the Israel of God here with πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ of Rom. 11:26. For all his demoting of the law and the customs, Paul held good hope of the ultimate blessing of Israel. They were not all keeping in line with "this rule" yet, but the fact that some Israelites were doing so was in his eyes a pledge that this remnant would increase until, with the ingathering of the full tale (πλήρωμα) of Gentiles, "all Israel will be saved".'

⁷⁰ Fung, *Gal*, 310 quoting O'Neill: 'Paul "can hardly have meant to bless the whole of Israel ..., irrespective of whether or not they held to the canon of the cross of Christ."'

⁷¹ Betz, *Gal*, 323.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 323.

expression from his Jewish-Christian opponents,' who would identify themselves with the true Israel. For them the gospel of the cross would be the completion of the Jewish faith. But although the gospel of Christ is the decisive element for the constitution of the true Israel, salvation is still available only as a member of the Jewish nation. In other words, Paul's opponents attach the salvation-historical 'pre' of the Jewish Torah to the Christian gospel of the cross. And this is exactly what Paul denies with vehemence. For him the gospel of the cross of Christ has ultimately abolished the soteriological privilege of the Jewish nation and the soteriological relevance of law-obedience. So, the claim of his opponents to be the true Israel made perfect by the gospel of Christ cannot be true. Rather, the title 'Israel of God' could only be given to those of Israel who conform to the rule of the new creation in Christ, i.e. to those who accepted the absolute salvation-historical 'pre' of the Christian gospel over the Jewish Torah. To sum up: For the opponents the Jewish Torah defines and alters the Christian gospel, for Paul, however, the Christian gospel completely redefines the role of the Jewish Torah. And only those of Israel who go along with that redefinition by the gospel of the cross can legitimately be called the true Israel, the 'Israel of God'. Thus, the intention of v.16c is not to tear away the title 'Israel (of God)' from the Jewish nation,⁷³ but to snatch it from his judaizing opponents who claim to be the true Israel. Against this background it is even more striking how severe an attack Paul launches against his opponents since he does not only question their being Christians but he also denies their belonging to the true Israel, the 'Israel of God'. They are neither true Christians nor true Israelites.⁷⁴

⁷³ This seems to be an impossible thought for Paul, particularly against the background of Rom 9-11.

⁷⁴ Another possible solution is offered by Mell, *Schöpfung*, 318ff. He understands Ἰσραήλ τοῦ θεοῦ as referring to Israel as God's chosen people. Paul adds the unusual τοῦ θεοῦ to Ἰσραήλ because he has to emphasize the salvation-historical significance which Israel as the people of God's covenant still has. He has to do so since from his preaching of the gospel up to now 'könnte gefolgert und eben gegen die Christusverkündigung des Paulus eingewendet werden, daß sie die heilsgeschichtliche Beziehung des Bundesvolkes Israel zu Gott nicht mehr berücksichtigt und deshalb den Irrweg eines jüd. Apostaten darstelle.' (320f) 'Um dem Vorwurf eines heilsgeschichtlichen, soteriologischen Dualismus zu begegnen bzw. die soteriologische Exklusivität des Christusevangeliums nicht geschichtstheologisch in eine Aporie ausmünden zu lassen, fügt Paulus an den Segenszuspruch über die Anhänger des neuen soteriologischen Kanons die Hoffnung künftiger Rettung von Israel an. Trotz soteriologischer kosmischer Neuordnung in Christus bleibt die vorgängige geschichtliche Verheißung Gottes an Israel in Kraft (vgl. Röm 9,6ff)' (321f).

5.4) Summary and evaluation

1. *Καινὴ κτίσις* in Gal 6.15 is constituted in and through the Christ event on the cross. It has a christological basis. Thus, we can only reach an adequate understanding of *καινή κτίσις* via evaluating the meaning of the cross of Christ in the Pauline theology. The cross is the hermeneutical key to the understanding of the *καινή κτίσις*.

2. The cross of Christ has a destructive and a constructive side. It is destructive in a twofold regard. Firstly, the cross is the destruction of the relationship of the world to the Christians. On the cross the enslaving power of the world (the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*) has been overcome and the soteriological privilege of the synagogue has met its end. The old age of the sovereignty of the world has passed. That means the world, sin and death have ultimately lost their enslaving grip over the Christians. The world can no longer define the soteriological or social identity of the Christian community.

Secondly, the cross is the destruction of the relationship of the paradigmatic 'I' to the world. I am torn away from the sovereignty of the world. The cross is the denial of the relationship between me and the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. My worldly existence has been put to death.

To sum up: On and through the cross, the world has become 'slave-less' and I, the former slave, have become 'world-less'.

3. The constructive side of the cross is described with the summarizing expression *καινή κτίσις*. The cross is the inauguration of God's ultimate new creation. It is not at all surprising that the *καινή κτίσις*, in analogy to the destructive side of the cross, is constructive in a twofold regard: Firstly, the *καινή κτίσις* in the cross of Christ has replaced the old age by a new eschatological age. The old dominion is replaced by a new dominion. The old soteriological and social order is replaced by a new soteriological and social order: the soteriological and social particularism of the synagogue is replaced by the soteriological and social equality of all mankind. The soteriological exclusiveness of the Torah is replaced by the soteriological exclusiveness of the cross. The cross has become the *Shibboleth* of the new creation, the realm of God's peace and mercy.

Secondly, the *καινή κτίσις* in Christ on the cross has brought about a new humanity which is characterized by its conformity to the new eschatological reality. For this new eschatological, universal humanity the soteriological and social divisions of the old realm have been irrevocably abolished. Therefore, the new humanity consists of Jews and Gentiles, slaves and free people, men and women

(3.28). If we now recall that the *καινή κτίσις* is absolutely based on the inclusive Christ event on the cross, than we could equally say that *in Christ* a new humanity has been created. In other words, Paul's ecclesiology can only be understood adequately on the basis of the Christ event as inclusive representation. For Paul christology is the constitution of ecclesiology.

To sum up: *καινή κτίσις* in Gal 6.15 clearly has a cosmological and an anthropological-ecclesiological dimension. The people of the new eschatological humanity live as new creatures in a new creation.

4. It is almost superfluous to emphasize that Gal 6.15 confirms the picture of *καινή κτίσις* that we evaluated in 2Cor 5.17. In both passages *καινή κτίσις* is entirely based on the Christ event at the cross which is regarded as the eschatological turn of the ages that inaugurated a new eschatological reality with a new soteriological order. In both passages *καινή κτίσις* is invoked to counter Jewish Christian opponents. But since the opponents in Corinth are not the same as those in Galatia the thrust of Paul's usage of *καινή κτίσις* is slightly different: In 2Cor Paul emphasizes the universal anthropological-individual dimension of *καινή κτίσις*. In Gal, however, Paul is forced by his opponents to stress the cosmological and the anthropological-ecclesiological side of the *καινή κτίσις*: the new cosmic reality of the *καινή κτίσις* involves a new universal soteriology which abolishes the old soteriological particularism of the synagogue. And in that new cosmic reality neither the belonging to the Jewish nation nor the belonging to the Gentiles is of any value - but the belonging to the *καινή κτίσις* as the new universal people of God.

§ 6) Participation in the *καινή κτίσις*

6.1) The inclusive Christ event

We have already seen that for Paul *καινή κτίσις* is exclusively based on the atoning Christ event at the cross. In Christ's death and resurrection a new creation has come to be, a new eschatological reality, a new age of reconciliation, a new humanity of new people. On the cross the old world, the old dominion, the old soteriological and social divisions have been put to death. In short: *καινή κτίσις* in Paul is defined christologically (or staurologically). Therefore, the question as to our participation in the *καινή κτίσις* is nothing else than the question as to our participation in the Christ event at the cross.

The first and fundamental answer to our question has to be: In an active sense we cannot participate in the Christ event at all, but we are already - passively - made participants of the Christ event since Christ died and was raised as the inclusive representative *ὑπὲρ πάντων*. 'One died for all - therefore, all died' (2Cor 5.14). That means that an anthropological interpretation of the Christ event is not necessary since Paul's christology 'läßt das Christusgeschehen als solches und immer schon auf den Menschen zulaufen, läßt den Menschen im Christusgeschehen von Anfang an (und nicht erst nachträglich) vorkommen. Ursprünglicher als in diesem Ansatz der Christologie kann der Mensch nicht bedacht sein. Ist er doch von Gott bedacht, ehe der Mensch sich selbst bedacht haben kann. Insofern ist die Christologie oder besser: Gottes Handeln in Christus dem Menschen und seiner Geschichte immer schon voraus.'¹ If this is so, i.e. if it is right, 'daß nach Paulus die Geschichte Jesu Christi die *von Gott her für uns* geschehene Geschichte ist, dann sind wir von dieser Geschichte immer schon umfaßt. Dann gilt Gottes Intention in dieser Geschichte von Haus aus uns. (...) Dann kommen wir in dieser Geschichte immer schon vor und können uns in ihr wiederfinden. Dann nimmt diese Geschichte unsere Geschichte in sich auf und wird zu unserer Geschichte. Das ist deshalb so, weil Gott diese Geschichte für uns geschehen sein ließ, weil Christus für uns starb.'² And on the contrary, if this were not so, if the Christ event were not meant to be an act of inclusive representation for the benefit of all mankind, any effort to make the Christ event applicable and accessible for us today would be quite dubious, not to say in vain. For how could an event that took place 2000

¹ Eichholz, *Theologie*, 199.

² *Ibid.*, 201f (italics original).

years ago possibly be applicable to me, if this event, by definition, had not happened also for my benefit, if it had not been an event of personal representation in which I was meant to be included right from the beginning? 'Wäre diese Geschichte [= the Christ event] uns nämlich nicht von Anfang an zgedacht, nähme sich in ihr nicht Gott selbst unser in seinem unbegreiflichen und uneinholbaren Zuvorkommen an, so könnten wir uns nicht auf sie beziehen, so ließe sie sich nicht auf den Menschen hin interpretieren.'³

To sum up: It is the inclusive Christ event itself as God's eschatological history $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$ that made and - through its proclamation in the present - still makes us participants of the $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\eta}\ \kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$.

6.2) The gospel of the inclusive Christ event

6.2.1) The proclamation of the inclusive Christ event

The inclusive Christ event must not be misunderstood in the sense of an automatism of salvation for all mankind. Otherwise, it would make little sense to preach the gospel of the cross with an urgency such as is characteristic for Paul's apostolic ministry. Rather, we have to emphasize now what we already mentioned above: 'Das *eine* Heilsgeschehen der rettenden Zuwendung Gottes zu dem der Sünde verfallenen, gottfeindlichen Menschen'⁴ consists of two constitutive elements: God's *saving act* in the atoning death for all and in God's *saving word*, the proclamation of that saving act on the cross. In the past on the cross God has acted once for all for the reconciliation of all and in, with and through the preaching of his ministers God speaks his own creative word which makes reconciliation prevail through the ages. God's reconciliation in Christ is the great eschatological Exodus, the liberation from the slavery of sin and death *and* it is the 'Eisodus' into the new age, the new dominion, the new creation. Hence, 'die Versöhnungstat Gottes proklamieren, heißt ... teilnehmen (nicht mehr, aber dies immerhin) an dem Triumphzuge, den das Evangelium und somit Gott selbst in seinem Wort durch die Welt angetreten hat.'⁵ God's gospel of reconciliation, the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon$, is

³ Ibid., 210.

⁴ Hofius, "Gott ...", 31 (italics original).

⁵ H.-J. Iwand cited in Hofius, "Gott ...", 32.

the irreversible constitution of the *καινή κτίσις* which has already become a present reality. And the gospel is God's creative word that brings about what it says. 'For God, who said, "Let light shine out of darkness," made his light shine in our hearts' (2Cor 4.6) and he who says 'Be reconciled,' (2Cor 5.20) accomplished our reconciliation.

To sum up: through the inclusive Christ event and its proclamation God made and still makes us participants of the *καινή κτίσις*. The eschatological Christ event has not only taken place in the past but it is at the same time an always present reality.

6.2.2) Faith in Christ, the inclusive representative

Again, if we said that through the proclamation of the gospel God makes us participants of the *καινή κτίσις* we must be wary of assuming an automatism. Rather, we have to ask now: *How* does the proclamation of the gospel make us participants of the *καινή κτίσις*?

The answer to this question can be found only implicitly in our *καινή κτίσις*-passages. In 2Cor 5.14 Paul says that the love of Christ leaves open no other way for him since he has come to the judgement (*κρίναντας*): 'one died for all - therefore all died.' In our interpretation of this passage (see above) we could make plain that the aorist *κρίναντας* must be understood as a reference to Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus. It is this reference that is of particular interest in this section.

How does Paul describe his experience on that road? Again, we may point to 2Cor 4.6: God made his light shine in Paul's heart 'to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ.' I.e., meeting Christ on the way to Damascus illuminated Paul's heart, so that he could see Christ as he really is - as the crucified and risen Lord. This new knowledge is not a neutral knowledge to which Paul could respond in one way or the other. This knowledge hit Paul's heart, the centre of his personality, and changed his whole life, leaving open no other way for him than - to *believe* and therefore to preach that knowledge (4.13!). Damascus made Paul, the persecutor of Christ, a believer in Christ. And 'was dem Apostel in der unmittelbaren Begegnung mit dem gekreuzigten und auferstandenen Kyrios als dem Evangelium in Person widerfahren ist, das ereignet sich überall da, wo das verkündigte Evangelium sich als rettende δύναμις θεοῦ erweist: das

Wunder der Neuschöpfung, das nur mit dem Wunder der Erschaffung des Lichtes am ersten Schöpfungstag verglichen werden kann.’⁶

So, the answer to our question at the beginning of this section has to be: the (proclamation of the) gospel made Paul a participant of the *καινή κτίσις* by giving him a new - the true - knowledge of Christ together with the faith in Christ. For Paul there is in fact no participation in the *καινή κτίσις* without being existentially involved. Faith in the crucified and risen Christ is the constitutive element of the participation in the *καινή κτίσις* on the side of mankind. And the vehicle of this faith is the proclamation of the gospel of Christ (Rom 10.17). Faith is the mode of our participation in the *καινή κτίσις* and since it is an eschatological reality it cannot be a human possibility. Faith in Christ the crucified and risen Lord is as much God’s own work as the Christ event at the cross itself. So, after all, we can further our understanding of *καινή κτίσις*: It is constituted by the eschatological Christ event in the past and the proclamation of this event in the present evoking faith.⁷ Hence, we could formulate it thus: faith is the seal of the new creation that testifies to having become a participant in the *καινή κτίσις*.

This picture of the role of faith with regard to the participation in the *καινή κτίσις* is confirmed in Gal. In the postscript Paul emphasizes that in Christ on the cross a new age and a new humanity has been established. The old reality with its soteriological and social divisions is replaced by a new reality, with its own new soteriological and social order: what counts is neither circumcision nor uncircumcision but being a participant in the *καινή κτίσις* (6.15), i.e. being part of the new eschatological humanity of which Christ is the firstfruits. Paul calls this new humanity ‘the family of believers’ (6.10). Elsewhere he says that ‘you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.’ (3.26) For Paul faith is the mode of participating in the great new Exodus in Christ, the Exodus from the slavery of the world, the sin, and the law (5.22-25!) to live in freedom (5.13) as the beloved children of God. Moreover, faith is the mode of participating in the life of the risen Christ so that Paul can even say: ‘The life I live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.’ (2.20) Faith in Christ stands at the heart of Paul’s preaching. The apostle was even called ‘the evangelist of faith’ (1.23).

To sum up: the proclamation of the gospel of ^{the} inclusive Christ event is the vehicle of God’s eschatological gift of faith which makes us participants, i.e. new

⁶ Hofius, ‘Wort Gottes,’ 162.

⁷ Eichholz, *Theologie*, 202 has rightly emphasized that the Christ event is always to be seen in the context of proclamation and faith. ‘Dieser Kontext ist bei Paulus nie wegzudenken. Fiele er weg, so behielten wir Sätze einer Metaphysik bzw. einer Gnosis in der Hand.’

creatures of God's *καινή κτίσις*.⁸ Faith is the mode of participation in the *καινή κτίσις*.

6.2.3) Baptism into Christ, the inclusive representative

We have already mentioned Gal 3.28 and its context as a parallel to Paul's statement about the *καινή κτίσις* (6.15).⁹ The new creation has abolished any soteriological or social privilege once and for all, establishing a new eschatological universal humanity: 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ' (3.28), 'you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus' (3.26) for, Paul continues, 'all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ' (3.27). Paul clearly parallels 'faith in Christ' and 'baptism into Christ'. Thus, if we previously spoke of faith as the mode of our participation in the *καινή κτίσις* we have to extend our understanding on the basis of that parallel: faith *and* baptism is the mode of our participation in the *καινή κτίσις*. Faith *and* baptism is the mode of our participation in the new humanity of those who belong to Christ (3.29). This is also indicated by the phrase *Χριστόν ἐνδύσασθε* (3.27b).¹⁰ 'The Christian who puts on Christ does not thereby become Christ, but does share the character and consecration to God of Christ (Rom 13.14; cf. Eph 4.24; Col 3.10,12) and does belong to Christ (Gal 3.27f) and is part of that new humanity created by God in Christ.'¹¹ In short: Through faith in Christ and baptism into Christ 'participation in the *καινή κτίσις* (6.15), in the new humanity of Christ is granted (3.29).'¹² Hence, since faith and baptism are paralleled we may conclude that just like faith baptism must be seen in an indissoluble connection to the inclusive Christ event and its proclamation. As such baptism, precisely 'baptism into Christ,' belongs to God's one saving event of Christ's in-

⁸ Or with Hofius, 'Wort Gottes,' 163 we could formulate: 'Es ist einzig der durch Gottes Schöpferwort verwandelte und durch das Licht der Neuschöpfung erleuchtete Mensch, der - als *καινή κτίσις*! - die Herrlichkeit Gottes auf dem Angesicht Jesu Christi zu erkennen und an den gekreuzigten und auferstandenen Kyrios zu glauben vermag.'

⁹ See above comment on 6.14f; cf. also § 5.4 and § 6.2.2.

¹⁰ According to Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 338 this 'clothing-with-Christ'-language 'may have had its place already in early Christian baptismal traditions, perhaps aided by the re-clothing necessary after the act of baptism.' Cf. also Dunn, *Baptism*, 110.

¹¹ Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 338f. Cf. also p.57: 'In baptism the first Christians were conscious of becoming members of the community of the Messiah, enjoying fellowship with him'.

¹² Dunn, *Baptism*, 110.

clusive death and resurrection. 'So hält mir die Taufe zuletzt die Geschichte Jesu Christi als für mich geschehene Geschichte vor, und ich bekenne mich zu dieser Geschichte'¹³ This might well be the intention of the passive ἐβαπτίσθητε and the middle ἐνδύσασθε in 3.27: those who were baptized into Christ, i.e. those to whom the gospel of Christ has been proclaimed, bringing about faith, those have clothed themselves with Christ, i.e. they have given the public confession that they belong to Christ. The baptism into Christ proclaims over me what Christ has already done for me.¹⁴ It does not repeat what happened in Christ already.¹⁵ It is not the bridge from Christ to mankind since Christ himself is the bridge as inclusive representative.¹⁶ But now, 'verkündigt die Taufe, was im Christusgeschehen für mich geschehen ist, so wird (...) ihre *unumgängliche Funktion* und ihr *äußerster Rang* [umschrieben]. *Sie sagt mir an und sagt mir zu, was Christus für mich getan hat. Das muß mir angesagt und zugesagt werden: ich kann es ohne diese Ansage und Zusage nicht wissen. Diese Zusage sagt mir mein Heil zu,*'¹⁷ as *promissio Dei* which brings about what it says.

To sum up: Baptism has its place within the context of the proclamation of and the faith in Christ. As such it belongs to God's one saving event in Christ. Hence, it is an integral element of our participation in the καινή κτίσις in Christ.

6.3) The Spirit

In a section concerning the participation in the καινή κτίσις we can hardly ignore the role of the Holy Spirit although τὸ πνεῦμα does not occur explicitly in 2Cor 5.11-21 and Gal 6.11-16. Yet, it cannot be the goal of this study to deal with the whole of Pauline pneumatology at due length but at least some brief remarks on that topic should be made with - for our purpose - particular emphasis on 2Cor and Gal.

1. In 2Cor 3.17(+18) Paul has indissolubly linked the Spirit to the crucified and

¹³ Eichholz, *Theologie*, 212.

¹⁴ So, the cross is the presupposition of baptism. In other words, it is the eschatological Christ event at the cross that gives meaning to baptism (cf. Tannehill, *Dying*, 70f).

¹⁵ Ebeling, *Gal*, 288: 'Durch diesen je einmaligen individuellen Akt [wird] nichts anderes proklamiert, als was für alle ein für allemal geschehen ist.'

¹⁶ Eichholz, *Theologie*, 211.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 211 (italics original). Cf. Ebeling, *Gal*, 288: It is not possible to baptize 'ohne daß eine begleitende Deklaration (...) das Christusgeschehen bezeugt und zueignet.'



risen Lord: Ὁ κύριος¹⁸ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν. This is not to be understood in the sense of an identification between Christ and the Spirit.¹⁹ What Paul wants to emphasize is that the work of the Spirit must not be separated from the work of Christ. Or with Schlatter: 'Jenseits des Christus gibt es keine Wirksamkeit des Geistes.'²⁰ The reality of the risen Christ is essentially related to the reality of the Spirit.²¹ So, the καινὴ κτίσις, the new reality *post crucem*, is not only the dominion of the crucified and risen Lord but at the same time the realm of the life-giving Spirit of the Lord. And to participate in the καινὴ κτίσις means at the same time to participate in that Spirit. Moreover, just as the new creation has been brought about through the Spirit when he raised Christ from the dead (Rom 1.4) our participation in the καινὴ κτίσις is achieved by the Spirit: we are God's sons - κατὰ πνεῦμα, 'born by the power of the Spirit' (Gal 4.29).

2. We have already seen that καινὴ κτίσις and reconciliation in 2Cor 5.11-21 are coordinate conceptions.²² To be reconciled to God is the other side of being a participant in the new creation in Christ. Furthermore, we have just pointed to the proclamation of the gospel (of reconciliation) through which God himself makes the καινὴ κτίσις prevail in the present. In and through the apostolic ministry of reconciliation (2Cor 5.18) God speaks his own creative word that effects what it says. In 2Cor 3.8 this very ministry is called the διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος. The ministry of reconciliation is the ministry of the Spirit. 'Das heißt: Er ist ein "Dienst", der das vom Geist Gottes erfüllte und in der Kraft des Geistes die Herzen neuschaffende Evangelium verkündigt und damit jenes Wort laut werden läßt, in dem Gott selbst den in Christi Tod und Auferstehung ergangenen Freispruch zum Leben - Glauben wirkend - "offenbart".'²³ In Pauline words: 'You show that you are an ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ, the result of our ministry, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God (...) on tablets of human hearts' (2Cor 3.3; cf. Ezek 36.26f). In and through the apostolic ministry of proclaiming the gospel of Christ the life-giving Spirit (2Cor 3.6), as the presence of the crucified and risen

¹⁸ Hofius, 'Gesetz,' 119 n.258: 'Die Deutung auf Christus ergibt sich eindeutig daraus, daß V.16 den Worten τὸ κάλυμμα ... ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται V.14b entspricht.' In the same line Hughes, 2Cor, 115 n.14; Wolff, 2Kor, 76.

¹⁹ Cf. only the genitive 'the Spirit of the Lord' (not 'the Spirit is Lord!') in v.17b that speaks well against an identification.

²⁰ Paulus, 518. Cf. also Wolff, 2Kor, 76: 'ἐστιν ist nicht im Sinne einer logischen Identitätsaussage zu verstehen, sondern drückt ein Wirken aus (...): Der erhöhte Christus (Kyrios) wirkt stets durch Gottes Geist (...), von dem zuvor (...) die Rede war.'

²¹ That the Spirit is involved in the Christ event is explicitly said in Rom 1.4 where Paul stresses the fact that it was the Spirit who raised Christ from the dead.

²² See comment on 2Cor 5.18f and the summary in § 5.4.

²³ Hofius, 'Gesetz,' 86.

Christ, makes us participants in the *καινή κτίσις*. Moreover, he himself remains with the participants in the new creation: he is put in our hearts as a deposit guaranteeing what is to come (2Cor 1.22; 5.5; cf. Gal 3.2,5) and he is the seal of our sonship to God (2Cor 1.22; Gal 4.6). So, the Spirit set the start of the Christian life (cf. Gal 3.3) and he remains its sign.²⁴

3. Having discovered the indissoluble relationship between the Spirit and the inclusive Christ event and its proclamation it is only natural to expect the same relationship with regard to faith. And indeed, this is what we find in Paul. In 2Cor 4.13 Paul calls the Spirit the *πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως*²⁵ who made him, Paul, believe in Christ and therefore preach the gospel of Christ.²⁶ Obviously, in and through the proclamation of the gospel the Spirit brings on and effects faith. This insight is strengthened by 1Cor 2.4f where Paul says that his proclamation of the gospel happened 'with a demonstration of the Spirit's power, so that your faith might not rest on men's wisdom, but on God's power.' For Paul the power of the Spirit (of God) is the basis and the foundation of faith.

To sum up: The Spirit is inseparably linked to God's creative word of the gospel and its proclamation. As such he is also essentially related to faith in so far as he brings and effects faith. So, we can formulate emphatically: there is no participation in the *καινή κτίσις* without the Spirit.²⁷ In and through the proclamation of the gospel of Christ the Spirit of the Lord makes us participants of the *καινή κτίσις* by giving us faith.

²⁴ Note the analogy to what we said about the twofold nature of the 'love of Christ' in 2Cor 5.14f. It is surely not pure accident when Paul states 'love' as the main fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5.22).

²⁵ Amongst others Hughes, *2Cor*, 147 wants to understand *πνεῦμα* 'in the general sense of "disposition" or "impulse".' But within the same sentence Paul speaks about the resurrection (v.14) which makes Hughes' assumption rather unlikely. Rather, with Wolff, *2Kor*, 94 n.223 the nearest context points to a theologically shaped conception of *πνεῦμα*, i.e. the 'Spirit of faith' is the 'Spirit of the Lord'. Cf. also Lang, *Kor*, 282.

²⁶ Cf. Hofius, 'Wort Gottes,' 167; also *ibid.*, 167 n.133.

²⁷ Merk, *Handeln*, 19: 'Neue Schöpfung gibt es nur dort, wo es Gottes endzeitliche Gabe des Geistes gibt.'

PART III: NEW CREATION AND NEW LIFE

§ 7) Ethical implications of *καινή κτίσις*

7.1) 2Cor 5.11-21

In 2Cor 5.14f Paul tells us that Christ's love has become the directing force of his life. On the road to Damascus Christ's love has revealed itself to Paul giving him a new life and commissioning him for the ministry of preaching that love: 'One died for all, therefore all died.' Christ's love, manifested at the cross and powerfully, renewingly revealed to Paul in his conversion, made Paul a participant of the *καινή κτίσις* that God has inaugurated through Christ's inclusive death and resurrection. But for Paul Christ's love is not exhausted with making us participants of God's new creation. Christ's love does not leave us alone in that new reality. It is not just the starting point of the new Christian existence. Rather, it is also the power that compels us to lead a new life in that new reality. Thus, the purpose of Christ's loving work at the cross is not just to give us a new status (as new creatures in a new creation) but also to make us live our new lives. We are placed under the gift *and* under the claim (in this order!) of Christ's love.²⁸ This is meant when Paul says (v.15): 'And he died for all, that those who live no longer live for themselves but for him who died and was raised for them.' For Paul Christ's inclusive death and resurrection is the basis for the whole Christian existence²⁹ - regarding its being and regarding its ethics. So, Christian ethics 'fängt (...) nicht bei sich selbst an, wie denn auch der Christ nicht mit sich selbst anfängt. Der Christ wird ja vielmehr aus dem Tode geboren, nämlich aus dem Tode Christi, in den hinein der Sünder getauft wird (Röm 6,3). Und wenn er, der mit Christus mitgekreuzigt ist, nun (wieder) seinem Gott lebt, so doch, wie Paulus pointiert sagt, nicht er, sondern es lebt Christus in ihm (Gal 2,19f). Der Christ kann also gar nicht an sich selbst interessiert sein',³⁰ he can no longer live for himself. If this is so, i.e. if Christ himself in his love is living in the Christians then Christ himself and his love is the subject of the Christian life.³¹ Christ's love is the directing force of the Christian life.

²⁸ Cf. Furnish, *2Cor*, 328.

²⁹ Jüngel, 'Erwägungen,' 382 (italics original): 'Gottes *Tat* wirkt also unser *Sein*.'

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 381.

³¹ The peculiar usage of the datives in v.15 (cf. above notes on 2Cor 5.15) point in the same direction: If Christ lives in the Christians they do no longer belong to themselves but to Christ. Therefore, they can no longer live as though they belonged to themselves since they are Christ's own.

Thus, v.14f 'adroitly summarizes Paul's indication that the "constraining love" of Christ compels him to live a life of renewal as one honoring God through an honest portrayal of the Gospel, and a sincere ministry. This has been made possible by the work of Christ, something that propels Paul onward. Moreover, Paul's conclusion focuses on the meaning of Christian and apostolic existence, and offers a "measuring rod" for a true evaluation of his ministry'.³² Ruled by Christ's love Paul can only live 'for God' and 'for you,' the church (v.13),³³ and not for himself as his opponents do (cf. v.12) who boast in their external appearance, thereby revealing their true character: they are stigmatized by the fleshly 'for themselves'.

In other words, the purpose of Christ's love, manifested in his death and resurrection *for us*, is to give us new life and to evoke our love for Christ, which will make us live our new lives *for him*. Hence, Christ's love does not only make us glory in our new status but it also makes us realize that new status in our daily life. And if Paul boasts in the cross then he does that legitimately only because he lives according to that new status, i.e. he lives *for Christ* and *for the church* (v.13). The Christ event aims at new creation *and* new life. Or to use technical terms: christology and staurology aim at soteriology *and* ethics, in that very order. Only a new creature in Christ has the ability to live a new life.³⁴

The general theological statement of v.14f provides the ground on which v.16 is based: 'It follows that from now on we know no-one according to fleshly standards. Though we once knew Christ according to fleshly standards, we do so no longer.' With this verse Paul gives an example of the ethics of the new life. The Christ event and his own conversion made Paul a participant in the new creation in which the old standards of ethics, such as the way of knowing a person, have lost their validity. Paul has experienced a total change of his whole thinking. He says that a true Christian can no longer judge anyone as if Christ had not died as inclusive representative for all (v.14f). He can no longer judge anyone according to fleshly standards such as the external appearance. Rather, the criterion is whether anyone conforms to Christ's love manifested in his death and resurrection *for all*,

³² Martin, *2Cor*, 133.

³³ Cf. Furnish, *2Cor*, 329: 'The apostle, like every believer, is called to serve Christ by serving others. That is one claim Paul can and does make for his apostolate.'

³⁴ Cf. Schulz, *Ethik*, 384f: 'Wie der Mensch vor und neben Christus als Ganzer fleischlich ist, unter die Sündenmacht verkauft wurde und im Modus der Besessenheit wie in Gefangenschaft existierte (...), so wird er durch das Evangelium zur neuen Schöpfung (2.Kor. 5,17). Dem in Wort und Sakrament vollzogenen Herrschaftswechsel entspricht die totale Erneuerung und Neuschöpfung des Menschen wie die völlige Inanspruchnahme durch Christus. Nur diese durch das Wunder des Glaubens ins Leben gerufene neue Kreatur vermag im neuen Gehorsam zu stehen und den neuen Lebenswandel zu führen.'

i.e. whether anyone lives his or her life *for* God and *for* the others (cf. v.13). For Paul the Christ event is the measuring rod for Christian behaviour, for Christian ethics. And the opponents cannot meet that new christological-ethical standard. They still live according to the old fleshly categories. Looking at anyone, looking even at Christ they (can?) only see 'was sie in ihrem Selbstverständnis bestätigt: sie leben für sich selbst (V.15b!)'.³⁵ For Paul it is an irreconcilable contradiction to claim to be a true Christian, or even more to be a true apostle, and to live for one's own benefit. So, the behaviour of the opponents towards Paul and the Corinthian church is not, as it should be, motivated by Christ's love. They do not see Christ as he really is. In other words, they have a defective christology and therefore their ethics lacks its basis.

7.2) Gal 6.11-16

In 2Cor 5.11ff we have seen that the purpose of the *καινή κτίσις* brought about in Christ event at the cross is to make us participants of that new reality *and* to make us live our new life according to it. This is exactly what we find in Gal 6. On the one hand Paul says in v.15 that the old soteriological divisions between Jews and Gentiles have lost their validity. *Post crucem* the only thing that counts is to be participant of the *καινή κτίσις*, to be part of the new humanity which is one in Christ. So, the *καινή κτίσις* speaks of a new soteriology. But on the other hand this new soteriology includes at the same time a reordering of social relationships: Jews and Gentiles can now communicate with one another without any restrictions. They are all one, equal in Christ (3.28). No more will a Jew become unholy through keeping contact with a Gentile. The barrier between Jews and Gentiles has been torn down in the *καινή κτίσις* and the Christian community ought to conform to that new reality, not just in their mind but also in their daily life. It is for this reason that Paul so harshly criticized Peter in Antioch who ate with Gentiles but eventually drew back and separated himself from them for the fear of those who belonged to the circumcision group (cf. 2.11-14), i.e. for the fear of those who did not acknowledge that the barrier between Jews and Gentiles has been torn down in Christ. The Christians ought to live and to behave according to the freedom in and of the new creation. The new soteriological order has in-

³⁵ Wolff, *2Kor*, 127.

evitable ethical implications. The *καινή κτίσις* is not just the gift of a new existence but at the same time the claim to realize this gift in daily life. It is - to use Pauline words - the *κανών* (v.16), the new decisive reality to which the Galatians ought to conform (*στοιχεῖν*) with all their life and that means also - with all their conduct. It is a contradiction in itself to participate in the new creation in Christ without living accordingly. Christians do not just have a new status - they also have a new Lord, Christ, who is the subject and the driving force of their life (2.20). The *καινή κτίσις* is inaugurated through and in Christ and Christ himself is the Lord of the *καινή κτίσις*. But how can such a life according to the new creation in Christ be described more concrete? A brief look at the closest parallels to our passage may be quite revealing with regard to the concrete ethical implications of the *καινή κτίσις*.

7.3) Parallels to Gal 6.15

7.3.1) Gal 5.6

Two structural parallels³⁶ in the wider context of Gal 6.15 make the ethical implications of the *καινή κτίσις* even clearer. In 5.6, the first and the closest parallel to 6.15, Paul formulates: 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision has any value. The only thing that counts is faith expressing itself through love.'³⁷ Again we see what we already found out in section 5.2.2: faith and *καινή κτίσις* are indissolubly linked. We were even led to formulate that faith is the mode of our participation in the *καινή κτίσις*. So, it is no wonder that Paul could substitute 'καινή κτίσις' in 6.15 for 'faith' in 5.6.

In the first part of the sentence - just as in 6.15 - Paul stresses the fact that ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ the soteriological division of mankind into Jews and Gentiles is overcome, is abolished. Since then the state of circumcision or uncircumcision has become irrelevant with regard to salvation. The old soteriological division is superseded by the new soteriological equality of all mankind: the only thing that counts now is the *καινή κτίσις* (6.15) or, as Paul says here, faith in Christ.

Now, with regard to the ethical question it is of particular interest to see how Paul defines πίστις in 5.6: it is the πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, the faith ex-

³⁶ In fact the only ones in Gal, as Mell, *Schöpfung*, 306 has correctly stated.

³⁷ See also 1Cor 7.19: 'Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing. Keeping God's commands is what counts.'

pressing itself through love. Does that not confirm what we found out already, i.e. that Christians did not only become new creatures within a new creation, they are not only incorporated in a new humanity in Christ but they express their new status, their new reality in their daily life? Or to use the terminology of 5.6: What counts is not just faith that gives a new status; what counts is faith that expresses itself through love, faith that is active in love. In short, what counts is a loving faith. Love is the inevitable expression of faith. Or we could also say that love is the inevitable expression of our new status, our new existence within the *καινή κτίσις*.³⁸

So, the Christian ethics of love is primarily based on the faith in Jesus Christ, i.e. on christology although we should keep in mind that in 5.22 love occurs as the first-fruit of the *Spirit*. But this observation can hardly make us wonder since we already pointed to the inseparable relationship between Christ and the Spirit.³⁹ Christian life and Christian ethics without the Spirit is unthinkable for Paul. Christians live by the Spirit (5.16,25).⁴⁰

But what does Paul mean by 'love' in Gal 5.6? What does 'love' mean *in concreto*? Paul gives the answer in 5.13f: Love means to serve one another. In fact 'the entire law is summed up in a single command: "Love your neighbour as yourself."' Thus we find an remarkable coincidence between our considerations concerning *καινή κτίσις* and ethics in 2Cor 5 and Gal 6. In section 6.1 we came to the conclusion that Christ's love manifested at the cross is not just meant to make us new creatures in a new creation but to evoke our love for Christ which expresses itself through a life *for* Christ and *for* the church (cf. also Gal 6.10). Our love evoked through Christ's love for us is never ever self-seeking. True lovers do not live for themselves but for Christ and for the others (2Cor 5.15). 'Diese sich selbst aufgebende Liebe zum anderen ist (...) nicht nur Herz und Mitte, sondern auch das schlechthin maßgebende Kriterium der paulinischen Ethik.'⁴¹ To obviate a possible misunderstanding: Christian love does not merge into ethics since it has its continuous source in Christ's love manifested on the cross and this love cannot be simply understood ethically but only theologically. Christ's love gave us a new reality and through the Spirit, who lets it grow as a fruit in the Christians' life (5.22), it is the driving force which leads us on in that new reality. So, Christian life

³⁸ Cf. also Harnisch, 'Einübung,' 285f: Gal 5.6 'stellt fest, daß "in Christus" das System der Abgrenzungen, das auf die Sicherung religiöser Privilegien bedacht ist, vom Lebensprinzip des Glaubens abgelöst wird, eines Glaubens freilich, der in die Praxis der Liebe drängt und im Medium dieser Praxis sein Wesen hat.'

³⁹ Cf. above section 5.3.

⁴⁰ On the pneumatological dimension of Pauline ethics cf. amongst others Schrage, *Ethik*, 181-184.

⁴¹ Schrage, *Ethik*, 219.

is based on love and led by love.⁴² But if we emphasize that Christian love does not merge into ethics we have to say at the same time with Schrage: ‘Wo die Taten der Liebe im sichtbaren, realen Leben nicht mehr zeichenhaft aufleuchten, wird ihre Echtheit zweifelhaft. Das Einzelne und Konkrete *ist* nicht die Liebe, aber die Liebe verleibt sich und bekundet sich darin, wird sich dieser Ausdrucksformen bedienen und nicht in der Unanschaulichkeit verharren.’⁴³ For Paul love can be seen and be recognized (2Cor 2.4; 8.8).

Thus we may conclude: God’s new creation is a creation of Christ’s love at the cross. The new reality is a reality characterized by love. Therefore, every believer who is incorporated into the *καινή κτίσις* enters that new reality of love. And since to be incorporated into the *καινή κτίσις* does not simply mean to receive a new status but to receive a new life, and since life is only real life if it is lived, the incorporation into the *καινή κτίσις* bears inevitable ethical consequences which can only stand under the sign of love. The life in the *καινή κτίσις* can only be a life of love for Christ and the neighbour. Christian ethics is essentially an ethics of love that serves one another (5.13) and is never ever self-seeking.

7.3.2) Gal 3.28

Undoubtedly the second parallel to Gal 6.15, 3.28, is the more interesting and important one with regard to the ethical question: ‘There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.’ Here we find the same argumentative structure of old - new, once - now as in 6.15: the new reality in Christ has overcome and done away with the differentiations of the old reality. In that new reality it is not decisive at all to be Jew or Gentile (= ‘Jew and Greek’ in 3.28) but to belong to the new humanity in Christ (the *καινή κτίσις* of 6.15; the ‘all one in Christ’ of 3.28) in which all are equally sons of God. What makes the parallel so interesting for us is that Paul adds two other sets of opposites to that statement which are crucial for the ethical question. However, before we examine 3.28 in more detail we need to give some concise introductory notes on Gal 3.26-28.

⁴² Harnisch, ‘Einübung,’ 296 formulates (italics original): ‘Will Paulus sagen, *wozu* die Glaubenden vorgerufen sind, so kann er nur daran erinnern, *wovon* sie in Wahrheit leben’.

⁴³ *Ethik*, 218.

It is widely agreed that 3.28 together with v.26f is to be regarded as an element of a pre-Pauline baptismal tradition⁴⁴ which Paul took over but not, however, until he had reinterpreted it: 'Um es in den Kontext einzupassen, ist in V.26 γάρ als "syntaktische Überleitung" und διὰ τῆς πίστεως als "inhaltliche Verklammerung" mit dem Thema von Gal 3,11ff eingefügt, während ὑμεῖς am Ende (V.28d) als betontes Personalpronomen vorab (s.V.29a) von Paulus eingetragen worden ist.'⁴⁵

The *Sitz im Leben* of this tradition is likely to be in the baptismal service of the primitive church. We could understand this tradition as a declaration which explains to the baptized 'was es mit ihrem Getauftsein auf sich hat und wer sie daraufhin sind; also als eine Identitätserklärung und, dem Aussagetenor nach, als einen performativen Satz':⁴⁶ all those who were baptized into Christ are now υἱοὶ θεοῦ (v.26), they are all εἷς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (v.28). The baptized has got a new status, a new identity. He or she has become a participant in the καινὴ κτίσις.⁴⁷

If we have a closer look at v.28 now we should be aware of two things. Firstly, v.28 has its place within a christological argumentation.⁴⁸ I.e. vv.26ff have primarily a christological-soteriological and not an ethical thrust. That does not, however, mean that v.28 is of no ethical relevance. On the contrary! But any legitimate ethical interpretation of v.28 has to keep in mind the christological thrust of the passage. Again we see that the main characteristic of Pauline ethics is that it is based on christology.

Secondly, it is important to note that v.28 is a statement about the new reality of and in the church.⁴⁹ In the church, i.e. amongst those who are baptized (v.27), who are sons of God (v.26), who are in Christ (v.26,28) and belong to him (v.29) the polarities of v.28 are abolished. This observation is crucial since it prevents us from too quickly politicizing v.28 by transforming it directly into a social-ethical concept for the whole world.⁵⁰ But of course, if the church conforms to v.28, i.e. if

⁴⁴ Cf. the commentaries and e.g. Mell, *Schöpfung*, 306f; Schnelle, *Gottesgerechtigkeit*, 58f.

⁴⁵ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 306f.

⁴⁶ Ebeling, *Gal*, 287; cf. also Betz, *Gal*, 189; Harnisch, 'Einübung,' 284.

⁴⁷ We have already discovered the peculiar relationship between the inclusive Christ event, faith and baptism (cf. above § 6). Therefore, we need not recapitulate the whole topic here. However, we should always keep in mind that baptism must not be understood as an anthropological completion of the Christ event. The inclusive Christ event needs no completion and baptism is 'only' the performative proclamation of that event upon those to be baptized.

⁴⁸ Cf. v.26: 'through faith in Christ Jesus'; v.27: 'baptized into Christ ... clothed with Christ'; v.28: 'one in Christ Jesus'; v.29: 'belong to Christ'.

⁴⁹ With Rengstorff, 'Mann,' 10; cf. Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit*, 61 who also emphasizes that the sets of polarities in v.28 must not be understood as a revolutionary or utopian program. Rather, they aim at 'reale Veränderung innerhalb der Gemeinde' (emphases original).

⁵⁰ In the light of this, the tendency of Betz' interpretation of the second set of opposites ('neither slave nor free') 'as a declaration of the abolishment of the social institution of slavery' (*Gal*, 193ff) seems quite problematic to us. Rengstorff, 'Mann,' 11 justly emphasizes that Gal 3.28 'ist (...) theologischer,

it refuses to recognize those distinctions, such a refusal would in itself be a subversive activity against a society that upholds those old distinctions. Moreover, together with the church as a whole each single Christian has become a new creation in Christ, i.e. each single Christian is called to conform to this new reality in daily conduct. But the Christian does not only live in the *church* but primarily in the *world*. That means, the Christian reality is not just locked in the ghetto of the church but it presses into realization in the world.⁵¹ But the Christian reality of Gal 3.28 can never be used as a social or political program for a non-Christian world.

For our purpose here, we need not struggle with the question whether or not v.28 is an element of a pre-Pauline tradition.⁵² What can be said at any rate is that Paul, forced by the judaizing opposition in Galatia, 'in dem Satze Gal. 3,28 mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit eine denkbar scharfe Abgrenzung der Christenheit von ihrem jüdischen Mutterboden vollzogen hat.'⁵³ If this is so, we presume, then it should be possible to find a Jewish pendant to the three sets of opposites in v.28. And that pendant can be found! In *t.Ber.* 7.18, a daily prayer for Jewish men, the male Jew thanks God that he was not made a Gentile, or a slave or a woman.⁵⁴ This thanksgiving formula expresses belief that birth is constitutive for a relationship to God. 'Kurz: zum Juden wird man nicht am 8.Tage gemacht, sondern geboren.'⁵⁵ So, for the Jewish man who prays this prayer the soteriological

nicht soziologischer oder gar sozialreformerischer Art.'

⁵¹ This is indicated e.g. in 2Cor 5.16 where Paul says that after his conversion he no longer knows anybody (not only the Christians!) according to fleshly standards. For him as a Christian the old classifications of the world have lost their validity - even in his relation to non-Christians. Cf. Käsemann, 'Anthropologie,' 58: 'Die kirchliche Gemeinschaft mag uns Mut, Ausrüstung und Richtung für das jeweils Vordringliche geben. Unsere Sendung wird von ihr weder begründet noch begrenzt. Sie durchstößt den Kirchenraum ebenso wie jedes andre Lager und folgt ihrem Herrn ins Niemandsland zwischen den Fronten, um in die Versöhnung zu rufen.'

⁵² On that question see e.g. Betz, *Gal*, 191ff; Bruce, *Gal*, 187f; Meeks, 'Image,' 165-208; Mell, *Schöpfung*, 310ff; Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen,' 3f.

⁵³ Rengstorf, 'Mann,' 11. This view is confirmed by the anti-judaizing thrust of the whole letter and particularly by the parallel in 6.15 where the first part ('neither circumcision nor uncircumcision') is an unmistakable spearhead against the judaizing opponents.

⁵⁴ This threefold formula can be traced back as far as 150 AD (R. Judah b. Elai or R. Me'ir, cf. *b.Men.* 43b). 'Überall erscheint sie indes ausdrücklich als in Geltung stehende Anweisung. Demgemäß wird sie überall nicht bloß als traditionell bezeichnet, sondern auch halachisch praktiziert' (Rengstorf, 'Mann,' 11 n.7; cf. the evidence cited there). Moreover, we can say with Bruce, *Gal*, 187 (cf. also Rengstorf, 'Mann,' 13f): 'The formula may be even earlier, for it seems to have been modelled on a Greek formula going back as far as Thales (6th century BC), who is reported by Hermippus to have said that there were three things for which he was grateful to fortune: that he was born a human being and not a beast, a man and not a woman, a Greek and not a barbarian (Diog.Laert., *Vit.Phil.* 1.33).' In the light of this we may conclude with considerable certainty that Gal 3.28 can be understood legitimately in the light of *t.Ber.* 7.18 (so with Mell, *Schöpfung*, 312 n.132 against e.g. Betz, *Gal*, 184f n.26).

⁵⁵ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 313.

privilege of the Jewish nation and the inferiority of women and slaves are based on a theology of creation. For him both are irrefutable rules of God's creation. In this view, which probably was held by Paul's opponents, '**Schöpfungsgnade und Erwählungsheil**'⁵⁶ fall into one. Therefore, if Paul really wants to deny and to refute the soteriological privilege of the Jewish nation, he has to argue creation-theologically. And this is exactly what he does. He contrasts the old creation with its old order (soteriological privilege of Jews; inferiority of women, non-Jews or slaves) with a new creation with a new order that replaces the old. The characteristics of the new order are: soteriological equality of all mankind, whether Jews or Gentiles; abolition of any inferiority of women, slaves or non-Jews. In the new creation God's grace in Christ applies to all mankind creating one community, not many. Thus 'there can no longer be barriers separating otherwise disparate groups.'⁵⁷ This is the new reality of those and for those who already are participants in God's new creation in Christ. And this is precisely what the opponents would deny. So, Gal 3.28 as well as 6.15 can best be understood as a heavy attack of Paul launched against his opponents and their theological identity. And as such it fits perfectly well into the thrust of the entire letter.

But now, what does Paul mean when he formulates 1) 'neither Jew nor Greek,' 2) 'neither slave nor free,' 3) 'neither male and female'?

Ad 1) The gulf between Jews and Gentiles has been abolished in Christ. Jew and Greek (=Gentile) stand side by side. No one is superior or inferior to the other any more. The Gentile need not become a Jew in order to be saved. Despite difficulties - this *is* the reality in which the church lives and to which it is ought to conform. For this reason Paul sharply opposes the proselytizing activity of his opponents as irreconcilable with that new reality. And for the same reason Paul opposed Peter's hypocrisy in Antioch (cf. Gal 2.11-14). Peter has had table fellowship with Gentiles, thus living in conformity to the new barrierless reality. But then he drew back because he was afraid of the Jews and in doing so he actually rebuilt the barriers between Jews and Gentiles. That behaviour provoked Paul's relentless critique. The gulf between Jews and Gentiles *is* done away with. So, how can one possibly lead a Christian life as though that gulf is still a reality? Decisive is, therefore, not only to know or to be set free by the truth of the gospel but to act in line with it (2.14).⁵⁸ The Christian church does not know any soteriological or ethnic

⁵⁶ Ibid., 314 (bold original).

⁵⁷ Cousar, *Gal*, 85.

⁵⁸ Käsemann, 'Anthropologie,' 52f: 'Gegenwärtige Erlösung läßt sich nur behaupten, wenn einzelne Menschen, in sichtbarer Gemeinde zusammengefaßt, sie in ihrer Leiblichkeit anstößig und glaubwürdig vertreten und mit ihrer Existenz klarmachen, welchen Sachzwängen sie nicht mehr letztlich unterliegen. Heil, das nicht in gelebter Jüngerschaft sich bekundet, wird zum religiösen Postulat und zur

superiority or inferiority and it has to conform to that knowledge in its conduct. Hence, the Antioch incident makes unmistakably clear 1) how important ethical conduct for Paul is, 2) that ethics for Paul is always an urgent call back to the roots of the Christian existence, the new creation in Christ.⁵⁹ Ethics does not create this new reality but the new reality creates a new ethics.⁶⁰

Ad 2) 'The social inferiority of slaves was marked enough in Jewish society, but still more so in Mediterranean society generally and most of all in Roman law.'⁶¹ Therefore, the proclamation of the abolition of the inferiority of slaves and the superiority of free people as a *present reality*⁶² in the church must have had a revolutionary sound for the society in NT times. This proclamation could even raise hopes for many slaves, particularly if that abolition could be seen in the church as already realized. But we have to note that Paul never attacks the institution of slavery as such head-on, but he denies its validity within the space of the church. A slave who becomes a Christian is not called to fight for freedom although if (s)he can gain freedom (s)he should do so (1Cor 7.21)⁶³ - but within the church 'ist der Sklave kein Sklave, und die Freiheit des Freien unterliegt hier einem anderen Maßstab als dem seines Standes.'⁶⁴ 'For he who was a slave when he was called by the Lord is the Lord's freedman; similarly, he who was a free man when he was called is Christ's slave' (1Cor 7.22). Slaves and free people are equally one in Christ. They all have one and the same Lord. And the one lordship of Christ does not admit any other lordship, e.g. the lordship of some people over others in the church, not even the lordship of Christians over non-Christians. 'The lordship of Christ declares all other claims to lordship illegitimate. God does not call us to be lords over our neighbors; only Jesus Christ is Lord.'⁶⁵ Under this lordship we are all entitled to enjoy equal rank with one another. 'This could mean, for example, that someone who was a slave in the outside world might be entrusted with the spiritual leadership in the church, and if the owner of the slave

unverständlichen Ideologie.'

⁵⁹ Cf. Merk, *Handeln*, 235 who points out that salvation is always the presupposition of ethics.

⁶⁰ Scroggs, 'Existence,' 130: 'Knowing how to act is the result, not the cause, of being.'

⁶¹ Bruce, *Gal*, 188.

⁶² There is certainly a 'long tradition of social criticism against the institution of slavery in the Hellenistic world (Sophists, Cynics, Jews).' (Betz, *Gal*, 193; cf. the material he presents on pp.193-94). But to simply declare the abolition of the differentiation between slave and free a present reality can hardly be paralleled with such social criticism.

⁶³ However, reading through this passage we have to ask whether Paul's commendation to remain in one's plight is not simply given in the view of the imminent parousia (cf. 1Cor 7.26). So, 1Cor 7.21 remains a little ambiguous (cf. also Cousar, *Gal*, 86).

⁶⁴ Ebeling, *Gal*, 294.

⁶⁵ Duff, 'Apocalyptic,' 284.

was a member of the same church, he would submit to that spiritual leadership. There is sufficient evidence that this was not merely a theoretical possibility.⁶⁶ An outstanding example is Onesimus, the runaway slave, whom Paul sent back to Philemon, 'no longer as a slave, as a dear brother. He is very dear to me but even dearer to you, both as a *man* and as a *brother* in the Lord' (Phlm 16; italics F.B.). The church obviously provided a setting in which the barrier between slave and free has been torn down and the Christians are to conform to that new reality.

Ad 3) The ancient society was far away from giving equal rights to men and women.⁶⁷ Women are regarded as inferior to men. In *t.Ber.* 7.18 we could already see that in Judaism this inferiority has a creation-theological foundation. But, as Paul emphasizes, in the new creation and thus in the church this inferiority has been abolished through a new creative act of God in Christ.⁶⁸ 'Hier findet eine immer und vorwiegend sexuelle Bewertung der geschlechtlichen Differenziertheit von Mann und Frau, die den im Verhältnis beider aktiven Mann nicht weniger erniedrigt als die Frau, ebenso ihr Ende wie die Verachtung der Frau als Frau in einer männlich bestimmten Welt und Gesellschaft. Es geht allerdings nicht um Emanzipation der Frau nun auf Kosten des Mannes, sondern um die Sicherung ihrer Würde als Geschöpf Gottes, in der sie zwar nicht gleichartig, wohl aber gleichwertig vor Gott und in der von ihm so neugeordneten menschlichen Gemeinschaft steht.'⁶⁹

If we look at Paul himself, we can see that this abolition is not just a desirable theory. In 1Cor 11.11-12 he affirms an equal interdependence between women and men and Phil 4.2-3 gives the impression that Paul worked side by side with women 'in the cause of the gospel' (4.3). Moreover, when he mentions women by name he never does it in a patronizing way (cf. Rom 16). On the contrary! In Rom 16.3 he greets the couple Priscilla and Aquila naming Priscilla first!⁷⁰ And if we find that Paul makes any differentiations between men and women, they are only practical measures for the sake of order within the church. They are never differentiations for their own sake.⁷¹ At any rate, one thing is clear: Gal 3.28 is the

⁶⁶ Bruce, *Gal*, 188f.

⁶⁷ This applies to Judaism as well as to the Hellenistic or Roman world, cf. e.g. Strack/Billerbeck, III, 557-563; 610-613; Rengstorf, 'Mann,' 11-16.

⁶⁸ That this abolition is regarded as a creative act of God is indicated by the form of our statement, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ, which echoes Gen 1.27: ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

⁶⁹ Rengstorf, 'Mann,' 22.

⁷⁰ With good reason Rengstorf, 'Mann,' 16 writes: 'Das alles will nicht zuletzt deshalb sorgfältig beachtet werden, weil man Paulus eine besondere, betont freundliche Stellung zur Frau gerade nicht wird nachsagen können.'

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 17.

basic theological principle about the new relationship of equality between men and women in the church. 'If any restrictions on it are found elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, as in 1 Cor. 14:34f. (...) or 1 Tim. 2:11f., they are to be understood in relation to Gal. 3:28, and not *vice versa*.'⁷²

We may conclude now: The unity Paul 'declares is not one, in the first instance, in which ethnic, social, and sexual differences vanish, but one in which the barriers, the hostility, the chauvinism, and the sense of superiority and inferiority between respective categories are destroyed. Being in Christ does not do away with Jew or Greek, male or female, even slave or free, but it makes these differences before God irrelevant'⁷³ - and thus irrelevant in the church. Despite difficulties (cf. 1Cor 11.2-16; 14.34f; Gal 2.11-14; Phlm 16) those classifications *are already* overcome in the church; their abolition is a present reality and for Paul it is crucial that the Christians conform to that reality in their conduct. The new reality necessarily calls forth a conformable ethical conduct. 'Thus in the midst of a society which lives according to Old Age distinctions, the Church provides 'pockets' of a new life.'⁷⁴ And this new life according to a new reality in itself functions as a social critical potential on even a revolutionary scale within society up to the present day. Not just in the sense that the church as a new society functions as a stumbling-stone for the old society, but also in the sense that each single Christian lives in conformity to the new reality in Christ - in the church *and* in the world. And wherever a church with its members lives in conformity to Gal 3.28 (and thus to 6.15!) in the midst of a society which upholds those old classifications it will cause and have trouble and conflict. On the other hand, wherever a church falls back to conform again to the old world distinctions it will lose its critical power; moreover, it actively denies the new reality in Christ. Such a church which adapts to worldly standards is a living self-contradiction, a living hypocrisy against which Paul set himself (Gal 2.11-14) as if he had foreseen that this would be one of the basic problems of the church in the future.

⁷² Bruce, *Gal*, 190.

⁷³ Cousar, *Gal*, 86; cf. Bruce, *Gal*, 189: 'It is not their distinctiveness, but their inequality of religious role, that is abolished "in Christ Jesus".'

⁷⁴ Duff, 'Apocalyptic,' 287.

§ 8) Summary and conclusion

1. Both *καινή κτίσις*-passages occur in a polemical context where Paul has to struggle with Jewish Christian missionaries. In the case of 2Cor those missionaries were undermining Paul's authority as apostle so that Paul finds himself compelled to defend his apostolate. In Gal they attacked Paul's gospel of the cross by proclaiming their own different gospel of circumcision, law-obedience and cross. Both attacks hit the nerve of Paul's theology and forced the apostle to clarify his position and to deepen his theological argument. So, his statements about the *καινή κτίσις* can be called theological *Spitzensätze* which concisely express the heart of Paul's theology. However, as we saw, the term *καινή κτίσις* is not of Pauline origin. Rather, it appears to be a 'vorpaulinischer Konsensbegriff frühjüdischer Eschatologie für das Gottes Initiative vorbehaltene überwältigend-wundervolle futurische Endheil'⁷⁵ which is rooted in the theology of Deutero-Isaiah, particularly in Isa 43.16-21 (cf. 2Cor 5.17b!). This abstract idea of *καινή κτίσις* is not predetermined one-sidedly in early Judaism and therefore it is open for a new interpretation. Paul's new interpretation, however, must have sounded provokingly in his opponents' ears: he regarded and proclaimed *καινή κτίσις* as a *present* and an *anthropological* reality which is, as we saw, without analogy in Judaism. For Paul Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy is already fulfilled in Christ. The great new Exodus, the liberation from the slavery of sin, has already been taken place in Christ. The new creation with its new dominion and its new soteriological and social order has already come to be! With this interpretation of *καινή κτίσις* Paul undermines the theological position of his opponents decisively.

2. We have recognized the strong influence of Deutero-Isaiah on Paul's conception of *καινή κτίσις*. But what can be said about *καινή κτίσις* in its concrete Pauline setting? As our study has shown, the conception of *καινή κτίσις* in Pauline theology is primarily and essentially of *christological* and *soteriological* nature.⁷⁶ The *καινή κτίσις* has been inaugurated in and through the eschatological Christ event at the cross. In Christ on the cross the old soteriological distinction of humanity into Jews and Gentiles has been overcome. These distinctions have no place any more in the *καινή κτίσις*. The *καινή κτίσις* in Christ has established a new order of soteriological equality in which 'neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything' (Gal 6.15). Moreover, for Paul the *καινή κτίσις* is the creation of Christ's love since the cross is the ultimate manifestation of Christ's love.

⁷⁵ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 257.

⁷⁶ This is convincingly proved by Mell's study cf. e.g. his summary, *Schöpfung*, 394-397.

This love is not love for its own sake but it has an object: humanity. Christ's love for us led him to give his life for us as inclusive representative for all. 'One died for all, therefore all died' (2Cor 5.14). And since the Christ event has no end in itself the *καινή κτίσις* does not either: it is a creation for all humanity right from the beginning.

3. Although the emphasis does not lie on this aspect *καινή κτίσις* in Paul has also a *cosmological dimension*⁷⁷ in so far as the Christ event has implications on a cosmic scale. In Christ's death and resurrection the powers of the old world, sin and death, have been ultimately put to death. On the cross the count-down for the destruction, or better the liberation, of the old world has been set - irrevocably. The cross is the eschatological turn of the ages which set up a new reality, a new realm with a new Lord. The whole human and non-human world with its history is not the same since the Christ event. It moves toward the revelation of the sons of God (Rom 8.19). Hence, the Christ event, and with it the *καινή κτίσις* in Christ, has also *future implications* and consequences. But with Schneider we have to notice that this future and ultimate manifestation of God's saving power is not explicitly called *καινή κτίσις*.⁷⁸ But it is implied and as such it cannot be ignored.

4. Paul, however, uses *καινή κτίσις* in a pronounced *present-anthropological* sense.⁷⁹ The non-human creation 'waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed' (Rom 8.19). That means, the children of God are already, i.e. in the *present*, children of God. They will only be revealed in the future. They are already called, or even more, they *are* already a *καινή κτίσις*. It is only against the background of Christ's death and resurrection as inclusive representative for all that Paul can use *καινή κτίσις* in this *anthropological* sense: 'If anyone is included in the Christ event, (s)he herself/ himself has become a new creation' (2Cor 5.17), i.e. (s)he shares the new reality that has been established in Christ. For those who are in Christ, i.e. for those who have been made participants of the *καινή κτίσις* through the proclamation of the gospel of the inclusive Christ event, through faith and baptism and through the power of the Spirit - for those the old world with its soteriological and social standards has died. They participate in the life of the

⁷⁷ Pioneering as Mell's study may be, it is a decisive weakness of it that this cosmological dimension is, as it were, under-exposed.

⁷⁸ 'Idee,' 268.

⁷⁹ This is the correct conclusion of Mell, e.g. *Schöpfung*, 394-397. On the other hand, we cannot fully confirm Aymer's interpretation of *καινή κτίσις* (*Understanding*, 181) as an anthropological and *equally* as a cosmological conception. *Καινή κτίσις* is no explicit cosmological conception in Paul. Instead, it seems more appropriate to us to speak of cosmological *implications* or of a cosmological *dimension* of *καινή κτίσις*. The same critique applies to Aymer's interpretation of *καινή κτίσις* as a present and equally as a future reality.

risen Lord (Gal 2.20) and they live this new life in the new realm and under the new dominion of Christ. Being participants in the new creation they are no longer ruled by the power of sin and death and their rebellion against God is overcome: they are reconciled to God since Christ was made sin for them in order that they may become God's righteous ones. Therefore they live in a restored *relationship*⁸⁰ to God which is characterized by peace and mercy.⁸¹

But it is not just that the *individual* is called a new creation in Christ. In the course of our study we came to the conclusion that *καινή κτίσις* must also be understood *ecclesiologically*: what counts is neither to belong to the Jewish nation nor to belong to the Gentiles but to belong to the one new humanity of the *καινή κτίσις* in Christ (Gal 6.15; 3.28) - the church. Both sides of *καινή κτίσις*, the individual and the ecclesiological, must be held together.

5. As to the question of ethical implications of *καινή κτίσις* we came to a positive answer. We first recognized that Christ's love on the cross does not only give us a new status but it also transforms us, making us lovers of Christ and this will be expressed in our daily conduct (Gal 5.6). So Christian ethics stands under the sign of love which is not self-seeking but which lives for Christ (2Cor 5.25) and for one another (2Cor 5.13). Love is the measuring rod of the new life in the new creation.

Moreover, we have seen that Christ himself is the subject of the ethical conduct within the *καινή κτίσις*. Because the new life of the Christians is the life of the risen Christ Paul can even say that it is Christ himself who lives his, Paul's life. So, even with regard to his actions the believers expect everything from Christ.⁸² Therefore, Paul can say about himself, 'daß seine Leiden geschehen, damit wir nicht auf uns selbst vertrauen, sondern auf Gott, der die Toten lebendig macht (2Kor 1,9). *Deshalb* hat der Apostel Wohlgefallen an Schwachheiten, Mißhandlungen, Nöten, Verfolgungen und Ängsten um Christi willen (2Kor 12,10). Deshalb *rühmt* er sich seiner Schwachheit, damit Christi Kraft in ihm wohne (2Kor 12,9). Der für die christliche Ethik konstitutive Zug nach unten ist also ein hoffnungsvoller Zug. Denn wer diesem Zug folgt, überantwortet sich weder der eigenen Kraft

⁸⁰ Cf. also Mell, *Schöpfung*, 396.

⁸¹ In the light of this Schneider's interpretation of *καινή κτίσις* as moral-religious renewal is too narrow. The new reality of the *καινή κτίσις* in Christ gives its participants a new existence, a new being, and the moral-religious renewal is just a consequence of this new existence. Stuhlmacher, therefore, speaks of the ontological character of *καινή κτίσις*. This interpretation tends in the right direction although we would rather be cautious in using philosophical terminology to describe a Pauline phenomenon. There is already plenty of terminological confusion within NT scholarship. For a critique of Stuhlmacher's proleptic interpretation of *καινή κτίσις* see § 4 n.179.

⁸² Cf. Jüngel, 'Erwägungen,' 388.

noch der anderer Menschen, sondern *Gottes* Kraft. In solcher Überantwortung unterscheidet sich der Christ von der Welt und *soll* er sich penetrant von ihr unterscheiden (Röm 12,2). So ist sein ganzes Tun "vernünftiger Gottesdienst" (Röm 12,1).⁸³

Finally, we realized that the ethical implications of *καινή κτίσις* could be described more concrete as a reordering of social relationships. 'Living in the new creation involves finding a way of regarding people differently than in the old order, where race, nationality, sex, economics, and the like provide categories by which individuals and groups are valued. It means no longer "using" people as an occasion for selfish boasting. Instead, they become recipients of a service offered in love, neighbors to be cared for, those for whom God's mercy is freely given.'⁸⁴ A church which lives according to this new standard will be a critical potential in a society that upholds the old worlds distinctions. But apparently this is one of the basic problems of our churches *today*. Where are the churches who live in conformity to the reality which created them? Where are the churches which would function as critical potential in our modern society? What we need today is, however, not an ethical appeal but the call back to the new reality that created the church and in which the church has its life - the new creation in Christ Jesus.

⁸³ *Ibib.*, 388.

⁸⁴ Cousar, *Gal*, 156.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) Textual editions and dictionaries etc.

- Bauer, W./Aland, K.+B., *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin-New York 1988⁶.
- Blaß, F./Debrunner, A./Rehkopf, F., *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen 1990¹⁷.
- Bornemann, E./Risch, E., *Griechische Grammatik*, Frankfurt-Berlin-München 1978².
- Cremer, H./Kögel, J., *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Stuttgart-Gotha 1923¹¹.
- Holy Bible, New International Version, Colorado Springs 1984.
- Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version. Containing the Old and New Testament with the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical Books, New York-Glasgow-London-etc. 1973.
- Liddell, H.G./Scott, R./Jones, H.S., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1940⁹ (reprinted 1961).
- Menge, H./Güthling, *Langenscheidts Großwörterbuch Griechisch-Deutsch*, Berlin-München-Wien-Zürich 1981²⁴.
- Metzger, B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, London-New York 1971.
- Moulton, W.F./Geden, A.S.(eds.), *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, Edinburgh 1978⁵ (revised by H.K.Moulton).
- Nestle, E./Aland, K. (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart 1979²⁶.
- Rahlfs, A., *Septuaginta. Vol. 2: Libri poetici et prophetici*, Stuttgart 1965.
- Robertson, A.T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, London 1914.
- Sophocles, E.A., *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, 2 Volumes, New York n.d.
- Sparks, H.F.D. (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, Oxford 1984.
- Vermes, G., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, London 1987³.

2) Commentaries

- Barrett, C.K., *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC, London 1973.
- Becker, J. et al., *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon*, NTD 8, Göttingen 1976¹⁴.
- Betz, H.D., *Galatians. A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia 1979.
- Bligh, J., *Galatians. A Discussion of St Paul's Epistle*, HousCom I, London 1969.
- Bruce, F.F., *1 and 2 Corinthians*, NCB, London 1971.
- , *The Epistle to the Galatians. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, Exeter 1982.
- Bultmann, R., *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther*, KEK Sonderband, Göttingen 1976.
- Cousar, C.B., *Galatians*, Int, Atlanta (Georgia), 1982.
- Burton, E. de W., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, ICC, Edinburgh 1921.
- Duncan, G.S., *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*, MNTC, London 1934.
- Ebeling, G., *Die Wahrheit des Evangeliums. Eine Lesehilfe zum Galaterbrief*, Tübingen 1981.
- Filson, F.V./Reid, J., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, IB 10, New York-Nashville 1953, 263-425.
- Fung, R.Y.K., *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids 1988.
- Furnish, V.P., *II Corinthians*, AB, New York 1984.
- Goudge, H.L., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, Westminster Commentaries, London 1927.
- Héring, J., *The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, London 1967.
- Hughes, P.E., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, 1962 (repr. 1988).
- Lang, F., *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD 7, Göttingen 1986¹⁶.
- Lietzmann, H., *An die Galater*, HNT 10, Tübingen 1932.
- Lightfoot, J.B., *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London 1910.
- Luther, M., *Der Galaterbrief*, D.Martin Luthers Epistel-Auslegung Vol.4 (ed. H.Kleinknecht), Göttingen 1984².
- Martin, R.P., *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40, Waco (Texas) 1986.
- Michel, O., *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEK 4, Göttingen 1978^{14/5}.
- Moule, H.C.G., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, London 1976.
- Mußner, F., *Der Galaterbrief*, HTKNT 9, Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1974.
- Oepke, A., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, THKNT 9, Berlin 1973.

- Plummer, A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC, Edinburgh 1915.
- Ramsey, W.M., *A Historical Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London 1899.
- Schaff, P. (ed.), *Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, ...*, A Selected Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. 13, New York 1889.
- Schlatter, A., *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon*, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 7, Stuttgart 1963.
- , *Die Korintherbriefe*, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 6, Stuttgart 1974.
- , *Paulus der Bote Gottes. Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther*, Stuttgart 1969⁴.
- Schlier, H., *Der Brief an die Galater*, KEK 7, Göttingen 1971¹⁴.
- Stamm, R.T./Blackwelder, O.F., *The Epistle to the Galatians*, The Interpreters Bible X, New York-Nashville 1953, 427-593.
- Strachan, R.H., *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, MNTC, London 1935.
- Strack, H.L./Billerbeck, P., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch 2*, Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte, München 1924.
- , *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch 3*, Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis, München 1926.
- Stuhlmacher, P., *Der Brief an die Römer*, NTD 6, Göttingen-Zürich 1989^{14/1}.
- Wilckens, U., *Der Brief an die Römer 1*, EKK 6/1, Zürich-Einsiedeln-Neukirchen/Vluyn 1978.
- Windisch, H., *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, KEK 6, Göttingen 1924⁹.
- Wolff, C., *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THKNT 8, Berlin 1989.

3) Monographs, essays, articles

- Aymer, A.J.D., *Paul's Understanding of ΚΑΙΝΗ ΚΤΙΣΙΣ: Continuity and Discontinuity in Pauline Eschatology*, University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor 1983.
- Barclay, J.M.G., *Obedying the Truth. A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*, SNTW, Edinburgh 1988.

- Barrett, C.K., 'New Testament Eschatology. I - Jewish and Pauline Eschatology,' *SJT* 6 (1953), 136-155.
- , 'Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians,' *NTS* 17 (1971), 233-254.
- Baumgarten, J., *Paulus und die Apokalyptik. Die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferung in den echten Paulusbriefen*, WMANT 44, Neukirchen/Vluyn 1975.
- Beale, G.K., 'The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5-7 and Its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1,' *NTS* 35 (1989), 550-581.
- Beck, H., 'Friede,' *TBLNT* 1, 388-394.
- Becker, J., 'Die neutestamentliche Rede vom Sühnetod Jesu,' *ZTK Beiheft* 8 (1990), 29-49.
- , 'Erwägungen zur apokalyptischen Tradition in der paulinischen Theologie,' *EvTh* 30 (1970), 593-609.
- Beker, J.C., *Paul the Apostle. The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*, Philadelphia 1980.
- Betz, O., 'Fleischliche und "geistliche" Christuserkenntnis nach 2.Korinther 5,16,' in *TBei* 14 (1983), 167-179.
- , 'Die Übersetzungen von Jes 53 (LXX, Targum) und die Theologia Crucis des Paulus,' in id., *Jesus - Der Herr der Kirche. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie* 2, WUNT 52, Tübingen 1990, 197-216.
- Bieringer, R., '2Kor 5.19a und die Versöhnung der Welt,' *ETL* 63 (1987), 295-326.
- Borse, U., *Der Standort des Galaterbriefes*, BBB 41, Köln 1972.
- Büchsel, F., 'καταλλάσσω,' *TWNT* 1, 254-258.
- Bultmann, R., *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen 1954².
- , 'ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ,' in id., *Exegetica*, Tübingen 1967, 470-475.
- , 'καυχάομαι,' *TWNT* 3, 646ff.
- Braun, H., 'Qumran und das Neue Testament. Ein Bericht über 10 Jahre Forschung (1950-1959),' *TRu new series* 29.3 (1963), 142-176, 184-260.
- Breytenbach, C., *Versöhnung. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie*, WMANT 60, Neukirchen/Vluyn 1989.
- Childs, B.S., *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*, London 1984.
- Chilton, B.D., 'Galatians 6.15: A Call to Freedom before God,' *ExpT* 89 (1977-78), 311-313.
- Cohn-Sherbok, D., 'Paul and Rabbinic Exegesis,' *SJT* 35 (1982), 117-132.
- Dahl, N.A., 'Christ, Creation and the Church,' in *The Background of the NT and Its Eschatology*, FS Dodd (eds. W.D.Davies/D.Daube), Cambridge 1956, 422-465.
- , 'Der Name Israel: Zur Auslegung von Gal 6,16,' *Judaica* 6 (1950), 161-170.

- Daube, D., *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London 1956.
- Davies, W.D., *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, Philadelphia 1980⁴.
- , 'Paul and the People of Israel,' *NTS* 24 (1977/78), 4-39.
- Delling, G., 'στοιχέω,' *TWNT* 7, 666-669.
- Duff, N.J., 'The Significance of Pauline Apocalyptic for Theological Ethics,' in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*, FS J.L.Martyn (eds. J.Marcus and M.L.Soards), *JSNTSup* 24, Sheffield 1989, 279-296.
- Dunn, J.D.G., *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, SBT 2nd series/15, London 1970.
- Ebeling, G., 'Der Sühnetod Christi als Glaubensaussage. Eine hermeneutische Rechenschaft,' *ZTK Beiheft* 8 (1990), 3-28.
- Eichholz, G., *Die Theologie des Paulus im Umriß*, Neukirchen/Vluyn 1988⁶.
- , 'Prolegomena zu einer Theologie des Paulus im Umriß,' in id., *Tradition und Interpretation. Studien zum Neuen Testament und zur Hermeneutik*, München 1965, 161-189 (= *Hören und Handeln* [FS E.Wolf], München 1962, 85-105).
- Eßer, H.H., 'Barmherzigkeit,' *TBLNT* 1, 51-55.
- , 'Schöpfung,' *TBLNT* 2, 1075-1084.
- Findeis, H.-J., *Versöhnung-Apostolat-Kirche. Eine exegetisch-theologische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Versöhnungsaussagen des Neuen Testaments (2Kor, Röm, Kol, Eph)*, FB 40, Würzburg 1983.
- Foerster, W., 'κτίζω κτλ.,' *TWNT* 3, 999-1043.
- Friedrich, G., 'Die Gegner des Paulus im 2.Korintherbrief,' in id., *Auf das Wort kommt es an. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Göttingen 1978, 189-223.
- Furnish, V.P., *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, Nashville-New York 1968.
- Georgi, D., *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2.Korintherbried. Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike*, *WMANT* 11, Neukirchen/Vluyn 1964.
- Gerhardsson, B., *The Ethos of the Bible*, E.T., London 1982.
- Gese, H., 'Die Sühne,' in id., *Zur biblischen Theologie*, Tübingen 1989³, 85-106.
- Günther, W./Link, H.-G., 'Liebe,' *TBLNT* 2, 895-901.
- Guhrt, J., 'Welt,' *TBLNT* 2, 1381-1385.
- Gunther, J.J., *St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background. A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings*, *NovTSup* 35, Leiden 1973.
- Guthrie, D., *New Testament Theology*, Leicester 1981.
- Hahn, F., "'Siehe, jetzt ist der Tag des Heils.'" Neuschöpfung und Versöhnung nach 2.Korinther 5,14-6,2,' *EvTh* 33 (1973), 244-253.
- Hahn, H.C., 'Gewissen,' *TBLNT* 1, 555-560.
- , 'Ruhm,' *TBLNT* 2, 1051-1053.

- Harnisch, W., 'Einübung des neuen Seins. Paulinische Paränese am Beispiel des Galaterbriefs,' *ZTK* 84 (1987), 279-296.
- Hays, R.B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, New Haven-London 1989.
- Hengel, M., 'Der Kreuzestod Jesu Christi als Gottes souveräne Erlösungstat. Exegese über 2.Korinther 5,11-21,' in *Theologie und Kirche. Reichenau-Gespräch* (ed. Evangelische Landessynode in Württemberg), Stuttgart 1967, 60-89.
- Hofius, 'Erwägungen zur Gestalt und Herkunft des paulinischen Versöhnungsgedankens,' *ZTK* 77 (1980), 186-199; now in id., *Paulusstudien*, Tübingen 1989, 1-14.
- , 'Gesetz und Evangelium nach 2.Korinther 3,' in id., *Paulusstudien*, Tübingen 1989, 75-120.
- , "'Gott hat unter uns aufgerichtet das Wort von der Versöhnung' (2Kor 5,19)," *ZNW* 71 (1980), 3-20; now in id., *Paulusstudien*, Tübingen 1989, 15-32.
- , "'Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen" als Thema biblischer Theologie,' in *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 2, Neukirchen/Vluyn 1987, 79-105; now in id., *Paulusstudien*, Tübingen 1989, 121-147.
- , 'Sühne und Versöhnung. Zum paulinischen Verständnis des Kreuzestodes Jesu,' in Maas, W. (ed.), *Versuche das Leiden und Sterben Jesu zu verstehen*, München-Zürich 1983, 25-46; now in Hofius, O., *Paulusstudien*, Tübingen 1989, 33-49.
- , 'Wort Gottes und Glaube,' in id., *Paulusstudien*, Tübingen 1989, 148-174.
- Hooker, M.D., 'Interchange in Christ,' *JTS* 22 (1971), 349-361.
- Howard, G., *Paul: Crisis in Galatia. A Study in Early Christian Theology*, SNTSMS 35, Cambridge-New York-etc. 1990².
- Hyldahl, N., *Die paulinische Chronologie*, ATDan 10, Leiden 1986.
- Janowski, B., *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*, WMANT 55, Neukirchen/Vluyn 1982.
- Jeremias, J., *Die Kindertaufe in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten*, Göttingen 1958.
- Jewett, R., *Dating Paul's Life*, London 1979.
- , *Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10, Leiden 1971.
- , 'The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation,' *NTS* 17 (1971), 198-212.
- Jüngel, E., 'Erwägungen zur Grundlegung evangelischer Ethik im Anschluß an die Theologie des Paulus,' *ZTK* 63 (1966), 379-390.
- Käsemann, E., 'Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesu bei Paulus,' in *Paulinische Perspektiven*, Tübingen 1969, 61-107.

- , 'Erwägungen zum Stichwort "Versöhnungslehre im Neuen Testament",' in FS Rudolf Bultmann (ed. E.Dinkler), *Zeit und Geschichte*, Tübingen 1964, 47-59.
- , 'Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus,' in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*. Auswahl, Göttingen 1986, 160-172.
- , 'Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik,' in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*. Auswahl, Göttingen 1986, 133-159.
- , 'Zur Paulinischen Anthropologie,' in *Paulinische Perspektiven*, Tübingen 1969, 9-60.
- Kertelge, K., 'δικαιοσύνη,' *EWNT* 1, 784-796.
- Kim, S., *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, Grand Rapids 1982.
- Kümmel, W.G., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Heidelberg 1983²¹.
- Kuhn, H.W., *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindegliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu*, SUNT 4, Göttingen 1966.
- Kuhn, K.G., 'Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,' *ZThK* 47 (1950), 192-211.
- Lohse, E., *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments*, Theologische Wissenschaft 4, Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln-Mainz 1983⁴.
- , *Theologische Ethik des Neuen Testaments*, Theologische Wissenschaft 5/2, Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln-Mainz 1988.
- Lüdemann, G., *Paulus, der Heidenapostel 1. Studien zur Chronologie*, FRLANT 123, Göttingen 1980.
- , *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*, E.T. Minneapolis 1989 (new ed. of the German original, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel 2. Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum*, FRLANT 130, Göttingen 1983).
- , *Paulus und das Judentum*, TEH 215, München 1983.
- Lührmann, D., 'Gerechtigkeit, III. Neues Testament,' *TRE* 12, 414-420.
- Macho, A.D., *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento 1*, Ediciones Cristianidad, Madrid 1984.
- Marshall, I.H., 'Is Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?,' in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, FS E.E.Ellis (eds. G.F.Hawthorne/O.Betz), Grand Rapids 1987, 33-42.
- Martin, R.P., *Reconciliation. A Study of Paul's Theology*, Marshall's Theological Library, London 1981.
- Martyn, J.L., 'Epistemology at the Turn of the Ages: 2 Corinthians 5.16,' in *Christian History and Interpretation. Studies Presented to John Knox* (eds. W.R.Farmer et al.), Cambridge 1967, 269-87.

- , 'Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians,' *NTS* 31 (1985), 410-424.
- Meeks, W.A., 'The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity,' *HR* 13 (1973-74), 165-208.
- Mell, U., *Neue Schöpfung. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie*, BZNW 56, Berlin-New York 1989.
- Merk, O., *Handeln aus Glauben. Die Motivierung der paulinischen Ethik*, Marburg 1968.
- Michel, O., 'Der Christus des Paulus,' *ZNW* 32 (1933), 6-31; now in id., *Dienst am Wort. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. K.Haacker), Neukirchen/Vluyn 1986, 50-72.
- , 'Erkennen dem Fleisch nach (2Kor 5,16),' in *EvT* 15 (1954), 22-29; now in id., *Dienst am Wort. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. K.Haacker), Neukirchen/Vluyn 1986, 116-123.
- Minear, P.S., 'The Crucified World: The Enigma of Galatians 6,14,' in *Theologia Crucis - Signum Crucis* (eds. C.Andresen/G.Klein), FS E.Dinkler, Tübingen 1979, 395-407.
- Moule, C.F.D., 'Jesus, Judaism and Paul,' in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* (eds. G.F.Hawthorne/O.Betz), FS E.E.Ellis, Grand Rapids 1987, 43-52.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, London 1968.
- Neugebauer, F., 'Das paulinische "in Christo",' *NTS* 4 (1957/58), 124-138.
- Patte, D., *Paul's Faith and the Power of the Gospel. A Structural Introduction to the Pauline Letters*, Philadelphia 1983.
- Petzke, G., 'κτίζω,' *EWNT* 2, 803-808.
- Rad, G. von, *Theologie des Alten Testaments 2. Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels*, München 1965.
- Rengstorff, K.H., 'Mann und Frau im Urchristentum,' *Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. Geisteswissenschaften Heft 12*, Köln-Opladen 1954, 7-52.
- Richardson, P., *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, SNTSMS 10, Cambridge 1969.
- Ridderbos, H., *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, E.T. Grand Rapids 1975.
- Robinson, J.A.T., *Redating the New Testament*, London 1976.
- Sanders, E.P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, London 1977.
- Sanders, J.T., *Ethics in the New Testament. Change and Development*, London 1975.

- Schneider, G. 'Die Idee der Neuschöpfung beim Apostel Paulus und ihr religionsgeschichtlicher Hintergrund,' *TTZ* 68 (1959), 257-270.
- Schnelle, U., *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart. Vorpaulinische und paulinische Tauftheologie*, GTA 24, Göttingen 1983.
- Schrage, W., *Ethik des Neuen Testaments*, NTD Ergänzungsreihe 4, Göttingen 1989^{5/2}.
- Schrenk, G., 'δικαιοσύνη,' *TWNT* 2, 194-214.
- , 'Der Segenswunsch nach der Kampfpistel,' *Judaica* 6 (1950), 170-190.
- , 'Was bedeutet "Israel Gottes",' *Judaica* 5 (1949), 81-94.
- Schulz, S., *Neutestamentliche Ethik*, Zürcher Grundrisse zur Bibel, Zürich 1987.
- Schweizer, E., 'σάραξ. E. Das Neue Testament,' *TWNT* 7, 123-145.
- , *Theologische Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, GNT 2, Göttingen 1989.
- Scroggs, R., 'Eschatological Existence in Matthew and Paul: *Coincidentia Oppositorum*,' in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*, FS J.L.Martyn (eds. J.Marcus and M.L.Soards), JSNTSup 24, Sheffield 1989, 125-146.
- Seebaß, 'Fleisch,' *TBLNT* 1, 342-347.
- Sjöberg, E., 'Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palästinensischen Judentum,' *ST* 4 (1950), 44-85.
- , 'Die Neuschöpfung in den Toten-Meer-Rollen,' *ST* 9 (1955), 131-136.
- Stott, J.R.W., *The Cross of Christ*, Leicester 1989² (repr. 1990).
- Stuhlmacher, P., 'Erwägungen zum ontologischen Charakter der καινή κτίσις bei Paulus,' *EvT* 27 (1967), 1-35.
- , 'Sühne oder Versöhnung?,' in *Die Mitte des Neuen Testaments* (eds. U.Luz/H.Weder), FS E.Schweizer, Göttingen 1983, 291-316.
- Sumney, J.L., *Identifying Paul's Opponents. The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians*, JSNTSup 40, Sheffield 1990.
- Tannehill, R.C., *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology*, BZNW 32, Berlin 1967.
- Tiedtke, E., 'Angesicht,' *TBLNT* 1, 20-22.
- Thackeray, H.St J., *St Paul and Contemporary Jewish Thought*, London 1900.
- Thüsing, W., *Gott und Christus in der paulinischen Soteriologie*, Vol. 1: *PER CHRISTUM IN DEUM. Das Verhältnis der Christozentrik zur Theozentrik*, NTAbh 1/I, Münster 1986³.
- Trebilco, P.R., *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*, SNTSMS 69, Cambridge - New York etc. 1991.
- Vorländer, H., 'Versöhnung,' *TBLNT* 2, 1307-1309.
- Wedderburn, A.J.M., *Baptism and Resurrection*, WUNT 44, Tübingen 1987.

--, 'Some Observations on Paul's Use of the Phrases "in Christ" and "with Christ",' *JSNT* 25 (1985), 83-97.

Weder, H., *Das Kreuz Jesu bei Paulus. Ein Versuch über den Geschichtsbezug des christlichen Glaubens nachzudenken*, FRLANT 125, Göttingen 1981.

Wolter, M., *Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu Röm 5,1-11*, BZNW 43, Berlin-New York 1978.

