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### List of Abbreviations

**Note:** Abbreviations in this thesis are primarily taken from *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*, 2nd edition (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). Some of these and additional abbreviations are indicated in the following tables.

#### Primary Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–4 Macc</td>
<td>1–4 Maccabees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 En</td>
<td>1 Enoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QH</td>
<td>Hodayot/Thanksgiving Hymns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM</td>
<td>Milhamah/War Scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab</td>
<td>Pesher Habakkuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS</td>
<td>Serek Hayahad/Rule of the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QSa</td>
<td>Rule of the Congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bar.</td>
<td>2 Baruch (Syriac Apocalypse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q369</td>
<td>Prayer of Enosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q374</td>
<td>4QDiscourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q377</td>
<td>Apocryphal Pentateuch B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QFlor</td>
<td>Florilegium/Midrash on Eschatology (4Q174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QM</td>
<td>Miqṣat Maʿasė ha-Torah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpPs*</td>
<td>Pesher Psalm 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QMelch</td>
<td>Melchizedek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abr.</td>
<td>De Abrahamo (Philo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant.</td>
<td>Antonius (Plutarch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As. Mos</td>
<td>Assumption of Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>Instituo oratoria (Quintilian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos. Asen.</td>
<td>Joseph and Aseneth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jub.</td>
<td>Jubilees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdt</td>
<td>Judith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.B.</td>
<td>Liber antiquitatum biblicarum (Pseudo-Philo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mor.</td>
<td>Moralia (Plutarch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mos.</td>
<td>De vita Mosis (Philo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut.</td>
<td>De mutatione nominum (Philo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesiq. Rab</td>
<td>Pesiqṭa Rabbati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Phil</td>
<td>Polycarp, To the Philippians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pss. Sol.</td>
<td>Psalms of Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE</td>
<td>Quaestiones et solutions in Exodum (Philo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RomAnt</td>
<td>Roman Antiquities (Dionysius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RomHist</td>
<td>History of Rome (Livy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacr.</td>
<td>De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini (Philo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Eli Rab.</td>
<td>Seder Eliyahu Rabbah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sib. Or.</td>
<td>Sibylline Oracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>Sirach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph.</td>
<td>In sophistas (Isocrates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tg. Onq.</td>
<td>Targum Onqelos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Jud.</td>
<td>Testament of Judah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Levi</td>
<td>Testament of Levi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Virt.** *De virtutibus* (Philo)
**Wis** *Wisdom of Solomon*

### Secondary Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>The Anchor Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABR</td>
<td><em>Australian Biblical Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNT</td>
<td>Augsburg Commentaries on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGIU</td>
<td><em>Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnBib</td>
<td><em>Analecta biblica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTC</td>
<td>Abingdon New Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td><em>Aldersgate Papers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYBRL</td>
<td>Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBR</td>
<td><em>Bulletin for Biblical Research</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECNT</td>
<td>Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETL</td>
<td>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEvT</td>
<td><em>Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHGNT</td>
<td>Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT</td>
<td><em>Beiträge zur historischen Theologie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib</td>
<td><em>Biblica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BibInt</td>
<td><em>Biblical Interpretation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BibRec</td>
<td><em>Biblical Reception</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>Biblical Interpretation Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJRL</td>
<td><em>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNTC</td>
<td>Black’s New Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>The Biblical Resource Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSac</td>
<td><em>Bibliotheca sacra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTB</td>
<td><em>Biblical Theology Bulletin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJZ</td>
<td><em>Biblische Zeitschrift</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZW</td>
<td><em>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZNW</td>
<td><em>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neustamentliche Wissenschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td><em>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQMS</td>
<td>The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBR</td>
<td><em>Currents in Biblical Research</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConBNT</td>
<td>Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COQG</td>
<td>Christian Origins and the Question of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CtaM</td>
<td><em>Crucible: Theology and Mission</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td><em>Dead Sea Discoveries</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCA</td>
<td>Early Christianity in the Context of Antiquity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEC</td>
<td>Emory Studies in Early Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL</td>
<td><em>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpTim</td>
<td><em>Expository Times</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRLANT</td>
<td>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBS</td>
<td>Guides to Biblical Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCT</td>
<td>Gender, Culture and Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHAT</td>
<td>Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNS</td>
<td><em>Good News Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCOt</td>
<td>Historical Commentary on the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNT</td>
<td><em>Handbuch zum Neuen Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNTC</td>
<td>Harper’s New Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBC</td>
<td>Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>The International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBQ</td>
<td>Jewish Bible Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JETS</td>
<td>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHC</td>
<td>Journal of Higher Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNT</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNTSup</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOT</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOTSup</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSP</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEK</td>
<td>Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>Loeb Classical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEC</td>
<td>Library of Early Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNTS</td>
<td>Library of New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>Library of Pauline Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>New American Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBBC</td>
<td>New Beacon Bible Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCB</td>
<td>New Century Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBC</td>
<td>New Cambridge Bible Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEzT</td>
<td>Neutestamentliche Entwürfe zur Theologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIB</td>
<td>The New Interpreter’s Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIBCNT</td>
<td>New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIBCOT</td>
<td>New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICNT</td>
<td>The New International Commentary of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOT</td>
<td>The New International Commentary of the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGTC</td>
<td>The New International Greek Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIVAC</td>
<td>The NIV Application Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovT</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovTSup</td>
<td>Supplements to Novum Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSBT</td>
<td>New Studies in Biblical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>New Testament Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTSI</td>
<td>The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>New Testament Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTL</td>
<td>Old Testament Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBM</td>
<td>Paternoster Biblical Monographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCNT</td>
<td>Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>Pentecostal Commentary Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNTC</td>
<td>The Pillar New Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSt</td>
<td>Perspectives in Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNBC</td>
<td>Readings: A New Biblical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRev</td>
<td>Rhetoric Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR</td>
<td>Recherches de science religieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTNT</td>
<td>Reading the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SacPag</td>
<td>Sacra Pagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANT</td>
<td>Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLDSS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLMS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLSymS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>Studies in Biblical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHBC</td>
<td>Smyth &amp; Helwys Bible Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNTSMS</td>
<td>Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNTW</td>
<td>Studies of the New Testament and its World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Sacra Pagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBL</td>
<td>Studies in Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDJ</td>
<td>Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STJ</td>
<td>Scottish Journal of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SwJT</td>
<td>Southwestern Journal of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANZ</td>
<td>Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBNJCT</td>
<td>Themes in Biblical Narrative Jewish and Christian Traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THKNK</td>
<td>Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THNTC</td>
<td>The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>Trinity Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNNTC</td>
<td>Tyndale New Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TynBul</td>
<td>Tyndale Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEE</td>
<td>Verbum Et Ecclesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTP</td>
<td>Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>Word Biblical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTJ</td>
<td>Westminster Theological Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUNT</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZECNT</td>
<td>Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZTK</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZWB</td>
<td>Zürcher Werkkomentare zur Bibel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCAA</td>
<td>Corinthian Challenge and Apostolic Apologia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>Contemporary English Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRE</td>
<td>Damascus Road Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Dead Sea Scrolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSSE</td>
<td>The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESV</td>
<td>English Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spp</td>
<td>First Person Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSB</td>
<td>Holman Christian Standard Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISV</td>
<td>International Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJV</td>
<td>King James Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEB</td>
<td>Lexham English Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMT</td>
<td>Maccabean Martyr Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASB</td>
<td>New American Standard Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETS</td>
<td>New English Translation of the Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>New International Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKJV</td>
<td>New King James Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSVA</td>
<td>New Revised Standard Version, Anglicized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV</td>
<td>Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STJL</td>
<td>Second Temple Jewish Literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This thesis investigates references to Paul’s Christophany in the undisputed Pauline letters. Paul’s Christophanic experience has been the subject of much scholarly analysis. However, treatments of this phenomenon, while widely varied, have primarily concentrated on reconstruction of the cause, event, and effects of this phenomenon, discovery of the foundation of Paul’s Christology and/or reconstruction of his Christology, and on conversion/call in general. Few have focused on the purpose behind Paul’s employment of his Christophanic references in their particular literary and socio-historical contexts and none have undertaken a full-length study of each Pauline Christophanic references seeking to discover the extent to which Paul uses these references in context to shape his various communities. This is the task of this thesis. It begins by setting criteria for establishing which of the many proposed references can be deemed a Christophanic reference and based on these criteria confirms five pericopae for further evaluation: Gal 1:11–17; 1 Cor 9:1–2, 16–17; 1 Cor 15:1–11; Phil 3:4–14; and 2 Cor 3:1–4:6. Each of these confirmed references is then evaluated within their specific literary and socio-historical contexts. Special attention is given to possible intertextual links which aid in interpreting Paul’s larger purposes within the epistles as well as more specific purposes behind his employment of the Christophanic reference. A significant reliance on Isaiah, especially Isa 40–66, is highlighted. Through this assessment, the importance of Paul’s Christophanic references as part of his larger arguments is established. It is shown how Paul uniquely shapes the various Christophanic references to fit the needs of his argument and through it, the needs of the community. Furthermore, it evidences that Paul’s Christophanic references are not primarily used to establish his apostolic status or to assert his apostolic authority. Through this study, the corporate nature of Paul’s Christophanic references becomes increasingly evident and multiple general conclusions are drawn, which provide a possible glimpse into Paul’s understanding of his Christophanic experience. Specifically, it is argued that Paul’s Christophanic references primarily functioned in three ways. They functioned didactically, providing an avenue for instruction within Paul’s overall argument. They functioned paradigmatically, offering the various communities a model of correct identity and action that should be imitated. Lastly, a few of the references also functioned analogously, illustrating Paul’s understanding of the shared elements of their conversion, calling, and identity, which are made possible through a revelation of Christ/Spirit to all believers.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Any student of the Apostle Paul and his letters will eventually engage, no matter how shallowly, with the subject of his “Damascus Road Experience” (DRE). As one does, a multitude of questions will quickly surface. The difficulty in answering any such questions is quickly deduced as one surveys the copious pages of literature on the subject and comes to recognise there is much more said about this event than is actually known.

The legendary status of Paul’s DRE is as much fabricated as it is factual. Much of what is reconstructed comes from the three accounts in Acts (9:1–19; 22:1–21; 26:4–18)\(^1\) and not directly from the Pauline epistles. This is not a statement about the historicity of one or the other.\(^2\) Each writer employs these references for particular purposes unique to his various situations and audiences.\(^3\)

This thesis will not evaluate Luke’s accounts in Acts or compare and contrast them to Paul’s own references.\(^4\) It is enough to acknowledge both authors write about an

\(^1\) Unless otherwise indicated, Scriptural and Apocryphal quotations are from the NRSVA.


event in Paul’s life where Christ is manifested, in some form, to Paul. Thus, this event can be called a Christophany (Χριστός + φανερώ). Since this thesis relies exclusively on Paul’s accounts of this event, it will employ the language of “Christophany” and its cognates rather than DRE, even where others refer to this event with DRE language.

1.1 A Review of the Relevant Literature

The literature addressing Paul’s Christophanic references can be broadly grouped into three approaches: (1) those seeking to reconstruct that which precipitated the event, the specifics of the event itself, or the particularities of Paul’s subsequent mission to the Gentiles; (2) those seeking to discover the foundations for Paul’s Christology and/or to reconstruct Paul’s Christology; and (3) those focusing on conversion and/or call in general. These broad categories overlap both in content and in scholarship. Therefore, rather than dividing the review into these approaches, those scholars who are most relevant to the discussion are highlighted showing their focus, methodology, strengths and weakness. This is followed by a brief comparison of these works and concluded with explanation of how this thesis both differs from and augments these works.

1.1.1 Seyoon Kim

Seyoon Kim’s published doctoral thesis is perhaps the most ambitious attempt to locate not only Paul’s apostleship, but moreover, the whole of Paul’s gospel within his Christophany. Against the scholarly tide of his day, which effectively dismissed Paul’s

---


4 These studies often use a sociological or psychological methodology, which is not the focus of this thesis.

Christophany, arguing Paul spoke “surprisingly seldom” about it, Kim insists that references and allusions to this event abound in the Pauline corpus. Conflating the Pauline accounts and Acts, Kim seeks an historical re/construction of the event from whence to derive and subsequently construct Paul’s Christology and soteriology. He begins by denying any psychological pre-conversion preparation saying, “[Paul] was rather satisfied with his achievement in Judaism.” Kim argues adamantly for an “objective, external event” wherein “Christ appeared to Paul accompanied by the radiance of glory (2 Cor 4.6; Acts 9.3; 22.6; 26.13)” and whereby Paul was both converted and commissioned. The physical act of seeing God’s glory stands at the centre of Kim’s thesis, which relies heavily on 2 Cor 3:4–4:6. Kim believes Paul saw Christ as the εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15), a concept nearly synonymous with Christ as the Son of God (Gal 1:16)—“Paul saw the risen Christ as the Son of God and as the Image of God at the same time, namely at the Damascus Christophany.” This εἰκὼν-Christology, as Kim calls it, forms the basis for Paul’s Wisdom-Christology and Adam-Christology. From the former derives Paul’s understanding of Christ as pre-existent (divine), as agent of divine revelation and salvation, and as one who supersedes the Torah. From the latter derives his understanding of the humanity of Christ, as the one who restores the divine glory enabling believers to be justified in Christ and thus bear the image and glory of Christ as part of the new creation.

---

8 Kim, *Origin*, 3-31. For Kim, this includes both undisputed and disputed Pauline letters.
9 The use of “re/construct” is meant to illustrate that these various attempts to reconstruct Paul’s Christophany are usually better understood as construction by these later interpreters, which may or may not be accurate. Cf. Mark D. Nanos, ed., *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), xii, n. 1.
10 Kim, *Origin*, 54.
11 Kim, *Origin*, 56.
12 Kim, *Origin*, 257.
13 Kim, *Origin*, 104-257.
14 Kim, *Origin*, 258-60.
15 Kim, *Origin*, 260-68.
Kim’s work has several strengths. It takes seriously Paul’s Christophany as a major source of Paul’s gospel. In so doing, it also attempts to show Paul as a shaper rather than an inheritor of early church theology. However, Kim’s attempt to explain the complexities of Paul’s Christology and soteriology as solely rooted in his Christophany is not convincing.\(^\text{16}\) If he is wrong about 2 Cor 3:4–4:6, either about it being a Christophanic reference or about it giving concrete descriptions concerning this event, then his thesis is seriously weakened. Moreover, his overconfidence in 2 Cor 3:4–4:6, read in consultation with the Acts accounts, and through the lens of various throne-theophany visions (e.g. Dan 7; Ezek 1),\(^\text{17}\) is too dependent on strained philological connections. In his attempt to re/construct the historical foundations of Paul’s thought and then to explicate his Christology and soteriology, Kim often ignores the literary contexts of Paul’s various Christophanic references.

1.1.2 James D. G. Dunn

James Dunn has not written a full monograph on Paul’s Christophany but has published many essays around this topic and has addressed it in appropriate sections of his various commentaries and books. His writings on the subject span decades and evidence minor shifts in thinking on the matter.\(^\text{18}\) Like Kim, Dunn’s work in mostly an attempt at historical re/construction. Unlike Kim, Dunn focuses more on the aftermath of this experience than on the event itself. In regard to what Paul actually “saw” in the Christophany, Dunn concludes “[t]he only answer that Paul allows us to give is

\(^{16}\) Kim, *New Perspective*, 213, 296, slightly alters his initial thesis.

\(^{17}\) Kim, *Origin*, 205-52; idem, *New Perspective*, 194-208, where Kim stresses the importance of understanding Paul’s Christophany as a merkabah vision.

\(^{18}\) Kim, *New Perspective*, 1-84, accuses Dunn of multiple ‘self-contradictions.’ On some of these points, Kim’s argument is valid (esp. 14-15). However, most of Dunn’s so-called contradictions can be explained as slight shifts in thinking, mostly as a result of addressing different aspects of Paul’s Christophany. Dunn’s constant element remains the focus on Paul’s calling to the Gentiles. Kim’s frustrations are mostly targeted at Dunn’s disagreements with Kim’s work and at Dunn’s ‘New Perspective’ reading. Kim’s critique is not entirely fair, since Dunn’s treatment of the Christophany is usually incidental within a larger discussion.
‘Jesus’”,¹⁹ beyond this Paul gives no further information, most likely because there is no further information to give. In Dunn’s reading of 2 Cor 4:4, 6, which he believes is a Christothen reference, Paul’s seeing of Jesus was likely in the form of a physical “blinding light,” which for Paul was “the visible manifestation of God . . . it was all that could be seen by the human eye of the risen Jesus.”²⁰ In critique of Kim, Dunn warns that 2 Cor 4:4, 6 speaks of “the impact of the event on Paul rather than a description of the event itself.”²¹

Dunn stresses calling over conversion²² and argues that from the beginning “God’s purpose in revealing his Son in Paul (that is, on the Damascus road) was to commission Paul as apostle to the Gentiles.”²³ This point is made clear in Paul’s writings (esp. Gal 1:15–16) and confirmed in the Acts accounts (esp. 26:13–18). Furthermore, it is not necessarily an auditory appeal²⁴ (or command), but a derivative of Paul’s first-hand experience with the cursed Christ (Deut 21:23; cf. Gal 3:13).²⁵ Paul came to understand God had “accepted and vindicated this one precisely as the crucified” and this meant “God must therefore favour the cursed one, the sinner outside the covenant, the Gentile.”²⁶ This revelation transformed Paul’s identity, his self-understanding as a Jew.²⁷

In his earlier works, Dunn makes a clear distinction between Paul’s commission, which was the “chief content” of the Christophany, and Paul’s Christology and

---

²³ Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 89, also 99-100.
²⁴ Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 102 n. 8; cf. idem, Spirit, 113-14.
²⁵ Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 99-100. Dunn, New Perspective, 351-53, slightly amends this position.
²⁶ Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 100.
²⁷ Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 99; idem, “Paul and Justification,” 86.
soteriology, i.e. the content of his gospel. Dunn argues it is from this calling that Paul eventually formed his understanding of the antithesis between the law and Christ, and the related issue of God’s righteousness vis-à-vis one’s own righteousness, mostly as a result of the Antioch incident (Gal 2:11–21). This view slightly shifts in Dunn’s later works where he writes: “It would be more accurate to say that the principle [Gal 2:16] was implicit in the ‘revelation’ made to him on the Damascus road.” Likewise, of Paul’s gospel, Dunn later writes: “But however Paul achieved the conscious expression of his gospel, the point for us to note is that in Paul’s mind the gospel was already contained within that appearance outside Damascus; his gospel was simply an ‘unpacking’ of ‘the revelation of Jesus Christ.’”

In regard to Christology, Dunn supports an Adam-Christology based on Paul’s εἰκὼν language in 2 Cor 4:4, 6, which may be traced back to his Christophany, but argues Paul’s Wisdom-Christology would have taken longer to develop.

One of the greatest strengths of Dunn’s work is his recognition of the limitations of Paul’s Christophanic references in providing the exact details of this event. While seeing the Christophany as a “fulcrum point” of Paul’s life and theology, he, nevertheless, is cautious about attributing specifics to this experience. Dunn places a higher value than does Kim on Paul’s pre-conversion knowledge, which derives from his Jewish background, and how this comes to shape his understanding of the Christophany. Rather than stressing the singular source of Paul’s thought and its immediacy in this single event, Dunn allows for extended contemplation on Paul’s part and takes seriously

---

28 Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 90-92.
32 Dunn, Spirit, 111, cf. 108; cf. idem, Theology, 179.
34 Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 97-98; idem, Theology, 267-77, 290; idem, Christology, 176-94.
35 Dunn, Theology, 722-29.
various other sources for Paul’s thought, including his Jewish upbringing, Jewish
literature, and the Jesus tradition handed down to him from the other apostles (Gal
1:18, cf. 1 Cor 15:3). Finally, Dunn’s exegesis of the various references, especially Gal
1, better engages the literary and historic contexts in which they are found. Nevertheless,
Dunn’s work focuses on his “New Perspective” reading, for which the topic of Paul’s
Christophany is largely tangential. Therefore, several questions remain unanswered.

1.1.3 Timothy Churchill

Timothy Churchill’s published thesis is the latest attempt to explore Paul’s
Christophany in order to define his Christology. Churchill acknowledges the broad
similarities between his work and Kim’s with two main distinctions. First, Churchill
says he is more concerned with the event itself than with the outcome of this event. To
some extent, this is a splitting of hairs as both Churchill and Kim seek to re/construct
Paul’s Christology. While Kim’s approach is to understand how Paul’s Christology (and
soteriology) derives from his Christophany and the particular details therein, Churchill’s
approach is more literary; he seeks to read the Christophany within the genre of ancient
Jewish epiphanies. Based on Churchill’s understanding of how this literary genre
functions, the Christophany (or epiphany) itself reveals the Christology. Second, while
both Churchill and Kim include the accounts of Paul and Acts, Churchill evaluates these
two separately, allowing them their own voices before comparing and contrasting the
results, whereas Kim merges the two.

---

40 Churchill, *Divine Initiative*, 7. Two additional differences are Churchill’s evaluation of only undisputed Pauline letter references and his move beyond only an evaluation of Christological titles in his construction of Paul’s Christology.
Churchill evaluates a selection of Jewish Epiphany narratives from the OT, Apocrypha, OT Pseudepigrapha, DSS, Philo, Josephus, and Rabbinic writings. Besides defining the basic narrative structure (introduction, appearance, message, departure, and conclusion\(^41\)), he also categorises these various epiphanies into two broad patterns and two characterisation types. The two categories are 1) Divine Initiative epiphanies: “those involving the appearance of heavenly beings without the prior knowledge or expectation of their human counterparts, in order to deliver a message or perform an action that is entirely unanticipated” and 2) Divine Response epiphanies: “those involving the appearance of heavenly beings in response to a human request for a vision or appearance, or in answer to a human question or desire for knowledge.”\(^42\) The two characterisation types are Type-I, which depict God in “angelomorphic or anthropomorphic forms,” and Type-II, which depict God “in neither human nor angelic form.”\(^43\)

Churchill’s evaluation of the undisputed Pauline Christophanic references is in general agreement with Kim’s. However, Churchill argues 2 Cor 3:4–4:6 is not a Christophanic reference but “involves pre-Pauline creation-incarnation imagery” and if it is a reference to an actual vision, then it is more likely speaking of 2 Cor 12:1–4.\(^44\) His analysis of Paul’s accounts under the genre of epiphany narrative is strained as he himself admits they are not presented in narrative form and are missing common structural elements.\(^45\) His solution is the amalgamation of the various references with greatest reliance on Gal 1. Churchill is forced to “construct a comprehensive narrative summary of the event.”\(^46\) The main elements of Churchill’s construction are as follows:

\(^{42}\) Churchill, *Divine Initiative*, 41.
\(^{44}\) Churchill, *Divine Initiative*, 252, for full argument see 130-35.
\(^{45}\) Churchill, *Divine Initiative*, 149
\(^{46}\) Churchill, *Divine Initiative*, 150.
**Introduction** (usually includes summary title and setting⁴⁷) – Churchill believes that Gal 1:11–12—“the gospel preached by me is . . . by the revelation of Jesus Christ”—serves as Paul’s given title for his epiphany narrative. Concerning setting, Churchill argues that Paul does not give these details, because they are insignificant. Instead, his past life and past identity function as the setting.⁴⁸

**Appearance** (usually includes transition from introduction, identity of epiphanic figure, and imagery of revelation and sight) – Churchill argues that the transition is abrupt, showing the appearance was an “unexpected interruption in Paul’s life, which occurred at the time of God’s choosing.”⁴⁹ Jesus is clearly identified as the epiphanic figure, although with a variety of terms. Paul’s references to revelation (Gal 1:12, 16) and seeing (1 Cor 9:1; 15:8) are clear. Churchill believes that this event was likely both an external encounter and a vision.⁵⁰

**Message** (usually includes central message either by words, actions, or images, recipient’s reaction, recipient’s questions and epiphanic figure’s response) – Paul does not give the direct words or actions of Jesus, nor does he tell of his immediate reaction or response. Churchill argues that the content of the message is clearly and consistently seen in many of Paul’s Christophanic references: “first, that Jesus called Paul to be his messenger; second, that Jesus gave Paul his message, the gospel; third, that Jesus gave Paul his audience, the Gentile nation.”⁵¹

**Departure** (this element is often omitted; when included it describes departure and gives recipient’s response) – This element is omitted in Paul’s retellings.

**Conclusion** (usually resolves the epiphany by stating the effects on the recipient) – While there is little information given by way of conclusion, Churchill sees Gal 1:16–

---

17 (Paul’s going to Damascus and Arabia and not to Jerusalem) as serving this function.\textsuperscript{52}

Churchill then evaluates the category and type of Paul’s epiphanic narrative. Churchill sees little evidence that Paul initiated this encounter, either by way of an internal struggle or by external actions or words. Therefore, it is categorised as a Divine Initiative epiphany. Furthermore, because it was an unexpected event which Paul did not initiate, Churchill argues that it cannot be taken as a merkabah-like experience.\textsuperscript{53} With regard to type, Churchill evaluates the direct and indirect characterisations of Jesus given by Paul in his Christophanic references. He concludes that Paul presents Jesus as having a “unique relationship to God the Father, and as divine.”\textsuperscript{54} However, this is atypical of both Type-I and Type-II categories of characterisation. “This represents a significant innovation from other ancient Jewish epiphanies, since the characterization of a human in divine form either breaches the boundary between God and other beings, or implies a presumption of Jesus’s pre-existence.”\textsuperscript{55} The last section of Churchill’s work evaluates the accounts in Acts and comes to the same conclusions concerning category and type. Furthermore, Churchill argues Acts also recounts the same basic message about Paul’s calling to the Gentiles and presents the same picture of Jesus as being in a unique relationship with God and as divine.\textsuperscript{56}

Churchill’s work has several strengths. First, its approach offers the potential for bringing greater clarity to Paul’s Christophany while avoiding reliance on minute details for the re/construction of Christology. Churchill’s findings are cautious and measured. Second, he is not primarily concerned with historical re/construction of the event and attempts to take seriously the literature and its context. Churchill’s analysis is strongest

\textsuperscript{54} Churchill, \textit{Divine Initiative}, 186.
\textsuperscript{55} Churchill, \textit{Divine Initiative}, 254. Churchill doesn’t believe the Christophanic references evidence a belief in the pre-existence of Christ but does see this belief in other sections of Paul’s letters.
\textsuperscript{56} Churchill, \textit{Divine Initiative}, 191-249.
when evaluating the many Jewish epiphanies and the Acts accounts, which fall within the broader genre of narrative. But Churchill’s melding of the various Pauline Christophanic references in order to form his own narrative epiphany exposes the weaknesses of his chosen methodology.

1.1.4 Beverly Roberts Gaventa

Beverly Roberts Gaventa has done extensive work on the subject of Paul’s Christophany. Her unpublished PhD dissertation
57 is her most comprehensive treatment
58 and investigates the full scope of Paul’s experience including cause, event, and result, through a comprehensive literary evaluation of Paul’s accounts apart from Acts.
59 Her evaluation includes Gal 1:11–17, 1 Cor 9:1–2, 15:8–10, 2 Cor 4:6, 12:1–4, Phil 3:2–11, and Rom 7. Through this evaluation, she dismisses 2 Cor 4:6, 12:1–4, and Rom 7 arguing they do not directly pertain to Paul’s Christophany.
60 Of the remaining references, Gaventa finds little information which would enable a re/construction of the cause or the event itself, believing such an attempt would be “fruitless.”
61 From 1 Cor 9:1–2 and 15:8–10, she concludes this event was “a call to apostolic office,” which included the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, and “a call from unworthiness to faithfulness.”
62 These points are confirmed and augmented in the final two references, which Gaventa believes are the most significant in understanding Paul’s conversion.

---

58 See also, Gaventa, From Darkness, 17-51, which is mostly a reduction of chapter 3 of Gaventa’s dissertation. I will reference this work when it differs from Gaventa’s earlier work or when its addition is significant.
59 Gaventa, “Conversion,” 113, notes this omission is largely based on space. However, in From Darkness she devotes the largest portion of her attention to Acts (52-129), treating it separately from Paul’s letters.
Galatians 1:11–17 adds an understanding of this call as aligning with the OT prophets\textsuperscript{63} and together with Phil 3:2–11 the following is deduced:

(1) While Paul speaks of his past, he does so with neither guilt nor remorse; (2) he characterizes the change which took place in his life as one of cognition; (3) the identity of the Messiah was central to this change in Paul’s understanding; and (4) Paul implicitly connects his own personal change in understanding with the cosmic change which has come about in the Christ-event and draws upon both in order to persuade his audiences that they must also change their own perceptions.\textsuperscript{64}

Gaventa’s reference to Paul’s conversion as a cognitive shift is easily misconstrued. Here, it appears Gaventa is making a distinction between conversion and call\textsuperscript{65} as she goes on to articulate Paul’s self-understanding as one who continued to stand within the traditions of his Jewish heritage. In explanation, Gaventa writes: “Paul underwent a radical change in his understanding of what made his own life worthwhile.”\textsuperscript{66} However, in a later article, Gaventa appears to alter or at least supplement her views on what took place. She writes: “Paul does not construct his theology out of the content or experience of his conversion. Indeed, the reverse is true. It is Paul’s understanding of the gospel that brings about a re-construction or re-imagining of his past.”\textsuperscript{67} These words give the impression that the event itself could have been largely imagination.

A further conclusion is reached regarding the purpose of Paul’s Christophanic references within their literary context. Gaventa argues Paul includes these references “for the purpose of theological persuasion, and in each case the goal of that persuasion is to encourage Christians to imitate Paul himself.”\textsuperscript{68} This is an intriguing proposal that needs to be fleshed out further in Gaventa’s exegetical analysis, which only includes a

\textsuperscript{63} Gaventa, “Conversion,” 236.
\textsuperscript{64} Gaventa, “Conversion,” 341.
\textsuperscript{65} Gaventa concludes that neither word is adequate and that this event combines elements of both conversion and call (Gaventa, “Conversion,” 353-54; idem, \textit{From Darkness}, 40).
\textsuperscript{66} Gaventa, “Conversion,” 344.
\textsuperscript{68} Gaventa, “Conversion,” 346.
few passing mentions of this idea.\textsuperscript{69} Furthermore, in \textit{From Darkness to Light}, this aspect is almost completely absent,\textsuperscript{70} which is unfortunate as Gaventa devotes a section to “The Transformation of Believers,”\textsuperscript{71} which would have benefited from a discussion on imitation. One notable exception to this lacuna comes in an article on Galatians\textsuperscript{72} where Gaventa articulates the dangers of reading Gal 1–2 merely for historical re/construction\textsuperscript{73} and as a result viewing these chapters as having a distinct purpose and focus from the rest of the epistle.\textsuperscript{74}

In Galatians as a whole, Gaventa proposes, Paul has constructed his autobiographical narrative as a “biography of reversal” whereby he “juxtaposes his former way of life with his response to revelation.”\textsuperscript{75} In Gal 3, Paul transitions from his situation to the Galatians’ as he invites them to “reflect on their own experience of the gospel,”\textsuperscript{76} which culminates in what Gaventa believes is a call to imitation in 4:12.\textsuperscript{77} This argument has merit but will require further substantiating if it is to have wider scholarly acceptance.

Gaventa’s work, which is ultimately an attempt at historical re/construction of the cause, event, and the result of Paul’s Christophany, is safeguarded by her literary methodology. In the end, she contributes little to historical re/construction, and her work is stronger for it. Her grounding of the various references in their literary context positions her to answer the more accessible, and arguably, more significant, question of why Paul included these references in their particular socio-historical and literary contexts. In so doing, she is able to postulates a paradigmatic purpose behind Paul’s use

\textsuperscript{69} Gaventa, “Conversion,” 129, 166, 245, 280.
\textsuperscript{70} Gaventa, \textit{From Darkness}, 33 does have one statement related to imitation.
\textsuperscript{71} Gaventa, \textit{From Darkness}, 40-46.
\textsuperscript{73} Gaventa, “Galatians,” 311-13.
\textsuperscript{75} Gaventa, “Galatians,” 315.
\textsuperscript{76} Gaventa, “Galatians,” 318-19.
\textsuperscript{77} Gaventa, “Galatians,” 321-22.
of these references, especially in relation to Galatians. However, because her focus has largely been on an historical re/construction of Paul’s Christophany, Galatians being the exception, Gaventa’s conclusions concerning the literary purpose have been tangential and as a result have not received the attention due them.

1.1.5 Paula Fredriksen

Paula Fredriksen has done limited work on Paul’s Christophany, mainly because she views it as relatively unimportant in understanding Paul who makes “brief” and “infrequent” references to this experience.78 Her only substantial engagement on the subject comes in one article.79 Nevertheless, the challenges she raises must be addressed by those seeking an historical re/construction of Paul’s Christophany and its impact. Fredriksen’s historical evaluation is cautious, arguing the historian is unable to know “[w]hat actually happened, what the convert actually thought or experienced at the time of his conversion.”80 Instead, Fredriksen seeks to free Paul from multiple anachronistic readings. Primarily, she is convinced that most of the work done on Paul’s Christophany is built upon either intentional or “back door” readings of Acts. Of particular disturbance to Fredriksen is “[n]ot the narrative details of Luke’s portrayal, but the situation it presupposes of two clearly perceived and sharply contrasting religious options”,81 namely, between Judaism and Christianity.82

---

78 Fredriksen, “Paul,” 15 and n. 38.
80 Fredriksen, “Paul,” 34, emphasis hers.
81 Fredriksen, “Paul,” 5.
Once the Lukan influence is removed, Fredriksen argues, there is very little concrete detail concerning the Christophany itself. First, it should not be designated a conversion. Instead, Paul speaks of this event in terms of a prophetic call similar to those found in Isaiah and Jeremiah and fully within acceptable and known Jewish boundaries.⁸³ Second, Paul “did indeed experience a radical change in his religious consciousness,”⁸⁴ which for Fredriksen was probably an internal or intellectual struggle after having been introduced to the early Jesus movement through a Jewish community in Damascus.⁸⁵ Therein, Paul became convinced Jesus was God’s son and/or the messiah and he should stop persecuting these Jewish Christ-followers⁸⁶ and begin preaching this Christ and his imminent return to the Gentiles.⁸⁷ Here, Fredriksen is on speculative historical ground as she attempts to re/construct the cause of Paul’s “radical change” based purely on conjecture from particular data points, which ironically are strongest in Acts.

Fredriksen’s most intriguing proposal concerns the “retrospective self” and her treatment of retrospective conversion narratives. She uses Augustine as a model and compares his earlier reflections on his conversion, as well as on the conversion of the apostle Paul, to those written some fourteen years later in his Confessions.⁸⁸ She notes a dramatic change saying of Augustine: “His view of his conversion, continually contoured by his circumstances, maximizes its theological and polemical value.”⁸⁹ She finds similarities between how Augustine and Paul both retrospectively shape their conversion narratives to meet current circumstances. Fredriksen sees Paul’s

⁸³ Fredriksen, “Paul,” 15-17, 30.
⁸⁴ Fredriksen, “Paul,” 16.
⁸⁵ Fredriksen’s stance on the historicity of this event is unclear. Using Paul’s language, she sometimes speaks of a revelation of Jesus Christ (Jesus to Christ, 52, 154, 174) but speaks more often of his interaction with Jewish Christians in Damascus, which she believes to have been his home base (so, “Paul,” 9-14; Jesus to Christ, 55, 154-57).
⁸⁶ For Fredriksen’s view of Paul’s persecution see “Judaism,” 548-58; idem, Jesus to Christ, 142-57.
⁸⁷ Fredriksen, “Paul,” 19; cf. idem, Jesus to Christ, 157-76; idem, “Judaism,” 558-64.
Christophanic references as rhetorical arguments used to persuade his various audiences (and possibly himself) toward recognition and affirmation of his apostolic authority and his message.⁹⁰ In Fredriksen’s words: “To see a content-filled moment of conversion is to have constructed a narrative whereby the moment emerges retrospectively as the origin of (and justification for) one’s present.”⁹¹

Fredriksen’s restrained reading of Paul’s Christophanic references is both a strength and a weakness. Her willingness to allow for an historical event such as Paul’s Christophany, while being unwilling to re/construct the particulars, allows her to focus on other more defined (and definable) data points. It is a welcome reminder to the modern reader that Paul has his own agenda in writing, and details and differences within his Christophanic references may be more reflective of the historic situation necessitating the particular letter than the historic Christophanic event itself.⁹² Nevertheless, this restrained reading does not engage the literary context of Paul’s Christophanic references enough; her reading of Paul is too historically focused and allows outside data almost fully to govern Paul’s past and present thought. An additional critique of Fredriksen’s work concerns the correlation between Augustine’s and Paul’s “conversion” experiences. She adamantly claims Paul’s Christophanic experience to be a call and not a conversion and yet is content to compare it to Augustine’s experience, which is undoubtedly a conversion. While it may be viable to speak of Paul modifying or emphasising different aspects of his Christophany to meet specific aims, it does not necessitate these aims always being polemical. There is a variety of possibilities for why one might reference such an event; for example, Gaventa’s suggestion of imitation.

---
⁹⁰ Fredriksen, “Paul,” 29; idem, Jesus to Christ, 158-59.
⁹¹ Fredriksen, “Paul,” 33.
⁹² George E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 415. Ladd writes: “The fact that Paul’s letters are ad hoc correspondence, usually called forth by specific situations in the Pauline churches, places certain limitations upon our study of his thought, the chief of which is that we do not have Paul’s complete thought” (emphasis his).
1.1.6 Comparison of the Various Works

The Pauline scholars who comment upon Paul’s Christophanic experience are many, but those considered above are significant voices in the ongoing discussion concerning the importance and complexity of Paul’s Christophanic references and are representative of the diversity of literature surrounding this debate. Kim, Dunn, Gaventa, and Fredriksen all have as their goal (whether stated or implied) historical re/construction, but they approach this goal from very different angles. Kim is the most optimistic, believing that the Pauline accounts together with the Acts accounts contain all the information necessary for unlocking the mystery of this event and its results. This optimism brings Kim and Churchill nearer, even though Churchill’s stated goal is Christological re/construction and his methodology is literary-form critical, rather than historico-philological. Closer still, it is nearly impossible to separate Kim’s Christological conclusions from his re/construction of this event. For Churchill, the event and Paul’s Christology are so interconnected as to make them one and the same. Dunn places far less value on re/construction of the actual event but his later works show an increased emphasis on the impact of this event on Paul’s Christology, although allowing for extended contemplation. In this respect, Dunn, Kim and Churchill are not far apart in both historical re/constructions and the belief Paul’s description of this event provides significant evidence for unlocking his Christology.

This (over)confidence is balanced by the realism of Gaventa and Fredriksen, who evidence varying degrees of scepticism about the re/constructive value of Paul’s words. Gaventa arrives at this conclusion through a literary critical approach whereas Fredriksen’s approach is more strictly historical, at least as it pertains to Paul. Together their work goes a long way in closing the door on subsequent attempts at historical re/construction of the details of the event itself or of the causes behind this event; indeed, they show past attempts to be construction rather than reconstruction. This conclusion
should not, however, negate the possibility of employing these Christophanic references toward an understanding of Paul’s Christology or of his self-understanding. This is confirmed in Dunn’s work on how Paul’s Jewish background shapes his understanding of the Christophany, in Churchill’s correlation between Paul’s accounts and Jewish epiphany, and in Gaventa’s and Fredriksen’s recognition of prophetic call in Paul’s language. These explorations have immense value as do most attempts which seek to understand the impact of the Christophany. However, unlike Kim’s view, this impact must not be overly reliant upon an accurate re/construction of the event itself.

Another significant connection and contribution of Gaventa’s and Fredriksen’s work is their desire to take seriously the purpose behind Paul’s employment of these references in their current state and current locations. Fredriksen’s heuristic comparison between Augustine and Paul leads to the conclusion Paul’s purpose is apologetic. This apologetic purpose, along with statements Fredriksen makes concerning the cause of Paul’s transformation, may lead readers to the conclusion Paul’s Christophanic accounts are fictitious productions, maybe not in their entirety but at least in many of their details. However, Fredriksen would likely agree that since the historicity of this event is neither provable nor disprovable, such a conclusion is neither warranted nor helpful. Gaventa’s more literary approach concludes that Paul’s purpose is to provide a paradigm for believers to emulate. This conclusion exposes the value Paul places in this personal experience and simultaneously reveals Paul’s understanding that this experience is not for him alone. This reading seems both plausible and helpful and will receive further exploration as this thesis unfolds.
1.1.7 The Differences, Similarities and Uniquenesses of this Thesis

These significant scholarly works provide helpful illumination to Paul’s Christophanic experience. But there are gaps this thesis will address. These differences can broadly be grouped into the categories of focus and methodology.

First, unlike Kim, Dunn, and Churchill, this thesis is not concerned with re/construction of the event or what precipitated it. Like Gaventa and Fredriksen, I am sceptical regarding the possibility and the results of such an endeavour based on the evidence available. In a similar vein, I am neither seeking to re/construct Paul’s Christology nor to argue how or if it derived from his Christophany. While I see value in the former, I believe Paul’s Christophanic references are too sparse to accomplish the latter. Generally speaking, Kim, Dunn, and Churchill are primarily focused on the event itself. Thus, their hermeneutical methodologies are fixated on getting behind the text. Even when evaluating the text, their “behind the text” focus limits their engagement and the literary context is not given due attention. This thesis differs both in focus and methodology from these scholars.

Although Fredriksen does engage in some re/construction of the event itself, her primary concern is to discover why Paul employs his Christophanic references. This could lead to a text-centred approach. But her chosen methodology is a mixture of “behind the text” historical evaluation and “in front of the text” social-psychological evaluation. While this thesis is in general agreement with Fredriksen’s focus, it will differ significantly from her methodology. As such, the conclusions reached will also differ. While differences in methodology do not automatically lead to differing conclusions, just as similarities in methodology do not automatically lead to like conclusions, I believe that some foci lend themselves more readily to particular methodologies, which then have the potential for more fruitful results. The question “Why does Paul employ his Christophanic references?” lends itself to an “in the text”
approach which takes seriously the literary context as well as the socio-historical context connected to the various letters which include these references. This does not negate the use of either “behind the text” or “in front of the text” methodologies; they are, however, secondary.

Gaventa’s stated focus is a re/construction of the cause, event, and results of Paul’s conversion, which is closest to Kim and Dunn. However, her methodology, which significantly engages the text in its literary and socio-historical context, moves her away from her stated focus. Instead, what inevitably emerges is a secondary, less articulated, and more tangential focus, which is similar to Fredriksen’s. While the methodological approach taken in this thesis is similar to Gaventa’s, it is augmented by evaluation of the various citations, allusions and echoes to OT Scripture both in and around Paul’s Christophanic references. This will aid in understanding Paul’s aim in employing these Christophanic references and may also illuminate Paul’s underlying theological convictions concerning his conversion/call and/or believers’ conversion/call within the eschatological Kingdom.

Unlike Gaventa, the primary focus in this thesis is on answering the question, “Why does Paul employ his Christophanic references in their particular literary and socio-historical contexts?” This focus should lead to a solidly supported conclusion. Like Gaventa, I believe that “imitation” may offer the best answer to the question of purpose but I also contend that this imitation is far more substantial and encompassing than Gaventa articulates. The more focused methodology and a slightly different delineation of Christophanic references will lead to exegetical conclusions that differ at key points from those reached by Gaventa.
1.2 Methodology

To describe why Paul employed Christophanic references in specific literary and socio-historical contexts, this thesis uses, what is best described as, a “text-centred, author-oriented intertextual” analysis. Of course, asking the question “why?” places the interpreter on speculative ground concerning the possibility of discovering the intended meaning of the author’s communication.⁹³ Therefore, a few methodological considerations must be addressed to avoid the impression that this is an attempt to get into Paul’s psyche and discover Paul’s feelings about his Christophany.

First, the question of “why” should not be confused with the question of “how.”⁹⁴ The latter speaks of method and/or manner and the former of reason and/or purpose. Although they should not be confused, they are clearly related. For the modern reader of ancient texts, “how” becomes the means for discovering “why.”⁹⁵ Therefore, this thesis analyses the socio-historical settings of Paul and his audiences alongside the textual elements of such things as vocabulary, syntax, rhetorical device, location within the argument, and the employment of various intertexts in order to better understand the message Paul is trying to communicate.

Second, the methodological approach taken in this thesis should not be mistaken for a purely literary approach that often seeks meaning only in the modern reader.⁹⁶ As

---

⁹³ Anthony C. Thiselton, New Horizons in Hermeneutics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 472-73: notes a major shift away from authorial intention and toward a semiotic system in many strands of literary formalism. Nevertheless, Kevin J. Vanhoozer, Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 43-97, 201-80, makes a significant appeal for still considering authorial intention provided one is aware of and avoids the pitfalls of the methodological fallacies of relevancy, transparency, identity, and objectivity, which he outlines (82-85).

⁹⁴ Additionally, there are the questions of “What constitutes a Christophanic reference for this thesis?” and “Where and in which Pauline epistles are these Christophanic references to be found?” These questions are addressed in Chapter 2.

⁹⁵ See, for instance, the work of Holly Morse, “What’s in a Name? Analysing the Appellation ‘Reception History’ within Biblical Studies,” BibRec 3 (2014): 243-264. Morse argues that Reception Criticism “designates an approach to biblical studies that asks how and why the Bible has been, and continues to be, made meaningful for individuals and communities throughout history” (253).

⁹⁶ For example, Reader-Response Criticism or other postmodern, poststructuralist approaches. See, Thiselton, New Horizons, 471-555.
Kevin Vanhoozer writes, “it is important to recover the author’s thought, but this is best done not by psychological intuition but by historical inference—by an analysis of the author’s public communicative action.” The “text-centred” aspect of the method acknowledges the fact that Paul’s available “communicative action” is in the form of a written text. This methodological approach attempts to discover, through the structure and mechanics of the text, what Paul is trying to express. Furthermore, since the text is not simply a series of words detached from a setting, this thesis carefully considers the historical and social context in which these words were first penned and first read. In sum, the immediate and larger literary setting of the particular texts provides a context for describing why Paul employed his Christophanic references, and the socio-historical context provides a lens through which to interpret the words and images of the text.

In some respects, therefore, this is an historical-critical/grammatical method. However, it is not primarily concerned with some “behind the text” matters such as Source, Form, and Textual Criticisms. Additionally, while the methodology undertaken in this thesis is primarily concerned with the final form of the text, it does not approach the text from an ahistorical perspective. Neither is it primarily concerned with Canonical Criticism. Rather, it seeks first to examine how Paul employs his Christophanic references in each letter as a particular instantiation within the specific contexts of that communicative event. Additionally, it will be argued that Paul made use of intertexts in many of his Christophanic references, a phenomenon often referred to as intertextuality. Therefore, this thesis will identify and interpret Paul’s use of intertexts.

---

100 This word was coined by Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 36. Nevertheless, the foundation for the modern concept of intertextuality comes from Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic*
Due to the popularity of intertextuality within biblical studies and the controversies over its methodological validity and functionality, the third concern is to provide an explanation of this phenomenon and why its use in this thesis is required. The primary argument for the validity of an intertextual analysis is that Paul cites the Jewish Scriptures often and extensively.Obviously, Paul’s worldview is dominated by a Jewish framework heavily influenced by the Scriptures. The primary challenge of interpreting Paul’s use of intertexts is that his hermeneutic process of citing the Jewish Scriptures remained unchanged by his Christophany. However, this radical experience did change how he read the Scriptures—through the lens of his conviction that Jesus is the Messiah—and why he continued to cite intertexts—to use this reinterpreted narrative to bring further authority and clarity to the gospel he preaches (see Rom 1:3). For Paul, the revelation of the gospel was a continuation of the revelation of Scripture and vice versa. As Markus Bockmuehl writes: “Given the advent of the Messiah, Scripture itself now makes the gospel clear.”

The debate regarding the validity and functionality of intertextuality often involves hermeneutical ideologies. Geoffrey Miller has classified intertextuality into two

---


103 Markus Bockmuehl, Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 154.
seemingly disparate methodological approaches: ‘reader-oriented’ and ‘author-oriented.’ The reader-oriented approach to intertextuality is a postmodern and poststructuralist synchronic approach in which texts continually take on new meaning. As Thomas Hatina writes, “intertexts are viewed as only existing in the actual communicative process—always oscillating, being experienced only in an activity.” Conversely, author-oriented intertextuality is a diachronic approach that complements traditional and historically grounded interpretive methods. According to Miller, in this approach the modern reader should look for “markers” left by the author to guide them to the source-text/s and the modern “[r]eaders are not free to explore the inexhaustible plurality of meaning of any given text by reading it alongside countless others, but must confine their pursuits to those specific texts the author has in mind.”

Richard Hays, a pioneer in applying intertextuality to the interpretation of Scripture, desires to hold these approaches in “creative tension.” An important aspect of Hays’ interpretative approach is his understanding of the literary trope metalepsis. “Metalepsis is a rhetorical and poetic device in which one text alludes to an earlier text in a way that evokes resonances of the earlier text beyond those explicitly cited. The result is that the interpretation of a metalepsis requires the reader to recover unstated or suppressed correspondences between the two texts.” Metalepsis, at first glance, places

105 Thomas R. Hatina, “Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?” Biblnt 7.1 (1999): 31. Hatina seems unable to envision a definition or use of intertextuality that is void of its poststructuralist ideology. He, therefore, bids the abandonment of this term by those undertaking an author-oriented intertextuality (42). See also, Miller, “Intertextuality,” 305; and David I. Yoon, “The Ideological Inception of Intertextuality and its Dissonance in Current Biblical Studies,” CBR 12 (2013): 71-74. Nevertheless, the term “Intertextuality” to denote a more author-oriented approach has taken root in biblical studies and is not likely to vanish quickly.
106 Miller, “Intertextuality,” 287.
107 Hays, Echoes, 26–28. Hays lists five possible places where a hermeneutical event occurs: 1) in the author’s mind; 2) in the original readers of the text; 3) in the text itself; 4) in the modern reader’s act of reading; 5) in a community of interpretation (26). Roughly speaking, 1, 2, 3 corresponds to an author-oriented approach and 4 and 5 to a reader-oriented approach.
108 Hays, Conversion, 2, emphasis his. Cf. Steve Moyise, “Intertextuality and Biblical Studies: A Review,” VEE 23.2 (2002): 418-31. Moyise believes the source-text is not simply altered by its new context or by how a particular author chooses to utilise or reconstitute it. Instead, the source-text “fights back . . . reminding the reader that it once belonged elsewhere and has certain ‘rights’. . . . [T]he new
a heavy burden on the modern reader that could easily give way to a more reader-oriented interpretation. Nonetheless, Hays insists that “[c]laims about intertextual meaning effects are strongest where it can credibly be demonstrated that they occur within the literary structure of the text and that they can plausibly be ascribed to the intention of the author and the competence of the original readers.”¹⁰⁹

The author-centred aspect of the present methodological approach holds, with Hays, that when evaluating occurrences of intertexts within Paul’s Christophanic references, metalepsis requires exploring the literary and socio-historical context of the source-text to see if additional thematic connections are being proposed by Paul, and how such connections aid in understanding why Paul utilised that Christophanic reference. While each of the main exegetical chapters (3–6) evidence some intertextual analysis, this approach is especially relevant to the chapter on Galatians (3) and the chapter on Second Corinthians (6).

Because, in addition to the more easily identified citations/quotations, this thesis seeks to uncover possible OT allusions and echoes¹¹⁰ related to Paul’s Christophanic references, Hays’ seven criteria are used as a weighted guide.

(1) Availability. Was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or original readers? . . . (2) Volume. The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns . . . (3) Recurrence. How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage? . . . (4) Thematic Coherence. How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that Paul is developing? . . . (5) Historical Plausibility. Could Paul have intended the alleged meaning effect? . . . (6) History of Interpretation. Have other readers, both critical and precritical, heard the same echoes? . . . (7) Satisfaction. With or without clear confirmation from

¹⁰⁹ Hays, Echoes, 28.
¹¹⁰ Hays, Echoes, 29, confesses the difficulty in distinguishing between echo and allusion and utilises the terminology “flexibly.” He does, however, still define allusions as dependent upon authorial intention but says an echo does not necessarily depend on conscious intention. So also, Michael B. Thompson, Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.13, JSNTSup 59 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 30. With regard to their use within this thesis, Hays’ general classification will suffice: “allusion is used of obvious intertextual references, echo of subtler ones” (29, italics his). Still more subtle are thematic parallels. Matthew S. Harmon, She Must and Shall Go Free: Paul’s Isaianic Gospel in Galatians, BZNW 18 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 30, defines thematic parallel as “ideas/concepts shared between texts that transcend precise verbal relationships.”
Based strictly on Paul’s OT citations, apart from any allusions or echoes, criterion 1 may be assumed, at least as it concerns Paul himself. Of the remaining six, more weight is given to 2, 3, 4, and 7. While these criteria are not foolproof and still necessitate a significant amount of subjectivity, they provide a safeguard. In Hays’ words: “There are always only shades of certainty when these criteria are applied to particular texts.”

As this thesis unfolds, it is demonstrated that Paul’s Christophanic references include significant allusions to Isaiah, especially chapters 40–60. Isaiah provides Paul with a foundation for articulating the identity of Christ, his own apostolic calling, and the role of believers in the eschatological age. Many studies highlight Paul’s significant reliance upon Isaiah, and the fact that he quotes it more than any other single book. Hays posits an additional fifty allusions to Isaiah in the undisputed Pauline letters, concluding: “This rough statistical evidence suggests—at the very least—that Paul attributed particular significance to the prophecies of Isaiah.” J. Ross Wagner states: “Paul’s citations and allusions to Isaiah are not plundered from random raids on Israel’s

---

111 Hays, Echoes, 29-31, italics his. Cf. Thompson, Clothed, 32-33. Thompson lists 11 criteria for discerning if an allusion or echo to Jesus tradition is found in the epistles. As such, many of these criteria do not apply to the current study. Those remaining are similar to Hays’.

112 The final criterion of satisfaction is often downplayed. However, see Peter J. Leithart, Deep Exegesis: The Mystery of Reading Scripture (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009). Leithart elevates the criterion of satisfaction arguing that a “hypothesis is compelling because of the over-all coherence of the story, which encompasses many established facts but which goes beyond that mere collection of facts” (134).

113 Hays, Echoes, 32.


115 Koch, Die Schrift, 21-23, lists twenty-eight; Hays, Conversion, 46-47, lists thirty-one; Silva, “OT in Paul,” 631, lists twenty-seven, with Psalms the next closest at twenty-three. Furthermore, Harmon, Galatians, 11 n. 41, believes: “Of the thirteen Pauline letters, only Philo...
sacred texts. Rather, they are the product of sustained and careful attention to the rhythms and cadences of individual passages as well as to larger themes and motifs that run throughout the prophet’s oracles.” Furthermore, with respect to Paul’s Christophanic references, multiple scholars have emphasized Paul’s paralleling of his account to the so-called Suffering Servant passages of Isaiah. For these reasons, significant exploration of how Paul appropriates Isaiah in and around his Christophanic references is undertaken, especially in Chapters 3 and 6.

The final methodological consideration is that the thesis is limited to evaluating the Christophanic references in the so-called undisputed letters. While this practice is commonplace within Pauline Studies, the reason for the limitation in this thesis is due to word count restrictions. A “text-centred, author-oriented intertextual” analysis, as outlined above, requires a significant amount of space for analysing and interpreting each Christophanic reference. Even including the less disputed letters of Ephesians, Colossians and 2 Thessalonians, would require an additional two chapters, as well as the explanation to justify their inclusion. Still, further research in the disputed letters as a test for the thesis advanced here would be a worthwhile project.

Procedurally, this thesis can be summarily outlined as follows. Chapter 2 establishes a coherent procedure for identifying Christophanic references. Chapters 3–6 evaluate the confirmed Christophanic references within their literary and socio-historic context as a means for interpreting their purpose/s within their particular contexts.

---

117 Wagner, Heralds, 356.
119 Romans, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, First Thessalonians, and Philemon.
120 While Pauline authorship of First & Second Timothy and Titus continues to be suspect in scholarship, the pendulum appears to be swinging regarding Ephesians, Colossians, and Second Thessalonians. E.g., Paul Foster, “Who Wrote 2 Thessalonians? A Fresh Look at an Old Problem,” JSNT 35.2 (2012): 150-75, and note the survey (171); Douglas A. Campbell, Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), esp. 190-338, who makes a strong argument for the authenticity of these three epistles.
Chapter 7 provides a brief comparative analysis of these various purposes to see if a more general purpose/s may be established for Paul’s Christophanic references.

1.3 Conclusion

This introduction shows the complexities surrounding Paul’s Christophany in scholarly study revealing multiple foci and methodologies. In so doing, it exposes the need for a full-length evaluation of the purpose/s behind Paul’s employment of his various Christophanic references in their specific literary and socio-historical contexts. Its significant contribution is a rediscovery of how each reference functions integrally within the individual epistolary argument. It discloses how Paul uniquely shapes each Christophanic reference to fit his needs and the needs of the community. It demonstrates throughout that Paul’s Christophanic references had little to do with asserting or defending his apostolic status and authority. Instead, these Christophanic references function within Paul’s larger arguments to provide additional instruction, examples to be emulated, and theological insight concerning the shared revelatory experience of those in Christ. A further contribution is the synthesis of the various findings, which reveals congruity in function between the individual Christophanic references as well as demonstrating the overall corporate direction of these references.
Chapter 2

PROLEGOMENA

There is considerable debate regarding the passages in which Paul makes reference to his Christophanic experience. There is near unanimous agreement\(^1\) on Gal 1:11–17 (vv. 12, 16)\(^2\), 1 Cor 9:1–2 (v. 1) and 1 Cor 15:1–11 (v. 8),\(^3\) with most also accepting Phil 3:4–14 (vv. 7–9, 12). Additionally, 2 Cor 3:1–4:6 (3:16–18; 4:1, 6) has considerable support, whereas 2 Cor 5:16–18, 2 Cor 12:1–4, and Rom 10:2–4 have had limited support. Many scholars also acknowledge the multiple declarations to Paul’s “call” (Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1), to “grace” (Rom 1:5; 12:3; 15:15; 1 Cor 3:10; Gal 2:9), to “apostleship” (Rom 11:13; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1), and to apostolic work (Rom 1:13; 1 Cor 1:17; 2 Cor 10:8; 13:10; cf. Gal 2:2) as Christophanic references. Lastly, there are a handful of acknowledged references from the so-called disputed Pauline letters (Eph 1:1; 3:1–13; Col 1:1, 23c–29; 1 Tim 1:11–14; Titus 1:3), which will not be considered.

2.1 Delineation of Christophanic References

Surprisingly, few scholars have established criteria for delineating a Christophanic reference. As a prolegomenon to this study a working definition needs to be proposed against which the passages noted above can be tested.

---

2 Parenthetical verses are those on which most agree, whereas contextual ranges vary considerable.
3 Both Bornkamm, *Paul*, 16-25; and Gaventa, *From Darkness*, 21-40, make passing references to the two Corinthian references but focus entirely on Gal 1 and Phil 3.
Christophany can refer to any manifestation/revelation of/from Christ, and since Paul apparently had several such phenomena (2 Cor 12:1; Gal 2:2; cf. Acts 16:9–10; 18:9; 22:17; 23:11), this study limits “Christophany” to speak of Paul’s initial encounter with Christ. The following two criteria will be used to confirm whether Paul is making a Christophanic reference: Criterion 1—if there is a reference or allusion to a manifestation/revelation of/from Christ to Paul, and Criterion 2—if the text identified by Criterion 1 can be connected to Paul’s initial call/conversion. Both criteria must be met to be considered in this study. Additionally, there is need to categorise confirmed references so as to bring further clarity into the ongoing discussion. This too has rarely been done and when it is, there is no definition of the categories.\(^4\) The broad categories of primary and secondary will be used: primary references are those where Paul is said to refer directly (and thus intentionally) to this event (i.e., Christophany is in the foreground); secondary references are those where Paul is said to refer indirectly (either intentionally or unintentionally) to this event (i.e., Christophany is in the background).

2.1.1 Galatians 1:11–17

In Gal 1, Paul claims his gospel came not from a human source but through an ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (v. 12) and that God ἀποκάλυψαι τὸν νιόν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί (v. 16). In the NT, ten of the eighteen uses of ἀποκάλυψις\(^5\) and nine of the twenty-six uses of ἀποκάλυπτω\(^6\) are found in the undisputed Pauline letters. In each of these uses, 

---

\(^4\) Dietzfelbinger, \textit{Paulus}, 44, gives the clearest categorisation acknowledging only four direct references (Gal 1:15; 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8; 2 Cor 4:6) and multiple other references where Christophany \textit{im Hintergrund steht} (Gal 1:11, 16; 2:2, 7-9; 1 Cor 1:1; 3:10; 2 Cor 3:7-11; Rom 1:1; 11:13; 15:15, 16, 18; Phil 3:4b-11; 1 Thess 2:16). Churchill, \textit{Divine Initiative}, 99-148, does not directly categorise these references but acknowledges some as more dubious (2 Cor 10:8, 13; Rom 11:13) and uses these as “support” text only.

\(^5\) Rom 2:5; 8:19; 16:25; 1 Cor 1:7; 14:6, 26; 2 Cor 12:1, 7; Gal 1:12; 2:2; cf. Eph 1:17; 3:3; 2 Thess 1:7.

\(^6\) Rom 1:17, 18; 8:18; 1 Cor 2:10; 3:13; 14:30; Gal 1:16; 3:23; Phil 3:15; cf. Eph 3:5; 2 Thess 2:3, 6, 8.
God is either the direct or the implied agent. The phrase “ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” can be viewed as either a subjective (“a revelation from Christ”) or objective genitive (“a revelation of Christ”). In light of verses 15–16, where God is clearly the agent, the objective genitive reading is preferable.

The prepositional phrase ἐν ἐμοί (v. 16) also raises interpretive questions. It can be translated as a simple dative (“to me”), as locative (“in me”)10, or as instrumental (“through me”). Complicating the decision is debate concerning the kind of appearance Paul experienced, whether internal/spiritual or external/physical. Proponents of the former usually prefer the locative translation while those in support of the latter usually prefer the simple dative. However, one should avoid deriving any conclusions based strictly on ἐν ἐμοί; Paul seems to have been able to speak of his Christophanic experience in multiple ways. As already noted, historical reconstruction based on strained philological methodology is suspect. It seems equally logical that Paul’s use of ἐν ἐμοί is making a theological claim rather than a specific Christophanic claim. Whichever way one translates this phrase, the divine agency of this revelation to/in Paul fulfils Criterion 1.

---

7 Both Morton Smith, “On the History of ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΩ and ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ,” in Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979; ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989); 14; and Bockmuehl, Revelation, 33, express surprise at the NT, and especially Pauline, use of ἀποκάλυψις and ἀποκαλύπτω to express theological revelation as this is rarely the case in the LXX.


10 Martyn, Galatians, 158; Gaventa, From Darkness, 27.

11 Dunn, Galatians, 64; F. F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Galatians, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 92-93.


14 Kim, Origin, 56-57; cf. Wright, Resurrection, 380, who argues it is both ‘to’ and ‘through.’

15 Churchill, Divine, 119.

Criterion 2 is clearly met in the rest of the pericope. Paul’s “earlier life in Judaism” (vv. 13–14) is set against the report of verse 23—“The one who formerly was persecuting us is now proclaiming the faith he once tried to destroy.” Furthermore, the contrast is unmistakably the result of God having set apart, called, and revealed for the purpose of (ίνα) Paul proclaiming Christ among the Gentiles (v. 16), resulting in God’s glorification (v. 24). While Paul speaks often of his call and apostleship and never uses the language of “repentance” or “conversion” about himself, there is evidence to show at least some immediate and significant transformation or alternation took place in light of the Christophany. Paul moved from viewing Christ as a blasphemous criminal to knowing him as the risen Lord, from persecuting the church to building the church through the proclamation of the gospel.

Galatians 1:11–17 is a Christophanic reference, having met both criteria. Additionally, the context shows this to be a primary reference. Paul intentionally employs his Christophany as part of an extended autobiographical section (1:11–2:14) which highlights, among other things, the source of his gospel message (cf. 1:1). N. T. Wright has claimed this pericope is “the only time Paul refers explicitly to what happened to him or in him on the Damascus Road.” As will become evident, this is the clearest and most extensive reference. Whether it is the “only” explicit (primary) reference cannot be substantiated at this point.

---

18 This does not discount the strong possibility that Paul’s transformation continued and that it may have taken years for him to develop his understanding of how Christ functioned, especially in connection to the law.
19 For debate over call versus conversion see, Krister Stendahl, Paul Among Jews and Gentiles (London: SCM, 1977), 7-23; Alan Segal, Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee (New Haven: Yale, 1990), 7; Stephen Chester, Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul’s Theology and the Corinthian Church, SNTW (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 163; Gaventa, “Conversion,” 342-54.
20 N. T. Wright, Paul and the Faithfulness of God: Parts III and IV, COQG (London: SPCK, 2013), 1420-421, emphasis his. The reference to Damascus in Gal 1:17 (cf. 2 Cor 11:32) provides possible correlation to the Acts accounts. This may be the justification for Wright’s claim.
2.1.2 First Corinthians 9:1–2 (16–17)

Paul begins 1 Cor 9 with four rhetorical questions, each expecting a positive response.²¹ The third question comprises the heart of this proposed Christophanic reference—οὐχὶ Ἡσοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἄρακα (v. 1). These are significant words, which meet Criterion 1.²² The verb ἄρακα is a perfect active indicative form of ὁράω and has been understood to underscore the continued impact of a single event²³—Paul’s having seen the risen Lord.²⁴

Criterion 2 is more difficult to establish, as Paul does not directly mention his pre-Christophanic life or his calling; apostleship is simply stated as a present reality. Furthermore, Paul’s reference to “seeing” Jesus could point to a subsequent rather than initial event. In light of the positive response expected from Paul’s rhetorical questions, one might assume the Corinthians knew of his Christophanic experience and of his transformation. Furthermore, if Paul is speaking about his Christophany then his use of Ἡσοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν²⁵ would evidence a significant transformation in his thinking—the earthly Jesus is now his Lord²⁶ and the one who establishes his apostleship. However, this reading is still too inferential.

Before disqualifying this reference, it is beneficial to evaluate the larger context and especially 9:16–17.²⁷ Paul states that his gospel proclamation is not of his own will

---

²⁵ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 395 n. 14, argues this is “semitechnical language for speaking of Christ in his resurrection” (cf. Rom 4:24).
²⁶ Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 668.
but out of obligation, because he has been entrusted (πεπίστευμαι) with a stewardship (οἰκονομία). The language of obligation and especially οἰκονομία “almost always points to servile status” and “slave” (δοῦλος), a common self-designation for Paul, is usually tied to his call (Rom 1:1; Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1; cf. 1 Cor 9:19; 2 Cor 4:5). Additionally, Paul’s use of the perfect passive form πεπίστευμαι points to a specific event in Paul’s past where God entrusted him with the ongoing task of proclaiming the gospel. Taking 9:1–2 together with 9:16–17 confirms this is a Christophanic reference.

This passage also falls within the category of primary reference as Paul intentionally invokes his Christophanic reference as part of his current argument, which is part of a larger argument concerning the “rights” and “freedoms” of those in Christ. This primary reference is extremely sparse, especially when compared to Gal 1:11–17. Nevertheless, Paul deems it necessary to point specifically to this experience.

2.1.3 First Corinthians 15:1–11

The whole of 1 Cor 15 focuses on resurrection, with verses 5–8 on resurrection appearances. At the end of a kerygmatic formula (vv. 3–5), Paul gives a list of all those to whom the resurrected Christ appeared. The list can be divided into four lines, each including the verb ὠφθη, the aorist passive form of ὁράω. Paul describes Christ’s appearance to him in identical language to the other resurrection appearances. This may strengthen the possibility that Paul’s experience was an external/physical phenomenon rather than an internal/spiritual one. Regardless, this reference fulfils Criterion 1.

---


30 Both Fee, *First Corinthians*, 395 n. 15; idem, *Galatians*, PCS (Dorset, UK: Deo, 2011), 43; and Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 136-37, appear to view 1 Cor 9:1 and 15:8 as more certain Christophanic references than Gal 1:11-16.

Criterion 2 is also straightforward. Paul’s reference to ἔκτρωμα (v. 8) and to having persecuted the church of God (v. 9; cf. Gal 1:13; Phil 3:6) establishes the baseline for the transformation wrought through the divine encounter with Christ. The focus of verse 10 is firmly on God’s grace, referenced thrice, which called and enabled Paul to work “harder than any of them,” a reference to his proclamation of the gospel (vv. 1, 2, 11). This is, therefore, a confirmed Christophasic reference, which is also primary; Paul intentionally positions his experience in the midst of his larger argument.

2.1.4 Philippians 3:4–14

Concerning Criterion 1, this reference differs from those above; there is no overt language of a visual or revelatory encounter with Christ. Many make mention of Paul’s use of the aorist passive κατελήμφθην in verse 12 and see an allusion to his being apprehended or forcefully seized by Christ. This allusion is weak by itself. A stronger case for meeting Criterion 1 may be made in Paul’s language of “knowing” Christ. In verse 8, Paul claims to regard everything as loss διὰ τὸ ὑπέρέχον τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου μου. V. Koperski and others make solid arguments for the Jewish origins of Paul’s knowledge language, where ידע, and cognates, usually signifies intimacy and the profoundly personal relationship between God and his people (e.g. MT Gen 4:1; Ps 9:11; Jer 31:34; Isa 40:13; Hos 2:21–22; cf. Bar 2:15, 31; Wisd 15:3 cf. Gal 4:9). Furthermore, Peter Stuhlmacher suggests that in apocalyptic literature such as

---

32 Fee, First Corinthians, 734-35, claims this as the basis for Paul’s theology of grace.
33 Wallace, Snatched, 174-75, argues Paul is emphasising unworthiness rather than authority.
36 V. Koperski, The Knowledge of Christ Jesus My Lord: The High Christology of Philippians 3:7-11, CBET 16 (GA Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), esp. 20-65; see also Bockmuehl, Philippians, 205-06. Contra, Martin Dibelius, An die Thessalonicher I, II. An die Philippfer, HNT 11 (Tübingen, Mohr-Siebeck 1937), 89, who argues a Hellenistic mystical background.
37 Flemming, Philippians, 167.
Daniel, there is “Die Auswechselbarkeit und Vergleichbarkeit von Erscheinungs-, Enthüllungs- und Erkenntnisterminologie,”\(^{38}\) as they all derive from the same divine source (Dan 2:21; 8:19; 9:25; 2 Bar. 56:1–2; 76:1). This close association is also evidenced in the Qumran literature (e.g. 1QpHab 11:1–2; 1QS 2:3; 11:3–4a).\(^{39}\)

The connection between knowledge and revelation is also clear in the larger context of Philippians. In this letter, Paul employs φρονέω\(^{40}\) to encourage the Philippians toward a unity of mind/attitude with him, one another (2:2), and Christ (2:5; cf. 1 Cor 2:16; Rom 12:2); and Paul concludes the current pericope with these words: Ὑσοι σῶν τέλειοι, τοῦτο φρονέμεν· καὶ εἰ τι ἐτέρως φρονεῖτε, καὶ τοῦτο ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν ἀποκαλύψει (3:15). Just as God revealed the intimate knowledge of Christ to Paul (3:7–8), thus giving him a unity of mind with Christ, so too God has/will reveal himself to the Philippians (cf. Phil 1:9–10; 1 Cor 1:5–6; 2 Cor 4:6).

Criterion 2 is more easily established. Paul gives a list of his pre-Christophanic merits, both inherited and achieved (vv. 5–6), followed by an “accounting” of their transvaluation in light of knowing Christ Jesus (vv. 7–9). The dichotomy between past and present does not highlight the difference between Judaism and Christianity; this is too anachronistic. Within the context, the stress lies on the contrast between confidence in the flesh and confidence in Christ. The latter took place as a result of a past event in which Paul “suffered the loss of all things” (note the aorist passive ἔζημιώθην; v. 8).\(^{41}\)

When this is taken together with the aorist passive κατελήμφθην (v. 12) it becomes more likely Paul is reflecting on his Christophanic experience in this pericope. Having met both criteria, Phil 3:4–14 may confidently be included as a Christophanic reference. It is

---

38 Peter Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium*, FRLANT 95 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 76.
40 Phil 1:7; 2:2(bis), 5; 3:15(bis), 19, 4:2, 10(bis).
also worth noting the language of call (κλῆσις) in verse 14 is linked to a specific athletic imagery and does not appear to be connected to Paul’s Gentile commission.\(^{42}\)

This is not an explicit reference; Paul’s Christophany sits in the background.\(^{43}\)

While Paul’s audience likely would have heard an allusion to his Christophany, this recognition is not necessary for his point to be made. Otherwise, Paul would have introduced it in a similar fashion as he did in Gal 1:11–17, 1 Cor 9:1–2, 16–17, and 1 Cor 15:1–11. Neither the audience nor the situation necessitated overtness. Nevertheless, this reference is most likely intentional. There can be little doubt that from Paul’s perspective the subject at hand brought his Christophanic experience sharply to his mind.

2.1.5 Second Corinthians 3:1–4:6

There is considerable scholarly support for viewing sections of 2 Cor 3:1–4:6 as a Christophanic reference.\(^{45}\) Among the most liberal is Kim, who argues that 3:16–18 and 4:4–6 refer to Paul’s experience of Christ’s glory on the Damascus Road and 3:6 and 4:1, 4–6 refer to his call to be a minister of the new covenant.\(^{46}\) Both criteria are seemingly met in this expansive pericope. Fulfilling Criterion 1 are the multiple references to what can be understood as a visual/revelatory experience of Christ.\(^{47}\) Paul speaks of “beholding (κατοπτριζόμενοι)\(^ {48}\) as in a mirror the glory of the Lord” (3:18a, NASB) and of the God “who has shone (ἔλαμψεν) in our hearts to give the light (φωτισμὸν) of the


\(^{44}\) Ashton, *Religion*, 125.


\(^{47}\) Wright, *Resurrection*, 385-86, stresses this is an ‘inner’ experience rather than visual/physical.

knowledge (γνώσεως) of the glory of God in the face (προσώπῳ) of Jesus Christ” (4:6).

Fulfilling Criterion 2, Paul speaks of how the surpassing glory has set aside the past glory (3:9–11; cf. Phil 3:7–8), how turning to the Lord removes the old veil (3:16), of “being transformed (μεταμορφοῦμεθα) into the same image from one degree of glory to another” (3:18b), and of the renouncing of shameful things (4:2).

The difficulty with viewing any part of this pericope as referring to Paul’s Christophanic experience is the continuous use of the first person plural (fpp) in the larger context of 2:14–7:4.49 Kim argues all of the “we” references in 3:1–4:6, with the exception of the ἡμεῖς πάντες of 3:18,50 are “stylistic plural[s] referring to Paul himself alone.”51 Regarding 3:18, Kim sees Paul as applying his own Christophany as a “typical” model for believers’ conversion, though not including a physical/outward seeing of Christ, and even adds that 4:6 is a “typical” apostolic commission.52 For Kim, however, this appears to be a concession, mostly to account for the πάντες in 3:18. He argues this generalisation is tangential to Paul’s main concern of “defending himself and his gospel against the charges of his opponents.”53 Kim’s proposed “stylistic plural” as a reference to Paul alone does not seem tenable. At the least, it would refer to Paul and the other ministers/apostles,54 especially in light of the leadership factions Paul sought to lessen in 1 Corinthians (cf. 1:10–17; 3:5–9; 4:9–13; 15:1–11; 16:12). Furthermore, the parallels between 3:16, 18 and 4:4, 6 make it more feasible Paul is speaking in general terms to all believers throughout the pericope.55

49 Murray Harris, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 240-41; Barnett, Second Corinthians, 137-45; Thrall, Second Corinthians, 188.
50 Belleville, Reflections, 275-76, argues 3:18 only refers to Paul and “all true gospel ministers.”
53 Kim, Origin, 5-6 n. 7, cf. 235.
54 Belleville, Reflections, 275-76; Wallace, Snatched, 179.
Wright questions the validity of seeing this pericope as a Christophanic reference precisely because of the inclusive language. His question, aimed at Kim, is apropos: “how could Paul have generalized from his experience – granted his placing of his seeing of Jesus at the end of a one-off sequence in 1 Cor. 15.8 – to the experience he and the Corinthians all shared?”66 Wright may be correct to assume Paul’s conversion/call is unique and cannot be exactly duplicated. Nevertheless, as will be argued in Chapter 4, this is not the point of Paul’s Christophanic reference in 1 Cor 15:8–10. Wright also argues that 3:1–4:6 is not concerned with conversion or call but with a constant experience in the life of the believer and, therefore, cannot be a reference to Paul’s Christophany.57 While Wright is accurate concerning the ongoing nature of the experience described in 3:18, this does not negate the possibility that Paul is also speaking of conversion/call in this verse or in the larger pericope, especially in 3:16, 4:4, 6. These verses are too directly related to the initial experience and implications of “turning” to the Lord. It seems more plausible that Paul is explicating the process from conversion/call to continued transformation as a way of helping the Corinthians understand what has taken place and should continue to take place in the life of believers because of the eschatological new creation.

The ongoing scholarly debate concerning the validity of 3:1–4:6 as a Christophanic reference, which derives from the ambiguity of the text itself as it pertains to this issue, precludes its categorisation as a primary Christophanic reference. Nevertheless, as shown above, there are significant connections between the confirmed Christophanic references and the experience Paul extends to all believers in this pericope. Furthermore, since both criteria appear to have been met, 2 Cor 3:1–4:6 will be

---

deemed a secondary Christophanic reference and this a priori assumption will be confirmed in Chapter 6.

2.1.6 Second Corinthians 5:16–18

This pericope has limited support as a Christophanic reference. It does appear to meet Criterion 2 as Paul speaks of a shift in eschatological perspective from “old” to “new.” Additionally, there are multiple references in and around this pericope that correlate to apostolic ministry, which could point to Paul’s initial call. For example, his reference to being compelled (συνέχει) by God’s love could be understood as apostolic obligation (cf. 1 Cor 9:16–17) as well as his references to having been given a “ministry of reconciliation” from God (v. 18) and being “ambassadors for Christ” (v. 20).

Kim suggests Paul’s reference to previously having known Christ “according to the flesh” is an indirect way to speak of his prior persecution of Christ-followers and that Paul’s words likely reflect an awareness of his opponents’ critique against him on this point. Therefore, argues Kim, Paul’s use of ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (v. 16; cf. ἀλλὰ νῦν) is a reference to the time of Paul’s conversion, which is the moment when Paul stopped viewing Christ according to the flesh and became a new creation (v. 17), having been reconciled to Christ and given a ministry of reconciliation (v. 18). While Kim does acknowledge the eschatological dichotomy being presented in Paul’s words, especially verse 17, he once again ignores the fpp’s and thus over-personalising Paul’s new creation language. Rather than thinking “primarily of his own case,” Paul understands the new creation reality to have already been inaugurated through Christ and connected to the

58 Kim, New Perspective, 223, well overstates his claim that 2 Cor 5:16 is “universally recognized as alluding to” Paul’s Christophany.
60 So Kim, New Perspective, 224-25.
62 Kim, Origin, 16.
eschatological people of God rather than specifically to his own experience; he would of course include himself as part of the eschatological people of God.\textsuperscript{63}

Criterion 1 is especially difficult to establish as there is no direct reference to a visible/revelatory experience. There are multiple references to “knowing” (οἴδαμεν, ἐγνώκαμεν, γινώσκομεν) in verse 16, which could compare to those in Phil 3:7–9. However, the emphasis is on “no longer” knowing Christ, or anyone else, according to the flesh. Stanley Porter has recently claimed that verse 16b is actually a reference to Paul’s own personal experience of having seen the earthly Jesus prior to his conversion/call.\textsuperscript{64} Even if this claim could be substantiated, it would still not fulfil Criterion 1. Mark Seifrid postulates an intriguing proposal that Paul’s use of “according to the flesh” is in reference to his opponents’ claims to have had similar post-resurrection encounters with Christ (cf. 2 Cor 12:1–4); “Paul does not contest the claim of the opponents to have known Christ, but here with his first-person plural, he indicates that he is their equal. His point here, however, is that such knowledge of Christ has been transcended by another.”\textsuperscript{65} Nevertheless, even if Seifrid’s proposal could be verified, the focus would still be on a “knowing” which has been superseded and not specifically on Paul’s Christophanic experience of “knowing” Christ.

Therefore, while an argument for Criterion 2 could be made, Criterion 1 has not been met and this pericope must be excluded from consideration as a Christophanic reference. However, the thematic connection of conversion imagery between this pericope and 2 Cor 3:4–4:6, as well as the continuation of the use of the fpp language, may give significant insight into understanding the latter. For this reason, 2 Cor 5:16–18 will be further studied as part of the larger context of 2 Cor 3:4–4:6.

\textsuperscript{63} While v. 17 is decidedly singular (ὅπερ εἰς τις ἐν Χριστῷ), the new creation is a collective reality, which includes all believers as well as the ever-expansive Kingdom.
\textsuperscript{64} Cf. Porter, “Did Paul.”
\textsuperscript{65} Seifrid, \textit{Second Corinthians}, 249.
This passage makes reference to ὀπτασίας καὶ ἂποκαλύψεως (v. 1; cf. v. 7) and to a particular ecstatic experience in which “a person,” almost definitely Paul,\(^{66}\) “was caught up into Paradise and heard things that are not to be told, that no mortal is permitted to repeat” (v. 4). This would appear to satisfy Criteria 1. However, Paul says this event took place “fourteen years ago,” and based on the dating of Second Corinthians (ca. C.E. 55–57), most scholars\(^ {67}\) quickly dismiss the possibility of this being a Christo\(^ {68}\) phanic reference, especially since attempts to reconcile the two dates have been unconvincing.\(^ {69}\) There are multiple other points which make this a dubious Christo\(^ {68}\) phanic reference. First, Paul speaks of an unutterable event, whereas in Gal 1:11–17 (cf. 1 Cor 15:8–11) the Christophany requires Paul’s continued proclamation.\(^ {70}\) Second, nowhere else does Paul overtly connect his Christophany to a heavenly ascent.\(^ {71}\) Third, unlike other confirmed references, here, Paul self-distances himself from the revelation, probably due to the parodic nature of his apologia in this section (chs. 10–13).\(^ {72}\) Fourth, rather than “knowing” (Phil 3:8), Paul claims, “I do not know” (vv. 2–3, bis; cf. 2 Cor

---


5:16). Finally, the larger context centres on boasting and there is no reference to calling or apostleship.\(^{73}\) Having not met Criterion 2, this passage is disqualified.

2.1.8 Romans 10:2–4

Romans 10:2–4 is part of large and challenging section of Romans (9:1–11:36) in which Paul’s thesis of salvation for both Jews and Gentiles through faith (1:16) is enunciated\(^{74}\) and climaxed.\(^{75}\) On the surface, this passage has very little to do with Paul’s Christophany. However, Carey Newman argues in “Romans 10:2–4 Paul reads the history of Israel in light of his own conversion experience.”\(^{76}\) Others have made similar assertion which appear to rely almost entirely on the shared language of ζηλος in Rom 10:2 and Phil 3:6 (cf. ζηλωτής in Gal 1:14),\(^{77}\) which then opens further linguistic connections of “righteousness” and “knowledge” between these pericopae.

But does this passage actually meet the Christophanic criteria set out in this thesis? Since Paul makes no reference to his own conversion/call, Criterion 2 is not met. Regarding Criterion 1, a case could be made from Paul’s “knowledge” language (ἐπίγνωσιν in 10:2; ἀγνοοῦντες in 10:3); but again, the emphasis is on not knowing and thus correlates more with 2 Cor 5:16 and 12:2–3 than with Phil 3:7–9. For Kim, Paul is contrasting the “ignorance” of the Jews in trying to establish their own righteousness through their zeal for the law with God’s righteousness, which he received through faith as a result of his Christophany.\(^{78}\) One of the difficulties with this reading is it presents Paul as one who condemns Israel for doing the very thing (in Kim’s reading) he was

---


\(^{74}\) James D. G. Dunn, Romans 9-16, WBC 38B (Dallas: Word, 1988), 519-20;

\(^{75}\) N. T. Wright, The Climax of the Covenant; Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 234.

\(^{76}\) Newman, Glory-Christology, 165.


\(^{78}\) Kim, New Perspective, 79-81.
unable to do apart from the Christophany; this hardly seems just. Nevertheless, it is not this unjustness which disqualifies it from being a Christophanic reference. It does not meet Criterion 2 and likely does not meet Criterion 1, having no manifestation/revelation of/from Christ.

2.1.9 References to Call, Grace, Apostleship, and Apostolic Work

Regarding those passages which make reference to Paul’s “call” (Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1), to “grace” (Rom 1:5; 12:3; 15:15; 1 Cor 3:10; Gal 2:9), to “apostleship” (Rom 11:13; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1), and to apostolic work (Rom 1:13; 1 Cor 1:17; 2 Cor 10:8; 13:10; cf. Gal 2:2), two things are immediately evident. First, each of these references could be seen as pointing to Paul’s initial conversion/call and could therefore fulfil Criterion 2. Nevertheless, one would still need to substantiate that each was indeed a reference to Paul’s initial conversion/call and not just a general declaration of his present reality. Second, none of these references directly mentions or alludes to a manifestation/revelation of/from Christ. Therefore, they do not meet Criterion 1 and as such cannot be considered Christophanic references.

2.2 Conclusion

From the evaluation of the proposed Christophanic references, it has been concluded that 2 Cor 5:16–18, 2 Cor 12:1–4, Rom 10:2–4, and the various references to call, grace, apostleship, and apostolic work do not meet one or both of the stated criteria and have therefore been disqualified. On the other hand, Gal 1:11–17, 1 Cor 9:1–2, 16–17, 1 Cor 15:1–11, and Phil 3:4–14 each meet both criteria and are therefore confirmed Christophanic references. The first three have been categorised as primary references and the final as secondary. Finally, 2 Cor 3:1–4:6 was deemed a secondary Christophanic reference although the presence of the $fpp$’s brings continued ambiguity to this status.
Nevertheless, an a priori judgment of 2 Cor 3:1–6:4 will be confirmed in the evaluation of this epistle.

2.3 Outline of the Study

I am now in a position to offer a more complete outline of this study. Chapters 3–5 will evaluate the now-confirmed Christophanic references in their larger literary and socio-historical contexts to understand exactly why Paul employs them. This evaluation will take place chronologically. Therefore, Chapter 3 will look at Gal 1:11–17, Chapter 4 at 1 Cor 9:1–2, 16–17 and 1 Cor 15:1–11, and Chapter 5 at Phil 3:4–14. Next, Chapter 6 will be devoted to the complexity of 2 Cor 3:1–4:6 and will provide evidence which confirms its Christophanic status. Finally, Chapter 7 will bring the finding of Chapters 3–6 together and compare them to see if a more general consensus for why Paul employs his Christophanic references can be reached.
Galatians 1:11–17 is Paul’s most overt reference to his Christophanic experience and is contained in his most extensive autobiographical narrative (1:11–2:21). However, many scholars have lost sight of the context and purpose of the autobiographical statements focusing on the apologetic nature of Gal 1–2 and divorcing them from what they consider the theological arguments found in Gal 3–4.¹ As Gaventa writes, “it is not surprising that Galatians 1 and 2 are used extensively, and almost exclusively, for writing the history of primitive Christianity.”² In light of these emphases, Paul is often depicted as a maverick apostle seeking to demonstrate his independence from and dominance over the Jerusalem church and its leaders,³ and this is also viewed as the primary purpose behind Paul’s Christophanic reference.⁴ As noted in Chapter 1, Gaventa argues for a reading of Galatians which takes seriously the integral place of Gal 1–2 within the whole epistle and for viewing Paul’s Christophanic reference as functioning paradigmatically.⁵

¹ J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians (London: Macmillan, 1865); Ernest de Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921); George S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (New York: Harper, 1934); Walter Schmithals, Paul & the Gnostics, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville, Abingdon, 1972); Dieter Betz, Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); Bruce, Galatians; Longenecker, Galatians; Dunn, Galatians; Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch, Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006); Thomas R. Schreiner, Galatians, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010).


⁴ Karl O. Sandnes, Paul—One of the Prophets? A Contribution to the Apostle’s Self-Understanding, WUNT 2.43 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1991), 67; Newman, Glory-Christology, 204-05.

⁵ Gaventa, “Galatians”; idem, “Conversion,” 237-46. A paradigmatic function behind Gal 1–2 is also posited by: George Lyons, Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding, SBLDS 73
This chapter builds upon and significantly extends beyond Gaventa’s work. Beforehand, some preliminary concerns must be addressed, which help to lay the groundwork for evaluation of the Christophanic reference. This includes a brief introduction to the overall theme of Galatians and an extended analysis of Isaiah as an important intertextual background for understanding Paul’s autobiographical section in Galatians.

3.1 Preliminary Considerations

3.1.1 The Occasion and Theme of Galatians

The impetus for Paul’s writing of Galatians is found in 1:6–7. “Agitators” had entered into the Galatians’ community and were perverting the gospel of Christ. As a result, the Galatians were in the process of “turning to a different gospel.” Paul writes in reaction to this incident and his letter evidences his passion for the gospel and for the church in Galatia. This passion is often mistaken for a kind of reckless haste. While the situation may have necessitated swiftness, the epistle as a whole evidences a careful and planned response with a deliberative approach.

---


7 E. Randolph Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition, and Collection* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 123-33, is incorrect that Paul was too rushed to write a thanksgiving.

8 Robert A. Bryant, *The Risen Crucified Christ in Galatians*, SBLDS 185 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001), 115, argues that Paul’s reference to καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί in 1:2a is proof that Paul discussed the situation and his response with others.

It has been noted that the thanksgiving sections of Paul’s letters are more than mere epistolary requirement; they set the tone and theme for the whole epistle. In the case of Galatians, the lack of a thanksgiving itself provides the tone; when it is coupled with Paul’s astonishment (1:6) and double curse (1:8–9), the audience would have quickly deduced the gravitas of the situation. Concerning theme, it is argued by many that 1:6–9 encompasses the theme of “gospel” and the tone and content shows that Paul is defending his gospel. Others have pointed to 1:1, 11–12 arguing that Paul’s emphasis on his Christoform experience correlates to the theme of apostolic apologia.

However, there is another possible location for establishing the epistle’s theme, namely 1:1–5. Modern epistolary and rhetorical studies have often relegated this pericope to the place of “introduction” or “prescript.” Nevertheless, Paul’s extended opening may provide far more than introduction. It will be shown that rather than defending his apostleship and distancing himself from the Jerusalem church, Paul seeks to persuade the Galatians that a new eschatological age had dawned and what they experienced while Paul was present was still true in his absence. Paul’s Christoformic reference, as well as the whole of the autobiographical narrative of Gal 1–2, is brought

13 O’Brien, Thanksgiving, 265, writes: “No thanksgiving period omits a reference to the gospel” and that “Thanksgiving and the gospel are inextricably linked.” Thus, he insinuates that Galatians 1:6–9 function as Paul’s thanksgiving section.
14 See n. 1 above.
15 See n. 3 above.
16 Many note correlations between themes found in Gal 1:1–5 and those found throughout the letter: e.g. Betz, Galatians, 37-43; Kennedy, Rhetorical, 147-148; Martyn, Galatians, 92-106. However, few argue 1:1–5 provides the theme. Two exceptions are: Van Voorst, “No Thanksgiving,” and David Cook, “The Prescript as Programme in Galatians,” JTS 43.2 (1992): 511-19. Cf. Nanos, Galatians, 71.
into the discussion as proof of this eschatological reality and as an example of how one transitions between these two ages.

3.1.2 Intertextual Reliance upon Isaiah 40–66

The importance of Isaiah for Galatians is brought into question because it contains only one direct citation (4:27, cf. Isa 54:1). However, if one includes possible allusions, echoes, and thematic parallels then the role of Isaiah within Galatians must be reconsidered.

Important to the current study on Paul’s Christophanic reference, is a well-noted allusion in 1:15 to Isa 49:1 or Jer 1:5 or both. There are at least two reasons to see Isa 49:1 as the primary referent. First, the verbal connection is greatest between 1:15 and Isa 49:1, the former quoting verbatim four words from the latter and both utilising the verb καλέω (cf. Isa 49:6).

---


18 J. Ross Wagner, “Isaiah in Romans and Galatians,” in Moyise and Menken, Isaiah in NT, 129, “Isaiah plays a relatively minor role in Galatians.”

19 So Harmon, Galatians.


21 Segal, Paul, 13-14; L. Ann Jervis, Galatians, NIBCNT (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 43; Witherington, Galatians, 105.

22 Munck, Paul, 24-26; Gaventa, “Conversion,” 231; Ronald Y. K. Fung, The Epistle to the Galatians, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 63-64; Martyn, Galatians, 156-57. Cf. Kim, New Perspective, 201-06, who suggests a combined allusion to Isa 41:8-9, 42:1 and Jer 1:5.

23 This does not negate the possibility that Jer 1:5 or other call narratives also shaped Paul’s understanding.
Second, there are multiple other connections between the larger contexts of these two pericopae. Paul’s self-description as δοῦλος (1:10; cf. Rom 1:1; Phil 1:1; 2 Cor 4:5) appears to correlate with the servant of Isa 49:3, 5, who was called to glorify Yahweh (καὶ ἐν σοὶ δοξασθήσομαι, 49:3) by being a light to the nations (εἰς φῶς ἔδωκαν, 49:6; cf. 49:8b) and who grieved over labour given in vain (κενῶς ἐκοπίασα, 49:4). Similarly, Paul’s call is to proclaim Christ among the nations (ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Gal 1:16), which has led the churches in Judea to glorify God (ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν θεόν, 1:24). Additionally, Paul mentions going to Jerusalem to make sure he has not run in vain (εἰς κενῶν, 2:2).

These striking parallels lead many scholars to conclude that Paul is seeking to represent his own call in the form of an OT prophetic call narrative, perhaps in order to establish and legitimise his authority. However, attempts to categorise Paul’s Christophanic reference into the various formgeschichtlichen elements outlined by Norm Habel are neither convincing nor consistent. This does not negate the possibility that Paul understood himself as fulfilling some type of prophetic role; it is only a question of the necessity of making Paul’s words conform to a particular narrative form. Others have argued Paul understood himself as fulfilling the specific role of the Isaianic servant. In

light of the multiple allusions to Isa 49, the latter proposal appears more convincing. However, before drawing conclusions, it is beneficial to see if there are additional Isaianic allusions or echoes that may shed light on the importance of Isaiah for this epistle and which may, therefore, help to interpret Paul’s use of Isa 49 as part of his Christophanic reference.

Another important Isaianic allusion comes in the prescript, which comprises the theme of this epistle. Multiple scholars argue that 1:4 (cf. 2:20) contains an allusion to Isa 53,29 with the exact verse being contested.

Gal 1:4 τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν

Isa 53:6 καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν

Isa 53:10 ἐὰν δόθη περὶ ἀμαρτίας, ἣ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὁμοιάζει σπέρμα μακρόβιον, καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν

Isa 53:12 καὶ αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτὸν παρεδόθη

Here, it is unnecessary to rehash the debates offered for the various referent30 whether or not it can be shown that the Jewish idea of vicarious suffering stems from Isa 53.

Hermann Spieckermann has traced the prehistory of vicarious suffering in the OT, arguing that it resembles the prophetic intercession and prophetic suffering evidenced in Deuteronomic Moses, Amos, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.31 However, Spieckermann believes Isa 53 evidences a new and unique sense in at least four ways: 1) “It becomes suffering

30 Among the most significant arguments see: Ciampa, Presence, 51-61, who favours Isa 53:6; Harmon, Galatians, 56-66, who favours Isa 53:10; Rohde, Galatian, 35, who favours Isa 53:12.

for the guilt of others that is intended by God and the Servant together”; 2) it is concentrated on the role of a single figure who is able to remove guilt for all time; 3) “God makes the Servant’s righteousness a part of the vicarious event”; 3) it is for the “many,” which includes other nations. Spieckermann is correct in highlighting these significant differences, many of which appear to continue until the NT period.  

Therefore, caution should be taken before assuming any kind of solidified concept behind the identity and work of the Servant; these were still very much in statu nascendi.  

The absence of a prehistory does not exclude the possibility of a subsequent (possibly independent) source for Paul’s understanding of vicarious suffering. Many have suggested Maccabean Martyr Theology (MMT). Of particular importance is 2 Macc 7:37–38, 4 Macc 6:28–29, and 4 Macc 17:21–22. There are, however, significant difficulties in viewing these as a source for Paul’s understanding of Christ’s vicarious suffering. First, 4 Maccabees, which evidences the clearest and more developed MMT, is dated much too late to be considered a source for Paul. Second, MMT fails to meet

---

34 For a history of the use of Isa 53 in the intertestamental period see: Martin Hengel with Daniel P. Bailey, “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian Period,” in Janowski and Stuhlmacher, Suffering Servant, 75-146. They argue the exaltation motif of Isa 52 – 53 is strongest in these later writings and “the motif of vicarious atoning death . . . recedes more or less into the background in other pre-Christian texts” (146). See also Morna D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament (London: S.P.C.K., 1959), 53-61.  
35 Spieckermann, “Vicarious Suffering,” 14; Wright, Climax, 60.  
important elements found in Isa 53 and in Paul’s writings. For example, the martyrs’
sacrifice is not necessarily intended by God for the purpose of atonement; rather, the
martyrs themselves make an appeal to Yahweh that their actions might provide
atonement for others. Additionally, and of great importance to Paul, this sacrificial act is
only for the Jewish nation and not for the “many” (cf. Dan 11:34–35).

Third, many have correctly asserted MMT “is itself based on exegetical reflection
upon scriptural material in general relating to sacrifice and redemption and Isaiah 53 in
particular.” The fact Paul’s words in 1:4 show a greater linguistic and thematic
connection to Isa 53 than to 2 Macc 7:37–38 may suggest Paul is doing his own
exegetical reflection on the former text rather than on the latter. This assertion may be
strengthened by Paul’s multiple other allusions to Isa 53 in places where he refers to
Christ’s vicarious suffering (Rom 4:24–25; 5:15–19; 1 Cor 15:3–4; Gal 2:20; Phil 2:7–9;
cf. Eph 5:2, 25; 1 Tim 2:6; Titus 2:14). Fourth, the recognition that Isa 53 was a
significant text for the early church’s understanding of the person and work of Christ
coupled with the recognition that some of the Pauline references evidence pre-Pauline
kerygmatic tradition (esp. 1 Cor 15:2–3; cf. Phil 2:6–11; and possibly Gal 1:4), lends
itself to the conclusion that if Paul is borrowing from a source other than Isa 53, it is
likely from early church Christology, which itself is based on Isa 53.

39 Ciampa, Present, 58-59; so also, Williams, Maccabean, 72-84; Heard, “Maccabean,” 185-393.
40 However, 2 Macc 7:37 does include the verb προδίδωμι.
43 Of course, Paul could have both Jesus tradition and MMT in the back of his mind as he himself evaluates Isa 53. Cf. Ciampa, Presence, 52-59; Dunn, Galatians, 35.
There is, therefore, strong evidence for viewing Isa 53 as a significant foundation text for Paul’s interpretation and understanding of Christ’s atonement and for viewing 1:4 (and 2:20) as alluding to parts or all of Isa 53. Matthew Harmon’s point is significant: “The fact that a plausible case can be made for an allusion to three different portions of the same passage of scripture indicates the probability that the allusion itself is to the totality of the passage rather than to just a specific line from it.”

Harmon argues for three additional references to Isa 53 in Gal 3. First, he views Paul’s use of ἐξ ἀκοής πίστεως in 3:2, 5 as an allusion to Isa 53:1 (τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν). This connection is made by others, and should be seen as a strong possibility in light of Rom 10:16–17. Second, Harmon makes a case for seeing an allusion to Isa 53 in 3:13, although not denying the citation from Deut 21:23, which he believe is best interpreted in light of the Isaiah passage. Harmon’s argument is mostly reliant upon the parallels he perceives between Gal 1:4 and 3:13. Roy Ciampa makes a similar appeal adding a comparison between the language of “curse” in Deut 21:23 and the description of the Servant in Isa 53:2–3. While this appears to be a faint echo, rather than a solid allusion, it should not automatically be dismissed.

Finally, Harmon sees a thematic parallel between Paul’s reference to Christ as the singular seed (σπέρμα) in 3:16 (cf. 4:1–7) and Isaiah’s references to Abraham’s seed (σπέρμα Αβρααμ) in Isa 41:8, which is later understood as the Servant’s seed (σπέρμα; Isa 53:10; 54:3). Harmon notes the more obvious connection between Paul’s words and Gen 17:7–12, 19 (cf. Gen 12:7; 13:15; 15:18), but argues Paul reads the Genesis passage

---

47 E.g. Hays, *Faith*, 128-31; Bruce, *Galatians*, 149
through the lens of Isaiah and in so doing transforms the narrative of Gen 12–25 in a way which benefits his “faith” perspective rather than his opponents’ “law” perspective.\(^{51}\) Harmon’s argument has some weaknesses.\(^{52}\) Nevertheless, the Servant of Isa 40–66 may be the most profitable imagery for working through Paul’s difficult reading of Christ as the singular seed over and against the seed as collective faithful Israel (cf. 3:29; Rom 4:18; 9:7).

It has become evident thus far that Paul does make multiple references to Isaiah in general and to the Servant texts in particular.\(^{53}\) Additionally, since Paul applies aspects of the Servant’s identity and work to both Christ and himself, further work must be undertaken before conclusions can be drawn concerning why Paul utilises this imagery in his Christophanic reference. In light of the emphasis on the Isaianic Servant, a brief analysis of this subject will precede the exegesis of Galatians.

### 3.1.3 The Servant and the Servants

The Hebrew word יְהֹוָה is used thirty-one times in Isa 40–66 (MT): twenty times in the singular, all in chapters 41–53, and eleven times in the plural, all in chapters 54–66. The LXX makes use of four different words to encompass these same references (παῖς \(^{54}\) [fourteen times]; δοῦλος \(^{55}\) [nine times]; δουλεύω \(^{56}\) [seven times]; θεραπεύω \(^{57}\) [once]). However, the LXX adds 45:14 and omits 66:14; it also pluralises 42:19[bis] and 49:7 and singularises 65:8. The MT’s abrupt and decisive shift from the singular to the plural, the LXX’s blurring of these lines, and the multiple singular references in both, which appear


\(^{52}\) E.g., his reading of Isaac as the singular seed in Gen 17:19 is not convincing and may undercut his main agenda of arguing for the necessity of Isaiah in Paul’s reading.

\(^{53}\) By “Servant texts,” I am not referencing the so-called “Servant Songs” (Isa 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13–53:12) of Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, GHAT 3.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892). I am speaking about the multiple references, both stated and inferred, to the Servant/servants throughout Isa 40–66 in their literary context.

\(^{54}\) Isa 41:8, 9; 42:1, 19; 43:10; 44:1, 2, 21(bis), 26; 45:4; 49:6; 50:10; 52:13.


\(^{56}\) Isa 53:11; 65:8, 13(thrice), 14, 15.

\(^{57}\) Isa 54:17.
to function as a collective, have led to great confusion concerning the identity or identities of the servant/s.

Chapters 40–48 continually designate the singular servant collectively as Israel or Jacob. Even in chapter 42, which includes the first so-called “Servant Song,” the identity of the servant is collective Israel whose main role is to bring justice to the nations (42:1, 3, 4) because Yahweh has given them as “a covenant to the people, a light to the nations” (42:6). H. G. M. Williamson has established multiple connections between 42:1–4 and the role of Israel as described in Isa 1–39. Furthermore, Peter Wilcox and David Paton-Williams demonstrate that while there is a difference in the character between the servant in chapter 42 and Israel’s character in chapters 40–48, the identity is the same. “[T]he prophet looks forward to a time when passive Israel will take up his [sic] mantle once more, as Yahweh’s active servant among the nations.” In the words of Goldingay, “It is . . . because Israel cannot fulfill the servant role which is her responsibility, that the identity of the servant which was explicit in chapter xli is open in chapter xlii. The picture of the servant has become a role seeking for someone to fulfill it.”

This “someone” is introduced in chapter 49. Though still named Israel (49:3), this Servant is clearly represented as an individual who speaks in the first person singular about his being called by Yahweh (49:1–5) “to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel” and to be “a light to the nations, that [Yahweh’s] salvation may reach to the end of the earth” (49:6). The Servant being both called Israel and called to

---

62 Here, Servant with a capital ‘S’ represents the individual servant.
restore Israel creates confusion. The LXX complicates this further by pluralising servant (τῶν δούλων) in 49:7. Wilcox and Paton-Williams’s proposal makes the most sense of this passage and its correlation to Isa 42. They take the יִשְׂרָאֵל of verse 3 not as a vocative (“You are my servant, [O] Israel”) but as a predicative, thus rendering it “You are my [S]ervant, [you are] Israel.”

The Servant becomes representative of the whole. The Servant does not replace Israel; the Servant “remains inseparable from Israel—but as a faithful embodiment of the nation Israel who has not performed its chosen role.”

The exact (historical) identity is not the primary goal of the texts. The obscurity surrounding the Servant actually serves to emphasis his role and his connection to Yahweh. The anonymity of this singular Servant throughout chapters 49–54 emphasise Yahweh’s working through the Servant to bring his covenant promises to fruition. There are places where the lines are blurred to such an extent that one might see Yahweh as the Servant (e.g. 49:7; 51:4–6; 53:13). Almost metaphorically, the Servant represents the suffering Yahweh has endured at the hands of Israel’s disobedience. In Richard Bauckham’s words: “The Servant, in both his humiliation and his exaltation, is therefore not merely a human figure distinguished from God, but, in both his humiliation and his exaltation, belongs to the identity of the unique God.” This does not negate the participation of the Servant, nor of Israel as a whole. Yahweh, through the Servant, is seeking to awaken Israel to embrace her calling and embody her covenant commitment.

---


65 Childs, Isaiah, 385.


67 Gignilliat, Paul, 88 and n. 147; Wilcox and Paton-Williams, “Servant,” 98.

68 Wilcox and Paton-Williams, “Servant,” 95.


70 Childs, Isaiah, 402-04.
(51:9; 52:1–2). One can even see a corporate call to consecration (52:11) and covenant renewal for Israel (55:1–12), which is extended to all obeying nations (56:1–8; 66:18–21).

This constitutes a final shift in the identity of the servant; namely, an expanded return to the collective servant, here represented with the plural (e.g. 54:17; 55:6). The plural “servants” is foreshadowed in 53:10 as the singular Servant’s suffering results in “offspring” or “seed” (זרע; cf. 44:3) who prolong his days. This protraction does not refer to the Servant’s escape from death but to the offspring who turn from their transgressions and receive the same Spirit that guided the singular Servant (59:20–21; cf. 11:2; 42:1), the same mission (61:1–2, 9; 62:2, 10–12), and possibly the same suffering (57:1–2). Isaiah 65–66 concludes with a glorious picture of God’s faithfulness and restoration of his creation, in which the servants hold a special place (65:8–9, 12–15; 66:14).

3.1.4 Summary

The ambiguity of identity as well as the connection between the singular Servant and his seed (the servants), appears to have provided Paul with a significant foundation for his understanding of Christ’s identity, his own identity, and the identity of all believers. In what follows, it will be demonstrated that an understanding of this Isaianic Servant/s and his/their role aids the modern reader in interpreting Paul’s Christoformic reference as well as other significant sections of Galatians.

---

74 Beuken, “Trito-Isaiah,” 76-85.
One further point needs to be articulated. This reading does not necessitate a recognition or understanding of the various Isaianic allusions and echoes by the Galatians. This neither discounts the possibility for such Isaianic underpinnings nor does it mean the Galatians would have missed Paul’s point. Paul’s argument contains multiple layers and one such layer is Paul’s understanding of the Jewish Scriptures, which naturally moves behind the text and surfaces both intentionally and unintentionally from time to time. Nevertheless, there does appear to be some assumed knowledge of various OT passages and especially the Abrahamic narrative (Gal 3:6–9, 16–19; 4:21–31). Paul quotes the OT at least ten times from at least five different books. Although Paul’s familiarity with this group cannot easily be deduced, it would appear the Galatians had at least a basic familiarity with the OT, which may have come from Paul’s teaching, from the Agitators’ teaching, from synagogue teaching, or from a combination thereof.

3.2 Exegesis of Paul’s Autobiographical Data

3.2.1 Galatians 1:1–5

Paul’s opening words (1:1–5) encompasses the theme of Paul’s Jewish eschatological gospel and the Galatians place within it. In these five short verses Paul reveals that

---

75 I. Howard Marshall, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 216, comments on how Paul’s use of Scripture “dominates much of the discussion, almost providing the structure of the argument as well as the basis for it.”

76 Silva, “OT in Paul,” 631, lists: Gen 15:6 (Gal 3:6); Gen 12:3 + 18:18 (Gal 3:8); Deut 27:26 (Gal 3:10); Hab 2:4 (Gal 3:11); Lev 18:5 (Gal 3:12); Deut 21:23 (Gal 3:13); Gen 13:15 (Gal 3:16); Isa 54:1 (Gal 4:27); Gen 21:10 (Gal 4:30); Lev 19:18 (Gal 5:14); and Ps 143:2 (Gal 2:16) as debated. Cf. Koch, *Die Schrift*, 22-23.

77 Pace, Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 114-35, who argues Paul’s audience did not know the OT Scriptures well otherwise they would have “noted grave problems with the arguments that he erects” (135). Contra, Ciampa, *Presence*, 267, who goes so far as to say: “It is clear from the content of the letter that the Galatian churches were definitely involved in vigorous study of the Scriptures.”


Christ the Lord (2) has been raised from the dead (3) by God the Father; that (4) the
churches of Galatia are recipients of (5) God’s grace and peace, which has been extended
through (6) Christ having given himself for sins (7) in order to rescue humanity from the
present evil age; and that this was (8) the will of God.

(1) Although Χριστός (vv. 1, 3) is often viewed simply as a cognomen, it
arguably has some messianic connotations, at least for Paul. While diverse in
meaning, the concept shares the overarching themes of God’s future intervention
through some Davidic connected figure, whether human or angelic (e.g. 2 Sam 7:8–16;
Isa 9:2–7; 11:1–9; Jer 23:5–8; Ezek 34:23–24). On its own, this titular reference may
carry little significance for Paul’s audience. Nevertheless, what Paul connects to this
title, and thus to the historical person of Jesus, is significant. This “anointed one” is
referenced as κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (v. 3). The background for Paul’s understanding of

82 Wright, Climax, 46; idem. Paul, 817-25. is a strong proponent of this view believing that for Paul, Χριστός is incorporative and has not lost the titular sense of ‘Messiah.’ See also: de Boer, Galatians, 24; Ciampa, Presence, 38-39. Contra, Andrew Chester, Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology (WUNT 207; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 383, who argues Paul’s primary use of Χριστός is not titular and that for Paul’s Gentile audience the use of Χριστός as a title would not be a commendable designation (cf. 102-03 n. 228). Nevertheless, Chester does believe Paul viewed Jesus as the fulfilment of a particular Jewish messianic category, namely, “where the Messiah is a human or angelic figure belonging . . . in the heavenly world, a figure who at the same time has had a specific, limited role on earth” (394-95; cf. 307). Cf. Matthew V. Novenson, Christ Among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012), 88-97, who argues that in Paul, Χριστός is not a name or a title but an honorific. Novenson’s work has had a significant impact on Wright’s later work: see Wright, Faithfulness: Book II, 824-25.
83 There is ongoing debate over the scope and impact of messianism in the various streams of Judaism. Two collected works highlight the complexity of the issue and argue there was no uniform or definitive messianic expectation within Judaism. See: Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs, eds., Judaism and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); James H. Charlesworth, ed., The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992). Still, Chester, Messiah and Exaltation, argues that in the 1st Century BCE and 1st and 2nd Century CE “there was clearly a generally widespread acquaintance with royal messianic expectation” (282; see also 356-62) and that while there may appear to be a “messianic vacuum” from 500–200 BCE, it is more proper to think of a “latent messianism” (283-84 and n. 293). Chester is able to reach this conclusion, in part, by moving beyond philological studies, which rely exclusively on passages containing the term “messiah” (204).
the language and concept of κύριος is thoroughly Jewish. While this dictum may have conjured imperial overtones and thus anti-imperial connotations in the minds of the Galatians, Paul uses it to construct a particular picture of the Christ.

(2) Reference to Christ’s resurrection in a Pauline prescript is rare (cf. Rom 1:4) and, here, gives further definition to Christ. If Paul is reading Isa 40–66, then reference to Christ’s resurrection in Gal 1:1 may be an allusion to LXX Isa 52:13 where the Servant is said to be υψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται. The word υψωθήσεται (from υψόω, a translation of the Hebrew מָרַם) is often translated as “raised” or “exalted” and is closely linked with Christ’s resurrection (cf. Phil 2:9; Acts 2:32–33; 5:30–31). Most interesting is the LXX’s translation of the Hebrew נאש (lifted up) with δοξάζω (glorified; cf. Gal 1:5, 24), which is unprecedented and may have been selected because of its relationship to the Servant figure.

Regardless of whether or not Paul intentionally alludes to Isa 52:13, his mention of Christ’s resurrection serves as a significant eschatological marker. God has done a new thing in raising Christ from the dead and this “new thing” is just the beginning of


89 The four other translations of נאש (nif'al, passive) are as follows: 1 Chr 14:2 with the verb אנדא; Isaiah 2:12 with the noun מָרַם; Isaiah 6:1 with the verb 엕אל; and Isaiah 33:10 with the verb הψיו. The closest correlation is the LXX translation of Isaiah 33:10, which contains both υψόω and δοξάζω, but where they are used to translate the opposite Hebrew word (i.e., δοξάζω from מונע and υψόω from נאש).

90 Cf. Beker, Paul, 152.
what God is doing in and through Christ. Paul sets the stage for a new reality that sits both within and without of the Galatians present reality.

(3) Paul’s multiple references to God as father (1:1, 3, 4; cf. 4:2, 6) is a relatively common concept within Judaism, which is usually connected either to corporate Israel (e.g. Ps 68:5; Isa 63:16; 64:8; Jer 31:9; Mal 1:6; cf. Exod 4:22; Deut 14:1; Hos 11:1) or to an individual within the line of the Davidic kingship (e.g. 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Chr 17:12; Ps 89:26). This concept also takes on possible messianic overtones by the Second Temple Period (cf. 4QFlor 1 I, 11), which has its origin in the OT and especially 2 Sam 7:14. James Scott argues 2 Sam 7:14 contains an adoption formula that is taken up in subsequent Jewish tradition and applied “eschatologically either to the Messiah (4QFlor 1:11), to Israel (Jub. 1:24), or to both (T. Jud. 24.3).” It is not difficult to see how Paul could utilise fatherhood and sonship/child-ship language in relation to Christ (Gal 1:16; 2:20; 4:4, 6) and in relation to collective Israel (cf. Gal 4:5). Nevertheless, Paul’s purpose for employing this concept in Galatians is to remind them of their eschatological inclusion through Christ (1:1–4; 4:4–7).

Within Jewish literature, the universality of God’s fatherhood is reflected in general terms (e.g. Wis 14:3; Ant. 1:20, 230; 2:152) and Gentile inclusion is attested on an individual basis reliant upon repentance and conversion to Judaism (Jos. Asen. 12:8, 12–14). Nevertheless, the large-scale universal adoption of Gentiles in a manner similar to that of Israel’s adoption appears to be missing. There is, however, the concept of the eschatological inclusion of the Gentiles, which crops up in Isa 2:2–4 and is later

91 Khobnya, Father, 19-44. Examples of this concept in STJL include: Tob 13:3–4; 3 Macc 6:3; Jub. 19:29.
93 See Khobnya, Father, 42-44.
connected to the role of the Servant/servants (e.g. 45:20–23; 49:6; 55:5; 56:1–8; 60:3; 66:18–21). Thematically, an argument can be made that the Isaianic Servant is the Davidic heir (cf. Isa 7:13–14; 9:6–7; 16:5; 55:3). But whereas the Davidic heir of 2 Sam 7:14 is punished for his iniquity (ἀδικία) the Isaianic Servant is righteous (δίκαιος) and makes others righteous (δικαιοσαί) through his bearing of their sin (Isa 53:11). In this way, the Isaianic Servant is antithetical to the Davidic heir; “this future Ruler will carry out his responsibilities with a fidelity that was lacking in Judah’s contemporary kings.”

Unlike David’s offspring (σπέρμα), the Isaianic Servant produces offspring (σπέρμα) that will continue Yahweh’s righteous mission. Paul’s justification for the inclusion of the Gentiles as children of God the father may be birthed in this eschatological picture of the new Servant-Davidic King who is adopted by God and brings others into the family by their connection to him.

(4) Paul’s use of ἐκκλησία (1:2, 13, 22) is likely grounded in the Jewish concept of the בָּנָא (Deut 23:2–4, 9; 1 Chron 28:8; Mic 2:5) or σύναξις (Judg 20:2; Neh 13:1), which the LXX renders ἐκκλησία κυρίου (cf. Gal 1:13). Within their contexts, reference to the ἐκκλησία κυρίου refers to the assembly or congregation of Israel. It is not surprising: the Hebrew phrase יִשְׂרָאֵל קָהָל and the Greek phrase ἐκκλησία Ἰσραήλ are also well attested (Deut 31:30; Josh 8:35; 1 Kings 8:14; 1 Chron 12:2; 2 Chron 6:3). Paul’s use of ἐκκλησία in relation to the Gentiles does not necessarily denote a replacement of Israel. Nor does it mean that Paul is only employing the word in the

---


96 Used forty-four time in the undisputed Pauline epistles.

97 In Gal 1:2 ἐκκλησία is used in the plural but it carries the same basic meaning as the other uses. For LXX uses of the plural see: Ps 25:12; 67:27.

98 Dunn, Theology, 539, is correct to note that Paul is “representing the more inclusive strand of Israel’s heritage over against those who emphasized its exclusiveness.”
generic Hellenistic sense of “assembly” or “gathering” (cf. Acts 19:32, 39, 40–41).99 Paul’s words serve to remind the Galatians of their new identity as the people of God, both Jew and Gentile (cf. Gal 1:13, 22).100 Rather than focusing on nationality, this concept reminds the Galatians of the dawning of a new eschatological reality101 in which Gentiles become the ἐκκλησία of God as they simultaneously become children of God the Father.

(5) The grace and peace “formula,” assumed to be an adopted and adapted part of the Hellenistic epistolary form,102 may signal the disclosure of God’s new reality to the recipients.103 Ulrich Mauser notes that this formula (or variations of it) is frequent in Jewish literature apart from letters and speak of God’s imparted blessings on his people. He further notes how grace is often connected with persons who have been given a revelation from God.104 In this benedictory statement, Paul extends a revelation of God’s grace and peace to the Galatians, where “grace” refers to “an activity and a sphere, by and in which believers are privileged to live” and “peace” is “that condition of eschatological well-being (‘salvation’) that only God can bring about.”105

(6) Reference to Christ’s sacrificial death for sin not only highlights the work of this Christ, a concept Paul is continuing to construct, it also emphasises the Galatians’ corporate sin in conjunction with Israel’s.106 Paul is effectively writing Gentiles into Israel’s story, not as the “other nations,” before whose eyes Israel is called to evidence

---

99 Contra Beker, Paul, 313-17; Young-Ho Park, Paul’s Ekklesia as a Civic Assembly: Understanding the People of God in Their Politico-Social World, WUNT 393 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), passim.
100 Cf. de Boer, Galatians, 26-27.
101 Cf. 1QM 4:10; 1QSa 2:4; and see, J. Roloff, “ἐκκλησία,” EDNT 1:411.
103 John M. G. Barclay, Paul & the Gift (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 352-53, speaks of Christ and the Christ-event as God’s beneficence and highlights the radicalness of this Christ-gift being given to such unrighteous beneficiaries as the Gentiles.
105 De Boer, Galatians, 28.
106 See Ciampa, Presence, 60 and n. 100.
the glory of God, but as the people of God, who have disobeyed and who have required a Servant figure to redeem them and to remind them of their covenant commitment. Thus, Paul places the Galatians within the sphere of the eschatological redemption of the Servant (cf. Isa 53) and challenges them to embrace the Servant’s mission in this new eschatological reality.

(7) This phrase τὸ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ (1:4) is Paul’s most blatant declaration of his eschatological framework (cf. Rom 12:2; 1 Cor 1:20; 2:6, 8; 3:18; 2 Cor 4:4).107 Paul has already alluded to and now clearly announces the apocalyptic in-breaking of a new age in which the Christ event has enabled the participation of the Gentiles into the eschatological Kingdom. The word ἐξαιρέω is rare in the NT and only used here by Paul (Gal 1:4). It frequently occurs in the LXX as a reference to deliverance or rescue from one’s enemy (e.g. Ex 3:8; 18:4; Deut 23:15; Isa 50:2; 60:16; Dan 3:17) and this same use is well attested in Acts (Acts 7:10, 34; 12:11; 23:27; 26:17). In Matthew, it carries rather violent and graphic connotations (Mt 5:29; 18:9), which may be closer in meaning to how Paul utilises it. The Galatians have been plucked from108 the present evil age and this is said to be the purpose (ὅπως) of Christ’s sacrificial giving (cf. Isa 53:10–11).

The reality of two ages is a fundamental part of Paul’s eschatological understanding but these “ages” cannot be viewed as strictly temporal categories. “[T]hey are also spatial categories, referring to two spheres or orbs of power, both of which claim sovereignty over the world.”109

(8) That these events take place as part of “the will of God” is significant; it buttresses Paul’s conviction of Gentile inclusion as part of God’s overarching plan (cf.

---

107 See esp. Martyn, Galatians, 97-105; de Boer, Galatians, 31-36.
108 Cf. Martyn, Galatians, 90-91, who translates ἐξαιρέω as “snatch us out of the grasp of.”
109 De Boer, Galatians, 33. See also, Schütz, Paul, 116-17; John G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature,” JBL 93 (1974): 356-85. Gammie suggests at least ten different types of dualism in apocalyptic literature. Of special importance to this study are temporal, spatial, and theological dualisms.
Isa 2:2; 45:20–25; 49:6, 8; 56:3–8; 60:1–6; 66:18–23). Furthermore, this phrase τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ parallels Paul’s opening words in Gal 1:1 concerning his own calling (cf. 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1) and together highlight an important supporting theme for this epistle; namely, the dichotomy between divine and human actions and desires, henceforth referred to as divine—human dichotomy.110 This concept is integrally tied to Paul’s eschatological framework as Paul aligns his divine gospel with the new age and the agitators’ human gospel with the present evil age.

Paul’s opening words provide the context for the whole letter. As Ciampa writes:

“Paul is clarifying right from the start the ‘necessary presuppositions’ or ‘background knowledge’ necessary to properly understand and follow his discourse and the ‘conceptual framework’ within which it will develop.”111 Paul begins by assuring the Galatians of the new eschatological reality which has come about through the Servant Christ. The Galatians themselves are proof of this new reality. Their own adoption into the family of God, the ἐκκλησία, bears witness to the glory of God’s revelation of himself through Christ (1:5; cf. 1:24).112 Paul addresses the Galatians’ perilous situation by giving them further proof of this new eschatological reality and of their inclusion in it. Paul knows that if the Galatians embrace their eschatological identity in Christ, then they will also accept Paul’s gospel and live in accordance with it. Paul addresses a concrete situation with a theological argument;113 even his autobiographical section is theologically purposed to reveal this eschatological reality.

110 Lategan, “Paul,” 418-30, argues the “God-man tension” is the main theme of the whole epistle. While his analysis is good, he misses the larger eschatological function of the divine—human motif. See also, Lyons, Autobiography, 152-56.
111 Cf. Ciampa, Presence, 68.
113 William S. Campbell, Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 161, is correct when he writes: “Theologizing in Paul is designed to change people, to transform communal life and to create a Christ-like pattern of life within his communities.”
The gospel which the Agitators are “perverting” is the eschatological gospel Paul laid out while present (1:8) and has once again articulated in the prescript. In 1:6–10, the content of the gospel takes backstage to Paul’s main concern of establishing the source of the true gospel vis-à-vis the source of other gospels. Paul elevates his proclaimed gospel to the status of direct revelation from God; God is τὸ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι [Χριστοῦ]. In this way, Paul intentionally shifts the focus off himself (cf. 1:1). The Galatians have been called by God through grace and specifically through the revelation of God’s son before their very eyes (3:1b). That Paul is the voice-piece is only significant as he places himself under the same authority to which he calls the Galatians to submit. The validity of Paul’s previously preached gospel is seen in its original effectiveness to call the Galatians into a new reality.

Galatians 1:6 references several shifts in location. The Galatians have already been plucked out of (ἐξαιρέω; 1:4) the present evil age and brought in the sphere of Christ’s grace (ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ); now they find themselves quickly returning (οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε) into a different gospel (εἰς ἕτερον ἐυαγγέλιον). Though Paul does not explicitly reference the age to come, the “ἐν Χριστῷ” formula (cf. 1:22; 2:4; 17; 3:26, 28) is Paul’s way of talking about participation and location within the coming age. “Present evil age” and “a different gospel” also appear to function as parallels. The Galatians are in danger of returning to their previous state and to their previous location.

---

114 Martyn, *Galatians*: 106, 112-13, translates Gal 1:7b as “they wish to change the gospel of Christ into its opposite,” which captures the dichotomy between Paul’s gospel and the Agitators.
115 Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 77, notes that God is always the subject of the verb καλέω when used by Paul in a theological sense.
116 While Χριστὸς is absent in a few important mss (P66, G, H[20]), it is found in many other important mss (P51[20], א, B, Ψ).
117 Cf. Witherington, *Galatians*, 83, who says, “it is the message not the messenger which matters.”
119 For an excellent evaluation of Paul’s use of this language see, Constantine R. Campbell, *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012).
outside of the eschatological reality brought forth through Christ. Paul may also be
insinuating that those who participate in a different gospel join those who espouse this
gospel in their eventual anathema.

Here, Paul must remind the Galatians of their original calling to participate in the
eschatological kingdom and challenge them to explore the source and effectiveness of
other gospels. The severity of perverting the gospel is seen in Paul’s double anathema
(1:8–9), to which he intentionally submits his own subsequent proclamation.
Reference to ἠ ἀγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ possibly proclaiming a different gospel has been
understood as either functioning hyperbolically or as referring to Paul’s opponents
who may have claimed such authority concerning their own proclamations. Kjell
Morland argues that Paul includes angels as a way of evidencing the source of this curse
as coming directly from God who is the only one capable of rendering such a judgment
upon heavenly beings. If Morland is correct, then the divine—human dichotomy Paul
is establishing is significantly narrowed; Paul places every other living creature under the
authority of God the father and the Lord Jesus Christ. If the opponents are claiming some
type of angelic authority (cf. 3:19), then even this must be brought under the authority of
the God who has already revealed the true gospel to the Galatians as evidenced through
their reception (1:9).

When read in correlation with 4:14, Paul’s recollection of the Galatians’
welcoming him ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ . . . ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, may solidify this reading.
Reference to an angel in 1:8 may be another reference to Paul himself. The fpp’s in

120 See Sandnes, Paul, 70–73, for the possible connection between Gal 1:6-9 and Deut 13.
121 So Moo, Galatians, 81; Hays, “Galatians,” 206.
122 Betz, Galatians, 53; Martyn, Galatians, 113; de Boer, Galatians, 48. Contra Seth M. Ehorn,
123 Kjell Arne Morland, The Rhetoric of Curse in Galatians: Paul Confronts Another Gospel,
124 Ciampa, Presence, 90, notes that if Paul is alluding to Deut 13, reference to an angel “could
reflect an apocalyptic echo of the reference to prophets as heavenly messengers.”
1:8–9 would then be taken as genuine plurals\(^{125}\) referring to Paul and his companions, possibly even other apostles, and the reference to himself (.Pass) would show the Galatians that Paul holds himself to this same standard; he is not excluded from the possibility of this divine anathema. The Galatians would also be reminded that while they may have viewed Paul as ἄγγελος, through Paul’s proclamation of the gospel (4:13),\(^{126}\) they came to a revelation of Christ himself (ὡς Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν).

Paul’s two rhetorical questions in verse 10 are essentially synonymous\(^{127}\) and serve a significant paradigmatic purpose. The sternness of Paul’s words and the insinuation the Galatians are in danger of entering into the anathema may have seemed overly harsh to Paul’s audience. However, Paul seeks to model a truth; those who have entered the eschatological age no longer live by the worldly standards of the present evil age. Instead, they have begun the process of being reshaped by Christ and have been called to become servants of this Christ rather than servants of human beings (cf. 1 Cor 7:23; 2 Cor 4:5).\(^{128}\) The concluding sentence of the pericope solidifies the incompatibility of these two realities—εἰ ἑτὶ ἀνθρώπως ἡμετέρως, Χριστὸς δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἡμὴν (1:10c).

Paul’s reference to being a “servant of Christ” is not primarily a reference to his apostleship\(^{129}\) or his prophetic position;\(^{130}\) it carries a more general invitation for all believers,\(^{131}\) here the Galatians specifically, to embrace fully the Lordship of Christ as

---


\(^{128}\) Longenecker, *Galatians*, 19, is correct to emphasise that Paul is not specifically speaking against pleasing others (cf. 1 Cor 10:33; Gal 5:13) “but against gaining the favor of others for one’s own advantage and as the motivation and goal of Christian ministry.”


\(^{130}\) Pace, Beker, Paul, 115-18; Moo, *Galatians*, 84; Ciampa, *Presence*, 94-95 and n. 87.

part of their new eschatological identity (cf. Rom 12:11; 14:18; 1 Cor 7:22; Phil 1:1; 1 Thess 1:9). The use of δοῦλος, when read in correlation with 1:15–16, is an allusion to the Isaianic Servant (esp. Isa 49:1–6). However, if the reference to Christ’s atoning action in 1:3–4 is seen as an allusion to Isa 53 and the role of the Isaianic Servant, it may be better to understand Paul’s use of Χριστοῦ δοῦλος as a reference to Paul’s role as one of the servants of the Servant. This hypothesis will be further evaluated in the following section.

3.2.3 Galatians 1:11–24

This autobiographical section, which contains Paul’s Christophanic reference, comes only after he has placed himself under God’s divine authority, thus locating himself on the correct side of the eschatological divide. This recognition helps avoid reading the pericope as primarily an apostolic apologia. If a defence, it is a defence of the gospel.

Paul begins the body of this letter by referring to the Galatians as ἀδελφοί (1:11; cf. 3:15; 4:12, 28, 31; 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18), which appears to be a shift in tone. It draws the audience back to the prescript and reminds them that, despite a stumble in judgment, they are still the ἐκκλησία, those set free from the present evil age. This section focuses on the divine source of the gospel and equally upon the revelatory aspect of God (cf. 1:1). Dunn may be correct to note the phrase “to make known” is often used in apocalyptic thought concerning “the revelation of heavenly mysteries.” More noteworthy is Paul’s phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ (Gal 1:11b).

Paul makes significant use of both the noun εὐαγγέλιον and the verb εὐαγγελίζω in his letters; Galatians is no exception (εὐαγγέλιον: 1:6, 7, 11; 2:2, 5, 7,

132 So de Boer, Galatians, 72; Gaventa, “Conversion,” 199.
133 Dunn, Galatians, 52. Dunn relies mostly on Theodotian’s Greek translation of Daniel citing 2:23, 28–30, 45; 5:7–8, 15–17; 7:16, but also cites 1QpHab 7:4-5; 1QH 4:27-28; 7:27.
134 Forty-eight times in undisputed letters.
135 Nineteen times in undisputed letters.
Although the Galatians may originally have understood this language through the interpretive lens of the Emperor Cult,²⁻¹ Paige draws on the language of the prophets (LXX Joel 3:5; Nah 2:1), specifically Isaiah (LXX 40:9[bis]; 52:7[bis]; 60:6; 61:1; cf. MT 41:27),¹ a suggestion strengthened by Paul’s quotation of Isa 52:7 in Rom 10:15. There are three notable features of the Isaianic εὐαγγελία. First, it is always used in verb form. Second, in all but one instance (Isa 60:6), the verb is directly or indirectly connected to the action of the Servant/servants (cf. 11QMelch II.16–24). Finally, the verb is always used in reference to a revelation of Yahweh’s eschatological deliverance (cf. Pss. Sol. 11:1).¹³ This last point speaks to why the Septuagintal interpreters of Isaiah understood this message to be “good news” and utilised the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι.¹³⁻⁹

Similarly, Paul’s use of the verb form carries a revelatory connotation. This is evident when Paul utilises the noun and verb forms together, as in 1:11—τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγέλισθέν (cf. 1 Cor 15:1; 2 Cor 11:7). Paul understands the proclamation of the gospel to be a dynamic and revelatory event in which salvation is made known and made possible (cf. Rom 1:16–17).¹⁴⁰ While the prepositional phase ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ, in correlation with the passive participle εὐαγγέλισθέν, denotes Paul as the direct agent, it may be possible to see a divine agent sitting behind Paul’s actions (cf. Rom 3:21; 2 Cor 1:4; 3:3; 8:19); this appears to be the emphasis of 1:11–12.

---

¹³⁸ Cf. Jan L. Koole, Isaiah III, HCOT (Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1997), 72, who argues the Hebrew בָשַר of Isaiah points to the fall of Babylon and with it “the dawning revelation of Yahweh’s kingship.”
¹⁴⁰ Bockmuehl, Revelation, 138.
Together, these verses form an important chiastic structure,\textsuperscript{141} which elucidate Paul’s understanding of God’s revelation of Christ.

\[\text{11} \Gamma νωρίζω \gamma \upsilon \mu\omicron \nu, \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\rho\omicron,\]
\[\text{τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελίσθην ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ}\]
\[\text{ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἀνθρώπου}\]
\[\text{12} \text{oùdê γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὕτε ἑδιδάχθην,}\]
\[\text{ἀλλὰ δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.}\]

Paul makes known to the Galatians the ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ which takes place through τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελίσθην. It is clear Paul parallels εὐαγγέλιον and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1:7; cf. Rom 1:9; 15:19; 16:25; 1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 2:12; 4:4; 9:13; 10:14; Phil 1:27; 1 Thess 3:2); Christ is the auto-euangelion.\textsuperscript{142} What is less clear is the strong possibility Paul is equating εὐαγγελίζω and ἀποκάλυψις.\textsuperscript{143} If so, then Paul makes a significant parallel between his own Christophanic experience and the Galatians’ experience mediated through Paul’s preaching of the gospel; in both cases, Christ is being revealed by God.\textsuperscript{144} This is why Paul can so adamantly deny the human origins behind his gospel.

The language of ἀποκάλυψις\textsuperscript{145} and ἀποκαλύπτω\textsuperscript{146} is significant in Paul. However, great debate arises over how best to interpret these words in their historic and

\textsuperscript{141} Gaventa, “Conversion,” 203, notes a chiastic structure but hers if focused on source versus method. She therefore argues for a subjective genitive reading of ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: seeing a contrast between the sources of ‘humanity’ and ‘Christ.’


\textsuperscript{144} I interpret ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as an objective genitive, especially in light of Gal 1:16. So also Bruce, Galatians, 89; Schreiner, Galatians, 97; Martyn, Galatians, 144; Hays, “Galatians,” 211. Contra Longenecker, Galatians, 23-24; Fee, Christology, 229; cf. Moo, Galatians, 95; Moisé Silva, Interpreting Galatians: Explorations in Exegetical Method (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 45.

\textsuperscript{145} Rom 2:5; 8:19; 16:25; 1 Cor 1:7; 14:6, 26; 2 Cor 12:1, 7; Gal 1:12; 2:2; cf. Eph 1:17; 3:3; 2 Thess 1:7. Found five times in the rest of the NT (Luke 2:32; 1 Pet 1:7, 13; 4:12; Rev 1:1).

\textsuperscript{146} Rom 1:17, 18; 8:18; 1 Cor 2:10; 3:13; 14:30; Gal 1:16; 3:23; Phil 3:15; cf. Eph 3:5; 2 Thess 2:3, 6, 8. Found thirteen times in the rest of the NT (Matt 10:26; 11:25, 27; 16:17; Luke 2:35; 10:21, 22; 12:2; 17:30; John 12:38; 1 Pet 1:5, 12; 5:1).
literary contexts. This is compounded by the now commonplace use of “apocalyptic” as an adjective describing a particular literary genre as well as a particular Jewish theological framework.\textsuperscript{147} This subset of apocalyptic literature and the worldview which either births it or is birthed from it does not actually employ this language to describe itself prior to the book of Revelation (1:1).\textsuperscript{148} Additionally, while the \textit{ἀποκάλυψις} lexeme shows up ninety times in the LXX OT, with an additional fourteen times in the apocrypha, the majority of these uses are connected to human “uncovering.” In the relatively few cases where God is the subject of this uncovering, it is rarely an apocalyptic-type revelation\textsuperscript{149} (although see Num 22:31; 1 Sam 3:21; 9:15).\textsuperscript{150} There are, however, a handful of places which speak of God’s revealing of himself and/or his salvation to the masses and three out of the four instances take place in Isaiah (52:10; 53:1; 56:1; cf. Ps 97:2).

Since an intertextual reliance upon Isaiah has already been established, it is wise to explore further connections in Paul’s \textit{ἀποκάλυψις} language. Isaiah 52:7, 10 directly connects the 	extit{proclamation} (ἐὐαγγέλισθαι) of God’s eschatological salvation with the 	extit{revelation} (ἀποκάλυψις) of this salvation,\textsuperscript{151} strengthening the plausibility for the same connection in Gal 1:11–12 and providing the locus for Paul’s understanding.


\textsuperscript{149} Num 24:4; 16; 1 Sam 2:27; 3:7; 9:15; 2 Sam 7:27; 22:16; Ps 28:9; Isa 3:17; Jer 13:26; Ezek 16:37; Hos 2:12; 7:1; Amos 3:7; Micah 1:6; Nah 3:5; Sir 42:19.

\textsuperscript{150} Cf. Smith, “\textit{ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΩ},” 9-10; Bockmuehl, \textit{Revelation}, 32-33, 101-02.

\textsuperscript{151} Cf. Childs, \textit{Isaiah}, 406, “The reign of God has not just been announced, but the prophetic drama testifies to its actual reception by Zion for all the earth to see.”
Isa 52:7  
like season upon the mountains, like the feet of one bringing glad tidings (εὐαγγελίζομένου) of a report of peace, like one bringing glad tidings (εὐαγγελίζωμεν) of good things, because I will make your salvation (σωτηρίαν) heard, saying to Sion, “Your God shall reign”

Isa 52:10  
And the Lord shall reveal (ἀποκαλύψει) his holy arm (βραχίον) before all the nations (πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν), and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation (σωτηρίαν) that comes from God. (NETS)

Additionally, within Isaiah, there is a significant connection between Isa 52:7–10 and 40:1–11. In the latter, the author speaks of the divine comfort (40:1; cf. 52:9) Israel will soon experience resulting in the glory of the Lord being revealed (ὁράω) and all flesh seeing God’s salvation (διηνεμέω στὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ; 40:5). Israel is the one who is to proclaim the good news (εὐαγγελίζομένος; 40:9[bis]) of God’s coming strength, his arm (βραχίον; 40:10). It is this “arm of the Lord” Isa 53:1 directly connects with the singular Servant who has been revealed to those who have believed what they have heard (κύριε, τίς εἰπεν τῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίον κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη). The final Isaianic use of ἀποκάλυψιν in Isa 56:1 is also significant; it relates the coming revelation of God’s salvation and mercy (γὰρ τὸ σωτήριόν μου παραγίνεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἔλεός μου ἀποκάλυπτην) to the eunuchs and to the foreigners who join themselves to the Lord and become his servants (Isa 56:6).

Several links can be made between Paul’s train of thought in Gal 1 and Isaiah. Here, Paul finds a place of clarity for interpreting his own Christophanic experience. Christ is the long awaited Servant who has ushered in God’s eschatological salvation and reign through his atoning death (1:4) and who has made possible the inclusion of the Gentiles (1:16). Paul now finds himself one of the servants of the Servant (1:10) and, therefore, one of the heralds of this eschatological salvation (1:1, 11), which is simultaneously the revelation of Christ to those who believe what they hear (1:6; cf. 1

152 The Hebrew word גָלָה, here translated as ὡράω is translated elsewhere in the LXX as ἀποκαλύπτειν (most notably Isa 53:1; 56:1).
Cor 1:18–25). Now, in the whole of this letter, Paul seeks to convince the Galatians they too have become servants of the Servant and to warn them against straying from this new eschatological identity.

In many ways, 1:11–12 actually stands as the conclusion of 1:6–10 while simultaneously providing a springboard for 1:13–24.\(^{153}\) Paul concludes 1:6–10 by inviting the Galatians to remember and to embrace their own eschatological calling, which was highlighted in 1:6. Paul’s intentional use of παραλαμβάνω in 1:12b is meant to point back to παραλαμβάνω in 1:9. In the latter, Paul speaks of the Galatians having “received” the authentic gospel through Paul’s proclamation. In the former, Paul speaks of himself having received Christ through a revelation from God. Paul now makes clear that these two experiences are identical, not in their particulars but in their content, source, and dynamism; both are revelations of Christ from God. Some scholars argue Paul avoids using παραλαμβάνω to speak of his Christophanic experience believing he makes a distinction between the received tradition of the Galatians and his own divine revelatory experience (cf. 1 Cor 15:1–3).\(^{154}\) The Greek does not warrant such a distinction and the ellipsis of 1:12b naturally points back to the verb παραλαμβάνω (and possibly also ἐδιδάξαν) in 1:12a.\(^{155}\) The irony of 1:8–9 now comes to the forefront.\(^{156}\) It is impossible that a contrary gospel could be “gospeled” (εὐαγγελίζω) to the Galatians\(^ {157}\) because God is the source behind all revelations of Christ whether they be received by Paul or by the Galatians and whether they be proclaimed by Paul or others (2:7–9; cf. Phil 1:15–18; 1 Cor 15:11).

\(^{155}\) David A. deSilva, Galatians: A Handbook on the Greek Text, BHGNT (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), 14; so also, Williams, Galatians, 43; Peter Oakes, Galatians, PCNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 51; Betz, Galatians, 62; de Boer, Galatians, 82.
\(^{156}\) Cf. Nanos, Galatians, 296-98.
An analysis of 3:1–5 will help solidify the connection Paul makes between his own Christophanic experience and the Galatians’ experience. While 3:1–5 serves to introduce a new but interconnected part of Paul’s argument, it also intentionally points back to and parallels 1:6–12. First, in 3:1–5, Paul returns to the Galatians current predicament; they have been “bewitched” and are in danger of acquiescing to a human rather than divine gospel (1:6–9). The language shifts to Spirit and flesh but the dichotomy is the same. Second, Paul’s reference to the Galatians’ initial experience of Christ significantly parallels Paul’s Christophany.

Gal 3:1c κατ’ ὄφθαλμον Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος

Gal 1:12b δι’ ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

Linguistically there is a link between ὁράω and ἀποκάλυψις, which is clear from Paul’s other Christophanic references (1 Cor 9:1; 15:8). The parallel becomes more obvious when read with Isa 40:5 and 52:10, which both emphasise “seeing” God’s salvation.

Isa 40:5 καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σάρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ

Isa 52:10 καὶ ὄψθηται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.

This salvation is specifically tied to the work of the Servant in Isa 52:13–53:12; a connection Paul has already alluded to in 1:4 and 2:20. The latter is significant as it posits a personal element to Christ’s crucifixion. Although little is known of what transpired during Paul’s Christophanic experience, it may be safe to assume it was here that Paul came to understand Christ as “the Son of God who loved [Paul] and gave himself for [Paul]” (2:20). In sharing this personal revelation, Paul hopes to move the Galatians toward embracing co-cruciformity with Christ (Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι; 2:19; 158, 159)


159 Martyn, Galatians, 281, “Paul employs for a second time the epistolary rebuke (cf. 1:6).”
cf. 5:24; 6:14). In light of Paul’s ensuing argument (3:10–14), it makes sense that Paul would closely tie Christ’s crucifixion to the Galatians’ salvation.

The justification for returning to Isaiah for interpreting 3:1–5 is found in Paul’s echoing of Isa 53:1 in 3:2, 5. The possibility for such a connection was mentioned in section 3.1.2 and now appears surer. Harmon notes that Isa 53:1 is the only place in the whole LXX where the combination of ἀκοή and πίστις/πιστευω appears.\(^{160}\) In its context, the “hearing” relates to proclamation of the gospel (Isa 52:7), which has already been shown to equate with God’s revelation of his salvation (Isa 52:10; 53:1; 56:1). This is also the case in 3:2, 5. The focus appears firmly on divine action over human action.

“Paul’s emphasis lies . . . upon the proclaimed message (ἀκοή), which calls forth faith, as the means by which the Spirit is given.”\(^{161}\)

The final parallel between Gal 1:6–12 and 3:1–5 is found in Paul’s use of λαμβάνω in reference to the Galatians reception of the Spirit (3:2, 14; cf. 1:9, 12), which introduces another divine—human dichotomy. Like his own Christophanic reference, the dichotomy is focused on the source of the reception rather than the object of reception.

Thus, the contrast is not between πνεῦμα and ἔργον νόμου, but between the human source of ἔργον νόμου and the divine source of ἀκοής πίστεως. The latter has already been seen to equate with gospel proclamation and in Isa 53:1 is directly paralleled with God’s revelation. Therefore, it appears surer in 3:1–5 that Paul is aligning the Galatians’ conversion experience with his own Christophanic experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Human source</th>
<th>Divine source</th>
<th>Object of reception (παραλαμβάνω/λαμβάνω)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gal 1:12</td>
<td>παρά ἄνθρώπου</td>
<td>δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως (ἐφαγγελίζω)</td>
<td>Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (ἐφαγγέλλω)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 3:2</td>
<td>ἐξ ἔργον νόμου</td>
<td>ἐξ ἀκοής πίστεως</td>
<td>τὸ πνεῦμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{160}\) Harmon, Galatians, 130.

This chart raises a question concerning the relationship between Christ and the Spirit. Paul does not deny the Galatians’ reception of Christ in his language of their receiving the Spirit; it is Christ who was displayed before their eyes (3:1) and it is the gospel of Christ which was received by both Paul and the Galatians (1:9, 12). Nor does Paul deny his own reception of the Spirit (cf. 3:14; 4:6; 5:5). As Dunn writes, “in Paul’s experience Christ and the Spirit [are] one, and . . . Christ [is] experienced through the Spirit.”\(^{162}\) Thus, Paul can refer to the Spirit as τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ (4:6; cf. Rom 8:9; 2 Cor 3:17, 18; Phil 1:19). However, when it comes to the particulars of Paul’s Christophanic experience as they relate to believers’ conversion experience, there are differences. Foremost is the reality that Paul considers his Christophany to be in a rare category of believers (cf. 1 Cor 15:6–8) who experienced a more direct revelation of Christ. Nevertheless, Paul does not overemphasise these differences. Instead, Paul creates a new but related category to articulate the revelation of Christ from God through the Spirit which all believers experience—a Pneuma-Christophany.

Galatians 1:13 marks a slight shift in purpose from the preceding two verses, which were meant to more closely align the experiences of Paul and the Galatians. Gaventa highlights the disruption of 1:13–14 in the midst of what otherwise would be a continuation of Paul’s Christophanic reference between 1:11–12 and 1:15–17.\(^{163}\) Gaventa believes Paul calls upon his own experience as a paradigm to show how the Christophany radically changed his direction away from something otherwise seen by Paul as a “good and obedient life.”\(^{164}\) “What the Galatians can imitate is Paul’s single-minded response to the gospel that was revealed to him. . . . To become as Paul is[,]”

---

163 Gaventa, “Conversion,” 238-40, 244-45.
164 Gaventa, “Conversion,” 139.
means to allow Christ to live in oneself (cf. 2:20) to the exclusion of the Law or of any other tradition or category (cf. 3:27–28).”

Gaventa’s observations are important and help move the conversation away from an apostolic apologia reading of Paul’s Christophanic reference. Two things are worth highlighting and extending. First, Paul does not present Judaism in a negative light; his own past actions are stated pragmatically, even with a hint of pride (cf. Phil 3:4–6). Paul’s previous mode of existence is not introduced in order to denounce as much as to provide a foundation for Paul’s reversal in light of the new eschatological reality which has dawned in Christ. Gaventa overextends when she makes “exclusion of the Law” a focal point in this reversal. Galatians 1:13–14 present a particular picture of law observance from which Paul shifts; namely, an over reliance upon works of the law (cf. 2:15–17). The law itself is not bad (cf. 3:19–29; Rom 7:7–12). Paul’s reference to “zeal” (cf. Num 25:10–13; 1 Macc 2:26) in relation to τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων (1:14) should not be read as a direct antithesis to the gospel. Instead, Paul expresses how his past life was steeped in human achievement (cf. Rom 10:2–3). Paul walks a thin line between seeking to articulate his own Christophanic experience in terms of a divine—human dichotomy while not completely dismissing his Jewish heritage (cf. Rom 9:4–5) or Jewish law observance. Remember, Paul is speaking to a Gentile audience and one of his primary foci is to evidence the dawning of the new eschatological reality and the inclusion of the Gentiles into the eschatological people of God apart from works of the law.

165 Gaventa, “Galatians,” 322.
166 Gaventa, “Galatians,” passim, believes apostolic apologia is not the primary purpose behind Paul’s Christophanic reference but allows for it as a secondary purpose. Cf. Hays, “Galatians,” 213, who also includes both but reverses the order.
The second important aspect of Gaventa’s reading is her focus on Paul’s desire for the Galatians to imitate his “response to the gospel.” By this, Gaventa means the singular focus on Christ apart from any other worldly distraction;\(^\text{169}\) it is “Christ-faith alone.”\(^\text{170}\) However, Gaventa appears to bring the discussion of 2:15–5:1 into what Paul is doing in 1:13–24. While agreeing that Paul seeks imitation of his response to the gospel, the focus is not on the content of the gospel but upon the source behind it and the action such a source elicits. Thus, Paul continues the divine—human dichotomy began in 1:1, 11–12. This is seen in at least three ways.

First, Paul’s narration of his “reversal” in 1:13–16a resolves in the rather odd declaration of 1:16b–17—“I did not confer with any human being . . . but I.” Whereas the “old” Paul would have sought human approval before beginning such a mission (cf. Acts 9:1–2; 22:5; 26:10, 12), the divine Christophany needed no further consultation but moved Paul to immediate action. While the purpose of Paul’s trip to Arabia cannot be fully known, Paul links it to the mission he has just received, proclamation of the gospel among the Gentiles.\(^\text{171}\)

Second, the disruptive interjection of 1:20—“In what I am writing to you, before God, I do not lie!”—appears to function as an alibi for Paul’s divine commission and moreover for his divine gospel message.\(^\text{172}\) It is assumed such an alibi is only necessary if Paul is seeking to defend his apostleship.\(^\text{173}\) This need not be the case. If indeed Paul is continuing a divine—human dichotomy, then it is possible in his historical retelling of the events surrounding his call Paul deems it necessary to reaffirm what was said in 1:16b. Moreover, the focus may not be on the oath itself but rather on the phrase ἵδον

\(^{169}\) See Gaventa, “Singularity,” passim.


ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, note its emphatic location in the Greek. This phrase would then function to emphasise God’s presence (cf. LXX Exod 3:6; 2 Sam 6:7; Ps 60:8) within Paul’s autobiographical narrative and even to stress the revelation of this God in Paul’s actions (cf. 2:2). Paul may also be juxtaposing the “face” of God, which had been made known to Paul through the Christophanic event, with his own unknown face— ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ (1:21). At the least, the last point functions to place the focus on God rather than Paul.

Third, this section ends in the same way it begins, with the contrast between a “former” way of living—persecuting the church (1:23; cf. 1:13)—and a “now” way of living—proclaiming the faith (1:23; cf. 1:16)—with the stress falling on the resultant glorification of God (1:24). The dual time markers ποτε and νῦν stress the “time/locus” shift which has taken place in Paul’s own life. Additionally, Paul’s dual reference to having “persecuted” (διώκω; 1:13, 23) the church begins an often neglected feature in the epistle (cf. 4:29; 5:11; 6:12). It illustrates the difference in attitude and action between those residing in the “present age” and those residing in the “coming age.”

Gal 1:13, 23 Paul persecuted (ἐδίωκον/διώκων) the church prior to his Christophanic experience.

Gal 4:29 The child born of the flesh persecuted (ἐδίωκε) the child born of the Spirit.

Gal 5:11 Paul is now being persecuted (διώκομαι) for not preaching circumcision by those who preach circumcision.

Gal 6:12 Paul’s opponents preach circumcision in order to avoid being persecuted (διώκονται) for the cross of Christ.

The dichotomy is clear. The persecutor is one who is ignorant of the eschatological reality (1:13, 23; 4:29) while the persecuted are those residing in this new reality (4:29; 5:11; 6:12).

---

174 There is the possibility of an echo to Moses’ call in Exod 3:6 (LXX): ἀπέστρεψεν δὲ Μωυσῆς τῷ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, εὐλάβετο γὰρ κατεμβλέψαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.

175 See Lyons, Autobiography, 147, see also 146-152; idem, Galatians, 67-68.

5:11). The irony of the agitators is that in seeking to be included in the eschatological promises of God they have inadvertently denied its reality; they have become persecutors in order to avoid being persecuted (6:12). They failed to see the eschatological reality and freedom afforded by the cross of Christ (cf. 3:13–14).177

Through Paul’s Christocentric narrative, he places his previous life in pharisaical Judaism on the wrong side of the divine—human divide and actually aligns his old self with the agitators.178 However, Paul’s point is not that his previous way of life was wrong in and of itself. Rather, it is the presence of a new eschatological reality made possible through Christ which has changed everything. Paul will make this important distinction clear when he speaks of how the law was given as a guardian until the “fullness of time had come” in God’s sending of his Son (3:23–4:7). Paul’s calling and his mission to the Gentiles is irrefutable proof that this time has indeed come. Additionally, the Galatians’ conversion and calling, which Paul intentionally parallels to his Christocentric experience in 1:6–12 (cf. 3:1–5), is also irrefutable proof of this new eschatological reality.

The divine—human dichotomy is employed by Paul to stress humanity’s inability to grasp God’s salvific act in Christ without the relocation of the individual/group into the sphere of a new reality. Since Paul has already included the Galatians in this new reality as part of the eschatological people of God (1:2–6), they should have already recognised the incompatibility of the agitators’ message with the gospel which has been divinely revealed to them through the proclamation of the gospel. Paul’s astonishment at the current predicament is meant to shame the Galatians for not recognising what should have been clear to them (1:6; cf. 3:1, 3; 5:7–8) and to move them toward right action in

---

177 Baasland, “Persecution,” 140-41, shows the link between “persecution” and “curse” in Galatians and its connection to OT curse motifs, esp. Deuteronomy.

the future. Rather than trying to defend his apostleship, Paul attempts to demonstrate how his calling originates and continues to be guided by a divine source in order to provide the Galatians with a paradigm to imitate. Galatians 1:6–24 can be charted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>divine revelation</th>
<th>leads to</th>
<th>eschatological people of God</th>
<th>leads to</th>
<th>continued human guidance equals</th>
<th>possible anathema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continued divine guidance</td>
<td>glory to God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One question remains; why does Paul allude to Isa 49:1–6 as part of his Christophanic reference? As noted, most scholars understand this as part of Paul’s apostolic apologia emphasising his prophetic-like calling in general or his Isaianic Servant role specifically and functioning to prove his authority. How does this reading change if apostolic apologia is not the purpose behind Paul’s Christophanic reference? As evidenced in section 3.2.1, Paul has constructed a picture of Christ as the messianic saviour who atones for sin by his sacrificial death and resurrection (1:1–5); Christ is the singular Isaianic Servant. Furthermore, as mentioned in section 3.2.2, Paul is one of the servants of the Servant Christ (1:10). These factors should guide ones’ interpretation of Paul’s allusion to Isa 49:1–6 in 1:15–16.

Some clarity may be found in the prepositional phrase ἐν ἐμοί (1:16). As noted in Chapter 2, this phrase has sparked much debate, which are mostly attempts at historical reconstruction of Paul’s Christophanic experience. However, there may be a more theological reason Paul employs this phrase. Newman argues ἀποκαλύψαι...ἐν ἐμοί is an echo of ἐν σοὶ δοξασθήσομαι (Isa 49:3).179 Newman links ἀποκαλύπτω and δοξάζω by showing how the latter often “denotes the manifestation of God’s visible presence” in

the prophetic writings (cf. LXX Isa 24:21–23; Ezek 28:22; 39:13; Hag 1:8). For Newman, ἐν ἐμοί is proof that Paul’s Christophany was an ecstatic throne room experience where he came to know Christ as the divine glory (glory-Christology) and the link to Isa 49:3 shows Paul interprets his “apostolic ministry as a conduit for divine Glory.”

Newman’s proposed echo is intriguing and is strengthened when read in correlation with Paul’s rather odd statement in Gal 1:24—καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν θεόν. This ἐν ἐμοί is usually translated causally, which is logical unless one views 1:24 as also echoing Isa 49:3. Taken together and read through the lens of Isa 49, Gal 1:16 and 1:24 could be read as further proof that Paul understood himself as the Isaianic Servant and God’s glorification in Paul was proof of his divine calling. However, this reading forgets the references to Christ as the Servant already mentioned above. Paul reminds us of this fact in 1:16; it is τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ who was revealed “in Paul.” The parallel between 1:16 and 1:12 is assurance the “son” is a reference to Christ.

Harmon acknowledges the difficult tension between Christ as Servant and Paul as Servant and believes 2:20 provides the key for unlocking this conundrum. This verse brings together Christ’s sacrificial death, his sonship, and his location in Paul. For Harmon, Paul understood Christ’s dwelling in him through the Christophanic experience as a participation in Christ’s crucifixion (2:19) leading to his own worldly death. Harmon writes:

Because of this truth, Paul can refer to his own apostolic mission as the fulfilment of the Servant’s commission in Isa 49 to be a light to the nations, since it is ultimately Christ who fulfils the mission through him. As a result, God’s intention of revealing his Son “in” Paul (Gal 1:16) reaches its intended goal of

---

180 Newman, Glory-Christology, 206.
181 Newman, Glory-Christology, 207.
182 So NASB, NRSV, NIV, ESV.
183 So Harmon, Galatians, 88-89.
184 Harmon, Galatians, 100-02, claims Gal 2:20 also echoes Isa 49:3 but it may be better to understand it as an echo of Gal 1:16, 24.
God being glorified “in” Paul (Gal 1:24), because Christ lives “in” Paul (Gal 2:20) to fulfil the Servant’s commission to be a light to the nations.  

Harmon’s reading is astute, taking seriously the role of Christ as well as the unique aspects of Paul’s apostolic commission. Harmon also notes the possibility that Paul understood this mission extending to at least other apostles and possibly to all believers. However, Harmon finds little proof of this idea in Galatians.  

Nevertheless, the work already carried out in this section makes the likelihood of the Servant’s mission being extended to all believers more plausible. It has been shown Paul closely links his own Christophany in 1:11–12 to the Galatians’ experience of Christ through the Holy Spirit in 3:1–5. It also has been shown that Paul provides his own divine—human reversal as a paradigm for the Galatians to imitate, making it possible for them to have the same outcome as Paul (1:13–24). To this can be added three additional supports. First, in Gal 1:15 Paul once again parallels his own Christophany with the Galatians (1:6); both have been called (cf. 5:8, 13) by God as an act of grace (cf. 2:9; 5:4).  

Gal 1:15 καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ  
Gal 1:6 τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι  

Second, Paul’s ἐν ἐμοί language in 1:16 (cf. 1:24; 2:20) finds a probable parallel in 4:19 where Paul expresses his deep desire for Christ to be formed ἐν ύμίν, referring to the Galatians. Additionally, in 4:19 Paul uses motherhood language calling the Galatians τέκνα μου and referring to his labour pains (ὡδίνω), which may be an echo of 1:15; Paul now provides the motherly womb but it is Christ who is being formed in the Galatians.  

Finally, Paul calls the Galatians to imitation in 4:12—Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὡς ἐγώ ὡς υμεῖς (cf. 1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; Phil 3:17; 4:9; 1 Thess 1:6). The context of this  

---

185 Harmon, Galatians, 119.  
186 Harmon, Galatians, 119-20 n. 257.  
187 Cf. Barclay, Paul & Gift, 332.  
imperative raises the question of what exactly Paul desires the Galatians to imitate and the causal phrase “for I also have become as you are” raises the question of how Paul has become like the Galatians. Galatians 3:6–4:11 articulates a new eschatological reality where Christ’s atoning death has brought the blessings of Abraham to the Gentiles and with it the Holy Spirit (3:14). It is a reality where the Gentiles are not obligated to carry out the law in order to be included in the family of God but through the faithfulness of Christ they are adopted as children and heirs (4:6–7). This theologically rich section unpacks Paul’s autobiographical statements in 2:18–21, which functions paradigmatically. In 4:12, Paul reminds the Galatians he has already become like them. In dying to the law (2:19), Paul has effectively become a Gentile sinner (2:16). As Dunn writes: “Paul, though himself a Jew, had become as one who was (like the Galatians) ‘without the law’, ‘outside the law’, in order to bring the gospel to them as ‘lawless’ Gentiles.”¹⁸⁹ This does not negate the law or even Paul’s observance of the law in certain circumstances (cf. 1 Cor 9:20–23); it is simply part of Paul’s missionary strategy. What Paul indeed comes to reject is “his zeal for the Law and the traditions.”¹⁹⁰ In this, Paul speaks of having been co-crucified with Christ, dying to self, and allowing God to reveal/glorify himself in Paul (2:20). This is what Paul invites the Galatians to imitate. Although they begin from different places, they all must die to self and allow Christ to live in them. This takes place as God’s revelation of Christ through the Spirit, which in their case took place through Paul’s proclamation of the gospel, transforms all believers into servants of the Servant who share in the general mission of being a light to the nations by allowing God’s glory to be evidenced in them and through them.

Throughout this pericope (1:11–24), Paul has consistently invited the Galatians to share in aspects of his Christophanic experience. There are certain particulars unique to

Paul in which the Galatians cannot share—his Jewish nationality, his past Pharisaical and zealous actions, and his exact encounter of Christ. However, Paul introduces his Christophany in such a way as to downplay these particulars making it possible for the Galatians to see in Paul’s experience something of their own. At points, Paul’s Christophanic reference invites the Galatians to imitation and in so doing draws them into deeper understanding of their eschatological identity through Christ and of the actions this new identity requires. At other times, his Christophanic reference is more than paradigmatic; he invites them to participate in a shared eschatological reality. Paul’s autobiographical narrative reveals the certainty of God’s dynamic revelation, transformation, and calling in all believers.

3.2.4 Galatians 2:1–10

Although the main task of the chapter has been accomplished through the preceding exegesis of 1:11–24, the continued evaluation of Paul’s entire autobiographical narrative will help to reinforce the above findings. In 2:1–10 Paul continues his autobiographical narrative in order to solidify the reality of Gentile inclusion in the eschatological age. This is accomplished through a continued “revelation motif” and through an intricate redescribing of Isa 49:6. The question of whether 2:1–10 refers to the Jerusalem Counsel of Acts 15\(^{191}\) or the relief efforts of Acts 11–12\(^{192}\) is unimportant for Paul’s theological point.

Paul’s use of δοκέω in reference to the Jerusalem leaders (2:2, 6a, 6c, 9) is the source of much angst. The dominate interpretation sees Paul walking a tightrope between

---


independence from and endorsement by the Jerusalem church. However, this may be understood as a continuation of the divine—human dichotomy. The focal point of this argument comes in 2:6b with the phrase πρόσωπον θεος ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει, and idiomatic expression referencing the impartiality of God. All human acknowledgements of position or stature mean nothing, only God’s approval counts. This is why Paul has no need to consult flesh and blood after his revelation (1:16) and why the Jerusalem leaders added nothing to the gospel Paul proclaims (2:6c).

This divine—human dichotomy is strengthened by the continuation of the “revelation motif” introduced in 2:2a. Martinus De Boer notes the ambiguity of the phrase κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, where the preposition with the accusative can assume several meanings: “in accordance with,” “as a result of,” or “for the purpose of.” The last of these options has had little recognition but may bring clarity to the passage. De Boer, taking ἀνέβην as a complexive aorist, paraphrases 2:2a: “My whole journey to Jerusalem, including what happened during my stay there, was a matter of God’s revelatory activity and intention.” Thus de Boer writes: “In Paul’s account, then, his second visit to the church in Jerusalem functioned as an apocalyptic revelation for the pillar apostles, as the means whereby God invaded their world to disclose to them—concretely in the persons of Paul, Barnabas, and Titus—the truth of the gospel.” This interpretation provides a clear dichotomy between God’s “revelatory activity” and the “acknowledged leaders” and may explain Paul’s use of δοκέω to solidify the contrast.

---

193 Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 118-22; idem, Galatians, 85-115; Betz, Galatians, 92; de Boer, Galatians, 115-19.
194 See De Boer, Galatians, 118; and James D. G. Dunn, Romans 1-8, WBC 38a (Waco, TX; Word, 1988), 88-89.
195 Dunn’s evaluation of προσωπεύθηκαν in 1:16 as having a technical meaning of “consulting with someone who is recognized as a qualified interpreter about the significance of some sign – a dream, or omen, or portent . . .” (Jesus, Paul, 110), lends weight to this interpretation.
197 See Wallace, Greek, 557.
198 De Boer, Galatians, 109.
Rather than seeking the approval of the Jerusalem church, this narrative speaks of Paul bringing a further revelation from God to them.

This “revelation” is actually a continuation and furtherance of Paul’s Christocentric narrative accomplished by the continuance of Paul’s initial allusion to Isa 49 in 1:15. Several connections appear. First, echoing Isa 49:4, Paul references the possibility of having run in vain (κενὸν; 2:2). Although Paul may genuinely fear that his Gentile mission would not be recognized by the Jerusalem church, it may also be a way of keeping Isaiah front and centre. Second, Paul’s reference to the “grace given to me” (2:9) points back to Gal 1:15 and thus to Isa 49:1. These two echoes make the final echo more feasible. Three times in quick succession, Paul mentions the dual missions of Peter and Paul (2:7, 8, 9); Peter to the circumcised and Paul to the Gentiles/uncircumcised (ἔθνος; cf. 1:16). Is it possible this is a reference to the dual mission of the Servant who was called to restore Israel and be a light to the nations (ἔθνος; Isa 49:6)?

Paul could be redescribing the Servant’s mission into two somewhat distinct missions.

This reading has several ramifications. First, it buttresses the above argument that Paul sees himself as one of the servants of the singular Servant Christ. If Paul is only fulfilling half of the Servant’s mission then he cannot possibly be the singular Servant. Second, it solidifies the extension of the Servant’s mission to at least other apostles; they too are servants. Third, it demonstrates the unity between the two parties (cf. 2:10) and intensifies the disharmony between them and the “false believers” (cf. 2:4). Finally, the acceptance of a mission to the Gentiles and moreover the recognition of God’s current

---

200 So Fung, Galatians, 90; Bruce, Galatians, 111.
201 Harmon, Galatians, 90-91, notes the possible echo of Paul’s mission to the Gentile but does not mention the mission to Israel.
202 An argument could be made from Rom 9–11 that Paul saw his Gentile mission as part of his Jewish mission. However, this is nowhere to be found in Galatians.
work is significant proof to the Galatians that the eschatological age had indeed dawned. But why would the Jerusalem leaders accept such a mission?

The Jewish tradition of an eschatological inclusion of the Gentiles is seen in Isa 2:2–4 where a Gentile pilgrimage to Zion serves as a marker to the eschatological reality. The theme is prevalent in the second half of Isaiah (e.g. 55:5; 56:1–8; 60:3; 66:18–21; cf. 40:5; 49:22–26; 52:10). While there are certainly other strands of Jewish thought concerning the eschatological fate of the nations, the Gentile pilgrimage motif is also attested in Scripture (Mic 4:1–3; Zech 2:11; 8:20–23) and in STJL (e.g. Tob 13:11; 14:5–7; Sib. Or. 3:710-721).

Sanders, Wright, and Fredriksen are but a few of the many scholars who believe this tradition lies behind Paul’s Gentile mission. Fredriksen’s reading is most intriguing since she argues the relevant literature lacks any reference to Gentile halakhic conversion; they do not become Jews. “Their redemption, rather, depended upon their spiritual and hence moral, ‘conversion’: Gentiles were expected when the Kingdom came, to turn from idolatry . . . and turn to the worship of the True God. . . . They would remain Gentiles and as Gentiles would they be saved.”

If Fredriksen is correct, then Paul’s law-free gospel for the Gentiles would not be a new concept to the Jerusalem leaders. The gospel Paul lays before them is not the

---

203 While parts of the Sibylline Oracles bear Christian marks, the majority of chapter three, including the noted section, appears to be of Jewish origins. For a short history of the debate surrounding the date and provenance of Book III see: Rieuwerd Buitenwerf, Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting: With an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary (Leiden: Brill, 2003), esp. 124-136.
204 E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983), 171.
205 Wright, Climax, 150-51.
206 Fredriksen, “Judaism,” 532-564; idem, Jesus, 84, 146-76.
208 Fredriksen, Jesus, 150, emphasis hers.
kerygma about Christ which they already knew and which Paul at least partially received
from Peter.\textsuperscript{209} It was the “revelation” that the dawning of the eschatological Kingdom
also meant law-free Gentile inclusion; Paul helped to reveal the implications of the new
age. It must have been Paul’s witness to Gentiles having received the Holy Spirit apart
from works of the flesh (3:2–5), and the witness of this indwelling through various signs
in their midst, which helped the Jerusalem leaders connect the dots. This is why the
Jerusalem leaders did not compel Titus to be circumcised (2:3), why they rejected the
circumcision group (2:4–5), and why they recognized Paul’s mission to the Gentiles (2:7,
8, 9). It seem improbable, if not impossible, that the Jerusalem leaders believed they
were only endorsing “God-fearing” status to the Gentiles or that Paul would have been
“ambiguous” about Gentiles gaining “full status as members of the covenant and full
heirs of its promises.”\textsuperscript{210} If Scot McKnight,\textsuperscript{211} Michael Bird\textsuperscript{212} and Fredriksen\textsuperscript{213} are
correct in their assessment that Judaism was not a missionary religion which actively
proselytised,\textsuperscript{214} then Paul’s mission would have been unique.\textsuperscript{215} The endorsement of
Paul’s mission by the Jerusalem leaders would thus stand out to the Galatians not
because it certified Paul’s apostleship or because it appropriated Paul’s gospel, but

\textsuperscript{209} Dunn’s analysis of Paul’s use of ἱστορέω in 1:18 of “gaining information” (Jesus, Paul, 110-
13) is convincing; Paul didn’t need to “consult” anyone concerning his revelation. However, it seems
improbable that Paul would visit Peter for fifteen days and not seek to learn from his vast knowledge and
experience of Christ (cf. 1 Cor 15).

\textsuperscript{210} Pace Dunn, Galatians, 15.

\textsuperscript{211} Scot McKnight, A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple
Period (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).

\textsuperscript{212} Michael F. Bird, Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second

\textsuperscript{213} Fredriksen, “Judaism,” 532-64; idem, Jesus, 84, 146-76.

\textsuperscript{214} This does not mean Jews did not proselytize or that Gentiles did not convert; there is plenty of
evidence of both. Rather, it means the majority of these conversions took place passively as Gentiles
became intrigued with Judaism, started attending synagogue, became God-fearers, and then made the
decision to become full members.

\textsuperscript{215} Contra Donaldson, Paul, 273-307, who believes Paul was a Jewish proselytizer before and
after his conversion/call.
because it concretely demonstrated that the eschatological reality of Isa 49 had come to fruition.

One further point needs addressing. Paul’s reference to the dual missions of Peter and himself (to Jews and Gentiles respectively) is not an inference there were two different covenants or two different paths for salvation.\(^{216}\) Paul understood the Jews as entering the covenant through God’s grace and not through the law. The law was simply an identity and boundary marker, which allowed Israel to participate in the covenant relationship. Nevertheless, Paul’s Christoform experience radically shifted his reality. Jesus was the long awaited messiah and his life was the telos, the consummation, of the law\(^{217}\) (Rom 10:4; cf. Gal 3:24; Gal 6:2; Matt 5:17). As such, Christ became the new identity and boundary marker for both Jews and Gentiles. The Christophany required Paul to re-examine his previous reading of the Jewish Scriptures through the lens of Christ. Paul discovered Christ had taken on the role of the Isaianic Servant and with it the curse of the law, providing once-for-all atonement for sin and allowing his offspring to live in and live out his righteousness and thus his righteous mission to be a light to the nations and to bring glory to God.

3.2.5 Galatians 2:11–17

The Antioch incident (2:11–17) is often viewed as a contradictory episode to the one reported in 2:1–10. Whereas the latter confirms Paul’s mission, presents a unity among the various leaders, and discloses a dependence on Paul’s part, the former rejects the mission, creates division among the leadership, and solidifies Paul’s independent mission. Perhaps the greatest modern proponent of this view is Dunn, who views Paul’s


“defeat” at Antioch\textsuperscript{218} as the watershed moment in early church history.\textsuperscript{219} He writes: “It shaped the future of Paul’s missionary work, it sparked off a crucial insight which became one of the central emphases in Paul’s subsequent teaching, and consequently it determined the whole character and future of that young movement which we now call Christianity.”\textsuperscript{220}

This is an arduous load for the present pericope to bear. Dunn’s interpretation has at least two flaws: (1) it assumes ex silentio Paul’s defeat; and (2) it ignores the context of Paul’s argument.\textsuperscript{221} Concerning the former, Ciampa convincingly argues Paul’s language deliberately implies his victory at Antioch. At hand is the idiomatic phrase κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῶ ἀντέστην (2:11). “Κατὰ πρόσωπον modifies ἀνθίστημι eight times in the LXX: Deut 7:24; 9:2; 11:25; 31:21; Judg 2:14; 2 Chr 13:7–8;\textsuperscript{222} Jdt 6:4. Each example of the idiom communicates the idea of making a successful resistance to an opposing power or force.”\textsuperscript{223}

Concerning context, Dunn’s interpretation contends the Jerusalem leaders changed their mind and now sided with the “false believers” (2:4–5). This would suggest the “circumcision faction” and the “people from James” (2.12) are one and the same.\textsuperscript{224} This would equate them with the “agitators” (1:7; cf. 6:11–13) and mean they too were ἀνάθεμα (1:8–9). According to Dunn’s rationale, part of Paul’s apologia is to seek the endorsement of those he is about to condemn. It is more plausible Paul’s retelling of the event serves to link Peter and the Jerusalem leaders to the Galatians rather than to the opponents. If Paul is seen to be “victorious” in the situation, then Peter becomes a

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{218} Dunn, \textit{Galatians}, believes what is lacking in Gal 2:11–14 provides evidence of Paul’s defeat. “Had Peter and the other (Christian) Jews backed Paul on that occasion, he could hardly have failed to draw attention to and underline that fact” (12); idem, “Antioch,” 160.
\textsuperscript{219} Cf. Markus Bockmuehl, \textit{The Remembered Peter: In Ancient Reception and Modern Debate}, WUNT 262 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 61-70.
\textsuperscript{220} Dunn, \textit{Jesus, Paul}, 162-63.
\textsuperscript{221} See also the critic by W. Campbell, \textit{Identity}, 51.
\textsuperscript{222} Although not clear in Ciampa’s quote, this reference accounts for two of the eight.
\textsuperscript{223} Ciampa, \textit{Presence}, 157-58.
positive example\textsuperscript{225} of one who has correctly responded to Paul’s correction and the Galatians should follow his lead. In this way, Peter and Paul’s example are also analogous.

Both the Galatians and Peter were in the process of turning from “the truth of the Gospel” (i.e. their position \(\epsilonν \chiριστῷ\)) to “a different gospel” (i.e. “the present evil age”) based on the influence of those advocating circumcision. Mark Nanos argues that Peter’s actions were denying the eschatological equality of the Gentile brought about through Christ which demanded that “they must live together as one, as social equals, Jews and Gentiles living righteoused [sic] together by God in Christ.”\textsuperscript{226}

Several points should be highlighted. First, the “condemning” (2:11) is not by Paul but by God.\textsuperscript{227} Here Paul continues the divine—human contrast. Second, the issue of mixed table-fellowship\textsuperscript{228} is noteworthy if one assumes Paul knew of Peter’s vision and previous confrontation with the circumcision group over this same issue (Acts 10:9–11:18). This would signal a continuation of the revelation motif.\textsuperscript{229} Peter would then be understood as being guilty of turning from the revelation God had already given him (cf. 3:1–5). Third, the action of “compelling” (\(ἀναγκάζω\); 2:14b) in Galatians is always in reference to circumcision (cf. 2:3; 6:12) and is equated with the false believers (2:4–5). Paul’s interrogative in 2:14b suggests the “compelling” had not actually taken place but rather Peter’s actions were leading him in this direction. Paul’s question is meant to shame Peter before it is too late (cf. 3:1–5). The last assertion is strengthened when 2:15–17\textsuperscript{230} is read as part of the current pericope. Since Gentiles are no doubt included in the

\textsuperscript{225} This may account for the positive references to Peter in First Corinthians. Cf. Bockmuehl, \textit{Peter}, 69.


\textsuperscript{227} The participle κατεγνωσμένος is passive and assumes a divine agent. Contra NRSV, which appears to view this as a middle participle rendering it “self-condemned.”

\textsuperscript{228} Contra Nanos, “Antioch,” passim.

\textsuperscript{229} This is not an absurd assumption especially in light of Gal 1:18.

ἔμπροσθεν πάντων (2:14), and since Paul’s words are directed toward “a Jew by birth” (φύσει Ἰουδαίος; 2:15), it seems unlikely Paul is addressing the general audience.  

The “we” includes Peter. Paul’s shift from third person singular to second person plural signals a change in attitude on the part of Peter.  

There is an obvious contrast between “works of the law” and “faithfulness of Christ” and it revolves around the verb δικαίωω. From the context, it seems logical to conclude δικαίωω equals salvation and inclusion in the covenant people. “Works of the law” (ἔργων νόμου) is not a negative commentary on the law but an idiomatic expression for “doing the law.” Therefore, the contrast is not between law and faith but between those who seek to be included in the covenant through doing the law and those who seek to be included by the faithfulness of Christ. The key is seen in the divine—human contrast. It is the choice of inclusion via God through Christ or inclusion via human effort through works of the law.  

Galatians 2:17 is an important verse, which ties this discourse to Peter’s actions and also serves to inform the Galatians of their own actions. Here the passive δικαιωθῆναι in correlation with ζητοῦντες should be understood as expressing human agency and thus conveying the idea that the act of “justifying” is being sought through human effort (i.e. ἔν ἔργων νόμου) even if it is erroneously thought to be done ἐν

---

231 This is an additional argument against seeing these verses as being directed at the Galatians.  
232 Jervis, Galatians, 70, “[T]he absolutely not! at the end of the verse [v. 17] would be Peter’s exclamation as he comes to grips with the theological consequence of separating himself from Gentiles [sic] believers” (emphasis his). Jervis goes so far as to attribute all of 2:15–16a to Peter, stating Paul’s view was somewhat different (72).  
Χριστῶ. It seems unlikely those who sought to be “justified” by God (i.e. διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) would find themselves ἁμαρτωλοί. Peter has made this negative shift and Paul is reminding him his actions are making him a servant of sin. The Galatians should thus come to recognise their own shift is potentially making them servants of sin rather than servants of Christ. They are seeking inclusion in the covenant people but their actions are having the opposite effect, moving them toward the “present evil age” rather than helping them to remain ἐν Χριστῷ.

3.2.6 Galatians 2:18–21

Paul’s use of the first person singular marks a move from the Antioch narrative to a direct address to the Galatians while still referencing Peter’s lapsus. The “I” should be understood as “universal”235 while still being very personal as it relates to Paul’s own experience.236 In these verses the temporal and spatial reality of the two ages and the divine—human contrast coalesce as Paul brings this first part of his polemic to a close and simultaneously jumpstarts the next.

De Boer shows several parallels between 2:19–21 and 1:13–16 and argues the former “constitute[s] Paul’s (further) interpretation of his conversion and call.”237 Paul recognises that if he was to build up his previous life then he would become a transgressor, not of the law but of Christ (2:18). The eschatological reality inaugurated through Christ has brought about a separation between Paul and works of the law238 (2:19a) and simultaneously a union between Christ and Paul (2:20a). This mysterious relocation took place as a result of Paul having been “crucified together with” Christ (2:19b).

235 So Lategan, “Paul,” 427; Betz, Galatians, 122.
236 So Dunn, Galatians, 142.
237 De Boer, Galatians, 159.
238 “Law” is shorthand for “works of the law.” So de Boer, Galatians, 159.
The link between 2:20 and 1:4 brings the Galatians back to the eschatological focus of the gospel. Galatians 2:20 also brings the divine—human contrast to a head.\textsuperscript{239} The only possible way of escaping the present evil age is by allowing the divine to reside within humanity (ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστὸς; cf. 1:16); it is by dying to self and residing in the “faithfulness of the Son of God”\textsuperscript{240} that one experiences the eschatological reality of the resurrection (cf. 1:1) in the present body (νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί).

Paul’s statement about not invalidating the grace of God (2:21) confirms the acceptance of the eschatological grace received by him (1:15) and the Galatians (1:6) at their calling. The contrast between grace and law in relation to justification parallels the contrast made above between Christ’s faithfulness and works of the law (2:16). The line between validation and invalidation of God’s grace (i.e. Christ’s death) is clearly drawn and there can be no mistaking the seriousness of crossing this marker (cf. 5:4).

3.3 Conclusion

The purpose of Paul’s autobiographical narrative and of the epistle as a whole is to persuade (remind) the Galatians the eschatological age has been inaugurated through the death and resurrection of Christ and that this reality means the Galatians are already the ἐκκλησία of God. This one theological truth and the reality it brings is so world-changing the Galatians’ grasp of it should convince them to reject the law-observant gospel preached by the agitators and fully embrace the truth of the gospel preached by Paul, Peter, and the Jerusalem leaders—the gospel of Christ which allows for a law-free inclusion of the Gentiles in the eschatological age. In the first two chapters, Paul’s method for carrying out this purpose is:

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{239} Cf. Lategan, “Paul,” 428-29.
(1) To articulate a particular picture of Christ as the Isaianic Servant who atones for sin and ushers in a new eschatological reality.

(2) To articulate a particular picture of the Galatians as those who through Christ have become recipients of God’s grace and peace and have assumed a new identity as God’s children, the eschatological church.

(3) To articulate a significant divine—human dichotomy whereby all things and persons on the “divine” side are part of the eschatological age and all things or persons on the “human” side are part of the present evil age.

(4) To provide his own Christophanic experience as proof of the eschatological age, proof of the revelatory aspects of the gospel of Christ, proof of the Galatians’ calling as the eschatological people of God, proof of Paul’s calling to be one of the servants of the Servant Christ, and proof of the Galatians’ same calling.

(5) To provide his account of his encounter with Peter and the Jerusalem leaders as proof of the eschatological age, proof of Gentile inclusion into the eschatological people of God apart from works of the law, and proof of the unity of this message among the church leaders.

(6) To provide his account of the Antioch incident in order to offer Peter as a positive example of one who, like the Galatians, comes close to accepting a “different gospel” but ultimately returns to the truth of the gospel of Christ.

Of these six points, number four, which contains five elements, is the most pertinent to the current study as it postulates particular purposes for Paul’s Christophanic reference. The findings of this study are as follows:

(a) Proof of the eschatological age – Paul recounts his Christophany to emphasise it is a revelation of the crucified and now resurrected Christ, which can only mean this Christ is the long-awaited messiah. From Paul’s Jewish perspective, this is proof the eschatological age has broken into the present. Additionally, the present
aspect of this eschatological reality is not only made possible through Christ but moreover in Christ.

(b) **Proof of the revelatory aspect of the gospel of Christ** – Paul recounts his Christophany in order to emphasise its divine source. This emphasis is not self-serving. Paul does not use it to defend his apostleship. Instead, Paul levels the playing field by arguing the proclaimed gospel is also a divine revelation equal to the revelation Paul himself has experienced. This means all believers, including the Galatians, experience their initial calling by way of divine revelation.

(c) **Proof of the Galatians’ calling as the eschatological people of God** – Paul recounts his Christophany in a way which intentionally parallels the Galatians’ experience to his own. Through the Holy Spirit, the Galatians received a manifestation of Christ, which was simultaneously a calling to become the eschatological people of God.

(d) **Proof of Paul’s calling to be one of the servants of the Servant Christ** – Paul recounts his Christophany with strong allusion to the Isaianic Servant. As such, Paul is able to confirm the identity of Christ as the singular Servant and simultaneously identify himself as one of the eschatological servants of the Servant who is called to carry out the mission of being a light to the nations and bringing glory to God.

(e) **Proof of the Galatians’ same calling** – Paul recounts his Christophany in such a way as to invite the Galatians to embrace the same calling he has embraced to become eschatological servants of the Servant Christ.

All five elements hold a common thread. They show the corporate nature of Paul’s Christophanic reference. Although definitely part of his understanding, this corporate aspect goes well beyond Paul’s viewing of his calling as designated for the purpose of bringing others into the eschatological Kingdom. Paul actually uses his
Christophanic reference didactically and paradigmatically. He uses it to teach the Galatians about their identity in Christ and to provide a paradigm for the Galatians to follow. He is willing to highlight the human frailty of his past action and identity in order to provide an example for the Galatians’ same reversal. He models transformation away from human/fleshly understanding and actions to divine/Spirit-led understanding and actions. Furthermore, he is willing to parallel his own calling as one of the servants of the Servant Christ in order to help the Galatians understand this same calling in their own lives. This does not negate his unique apostolic calling. Nevertheless, this does not appear to be the focus of his Christophanic reference.

Finally, the most radical and most corporate part of Paul’s Christophanic reference is how he intentionally downplays the particulars of his own event in order to emphasise the shared elements of the experiences. At multiple points, Paul’s Christophanic reference moves beyond paradigm and articulates a oneness in conversion/calling, experience and mission. The Galatians are not just invited to emulate a particular action or theology of Paul’s. They are invited to recognise the analogous parts of their eschatological conversion/calling. As they are relocated in Christ, they share together with Paul and all believers a dynamic revelation of Christ, co-crucifixion with Christ, the indwelling of God through the Holy Spirit, and a oneness with each other.
Chapter 4

PAUL’S CHRISTOPHANIC REFERENCES IN FIRST CORINTHIANS

This chapter evaluates Paul’s two Christophanic references in First Corinthians (9:1–2, 16–17; 15:1–11). First Corinthians evidences possible signs of a Corinthians challenge to Paul’s authority and is often viewed as an apostolic apologia whereby Paul seeks to persuade the Corinthians to accept his authority over that of other Christian leaders. Both Christophanic references bear the weight of the reading. This study argues that the majority of the Corinthians are not challenging Paul’s authority and Paul is not primarily defending his apostleship. It shows how moving beyond this hypothesis allows for a more consistent and theologically focused reading of this epistle in general and of Paul’s Christophanic references specifically. First Corinthians does contain multiple OT quotations, allusions, and echoes, which may suggest the Corinthians have a basic understanding of at least some OT texts. Nonetheless, unlike Galatians, Paul’s Christophanic references in First Corinthians do not rely heavily on a particular OT text for their interpretation. For this reason, intertextual issues will be addressed as needed. Before an exegetical evaluation of the two Christophanic references can take place, some preliminary issues need to be addressed. These will provide a context and foundation for interpreting these references.

4.1 Preliminary Considerations

4.1.1 The Occasion and Theme of First Corinthians

The immediate occasion for Paul’s writing of First Corinthians is almost certainly the need to address issues brought by Chloe’s people (1:11; cf. 5:1; 11:18, 15:12) and by the Corinthians’ own letter (7:1; cf. 8:1; 12:1; 16:1). It should be remembered that this letter “is the continuation of an ongoing conversation between Paul and the church” (5:9; 7:1; cf. 2 Cor 2:3–4). Paul is relationally investing in this community (4:14–15) and appears to know them relatively well (cf. Acts 18:1–18). Unlike the Galatians, who were in danger of succumbing to “a different gospel” from an outside source, the Corinthians are dealing with internal, interpersonal, and ethical issues, which are threatening to tear the body apart and hurting their testimony in the larger community. Paul addresses ethical and relational missteps as symptoms of deeper theological misunderstandings, while simultaneously tackling surface issues.

Taken together, the prescript (1:1–3) and thanksgiving (1:4–9) sections contain the theme and strategy of the epistle. Paul begins with a reference to his apostolic calling, which took place διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ (cf. 2 Cor 1:1). Several points suggest this prepositional phrase is not inserted as part of an apostolic apologia. For example, Paul

---


4 It is possible additional concerns were brought to Paul by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus (1 Cor 16:17). Paul may also glean further information from Apollos (1 Cor 16:12).

6 Contra Mitchell, Paul, 198-200; Ben Witherington III, Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 94; Thiselton, First Corinthians, 111-13, who all view 1 Cor 1:10 as containing the main thesis of unity. However, this focuses on a surface issue rather than on the deeper theological issues Paul is addressing throughout. For a view similar to the one argued in this thesis see, Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 61.

7 This is also a common phrase in the so-called disputed Pauline epistles, where the author/s does not appear to be mounting a self-defence (cf. Eph 1:1; Col 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1; cf. 1 Tim 1:1 & Titus 1:3).
has already shown himself capable of using identical language in reference to Christ’s atoning sacrifice (Gal 1:3–4). Additionally, Paul employs this language to speak of God’s will for believers’ transformation (1 Thess 4:3; 5:18), the need for believers to discern God’s will together (Rom 12:2), and as a way of centring his (Rom 15:32) and believers’ actions (2 Cor 8:5) in the realm of God’s authority; there can be little doubt that Paul understood the Corinthians calling (1:2, 9, 24) as also taking place by the will of God.⁸ Therefore, the primary antithesis is not between Paul’s position and the Corinthians or between Paul’s apostolic calling and others’ apostolic calling, but between divine agency and human agency. As in Galatians, Paul quickly establishes the divine—human dichotomy in order to aid the Corinthians in understanding the eschatological reality in which they are called to live.

Paul’s words in 1:2b allude either to Mal 1:11⁹ or Joel 3:5 LXX (Joel 2:32 MT). There are multiple reasons to see the latter as the primary referent.

1 Cor 1:2b  σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν
Joel 3:5  καὶ ἔσται πᾶς, δὲ ἀν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, σωθήσεται

Besides the near identical language, Anthony Thiselton notes Paul’s quotation of this same text in Rom 10:13 and argues the reference to day of the Lord in 1 Cor 1:7–8 makes the allusion more sure since Joel is specifically describing this eschatological event (Joel 3:4 LXX; cf. 1:15; 2:1–2; 4:14, 18).¹⁰ Paul’s mention of the Spirit’s endowment of χαρίσματα (1:7; cf. Joel 3:1–5 LXX) in connection with this day also correlates with Joel (3:1–5 LXX; cf. 1:15; 2:1, 11; 4:14). Additionally, Paul’s reference to the Corinthians as ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ who have been ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἀγίοις (1:2a) possibly correlates to Joel’s call to gather and ἀγιάσατε ἐκκλησίαν

---

⁸ Cf. Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 56-57.
⁹ Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 57-58.
¹⁰ Thiselton, First Corinthians, 78.
in preparation for Yahweh’s return (2:16 LXX). Finally, the larger context of Joel speaks of the people turning (or returning) to the Lord because the Lord is ἔλεημον καὶ οἰκτίρμων (2:13 LXX). The adjective ἔλεημον carries similar connotations to how Paul uses χάρις as referring to the act of God rescuing his people because of his covenant faithfulness (1 Cor 1:3–4).  

It becomes evident that Joel’s eschatology has invaded not only 1:2b but the whole of Paul’s introduction and thanksgiving (1:1–9). Paul uses this as a way of framing the direction of the epistle as a whole. The issue at hand is theological and principally eschatological. Paul begins by reminding the Corinthians that the eschatological age has already dawned and that the Corinthians are already part of the eschatological people of God, having experienced God’s grace given in Christ Jesus, God’s Spirit as evidenced by the gifts of the Spirit, and God’s calling into the fellowship of his Son. Nevertheless, Paul juxtaposes this already-ness with the reality of the not-yet-ness. The Corinthians are reminded they await τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1:7; cf. Gal 1:12). This is traditionally understood as a reference to Christ’s second coming and in light of 1:8 this reading may be sound. However, ἀποκάλυψις is not Paul’s normal language for speaking of the second coming (although cf. 3:13; Rom 8:19).

Paul may be highlighting the Corinthians’ deficiency with regard to their understanding of Christ and the eschatological age as evidenced by their lack of unity and care for one another (1:10). Thus, even as they are already sanctified in Christ Jesus

---

11 The adjective ἔλεημον is a translation of חַנּוּן in the MT. The Hebrew word חַנּוּן is the adjectival form of חנן and appears thirteen times in the MT, always as an attribute of God and more specifically to his hearing and responding to the cries of his people in accordance with his חָאָט (cf. Ex 34:6; Jonah 4:2; Ps 86:15; 103:8; 145:8; Neh 9:17).


13 This is noted by both Fee, First Corinthians, 42; and Horsley, First Corinthians, 40.
and called to be holy (1:2), they are not yet fully embracing this reality.\textsuperscript{14} This accounts for what would otherwise be repetition in 1:8, with Paul’s reference to the “day of the Lord.” Instead, 1:8 anticipates the not yet consummation of the eschatological age and balances Paul’s last statement by its assurance that it is God’s\textsuperscript{15} continued work in the Corinthians which is strengthening them and is able to make them blameless till the end. Paul maintains the already/not yet tension of both the eschatological age and of the Corinthians own transformation in this age and maintains the divine—human dichotomy.

Paul also addresses the corporate nature of the eschatological age and of the Corinthians’ eschatological identity. Through reference to Joel 3:5 LXX, Paul stresses the reality that the Corinthians’ inclusion into the eschatological people of God is not unique to them. They join the whole ἐκκλησία of God in Corinth; they join Paul and Sosthenes; and they join “all those who in every place call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours” (1:2b). They must be reminded that the eschatological reality in which they participate is neither defined by them nor theirs to define. Instead, in Christ, they share in something much bigger than themselves, something only God can bring about.

Paul’s purpose is disclosed in this reading of the prescript and thanksgiving sections. Paul addresses a deficiency in the Corinthians’ eschatological understanding, which is resulting in concrete ethical issues and causing disunity in the church. As Hays aptly articulates, “Paul [is] trying to teach the Corinthian church to think eschatologically.”\textsuperscript{16} Key to a proper eschatological worldview is a grasping of various dichotomies between divine and human, already and not yet, and corporate and individual. Paul’s strategy for carrying out this purpose is also seen in 1:1–9. First, Paul employs OT quotations and allusions as a way of constructing a foundation for the

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Thiselton, \textit{First Corinthians}, 76-77.
\textsuperscript{15} So Fee, \textit{First Corinthians}, 43-44.
\textsuperscript{16} Hays, \textit{Conversion}, 6.
Corinthians to understand their new eschatological identity.\textsuperscript{17} Second, Paul sets forth his own life as a model of this new identity and as impetus for present transformation. It will be argued that both of Paul’s Christophanic references contribute to this end.

4.1.2 Corinthian Challenge and Apostolic Apologia?

Many scholars see in First Corinthians evidence of a “Corinthian Challenge” and, therefore, read the epistle as an “Apostolic Apologia” (CCAA).\textsuperscript{18} While the interpretation of Paul’s Christophanic references posited in this chapter do not rise or fall on a non-CCAA reading, it is important to acknowledge the impact of a CCAA reading on 1 Cor 1:10–4:21, which often becomes the hermeneutical lens for interpreting the whole of the epistle (esp. 9:1–23; 15:1–11). The most influential CCAA reading of 1:10–4:21 is found in Nils Dahl’s “Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1:10–4:21.”\textsuperscript{19} Dahl’s conclusions,\textsuperscript{20} while possible, fail to do justice to the full content of this large unit, not least the wisdom sections (1:18–31; 2:6–16; 3:18–23). He treats the entire unit as preliminary, serving only to position Paul for what follows. Dahl himself notices

\textsuperscript{17} Hays, Conversion, 6.


\textsuperscript{19} Dahl, “Paul and Corinth,” 313-35.

\textsuperscript{20} Dahl, “Paul and Corinth,” 329, lists four conclusions; (1) that 1:10–4:21 is most definitely an apostolic apologia; (2) quarrels are mainly the result of opposition against Paul; (3) the quarrels are likely occasioned by the letter and delegation sent to Paul; and (4) the function of this section in the epistle is to re-establish his authority before he can address the issues raised. Many of Dahl’s conclusions are based on a belief that the slogans found in 1:12 represent four concrete factions with only the “Paul group” in support of Paul (similarly, Fee, First Corinthians, 8 and n. 22). Several have convincingly argued that Paul’s reference to the Christ-group is his own corrective to the divisions and does not represent a separate group (e.g., Mitchell, Paul, 86; Garland, First Corinthians, 49). Additionally, while, Dahl and Fee are correct that this letter is mostly directed to the whole congregation and not to a specific group, the few exceptions to this (4:18–19; 9:2–3) suggest Paul’s opposition is limited (cf. Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 54, 172). It should also be noted that if Paul were defending himself, his reprimanding of all parties, including the Paul-group, would seem counterproductive. However, if Paul is primarily concerned with correcting the Corinthians’ erroneous ethical missteps and theological misunderstandings, then human judgments against Paul would be of little concern to him (cf. 4:3–4).
weaknesses in his argument and in a later republication of this essay writes: “colleagues and students have convinced me that the characterization of 1 Cor. 1:10–4:21 as an apologetic section is one-sided and may be misleading.”21 Sadly, this quote takes place in a final footnote and the content of the essay remains unchanged. Still, many continue to rely heavily on Dahl’s earlier argument.22

For some, the strongest evidence of CCAA is found in 4:1–5. Of this pericope, Hays writes: “This is our first unambiguous indication that the Corinthians are in fact second-guessing Paul’s apostolic labors and questioning his authority.”23 Yet, Paul’s reference to being judged (ἀνακρίνω) does not automatically suggest the Corinthians are questioning his authority. Ben Witherington believes this judgment is only in reference to Paul’s speech and rhetorical ability and has nothing to do with questioning his apostolic authority.24 Furthermore, Paul’s use of the subjunctive mood with ἵνα may suggest a hypothetical situation.25

David Kuck argues the key to understanding all of 1:10–4:21 is found in 3:5–4:5 and the theme of apocalyptic judgment.26 He views Paul’s appeal to divine judgment as a way to “combat the detrimental social effects of the individual pursuit of spiritual wisdom.”27 “Paul uses judgement language not as a threat but as a positive motivation for his parenesis.”28 The primary function of 4:3, argues Kuck, is for Paul to apply 2:15 personally to stress the dichotomy between human reason and God’s judgement.29 Paul’s hypothetical judgment drives home the point Paul makes throughout this section; God’s

22 Most recently see, Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 136-40.
24 Witherington, Conflict, 137.
27 Kuck, Judgment, 156.
28 Kuck, Judgment, 222.
29 Kuck, Judgment, 198-200. Although seeing it as secondary, Kuck also succumbs to a CCAA reading (197-99).
power alone judges and justifies not human wisdom. Paul’s own model of divine reversal needs to be embraced (4:16) if the Corinthians are truly to be part of the eschatological people of God who evidence the mind of Christ (2:16).

While chapters 1–4 deal with the issue of Corinthian division, it is not a struggle between Paul and Apollos. Throughout this section Paul downplays any apostolic disagreements by his consistent use of the fpp pronoun to speak of the apostles’ common proclamation (1:21–23; 2:6–7), position (3:9; 4:1), and suffering (4:9–13). Paul’s affirmation of Apollos (3:5–9; 16:12) reveals there is “not the slightest hint that the teachers [are] themselves party to this quarrelling.”30 Nor does the text evidence that the conflict is primarily between Paul and the Corinthians,31 at least not from Paul’s perspective. Instead, the divisions in the church represent an internal power struggle, most likely based on social stratification rather than theological doctrine,32 which come out of a deficient eschatological understanding.

The theme of “power” (δύναμις) appears throughout this section (1:18, 24; 2:4, 5; cf. 4:19, 20) but is directly tied to Christ and his cross, to the Spirit, and to God. This power is only connected to Paul as he is connected to Christ. Paul’s power language creates a clear divine—human dichotomy throughout this section. This dichotomy is undergirded by an OT substructure. Paul utilises six OT references (1:19; 1:31; 2:9; 2:16; 3:19; 3:20; cf. respectively LXX Isa 29:14; Jer 9:24/1 Sam 2:10; Isa 64:4; Isa 40:13; Job 5:13; Ps 94:11),33 which are “all taken from passages that depict God as one who acts to judge and save his people in ways that defy human imagination.”34 These passages

30 Fee, First Corinthians, 48.
32 Peter Marshall, Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul’s Relations with the Corinthians, WUNT 2.23 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), passim.
33 Paul’s reference in 1 Cor 4:6 is most likely pointing back to at least one of these OT texts. So also, Morna D. Hooker, “‘Beyond the Things which are Written’: An Examination of 1 Cor. IV. 6,” NTS 10 (1963): 127-32; J. Ross Wagner, “‘Not Beyond the Things which are Written’: A Call to Boast Only in the Lord (1 Cor. 4:6),” NTS 44 (1998): 279-87.
34 Hays, Conversion, 13.
highlight God’s divine sovereignty and grace in the midst of human disobedience, ignorance and arrogance. They evidence the power struggle being advanced is not human versus human, as it might appear on the surface, but human versus divine or more precisely human wisdom versus God’s wisdom, flesh versus Spirit, and this age versus the coming age.

Paul’s OT citation in 1:31—Ὁ καυχόμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω—is significant, pointing back to either Jer 9:24, 1 Sam 2:10 LXX, or to both.\(^{35}\) While most scholars primarily focus on the Jeremiah passage, citing contextual linguistic parallels,\(^ {36}\) J. Ross Wagner has made a strong argument for First Samuel based on thematic parallels.\(^ {37}\) Furthermore, Wagner shows verbal and thematic links between 1 Cor 1:18–31 and 4:6–13, which also echo 1 Sam 2:10 LXX, especially Paul’s evoking of the triad in 4:10 (cf. 1:26). Wagner also argues, 4:6—“Nothing beyond what is written”—points back to the quotation in 1:31 and together these two sections provide an antithesis between the Corinthians’ anthropocentric boasting (cf. 3:21–22) and the actions of Paul and Apollos who boast only in the Lord.

Paul’s paternal language in 4:14–15 (τέκνα and πατήρ; cf. the maternal imagery of 3:1b–2) is often seen as a power play\(^ {38}\) in which Paul establish his dominance by invoking his status as *pater familias*.\(^ {39}\) Nevertheless, Thiselton’s appeal for taking this language at face-value should not be quickly disregarded.\(^ {40}\) Paul’s sternness throughout this epistle can just as easily represent his genuine love and compassion for those whom


\(^{40}\) Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 369.
he considers his spiritual children. Additionally, if along with Ciampa and Rosner 4:18–21 is understood as belonging to the subsequent section (5:1–8), which deals with sexual immorality, then Paul’s tone in these verses is appropriate considering the gravitas of the situation.41

Kathy Ehrensperger has argued Paul’s parental language is part of a larger Jewish pedagogical discourse.42 “[Paul] acts as a parent-teacher using power-over them to empower them and thus render himself, and the power-over exercised in this role, obsolete.”43 In essence, Paul sought to distribute power rather than wield it.44 This claim is substantiated as one remembers how Paul has already aligned his own calling with the Corinthian’s calling (1:2). Paul’s plea for imitation (4:16), echoing his plea for union of mind and purpose (1:10), is proof Paul desires for the Corinthians to share in the power of God, which he possesses in Christ. This can only take place as the Corinthians realise the reversal which must happen in their own life as a result of their calling and participation in the eschatological age.

This evaluation has shown a CCAA reading of 1:10–4:21 is not necessary. It muddies the waters and makes it difficult to interpret the whole of Paul’s argumentation, as well as the whole of the epistle. Rather than trying to defend, Paul primarily seeks to establish a new eschatological reality wherein the Corinthians understand the superiority of God’s wisdom over their own. Paul posits his own life as an example of one who has submitted to this new reality and embraced a shared eschatological identity along with all other believers, the Corinthians notwithstanding. Paul invites the Corinthians to follow

41 So Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 189-90.
43 Ehrensperger, Paul, 136.
44 This does not contradict Paul’s “power in weakness” theme in 1 Cor 1–2 or in Second Corinthians. Ultimately, the power Paul distributes is God’s power; this is the reason he cannot keep it to himself. Those possessing God’s power recognise it is not like the world’s power. Instead, it is only evidenced in human weakness and thus in full reliance upon God.
suit by encouraging them to embrace the same divine power and through it the same mind of Christ and same familial concern for one another which Paul has for them.

Before concluding this section, it is necessary to clearly state what the removal of (a primary) CCAA reading does not mean. First, it does not mean Paul sees his apostolic position as unimportant or ineffectual. Second, it does not mean Paul is unauthoritative. Paul speaks of apostleship more in this epistle than any other (ten times) and shows the importance of leadership in setting the example of transformation and Christ-like sacrifice. It is only through Paul’s position and the authority it affords him that he can influence the Corinthians’ thinking and actions.

The preliminary considerations addressed above provide a foundation for a more fruitful evaluation of Paul’s Christophanic references in 1 Cor 9 and 15 below. Additional CCAA readings will be addressed as needed in these exegetical sections.

4.2 Exegesis of First Corinthians 9

4.2.1 The Context: First Corinthians 8:1–13 & 10:1–11:1

Paul’s Christophanic reference in 1 Cor 9 is part of the larger argument of 8:1–11:1, which deals with the surface issue of idol food. In 8:1–13 Paul employs the Corinthians’ own words and their use of Deut 6 as part of his rebuttal. While Paul is in basic agreement with their monotheistic claims concerning God (8:4), their knowledge is based on the worldly wisdom of “authority/rights” rather than on the divine wisdom of “love.” Paul’s reshaped “Christianized Shema” (8:6) places Christ and his example of love at centre stage. Whereas the Corinthians’ actions are a stumbling block and source

---


46 Wright, Climax, 120-36.
of destruction to the weak (8:9, 11), Christ’s actions have led to salvation for the weak and the strong, both of whom find existence in Christ (8:6).

Paul’s reference to the “weak” who are being destroyed as ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι’ ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν (8:11), intentionally links those destroying and those being destroyed as part of the same body (cf. 5:11; 10:17; 12:12–31), adding that this sin is equally against Christ and the other (8:12). By linking the Corinthians’ knowledge to sinning against Christ, Paul demonstrates they are on the wrong side of the divine—human divide (cf. 1:10–4:17). The Corinthians need to grasp the profound union which takes place not only between them and Christ (cf. 3:16, 23; 6:15–20) but also between one another as a result of the death of Christ (cf. 10:16). This single eschatological event, and the believers’ connection to it, causes a shift in identity and eschatological location, which also means a shift in social location; they now reside “in Christ” as the body of Christ, and this should result in a shift in action toward one another. Paul’s own actions are similar to the sacrificial actions of Christ and provide another opposing model (8:13) to their own.

A similar contrast takes place in 10:1–11:1, Paul employs Israel’s story (now the Corinthians; 10:1; cf. 5:1) to emphasise the grace of God in his provisions to “all” Israel (10:1–4) against the actions of “some” who disobeyed and were destroyed (10:5–10). This warning serves to instruct the Corinthians, who are residing in the eschatological age (10:12). They have become part of Israel’s story and are prone to the same shortcomings and outcomes as those who fell into sin in the wilderness. The only direct citation comes from Exod 32:6 (cf. 10:7), the golden calf episode. The context of the Exodus passage, with its emphasis on idol worship, fits well with the surface issue of idol food which Paul is addressing. The Corinthians, while thinking they are involved in authentic worship to God, are actually bordering on idolatry; their arrogance and ignorance toward one another, as well as their perceived rights, is leading them toward
the perishable rather than the imperishable (9:25),\textsuperscript{47} and thus towards disqualification (9:27).

Paul reminds the Corinthians that they have entered into fellowship with Christ and his body (κοινωνία; 10:16; cf. 1:7) and have, therefore, become one body with each other (10:17; cf. 12:12–31). This eschatological union between Christ and each other means they cannot be partners (κοινωνός) with demons/idols (10:20) but are to imitate Paul in partnering with the gospel (συγκοινωνός; 9:23) by becoming slaves to all (9:19). The issue of idol food became almost superfluous. The eschatological people of God are not primarily marked by what or where they eat but by their active participation in the body of Christ and the mission of Christ; they bring glory to God (10:31) by seeking the advantage of the other (10:24) and not giving offense to anyone (10:32). This brief analysis of 8:1–13 and 10:1–11:1 is brought to further clarity through Paul’s antithetical example in 1 Cor 9.

4.2.2 Paul’s Antithetical Example in First Corinthians 9

Many scholars posit CCAA as the primary purpose behind chapter 9.\textsuperscript{48} However, there are several difficulties with this position: (1) Paul’s “apologia” does not defend his authority but surrenders it;\textsuperscript{49} (2) it does not legitimise his apostleship but only differentiates it;\textsuperscript{50} and (3) it presupposes acceptance of his apostolic authority\textsuperscript{51} arguing

\textsuperscript{47} This language (perishable and imperishable) foreshadows Paul’s resurrection discourse in 15:42, 53-54.


\textsuperscript{49} Willis, “Apostolic Apologia,” 40.

\textsuperscript{50} Brian Dodd, Paul’s Paradigmatic ‘I’: Personal Example as Literary Strategy, JSNTSup 177 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 97.

\textsuperscript{51} Witherington, Conflict, 78-79, 136 n. 1. Witherington also argues that Paul’s questions functions rhetorically “to anticipate possible arguments, not to answer actual arguments” (206).
from this position not for it. The last point is significant as it suggests that if Paul’s apostolic status and authority were being questioned, Paul is either unaware of this “reality” or lacks significant concern to significantly address it. Nevertheless, before dismissing a CCAA position, one must seek to answer the following three questions.

Why does Paul deem it necessary to reference his apostolic status at this point in the argument (9:1)? Why does Paul so intimately connect this status to the Corinthian community (9:2)? What does Paul mean by his use of ἀπολογία (9:3)?

It is best to begin with the final question as it provides clarity for addressing the other two questions. Margaret Mitchell is correct when she states that “[a]ny rhetorical analysis of 1 Cor 9 as an actual ἀπολογία must reconstruct the charge against which Paul defends himself here.” And in Mitchell’s analysis, all attempts thus far have failed. This is because Paul’s argument appears to lack any real logic in terms of an actual ἀπολογία. For example, Gordon Fee contends that Paul is defending himself against two charges. First, his refusal to take financial support from the Corinthians. Second, his vacillating views on marketplace food.

Does Paul actually defend himself against these two charges? Regarding the first proposed charge, Paul begins by asserting his apostolic right to receive support and then gives a defence for not receiving this support. In Fee’s own words, “That is unusual argumentation under any circumstance.” Concerning the second alleged charge, Paul’s larger argument in 8:1–11:1 could easily have been construed by the Corinthians as

---

52 Willis, “Apostolic Apologia,” 40. So also, Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 396, who write: “The series of rhetorical questions at the beginning of the chapter . . . depend upon the Corinthians’ agreement for their rhetorical power in support of the argument that follows.”

53 This too suggests limited opposition to Paul in Corinth at the time of this letter.

54 Mitchell, Paul, 244–46.

55 Mitchell, Paul, 244 and n. 330.

56 Most scholars see 9:3 as pointing forward to the issues of freedom and rights (9:4–23) rather than backwards to the issue of apostolic status (9:1–2). So, Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 400; Barrett, First Corinthians, 202; Hays, First Corinthians, 150; Fee, First Corinthians, 400-01; Witherington, Conflict, 207; contra Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 357.

57 Fee, First Corinthians, 393, 424-25.

58 Fee, First Corinthians, 392, see also 398 and n. 9.
additional vacillation rather than defence against such actions (e.g. 9:20-22;\textsuperscript{59} and cf. 8:13 and 10:29).\textsuperscript{60} Nevertheless, Paul’s use of ἀπολογία\textsuperscript{61} cannot be ignored. It would seem that he intentionally employs this language to represent a defence. The difficulty in deducing the charge/s or making sense of the argumentation may suggest that this is some type of mock or parodic defence.\textsuperscript{62} Reason for such a strategy will be suggested below.

If Paul is not defending himself, then why does he introduce his apostleship as such? As noted above, Paul’s apostolic status is stated rather than defended and assumes acceptance of this status and possibly even acceptance of the authority afforded by this status. Although seemingly trite, it can be assumed that Paul introduces his apostleship here because it is an important part of his ensuing argument. As Mitchell states: “In 9:1–3 he lays out the fundamental premises upon which his argument will build—that he is free, and that he is an apostle (because he has seen the Lord, and because he has founded churches such as the Corinthian church itself).”\textsuperscript{63}

Additionally, Paul may introduce his apostleship in order to emphasise the intimate connection between himself and the Corinthians (9:2), which would then serve the goal of persuading them to imitate his actions and attitudes of always considering the other and the gospel mission (11:1; cf. 4:14–16). This would fit Paul’s overall strategy in 8:1–11:1, where he goes to great lengths to intentionally show the intimacy that exists between Christ and his body as well as between the various members who make up this body, strong and weak together (e.g. 8:11–13; 10:16-17).

\textsuperscript{59} Fee, \textit{First Corinthians}, 428, sees 1 Cor 9:20–22 as pertaining to the eating of certain foods.
\textsuperscript{60} I am not suggesting, as some have, that Paul is inconsistent here. Throughout 8:1–11:1, Paul consistently places the gospel mission and the good of the whole body of Christ as the criteria that must govern one’s eating. However, if the Corinthians do not grasp or accept these limitations to their freedom, then they will likely only see Paul’s vacillations.
\textsuperscript{61} So also in 2 Cor 7:11; Phil 1:7, 16; cf. ἀπολογέομαι in Rom 2:15; 2 Cor 12:19.
\textsuperscript{63} Michell, \textit{Paul}, 247.
Another popular reading of 9:1–23 postulates that Paul establishes his apostolic position and rights (9:1–14) in order to relinquish these rights (9:15–23); in so doing, he provides an example for the Corinthians to emulate. Michael Gorman writes: “Like Jesus, Paul possessed a particular status, and thus certain rights associated with that status, but rather than exploiting them for his own advantage, he took the form of a slave for the benefit of others.” Here, Gorman parallels Paul’s example in 1 Cor 9 with Christ’s example in Phil 2:6-8, which he refers to as the “although [x] not [y] but [z]” pattern. As Gorman’s argument develops, he suggests that the “although” is simultaneously “because.” He writes: “It is not just although Christ, Paul, and all believers possess a certain identity ([x]) that their story has a certain shape (not [y] but [z]); it is also because they possess that identity.” This hypothesis is compelling, especially as it relates to Phil 2. But it raises potential problems when applied to 1 Cor 9. The “because” suggests that the truest identity and action of apostleship, and by implication all believers, is not the possession and application of rights but the surrender of these rights.

Although this does appear to be the needed corrective to those in the Corinthian community who are abusing their rights, it creates a significant division between Paul and Barnabas on one side and James and Cephas on the other. By comparing James’ and Cephas’ actions to Barnabas’ and his own (9:5–6) and then arguing the correct apostolic response is to lay down one’s rights, Paul elevates his commitment to the gospel above the other apostolic leaders. This is odd considering Paul’s multiple attempts to lessen the divisions presented in 1:12 and to provide a united front amongst the leaders (1:21–23; 2:6–7; 3:5–9; 4:1, 9–13; 15:1–11; 16:12). Is Paul creating unnecessary divisions in an

---

64 Michael J. Gorman, Apostle of the Crucified Lord: A Theological Introduction to Paul and His Letters (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 258-61; Mitchell, Paul, 247-50; Dodd, Paul, 98-101; Garland, First Corinthians, 403; Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 397.
65 Gorman, Apostle, 259.
66 Gorman, Inhabiting, 22.
67 Gorman, Inhabiting, 25, emphasis his.
epistle where he calls the Corinthians to unity? Before addressing this question, some additional inconsistencies, which present themselves within this reading of 9:1–14, will be highlighted and additional questions raised.

Brian Dodd argues Paul’s words in 9:1–14 would be construed as self-praise by the Corinthians, and that this type of boasting was highly offensive.68 Paul does not directly mention boasting in 9:1–14. However, there are several reasons why his words could be deemed boastful. First, Paul exalts himself above the Corinthians by highlighting his apostolic position and moreover his divine commission (9:1–2). Second, Paul appears to elevate himself above some of the other well-known apostles (9:5–6). Third, in light of his position Paul argues for his rights in such a way as to bring significant shame upon his audience (9:3–14). While self-praise was prized by some sophist,69 who likely had influence in Corinth,70 Paul had already gone to great lengths to stress the divine—human dichotomy in relation to boasting (1:26–31; 3:18–21; 4:6–7), which he reengages in 9:15–18. There is little doubt that Paul understood his many accomplishments as grace from God (cf. 15:10). There is no reason for him to boast in these accomplishments, since they are not primarily of his own doing. As Paul writes in 4:7: “What do you have that you did not receive? And if you received it, why do you boast as if it were not a gift?” Is Paul ignoring his own warning? Dodd’s solution to this quandary is to suggest that Paul is casting his boast in the form of a “fictitious” defence in keeping with Plutarch’s rules “On Praising Oneself Inoffensively,” which allows self-praise under certain conditions (Mor. 7.539-547).71 Nevertheless, Dodd’s explanation
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69 Plutarch, Mor. 7.547; Isocrates, Soph. 9-10, 19-20.
71 Dodd, Paul, 103-06.
does not actually address the seeming contradiction of Paul’s anthropocentric boast; it only makes it less offensive.

Another incongruity comes in Paul’s employment of ἐλεύθερος in 9:1, which is unusual in comparison with his other uses (7:21, 22, 39; 9:1, 19; 12:13; cf. ἐλευθερία in 10:29), and especially 9:19. With the exception of 9:1 and 9:19, all the other references to ἐλεύθερος pertain to socio-economic and legal status. Nevertheless, Paul employs them to emphasise eschatological identity and more specifically the transfer of identities which takes place as a result of ones’ union with Christ; “For whoever was called in the Lord as a slave is a freed person belonging to the Lord, just as whoever was free when called is a slave of Christ” (7:22). While Paul can speak of the freedom found in Christ (cf. Gal 2:4; 5:1), a more common self-designation is δοῦλος (Rom 1:1; Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1; cf. 3:5; 4:1, 2; 9:27). In 9:16–17, Paul’s use of the words “compulsion” (ἀνάγκη; 9:16; cf. 7:26, 37) and “unwilling” (ἀκων) in correlation with “stewardship/commission” (οἰκονομίαν; 9:17; cf. 4:1, 2) implies a deportment of servitude on Paul’s part, which shows him to be anything but free with regard to his eschatological calling. This focus is strengthened in 9:19—“For though I am free with respect to all, I have made myself a slave to all, so that I might win more of them.” Paul understands himself first and foremost as being a slave to Christ. As Peter Marshall writes: “His argument is as simple as it is astounding. ‘As an apostle I am a slave who has no rights at all.’” Thus Paul’s assertion in 9:19 carries a limitation 9:1 does not and raises the question of what Paul means by his claim to freedom in 9:1.

Finally, an irregularity can be seen between Paul Christophanic references in 9:1 and 15:8. Although ὁρῶ is employed in both, in 9:1 Paul uses the first person singular perfect active indicative (ἐδόρακα) rather than the third person singular aorist passive.
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72 Martin, *Slavery*, 82-83.
indicative (ὁφθη). The passive voice is significant not only in resurrection appearances (15:5–8), but also in other revelatory episodes.  

74 The LXX uses ὦφθη thirty-six times with all but six referring to theophanic events (or angelophanies) or persons reporting about previous theophanies. Likewise, of the eighteen occurrences of ὦφθη in the NT all but one refer to supernatural appearances to people. While there are some LXX uses of ὦράω in the active voice to report theophanies, they are the exception, not the rule. Philo captures this when he writes of Gen 12:7: “For which reason it is said, not that the wise man saw (εἶδε, aorist active indicative) God but that God appeared (ὁφθη) to the wise man; for it was impossible for anyone to comprehend by his own unassisted power the true living God, unless he himself displayed and revealed himself to him” (Abr. 17.80). Furthermore, the passive voice of 15:8 parallels Paul’s other Christophanic references; compare Gal 1:16 where God revealed his Son to Paul (cf. Gal 1:11) and Phil 3:12 where Christ took hold of Paul. Even in Second Corinthians, it is Christ who removes the veil that allows believers to behold the glory of the Lord (2 Cor 3:18) and God who takes the initiative to shine in our hearts (2 Cor 4:6). In each case but 9:1 the divine agency is made clear. However, in 9:16-17, Paul’s use of the present passive ἐπίκειται and perfect passive πεπίστευμαι in connection to his apostolic calling assumes divine agency. Paul’s nuancing of his Christophanic reference in 9:1 is regulated in 9:16-17.

74 Dunn, Jesus and Spirit, 108; cf. Witherington, Conflict, 301.
75 Wright, Resurrection, 323, surveys all eighty-five passive forms, forty-six of which “refer either to YHWH, or YHWH’s glory, or an angel of YHWH, appearing to people.”
76 Judg 19:30; Song 2:12; 1 Macc 4:6, 19; 9:27; 2 Macc 3:25.
77 Gen 12:7; 17:1; 18:1; 26:2, 24; 35:9; Ex 3:2; 16:10; Lev 9:23; Num 14:10; 16:19; 17:7; 20:6; Judg 6:12; 13:3; 1 Kgs 3:5; 9:2; 2 Chron 1:7; 7:12; Jer 38:3.
78 Gen 22:14; 48:3; 2 Sam 22:11; 2 Chron 3:1; Tob 12:2. Cf. Gen 1:9; Dan 8:1(bis); Baruch 3:22, 38.
80 Mt 17:3; Mk 9:4; Lk 1:11; 22:43; 24:34; Acts 7:2, 30; 13:31; 16:9; 1 Cor 15:5, 6, 7, 8; 1 Tim 3:16; Rev 11:19; 12:1, 3.
81 E.g. Gen 32:2; Judg 6:22; Isa 6:1.
It is intriguing that each of the inconsistencies highlighted in 9:1–14, apart from the division caused by Paul’s words in 9:5–6, can be resolved by Paul’s words in 9:15–23. Why is this? Interestingly, in a section (8:1–11:1) which addresses concerns raised by the Corinthians (8:1, Περὶ δὲ; cf. 7:182), and in which Paul employed many of the Corinthians’ own words and ideas (8:1, 4, 5, 6; 10:2383), it is always assumed chapter 9 represented only Paul’s words and convictions.84 Moving beyond this assumption opens up further possibilities for explaining the proposed discrepancies. Paul’s “defence” in 9:1–14 could reflects the attitude (and possibly the jargon) of some of the Corinthians who believe their knowledge, and even their social-economic position, gives them the right to do as they please. Paul’s use of ἐξουσία may be part of the Corinthians’ language rather than his. This is reflected in Paul’s shift to the second person plural in 8:9 (“this liberty of yours”), which contains Paul’s first use of ἐξουσία in this section. Additionally, if the saying “all things are lawful” (6:12; 10:23) are correctly attributed to the Corinthians,85 then the linguistic connection between ἐξεστίν and ἐξουσία86 may signal Paul’s play on words. There also appears to be a deliberate contrast between Paul’s use of δόναμις in 1:10–4:20 and his use of ἐξουσία in 8:1–11:1. The former is always connected to God and the latter evidences human attitudes. This proposal might also explain Paul’s reference to James and Cephas in 9:5–6. It seems at least conceivable that rather than Paul seeking to create division between the apostolic leadership, he is

82 Thiselton, First Corinthians, 32-34, 483.
84 A possible exception is, F. Stanley Jones, „Freiheit“ in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus: Eine historische, exegetische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), who believes Paul’s use of ἐξεστίν in 9:1 represents popular Hellenistic philosophical understandings and is used by Paul’s in response to the Corinthians’ use of the word in relation to idol food.
85 So Thiselton, First Corinthians, 460-61; Hurd, Origin, 68; Fee, First Corinthians, 251.
referencing an apostolic “right” the Corinthians have raised as a way of shaming Paul into accepting their patronage.

Paul’s argument is based on the Corinthians’ misconception of apostolic authority and is constructed as a way of showing the offensiveness of the Corinthians’ own boastful attitudes and actions toward one another.\(^87\) Paul accomplishes this by setting his perceived rights (ἐξουσία, 9:4, 5, 6, 12, 18) up as a kind of straw-man argument (9:1–14) in order to provide the antithesis in 9:15–23. Paul’s vehement retraction of authority in verses 12b, 15 makes the antithesis between these two sections clear. Even Fee, who argues strongly for a CCAA reading, “is somewhat taken aback that Paul, having so vigorously defended his rights to their support, now argues with similar emotion for his ‘right’ to give it up.”\(^88\) The interruption of verse 12b\(^89\) within Paul’s argument (9:1–14) speaks to the shear absurdity of Paul’s boasting. Paul would rather die (9:15) than put an “obstacle in the way of the gospel of Christ” (cf. 1:17; 2:1–5).

\(^{87}\) Although not necessarily agreeing with their conclusions, Mitchell’s, Witherington’s, and esp. Wueellner’s suggestion of a “mock” or “parodic” defence appropriately represents what I am suggesting. Quintilian defined parody as: “a name drawn from songs sung in imitation of others, but employed by an abuse of language to designate imitation in verse or prose” (Inst Orat 9.2.35 [Butler, LCL]) and that it was most powerful when it imitated real sayings or documents (Inst Orat 9.2.34 [Butler, LCL]). Furthermore, irony, a trope, was common in parody, which was a figure of speech, “But in the figurative form of irony the speaker disguises his entire meaning, the disguise being apparent rather than confessed. For in the trope the conflict is purely verbal, while in the figure the meaning, and sometimes the whole aspect of our case, conflicts with the language and the tone of voice adopted.” (Inst Orat 9.2.46 [Butler, LCL]). See also Margaret Sim, A Relevant Way to Read: A New Approach to Exegesis and Communication. (Eugene: Pickwick, 2016), 53-70. Using Relevance Theory, Sim argues for the importance of recognising verbal irony in Paul’s letters, which is defined as “an utterance or representation with which the speaker disagrees, but which is believed by his hearers or other participants” (53-54). She also gives this important warning: “It has been said by some who are nervous about attributing an ironic statement to biblical authors that such attribution is an attempt to get out of ‘hard’ sayings. In response, I would claim that the sayings are ‘hard’ because we do not recognise the speaker’s disassociating himself from such an opinion” (55, emphasis hers).

\(^{88}\) Fee, First Corinthians, 414.

\(^{89}\) Harry P. Nasuti, “The Woes of the Prophets and the Rights of the Apostle: The Internal Dynamics of 1 Corinthians 9,” CBQ 50.2 (1988): 246-64, explains the interruption of 9:12b by arguing vv. 13-14 carry a more personal connection to Paul’s commission and serve to anticipate vv. 15ff. This argument is unconvincing in light of Paul’s use of the more forceful conjunction ἀλλὰ in v. 12b.
There should be a clear distinction made between the language of “antithesis,” used above, and what some scholars deem a restraint, a refusal, or a renunciation of rights. Paul does not renounce certain rights for the sake of the body and the gospel. Instead, the antithetical nature of 9:15–23 shows that the boastful and selfish attitude of 9:1–14 is wrong, even while not denying the validity of some of the individual statements within. The first half of chapter 9 presents an anthropocentric attitude while the second half presents a Christ-centred attitude. By creating this contrast, Paul sets the example of moving from one sphere of reality to a new sphere; he models an eschatological reversal in attitude and action. This is similar to what Paul does in Phil 3:4–11. Therein Paul’s shifts from a previous confidence in the flesh to the new source of his confidence in Christ. However, in Phil 3, Paul’s list of previous confidences represents pre-Christophany understanding. Here, in 1 Cor 9, Paul speaks of apostolic rights, which appear to be post-Christophany perspectives, especially in light of his Christophanic reference in 9:1. Therefore, the parallel between 1 Cor 9 and Phil 3 only works if Paul is masking his apostolic rights in the human wisdom of some of the Corinthians. The active voice in Paul’s Christophanic reference in 9:1 may, therefore, speak to human boasting and reveal that Paul references this experience ironically.

4.2.3 Summary

I have tried to show that a CCAA reading of 1 Cor 9 is neither the only nor the most convincing reading of this passage. Instead, the “antithetical” reading set out above gives greater coherence to Paul’s rhetorical strategy. Throughout 8:1–11:1, Paul seeks to enlarge the Corinthians’ understanding of their union with Christ to include the body of
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91 Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 415-33.
92 Hays, First Corinthians, 152-55
93 Cf. Sim, Relevant, 56-57, 61-63, who argues 1 Cor 4:8 and 1 Cor 11:9 are cases of verbal irony.
Christ and the gospel mission. Only as they hold these three together are they embracing a correct eschatological identity. Paul’s personal example models this union. His Christophanic reference is a small part of a much larger argument. Paul’s claim to seeing the Lord in 9:1 uses irony as a negative example of human authority and freedom. Paul’s antithetical reference in 9:16–17, emphasises servitude to Christ through partnership with the gospel for the sake of the body of Christ. It advances a correct eschatological identity. Paul uses his own life to show the Corinthians the arrogance and offensiveness of their actions and attitudes toward one another and ultimately toward Christ (9:1–14). He then models an eschatological reversal (9:15–23), showing his own humility in imitating Christ’s sacrificial death for the sake of others (8:11, 13) and encouraging them to do the same (11:1). Part of being the eschatological people of God means one is not free with regard to the other (cf. 6:19). Paul’s attitude and actions sit in stark contrast to those of the Corinthians’ (cf. 8:9–12), showing him to be on the correct side of the divine—human divide and providing them with a correct model of eschatological reversal. By focusing the discussion around his eschatological calling in correlation with his reversal, Paul brings forth the Corinthians calling (1:2–9) and challenges them to this same eschatological reversal. In this way, Paul’s Christophanic reference functions both paradigmatically and didactically.

4.3 Exegesis of First Corinthians 15

4.3.1 The Context: First Corinthians 15:1–58
Paul’s Christophanic reference in 15:1–11 stands together with all of chapter 15 and the important subject of resurrection of the dead. Paul’s argument has been moving toward,
foreshadowing this crescendo (cf. 6:13b–14)\textsuperscript{95} wherein Paul addresses a vital element of the Corinthians’ eschatological reality and identity. As such, it flows tightly between a realized and future eschatology of resurrection\textsuperscript{96} and integrates themes developed earlier, especially union between Christ and believers and between believers and one another.

While containing vital theological themes, it serves a very pragmatic purpose addressing the fundamental issue of embodied faith, which is lacking in the Corinthians own secular-spiritualised and individualised actions. Their salvation is evidencing itself in outrageous acts of carnality rather than Spirit-led transformation and sanctification.\textsuperscript{97} Paul concludes the entirety of his argument with his clearest expression of how the eschatological event of Christ’s death and resurrection, and the believers’ connection to Christ, has shaped and continues to shape both the present and the future, both their beliefs and their actions, both their dying and living.

The external impetus for Paul’s immediate polemic is a group of Corinthians who denied ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν (15:12). Contextually, it may be concluded the Corinthians have (at least at one time) accepted Christ’s resurrection since Paul speaks of the Corinthians having “received” and “believed” the gospel message (15:1–3a), which would have included teaching about Christ’s resurrection (15:3b–5) and general (believer) resurrection (15:12–14).\textsuperscript{98} The main question is whether the Corinthians’ initial acceptance of Paul’s gospel included “bodily” resurrection or if they assumed a

\textsuperscript{95} See Wright, Resurrection, 277-97.
\textsuperscript{96} So Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 736. For an argument in favour of overrealized eschatology as well as survey of the literature see: Christopher M. Tuckett, “The Corinthians Who Say ‘There is No Resurrection of the Dead’ (1 Cor 15,12),” in The Corinthian Correspondence, BETL 125, ed. R. Bieringer (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 245-75; and Thiselton, First Corinthians, 40 and passim.
different conclusion based on their own cultural understanding of the term. Wright⁹⁹ and Alan Segal¹⁰⁰ demonstrate most Greeks and Romans believed in an afterlife (cf. 15:29) and a dominant view consisted of some sort of immortality of the soul apart from the body. Wright argues that both Jews and non-Jews only understood the concept of resurrection in terms of a bodily phenomenon; although the majority of non-Jews would have rejected the possibility of resurrection, they nevertheless would have understood the (Jewish) Pauline meaning of it.¹⁰¹ Paul’s language of ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν and his polemic in 15:35–50 suggests an argument around the “bodily” aspect of resurrection, which seems to assume an acceptance of the broad idea of resurrection apart from the specific element of corporeality (cf. 6:14; 15:1, 11).

It is more probable the Corinthians either initially misunderstood Paul’s teaching¹⁰² or recently came to abandon the bodily aspect of resurrection¹⁰³ they formerly accepted.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, since the thought of an embodied afterlife would be objectionable to most (cf. 15:50),¹⁰⁵ it stands to reason Jesus’ bodily resurrection would be at least equally objectionable. If the Corinthians are abandoning the idea of their own bodily resurrection, they may also be abandoning this same element with regard to Christ’s resurrection. Many scholars argue the latter while denying the former. They see the Corinthians denying their own bodily resurrection while fully accepting Christ’s
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⁹⁹ Wright, Resurrection, 32-84.
¹⁰⁰ Alan Segal, Life After Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 204-47.
¹⁰¹ Wright, Resurrection, 82-83.
¹⁰² Both Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 755 and Pheme Perkins, First Corinthians, PCNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 182, allude to the possibility of a misunderstanding about Christ’s bodily resurrection.
¹⁰⁵ Segal, Life, 425.
bodily resurrection. But this does not adequately explain why Paul includes 15:1–11 and especially the extended “appearance” list (15:5–8).

Matthew Malcolm argues that besides a disregard for the body there is a general disregard for the dead. This is not unique to the Corinthians but reflects wider Greco-Roman views about the inferior state of the dead. This disdain toward death and related concepts, leads to significant misunderstandings related to Christ’s death and the requirements of his followers and causes significant divisions among the body of Christ in Corinth. It is one thing to be conformed to Christ’s resurrection, quite another to be conformed to his death. For Paul, these two phenomena are inseparable; a person cannot understand the significance of the resurrection if they do not understand and accept the significance of death, both Christ’s and believers’.

4.3.2 Death and Resurrection: Dual Themes

The Corinthian’s attitude toward death helps explain what otherwise appears to be a perplexing secondary focus to resurrection in 1 Cor 15, namely death. Paul uses the adjective νεκρός thirteen times, the verb ἀποθνῄσκω five times, the noun θάνατος six times, and the euphemism κοιμάω four times. For comparison, in regard to
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109 1 Cor 15:12(bis), 13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 29(bis), 32, 35, 42, 52
110 1 Cor 15:3, 22, 31, 32, 36
111 1 Cor 15:21, 26, 54, 55(bis), 56
112 1 Cor 15:6, 18, 20, 51
resurrection. Paul uses the verb ἐγείρω nineteen times,113 the noun ἀνάστασις four times,114 and the euphemisms ζωοποιέω three times115 and ἀλλάσσω twice.116

In order to understand the importance of Paul’s “death” language, a brief analysis of how the language functions throughout the epistle becomes necessary. The adjective νεκρός is only found in chapter 15 and is always used in correlation with resurrection (e.g. ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν; νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται), always referring to those who have physically died irrespective of their standing in Christ. Dale Martin argues for the translation “corpse,” common in classical Greek.117 As an adjective, it does appear to need a qualifier, which is likely either “person” or “body.” Therefore, the translation “corpse” or “body” is justified. Paul uses νεκρός to stress the bodily aspect of the resurrection.

Paul’s use of ἀποθνῄσκω is much more nuanced. It can refer to literal physical death for both believers and non-believers (9:15; 15:32), and is especially used for Christ’s death (8:11; 15:3). Additionally, it can be used metaphorically, as when Paul says, “I die every day!” (15:31). These words are not a reference to physical death. Nor are they hyperbole, a way of saying his life is very difficult. Rather, Paul’s ἀποθνῄσκω is because of and in line with Christ’s ἀποθνῄσκω. The last two uses of ἀποθνῄσκω are more difficult to interpret: “for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ” (15:22) and “What you sow does not come to life unless it dies” (15:36). The context does not warrant construing these as reference to physical death. The former is part of an Adam/Christ typology and the latter an elaborate metaphor concerning the “changed” resurrection body; both are making a similar point. Those in Adam are marked by death, in the present and in the future, both physically and spiritually. Nevertheless, those in

113 1 Cor 15:4, 12, 13, 14, 15(thrice), 16(bis), 17, 20, 29, 32, 35, 42, 43(bis), 44, 52
114 1 Cor 15:12, 13, 21, 42
115 1 Cor 15:22, 36, 45
116 1 Cor 15:51, 52
117 Martin, Corinthian Body, 107-08 and see 271 n. 9 for a list of Greek sources.
Christ are made alive (ζωοποιέω) and freed from the finality of death both in the present and the future. Likewise, the seed which must die does so in order to be made alive (ζωοποιέω), changed from death to life both in the present and the future. This is an important point in Paul’s elaborate argument. He is not arguing all believers must or will die a physical death; he says the exact opposite in 15:51. Instead, Paul alludes to another type of death which all believers must undergo; a death Paul has undergone and continues to experience daily (15:31), a death to his own carnal desires, whether noble or self-serving. It is a death to the constraints of the present evil age, which allows for the embrace of a new eschatological age and with it a new eschatological identity.

Paul’s use of θάνατος is also quite versatile and closely aligns with ἀποθνῄσκω in regard to physical death in general (3:22; 11:26). However, in chapter 15, θάνατος is personified, similarly to how Paul personifies “Sin” in Rom 5:12–8:3. Paul describes “Death” in anthropomorphic terms as one who has come through Adam (15:21) and as an enemy waiting to be destroyed (15:26). Likewise, the poetic discourse of 15:54–56 (cf. Isa 25:8; Hos 13:14) is a mocking of Death, who has lost all power as a result of Christ’s resurrection and the impending resurrection of believers. Just as death to self is a plausible reality in the present through Christ, so too is the power of resurrection in the life of the believer. In effect, believers defeat the finality of physical death in the present as they acknowledge and live out the Lordship of Christ. This too is part of the new eschatological reality brought through Christ.

Paul uses the word κοιμάω, meaning to “fall asleep,” as a euphemism for death. For Paul it is not synonymous with ἀποθνῄσκω. The former is always used to refer to actual physical death, but only of believers in Christ. This is because κοιμάω “carries with it the expectation of awaking to a new dawn and a new day, i.e., the expectation of
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118 See Dunn, Theology, 111-14.
resurrection and the gift of renewed life and vigor.”119 It is to believers (ἀδελφοὶ)120 that Christ appears, both those living and those who have fallen asleep (15:6). Paul speaks about those who κοιμᾶω “in Christ” (15:18) and refers to Christ as the first fruit of resurrection for those who κοιμᾶω (15:20). When speaking about marriage, Paul says that it is the woman “in the Lord” who is free to remarry only after her husband, also “in the Lord,”121 falls asleep (κοιμᾶω), as long as her next marriage is “in the Lord” (7:39). Therefore, when Paul says “we will not all die (κοιμᾶω), but we will all be changed” (15:51), he means not all believers will face a physical death. This does not negate the need for believers to experience some type of death (ἀποθνῄσκω) in the present in order to be made alive in Christ (15:36).

Paul’s use of ἀπόλλυμι (to perish or destroy, used six times122) must also be evaluated. Similar to ἀποθνῄσκω and θάνατος, it can pertain to physical death or destruction (10:9, 10). It can also refer to the destruction of abstract phenomena such as wisdom (1:19). Unlike the others, it is exclusively reserved for unbelievers, those with no hope. Therefore, Paul can say the gospel is “foolishness to those who are perishing” (1:18), in reference to unbelievers. When he speaks of believers being destroyed by other believers (8:11), it is a reference to the shattering of their faith. The latter meaning helps clarify 15:18—“Then those who have died (κοιμηθέντες) in Christ have perished (ἀπώλοντο).” Paul argues if Christ has not been bodily raised, living believers remain in sin (15:17), no different from unbelievers. Furthermore, if Christ has not been bodily raised, then believers who have fallen asleep are actually dead, without hope.

119 Thiselton, First Corinthians, 1220, emphasis his.
120 Paul regularly uses ἀδελφός as a reference to those who are in Christ. See von Soden, “ἀδελφός,” TDNT 1:143-46.
121 That the deceased husband is a believer is clear from the passage. So Fee, First Corinthians, 355 n. 37. Such is also the case in 1 Cor 11:30.
122 1 Cor 1:18, 19; 8:11; 10:9, 10; 15:18.
4.3.3 Paul’s Example in First Corinthians 15:1–11

The opening section of 15:1–11 is importance in understanding how Paul employs death and resurrection to correct Corinthian misunderstandings of both. Unfortunately, many scholars read these verses, and especially 15:8–10, through a CCAA lens. For Kenneth Bailey, Joseph Fitzmyer, Fee, and others, Paul’s autobiographic insertion adds little to the current pericope, or to the chapter as a whole. But when CCAA is set aside, the importance of this pericope can be seen. It prepares Paul’s audience for his discussion concerning death and resurrection and Paul’s Christophanic reference provides an example for the Corinthians to emulate in the present. This is not an indictment of apostolic authority per se; Paul’s apostleship provides him with a platform for shaping the Corinthians understanding of human power and authority by stressing God’s power over his own.

It has been recognised that the ὀφθη references (15:5–8) form a chiasm based on grammatical structure and lexical repetition. However, there is a larger chiasm encompassing the entire pericope (15:1–11) and also based on thematic structure (see Appendix 1). Verses 1 and 11 frame this section around the themes of proclamation and belief. Paul’s use of γνωρίζω is meant to do more than “remind” the Corinthians of a previously accepted kerygma or to introduce new information about the gospel and resurrection. Paul begins this section by setting his argument in the form of a revelatory proclamation (cf. Gal 1:11). In so doing, Paul elevates the conversation and highlights the divine power behind the gospel he and others proclaim and behind the Corinthians’ previous acceptance of this same gospel. He is able to remind the
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124 Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 551.
125 Fee, First Corinthians, 719.
126 Cf. Bailey, Paul, 422.
127 Pace Fee, First Corinthians, 719; and Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 540, 544.
Corinthians τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην is a “demonstration of the Spirit and of power” and not a demonstration of “human wisdom” (2:4–5; cf. 1:17). Furthermore, γνωρίζω should be understood as introducing the whole of Paul’s argument (15:1–58) and not just this pericope. While much of the information introduced in 15:12–58 (esp. 15:35–58) is new to the Corinthians, Paul presents it as a continuation of the revealed gospel they have already received. It is part of the eschatological reality to which they now belong.

The focus on revelation does not negate the phenomena of tradition. Paul’s passing on what he also received (ὁ καὶ παρέλαβον; 15:3a) is a reference to the apostolic traditions handed down to him by other apostles. Debate arises around this topic, some seeing 15:3 as a contradiction of Gal 1:12, 16. But these statements are not at odds. Dunn shows that προσανατίθημι (Gal 1:16) carries the technical meaning of “consulting with someone who is recognized as a qualified interpreter about the significance of some sign – a dream, or omen, or portent.” Additionally, Dunn argues that ἱστορέω (Gal 1:18), which is usually translated simply “to visit,” bears the intended purpose of the visit as “gaining information.” While Paul did not need to consult any human to understand his revelatory experience (cf. Gal 2:6), he did visit Cephas (and James) with the purpose of gaining information about Christ and about the Church’s traditions.

Paul is not rejecting tradition, but rather elevating it to the level of revelation. Just as Paul received (παραλαμβάνω, 15:3) the traditions handed down to him from those in

131 Pace Churchill, Divine Initiative, 128.
133 Dunn, Jesus, Paul, 110.
Christ before him and through the study of the Scriptures,\textsuperscript{135} he in turn passes (παραδίδωμι, 15:3; cf. 11:23) these teachings to the Corinthians who both receive (παραλαμβάνω, 15:1) and believe (15:11). This reception is only made possible through the revelation of Christ to them by God through the Holy Spirit, which is part of the grace of God (1:4; 15:10). Both the transmission of tradition and the revelation from God occur simultaneously in the proclamation of the gospel (1:18; 2:4, 7; 4:1; 15:1, 11; cf. Gal 1:11–12; Rom 1:16–18). It is also clear Paul sees both elements as continuous. The Corinthians continually need to receive revelation from God through the Spirit (1:7; 2:10) and/via the apostolic teaching (15:1, 11).

The Spirit plays a vital role in Paul’s understanding of believers’ salvation and transformation. It is the Spirit who reveals (ἀποκαλύπτω) God’s wisdom to the believer, giving them the mind of Christ (2:10–16). Through the Spirit’s indwelling, believers join one another in participating in a singular temple identity (3:16; 6:19), having been washed, sanctified, and justified (6:11). It is through the Spirit believers proclaim the lordship of Jesus and participate in the one body receiving a “manifestation of the Spirit for the common good” (12:3–13). In 15:45, Paul brings together Christ and the Spirit (cf. Rom 8:9; 2 Cor 3:17, 18; Gal 4:6; Phil 1:19); the risen Christ is in some way identified with the life-giving Spirit of God (cf. Gen 2:7).\textsuperscript{136} This is not an amalgamation of the two but shows the ongoing work of the Spirit in the eschatological age, a work which includes the revelation of Christ.\textsuperscript{137}


The kerygma and extended appearance list (15:3–10a), which includes Paul’s Christophanic reference, form the climax of this section and begin the dual themes of death and resurrection which are explicated in 15:12–58. Argumentation over which phrases are Pauline and which are pre-Pauline creedal material is irrelevant to this reading.\(^{138}\) Whatever the origins of this material, Paul is arguing from a common held belief as a platform for what follows in 15:6–10. This does not mean the pre-Pauline material is insignificant, quite the contrary. Reference to Christ’s death and resurrection is of “first importance” (15:3).

Since Paul’s audience is rejecting a bodily resurrection, not resurrection in general, it is odd that Paul does not include reference to Christ’s body directly or via the empty tomb tradition.\(^{139}\) However, this may be intentional in order to emphasise the dual themes of death and resurrection. This does not mean bodily resurrection is unimportant, but Paul’s concern is not just in correcting the Corinthians’ erroneous theology. Throughout the epistle, Paul tries to shape their identity in order to motivate them toward genuine and lasting transformation in the present. In essence, Paul is trying to help them embrace their new eschatological identity as those who have died to their old life and have been raised to new life. This necessitates Paul’s theologically profound discussion concerning death and resurrection, of which Christ’s example is the architype.

Many hypotheses are set forth concerning the six resurrection appearances and the order in which they appear.\(^{140}\) Important here is the recognition that the list begins with Cephas and ends with Paul. Peter and his position are well-known in Corinth (cf. 1:12; 9:5) and Paul is the founder of this church (4:14–15). Since Paul’s apostleship is

---


\(^{139}\) Wright, *Resurrection*, 321, argues this is implicit with the resurrection language.

\(^{140}\) For detailed analysis see, Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1198-1208.
not being significantly questioned, their unified testimony concerning Christ’s resurrection is sufficient proof of this event (cf. Deut 17:6; 19:15). Additionally, Paul’s mention of the 500 witnesses with the extended description “most of whom are still alive, though some have died” (15:6), occupies the climactic position in this chiasm. Murphy-O’Connor recognises this climax, arguing that it best serves Paul’s apologetic purpose, not in arguing for his apostleship but for the reality of resurrection. He places the emphasis on the witnesses who are still living rather than on those who have died. This is a common reading for those arguing Paul addresses the issue of bodily resurrection. Those “still alive” are seen as authoritative witnesses to the resurrection. Conversely, those arguing Paul addresses denial of the futurity of resurrection emphasise “some have died,” and the reality that death precedes resurrection. In fact, this may not be an either/or but a both/and situation. Since the language of death and resurrection share equal footing, this reference provides Paul with another opportunity to stress both.

This explanation provides insight into Paul’s extended autobiography and Christophanic reference. When 15:8–10a is examined closely there are striking parallels with 15:3–5a. Most notable is the paralleling of Christ’s death and resurrection in Paul’s story. Paul’s description of himself as ἐκτρωμα (15:8) is difficult to interpret. Arguably, it is part of his “death” language. In Scripture, it is only found here and three times in the LXX (Num 12:12; Eccl 6:3; Job 3:16), where it always refers to a still-born child, and thus to literal physical death. Outside of Scripture, its use is well attested in Greek literature in reference to miscarriages, abortions, and possibly “untimely

142 Fee, First Corinthians, 730-31; Hays, First Corinthians, 257; Thiselton, First Corinthians, 1205-206; Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 550; Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 749-50.
144 See Garland, First Corinthians, 691-93, for a survey of prominent views.
births.” H. W. Hollander and G. E. van der Hout see Paul’s reference as self-depreciating, referring to his deplorable (death-like) state prior to his conversion when he persecuted the church: his unworthiness to be an apostle thus highlights the grace of God in calling him. David Garland, relying heavily on Hollander and van der Hout, but seeing Paul’s self-abasement as sincere, writes: “Before his call and conversion he was dead, but he was miraculously given life through God’s grace.” Paul’s use of ἐκτρόμομα to reference his own figurative death is not necessarily limited to his past life. After all, he writes, “I die every day!” (15:31); and from the immediate context it can confidently be stated Paul sees God’s grace as continually working in and through him (15:10) and not just at the moment of his call/conversion. Paul uses his own situation to underscore the necessity of (spiritual) death prior to (present) resurrection. This does not negate the surface issue of bodily resurrection. However, this surface issue allows him to address the more pressing theological issue that is dividing the community. The answer to most of their problems is a present death to self, to their own rights and positions. It is this action that allows them to fully participate in Christ and fully embrace their new eschatological identity.

In 15:3b, Paul refers to Christ’s vicarious death for sin “in accordance with the scriptures” (cf. Gal 1:4; 2:20), which alludes to Isaiah and parallels Christ and Paul. While the plural γραφὰς shows a broad concern for the whole biblical narrative, the most direct referent is Isa 53 (cf. Chapter 3). Paul subtly reveals his understanding of Christ as the Isaianic Servant who “died for our sins” and who was raised (15:4; cf. Isa

---

146 H. W. Hollander and G. E. van der Hout, “The Apostle Paul Calling Himself an Abortion: 1 Cor. 15:8 within the Context of 1 Cor. 15:8–10,” *NovT* 38 (1996): 224-36. Yet they too see Paul as using this to defend his apostolic position.
147 Garland, *First Corinthians*, 693; see also Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 552; Wright, *Resurrection*, 327-29.
149 So also, Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 747; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 724; Craig Blomberg, *First Corinthians*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 296.
52:13). This interpretation may also provide a lens for reading Paul’s Christophanic reference. While not as overt as those found in Gal 1, Paul’s words in 15:8–10 evidence some echoes of Isa 49:1–7. First, there is the shared language of καλέω and κενός (cf. Isa 49:1, 4). Second, Paul’s use of ἐκτρωμα is not a reference to just any kind of death but is specifically related to pregnancy, a death either in the womb or just outside the womb (cf. Isa 49:1, 5). Third, there is a divine emphasis in both passages; it is the work of God through the Servant which is highlighted. If Paul is echoing Isa 49 then it is ultimately governed by his allusion to Isa 53. Christ is the singular Servant who makes possible Paul’s obedience as one of the servants of the Servant. Paul’s own life, both his dying and rising as well as his divine calling, submission, and transformation is posited as a revelation of Christ’s power and transformation; and it is a model for the Corinthians to emulate.

Paul’s own example of a transforming grace both received and lived out provides a corrective to the Corinthians whose lives are marked by God’s grace, and yet appear to lack the necessary transformation which should serve as proof of God’s grace in their lives. Paul reveals this contrast by stating that his faith is not in vain, while the Corinthians faith is dubious at best (15:2, 10b). Through his own example, Paul calls the Corinthians to the same Christ-centred death, a death which leads to resurrection. In Malcolm’s words: “There can be no leaping ahead of present labour to manifest glory and immortality. Rather, the one pre-requisite for resurrection immortality is the inhabitation of death—Christ’s death—in the present.”¹⁵⁰ It is not enough for them to accept the gospel or to believe in the death and resurrection of Christ; they need to embody it and be transformed by it, both individually and corporately. This takes place as they die to themselves, to their own kind of wisdom, their own kind of power, their own kind of spirituality; as they die to the present evil age and as they presently live

under the resurrection power of Christ as part of a new eschatological people of God. By embodying the death and resurrection of Christ in the present they assure their faith is not without result (15:14) and their labour in the Lord is not in vain (15:58).

4.3.4 Summary

Paul’s Christophanic reference in chapter 15 reveal that both death and resurrection are part of the believers’ present calling. It is only as the Corinthians embrace the sacrificial death of Christ in the present that they are also able to embrace the transforming resurrection of Christ in the present. Paul’s own life, which is modelled after Christ’s, is an example of both these realities and he invites the Corinthians to walk with him in death so as to walk with him in life, both in the present and in the future.

4.4 Conclusion

Paul employs 9:1–2, 16–17 as part of the larger argument of 8:1–11:1, which seeks to transform the Corinthians’ thinking about their rights and freedoms in Christ. The first half of Paul’s Christophanic reference (9:1–2) functions both ironically and negatively. This negative example is balanced by the continuation of his Christophanic reference in 9:16–17, which functions positively to demonstrate the servant attitude necessary for those belonging to Christ. When taken together, 9:1–2 and 9:16–17 serve a didactic and paradigmatic purpose. Didactically, it evidences a new eschatological reality and seeks to teach the Corinthians the difference between human and divine attitudes and actions toward one another and toward the gospel message and mission. Paradigmatically, it provides a practical example of the necessary reversal for those united in Christ. While Paul’s calling is unique in its specific focus, nevertheless, all believers are called to glorify God by taking seriously their responsibility to the body of Christ and to the gospel of Christ.
Paul’s second Christophanic reference is part of a larger discourse on death and resurrection (15:1–58) designed to emphasise Christ’s actions as the norm for the Christian life; it too functions both paradigmatically and didactically. Just as Christ died and rose again, so too believers are called to die to their own anthropocentric desires in the present so as to experience resurrection life and power in the present. Paul’s Christophanic reference (15:8–10) emulates Christ’s actions by metaphorically portraying his own experience as one of dying and rising again by the grace of God. In so doing, Paul’s Christophanic reference becomes another example for the Corinthians to emulate. A second model of emulation may be found in Paul’s allusion to Isa 53 in regard to Christ and his echoing of Isa 49 in regard to his own experience. It is possible that Paul advances Christ as the suffering and exalted Isaianic Servant who ushers in a new eschatological reality and presents himself as one of the servants of this Servant. Didactically, Paul seeks to teach the Corinthians about the necessary transition from life to death to life, which must take place if they are truly to embrace their eschatological calling. Their previous lives, which include their socially conditioned ways of thinking and acting, need to be put to death so they can effectively live out of their new eschatological location and identity and in so doing love one another and Christ well.

Outside their wider literary contexts, both Christophanic references in 1 Corinthians are minor since they provide little historical data and lose their functionality. But when read in correlation with their larger sections and with the epistle as a whole, they strengthen Paul’s arguments by assisting the Corinthians in their understanding of what Paul is trying to teach them and then providing a paradigm they can follow in order to embody this particular teaching. Paul’s Christophanic references can, therefore, be said to be chiefly corporate in nature as they are not primarily concerned with gaining, maintaining, or asserting authority. Instead, Paul uses his own experience to shape the body of Christ and to further the Gospel.
Chapter 5

PAUL’S CHRISTOPHANIC REFERENCE IN PHILIPPIANS

Philippians 3:4–14 is the first example of a secondary Christophanic reference. While it appears deliberate, recognition by the Philippians that this is a Christophanic reference is not necessary for their comprehension of Paul’s meaning. As with the other references, Phil 3:4–14 is evaluated within its literary and socio-historical context in an attempt to better understand the purpose behind Paul’s employment of it. Unlike Galatians and 1 Corinthians, Philippians has no direct OT quotations and only a handful of allusions. This absence does not necessarily imply the scriptural illiteracy of the Philippians. While there is little evidence of a significant Jewish presence in Philippi (cf. Acts 16:13–14), the scarcity of scriptural citations may be based on the lack of “controversial issues of scriptural interpretation” in this community (cf. 1 Corinthians). Few details are known concerning the relationship between Paul and the Philippians; but it appears amicable as this group regularly supports Paul’s gospel mission in various ways (e.g. 1:7, 19; 2:25; 4:15–16). Therefore, at least limited teaching on the reading and study of the Jewish Scriptures by Paul to the Philippians may be assumed.

---

3 Pace Stanley, Arguing, 38-61.
5 Hays, Echoes, 21.
6 This may be evidenced in Polycarp’s confidence in the Philippians being “well versed in the Scriptures” (Pol. Phil 12.1 [Lake, LCL]), a letter written only a few decades later.
Paul’s Christophanic reference contains no OT allusions, which brings the validity of intertextual analysis in this chapter into question. Paul does, however, parallel 3:4–14 (esp. vv. 7–11) with the Christological narrative\(^7\) of 2:6–11\(^8\) and the latter contains multiple allusions to Isaiah.\(^9\) This raises the question of whether these same allusions are meant to impact the interpretation of Paul’s Christophanic reference; this will be addressed in the exegetical section below. In advance, a brief description of the theme of the epistle and an analysis of how Paul utilises the oppositional references and the Christological narrative as part of his overall strategy will provide the groundwork for a more fruitful evaluation of the Christophanic reference.

### 5.1 Preliminary Considerations

#### 5.1.1 The Occasion and Theme of Philippians

There is a variety of possible occasions for this “unified”\(^10\) letter, some ascertainable with relative certainty and others purely speculative.\(^11\) Based on the content and tenor of this letter, it is “fundamentally a progress-oriented, not a problem-solving discourse.”\(^12\) Paul desires for the Philippians’ continued growth toward Christlikeness and for the continued

---

\(^7\) While Phil 2:6-11 is often referred to as a “Christological hymn,” the term “Christological narrative” is used in this thesis to emphasize the larger Christ-story being posited by these verses.


\(^9\) The most liberal intertextual analysis on this connection is found in Lucien Cerfaux, “L’hymne au Christ—serviteur de Dieu (Phil. 2:6–11 = Is. 52.13–53.12),” in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux* Vol 2, BETL 6-7 (Gembloux: Duculot, 1954), 425-37.


\(^11\) See Flemming, *Philippians*, 27-29, for a list of the more likely occasions.

spread of the gospel in Philippi. The Philippians are experiencing a great deal of suffering, which is affecting their spiritual growth and their gospel effectiveness. Paul seeks to address these concerns by strengthening the Philippians’ understanding of their eschatological identity in the hopes this will strengthen their resolve. Paul’s argument strategically revolves around a series of examples, with Christ’s, then Paul’s examples holding the pinnacle positions. These two examples are bracketed with antithetical references to the Philippians’ opponents, which help distinguish eschatological identity from present-evil-age identity. Finally, the refrain of unity is seen throughout. Paul believes unity will help the Philippians overcome the spiritual impact of their suffering and will ultimately become part of their gospel witness.

5.1.2 The Philippian Opponents and Shaping Eschatological Identity

Since 2:6–11 and 3:4–11 form the heart of Paul’s argument and of the epistle as a whole, it is no accident that Paul frames these two pericopae with the four references to Philippian opposition (1:28; 2:15; 3:2, 18–19). In this way, he is able to show a marked difference between the Philippians’ new eschatological identity and the antithetical identity of their challengers. While various opponents have been suggested for each of the four references, the majority of scholars see at least two distinct parties with 1:28 and 2:15 referring to one group and 3:2 and 3:18–19 referring to another group. However, if

---

13 This includes active evangelism and possibly even preaching the gospel. See: Mark J. Keown, Congregational Evangelism in Philippians: The Centrality of an Appeal for Gospel Proclamation to the Fabric of Philippians, PBM (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008); Robert L. Plummer, Paul’s Understanding of the Church’s Mission. Did the Apostle Paul Expect the Early Church Christian Communities to Evangelize? (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 72-76, 134-35.

14 For an analysis of the theme of unity see Appendix 2.

Paul’s oppositional references are functioning as antithetical examples of eschatological identity, then the actual identity of these opponents is somewhat insignificant.\textsuperscript{16} Paul’s caricaturing of the opponents’ faults over and against the Philippians’ positive actions and attributes helps to unify them and to weakening the attraction of their opponents.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, it provides additional information and affirmation about their new identity. Not only are they those who “stand firm in one spirit, striving side by side with one mind for the faith of the gospel” (1:27), “children of God without blemish” who “shine like stars in the world . . . holding fast to the word of life” (2:15–16), and “the circumcision, who worship in the Spirit of God and boast in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh” (3:3), they are simultaneously not those set for destruction (1:28), not those who murmur and argue, not a “crooked and perverse generation” (2:14–15), not dogs, not evil workers, not the mutilation (3:2), and not enemies of the cross (Phil 3:18). In this way, the oppositional references continue to shape the Philippian’s eschatological identity.

5.1.3 The Christological Narrative and Shaping Eschatological Identity

The volume of literature written on 2:6–11 is witness to its importance within the epistle and to Christianity as a whole.\textsuperscript{18} Much of the scholarly debate revolves around


\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Helmut Koester, “The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment (Philippians III),” \textit{NTS} 8 (1961/2): 319-20, who comes to a similar conclusion saying the aim “is not to describe the opponents, but to insult them.” So also, Anthony J. Saldarini, “Delegitimation of Leaders in Matthew 23,” \textit{CBQ} 54 (1992): 659-80. Also see, Rupert Brown, \textit{Group Processes: Dynamics Within and Between Groups}, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 315-21. Brown’s sociological research on group dynamics may provide a lens for understanding the situation at Philippi. He argues that when a person who has entered a new social group continues to live among their old group, they must have a clear understanding of what makes them unique or the requisite for separation becomes untenable. The difficulty increases when there is no clear physical distinction (e.g. colour, dress, markings). The risk of re-assimilation is high, since previous social pressures persist and many previous social norms remain part of one’s new identity. Could it be that the Philippians find themselves in just such a situation?

\textsuperscript{18} For extensive bibliography see O’Brien, \textit{Philippians}, 186-88.
Christology, however, Paul’s primary aim is to shape the Philippians’ eschatological identity by reminding them of their eschatological foundations. This is similar to the reading put forth by Stephen Fowl who believes Paul employs the various hymns (i.e. Phil 2:6–11; Col 1:15–20; 1 Tim 3:16b) to remind and revise the community’s story to move them toward right moral belief and ethical action. Fowl’s hypothesis is astute, although this thesis argues Paul is more concerned with identity formation than he is with ethical behaviour, since the former births the latter.

These types of narrative genealogies are typical in the ancient world. Caroline Hodge shows how many influential people and even whole societies rewrote their foundation stories in order to bolster their identity. For example, one of Rome’s popular origin myths holds that her founders, twin brothers Romulus and Remus, were born of the god Mars and a royal Vestal virgin. Additionally, the Greek historian Dionysius rewrote Rome’s history showing they were descended from Greeks and not barbarians (RomAnt 1:9–70). In these various backstories, the importance of identity becomes evident. An important Roman colony such as Philippi (cf. Acts 16:12) would have prided itself in its place and power within Macedonia and the Empire. This may further strengthen the many proposals postulating that the Christological narrative stands in

19 Wright, Climax, 56-98; Dunn, Theology, 245-52; Martin and Dodd, Where Christology Began, passim; Gordon D. Fee, Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007), 370-400.

20 This reading does not depend on authorship of Phil 2:6–11. Although, the language and content of the pericope within the whole of the epistle seems to favour Pauline authorship. So Stephen Fowl, The Story of Christ in the Ethics of Paul: An Analysis of the Function of the Hymnic Material in the Pauline Corpus, JSNTSup 36 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 31-45; Wright, Resurrection, 228; Oakes, Philippians, 210.


23 Many of Fowl’s conclusions lean in this direction. Cf. Fowl, Story, 199-201.


antithesis to the Imperial Cult or the Emperor narrative;26 “Christ, not the Emperor, was now the true figure of authority.”27 The church needed to be reminded of their new backstory,28 which included unity in the face of suffering and ultimately hope in the midst of despair. Paul uses 2:6–11 for this purpose and in so doing seeks to reshape the Philippians’ eschatological identity. In the words of Hodge, “One way of describing Paul’s task as an apostle to the Gentiles is to say that he is rewriting their genealogies. Gentile peoples who follow Christ become brothers of Christ and descendants of Abraham. They are adopted into a new lineage and granted a new heritage.”29

Philippians 2:5 connects 2:1–4 and 2:6–11 with the underlying theme of unity. Debate revolves around how best to translate verse 5—Τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Walter Hansen shows how most translations fall into one of two categories, either emphasising the ethical aspect of the hymn—“Let this mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus”—or the doctrinal aspect—“Think this way among yourselves which also you think in Christ Jesus.”30 This is a false dichotomy, as Gorman demonstrates. He translates verse 5: “Cultivate this mind-set in your community, which is in fact a community in Christ Jesus.”31 Gorman underscores how Christ’s story ultimately defines the Philippians’ story, who are called to recognise and embrace this new eschatological reality of being “in Christ.”

While agreeing with most of Gorman’s outcomes, the following translation maintains the parallelism of the two clauses; “Each one of you should have this mindset

---

27 Oakes, Philippians, 170.
29 Hodge, If Heirs, 33.
30 Hansen, Philippians, 119-20.
in yourselves, which is the mindset you all already have in Christ.” The singular “each one” is garnered from the preceding context, which, while directed toward the whole community, speaks to the personal responsibility of each individual member. Paul’s emphatic call to same-mindedness in Phil 2:1–5 (thrice) suggests that this group is still acting more individually minded than corporately. This becomes clear in 2:3–4. Both verses are constructed of dual clauses with the “not…but” format emphatically positioned. In verse 4, the two clauses are divided by the participle, which governs both clauses.

3Nothing (do) according to selfish ambition not even vain glory (individual/negative)
Rather in humility consider one another as surpassing yourselves (corporate/positive)

4Not (just) each one looking out for yourselves (individual/neutral)
But also every one looking out for yourselves (corporate/positive)

A similar configuration occurs in 2:5:

5Each one of you should have this mindset in yourselves (individual/positive)
Which is the mindset you all already have in Christ (corporate/positive)

Paul does not view the individual as being fully consumed within the corporate body of Christ; rather, the individual has a personal responsibility within the whole. These verses move from the negative to the positive with regard to the role of the individual. In verse 3, the double negative of the first clause reveals a concrete prohibition and thus the ἀλλὰ carries adversative force. The believer in Christ is never allowed to act out of selfishness but must always act out of humility. In verse 4, the first clause is neutral, the individual is not prohibited from caring for themselves but is reminded of the priority of caring for the other. In this case, the ἀλλὰ followed by καί has continuative force. Finally, in verse 5, both clauses are positive with no conjunction separating them. The first clause invites the believer to embrace the reality of the second clause. In Christ, they enter a community that already possesses this Christ mindset (cf. 1 Cor 2:16; Rom 12:2).

However, the Philippians have not yet reached this goal (cf. Phil 3:12–13) because they
have yet to recognise the importance of unity within their eschatological identity. The Christological narrative is another step in this recognition.

While various aspects of the Christological narrative have been emphasised, not many underscore the unity between the Father and Son. Verse 6 states Jesus “exists in the form of God” (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων) and is “equal with God” (ἰσα θεό), although not wanting to exploit this connection. The background and meaning of μορφῇ θεοῦ is hotly debated. Most scholars agree it is grammatically connected to ἱσα θεῷ and both refer to Christ’s divinity, especially in light of the contrasting parallel of μορφὴν δούλου (v. 7). Paul expresses the unity between the Father and Son, since “[b]eing equal with God has to do especially with Christ’s sharing in God’s eternal glory and divine status.”

Moreover, unity is displayed in the mission of the Son. Christ’s kenosis, incarnation, slave-likeness, and death are all part of a divine mission of salvation. While soteriology is not explicit, or the primary purpose, it stands behind the description and reminds the Philippians what Christ accomplished and how this was accomplished. Paul’s reference to Christ’s exaltation (2:9–11) is not a reward or a promotion from the Father but confirmation of their shared mission and of the divine identity of the Father displayed through the Son. Paul declares Christ’s exaltation brings “glory to God the

---

36 Pace Robert Morgan, “Incarnation, Myth, and Theology,” in Martin and Dodd, Where Christology Began, 43-73; Dunn, Christology, 114-21; cf. Dunn, Theology, 281-88: for a slight revision of his position.
37 Flemming, Philippians, 113; Bockmuehl, Philippians, 132; Jürgen Habermann, Präexistenzaussagen im Neuen Testament (Frankfurt: Lang, 1990), 115.
38 Flemming, Philippians, 114.
39 Gorman, Inhabiting, 25-34, 122-23; Wright, Climax, 86-87; M. Sydney Park, Submission within the Godhead and the Church in the Epistle to the Philippians: An Exegetical and Theological
Father” (v. 11c). In this way, both are exalted since they each play an integral role within the divine mission.\footnote{Larry Kreitzer, “‘When He at Last Is First!’: Philippians 2:9–11 and the Exaltation of the Lord,” in Martin and Dodd, Where Christology Began, 121-22.}

The only explicit reference to suffering comes in verse 8 with the mention of Jesus’ death\textit{(bis)} on a cross, viewed as a disgraceful form of death by Gentiles\footnote{Martin Hengel, Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1977), 22-83.} and Jews\footnote{David Chapman, Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion, WUNT 2.244 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), esp. 41-222.} alike (cf. Deut 31:23). There are many other implicit references including Jesus’ self-emptying (v. 7a). Joseph Hellerman articulates the social humiliation of Jesus’ fall from “equal to God,” to slave, to death on a cross, which he describes as utter degradation.\footnote{Hellerman, Reconstructing, 130-48.} If social status is as important in Philippi as Hellerman purports,\footnote{Hellerman, Reconstructing, 88-109.} then Jesus’ humiliation would be viewed as a significant form of suffering, one in which followers of a crucified saviour likely shared. There is also the suffering of separation from the Father as well as the Father’s suffering, which stands behind the text.

resurrection and exaltation. For Christ-followers this is the natural progression (cf. 1 Cor 15).

Suffering is not, however, an end in itself. Both the Christological narrative of 2:6–11 and the suffering Servant text of Isa 52:13–53:12 speak of a deeper purpose behind this suffering. The Isaianic Servant suffers to make “intercession for the transgressors” (Isa 53:12) and to “make many righteous” (Isa 53:11) and this is carried out in willing submission to the Lord. Similarly, Paul presents Christ as a willing participant in God’s greater plan. While intercessory salvation and righteousness are not directly mentioned the allusion to Isa 45:23 in its literary context (45:22–25) carries these connotations:

22 Turn to me and be saved, all the ends of the earth! For I am God, and there is no other. 23 By myself I have sworn, from my mouth has gone forth in righteousness a word that shall not return: “To me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.” 24 Only in the Lord, it shall be said of me, are righteousness and strength; all who were incensed against him shall come to him and be ashamed. 25 In the Lord all the offspring of Israel shall triumph and glory. (NETS)

The work of the Servant of Isa 52:13–53:12 is the fulfilment of Isa 45:22–25.47

Furthermore, the work of Yahweh through the Servant ultimately leads to the triumph and glory of the offspring of Israel and the eventual shame of her enemies. This allusion would have brought hope to any Philippians who may have been educated by Paul in the Jewish Scriptures. Nevertheless, Paul leaves these concepts in the background. They are foundational but they are still secondary to what Paul is expressing through this Christological narrative. Paul emphasises the unity in mission over the actual mission. Christ’s suffering is seen as willing self-surrender for the sake of the mission. This is the mindset the Philippians are called to have both individually and corporately as they reside in Christ, the suffering Servant Saviour who is united in mission with the Father.48

---

47 Cf. Bauckham, Jesus, 208; Wright, Faithfulness: Book II, 683.
48 Cf. Ware, Paul, 229-33, who connects the Isaianic Servant, Christ, and Paul with regard to the eschatological mission to the Gentiles and argues Paul is encouraging the Philippians to join in this active (verbal) mission in spite of their suffering.
The Christological narrative reveals suffering is not just something the Philippians and Paul are experiencing. It is an important part of their backstory. They follow a suffering Servant Saviour who was exalted by the God of “power-in-weakness.” Yes, exaltation lies in their future (cf. 3:10–11, 21), but suffering defines their present reality and their present identity, not as victim but as a privilege granted by a gracious God (1:29). Their suffering is not meaningless; its purpose is to bring glory to God (1:11, 20; 4:20). Likewise, unity is part of their identity as those who have been called together to unite with the Father and Son in their mission. The example of Christ and the dual themes of unity and suffering, as modelled in the Christological narrative, provide a foundation for understanding Paul’s Christophanic reference.

5.2 Shaping Eschatological Identity in Paul’s Christophanic Reference

Like 2:6–11, Paul’s Christophanic reference in 3:4–14 is primarily about identity and is intended to reorient the Philippians toward understanding Christ as the source of this identity. Like the accounts of Timothy and Epaphroditus (2:19–30), Paul is the third and major example of one who has embraced the backstory of a suffering Saviour and who lives out of a new eschatological identity. Paul uses his own experiences as a way of revealing to the Philippians that Christ is also the primary source of their new identity. It is important they understand not only the correct source (Christ and not the flesh) but also the implications (transformation/co-formation) and purpose (Gospel/mission) of this new identity. Whereas Timothy and Epaphroditus stand as examples of what the Philippians are to embrace (unity and sacrifice), Paul’s autobiographical narrative aligns more closely to the backstory of Christ (2:6–11) and serves a much broader and important primary purpose—revealing the how.

49 Gorman, Inhabiting, 32.
This pericope is not about distinguishing the identities of Jews from Gentiles, but rather Gentiles from other Gentiles. Paul’s autobiographical references are couched in Judaism because this is his starting point and not because issues of Judaism (e.g. law, covenant, circumcision) are the focus. This passage should not primarily be studied for an understanding of Paul’s pre- or post-Christophanic beliefs about Judaism. Additionally, since Paul’s Christophanic reference is secondary, it should not be overemphasised as this too is not the primary focus.

5.2.1 Paul’s Past Confidence in the Flesh (vv. 4–6)

Paul begins his autobiographical account with a select list of his previous reasons for confidence in the flesh (cf. 2 Cor 11:21–23). They are designed to reveal Paul’s backstory and to bring the Philippians’ own backstories to the surface. Paul’s list, therefore, includes the important elements of “descent, geographic origins, and way of life,” which are essential to such narratives. The Philippians are probably not fully aware of the significance of all of Paul’s Jewish merits but could quickly relate them to their own fleshly markers, in which they too prided themselves, whether Greeks or Romans.

Most scholars see Paul’s seven-fold autobiographical catalogue (vv. 5–6) as unevenly divided between inherited (first four) and achieved (last three) merits, which

50 Pace Dunn, New Perspective, 470.
52 Hodge, If Sons, 36.
53 Peter Pilhofer, Philippi, Band 1: Die erste christliche Gemeinde Europas, WUNT 1.87 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 126, working off common Roman inscriptions makes the following comparison:

civis Romanus — ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ.
tribu Voltinia — φυλῆς Βενιαμίν
Cai filius — Ἐβραῖος ὡς Ἐβραίων
climax in the final statement—“as to righteousness under the law, blameless.” This interpretation tends to focus the argument around soteriology, and specifically a justification reading.\(^{54}\) Within the flow of Paul’s overall argument, this further isolates this chapter from the rest of the epistle. However, it is possible to view Paul’s fourth statement as the climactic declaration.\(^{55}\)

The phrase Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων is difficult to interpret having no parallels. Ἑβραῖος is only used two other times in the NT (2 Cor 11:22; Acts 6:1). The Acts reference makes a distinction between Ἑβραῖος and Ἑλληνιστής Jews,\(^{56}\) which may have been the difference between native Palestinians and diaspora Jews or as Martin Hengel argues, between Greek speaking and Aramaic/Hebrew speaking Jews.\(^{57}\) Many of Hengel’s conclusions rely on Luke’s uses of Ἑβραῖος (Acts 21:40; 22:2; 26:14),\(^{58}\) which do pertain specifically to the Aramaic/Hebrew language. Nevertheless, this reading should not automatically be applied to Paul’s statement in 3:5.\(^{59}\)

Ἑβραῖος is used forty-two times\(^ {60}\) in the LXX where it distinguishes Hebrews from other people groups, found both on the lips of foreigners and Israelites. It often focuses on the Hebrew’s connection to their God (e.g. Ex 3:18; 5:3; 7:16; 9:1; 1 Sam 4:6; 2 Macc 7:31; 11:13) and to servitude (e.g. Gen 39:14; Ex 1:15; 21:2; Jer 41:9, 14; Jdt 14:18). The latter is best demonstrated by the fact the LXX translates Ἰσραήλ, found thirty-four times in the MT, with some form of Ἑβραῖος in all but six\(^ {61}\) instances and in three of

\(^{54}\) N. T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 119, 124-25, correctly argues this pericope is not about soteriology but ecclesiology.


\(^{60}\) This includes nine variations of Ἑβραῖος (Ex 1:16, 19, 22; Deut 15:2; 1 Sam 4:9; 13:19; 14:11; 17:18; Jer 41:9).

\(^{61}\) Gen 14:13; 1 Sam 13:3, 7; 14:21; 29:3; Jonah 1:9.
these the LXX instead translates it with the word δοῦλος (1 Sam 13:3; 14:21; Jonah 1:9). Furthermore, Εβραῖος is similarly used in other Jewish literature⁶² to distinguish Israelites from Gentiles and especially in the Diaspora.⁶³ A certain degree of nationalistic pride appears to be associated with this moniker. Their identity is tied to their service of the true God and this distinguishes them.

This fits the current context where Paul thrice speaks about confidence in the flesh (3:3b–4). It correlates to the same theme Paul has already introduced thrice before (1:6, 14; 2:24), but which stands in opposition to the current context because therein confidence is solely grounded in Christ and not the flesh. Paul’s use of Εβραῖος εξ Εβραίων is a prideful statement which emphasises the previous source of his confidence. It is akin to saying a “man’s man.” Paul is a “Hebrew’s Hebrew”; from a Jewish worldly perspective, he is a step above the rest, par excellence.⁶⁴ This is similar to Paul’s self-ascription in Gal 1:14—“I advanced in Judaism beyond many among my people of the same age, for I was far more zealous for the traditions of my ancestors.” This fourth declaration helps balance and focus the interpretation of the other six merits; Paul is “boasting in the flesh.”⁶⁵

Dunn may be correct to emphasise that Paul’s first three credentials focus on ethnic identity.⁶⁶ Additionally, although the final three badges are more individually focused, Paul’s polemic is not primarily against “self-achieved righteousness.”⁶⁷ Instead, Paul highlights both inherited (corporate) and achieved (individual) merits, which define identity. By climaxing this list in the fourth declaration, he illustrates how each is

---

⁶² E.g., it is found 310 times in Josephus and fifty-eight times in Philo.
⁶⁴ Wallace, Greek, 103 n. 84, says this construction may be classified as “the genitive in relation to a par excellence noun.”
⁶⁶ Dunn, New Perspective, 474-76.
⁶⁷ Dunn, Theology, 370. Contra, Kim, New Perspective, 75-81; Ortlund, Zeal, 154-62. Cf. Dunn, New Perspective, 480, where there is a semi-retraction of his previous statement.
grounded in the same source, namely an overconfidence in the flesh. This does not necessarily mean Paul previously viewed his Jewish pedigree as a source of pride or as grounded in the flesh. The hyperbolic nature of Paul’s argument (esp. 3:8b) is designed to highlight the extremes between his past and present worldview and thus between “this age” and “coming age” realities; he sets up a divine—human dichotomy. From Paul’s eschatological position in Christ, all “this age” realities appear to be grounded “in the flesh” and all sources of identity other than Christ are lacking, even Torah, even Roman citizenship. As Nijay Gupta’s writes: “Paul does not condemn boasting in the flesh because it is inherently wrong, but because it has been exposed to be an outdated mode of operation.”

5.2.2 The New Source of Paul’s Confidence (vv. 7–11)

Paul moves to speak of the effect of gaining Christ. Having entered into a new eschatological age, Paul embraced a different perspective by which to view his past life in the past age. Paul’s shift to demoting his merits in light of his relationship to Christ would be both difficult and freeing to his Philippian audience. Paul’s point is not that these fleshly gains were necessarily bad; any could have value based on ones’ starting point. Paul seeks to shift their starting point from primarily being defined by previous backstories, which were grounded in the flesh, to being defined by their new backstory, which is grounded in Christ.

Paul’s opening statement (v. 7) frames the important categories of “gains” (κέρδος) and “losses” (ζημία). Here, the merits of verses 5–6 are fully in view. He does not deny their value, past or present (e.g. Rom 11:1–2; 2 Cor 11:22–23; cf. Rom 3:1–2, 9:1–5), only states διὰ τῶν Χριστοῦ they have now been transferred to the loss column.

---

68 Nijay Gupta, Worship that Makes sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul’s Cultic Metaphors, BZNW 175 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 146, see also 141–48; Similarly, Donaldson, Paul, 298.
At this point, the comparison is not between Christ and flesh but between earthly gains and losses. Paul’s wording places Christ and loss in the same column reminding the Philippians that suffering is intrinsically tied to Christ (2:6–8) and thus to all believers (1:29–30). This point is further underscored in verse 8 where Paul twice more credits Christ as the reason for his having suffered loss (ἐξημιώθην; cf. 1 Cor 3:15; 2 Cor 7:9). This may cause the Philippians to reflect on Paul’s earlier statement in 1:21 and to recognise its significance—to live in Christ means suffering, but to die (the ultimate loss) in Christ means gain (κέρδος).

Verse 8a forms the climax of Paul’s loss-gain metaphor as evidenced by the emphatic construction (ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε καὶ)⁶⁹ and the fact the rest of verses 8b–11 build off and further this statement. Paul’s regarding of “all things” as loss includes his ethnic merits and past achievements, but it also includes all fleshly confidences, past, present and future, including the Philippians’ ethnic and achieved merits.⁷⁰ Judaism is “not the sole target of Paul’s rhetoric.”⁷¹ Instead, Paul seeks to draw his audience into an understanding of how the “surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus” renders all other criteria impotent. Christ has become the new source of their identity and this identity is grounded in Christ’s suffering and includes their own suffering.

Suffering is but one aspect of their story with the other being the “gain” that comes through their union with Christ. Paul’s construction places “knowing Christ Jesus” in the “gains” column as evidenced by the parallel phrase “in order that I may gain Christ and be found in him” (v. 8b). While gaining Christ and knowing him are equal, the notion of being found in him takes this relationship to another level and

---

⁶⁹ O’Brien, Philippians, 386.
expresses a profound union (cf. 2:5). Even here, Paul makes union with Christ the goal behind the sacrifice of “all things” and the recognition of these things as rubbish (ἵνα Χριστὸν κερδήσω). In this way, Paul is able to acknowledge the previous value of past confidences as well as the pains of present loss. Simultaneously, he reminds the Philippians that because of their union with Christ, their gain far surpasses their losses, and to the extent their losses may be regarded as σκύβαλα.

Paul’s use of σκύβαλα is aimed at the source of his past confidence, namely “the flesh,” and not specifically at the merits listed in 3:5–6. This is confirmed by verse 9 where the contrast is between righteousness sourced in Torah and righteousness sourced in the faithfulness of Christ (cf. Gal 2:16). The fact verse 9 continues to articulate verse 8a shows how Paul’s construction intentionally places the former in the “losses” column and the latter in the “gains” column. Torah functions as part of Paul’s story of fleshly confidence as underscored by his use of the emphatic possessive pronoun ἐμὴν. Paul expects the Philippians to fill in the blank from their own contexts, e.g. “not having a righteousness of my own that comes from Roman citizenship.” Therefore, “to know,” “to gain,” and “to be found” in Christ are all part of having a righteousness which comes through the faithfulness of Christ, which is based upon faith. This latter use of faith is a reference to human faith, which derives from and correlates to Christ’s faith, and distinguishes it from confidence in the flesh.

---

72 C. Campbell, Paul and Union, 233-34.
73 Here, ἵνα plus the subjunctive denotes either purpose or purpose-result. For the latter see, Wallace, Greek Grammar, 473-74.
74 Cf. Flemming, Philippians, 167.
76 Bockmuehl, Philippians, 213; O’Brien, Philippians, 400; Foster, “Πίστις Χριστοῦ,” 109.
77 Cf. Wolfgang Schenk, Die Philippbriehe des Paulus: Kommentar (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984), 250-51, who argues the chiastic structure of verse 9 places ἐμὴν and ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει as contrasting corollaries.
It is now evident verses 8–9 forms a neatly presented pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[Ἀλλά] ἄτινα ἦν μοι κέρδη,</td>
<td>ταῦτα ἡγημαι διά τὸν Χριστὸν ζημίαν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ἄλλα μενοῦγε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι πάντα ζημίαν εἶναι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>διὰ τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου μου,</td>
<td>δι᾽ ὑπὸ τὰ πάντα ἐξημιώθην, καὶ ἡγοῦμαι σκῦβαλα ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ἵνα Χριστὸν κερδήσω καὶ εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ἄλλα τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paul begins by framing the two categories, linking loss to Christ (1). He then develops the categories further, always beginning with loss (2, 4) and moving toward the source of this loss (Christ), while identifying it as a gain (3, 5). This seeming paradox models Christ’s suffering and death prior to resurrection and exaltation. In the final two segments (6, 7), Paul reveals what ultimately is lost is confidence in the flesh (ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην), which capitulates to confidence in Christ (διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ). While Paul is specifically speaking of his own story, he does so to move the Philippians toward viewing all things from the perspective of being in Christ and from this perspective toward recognising that loss and suffering are proof of their union with Christ.78 This does not mean all suffering demonstrates this union, only those losses patterned after Christ’s willing obedience to the Father for the sake of the shared mission (cf. 2:6–11).79

This understanding is solidified in verses 10–11, which more fully articulate the correlation between Christ and suffering and advances the believers’ relationship from

78 Similarly, Bloomquist, Suffering, 181.
79 Stephen E. Fowl, Philippians, THNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 156.
union to participation. Paul’s goal is to know (τοῦ γνῶναι)τοῦ γνῶναι Christ more fully, which means knowing both “the power of his resurrection” and the “sharing of his sufferings.” Fee is correct, these “two go together hand-in-glove” and cannot be separated. Since Paul has already experienced this surpassing value (v. 8a), it must be possible for the Philippians to experience both of these phenomena in the present, through the Holy Spirit (cf. 1:19; 3:3). This is what Paul tries to make clear to them. They have experienced Christ’s suffering but this also means they have experienced the power of his resurrection. That Paul and the Philippians can currently participate in these phenomena is further proof of the eschatological age and of their eschatological identity.

With the phrases “becoming like him in his death” and “if somehow I may attain the resurrection from the dead,” both phenomena are recapitulated and advanced forming an important chiastic structure. Paul frames suffering with resurrection, both its present power and its future hope. The Philippians need assurance that suffering is not the end all (cf. Rom 8:17–18). Suffering is part of their eschatological calling but so is resurrection. Here the Philippians are reminded of their backstory, Christ was obedient to death but he was exalted to the glory of the Father (2:6–11). While this is an important truth, which the Philippians need to hear (cf. 3:21), it is not the focus of this passage, or of this epistle. Here the focus is the present, which needs to be shaped both by past realities and future hopes.

Paul’s use of κοινωνίαν and συμμορφομένος (3:10) in connection to Christ’s suffering and death is powerful imagery which denies all earthly reasoning. It is hard to

---

81 Bloomquist, *Suffering*, 179, notes the reversal in Paul’s current argument where we would expect suffering to come before resurrection.
82 Fee, *Philippians*, 331.
84 Cf. Rom 6:5; 1 Cor 15; Phil 2:8-9. Marvin R. Vincent, *The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985), 105, writes: “The order of arrangement here is the true one. The fellowship of the sufferings follows the experience of the power of the resurrection.”
imagine Paul putting a more positive spin on suffering than he does in this beautifully articulated declaration. Suffering has purpose and meaning which can only be understood, experienced, and even desired as one resides in a new eschatological reality where Christ is the source of identity. Furthermore, being “formed together” in his death brings identity to a completely new level. Believers who embrace such transformation reflect not their own suffering but the sufferings of Christ in their present life. This is reminiscent of Paul’s words in 2 Cor 4:8–11. In this way, suffering is tied to proclamation of the gospel. This gives greater depth to Paul’s use of κοινωνία, linking it to the other uses of the κοινων-root, which highlight suffering for the sake of the gospel (1:5, 7; 4:14, 15; cf. 1 Cor 9:23). Paul’s pathos is meant to move the Philippians toward a similar desire (3:17), which will further unite them together as the eschatological people of God (3:15) who are called to participate together in the proclamation of the gospel.

5.2.3 The Impact of Christ-Identity (vv. 12–14)

Paul concludes his autobiographical retelling by underscoring his determination to live out the fullness of his eschatological calling. Paul’s reference to not having fully taken hold of or arrived at the goal (τετελείωμαι; 3:12) looks backwards (Ωὐχ ὅτι)86 to 3:10–11 and does not just refer to resurrection87 but equally to his being formed together with Christ in his death. Paul is not seeking martyrdom88 or some fulfilment of “the pattern of Christ’s suffering”;89 although, he is prepared for such an end (1:20–23; 2:17; cf. 2 Cor 1:8–9; 4:8–12; Col 1:24). Rather, verses 12–14, along with the εἰ ποιῶς90 of verse 11, are a

86 Fee, Philippians, 342 and n. 17.
87 Pace Williams, Enemies, 196-97.
88 Pace Ernst Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philipper, KEK 9.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), passim.
90 Flemming, Philippians, 176.
reminder of the ongoing commitment needed by followers of Christ (cf. 2:12) and also of God’s commitment to them (3:12b; cf. 2:13).

It is because God has “taken hold” (κατελήμφθην) of Paul that Paul is so determined to take hold (καταλάβω) of Christ (3:12). This is a reference to Paul’s Christological experience and closely connects this section to 3:5–11. Paul does not change subjects, only metaphors. He moves from the accounting language of κέρδος and ζημία to the athletic language of καταλαμβάνω, σκοπός, and βραβεῖον.191 (cf. Rom 9:30–32; 1 Cor 9:24–27). There may be a significant parallel between Paul’s use of κερδαίνω and καταλαμβάνω. Just as Paul is willing to suffer the loss of all things in order to gain (κερδαίνω) Christ (3:8), so too he is willing to pursue (διώκω), to forget (ἐπιλανθάνομαι), and to strain (ἐπεκτείνομαι) in order to take hold of (καταλαμβάνω) Christ (3:12–13). Paul illustrates how continued union with Christ is not maintained through passivity but through active participation, even with the same vigour one previously pursued past confidences (cf. 3:6; διώκω) sourced in the flesh; this is the impact of being in Christ. Paul’s striving provides the Philippians with a model for their own continued striving toward the goal and prize of fully knowing Christ Jesus.

Verse 15 is an important transition as Paul reveals all he has been sharing is connected to the Philippians’ own situation and to their eschatological identity. Paul refers to them as the “mature” (τέλειοι), a play on the already/not yet reality of their identity; they are those who actively pursue Christ, but have yet to fully reach their goal (τετελείωμαι; 3:12; cf. 2:5). Paul reminds them that this same-minded (τοῦτο φρονόμεν) pursuit both unites them and distinguishes them from those who are different-minded (ἐτέρως φρονεῖτε; 3:19). Just as Christ revealed himself to Paul in the Christophany, God continues to reveal (ἀποκαλύπτει) himself to believers as they continue to “hold fast” to

---

Christ (3:16) and as they join together in imitating Paul, Timothy, Epaphroditus and all who reflect the story of Christ (3:17; cf. 1 Cor 4:6; 11:1; 1 Thess 1:6; 2:14). The Philippians have shown they are not enemies of the cross of Christ (3:18), but citizens of an eschatological kingdom and its suffering Saviour Servant (3:20; 2:6–11). Christ is the source of their present identity, the one who is already beginning to form them together (σύμμορφον) as a unified body which reflects the gospel and Christ’s glory (3:21), both in their suffering and in their constant striving together toward the goal of full union in Christ in their present resurrection living.

5.2.4 A Closer Look at Paul’s Christophanic Reference

The verbal\(^{92}\) and thematic\(^{93}\) connections between the Christological narrative and Paul’s own story are significant. Like Christ, Paul’s privileged status (3:5–6; cf. 2:6) is surrendered for the sake of the mission (3:7–9; cf. 2:7–8) with a hope of future exaltation (3:10–14; cf. 2:9–11). Nevertheless, multiple differences exist. First, Paul’s “privilege” is ultimately religious and is sourced in the flesh. Therefore, this “privilege” is actually part of a negative example.\(^{94}\) Second, Paul’s “loss” began involuntarily,\(^{95}\) when Christ “took hold” of him (3:12), and only later moves toward a willing relinquishment of these fleshly benefits. Thus, Christ is actually the motivation for Paul’s transformation. Third, Christ is also the source of Paul’s righteousness and faith. This narrative is foremost about what Christ has done in and through Paul and only secondarily about what Paul has and is doing in light of this union. Fourth, Paul does not appear overly concerned with exaltation or even with future resurrection. His concern is for the present and for a deeper union with Christ in all things, including death and resurrection. The Philippians

\(^{92}\) See Bloomquist, *Suffering*, 165.

\(^{93}\) See Williams, *Enemies*, 236-41.

\(^{94}\) Williams, *Enemies*, 168.

\(^{95}\) Cf. Bloomquist, *Suffering*, 166, 169, who insinuates that Christ’s actions were involuntary.
are reminded that Christ is the archetype and Paul, along with Timothy and Epaphroditus, merely an example, who is emulating Christ.

Paul’s example becomes an attainable model by which the Philippians can imitate Christ (cf. 3:17; 4:9). Paul does not elevate himself to being equal with Christ (another difference). Instead, he descends from what might otherwise be seen as a lofty apostolic position to align himself with every other believer in Christ. This may account for Paul’s lack of reference to his apostleship (ἀπόστολος) in this epistle, a rare omission, only here and in Philemon.  

Additionally, it may give explanation as to why the only use of ἀπόστολος in this epistle is targeted at Epaphroditus (2:25). Many downplay this epithet claiming it unequal to Paul’s apostleship and instead refers to a messenger commissioned by a local congregation for a particular task (cf. 2 Cor 8:23). However, Epaphroditus is also described by the term λειτουργός (cf. λειτουργία Phil 2:17, 30), priestly language Paul uses to describe his own divine commission “to be a minister (λειτουργός) of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles in the priestly service (ἱερουργέω) of the gospel of God” (Rom 15:16). It may be time to revisit Gerald Hawthorne’s often dismissed claim:

Paul, in harmony with the whole message to the Philippians, carefully chooses this word to stress again that relationships within the church must not be measured in terms of superiority or inferiority, but of equality. Epaphroditus is equally an “apostle” with Paul in that both were men commissioned and sent out with full authority to perform specific tasks of service.

Paul elevates a member of the Philippian community specifically commending him for modelling a Christ-like willingness to suffer and even die for the work of Christ (2:29–

96 This includes the disputed Pauline epistles.
In one respect, this shows Paul’s willingness to share the authority given to him through his Christophanic commissioning. In another sense, this reveals to the Philippians the significance of their eschatological position in Christ. They are neither limited by their worldly positions nor defined by their current physical situations. In Christ, they share a similar calling as Paul’s to embrace unity in the midst of suffering as they participate in the missio Dei.

Paul makes a similar but more overt connection between Timothy and himself with regard to their shared status as δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (1:1; cf. 2:22). The significance of this epithet in this epistle should not be overlooked as it provides an important link between the Christological narrative and Paul’s Christophanic reference. Paul’s identification as δοῦλος in a prescript is rare (i.e. Rom 1:1; Phil 1:1) and is only found here in the plural. This designation foreshadows Paul’s reference to Christ in 2:7, which alludes to the suffering Servant of Isaiah. While 3:4–14 does not utilise the word δοῦλος, the concept of servitude to Christ is seen in Paul’s use of κύριος (3:8), a correlative (cf. Matt 10:24–25; John 13:16; 15:15; 2 Cor 4:5; 2 Tim 2:24; Jas. 1:1). This is confirmed in the servile actions of Paul for Christ (3:7–8) and the phrase κατελήμφθην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] (3:12). The latter projects a vivid picture of Paul’s involuntary seizure by Christ (cf. Mark 9:18; John 8:3; 1 Thess 5:4). Paul’s Christophany subtly and briefly comes to the forefront to remind the Philippians of their own radical conversion experiences where Christ took hold of them through the proclamation of the Gospel by Paul and ultimately through the Holy Spirit, who “is the key to their unity” (cf. 2:1; 3:3). They too have been made slaves of Christ for the sake of the gospel (1:29; 2:5, 12–16; 3:17).

---

100 Hawthorne and Martin, Philippians, 163; cf. O’Brien, Philippians, 44-45.
101 Harris, Slave, 90-91.
102 Fee, Empowering, 754.
While no direct allusion to the Isaianic passage is found in Paul’s Christophanic reference, the above link provides an indirect reference via the Christological narrative. If this connection is allowed, then a further, more direct echo of Isaiah may be found, which gives further clarity to Paul’s self-understanding and how this identity encompasses all believers. A case can be argued for viewing Paul’s words in 3:9 as echoing Isa 53:11 (MT). The Isaianic Servant, through his actions, extends his righteousness to the many. The Servant’s vicarious suffering does more than atone for sin and provide salvation; it provides a means for transformation and then for participation in the Servant’s mission. In Paul’s understanding, the Servant provides a new eschatological realm of existence and identity. As Paul is found in Christ, he takes on God’s righteousness, which comes through the faithfulness of Christ and which transforms his own identity and actions to align with the mission of Christ, the suffering Saviour Servant. Paul’s impassioned declaration in 3:10–11, while linked directly to Christ’s example in 2:7–9, may also echo the intertextual allusions to Isa 52:13 and 53:12. It may be a way for Paul to evidence his having embraced the mission of the Servant.

This depiction does not concern Paul alone. As Gregory Bloomquist writes: “Paul uses the Servant Song material to depict servants.” Like Paul and Timothy, the Philippians must embrace their identity as servants of the suffering Saviour Servant Christ, and must embrace their calling to carry out the mission of the Servant, which, for them, begins with their deeper embrace of unity in the midst of their suffering. This extension of the “servants” status to the Philippians is at least partially evidenced in 1:11, which references the Philippians preparedness for the “day of Christ.” Paul’s words

---

103 The LXX translates the MT in a way that does not emphasise the extension of the Servant’s righteousness.
104 Bloomquist, Suffering, 167.
parallel 3:9 and thus Isa 53:11. The Philippians will be pure and blameless because they have been filled by Christ with the fruit of righteousness.

Additionally, Paul’s command to be “imitators together” (συμμιμητής; 3:17) of himself and others is a significant part of Paul’s argument and is specifically geared at the “mature” (τέλειος) who are called to be of the “same mind” (τοῦτο φρονεῖτε; 3:15; cf. 2:5). This message is difficult as the idea of being a slave would be unpopular. However, Paul is not asking them to do anything more or less than what Christ himself has done. In the Christological narrative δοῦλος is poetically paralleled with ἄνθρωπος implying being human is equal to being a slave.\(^{105}\) Paul makes similar claims in other places with the result being that believers are called into servitude to God (cf. Rom 6:15–23; 1 Cor 7:21–23; Gal 4:3, 8–9). Christ is the architype, and Paul follows in his example inviting others to do the same. Paul, while further down the path than the Philippians, shows his maturity by his active pursuit toward the goal (τελειῶω; 3:12) of “same mindedness” (τοῦτο φρονεῖτε) with Christ (2:5; cf. 3:15), which has already been shown to include unity in the midst of suffering for the purpose of mission.

The level of maturity evidenced by the Philippians is a likely reason for Paul’s secondary reference to his Christophany. Paul has no need to speak to this group about conversion as they have already shown their connection to Christ and his mission through their support of Paul and through their suffering for the gospel. This may also explain why soteriology is not the emphasis of the Christological narrative. Nevertheless, Paul does need to articulate a path toward greater union and participation with Christ and his mission, which begins with greater unity amongst the Philippians in their shared plight. Paul’s Christophanic reference helps illustrate how they can more fully embrace their eschatological identity in Christ by continuing to die to themselves and by

continuing to allow their lives, their being and doing, to be defined by their founder’s story.

Paul’s statement in 3:15b is intriguing in light of what is known about Paul’s Christophany from other places (esp. Gal 1:11–17). He writes: καὶ εἰ τι ἐπέρως φρονεῖτε, καὶ τοῦτο ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν ἀποκαλύψει. Paul recognises there may be some who will be of a “different mind” than him or Christ but he assumes God’s revelation will be the corrective. Since Paul’s authority is not in question but is assumed in Philippi, Paul has no need to spiritualise his exhortation. That is to say, Paul does not need to say, “I have just told you what you need to do but if you don’t believe me then God will show you I am correct.” Instead, Paul believes everything he has shared can only be grasped through a revelation from God through the Holy Spirit. Paul’s proclamation only has power as God gives it power. In light of the current context and Paul’s allusion to his Christophanic experience, this makes the words “this also” or “this too” (καὶ τοῦτο) important. What has God already revealed to the Philippians? Could Paul be speaking about their conversion? This idea is at least plausible if not probable. Chapter 3 has shown that Paul’s own Christophanic experience shapes the way he understands all believers’ conversion/call and continued transformation. Therefore, in 3:15b, Paul may be alluding to the Philippians initial revelation of Christ, through the Holy Spirit, brought about by Paul’s proclamation of the Gospel to them (cf. 1:6).

5.3 Conclusion

Paul needs to help the Philippians embrace some of the deeper realities of their new identity and the mission that comes with it. He needs to help them understand how unity in the midst of suffering for the sake of the mission of God is part and parcel of this new

---

106 Fee, Philippians, 357 and n. 24, is correct that καὶ εἰ is conjunctive and should be translated ‘and if’. Contra, Hawthorne, Philippians, 156, who views it as adversative and translates it ‘but since.’
identity, which has its foundation in a suffering Saviour Servant. Paul carries out this agenda by way of multiple examples, some positive and others negative, which all inform the Philippians about the depths of their eschatological identity. The two primary examples are Christ’s (2:6–11) then Paul’s (3:4–14). To understand the latter one must first understand the former, upon which it is reliant. The Christological narrative provides a foundation story, which gives purpose to the Philippians’ current situation. The suffering they are experiencing is neither unique to them nor is it something for which they should be ashamed. Christ’s exaltation, which has provided them with salvation, was predicated on his willing humility, suffering, and death. However, this was not carried out alone or aimlessly; it took place in unity with the Father for the sake of their shared mission in the world. Paul’s intertextual allusions to Isa 52:13—53:12 in correlation with Isa 45:23 helps to reveal this shared mission and provides a picture of Paul’s understanding of Christ as the suffering Saviour Servant.

Paul’s Christophanic reference, which sits in the background of 3:4–14, primarily functions paradigmatically. Paul is an example of one who has embraced his eschatological identity and with it the shared mission of God through Christ. Moreover, his Christophanic reference provides a tangible and concrete model for the Philippians to emulate. He presents a journey from initial union with Christ to deeper transformation and participation. By means of his own experience, Paul reminds the Philippians of their conversion and their need to continue in the transformation process by refocusing on the source of their faith and identity. He helps them place their own losses and suffering into the category of gains for the sake of Christ. By showing parallels between his own experience and Christ’s, Paul’s Christophanic reference also makes subtle echoes of the Isaianic Servant in general and more specifically to Isa 53:11 and the concept of the extension of the singular Servant’s righteousness and mission to his offspring. In so doing, Paul reveals a self-understanding as one of the servants of the suffering Saviour.
Servant, Christ. Additionally, Paul extends this identity and calling to all believers through his invitation to imitation (3:17) and through the various ways he elevates others to the same status and calling. In essence, Paul’s Christophanic reference teaches the Corinthians about their eschatological identity and calling in Christ and thus the reference also functions didactically, although to a somewhat lesser extent.

This Christophanic reference is secondary because Paul has no need to speak about conversion specifically. Instead, the reference is part of a larger purpose that takes the emphasis off himself and his Christophanic experience and places the focus on Christ and how he transforms identity and gives purpose. In this way, Paul’s story becomes Christ’s story even as Christ’s story becomes Paul’s. Additionally, Paul’s story becomes the Philippians’ story in part with an invitation to become the Philippians’ story in full. In other words, Paul uses his Christophanic experience for the sake of the body of Christ; his Christophanic reference is at its core corporate. Paul is willing to emphasise previous actions and attitudes that show his erroneous focus in light of Christ for the purpose of helping the Philippians understand their own fleshly sourced backstories. He is willing to downplay the significance of his apostolic position and elevate Epaphroditus for the sake of helping the Philippians understand their eschatological potential. He is willing to invite the Philippians to share in elements of his same eschatological calling as one of the servants of the Servant. This does not mean that Paul is unaware of the uniqueness of his own apostolic calling, only that for the sake of this community and the sake of God’s mission, Paul, like Christ, is willing to humble himself. Finally, Paul may be implying that the Philippians have shared in a similar revelation from Christ through the Holy Spirit as Paul experienced in his Christophanic experience (cf. 3:15b). However, there is not enough evidence in this epistle to fully substantiate this claim.
Chapter 6

PAUL’S CHRISTOPHANIC REFERENCE IN SECOND CORINTHIANS

This chapter carefully evaluates 2 Cor 3:1–4:6 giving evidence of its rightful place as a confirmed Christophanic reference and revealing how this reference functions within its literary and socio-historical context. Significant sections of Isaiah and Exodus form the foundation for interpreting this pericope and its larger literary context, which necessitates extended intertextual analysis. Likewise, the difficulty of understanding Paul’s use of the fpp in this Christophanic reference is also explored and its complexity is found to be integral to Paul’s overall epistolary purpose as well as to the functionality of the Christophanic reference. As the analysis unfolds, the importance of this Christophanic reference becomes increasingly evident.

6.1 Preliminary Considerations

6.1.1 Second Corinthians 2:14–7:4 and the Role of the First Person Plural

Second Corinthians 3:1–4:6 sits in the larger unit of 2:14–7:4. While the integrity of Second Corinthians has been disputed for nearly 250 years, with no clear end in sight,¹ present scholarship has tended to argue either for the unity of the epistle² or for a two-

---

¹ See Thrall, Second Corinthians, 3-49, for an analysis of the various arguments with strengths and weaknesses.

² Philip E. Hughes, Paul’s Second Epistle to the Corinthians, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962); Frederick W. Danker, II Corinthians, ACNT (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989); Barnett, Second Corinthians, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 137-45; James M. Scott, 2 Corinthians, NIBCNT 8 (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1998); Jan Lambrecht, Second Corinthians, SacPag 8 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999); Hafemann, Second Corinthians; Frank J. Matera, II Corinthians: A Commentary, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003); Fredrick J. Long, Ancient Rhetoric and Paul’s Apology: The
letter composite, viz. chs. 1–9 and 10–13.³ Neither of these hypotheses detours from the current focus since even the most imaginative and complex of the partition theories⁴ holds 2:14–7:4 (minus 6:14–7:1⁵) to be a single unit.⁶

One of the greatest difficulties in determining the aim of 2:14–7:4 is the continuous change in person. The overwhelming majority of this section is in the fpp.

Additionally, there are multiple uses of the second person plural and a handful of the first person singular.⁷ The fpp is particularly problematic since the implied subject is hard to ascertain.⁸ The majority of scholars interpret 2:14–7:4 as part of Paul’s apostolic apologia and move through this section with the assumption the bulk of the fpp’s refer to Paul alone,⁹ the so-called “stylistic plural” or “literary plural.”¹⁰ 


⁶ Also cf. Harris, Second Corinthians, 240-41; Barnett, Second Corinthians, 58 n. 7, 137-45; Thrall, Second Corinthians, 188.


⁸ Wallace, Greek, 393-99.


argues for the primacy of the literary plural within this section,\textsuperscript{11} provides a relatively standard reasoning for this position, namely, most of Paul’s argument, while in the plural, expresses concrete personal experiences and concerns.\textsuperscript{12} For example, Hafemann believes Paul has in mind his founding of the Corinthian church in 3:1–6 and his conversion/call in 4:1–6.\textsuperscript{13}

While these allusions to Paul’s personal experiences may be accurate, this does not necessitate Paul’s employment of the literary plural. There are several reasons to take many of Paul’s \textit{fpp} in 2:14–7:4 as genuine plurals which include others. Maurice Carrez has designated four “\textit{we}” categories used by Paul in Second Corinthians: WE-COMMUNITY, WE-MINISTERS, WE-APOSTLES, WE-I.\textsuperscript{14} The importance of determining how Paul is using the \textit{fpp} will prove invaluable in knowing how best to interpret this section.

Paul’s letters are riddled with references to his co-workers and companions. All of the undisputed epistle, except Romans, include mention of a “\textit{co-sender}” (1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:2; Phil 1:1; 1 Thess 1:1; Phlm 1).\textsuperscript{15} There is often an unnamed (cf. Gal 6:11; 1 Cor 16:21; Phlm 19) or named amanuensis (Rom 16:23).\textsuperscript{16} Paul sends greetings from co-workers, many likely present during composition (Rom 16:21–23; 1 Cor 16:19; 2 Cor 1: 7:6–15; Phil 2:19–30; Phlm 23–24). While none of this proves Paul’s \textit{fpp}’s are genuine plurals, it is a reminder that Paul writes in dialogue with others.\textsuperscript{17} Regarding co-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[14] Carrez, “Nous,” 476.
\item[16] For various roles of the amanuensis see: Richards, \textit{Secretary}.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
senders, it is improbable Paul would include these names without their knowledge and consent of the content—especially the WE-statements. It may also be assumed that Paul’s audience would take the fpp’s at face value, particularly in light of the multiple uses of the first person singular.

In Second Corinthians, there are several clues that Paul employs fpp’s in the sense of WE-MINISTERS/WE-APOSTLES. First, Timothy is named co-sender (1:1; cf. 1:13). Second, Timothy and Silvanus are named, along with Paul, as those who proclaimed Jesus Christ among the Corinthians (1:19; cf. 6:11), possibly a reference to the church’s founding (cf. Acts 18:5). Third, Paul mentions the arrival of Titus and his positive report concerning the Corinthians (7:6–7, 13–15). Fourth, Paul mentions Titus’s eagerness to return to Corinth to take up the collection (8:16–17, 23), along with two other brothers (8:18, 22). With so many of these references occurring directly before and after 2:14–7:4, it hard not to see many of Paul’s fpp’s in this section as including his co-workers.

Paul’s multiple references to suffering and affliction (1:4–10; 4:7–12; 4:16–5:5; 6:3–12; 7:5–6; 11:23–12:10; cf. 2:14–16) may strengthen this conclusion. Many scholars assume that these references pertain to Paul’s experience alone. Nevertheless, all but the final large unit of 11:23–12:10 are written in the fpp. While this latter list has some similarities with the earlier lists, this does not necessitate equivalence. Most scholars highlight the more aggressive tone and polemic of chapters 10–13 and the general shift
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18 Gorman, Apostle, 87.
19 Murphy-O’Connor, Letter-Writer, 19.
20 I have chosen to group WE-MINISTERS and WE-APOSTLES because the differences are not significant to this study. For the differences see, Carrez, “Nous,” 478-81.
to predominately first person singulars, whereas chapters 1–9, a section some believe Timothy co-authored (cf. 1:13), are dominated by use of the *fpp*. That Paul is comfortable speaking about his own suffering in the first person singular (11:23–12:10; cf. 2:2–4) should be a caution against automatically assuming use of the literary plural in Paul’s other hardship accounts. Paul is not alone in his affliction; in other places, he mentions co-workers who have suffered physically and been imprisoned with him (Rom 16:3, 7; Phil 2:25–30; Phlm 24).

Most scholars see limited use of the WE-COMMUNITY statements in 2:14–7:4, especially in light of the multiple uses of the second person plural. Furthermore, since there are certainly places where Paul is utilising the *fpp* as WE-MINISTERS/WE-APOSTLES (and possibly as WE-I), the interpreter is left trying to look for contextual clues as to when (or if) Paul shifts to the WE-COMMUNITY. Hafemann argues that Paul attaches the adjective πᾶς to the *fpp* when he intends to include the whole community of believers (3:18, 5:10), thus signalling a clear shift from his more widely used literary plural. But even Hafemann does not abide by this principle as he correctly argues 1:22, 5:21, 6:16 and 7:1 are WE-COMMUNITY references. It appears rather than indicating a shift in subject, the πᾶς of 3:18 and 5:10 provides emphasis at certain climactic points in Paul’s argument (cf. 5:14–15).

Carrez sees Paul offering a possible segue between the apostolic ministry and the Corinthians. He writes, “Ce NOUS/VOUS exprime la participation possible de la communauté au ministère qu'exerce Paul. S'il en est le porteur, elle en est le champ

---


23 Belleville, *Reflections*, 275-76, believes even passages such as 2 Cor 3:18 and 5:21 refer only to Paul and the other ministers.


Carrez accurately exposes, at least in part, the reason for Paul’s rather convoluted discourse. Paul sees his apostolic ministry as an important factor in helping people move from their present reality into the new eschatological reality, and thus to assume a new identity. However, the emphasis is not so much on Paul’s ministry as it is on the ministry of the new covenant, of which Paul and his associates are included. Paul invites the Corinthians to join the WE-MINISTER/WE-APOSTLES through their recognition and acceptance of this new ministry and new eschatological identity.

In this way, one can understand many of Paul’s “we” statements as paradigmatic. This explains why these statements are inclusive of other ministers and other apostles. Even statements which appear to be references to Paul’s unique experiences, such as his founding of the Corinthian church or his conversion/call, are stripped of their particulars in order to show the universal elements of these events. This is because Paul seeks to use this argument as a way of shaping the Corinthian’s eschatological identity, especially toward unity, and the ambiguity in person is an important strategic element.

6.1.2 Intertextual Reliance upon Isaiah 40–66 in Second Corinthians 1–7

There are multiple connections between 2 Cor 2:14–7:4 and Isa 40–66. The most obvious is found in 2 Cor 6:2, which is a verbatim quotation of Isa 49:8 (LXX). Two additional paraphrastic quotations are found in 6:17 (Isa 52:11) and 6:18b (Isa 43:6), which are part of a concatenation of seven OT citations. Still, most scholars give little attention to the larger Isaianic context from whence these quotations derive. Jan Lambrecht goes so far as to say, “Paul does not seem to take into account the rich

---

27 Gupta, Worship, 89, reaches a similar conclusion.
28 See Lambrecht, Second Corinthians, 123-25.
29 Furnish, Second Corinthians, 353; McCant, Second Corinthians, 55; Martin, Second Corinthians, 168-69.
theological ideas present in the Isaian [sic] context."^{30} This conclusion does not appear to account for the multiple allusions and echoes between these two texts.^{31} Most commentators correctly acknowledge an allusion to Isa 43:18–19 and 65:17–25 in 2 Cor 5:17.^{32} Additionally, Otfried Hofius makes a strong argument for seeing 5:18–21 (esp. 5:21) as finding its only parallel in Isa 53 (esp. 53:5).^{33} Florian Wilk notes a direct allusion to Isa 53:12 in 2 Cor 4:11 and sees parallels between the Isaianic context and Paul’s argumentation in 4:1–15 giving the following examples: “2 Cor. 4:3 (Isa. 53:1), 4:4 (Isa. 52.14), 4:5 (Isa. 52:11, 15), 4:6 (Isa. 52:13), 4:9 (Isa. 54:6).”^{34} Wilk also argues for an echo of Isa 49:13 in 2 Cor 7:6.^{35} G. K. Beale contends the most probable text behind 6:11b is Isa 60:5 rather than Ps 118:32 (LXX; 119:32 MT) or Deut 11:16.^{36} Finally, Paul Barnett briefly notes the association between Paul’s multiple use of παράκλησις and παρακαλέω, which open this epistle (esp. 1:3–7; cf. 7:4–13), and the opening words of Isa 40:1 (cf. Isa 51:3, 12, 19).^{37}

^{30} Lambrecht, Second Corinthians, 108; similarly Stanley, Arguing, 98-105.

^{31} Because of limited space, I cannot argue the validity of the various allusions that have been postulated; I will simply list those that seem most probable as well as the scholars who have made the strongest arguments for them.


^{34} Florian Wilk, “Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” in Moyise and Menken, Isaiah, 149, and n. 67.

^{35} Wilk, “Isaiah,” 153; also Beale, “OT Background,” 576.

^{36} Beale, “OT Background,” 576-77.

Based solely on linguistic connections, many of these intertextual links may appear suspect. However, if thematic parallels between Isa 40–66 and 2 Cor 2:14–7:4 are included, the relationship becomes more evident. Three dominant themes emerge out of a study of Isa 40–66: (1) an eschatological shift, especially evidenced in terms of an everlasting covenant, new things, and new heaven and earth (42:6–9; 43:18–19; 48:6–7; 49:8; 54:10; 55:3; 56:1–8; 59:20–21; 61:8; 62:2, 11–12; 65:17; 66:22–23); which involves (2) deliverance, restoration, and forgiveness of sin for Israel and the nations (40:1–5; 43:1–28; 44:22; 45:22; 46:12–13; 48:20; 49:6; 51:1–8; 52:1–11; 53:4–6, 10–12; 56:1–8; 61:1–11; 65:17–25; 66:18–24); and is made possible through (3) the role of the Servant and ongoing role of the servants (41:8–9; 42:1–4; 19; 43:10; 44:1–2, 21; 45:4; 48; 49:1–7; 50:4–11; 52:13–53:12; 54:17; 56:6 63:17; 65:8–9, 13–15; 66:14).

Many of the same themes are strongly represented and even central to 2 Cor 1–7. Paul’s words are bursting with the eschatological language of “newness.” He speaks of the resurrection (1:9; 4:14; 5:1–8), the ministry and reception of God’s Spirit (1:22; 3:3–18; 5:5), the coming day of judgment (1:13–14; 5:10), and about new covenant (3:6) and new creation (5:17). Paul’s quotation of Isa 49:8 brings together God’s promised salvation and the eschatological reality of the present—“See, now is the acceptable time; see, now is the day of salvation!” (6:2). Paul goes to great lengths to encompass the Corinthians in this new eschatological reality present in Christ, which is meant to shape their present identity.


39 Bauckham, Jesus, 34, focuses on the importance of these first two themes for early Christians and sees this as the impetus for their copious references to this section of Isaiah.


The Isaianic themes of deliverance, restoration and forgiveness of sins are also evidenced in Paul’s argument. Deliverance is demonstrated in the imagery of comfort and salvation (1:3–6; 2:15–16; 6:1–2; 7:6–11). Restoration is recast in terms of transformation into the image of God (3:18; 4:6, 16; 5:21; 6:14–7:1; cf. 4:4) and sharing in his mission (1:5–6, 21–22; 2:14–17; 3:1, 6; 4:1–11; 5:14–20; 6:4–10). Forgiveness is found in the Pauline metaphor of reconciliation (5:18–20; cf. 6:14–7:1\(^{42}\)). While these concepts have been divided, they are interconnected, in both Paul and Isaiah. Furthermore, all these concepts are thoroughly eschatological in Paul. Paul sees God’s promises in Isa 40–66 coming to fruition in the “now.”\(^{43}\)

The final Isaianic theme, which focuses on the role of the Servant and ongoing role of the servants (see Chapter 3), is especially intriguing when brought into connection with Paul’s uses of the fpp. Beale, in evaluating 2 Cor 5–7, argues that Paul applies the Isa 49 prophecy about himself—“He is in some way the fulfilment of the righteous ‘Servant, Israel.’”\(^{44}\) Beale reaches this conclusion in part because he focuses on Paul’s apostolic defence and ignores the fact that all of the pertinent Isaianic quotations and allusions take place in sections where Paul is speaking in the fpp. But if Paul’s fpp’s are genuine plurals which, at the very least, include WE-MINSTERS/WE-APOSTLES, then Beale’s reading is unnecessary. It would be more accurate to speak of Paul’s identification with the plural servants rather than with the singular Servant.

Mark Gignilliat, evaluating 5:14–6:10, comes to a similar conclusion that Paul views Christ as the singular Servant (cf. Rom 4:25; 1 Cor 15:1–4; Phil 2:5–11) and


\(^{43}\) Beale, “OT Background,” 579.

himself as the “servant of the Servant.” Gignilliat connects Christ and the Servant in 5:14–21 arguing verse 19—“God was reconciling the world to himself through Christ”—signals a link between God’s redemptive work and Christ’s reconciling actions. Reconciliation assumes an estrangement between humanity and God and Christ’s actions have provided a means of atonement and thus forgiveness of sin (cf. Isa 53:4–12). Comparing 5:21 and Isa 53:11, Gignilliat claims that just as the Servant’s sacrificial actions led to making many righteous, so Christ’s actions result in humanity becoming the righteousness of God. If Gignilliat’s reading is correct and Paul does view Christ as the singular Servant of Isaiah, then the multiple other allusions to Isaiah may be emphasising the new eschatological reality made possible by God through Christ. For Gignilliat, this means that Paul views himself not as the singular Servant but as an eschatological servant of the Servant (cf. 6:4; 11:23) who continues to herald God’s redemptive message in the world and who shares in the Servant’s suffering and righteousness.

Gignilliat’s reading of 5:14–6:10 is helpful in moving the reader toward a deeper consideration of the various OT Scriptures that shape Paul’s identity and thought. However, like so many, Gignilliat’s emphasis lies on Paul and his apostolic role within Second Corinthians. He fails to take seriously the role of Paul’s fpp and ultimately re-singularises the plural servants of Isaiah. In this way, Gignilliat’s reading is not significantly different from Beale’s. Likewise, Gignilliat’s reading is not markedly different from Hafemann’s; whereas Gignilliat is concerned with 5:14–6:10 and the undergirding Isaianic passages, Hafemann concentrates on 2 Cor 3 and the underlying

45 Gignilliat, Paul, 132-42; cf. Hughes, Second Corinthians, 220;
46 This follows the reading of 2 Cor 5:19 by Stanley E. Porter, Καταλλάσσω in Ancient Greek Literature, with Reference to the Pauline Writings (Cordoba: Ediciones El Almendro, 1994), 131-35, who argues the main clause should be taken periphrastically and also denoting means. Thus, Christ was the means by which God reconciled the world to himself.
47 Gignilliat, Paul, 100-03. Similarly, Dunn, Theology, 228-30.
48 Gignilliat, Paul, 104.
narrative of Exod 32–34. Hafemann views Paul’s argumentation through an apologetic lens and his reading of Second Corinthians as a whole bears this weight. This narrow reading, like Gignilliat’s, tends to skip over other important aspects of the text which need to be considered and even emphasised.

6.1.3 Intertextual Reliance Upon Exodus 32–34 in Second Corinthians 3:1–4:6

Paul makes multiple references to Moses and his ministry in 3:1–4:6. There are no verbatim quotations in this section; however, most scholars hold 3:16 to be an altered quotation of Exod 34:34 (LXX). This view is substantiated by the context of Paul’s argument, which relies heavily on Exod 34:29–35. Therein, Moses descends Mount Sinai with the second set of stone tablets (34:29 – πλάξ, [referred to as πλάκας λιθίνας in 31:18]; cf. 2 Cor 3:3) of the covenant (διαθήκη in the LXX; cf. 2 Cor 3:6, 13) and with a glorified (34:29, 30, 35 – δοξάζω in the LXX; גְּד in the MT; cf. 2 Cor 3:10[bis] face, which he veils (34:33, 34, 35 – κάλυμμα; cf. 2 Cor 3:13–16[four times]) because of the people’s fear. This account sits within the larger infamous golden calf narrative (Exod 32–34), which is a story of covenant violation and covenant renewal and highlights Yahweh’s mercy and Moses’ intercessory role amidst Israel’s disobedience and idolatry.

Hafemann contends that Exod 32–34 functions paradigmatically within the OT canon to demonstrate the limitation of the Sinai covenant. This is not a limitation on the part of Yahweh or on the part of Torah; it is a limitation on the part of the people.

“The problem with Israel is not their occasional disobedience, but their moral turpitude.

---

50 Hafemann, Paul, Moses; cf. Aernie, Paul, 114-57, who makes similar assertion about how Paul uses Exodus and Isaiah.
51 The LXX does not use διαθήκη in Exod 34:29; although it does in 34:27, 28. Cf. MT which uses עֵדוּת in 34:29 (cf. 31:18) and בְּרִית in 34:27, 28.
52 See also δόξα, used thirteen times in 3:1–4:6.
54 Terence E. Fretheim, Exodus, IBC (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1988), 279, appropriately titles this section “The Fall and Restoration of Israel.”
55 Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 230-31, 446-47.
The gross idolatry with the golden calf serves primarily to reveal this fact.”  

56 Israel is no longer able to bear the full weight of God’s glory and, therefore, Moses must be the mediatory of God’s presence. In consequence, argues Hafemann, Moses’ veiling is an act of mercy safeguarding the people from being fully overwhelmed by Yahweh’s reflected glory.  

57 With this interpretation in hand, Hafemann views Paul as giving a straightforward reading of the Exodus narrative in its context. Paul is not making a negative comparison between Moses and himself58 but between Moses’ ministry and his own. The former was deficient because of Israel’s “stiff-necked” condition, their lack of God’s Spirit, and thus their inability to encounter the glory of God face to face. The latter is sufficient because of the eschatological reality brought through Christ, in which the Spirit is now being poured out, so believers can, like Moses, experience the transforming glory. It is the difference between being under the old covenant and being under the new covenant.  

59 Hafemann’s emphasis on Paul’s apologetic purpose also moves him to argue for multiple connections between Paul’s (2:16b, 3:4–18) and Moses’ calls (Exod 3–4),60 viewing the primary function to highlight Paul’s role as God’s spokesperson. This connection establishes Paul’s legitimacy and authority despite his insufficiency, a theme common in the prophets.61 Hafemann maintains that Paul does not view himself as a second or new Moses,62 but views himself in line with the prophets, which carries with it

56 Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 226; similarly, Childs, Exodus, 564-65, 579.
57 Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 222-27.
60 So also, Stockhausen, Moses’ Veil, 82-85.
61 Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 92-186; idem, Second Corinthians, 126-33.
62 Pace Stockhausen, Moses’ Veil, 172-75; Peter R. Jones, “The Apostle Paul: Second Moses to the New Covenant Community, A Study in Pauline Apostolic Authority,” in God’s Inerrant Word: An
“an implicit claim to speak with divinely sanctioned authority to the people of God.”⁶³ Nevertheless, the prominence Hafemann places on Paul’s divine calling and apostolic role, implicitly if not explicitly, elevates Paul to “second Moses” status. For example, Hafemann writes:

[A]s the “Spirit-giver” with the gospel, Paul’s role is parallel to that of Moses’, the mediator par excellence between YHWH and Israel, whose task it was to give the law. . . . [A]s the “Spirit-giver”, Paul is the intermediary agent of the eschatological reality of the new age characterized by the work of the Spirit in the hearts of flesh prophesied by Ezekiel. It thus seems almost impossible to over exaggerate the significance which Paul attributed to his apostolic ministry in II Cor. 2:4–3:3.⁶⁴

Hafemann, contrary to his claims, does appear to make a strong comparison between the persons of Moses and Paul and not just between their different ministries. Paul is presented as the prophet par excellence of this new covenant and can be understood as greater than Moses because he does not just provide the Torah, he gives the Spirit, which frees people to see the glory of the Lord with unveiled face.

Hafemann’s reading raises the question of Paul’s role within 3:1–4:6. Is it, as Hafemann believes, central? Or is it secondary? To answer this question, Moses’ role within the Exodus narrative must be analysed. Therein, Moses appears to be elevated beyond mere prophet status to god-like status. In Exod 4:16, as part of Moses call, he is told Aaron would be his mouthpiece to the people and Moses would be as god/s to Aaron (תִָֽהְׂי ה־לּוֶַ֥לֵָֽאלֹהִָֽים). In Exod 7:1 Yahweh tells Moses he has made him a god/s to Pharaoh (נְׂתַתִַ֥יךֶָאֱלֹהִִ֖יםֶלְׂפַרְׂע ). Exod 32–34 also has several god-like references to Moses. In Exod 32:1, the people petition Aaron to make a god/s (פַּרְעָה) for them who will go before them, not to replace Yahweh, but to replace Moses, who is credited as being the one who

---

⁶³ Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 104, emphasis his. Similarly, Aernie, Paul, 72-184; Sandnes, Paul, passim.
⁶⁴ Hafemann, Suffering, 220. However, Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 102-03 n. 32, later notes the difficulty with associating the language of ‘Spirit-giver’ to Paul and says it is ultimately tied to Christ. Nevertheless, his language does not change much (cf. 400).
brought them out of Egypt, a role Yahweh is happy to relinquish to Moses (Exod 32:7). Moses also shoulders the role of divine judge by carrying out Yahweh’s wrath, which Moses has just extinguished (Exod 32:10, 11). In Exod 32:19, Moses descends the mountain and his “wrath burned hot” (וַיִָֽחַר־אַַ֨ף). Throughout Exodus, this phrase is always attributed to Yahweh alone (cf. Exod 4:14; 22:23; 32:10, 11, 22). In Exod 34:28, Moses writes the words of the covenant on the stone tablets, an action previously performed by the finger of God (Exod 31:18; 32:16). Finally, the shining face of Moses (Exod 34:29–35) may signal some type of divine transfiguration as he now begins to reflect physically the glory of God.

A type of apotheosis of Moses is also attested in STJL. Sirach 45:2 says, “[Yahweh] made [Moses] equal in glory to the holy ones” (cf. As. Mos. 10:2; 11:17; I En. 89:36). This angelification is directly connected to Exod 33–34 in Sir 45:3, “[Yahweh] gave him commandments for his people, and revealed to him his glory.” In 4Q374 2 ii:6–8, a connection is made between Exod 7:1 and 34:29–35, “and he made him like a God over the powerful ones, and a cause of reel[ing] (?) for Pharaoh … […] melted, and their hearts trembled, and [th]eir entrails dissolved. [But] he had pity with […]” and when he let his face shine for them for healing, they strengthened [their] hearts again, and at the time […]” (cf. 4Q377 1 ii:6–12). Whether this text signals Moses’ deification or angelification is debatable. At the very least, Moses is elevated to a god-

---

65 So George W. Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God*, JSOTSup 57 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 174. Fretheim, *Exodus*, 281-82, argues the people are not trying to replace Yahweh or Moses but want a visible image of the “messenger of God,” who is a physical representation of Yahweh in their midst, which ultimately makes them more independent from Yahweh.

66 While we are told of others on the mountain with Moses (e.g. the seventy elders of Israel), nevertheless, Exodus reports “God did not lay his hand on the chief men of the people of Israel” (Exod 24:11). Numbers 11:16–30 reports another episode where some of the spirit (Moses’ or Yahweh’s?) was taken from Moses and put on the seventy elders. Still, it is interesting God does not give the spirit directly to the elders but it comes from Moses.

like status. In Philo, the apotheosis appears more solidified. Philo says of Moses:

“Has he not also enjoyed an even greater communion with the Father and Creator of the universe . . . For he also was called the god and king of the whole nation . . . he established himself as a most beautiful and Godlike (θεοειδής) work, to be a model for all those who were inclined to imitate him” (Mos. 1:158). Moses is said to have gradually been transformed into the divine (Virt. 76; Sacr. 9), until “transforming him wholly and entirely into a most sun-like mind” (Mos. 2:288). Similarly, in his exposition of Exod 24:2, Philo say Moses’ mind was filled with God, having given up all mortal things, “he is changed into the divine, so that such men become kin to God and truly divine” (QE 2:29; cf. 2:40).

Nevertheless, even for Philo, this type of language concerning Moses, or any human figure, would not constitute a movement away from monotheism. In the words of Philo, “For there is in truth no created Lord, not even a king shall have extended his authority . . . but only the uncreated God, the real governor” (Mut. 22). Thus, Moses’ god-like status is delegated rather than essential. Moses’ elevated status, born out of the Exodus narrative, is grounded in his unique role as intercessory between the people and Yahweh.

---

68 Christopher G. Foster, “Communal Participation in the Spirit: The Corinthian Correspondence in Light of Early Jewish Mysticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (Ph.D. thesis, University of Manchester, 2013), 89-95. Also see As. Mos. 11:16, which describes Moses as “the sacred spirit who was worthy of the Lord, manifold and incomprehensible, the lord of the word, who was faithful in all things, God’s chief prophet throughout the earth, the most perfect teacher in the world.”


70 Bauckham, “Moses,” 263-64, argues that Philo’s descriptions of Moses usually refer to his virtuosity and this language carries a Stoic “figurative-ethical meaning.” However, in Mos. 1:158, Philo refers to Moses’ unique role as ruler of Israel but there is still no understanding of divine-like transformation.

71 Lierman, NT Moses, 231-32, 246-47; cf. Dunn, Christology, 19.

72 See Scott J. Hafemann, “Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey,” JSP 7 (1990): 79-104, who shows that Moses as mediator/intercessor, more than as prophet, lawgiver and deliverer, is emphasised in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature.
continued presence among Israel; “with Moses gone, access to Yahweh is cut off.”

This may account for Deut 18:15–18 and the concept of a second or new Moses, which was important within Judaism as evidenced by the Mosaic characteristics prevalent in the OT texts and especially the various depictions of the prophets.

There may also be connections between the phrase “man of God” (אִישׁ-הָאֱלֹהִּים) and the continuation of a Moses-like leader. The phrase is used six times in correlation to Moses (Deut 33:1; Josh 14:6; Ps 90:1; 1 Chron 23:14; 2 Chron 30:10; Ezra 3:2) and denotes not only a special relationship between Moses and Yahweh but moreover a remembrance of this relationship within Judaism. George Coats argues it becomes an epithet for Moses and when used of other OT figures (e.g. Elijah, Elisha, Samuel and David), it functions to connect these figures to Moses’ heroic saga and thus to his mediatory role therein.

Coats also believes “Servant of the Lord” (עָבְדֵי יְהוָה) is an epithet connected to Moses (cf. Exod 14:31; Num 12:7–8; Deut 34:5). This idea is most clearly seen in Joshua, which begins with a dual reference to Moses’ servant position and to his death (Josh 2:1, 2), and which points back to Deut 34:5. Here the reader is reminded of Moses’ selection of Joshua as Israel’s new leader (Deut 34:9; 31:1–8) and simultaneously reminded, “Never since has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face” (Deut 34:10). Yahweh commissions Joshua, saying he is to remember the deeds of Moses and to “act in accordance with all the law that my servant Moses

---

77 Cf. הָאֱלֹהִָֽים in 1 Chron 6:34; Dan 9:11; Neh 10:30.
commanded you” (Josh 1:7), and Joshua directs the people to “remember the words that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded” (Josh 1:13; cf. 8:31, 33; 11:12, 15; 22:2, 5). The people’s response is also telling: “Just as we obeyed Moses in all things, so we will obey you. Only may the Lord your God be with you, as he was with Moses!” (Josh 1:17). The proof of Joshua’s Moses-like connection to Yahweh is symbolised in his being called a Servant of the Lord at his death (Josh 24:29; cf. Judg 2:8). Outside Joshua, there are multiple other references to Moses as Servant of the Lord, usually tied to his Sanai actions of spokesperson (1 Kgs 8:56; cf. Ps 105:26), tent-maker (2 Chron 1:3; 24:6, 9), and especially law-giver (2 Kgs 18:12; 21:8; Neh 1:8; 9:14; Dan 9:11; Mal 3:22).

These images, Moses as god-like figure, man of God, and Servant of the Lord, attest to his importance within Judaism and most have a strong connection to Exod 32–34. It is hard to imagine a devout and studied Jew such as Paul being ignorant of the significance of Exod 32–34 and related traditions which branch from it. This raises the question of whether Paul is seeking to elevate his own apostolic position to this legendary status. Such a claim would have been tantamount to self-praise and would have been highly offensive to Paul’s Greco-Roman audience. Thrall notes this danger and, therefore, argues Paul’s reference to Moses is in response to the comparison being made by his critics, a hypothesis which is nearly impossible to substantiate.

There is of course another option available, namely, that Paul is not claiming to be a new or second Moses figure but making a connection between Moses and Christ.

79 See Chapter 4, section 4.2.2.
80 Pace, Finn Damgaard, Recasting Moses: The Memory of Moses in Biographical and Autobiographical Narratives in Ancient Judaism and 4th-Century Christianity, ECCA 13 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2013), 105-11.
82 Bockmuehl, Revelation, 149.
and presenting himself and his associates as servants of this new Moses (i.e. Christ). This is similar to the reading argued above concerning Paul’s use of Isaiah and his self-understanding as one of many servants of the Servant. This suggestion is strengthened if a link can be shown between Moses and Christ and if a connection between Isaiah’s Servant and Moses can be established.

Attempts to show early connections between a second Moses figure and an eschatological messianic figure rely heavily on latter rabbinic and Samaritan writings, with only a few arguing for the concept within the Qumran texts. This casts doubts on whether Paul would make such a connection. Nevertheless, the NT articulates a link between Moses and Christ, which is clearest in Act 3:17–26 and 7:20–53, where both Peter and Stephen quote Deut 18:15, 18 (Acts 3:22; 7:37) in correlation to Jesus. Likewise, all four gospel accounts draw Moses and Jesus together, making an implied, and sometimes overt, link (Matt 17:1–13; Mark 8:27–30; 9:2–8; Luke 24:26–27; John 1:45; 5:39–47; 6:14; 7:40–41; cf. Heb 3:1–6). John Lierman shows strong connections between the way early Christ-followers spoke about Christ and the way Jews were accustomed to speak about Moses. He writes: “The similarity is so extensive that it is difficult to resist the implication that early Christians in thinking about Christ must consciously have drawn on the figure of Moses in a fuller, more coherent way than has heretofore been acknowledged.” While a pre-Jesus connection between a second Moses figure and an eschatological messianic figure is inconclusive, the fact first and second-century C.E. Christ-followers, Jews, and Samaritans all made this association means it was not a difficult leap. The elevated status of Moses throughout Israel’s history made

---

84 Lierman, NT Moses, 279.
him an ideal messianic prototype. It is highly probable Paul could have come to this same conclusion. Nevertheless, the question remains whether Paul is suggesting, either implicitly or explicitly, this connection in 2 Cor 3–4.

The answer is partial found in the connection between the Servant of Isaiah and Moses. Many scholars argue for a new exodus motif in Isaiah. Bernhard Anderson, contending an Exodus typology in Isa 40–55, lists ten passages where this theme is especially prevalent (40:3–5; 41:17–20; 42:14–16; 43:1–3; 43:14–21; 48:20–21; 49:8–12; 51:9–10; 52:11–12; 55:12–13).86 While the emphasis is strongest in Isa 40–55, it is also found in both the earlier (4:5–6; 10:24–27; 11:16–18; 14:19, 24; 19:19–25; 35:8–10)87 and later sections of Isaiah (58:8–11; 63:7–14). However, Moses is only mentioned twice in the MT (63:11, 12) and once in the LXX (63:12). These citations sit within a corporate lament (63:7–64:11; cf. Neh 9), which begins with a remembrance of Yahweh’s gracious character as revealed in his deliverance of a rebellious people from Egypt and simultaneously enquires about the whereabouts of this great deliver (63:7–14).

There are several connections between this pericope and Exod 32–34. In the MT, verse 9 makes reference to Yahweh’s salvation by way of an “angel of his presence” (וּמַלְׂאַַ֤ךְֶפָנָיו). While this exact phrase is unattested elsewhere in the OT, it has parallels in Exod 33:2, 14–15 (cf. Exod 23:20–23),88 which highlights Yahweh’s continued presence despite Israel’s disobedience. The role of Moses is also highlighted, especially in the LXX. Whereas in the MT God’s glorious arm is said to go at the right hand of Moses (63:12), the LXX reads: ὁ ἀγαγὼν τῆς δεξιᾶς Μωυσῆν, ὁ βραχίων τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. The

---

88 Childs, Isaiah 40-66, 523; John N. Oswalt, The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 607. The LXX alters the MT to place the focus directly on Yahweh. This alteration is likely in keeping with the altered LXX version of Exod 33:14-15, which omits the word ‘presence.'
participle ὁ ἀγαγὼν points back to Yahweh as the one who leads Moses. However, the antecedent of ὁ βραχίων is more ambiguous. It could function with ὁ ἀγαγὼν as an attributive construction, which would make the translation similar to the MT—“the arm of his glory which led Moses by the right hand.” Nevertheless, the distance of ὁ βραχίων from the participle does not make this a straightforward reading. Furthermore, ὁ βραχίων appears to begin a subordinate clause, which makes the NETS rendering unlikely (“Where is his glorious arm?”). Instead, the word order in the Greek, with Μωσὴν directly followed by ὁ βραχίων, may signal an appositional construction. A more verbatim translation would then read: “the one who led by the right hand Moses, the arm of his glory.”

Reference to Moses as an extension of Yahweh’s glory is an allusion to Exod 34:29–35. This reading is strengthened by the LXX’s alteration of verse 11, which singularises the Hebrew יָם, and replaces “sea” with “land.” It, therefore, points back to Moses’ call—“the one who brought up from the land the shepherd of the sheep” (cf. Exod 3–4). Both in the MT and moreover in the LXX, the author/redactor invites the readers to join in calling Yahweh to a particular action, that of raising up another servant like Moses, through whom Yahweh’s glory might shine once more, so the people might again experience the Holy Spirit in their midst.

When this Mosaic reference is combined with the pervasive new Exodus motif and the OT understanding of Servant of the Lord as an epithet for Moses, the probability of construing a second Moses backdrop for the Isaianic Servant increases substantially. The Isaianic Servant’s role, like Moses’, is to allow Yahweh to be glorified through him

---

89 See, Wallace, Greek, 62.
90 The Syr. reads ‘Moses his servant’ rather than ‘Moses his people.’
92 So Coats, Moses, 207-11.
( Isa 49:3; cf. 40:5 ) by drawing together and delivering the tribes of Jacob and the survivors of Israel (cf. Jer 31:31–34; Ezek 37:15–28) and by being a light to the nations ( Isa 49:6 ). This is not a resurrected Moses but a new mediator, whose connection to Yahweh and intercessory role both models the Moses tradition and surpasses it (esp. Isa 52:13–53:12). 93

6.1.4 Summary

The foundation for a more fruitful interpretation of 2 Cor 3:1–4:6 has now been laid through this brief literary analysis, both grammatical and intertextual. It has been argued that Paul’s fpp’s are best understood as genuine plurals which include WE-MINISTERS and WE-APOSTLES. The proposal for understanding Paul’s fpp’s as invitations to WE-COMMUNITY has also been posited. Paul’s language is intentionally nuanced with the hopes the Corinthians will feel included and begin to participate in the WE-MINISTER/WE-APOSTLES. In this way, they function paradigmatically. This reading allows for an alternate motive for Paul’s argumentation. Rather than primarily being concerned with defence of his apostleship, Paul seeks to move the Corinthians toward embracing their new eschatological identity in Christ.

It has also been argued that Isa 40–66 sits behind Paul’s discourse in 2:14–7:4 and therein Paul develops an understanding of Christ as the singular Servant and all believers, himself included, as servants of the Servant. Important aspects of Gignilliat’s and Hafemann’s readings have been brought together, apart from their narrowed apostolic-centricities. It has been discovered that 3:1–4:6 is greatly enriched when the Exod 32–34 narrative is read through the lens of Isa 40–66. Paul’s comparison in 3:1–4:6 is not between Paul and Moses or even between Paul’s ministry and Moses’ ministry but between Christ and Moses. Christ is developed as a second Moses figure, which parallels

93 Coats, Moses, 208.
Paul’s understanding of the singular Isaianic Servant. When viewed from this perspective, Paul’s argument takes on an entirely new shape. Rather than trying to assert his apostolic authority, Paul’s self-understanding as one of the servants of the Servant is intentionally extended to his Corinthian audience. Here the beauty and brilliance of Paul’s nuanced use of the *fpp* is revealed. Paul calls the Corinthians to embrace their new eschatological identity as servants of the Servant by extending God’s forgiveness and reconciliation to them through the covenant renewal imagery of Exod 32–34 and through an allusion to his own Christophany. These proposals will be substantiated in the detailed exegesis of 3:1–4:6 below.

### 6.2 Exegesis of Second Corinthians 3:1–4:6

#### 6.2.1 Second Corinthians 3:1–6

Paul begins 3:1a with a rhetorical question concerning commendation. Mention of “epistles of commendation” (συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν) is in response to the current negative situation created by the “super apostles” (cf. 10:12, 18; 12:11), and possibly due to misunderstanding brought about by Paul’s first letter (1 Corinthians). The adverb πάλιν creates some confusion as to when Paul and the others previously commended themselves (cf. 5:12). Nevertheless, the focus is currently on the negative aspects of such a self-commendation. Paul moves the Corinthians toward an understanding of their own importance within the ministry of the new covenant, of which Paul and his associates are servants. Second Corinthians 3:2–3 forms an AB–AB pattern with the first tier (3:2) providing a transition from the plural “epistles of commendation” (3:1) to the singular “epistle of Christ” (3:3). The diagrammed translation is as follows:

---

2You yourselves are our epistle,  
(an epistle) having been engraved\(^95\) on our hearts, being known and being read by all people,  
3You yourselves are manifesting\(^96\) that you are an epistle from Christ, ministered to by us,  
(an epistle) having been engraved\(^97\) not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of hearts of flesh.

By moving from the plural epistles to the singular epistle (A), Paul is able to stress the unity he desires for the Corinthians, both amongst themselves and between them and the Pauline cohort; the former is evidenced in the emphatic ὑμεῖς ἐστε and the latter by the ἡμῶν. The Corinthians have become one with Paul and his associates by way of God’s engraving action (B; B\(_1\)), of which Paul and his associates played a significant role (A\(_1\)).

Paul is adamant the focus should be placed firmly on God (3:5–6). Paul does not claim authorship of this letter; Christ is the author (ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ\(^98\)). The role of Paul and his associates is ministers or servants (διακονηθεῖσα). The reason they do not need letters of commendation is because God is the one who has done these things and the evidence of his work is “being made known” through the Pauline cohort and “being manifest” by the Corinthians. Both of these groups together form a single epistle of commendation attesting to the sufficiency of Christ.

A proper understanding of Christ’s authority and work is the safeguard against self-praise, both for the Pauline cohort and for the Corinthians (3:4). Verse 4 may signal a shift from Paul’s use of the fpp as WE-MINISTERS/WE-APOSTLES in verses 1–3 to WE-COMMUNITY in verses 4–6, at least in a paradigmatic sense. While hard to prove, it does fit the flow of Paul’s purpose of unification presented in verses 1–3 and in the rest of Paul’s argument in 3:7–18, which climaxes in a definite WE-COMMUNITY

---

\(^{95}\) Attributive participle, modifying ἡ ἐπιστολὴ in (A).

\(^{96}\) Participle is translated as a middle because of its correlation to (A).

\(^{97}\) Attributive participle, modifying ἡ ἐπιστολὴ in (A\(_1\)).

\(^{98}\) Taken as a subjective genitive. So, Martin, Second Corinthians, 51; Furnish, Second Corinthians, 182. Cf. Harris, Second Corinthians, 263, who views Paul as the amanuensis.
statement (3:18). The difficulty with this reading comes in verse 6a with the reference to “ministers of a new covenant” (διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης), which many commentators believe is part of a WE-I statement pointing back to Paul’s Damascus encounter.\textsuperscript{99} This reading ignores the $fpp$ and focuses strictly on the comparison between Moses’ and Paul’s servant roles. However, διακόνος is widely used by Paul to designate not himself alone but also fellow servants (Rom 16:1; 1 Cor 3:5; Phil 1:1; 1 Thess 3:2\textsuperscript{100}), other authorities (Rom 13:4), false-servants (2 Cor 11:15, 23), and Christ (Rom 15:8; Gal 2:17). Apart from Phil 1:1, it appears to be a general term referring to Christian service rather than to a particular office or position;\textsuperscript{101} thus it may also include the Corinthians. Even as Paul’s Christophanic experience sits behind these words, his pluralisation of them is designed to disseminate the focus.

Reference to “new covenant” would immediately bring forward imagery of the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor 11:25), which for Paul’s audience is connected to Paul’s plea for unification amongst the Corinthians (1 Cor 11:17–22; 27–34). Here, Paul re-contextualises the concept for a similar purpose. The language of new covenant has been linked to Jer 31:31 (LXX Jer 38:31).\textsuperscript{102} Therein, the prophet proclaims a future day when God will establish a “new covenant” with the houses of Israel and Judah. God will place his laws in their minds and write them upon their hearts (cf. Ezek 36:26–27). The prophet also contrasts this new covenant to the previous covenant made with those God brought out of Egypt, a covenant they broke (Jer 31:32).

Jeremiah 31:32–33 is often seen as a reference to Exod 19:1–24:11.\textsuperscript{103} But mention of Israel’s covenant disobedience makes Exod 32–34 another possibility.\textsuperscript{104} If


\textsuperscript{100} The reading καὶ διάκονον τοῦ θεοῦ is well attested: e.g., A P Ψ 81 629* 1739.


\textsuperscript{103} E.g., J. A. Thompson, \textit{The Book of Jeremiah}, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 580.

\textsuperscript{104} So, J. Andrew Dearman, \textit{Jeremiah and Lamentations}, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 287.
so, mention of the new covenant may actually be an allusion to the covenant renewal of Exod 34:10–28. Terence Fretheim argues that Exod 34:10–28 actually depicts a “new covenant grounded in a new act of God on behalf of Israel.” This may mean that Paul is already grounding his argument in the Exodus narrative and echoes of Jer 31 and Ezek 36 are secondary. They sit in the back of Paul’s mind but the Exodus narrative is still front and centre as it has been since 3:3.

Paul concludes 3:6 with a contrast between the letter (γράμμα) which kills and the Spirit (πνεῦμα) which gives life. The latter points back to verse 3b (ἐγγεγραμμένη . . . πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζώντος) and makes a direct link between “ministers of a new covenant” and “epistle of Christ.” The singular epistle, which represents all believers, is aligned with the plural ministers, which currently represents Paul and his associates. Paul’s purpose in making this connection is to invite his readers to realise they are already included by way of being connected to the new covenant, which is connected to Christ. This foreshadows Paul’s words in 5:17.

The former, γράμμα, points forward to Moses and the “old covenant” (3:14; cf. Gal 4:21–5:1). Paul consciously constructs a comparison between Christ and Moses, not between Moses and himself. Paul make a deliberate shift from ἑπιστολή to γράμμα so there is no confusion between the continued comparisons in 3:7–18. Γράμμα is not equivalent to Torah just as πνεῦμα is not equivalent to Gospel (cf. Rom 2:29; 7:6). Paul is careful in his wording. Both γράμμα and πνεῦμα in verse 6b are connected to διακόνους rather than to καινῆς διαθήκης. Grammatically, this reading is more

106 Fretheim, Exodus, 308, emphasis his.
108 So correctly, Hafemann, Second Corinthians, 130-33.
109 Pace, Harris, Second Corinthians, 271; Thrall, Second Corinthians, 234; Stockhausen, Moses’ Veil, 34, 62.
difficult. Nevertheless, in light of the subsequent verses, this reading is preferred; otherwise, the antithesis between new covenant and old covenant is lost and letter/Spirit is easily misunderstood as pertaining to two different new covenants. Worse still, this reading may (mis)interpret Paul as equating life with new covenant and death with old covenant.

Paul’s point is that as servants of the new covenant, he and his associates are servants of Spirit and life rather than servants of letter and death (cf. 3:7–8; Rom 7:6). Stated differently, they are servants of the Servant Christ rather than servants of the Servant Moses. It is a seemingly minor difference but with major implications. If death is connected to covenant then God himself is found deficient. However, if death is connected to Moses’ ministry and construed through the lens of Heilsgeschichte, it does not automatically indict Moses or the old covenant. Rather than attacking Moses, Paul’s words are a qal wāḥōmer comparison. This technique requires the audience have a proper understanding and respect for Moses, who serves as a starting place for understanding the surpassing greatness of Christ (cf. Phil 3:8). In a predominately Gentile church, it is safe to assume some of their positive estimation of Moses can be accredited to Paul’s earlier teaching (cf. Acts 18:9–11).

6.2.2 Second Corinthians 3:7–11

In 3:7–11, Paul continues his Moses/letter, Christ/Spirit comparison as he brings his audience deeper into the Exod 32–34 narrative. Key to interpretation is a clear understanding of glory language as Paul employs δόξα thirteen times (out of nineteen) and δοξάζω two times (out of three) in 3:7–4:6. This concept unites the two correlating

---

111 Murphy-O’Connor, Theology, 32-33.
sides of Paul’s *synkrisis* as both share in the divine glory, which should be interpreted in line with the Hebrew כבוד, and thus with Yahweh’s powerful presence (cf. Exod 33:18–23; Isa 6:1–5).\(^{113}\)

This explains Paul’s reading of Exod 34:30 (LXX) in 3:7. Moses’ “ministry of death” came with the full weight of God’s powerful presence, which prevented the people from gazing at his face. The Exodus narrative says the people were afraid to approach Moses, which echoes Exod 20:18–19 where the people were afraid to approach Yahweh because of the spectacular manifestation they witnessed upon Mount Sinai. While “glory” is not employed in Exod 20:18–19 LXX (although cf. Exod 24:16–17 LXX), the powerful presence of Yahweh is evident; a presence now manifest on the face of Moses (Exod 34:29–35) as a result of his extraordinary encounter with Yahweh in Exod 33:18–23. One is immediately reminded of Isa 63:12 LXX and the understanding of Moses as an extension of God’s glory. Since Moses is Yahweh’s selected, and Israel’s elected, spokesperson, they cannot remove themselves from his presence and, therefore, the veil provides a barrier protecting the people from their valid fear of death (cf. Exod 19:9b–25).\(^{114}\)

Paul’s use of the participle τὴν καταργομένην should not be translated adverbially since it is articular and stands in an attributive relationship with τὴν δόξαν. Therefore, translations showing concession (NIV) or causality (ISV) should be avoided. This does not lessen the difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of καταργέω and of the continuous aspect of the present tense. Hafemann argues καταργέω is never used with the sense of “fading away” and this interpretation by others is based solely on 2 Cor 3. In light of Paul’s other passive uses of καταργέω and the Exod 32–34 backdrop,


\(^{114}\) Similarly, Hafemann, *Paul, Moses*, 312, believes that Moses’ veiling himself was an act of grace and mercy.
Hafemann believes it carries the meaning of being rendered inoperative in regard to effects.¹¹⁵ This interpretation alleviates problems caused by translations such as “fading away”¹¹⁶ or “being abolished.”¹¹⁷ For example, neither the Exodus narrative¹¹⁸ nor subsequent traditions speak of such an event. Rather, most allude to the opposite effect, the permanent glory of Moses’ face.¹¹⁹

Moses’ glory, which is God’s reflective glory, is often directly or indirectly equated with the old covenant. This becomes problematic if the old covenant is abolished by God. Paul does not believe God eradicates his own glory because God had a greater glory prepared as part of the new covenant. Instead, it is Moses who, acting on God’s behalf, renders the effects of God’s glory inoperative by way of the veil, while still providing an accessible Yahwistic presence for Israel.¹²⁰ The glory Moses possessed is Yahweh’s glory and is the same glory which is part of the new covenant.¹²¹ What changes is not the glory but the need for a veil to pacify the powerful presence of this glory; what changes is the greater presence of the Spirit, which is the hallmark of the new covenant (1:22; 3:8; 5:5; cf. Isa 44:1–5; 59:20–21; Ezek 36:26–27; Joel 2:28–32).

The ministry of the Spirit particularly equates with the ministry of righteousness (3:9). For Paul, the latter is closely related to the ministry of reconciliation (5:18–21) and both are closely related to the role of the Servant in Isaiah, whom Paul understands to be

¹¹⁶ Harris, Second Corinthians, 284-85; Hughes, Second Corinthians, 102. Cf. Collins, Second Corinthians, 83.
¹¹⁷ Barrett, Second Corinthians, 116; Matera, Second Corinthians, 82-83; Furnish, Second Corinthians, 203. Cf. Thrall, Second Corinthians, 244.
¹¹⁸ Pace, Childs, Isaiah 40–66, 621, who argues that Midrashic exegesis could have deduced from Exod 34 in correlation with Exod 40:35 that Moses’ glory was not permanent.
¹¹⁹ Belleville, Glory, 26-72, lists a variety of references on this subject including: S. Eli. Rab. 18; L.A.B. 19:16; Pesiq. Rab. 21:6; Tg. Onq. on Deut 34:7. She also lists some rabbinic texts she interprets as showing a transitory view of Moses’ glory (67).
¹²⁰ There may be a parallel between Yahweh’s actions in Exod 33:20–33 and Moses’ actions in Exod 34:33–35. As Yahweh protects Moses from the full weight of his glory by covering him with his hand, so Moses protects the people by covering his face with the veil.
¹²¹ So, Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 322-23.
Christ (cf. Isa 53:4–12). Second Corinthians 5:16–21 provides other parallels to 3:7–18, which prove helpful. First, Paul understands Christ as providing the means for reconciliation between God and humanity by way of being made sin (5:21). This is, for Paul, the deficiency in the ministry of Moses and the old covenant. While Moses is able to mediate an outward peace between Yahweh and Israel (Exod 34:7–14) and secure Yahweh’s sustained presence (Exod 33:12–17), he is unable to provide a means for internal cleansing (cf. 2 Cor 7:1; Ezek 36:25), which would allow the relationship to become internal and everlasting. Moses’ ministry is one of the external letter rather than of the internal Spirit. This is why Moses’ ministry is ultimately one of condemnation and death. This is not a condemnation of Moses or of God’s old covenant. It is a declaration of the supremacy of the Spirit (3:10), which is ultimately the supremacy of Christ (3:14).

Second, Paul can speak of believers becoming the righteousness of God only because the ministry of righteousness, which abounds in glory, has had and is having its desired effect. The righteousness of the Servant Christ (cf. Phil 2:6–11) has made many righteous (Isa 53:11; cf. 1 Cor 1:30; Gal 2:16–17; 3:24; Phil 3:9); and since the “ministry of righteousness” is equal to the “ministry of the Spirit,” then Paul and his associates by way of being “servants of the life-giving Spirit” are servant of the Servant Christ (contra 2 Cor 11:15). Paul is continuing to bring together the connection between Christ and the Spirit, which began in 3:3. Ironically, this life-giving Spirit, which is given to all believers (1:22; 5:5), results in death to self for all those who follow in the footsteps of the Servant (5:14–16; cf. 4:10–11).

The capstone of Paul’s qal wāḥōmer comes in 3:10–11. To understand verse 10 one must determine the antecedent of the neuter articular participle τὸ δῦνος ἀσμένον. Hafemann correctly disqualifies the masculine νόμος, the feminine δοξα, and the
feminine διακονία. However, he and others see the neuter as a reference “to the ministry of the old covenant as a whole, especially its theological purpose (v. 9a) and result (v. 7).” But διαθήκη is also feminine. Therefore, it is better to take τὸ πρόσωπον from 3:7 as the antecedent, which aligns with Exod 34:30, 35. Rather than speaking broadly about the entire old covenant, Paul is here speaking specifically about the face of Moses (τὸ πρόσωπον Μωϋσέως) in comparison to the “surpassing glory,” which is representative of Christ. The use of “surpassing” (ὑπερβάλλω/ὑπερβολή) appears multiple times in this letter usually juxtaposing suffering and God’s glorious power (4:7, 17; 12:7; cf. 1:8; 9:14). Paul reminds the Corinthians that God’s glory is intrinsically tied to suffering, for both Christ and his followers. Thus a paraphrase of verse 10 is as follows: “For indeed, [the face of Moses] which has been glorified has not been glorified in this respect, on account of the surpassing glory [of Christ].”

This interpretation is strengthened when taken together with verse 11. Like τὸ δεδοξασμένον, the neuter articular participle τὸ καταργούμενον also points back to the face of Moses, rather than to the feminine δόξα as it had in verse 7. Paul’s focus sharpens and rather than the glory itself being rendered inoperative by the veil, the face of Moses is rendered inoperative by glory. Many translations interpret the preposition διὰ as “with” (ESV, NIV, NASB, RSV) or drop the preposition and translate the noun adjectivally—“was glorious” (KJV; NKJV; HCSB). However, διὰ followed by the genitive (δόξης) is more generally translated as “through” or “by.” Moreover, when following a passive verb such as τὸ καταργούμενον, it expresses intermediate agency and

122 Pace, Furnish, Second Corinthians, 204; Matera, Second Corinthians, 89; Harris, Second Corinthians, 288; Belleville, Glory, 202-03. Stockhausen, Moses’ Veil, 121, argues for this view saying that the neuter in Greek can be used to emphasis “a general quality rather than an individual reality.”
123 Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 323, emphasis his; similarly, Harris, Second Corinthians, 288; Barnett, Second Corinthians, 186 and n. 34. Hafemann makes a distinction between the old covenant and ministry of death, which he believes has been abolished in Christ, and the glory of God that is revealed in the old covenant and remains in the new covenant (324 n. 213). Contra William J. Dumbrell, “Paul’s Use of Exodus 34 in 2 Corinthians 3 ,” in God Who Is Rich in Mercy: Essays Presented to Dr. D. B. Knox, ed. Peter O’Brien and David Peterson (Homebush West: Lancer Books, 1986): 186-87, who believes the old covenant is not abolished but built upon (cf. Jer 31:31-34).
124 Thrall, Second Corinthians, 250.
therefore “by” is the preferred meaning. The answer to how the face of Moses is being rendered inoperative by glory is found in verse 11b. Again, the neuter articular participle τὸ μένον points back to the neuter πρόσωπον, but rather than a reference to Moses’ face, it is a reference to Christ’s face, which is said to remain in glory. The face that remains in glory is equated with the “surpassing glory” of Christ, which is the same glory which renders Moses’ face inoperative. This is not meant to degrade the glorious face of Moses but rather to elevate the glorious face of Christ. The ministry of the Servant Christ is superior to the ministry of the Servant Moses to the extent the latter is eclipsed by the former. This eclipsing is partially in terms of effectiveness. The glory of Moses’ face was rendered ineffective for all but Moses whereas the glory of Christ’s face is able to be experienced and even extended to all (3:18).125

This comparison is important to Paul because his argument relies on an acceptance of Christ as the central Servant rather than Moses. The theme of Exod 32–34 is not Moses’ shining face but the story of covenant violation and covenant renewal. Paul’s desire is to emphasize the new eschatological covenant made possible through Christ and to invite the Corinthian’s to renew their covenant commitment to God, to Paul and his associates, and to the body of Christ as a whole.

6.2.3 Second Corinthians 3:12–18

A slight shift in Paul’s argument takes place in 3:12 as he returns to the *fpp* (cf. 3:7–11). Having shown the amelioration of Christ and the new covenant, Paul, for the first time, makes a comparison between Moses and himself. However, this comparison is not to himself alone but to all believers; Paul is using the *fpp* in the sense of WE-COMMUNITY throughout 2 Cor 3:12–18.126 “This hope” Paul refers to in verse 12a

---

126 So also, Barnett, Second Corinthians, 190 and n. 4.
points back to verses 10–11, to the surpassing glory which remains, and thus to Christ himself.\textsuperscript{127} It is because\textsuperscript{128} of this hope in Christ believers are able to employ great boldness (v. 12b). While the type of boldness cannot be confidently determined, if understood in the context of Exod 34:29–35, it may be a reference to the action\textsuperscript{129} of approaching the glory of God without fear, thus inviting the Corinthians to fully engage the covenant (cf. Exod 20:20; Wis 4:20–5:1). It is also possible Paul’s use of πολλῆ παρρησία is meant to echo the πολλῷ μᾶλλον of verses 9 and 11 (cf. v. 8), which points to the surpassing glory of Christ. By connecting πολλῆ παρρησία with χρώμεθα, which typically means “make use of” (cf. 1 Cor 7:21, 31; 9:12, 15; 2 Cor 1:17; 13:10), Paul claims those who have the hope of Christ are able to make use of Christ’s glory. “Great boldness” is only possible for those living in the eschatological new covenant/new creation sphere. This is what differentiates believers from those residing under the old covenant.

This boldness is often compared to Moses’ apparent lack of boldness, even impropriety, in veiling his face (v. 13).\textsuperscript{130} However, the οὐ καθάπερ (“not just as”) does not contrast believers’ boldness versus Moses’ cowardice. Instead, Paul focuses on the manner in which believers carry out their boldness in contrast to the manner in which Moses was forced to carry out his boldness. Paul’s positive depiction of Moses, as one who was able to withstand the glory of God’s powerful presence, means Moses is illustrative of the new covenant, although still tied to the old covenant. Moses, like believers, had the same hope which allowed him to employ great boldness. Yet, because of Israel’s disobedience and deficiency of Spirit (2 Cor 3:14; 4:4; cf. Exod 33:5), Moses’

\textsuperscript{127} Pace Hafemann, \textit{Paul, Moses}, 336-37, who believes ‘this hope’ points back to 3:8. See Hughes, \textit{Second Corinthians}, 107, for a list of 5 options for the referent of hope.

\textsuperscript{128} Εἰσοδόντες should be understood causatively.

\textsuperscript{129} The addition of “speech” to παρρησία is unwarranted here (contra NASB, KJV, NKJV). While παρρησία can pertain to speech, it can also pertain to action, which fits the context better (cf. 2 Cor 7:4; Phil 1:20; Philem 8). Also, see Belleville, \textit{Glory}, 194-98.

act of great boldness came in the form of veiling his face. It was an act of selfless grace and mercy so the Israelites would not be destroyed by the full weight of Yahweh’s glory (cf. Exod 32:7–14, 32; 33:12–17). Paul’s point is that because the new covenant has been inaugurated through Christ, believers no longer have veiled face (3:16, 18) and thus may more freely utilise their boldness to reveal this new reality.

As in verse 10, Paul’s use of τὸ καταργομένου in verse 13 takes τὸ πρόσωπον as its referent. Verse 13 is best read through the lens of verses 10–11 in correlation with Exod 34:33. In Exodus, Moses’ giving of the commandment was done with unveiled face. It was only after this point Moses covered his face for the dual reasons of protecting the people from the full weight of Yahweh’s powerful presence (cf. 2 Cor 3:7) and also to assure that the people did not worship him instead of the source of his glory. In verse 13, Paul argues that part of the reason Moses veiled his face was so the people would stop gazing at him, so as to recognise the surpassing glory of God, proleptically, Christ. The τέλος should be rendered “end” rather than “goal,” as Paul is making a hyperbolic comparison similar to the one made in verses 10–11. Moses’ face is coming to an end in the light of Christ’s surpassing glory.

Verse 14a is still wrapped in the Exodus narrative as it refers to Israel’s idolatry with the golden calf (Exod 32:9; 33:3, 5), possibly through the interpretation of Isa 63:17—“Why, O Lord, do you make us stray from your ways and harden our heart, so that we do not fear you?” (cf. Isa 29:10; 42:17–20; Deut 29:2–4). The ἀλλὰ is a reference to the negative outcome of Moses’ positive attempt to help the people see the

---

131 Similarly, Harris, Second Corinthians, 300, who says it was to “prevent preoccupation with outward δόξα.”
132 Cf. Belleville, Glory, 201-02; Martin, Second Corinthians, 68; Stockhausen, Moses’ Veil, 126. Although all with different reasons and conclusions than here. Stockhausen says Paul intended the ambiguity and thus the word carries both ideas, though in other places she argues more for ‘end’ (120).
133 Thrall, Second Corinthians, 257; Barrett, Second Corinthians, 119-20; Wright, Climax, 181.
134 Note Paul’s use of the aorist ἐπωρώθη.
135 John Goldingay, Isaiah, NIBCOT (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001), 360, writes: “Why do you harden our hearts?” implies that Yahweh has treated Israel and Pharaoh in the same way and that Yahweh lies behind the recalcitrance that Israel begins to show even at Sinai.”
surpassing glory. Isaiah 63:17 may also be in Paul’s purview in verse 15 when the veil moves from being over “their minds” to being over “their heart” as the MT uses the singular לֵב (cf. the LXX’s τὰς καρδίας).136

Verse 14b makes a shift to the present tense, which is meant to engage Paul’s audience137 with an eschatological quandary. The phrase ἄχρι (γὰρ) τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας may be an allusion to Deut 29:3 LXX— ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, which is also part of a Mosaic covenant renewal narrative. Paul’s use of ἡμέρα usually carries eschatological significance,138 and here and in verse 15, Paul juxtaposes the past and the present. Paul reminds the Corinthians that although they are living in the eschatological now, as part of the new covenant people, there are still those who continue to exist under the constraints of the old covenant (παλαιᾶς διαθήκης) age, who continue to hear and read Moses and the Torah he represents through the “same veil” (τὸ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον)140 veil rather than to Moses’ face, and certainly not to παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.141 Thus, the veil itself is being rendered inoperative in Christ. The present tense is imperfective as Paul focuses on the already and not yet effects of Christ’s actions.

Verses 15–16 both parallel and advance Paul’s point from verse 14.142

---

136 The difference between plural minds and singular heart should not be overemphasised, nor should the difference between mind and heart; they are more likely complementary. Cf. the NRSV translation of v. 15.
138 Rom 2:5, 16; 13:12, 13; 1 Cor 1:14; 6:2; 2 Cor 1:8; 5:5; Phil 1:6, 10; 2:16; 1 Thess 5:2, 4, 5, 8; cf. Rom 11:8; 2 Cor 4:3.
139 Pace, Thrall, Second Corinthians, 263-64, who thinks the veil lies over the old covenant and not over Moses’ face.
140 See Harris, Second Corinthians, 303, for four options on how to deal with this participle.
For until the day of today this same veil remains at the reading of the old covenant, not being unveiled.  

Because in Christ it is being rendered inoperative.

But as far as today whenever Moses is being read, a veil lies over their heart;  

Now whenever a person turns to the Lord, the veil is being removed.

Moses is likely a metonym for old covenant. Christ and Moses are juxtaposed in such a way as to highlight the superiority of Christ and the new covenant over Moses and the old covenant. The parallel between verses 14c and 16 also suggests Lord and Christ are synonymous. But this conclusion is greatly contested. Verse 16 is an altered quotation of Exod 34:34 LXX. It appears Paul invites his readers to do as Moses has done, to go to the Lord and have their veils removed. Within the Exodus narrative, κύριος is undoubtedly Yahweh, making many deduce Paul must also be referring to Yahweh. Thus, the continued narratological reading of Exodus alone is the strongest argument for this position.

Mehrdad Fatehi makes a strong argument for κύριος as a reference to Christ and not Yahweh. The following six points are among his strongest: (1) the connection between Christ, the Spirit, and the new covenant in 3:3 shows Christ to be the new covenant counterpart of Yahweh; (2) the emphasis is on the veil in 3:13–18 and 3:14c clearly states this veil is removed in Christ; (3) the parallelism between ἐν Χριστῷ in 3:14c and κύριος in 3:16; (4) the multiple connections between 3:16–18 and 4:1–6, which favours a Christological interpretation of the former; (5) the fact Paul refers to Christ as “the Lord of glory” in 1 Cor 2:8; and (6) since all the main verbs from 3:14b

---

143 Harris, Second Corinthians, 305
144 So Fatehi, Spirit’s Relation, 294; Hooker, “Beyond,” 301.
146 So, Dunn, Christ and Spirit, 123-24; Furnish, Second Corinthians, 212; Belleville, Glory, 255; Harris, Second Corinthians, 308-09; Thrall, Second Corinthians, 272-73; Fee, Presence, 312.
147 Thrall, Second Corinthians, 271-72, while arguing in favour of κύριος referring to Yahweh, notes Paul does sometimes use κύριος in an OT quotation to refer to Christ (Rom 10:13; 1 Cor 10:22; cf. 1 Cor 2:16; 10:26; 2 Cor 8:21) and that κύριος without the definite article often refers to Christ (e.g. Rom 1:7; 10:9; 1 Cor 1:3; 4:5; Phil 2:11), especially with a prepositional phrase. E.g., Paul’s use of ἐν κύριῳ, used thirty-four times in the undisputed Pauline letters and almost all in reference to Christ.
forward change from the past tense to the present, Paul has already made a switch to speaking about the application of the Exodus narrative in his current situation.\textsuperscript{148}

Additionally, throughout this large pericope (3:1–4:6), Paul utilises θεός and not κύριος to refer to Yahweh (3:3, 4, 5; 4:2, 4, 6, 7). Paul’s use of the phrase Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κύριον in 4:5 makes it unlikely Paul is referring to Yahweh as κύριος in 3:16–18. Furthermore, most scholars correctly see Paul’s use of the articular ὁ κύριος in 3:17 as anaphoric, pointing back to the κύριος of 3:16. However, by itself, 3:17 seems to point to κύριος as Christ, since the act of spiritual liberation (ἐλευθερία and its cognates) is usually connected to Christ (cf. Rom 8:2; 1 Cor 9:1; Gal 2:4; 5:1).\textsuperscript{149} The implicit connection between Christ and Spirit in 3:3, 6, 8 foreshadows the more explicit statement of 3:17. Taken together, all of these arguments solidify the conclusion κύριος in 3:16–18 is a reference to Christ and not Yahweh.

It is only after this debate is settled that the context can be reengaged. If 3:14–16 is read together with old covenant/Moses and Christ/Lord acting as contrasting parallels, then the contrasting parallel between verses 15 and 16 must also be taken seriously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. 15</th>
<th>whenever [a person] reads Moses</th>
<th>veil lies over their heart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 16</td>
<td>whenever a person turns to the Lord</td>
<td>veil is taken away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although verse 16 is a paraphrased quotation of Exod 34:34 LXX, Paul makes significant changes for the sake of his current argument. Instead of speaking about turning to Yahweh, Paul is contrasting the present situation of people turning to Moses and the old covenant versus those turning to Christ and the new covenant. Once again, this is not a negative statement about Moses or the old covenant. Moses’ veil has been removed because of the new eschatological reality brought about by Christ. Moreover,


\textsuperscript{149} There may be a strong parallel between 2 Cor 3:16b and Rom 8:2, where Christ and the Spirit participate in the act of liberation (ἐλευθεράω).
the need for the veil has also been removed. The people are able to look upon the glory of God because Christ has mediated an everlasting covenant with the Father, which removes sin and allows for true reconciliation. For Paul, the people are to look upon this glory via Christ’s glorious face rather than Moses’. However, even those who look upon Moses’ glorious face, by way of the reading of the old covenant, should still be redirected toward the surpassing glory of Christ, who is proleptically foreshadowed in Israel’s narratives, and Torah (cf. 1 Cor 10:4). In Paul’s understanding, those who refuse to recognise Christ, whether through the hearing of the gospel or through the reading of the old covenant, place a veil over their own heart.¹⁵⁰

Paul’s repositioning of the veil over the heart of unbelievers in verse 15 may implicitly highlight the spiritual depths of Israel’s blindness. However, the Corinthians, in hearing Paul’s allusions to Exod 32–34 would quickly have remembered similar references to Israel’s desert narrative, which Paul used in First Corinthians (10:1–11), writing the Corinthians into Israel’s story. Israel’s ancestors are now referred to as “our ancestors” (1 Cor 10:1; οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν) in relation to the Corinthians, and Paul speaks of their previous Gentile state (1 Cor 12:2; ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε; cf. 5:1; 10:20). As was shown in Chapter 5, Paul used various methods for shaping eschatological identity, including rewriting Gentile’s narrative genealogies (Phil 2:5–11; cf. Rom 11:17–24; 1 Thess 4:5).¹⁵¹ Therefore, one should not automatically interpret 2 Cor 3:1–4:6, or any part therein, as a polemic against Judaism.¹⁵² Nor should the assumption be the Corinthians would have come to this conclusion. Instead, the Corinthians are reminded of their propensity toward disobedience and the historic consequence of these acts. They are reminded of the prophetic promises of a new covenant and of the invitation before them for covenant renewal.

¹⁵⁰ Taking καται as middle not passive.
¹⁵¹ Cf. Donaldson, Paul, 236-38; Hodge, If Sons, 33.
Paul’s apparent equating of κύριος and πνεῦμα in 3:17–18 is unique. In other places Paul is able to speak of the Spirit in connection to both Christ (Rom 8:9c; 1 Cor 15:45; Gal 4:6; Phil 1:19; cf. Rom 1:3–4) and God (Rom 8:9b, 11[bis], 14; 15:19; 1 Cor 2:11, 14; 3:16; 6:11; 7:40; 12:3; 2 Cor 3:3; Phil 3:3). While the latter is more prevalent, the former is not out of the question, especially when Paul’s argument necessitates such a connection. Fatehi, in evaluating the role of the Spirit in correlation to both Yahweh and Christ, speaks of “dynamic identification.” In connection to Christ, this means the Spirit “does not refer to the risen Lord as he is in himself, but as he communicates his power, his life, his will, his very presence, to his people.”

In the current pericope, Paul needs to shift his argument from speaking about what God has done through Moses to what God has done through Christ. Still more, Paul’s goal is to move the people toward covenant renewal and thus toward greater unity. This necessitates their understanding of what God is doing in them through the Spirit. The dynamic presence of the Spirit in the life of the believer has already been noted in 3:3; believers are letters of Christ engraved by the Spirit. This verse is given new meaning in light of 3:16. When believers turn to Christ, the Spirit eliminates the heart of stone and engraves God’s law on their hearts. The Spirit is instrumental in the removing of the veil. Likewise, since Paul and his associates are servants of a new covenant (i.e. servants of Christ), they are simultaneously servants of the life-giving Spirit (3:6) who carries out the ministry of this new covenant (3:8). The Spirit is Christ in action bringing freedom in the life of the believer.

This freedom exemplifies itself in terms of unification and transformation. Paul begins 3:18 with the all-inclusive ἡμεῖς πάντες,156 which is meant to draw the Corinthians fully and explicitly into the narrative just constructed. What Paul has articulated is not limited to him or a select few. If this were the case, then Christ’s glory would not surpass Moses’ in term of effectiveness. Paul is not the mediator of the Spirit or of the new covenant;157 he is one of the servants,158 a servant of the surpassing glory, a servant of the Spirit, a servant of the Servant Christ, the new Moses. As one of the servants, Paul joins with all believers who together form a singular unveiled face (ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ).159 The singularity of this participial phrase is instrumental in Paul’s argument and parallels the singular epistle of Christ in 3:3. Paul’s words have eliminated the distance between him and the Corinthians and between themselves. Those in Christ form a glorious unified body (cf. Rom 12:1–5; 1 Cor 12:12–13, 27) with an unveiled face and unveiled heart. This stands in contrast to the veiled minds and heart of Israel (3:14–15), who continues to turn to Moses and experience the limitation and even constraint of the old covenant.

Paul’s use of “face” rather than “heart” is curious since the connection between verses 15 and 16 suggests the veil removed in Christ resides over the heart. Like in verse 12, Paul’s return to the fpp marks only the second time Paul makes a comparison between Moses and believers. Again, Moses is presented positively. Like Moses before

156 Hafemann, Suffering, 13 n. 24; Thrall, Second Corinthians, 282; Barrett, Second Corinthians, 124. Contra, Belleville, Glory, 275–76; cf. Wallace, Snatched, 179. Furthermore, while Paul would include both Jew and Gentile in his understanding of “we all,” here, his focus is on the unity of the Corinthians with each other and with him and his associates.

157 Pace, Hafemann, Paul, Moses, 400; idem, Suffering, 220.

158 Cf. Jeffrey A. Crafton, The Agency of the Apostle: A Dramatistic Analysis of Paul’s Response to Conflict in 2 Corinthians, JSNTSup 51 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 61, who utilises the contrasting language of “agent” and “agency,” which aligns with the difference suggested here between “mediator” and “servant.” Crafton, however, incorrectly sees a contrast between Moses’ role as agent and Paul’s role of agency (82-93). I would argue that both Moses and Christ are agents and Paul, along with all believers, takes on the role of agency.

159 Many translations pluralise this participial phrase (NIV, NRSV, CEV, HCSB, ISV); although some maintain the singular (NASB, KJV, NKJV, LEB, ESV). Cf. Harris, Second Corinthians, 313, who pluralises it calling it a ‘distributive singular.’
Yahweh, believers before Christ share an unveiled face. Nevertheless, the controlling contrast is still between those turning to Christ and those turning to Moses. The latter are unable to experience the full weight of the glory and thus unable to be transformed. The former, through the Spirit, have the freedom to gaze intently into Christ’s face and be transformed by the glory. The “unveiled-ness” of those in Christ is comprehensive, including face, mind, and heart. Furthermore, the use of face more appropriately fits Paul’s illustrative language of κατοπτριζόμενοι and εἰκόνα.

Κατοπτριζόμενοι, a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, can mean “behold as in a mirror” or “reflect like a mirror.” The former has stronger linguistic support in Hellenistic sources and when read in connection with its controlling verb (μεταμορφόω), the concept of transformation by beholding is preferable to transformation by reflecting (cf. Ezek 1:28; Wis 7:26–27; 1 John 3:2). The real query concerns the “mirror” through which believers behold. Since it is the glory of the Lord (i.e. Christ) believers behold, it is unlikely Christ is the mirror. Additionally, since Paul is here including all believers, he is not referring solely to himself and/or other ministers/apostles as the mirror. More probable is Lambrecht’s proposal of the gospel

---

160 Martin, *Second Corinthians*, 71, says the believer becomes like Moses by turning to the Lord. Contra, Belleville, *Glory*, 278, who believes the contrast is between Moses’ veiled face and the apostles’ unveiled face.


164 This doesn’t necessarily denote a solely visionary experience but may also include a mental contemplation. Cf. Volker Rabens, “Pneuma and the Beholding of God: Reading Paul in the Context of Philonic Mystical Traditions,” in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration and the Cultures of Antiquity: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Jörg Frey and John R. Levison, Ekstasis 5 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 313-14, who argues for both ideas but translates 2 Cor 3:18 as “transformation through contemplation.”

165 Contra, Harris, *Second Corinthians*, 314.


as mirror\textsuperscript{168} or Wright’s proposal of all believers as mirror.\textsuperscript{169} However, the fact the believers are experiencing transformation as a result of beholding the glory of the Lord through this mirror suggests it is neither the gospel nor the believers themselves but rather the dynamic power behind them both—the Spirit.\textsuperscript{170} This brings clarity to Paul’s final clause in 3:18—καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος—and helps strengthen the above reading of 3:17. In the absence of the physical presence of Christ, the Spirit becomes the mediator of the divine glory, which leads to transformation. This is not a comparison between those who saw Christ directly and those who experience him via the Spirit.\textsuperscript{172}

Paul has gone to great lengths to equate these two experiences. Again, the glory referenced is still God’s, here evidenced on the face of Christ (cf. 4:6), through the Spirit, for all believers to directly experience,\textsuperscript{173} rather than on the face of Moses. The face-to-face beholding of God’s glory has thus far been for the mediators (Moses and Christ). Furthermore, the surpassing glory of Christ and the new covenant suggests that whereas Moses only experienced the backside of God’s glory, Christ reflects the fullness of God’s glory. The servants of the Servant must await the consummation of the new age to experience a direct beholding (cf. 1 Cor 13:12).

The “same image” (τὴν αὐτήν εἰκόνα) refers back to Lord (i.e. Christ; cf. 4:4). In Paul’s understanding, believers do not simply gaze upon the glory. This continual gazing leads to continual transformation.\textsuperscript{174} Believers reflect the same image and thus the same glory through their connection with the Spirit. This may be an exposition on the surpassing-ness of Christ who is able to extend glory. Furthermore, when read in correlation with 3:2–3, Paul may be alluding to the Isaianic offspring of the Servant and

\textsuperscript{168} Lambrecht, “Transformation,” 302-03, stresses gospel but also includes the Christian life.

\textsuperscript{169} Wright, Climax, 183-89.

\textsuperscript{170} So also Philip, Pneumatology, 189-90; cf. Dunn, Theology, 422.

\textsuperscript{171} Καθάπερ ἀπὸ denotes agency. See Philip, Pneumatology, 190.

\textsuperscript{172} Pace Lambrecht, “Transformation,” 301-02; Thrall, Second Corinthians, 284.

\textsuperscript{173} So correctly, Garland, Second Corinthians, 199-200.

\textsuperscript{174} Wright, Resurrection, 384.
especially Isa 61:9—“Their offspring will be known among the nations, and their offspring among the peoples. All who see them will acknowledge them, that they are the offspring which Yahweh has blessed.” Paul makes clear this transformation and subsequent reflecting takes place communally with a singular unveiled face. Their continued transformation into glory requires them to be reconciled to Christ but also to his body, which includes Paul and his associates (cf. 5:18–20).

Herein, the importance of the Exodus covenant renewal imagery emerges as Paul invites the Corinthians to turn to Christ, who mediates a new covenant by way of the Spirit. His words serve as a speech-act calling the people to a specific action. Their acceptance of this invitation to covenant renewal will be evidenced primarily in their transformation, which first requires their full acceptance of the Spirit and which will thus lead to their full acceptance of all believers. The fpf has allowed Paul to include the Corinthians in the very transformation to which he is calling them. It is both paradigmatic and proleptic, the former as it points to Paul and his associates and the latter as it points to the Corinthians who are both already and not yet the eschatological people of God (cf. 1:13–14).

6.2.4 Second Corinthians 4:1–6

There is a notable focus on the proclamation of the gospel in 4:1–6. When read in correlation with the second person plural in 4:5 (cf. 4:12, 14–15), there is a tendency to see the fpf’s as strictly WE-MINISTERS/WE-APOSTLES or WE-I references. Nevertheless, Paul is reinforcing his previous argument by presenting a picture of those who presently live as part of the eschatological people of God over and against those living in the present evil age, more specifically his opponents (not the Corinthians). The διά οὗ τούτος, which begins this section, points backwards to the preceding section and most
directly to 3:18, which includes all believers.\textsuperscript{175} Likewise, Paul’s reference to τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην (4:1) should be read with 3:8–9 and the ministry of the
Spirit/righteousness (cf. 5:18; 6:3; 8:4; 9:1, 12, 13).\textsuperscript{176} The focus is on the work of the
Spirit in and through the eschatological people of God; it is on God’s mercy and its
tangible impact in the life of believers in general and here specifically in the life of Paul
and his associates. God’s transforming work has led them to act with great boldness
(3:12), to persevere (οὐκ ἐγκακοῦμεν, 4:1) in the midst of trial (cf. 4:16), to renounce the
hidden things of shame, and not to walk in craftiness nor adulterate God’s word (4:2a).
These are not words of defence. They are a concrete example of those who live as part of
the unveiled community of Christ.

The use of συνιστήμι in 4:2b brings the argument full circle to 3:1 and signals an
important difference between correct and incorrect commendation. The opponents’
commendation comes in the form of letters (3:2) or as self-commendation (10:12, 18); it
is external rather than internal (cf. 5:12) and human rather than divine. For Paul and his
associates, commendation is tied to τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας. Paul is not speaking
about human words which demonstrate his gospel is superior to others. Instead, Paul is
speaking about the ministry of the Spirit at work in and through him and his associates
(cf. 1 Cor 12:7), the Spirit who manifests the truth of the gospel “to the conscience of
everyone in the sight of God.”

The revelatory language of 4:2b is riddled throughout 2:14–7:4 and is often
connected to divine agency, though usually through an indirect human agent. God
manifests (φανεροῦντι) himself through the fragrance of those led in triumphal
procession (2:14). The Corinthians bear witness (φανεροῦμενοι) to being a letter written

\textsuperscript{175} Pace Thrall, \textit{Second Corinthians}, 298; Martin, \textit{Second Corinthians}, 76. Correctly, Harris, \textit{Second Corinthians}, 322.

\textsuperscript{176} Pace Kim, \textit{Origin}, 5, who believes it points to “the apostolic ministry of the new covenant”; see also Aernie, \textit{Paul}, 196-97.
by Christ via the Spirit ministered to by Paul and his associates (3:3) as well as written on their hearts to be known and read by all (3:2). Paul and his associates make visible (φανερωθῇ) the life of Jesus through their suffering (4:10, 11). Mark Seifrid argues Paul’s use of τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας “implies the setting of eschatological judgment” and links it to 5:10—“For all of us must appear (φανερωθῆναι) before the judgement seat of Christ” (cf. 1 Cor 3:13; 4:5; 14:25).\(^{177}\) However, rather than thinking strictly about eschatological judgment, Paul has in mind the divine revelation and divine presence believers experience as part of the eschatological new creation people of God.

When 4:2b is read in correlation with the Exodus narrative, which Paul intentionally reengages in 4:3–4, the concept of revelation and divine presence gains further credence. It is Christ who removes the veil by way of the Spirit and thus enables the believer to join the singular unveiled face of the believing community. It is from this new eschatological sphere of being they see the glory of the Lord and are transformed into this same image, an image which can then manifest Christ to others via this same Spirit. The manifestation of the Spirit is the removing of the veil (3:16), which allows the Corinthians to witness internally the truth of Paul’s gospel message and his faithful witness. The unveiling is simultaneously a union with Christ and his body and it takes place in the ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. 7:12). It is not Paul’s proclamation of the gospel that removes the veil,\(^{178}\) at least not directly. The Spirit must first remove the veil, thus enabling this gospel to be heard and received.

Paul sets a clear division between those who are part of the eschatological people of God and those who are not. This contrast is solidified in 4:3–4 with the distinction between veiled and unveiled. The veil is repositioned a third time, from Moses’ face (3:13) to Israel’s heart (3:15) and now over “our gospel,” i.e. “the gospel of Christ”

---

\(^{177}\) Seifrid, *Second Corinthians*, 193.

This veil is extended to the gospel as it represents Christ and the new covenant. In reality, it sits over the hearts and minds of unbelievers, as is made clear in 4:4 (cf. 3:14; Exod 33:5); it is a metonymy for hard-heartedness. Paul’s use of ἀπόλλωμι to refer to those who are veiled points back to 2:15–16 and solidifies the dichotomy between two very different groups: those perishing versus those being saved; those veiled versus those unveiled; and those blinded by the god of this world versus those seeing the image of the one true God. Paul’s words are not so much meant to indict the Corinthians as to include them. Together, Paul, his associates, and the Corinthians form the “we all” who have seen the glory of the Lord and who are being transformed by the Spirit (3:18). The antithesis between these two groups provides Paul another outlet for shaping the Corinthians’ eschatological identity as the people of God. Paul extends grace and forgiveness to the Corinthians while simultaneously providing a clear impetus for being on the “right” side of the eschatological divide.

In 4:5, Paul also reminds the Corinthians of his commitment to them, which goes hand in hand with his commitment to Christ. Just as the gospel Paul preaches is intrinsically bound to Christ, so too are all ministers of this gospel bound to the body of Christ; they are slaves to the body for Christ’s sake. Paul’s continued references to his suffering and now to his subjection (δοῦλος) to the Corinthians serves multiple purposes. It stands as a reminder to the Corinthians of the commitment Paul and his associates have for them (cf. 1:24; 12:15) and provides an example of what true commitment to Christ means. It evidences unity and invites recommitment, participation, and imitation (cf. Phil 2:7). Paul’s words may also recollect his previous statements in 1 Corinthians; all the work of Paul and his cohort is done under compulsion (1 Cor 9:16–17) and on account of Christ and the gospel in order to become fellow-partakers (1 Cor 9:23) who are not

---

179 Matera, Second Corinthians, 101.
180 Hafemann, Second Corinthians, 177.
disqualified (1 Cor 9:27). Likewise, the Corinthians must recognise the potential for disqualification and the role Paul and his associates play in seeking to build them up rather than tear them down (13:5–10).

Paul concludes this pericope (4:1–6) as well as the whole of this section (3:1–4:6) with an allusion either to Gen 1:3–4 or Isa 9:1 LXX. Either way, his intention is to remind the Corinthians of the creative power of God who is able to “let light shine out of darkness.” That is, God has done a new creative work in the midst of the current old creation (cf. 5:17) and is doing a new creative work in the heart and mind of believers as they become part of the unveiled community of Christ. The dichotomy is not between Paul and the Corinthians, nor between ministers of the gospel and all others. Rather, the eschatological dichotomy between old and new is extended to include the authoritative powers behind these spheres of existence. On the one side is the “god of this age” who prevents unbelievers from “seeing the light of the glory of Christ” (4:4) and on the other side is the God who has “shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (4:6).

This contrasting parallel between 4:4 and 4:6 may also shed light on Paul’s use of the *fpp* in 4:6, which contrasts unbelievers and believers. This conclusion is strengthened when the parallel between 4:6 and 3:18 is taken into account. The latter focuses on continued transformation (μεταμορφούμεθα) of all believers whereas the former pinpoints the decisive moment of faith (ἤλαμψεν). In both, the emphasis lies on God’s action through Christ and the Spirit, both past and present, in the life of Paul, his associates, and all believers.

---

181 For a defence of the former see: Thrall, *Second Corinthians*, 315-16. For a defence of the latter see Aernie, *Paul*, 204-14.
The connection between 4:5 and 4:6 (ὅτι) could lead to the conclusion that the *fpp* in 4:6 refers to WE-MINISTERS/WE-APOSTLES/WE-I. However, the intention behind these words is not to defend, to evidence authority, or to divide. Paul and his cohort are examples of the eschatological people of God who demonstrate the Spirit’s transformation. At the heart of this transformation is union with the body of Christ and unity within this body. This *fpp* is a WE-COMMUNITY statement intended to remind the Corinthians of God’s faithfulness in the past and to invite them to fully embrace the unveiled-face community in Christ.

### 6.3 Confirmation of Christophanic Reference

As noted in the Prolegomena, 3:1–4:6 meets both criteria for being deemed a Christophanic reference. Furthermore, analysis carried out in this chapter shows how Paul employs the Exodus narrative to invite the Corinthians to covenant renewal with Christ, Paul and his associates, and one another. In this way, he appears to invite them to renew their conversion and calling experience, which included a manifestation of the divine. Through allusions to Isaiah, Paul helps them to understand Christ as the singular Servant and Paul and his associates as servants of the Servant. Through his use of the *fpp*, he invites them to embrace a shared calling. The various references to conversion and call and the multiple references to some type of divine manifestation as part of this process suggest this secondary Christophanic reference is most likely intentional.

This conclusion fits the aim of 2 Cor 3:1–4:6. Paul’s goal has been to provide a paradigm for believer conversion, call, and transformation, which would unite them together as the eschatological people of God. One way for Paul to achieve this aim is to lessen the gap between himself and the Corinthians. Rather than elevating his unique experience, Paul intentionally extrapolates the universal elements of his Christophany.

---

183 See Harris, *Second Corinthians*, 333.
and re-particularises the particulars for the benefit of his audience.\textsuperscript{184} All believers, like Paul, experience Christ. However, in a surprising twist, Paul emphasises the connection between Christ and the Spirit (3:17-18). Rather than a Christophany, believers experience Christ through a manifestation of the Holy Spirit, a Pneuma-Christophany (cf. Gal 3:1–5; and possibly Phil 3:15).\textsuperscript{185} The Spirit enables an internal, \textit{then} external transformation (cf. 4:16) by way of an external, \textit{then} internal mediator, namely, Christ. This experience unites all believers as the singular community of the unveiled face, a new creation people of God who are continually being transformed into Christ’s image, by God’s glory, through the Spirit.

\textbf{6.4 Conclusion}

The uncertainty of a Christophanic reference in Second Corinthians called for a rigorous evaluation of 3:1–4:6 in its literary and socio-historical context. Because this proposed reference was embedded in a confluence of OT allusions, it required significant intertextual analysis. It was argued that Paul used Isa 40–66 to frame the whole of his discussion in 2:14–7:4, showing how Christ’s actions had led to an eschatological shift, resulting in deliverance, restoration, and forgiveness of sin. Through reference to Isaiah, Paul also established Christ as the singular Isaianic Servant and showed how he and his associates were the eschatological offspring of the Servant. It was also argued that Paul’s extensive use of Exod 32–34 in 3:1–4:6 was designed to help the Corinthians see the folly of their ways and to invite them to covenant renewal with Christ, Paul and his associates, and one another. Furthermore, when the Exodus narrative was read in correlation with Isaiah, it became apparent that Paul was not comparing Moses and himself or their ministries, but Moses and Christ. Christ was put forth as a second Moses

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{184} Cf. Dunn, \textit{Jesus, Paul}, 95.  
\textsuperscript{185} See Dunn, \textit{Jesus and Spirit}, 98-99.}
figure who surpassed Moses in his ability to extent God’s transforming glory to all who turned to him. In this way, Paul’s invitation to covenant renewal was simultaneously an invitation to embrace their eschatological identity and calling as servants of the Servant Christ.

Furthermore, the a priori judgment of 2 Cor 3:1–4:6 as a secondary Christophanic reference was confirmed. Paul alluded to this experience as a way of helping the Corinthians understand their own conversion and calling as well as their continued transformation in Christ. Paul’s Christophanic reference deliberately stood in the background because he was neither the focus nor trying to establish his authority. Paul moved the focus from his experience and authority and centred it firmly on what God had done and was doing in and through Paul and his associates and what God could and would do in and through all believers as they joined the covenant people through their faith in the faithfulness of Christ.

Paul’s Christophanic reference functioned both didactically and paradigmatically. Didactically, it was designed to teach the Corinthians about who Christ was, what he had done, and what he was continuing to do. It was also intended to teach them about who they were as believers and to inform them about their eschatological identity and calling to be servants of the Servant. Paradigmatically, Paul’s Christophanic reference evidenced a pattern for the Corinthians to emulate if they were to embrace this identity and calling. They needed to accept the invitation for reconciliation and follow the example of Paul and his associates in allowing Christ through the Holy Spirit to transform them continually, both internally and externally. Furthermore, the Corinthians needed to embrace certain elements of the ministry of the Spirit, ministry of justification, and ministry of reconciliation in the world.

The most radical element of Paul’s Christophanic reference was how his own Christophanic experience was presented through the Exodus narrative as the norm for all
believers. Rather than setting his own experience as an unattainable anomaly, Paul removed the particulars of his own Christophanic experience and re-particularised these elements to fit his audience’s situation. They did not have the benefit of the same revelation from Christ, so instead, they experienced Christ through a revelation of the Spirit. They did not have a specific call to apostolic ministry, but they shared with Paul and all believers in an invitation to embrace an eschatological calling to be servants of the Servant. These things moved beyond paradigm as Paul showed that he himself shared in these general elements. Paul, through his Christophanic reference, invited them to recognise the analogous parts of their conversion/call experiences. This, more than anything else, showed the corporate understanding Paul had about his own Christophanic experience and the corporate purpose for which he utilised this narrative.
Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

Many have undertaken a study of Paul’s Christophany with the aim of reconstructing the event and/or its impact on Paul’s life, theology and mission. These objectives have tended toward a removal of the Christophanic references from their literary and socio-historical contexts and toward an amalgamation of the various Pauline references and often also the Acts references. This study uniquely analysed why Paul employed these Christophanic references in their particular contexts, which gave each reference its own voice. As a result, its significant contribution has been a rediscovery of how each reference functions within the whole of Paul’s particular epistolary argument. A further contribution is the synthesis of the thesis’ findings in order to show the shared functionalities of Paul’s various Christophanic references. This can effectively be done now that the individual evaluations are completed. Additionally, the overall findings of this thesis allow for some measured assertions concerning Paul’s understanding of the event itself and its impact. This too is made possible because of the individual evaluations carried out in the body of this thesis. While these assertions move beyond the individual literary and socio-historical contexts, these contexts have provided the foundations.

7.1 Synthesis of the Findings

This thesis began by developing criteria for establishing what constitutes a Christophanic reference and then categorising confirmed references as being either primary or
secondary. This, in itself, has been a contribution to Pauline studies. Five references were confirmed—Gal 1:11–17; 1 Cor 9:1–2, 16–17; 1 Cor 15:1–11; Phil 3:4–14; 2 Cor 3:1–4:6. Of these five, the first three were classified as primary references, sitting in the forefront, and the last two were classified as secondary, sitting in the background. Each of these confirmed Christophanic references was extensively evaluated in its literary and socio-historical settings with special attention given to relevant intertextual issues. Based on the conclusions reached in Chapters 3–6, a synthesis of the findings can now be carried out, which reveals important shared elements regarding purpose.

It has been shown that each Christophanic reference functions as part of a larger argument fitting the overall theme and focus of the particular epistle. These Christophanic references are interpreted by their contexts as well as helping interpret overall themes of their particular epistles. These references cannot be divorced from their contexts without forfeiting at least some of their meaning and functionality and without weakening Paul’s overall argument.

Additionally, against much of the scholarly discussion it has been shown that Paul did not primarily utilise these Christophanic references to assert his apostolic authority or to validate or defend his apostleship. This is noteworthy since most apostolic apologia readings of these epistles rely heavily on the argumentation that Paul’s Christophanic references serve this purpose. This puts a significant burden upon these scholars to evidence apostolic apologia in other areas of the epistle/s apart from Paul’s Christophanic references.

Instead, this thesis has contributed to scholarship by showing that Paul’s Christophanic references always function didactically and paradigmatically. Didactically, Paul utilises these references to teach the various churches deeper theological truths about Christ, the apostolic ministry, and ultimately about their identity as the eschatological ἐκκλησία of God. These teaching points are intricately connected since
what is posited about Christ is exemplified in the apostolic ministry and becomes a defining element in believers’ eschatological identity. Within this didactic function, Paul is willing to exhibit his own past weaknesses or failings in order to evidence a divine—human dichotomy and a differentiation between the two ages. This is especially apparent in Paul’s multiple references to having persecuted the church (Gal 1:13; 1 Cor 15:9; Phil 3:6).

Paradigmatically, Paul uses his Christophanic references to provide a tangible example for his churches to emulate. This “example” takes on different nuances based on the particular situation, the particular audience, and the particular theological truth Paul is trying to express. Nevertheless, Paul’s model emulates Christ’s sacrificial actions and missional mindset and provides a pathway for his audiences to embrace their eschatological identity and their transformation into Christ’s likeness, which involves a greater recognition of and accountability to the body of Christ and the gospel mission. Paul is even willing to reference his Christophanic experience ironically as part of a negative example of worldly attitudes of power and freedom (1 Cor 9:1–2), only to model the eschatological reversal of these erroneous understandings in the continuation of this Christophanic reference (1 Cor 9:16–17).

Additionally, at least two of Paul’s Christophanic references function analogously, which comprises one of the most significant contributions of this thesis. In Galatians and 2 Corinthians (and possibly also Philippians), Paul intentionally strips his Christophany of its particulars and shapes his argument in such a way as to show the analogous elements of his experience with all believers. Paul speaks of all believers sharing in the same revelation of Christ that Paul experienced. Whereas Paul’s revelation appears to be more directly connected to Christ (cf. 1 Cor 15:8), he speaks of believers’ experience of the revelation of Christ as taking place through the Holy Spirit and usually by way of the proclaimed gospel. Since Paul’s various audiences already appear to know
about his unique Christophanic experience, this Pneuma-Christology is not meant to differentiate the two experiences but to align them.

Paul also speaks of all believers sharing in the same calling as his to be servants of the suffering Saviour Servant Christ, by uniting with Christ, taking on Christ’s righteousness, and participating in the missio dei. This twofold phenomenon moves beyond mere paradigm. Since Paul’s audiences have already experienced conversion/call, he is not here inviting them to emulate his identity, attitude, or actions. Paul is reminding these believers of their initial conversion/call and doing so in such a way as to move them toward a deeper and more profound understanding of their shared eschatological identity and shared calling in Christ. It is this knowledge that should move them toward greater Christ-likeness.

Each of these purposes highlight the corporate direction of Paul’s Christophanic references. Paul’s references invite participation in his own experience on multiple levels. Through the didactic elements, Paul invites his audiences to participate through learning; through the paradigmatic elements, Paul invites them to participate through following; and through the analogous elements, Paul invites them to participate through sharing.

7.2 Assertions Concerning Paul’s Christophanic Experience

Three measured assertions can now be posited with respect to Paul’s Christophanic experience and its impact. These are based on the individual contextual evaluations as well as the above synthesis and emphasise the likely impetuses behind why Paul utilises his Christophanic references for didactic, paradigmatic, and analogous purposes.

First, as has been shown, the book of Isaiah (esp. Isa 40–66) played a strategic role as the basis for various points Paul was attempting to argue within his Christophanic references, not least with regard to his own experience. It would appear that Paul’s
understanding of his Christophanic experience was either greatly influenced by his rereading of Isaiah or that Isaiah was the most fitting text for Paul to express information gained from his revelatory experience. Either way, the fact that Paul utilised this text to hold Christ up as the fulfilment of the Isaianic Servant and to argue the call upon all believers to become servants of the Servant shows the importance of Isaiah for Paul and for his communities.

Second, the fact that Paul highlights analogous elements between his Christophanic experience and believers’ experience in terms of both the revelatory event and the calling says something about Paul’s understanding of his own conversion/call. Paul’s Christophany was ultimately an act of being in Christ and part of the body of Christ; it was ontological. The Christophanic experience did not just shape him or his reading of the old covenant and the place of the Gentiles in the eschatological kingdom. Paul’s experience shaped the way he viewed conversion and call as a whole. For Paul, conversion can only take place through a revelation of Christ, whether directly or through the Holy Spirit, which removes the veil from one’s heart and mind and makes that one a part of the eschatological community of believers. Additionally, conversion always comes with a call to share in the mission of the Servant. Whether this understanding comes directly from Paul’s Christophany or through his subsequent rereading of the OT illuminated by the Spirit cannot be determined with any certainty. Nevertheless, the Christophany is the controlling factor in Paul’s understanding of the ontology of God’s eschatological conversion/call.

Third, and closely related to Paul’s ontological understanding of conversion/call, is Paul’s corporate understanding of conversion/call. This moves beyond saying Paul’s conversion/call was purposed for others and beyond saying Paul purposes his Christophanic references for the sake of building up the body of Christ. While these things are true, they are a result of Paul’s corporate understanding of conversion/call. In
other words, these references are corporate because Paul’s theological understanding about conversion/call is ultimately corporate. Paul may have understood his own Christophanic experience as corporate in that through this experience he joined all believers past, present, and future in participating in the mission of God through his participation in Christ. This explains why Paul’s Christophanic references are ultimately a means of solidarity and unification rather than distinction and division. Although personal, at its core, it is a corporate Christophany that shapes Paul’s mission and message.

7.3 Suggestions for Further Study

This thesis has significantly advanced the discussion concerning the purpose of Paul’s Christophanic references and made measured assertions concerning the Christophanic experience. The conclusions reached in this thesis provide an opportunity for further research, which, while beyond the scope of this study, may provide additional evidence to strengthen its findings.

First, further research remains to be done on Paul’s multiple references to “call” and “grace,” as they relate to Paul’s Christophanic experience. Paul’s “call” language (κλητός, κλησίς, καλέω) is employed to speak of his own call (Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1) and to believers’ call (e.g. Rom 1:6, 7; 1 Cor 1:2, 24; Gal 5:13; 1 Thess 4:7; cf. Phil 3:14). Therefore, Paul’s references to himself could function similarly to Gal 1:11–17 and 2 Cor 3:4–4:6, as a way of typifying his own calling or as a way of elevating believers’ calling.

Likewise, on five occasions (Rom 1:5; 12:3; 15:15; 1 Cor 3:10; Gal 2:9), Paul closely connects God’s “grace” with his own apostolic position and/or work. In four of these references, there is a formulaic use of the articular aorist passive participle τὴν ἀποθεόσαν followed by μοι. The focus is on a past “giving” of grace by God to Paul for a
particular purpose. Paul uses a very similar formula to speak of the grace given to believers (Rom 12:6; 1 Cor 1:4; 2 Cor 8:1; cf. the *fpp* in Rom 1:5), which may have an important parallel in speaking about the Holy Spirit given to all believers (1 Cor 12:7–8; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; 1 Thess 4:8).¹ This may provide parallels to Paul’s Pneuma-Christophany phenomenon in Gal 3:1–5 and 2 Cor 3:17–18 (cf. Phil 3:15).

Finally, an additional study needs to be undertaken on the proposed Christophanic references in the disputed Pauline epistles and most notably Eph 3:1–13. An evaluation of this pericope in correlation with the present study may provide an additional voice into the ongoing discussion of its Pauline authenticity.

¹ Barclay, *Paul & Gift*, briefly highlights the connection between call and grace as it relates to both Paul and all believers (pp. 332, 354, 358-60). Still, further work needs to be done on this intersection.
Appendix 1

Chiastic Structure of 1 Corinthians 15:1–11 (NRSV)

A 1 Now I should remind you, brothers and sisters, of the good news that I proclaimed to you, which you in turn received,

B in which also you stand. 2 through which also you are being saved, if you hold firmly to the message that I proclaimed to you—unless you have come to believe in vain.

C 3 For I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received: that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, 4 and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures, 5 and that he appeared to Cephas,

D then to the twelve.

E 6 Then he appeared to more than five hundred brothers and sisters at one time,

F most of whom are still alive,

F\(^{1}\) though some have died.

E\(^{1}\) 7 Then he appeared to James,

D\(^{1}\) then to all the apostles.

C\(^{1}\) 8 Last of all, as to someone untimely born, he appeared also to me.

9 For I am the least of the apostles, unfit to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. 10 But by the grace of God I am what I am,

B\(^{1}\) and his grace towards me has not been in vain. On the contrary, I worked harder than any of them—though it was not I, but the grace of God that is with me.

A\(^{1}\) 11 Whether then it was I or they, so we proclaim and so you have come to believe.
Chiastic Structure of 1 Corinthians 15:1–11 (Greek)

A 1 Εγνώριζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὅ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, δ καὶ παρελάβετε,

B ἐν δὲ καὶ ἑστήκατε, δι’ οὖν καὶ σώζεσθε, τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε, ἐκτός εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστεύσατε.

C 3 παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, δ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὦτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς καὶ ὦτι ἐπέφανεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς καὶ ὦτι ὥφθη Κηφᾶ

D εἰτα τοῖς δώδεκα.

E 6 ἔπειτα ὥφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίων ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ,

F ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἐς ἡρτι,

F1 τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν.

E1 7 ἔπειτα ὥφθη Ἰακώβῳ

D1 εἰτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάσιν:

C1 8 ἐσχάτων δὲ πάντων ὑσπερεῖ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὥφθη κάμοι. 9 Ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμὶ ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων δεικνύσαι καλεῖται ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 10 χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμὶ δεικνύσαι

B1 καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἐις ἐκεῖνοι ἐκ ἑνὸς ἐγεννήθη, ἀλλὰ περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκπλάσα, οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ ἀλλὰ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ [ἡ] σὺν ἐμοὶ.

A1 11 εἰτέ οὖν ἐγὼ εἰτέ ἐκεῖνοι, οὕτως κηρύσσομεν καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστεύσατε.
Appendix 2

The Theme of Unity in Philippians

The theme of unity is most clearly reflected in Paul’s use of φρονέω (ten times). While this word can convey several nuances, Paul uses it most often with regard to “having or developing a certain ‘mindset,’ including attitudes and dispositions.” Paul calls the Philippians to be of the same mindset as him (2:2), Christ (2:5), and all who are mature (3:15), vis-à-vis those who are of a different mindset (3:15; ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε), focused on earthly things (3:19). Paul’s repetitive plea for the church to be of the same mindset has led some scholars to see a degree of disunity within the church, one that is apparently best evidenced in the disagreement between Euodia and Syntyche (4:2–3).

Davorin Peterlin advances disunity as the central problem in the Philippian church, believing the conflict is between those who remain faithful to Paul and his gospel and those who are questioning these in light of Paul’s imprisonment and suffering. This hypothesis, while plausible, does not seem tenable. First, Paul’s language and tone evidence and emphasize an unthreatened unity between him and the Philippians (e.g. 1:3–8, 29–30; 2:12–18; 4:1, 14–16). Second, the φρονέω language highlights Paul’s positive mindset toward the Philippians (1:7) and their positive mindset toward him (4:10 [bis]). Third, Paul’s thanksgiving for the Philippians’ sharing in the gospel (1:5; cf. 1:7) and for their financial gift (4:14–16) does not give the slightest hint Paul is speaking to only a portion of the congregation or to a particular house church, but

---

1 BAGD, 1065-066: “to have an opinion with regard to,” “to give consideration to,” “to develop an attitude based on careful thought.”
2 Fee, Philippians, 89 and n. 80.
3 Cf. Bruce, Philippians, 19.
4 Davorin Peterlin, Paul’s Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church (NovTSup 79; Leiden: Brill, 1995), passim.
5 Cf. 2 Cor.
is fully inclusive. Fourth, the fact Paul believes sending Timothy to Philippi will result in
an encouraging report, “indicates he expects an amicable resolution of any problem”
addressed in this letter (2:19). Fifth, without the brief mention of Euodia and Syntyche
(4:2) the issue of disunity would not be so easily read into the rest of the letter; this is
exactly what Peterlin does. Finally, Paul’s κοινων- and σύν language emphasises
significant partnership between the Philippians and Paul and between the Philippians and
one another. Therefore, it may be concluded any disunity is not significant enough to
warrant major concern by Paul or major attention here.

Rather than emphasising disunity, Paul’s φρονέω language presents the
Philippians with an opportunity to further embrace the transformation begun in them
through Christ by growing in unity together, not only in the midst of their suffering but
also in their understanding of suffering. This climaxes in 2:1–4, which centres in the
rather odd imperative of verse 2a—πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαρὰν ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φρονήτε. This
should not be read as an arrogant, self-serving directive, but as a significant exhortation
within Paul’s overall argument, which demonstration his pastoral heart and underscores
an important aspect of unity. Paul’s joy is inextricably tied to the Philippians (1:18b–19;
2:16–18; 4:1, 10) just as theirs is tied to him (1:25–26; 2:28). Additionally, their joy
connects them to one another (3:1; 4:4–7) and to the gospel proclamation (1:3, 18a).
Paul’s joy is not contingent upon his physical circumstances (4:11–13), a point the
Philippians need to hear, but is tied to a variety of relationships, which Paul hopes to see
brought to completion (πληρώο; cf. 1:11; 2:2; 4:18–19). This brings some clarity to the

7 Keown, Congregational Evangelism, 59.
8 Peterlin, Paul’s Letter, passim but esp. 219-224; cf. Bruce Winter, Seek the Welfare of the City:
Christians as Benefactors and Citizens (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994), 99, who sees this as proof of ongoing
competition in the community for office and honour.
9 A view taken by Robert Fortna, “Philippians: Paul’s Most Ego-centric Letter,” in The
Gaventa (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), 220-34.
10 Fee, Philippians, 183.
strange *hina* clause— ἵνα τὸ οὖτο φρονήτε (2:2)—which functions epexegetically, bringing precision to Paul’s use of joy. It may thus be translated: “complete my joy; my joy is that you all be of the same mind.” Likewise, what follows in 2:2b–4 further explicates what Paul means by “same mindedness.”

The theme of unity is also evidenced in Paul’s use of the κοινων- root. Paul utilises both the noun and verb κοινωνία (1:5; 2:1; 3:1) and κοινωνέω (4:15) as well as the compound noun and compound verb συγκοινωνός (1:7) and συγκοινωνέω (4:14). There is a tendency to view the compound and non-compound forms as fully interchangeable having a unified meaning of either “to share with someone in something” (participation), “to give someone a share in something” (impartation), or “in the absolute” (fellowship). Therefore, the debate tends to revolve around how Paul uses the various words in their particular contexts rather than whether these words are actually interchangeable. One notable exception is Fee who in a footnote writes:

The compounding of κοινωνός with σύν is probably the sure giveaway that the word κοινωνία on its own does not mean to fellowship in the sense of “share something together” or “be partners in something” . . . but to “participate in” something. The compound means precisely what many have considered the basic word to mean, “to share together in” hence to be “participants together” in the grace of God.

Fee’s observation is astute and deserves further evaluation within the epistle as it may have potent consequences for interpretation of Philippians as a whole.

Fee sees the stress falling on the joint-participation between Paul and the Philippians. Thus, κοινωνία and κοινωνέω emphasise participation with Paul, meaning they share in a similar situation, action, or relationship with Christ, but do so independently, whereas συγκοινωνός and συγκοινωνέω underscore partnership with

---

14 Fee, *Philippians*, 91 n. 87, see also 83 n. 52.
Paul, i.e. cooperation. However, this distinction is hard to maintain, as witnessed by Fee’s several amalgamations. It is, after all, hard to understand Paul’s use of κοινωνία in 1:5 and 2:2 and his use of κοινωνέω in 4:15 as not including the aspect of partnership or cooperation with him. This is especially so in 4:15 when Paul speaks of the Philippians participating “with him” (μοι).

In order to understand the purpose behind Paul’s use of the compounded κοινων- root it must be evaluated alongside his other σύν compounds, which are bracketed between the compounded uses of the κοινων-root:

1. The Philippians “participate together” (συγκοινωνός) in Paul’s grace of suffering (1:7)
2. Paul speaks about his personal struggle of being “held together” (συνέχω) between life and death (1:23)
3. He calls them to “struggle together” (συναθλέω) for the faith of the gospel (1:27)
4. He commands them to be “together in spirit” (σύμψυχος) in the midst of their suffering (2:2)
5. He says that he “rejoices together” (συγχαίρω) with them in his suffering (2:17)
6. Likewise, they too must “rejoice together” (συγχαίρω) with him in their suffering (2:18)
7. He describes Epaphroditus as a “co-worker” (συνεργός) (2:25)
8. He also describes Epaphroditus as a “fellow-soldier” (συστρατιώτης) (2:25)
9. Paul expresses his desire to be “formed together” (σύμμορφος) with Christ’s death (3:10)
10. He commands them to become “imitators together” (συμμιμητής) of his example of sacrifice and straining toward the goal (3:17)
11. He tells the Philippians Christ will transform the body of their humiliation to be “formed together” (σύμμορφος) into the body of his glory (3:21)
12. He referred to Euodia and Syntyche as those who have “struggled together” (συναθλέω) with him (4:3)
13. He also describes Euodia, Syntyche, and Clement as “co-workers” (συνεργός)
14. He refers to an unnamed person as a “yokefellow” (σύζυγος) (4:3)
15. He request this yokefellow to “take hold together” (συλλαμβάνω) these women in their struggle (4:3)

---

15 Fee, *Philippians*, 83, 438 (especially n. 8), 439.
16 Suffering seems to be the impetus for this command in light of its connection to the preceding section (1:27–30).
17 Again, the context reveals the rejoicing to be connected to Paul’s being “poured out” as a sacrifice (2:17).
18 Read in correlation with 2:17, it appears the Philippians are called to rejoice in the midst of their suffering just as Paul rejoices with them in the midst of his suffering.
19 Various suggestions have been postulated concerning the identity of the one known only as σύζυγος. See O’Brien, *Philippians*, 480-81, for a list of options.
16. The Philippians “participate together” (συγκοινωνέω) in Paul’s affliction (4:14)

Several things are immediately evident from this list. First, all sixteen of Paul’s σύν compounds relate to suffering or struggling, either directly or indirectly. Second, all sixteen emphasise unity, whether between Paul and Christ (nos. 2[?], 9), between Paul and a specific member/s of the church (nos. 7, 8, 12, 13, 14), or between the Philippians and one another (nos. 1, 3, 4, 5[?], 6, 10, 11, 15, 16). The first two categories are intended to provide an example of unity for the Philippians to emulate in the midst of their travails, whereas the last category emphasises Paul’s desire for the Philippians’ further development of unity. This last category also helps clarify the nuance of Paul’s compounded κοινων-root. Setting aside these two uses (1, 16), the other seven references emphasise shared action between the Philippians and one another. Therefore, it can be postulated that rather than underscoring the link between Paul and the Philippians, the compounded κοινων-root underscores a shared action on the part of the Philippians. Paul is accentuated their past unity as a way of encouraging them toward continued unity.

---
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