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Abstract

This thesis uses a model of honour to make sense of Paul’s response to the situation in Galatians as he describes it in Galatians 6.12-15. We argue that the use of εὐπροσωπέω at 6.12, and its close proximity to καυχάμαι in the following verses, highlights that honour concern is present in this situation. We assess this by considering *face*, a term used by social theorists to describe the ‘self as it appears to others’, and *facework*, the strategies for maintaining and managing such — this is considered both as a social-scientific model and as a concept within ancient Mediterranean culture. This argument holds that Paul contradicts the opponents’ seeking of ‘good face’ (εὐπροσωπέω) as it is in direct contrast to what we term God’s *prosopagnosia* — πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἄνθρωπον οὐ λαμβάνει (2.6), and to his own position, which is to ‘boast in the cross’ (6.14). We read the idea of the boast in the cross as Paul’s attempt to reconfigure honour within the Christian assemblies of Galatia, a reconfiguring that centralises Christ’s disregard for common perceptions of honour, exemplified in his crucifixion. This approach then makes sense of Paul’s autobiographical data as his own attempt to model Christ’s *prosopagnosia* and similarly reads the data in 5.13-6.10 as Paul’s exhortation that the community live in this manner.
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1. Introduction: Face in Galatians

1.1 Introduction

‘Ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπήσαι ἐν σαρκὶ, οὕτωι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται. οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουσιν ἄλλα θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται. Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωσται κάθῳ κόσμῳ. οὗτε γὰρ περιτομῆ τί ἐστιν οὗτε ἀκροβυστία ἄλλα καὶνή κτίσις.

St. Paul, Galatians 6.12-15

‘Galatians fairly bristles with a sense of rivalry and competition.’
Jerome H. Neyrey

This thesis explores the importance of the honour concept of face for understanding how Paul intends to reconfigure the social situation of those he addresses in Galatians. The use of εὐπροσωπήσω and its connection to καυχάσμαι in Galatians 6.12-15 alert us to honour concern as an issue in Paul’s description of the crisis. These two words have received minimal examination from this perspective, but we will suggest they are significant in determining the conflict surrounding the situation in Galatia, why Paul considers the ‘boast in the cross’ an appropriate response, his representation of Christ in the letter, and the social implications of the redefined values that he imagines should define ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας.

Honour rarely escapes a mention in recent work on Galatians, yet often only a passing reference to its ubiquity as a cultural feature. It is common to see a somewhat monochromatic comment about ancient Mediterranean honour accompanied by a reference to Malina’s seminal The New Testament World but without a serious

---

2 e.g. Cosby (2009).
consideration of its impact on interpretation. Galatians, it seems, does not often interest those interested in honour.\textsuperscript{4} We will argue, however, that appreciating honour, and the concerns regarding it in the ancient Mediterranean world, are crucial to understanding the tensions in the Galatian assemblies and Paul’s response as he articulates it in his letter to them.\textsuperscript{5}

In his 1985 SBL presidential address, Wayne Meeks advised that understanding the behaviour of early Christian\textsuperscript{6} groups required a commitment to describe the larger culture ‘with its various local permutations’ that the early Christians lived in and how that affected the structure and interactions of their assemblies:\textsuperscript{7}

‘We know that the Christian communities of the first century did not exist in a vacuum, even though they often seem to do so in our books about them. The first Christians had to deal with their cousins and in-laws in their villages, and the concern for honor or shame of their extended families was as much a part of their world as the smell of the village dung heap.’\textsuperscript{8}

This position reflects Walter Bauer’s reported claim that, ‘On the way toward ascertaining the intention of an early Christian author the interpreter is first to ask how the original readers of the author’s document understood what he had said in it.’\textsuperscript{9}

The difficulty of locating the Galatian readers geographically, however, seems to have dissuaded many from attempting this type of analysis. Consequently, literary assessments of the epistle significantly outweigh contextual and recipient-focused


\textsuperscript{5} On the intersection of text and context, cf. Robbins (1996b: 144-191), and more broadly, Robbins (2009).

\textsuperscript{6} We will avoid the terms ‘church’ and ‘Christianity’ throughout, preferring ‘assembly’ and ‘Jesus movement’ as better representative of the first century situation, in agreement with Oakes (2015: 15). Whilst similar tensions exist for ‘Christian’ it appears less problematic. We will also reservedly use ‘Jew’ and related familiar terminology, noting the ongoing and valuable debate amongst current scholarship on reading this primarily as an ethnic term. We briefly consider this at §6.3.2.


\textsuperscript{8} Meeks (1986: 7).
As Sänger recently noted, this may also be due to Galatians’ place in Christian theology, ‘Neben dem Römerbrief gilt der Galaterbrief als das theologisch bedeutendste literarische Vermächtnis des Apostels Paulus’, as there is a reticence (ist bekanntlich umstritten) to allow theological issues to be affected by contextual concerns. Suggestions that have ventured an opinion on the initial audience either seem overly conjectural or slightly fanciful. John Barclay significantly influenced this field with his ‘mirror-reading’ methodology that attempted to avoid the petitio principii of interpreting a text based on a context generated from that very text. However, the rise in interest in social-context issues relating to NT study (sociology, cultural anthropology, social-sciences, etc.) combined with the compelling work of Stephen Mitchell on the Anatolian area appears to have brought, in the last couple of decades, more confidence to scholars working in these areas. J.L. Martyn, Philip Esler, Martinus de Boer and Peter Oakes have all produced commentaries which have, although using different methods, read the text with various levels of contextual awareness. Martyn’s proposal that we should attempt to ‘listen to the letter with Galatian ears’ is compelling, although regularly, in his case, suspiciously subjective.

---

9 As cited in Martyn (1997b: 210n10).
11 Sänger (2010: 1, 56).
12 cf. Ramsey (1900), who appears to have continually revised his opinions over the course of his career, further implying the conjecture of his views.
14 cf. Barclay (1987), see also Gupta (2012). Barclay’s criteria reduced some of the developing paranoia regarding any reconstruction of Paul’s various agonistic situations. cf. Sumney (1990: 75-120), Sumney (1999: 1-32) and, more recently, Sumney (2005) for further development of this approach. Whilst Lyons (1985: 96) considered this type of approach ‘unworkable’, others have suggested that not ‘reading between the lines’ is impossible (cf. The critique of Lyons and alternate proposal in Silva (2001: 106)). cf. Hardin (2014), who shows recent attempts to read Galatians ‘without a mirror’.
17 Martyn (1997a: 118, 42) suggests that Galatians provides ‘solid grounds’ on which to reconstruct an image of the ‘Teachers’ (his term for the opponents) and then read the letter with ‘Galatian ears’. This approach is ultimately, however, an exercise in mirror-reading. Interestingly, in an earlier published version of these ideas Martyn (1985: 313) advised a level of ‘poetic fantasy’ in this process. Barclay (1987: 85) explicitly criticised this, and curiously the paragraph in question is not present in either of the re-publications of said essay. cf. Martyn (1997a: 118; 1997b: 9). Other examples of mirror-reading can be seen in Brinsmead (1982), Howard (1990: 7-11), Jewett (1971: 209-212), Longenecker (1990: 129-133).
His suggestion, however, has been heeded by scholars and students alike with studies appearing that focus on different aspects of the Galatian context.\(^\text{18}\)

The analysis of behaviours, values, and perspectives of the people recorded in the New Testament (NT) has been somewhat contentiously approached in recent years by the use of social-scientific models as a ‘way in’ to the social world the texts represent.\(^\text{19}\) Whilst this approach has encountered objections (See §2.2-3), Zeba Crook argues, ‘If longevity can be the test of validity, then modelling in the study of the ancient world is here to stay.’\(^\text{20}\) This would appear to be the case for models of honour. Whilst they have been rightly criticised for crass, unrefined usage in some situations, the question presently appears to be not so much about whether honour models are useful for NT research, but rather what type and how they are to be used.\(^\text{21}\) If we really are to ‘listen with Galatian ears’,\(^\text{22}\) a model of honour would appear to limit the subjectivity inherent in Martyn’s approach and hopefully ensure that our argument sounds like something Galatian ears might actually hear. For, with Oakes, we agree that at the ‘heart of the contextual issues’ is how our model will relate to the epistle’s addressees, τὰ ἐκκλησίας τῆς Γαλατίας (1.2).\(^\text{23}\)

In addition to this, many scholars argue that the Greco-Roman household is the ‘basic context’ within which Christian assemblies were established.\(^\text{25}\) This position is well


\(^{\text{19}}\) See the exchanges about the use of models in NT research in Esler (1998b, 2000) and Horrell (2000) and our §Appendix 1, esp.§1.2.2-1.2.3.

\(^{\text{20}}\) Crook (2007: 251). Objections can be seen in Lawrence (2003), and also Finney (2012: esp.5-12).

\(^{\text{21}}\) cf. Downing (1999) who broadly concurs with the advice in Carney (1975) on models generally. Many of the fears about models amongst NT scholars seem to often relate to a misunderstanding about approach. Whilst the ‘kit-bashing’ approach in Malina (1986) appears unrefined, in actuality it reflects the nuance required to explore a distant cultural context (cf. Esler (1998b: 259)).

\(^{\text{22}}\) Martyn (1997a: 118, 42).

\(^{\text{23}}\) Oakes (2015: 11).

represented in the Pauline literature with the Christian gatherings identified with some sort of κατ’ οἶκον formula (cf. Romans 16.3-5; 1 Corinthians 1.16; 16.15, 19; Philippians 4.22; Philemon 2; Colossians 4.15), supporting the data in Acts which suggests that assemblies were often initially formed from household units (Acts 2.47; 10.1-11.18; 16.15, 31-34; 18.8). 26 We note also the instruction given πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους in Galatians 6.10, suggesting the applicability of this model to the Galatian assemblies. 27

During the early period of Roman empire the household group was the ‘foundation of society’ (Cicero Off. 1.53-54) and the place where honour and status were conferred. 28 The structure of the household was, therefore, hierarchical, reflecting the societal view of the natural distinction of superior and inferior people, and the tendency to develop vertical social ties rather than horizontal ones. 29 Longenecker and Oakes argue that Christian assemblies would likely be composed of a group of members with a perspective on life that was ‘innately hierarchical’. 30 Not only was this the nature of a household, but as the assembly grew the tendency would be to ‘draw in a social range spreading downwards’ (cf. Galatians 2.10). 31 Furthermore, we would also argue that the pervasiveness of honour concern would additionally suggest that the natural intention of those new members would be to increase their status both internally and externally as a result of their association. 32 For our purposes, the social location of an assembly, and

25 Following Meeks (1983: 84). To be clear, the household model is a relatively recent consideration in NT scholarship. The observation by Malherbe (1977: 61) that scholarship largely ignored the household’s helpful analogy to the NT (e.g. Gager (1975: 132-140)) preceded a sudden and significant growth in the field (cf. Banks (1980: 17-22)). Ascough (1998) and Gehring (2004: 5-16) offer helpful studies of this development. cf. Balch and Osiek (2003) and Osiek and Balch (1997). Adams (2013) objects to this model being universally accepted.


31 Oakes (2015: 12). This position follows, in addition to Oakes, the work of Balch (2004) and Wallace-Hadrill (1994, 2003). The Pompeian archaeology shows that the households were more complex and larger than they are sometimes represented to be, cf. Roberts (2013).

32 The suggestion that household members would cease to compete for honour does not sufficiently consider the difference between fictive kinship and family, pace Bartchy (2002: 93). Therefore,
thereby the economic stability of its members, is not overly important. Whether the assembly reflected the newer consensus that they were not as poor as earlier scholarship suggested or not, their presence within a household-analogous structure in the ancient Mediterranean makes it unlikely that their interactions would ordinarily avoid the competitive aspects of honour.\footnote{On issues relating to the socio-economic status of house churches, see Friesen (2005), Meggitt (1998), Oakes (2001: 40–49, 59-63), and the discussion between Friesen (2004), Barclay (2004), and Oakes (2004).}

On this basis, the model of a Pompeiian craftworker’s house that Oakes applies to reading Galatians is useful for our project.\footnote{Oakes (2015: 12).}

Oakes’ Pompeian Model Craftworker House-Church

40 people, comprising:

1. Craftworker (house c. 300 m\(^2\) ground plan including outside space), wife, children, a few (male) craftworking slaves, (female) domestic slave, dependent relative.

2. Several other householders (houses c. 20–250 m\(^2\)), some spouses, children, slaves, other dependants.

3. A few members of families with non-Christian householders.


5. A couple of free or freed dependents of non-Christians.

6. A couple of homeless people.\footnote{The shape of the model is developed in Oakes (2009: 46-89).}

For us the shape of the model is more informative than the specific details. Here we see a broad social profile that would be roughly representative of the types of people we might find in a Pauline assembly on the basis of his letters and what we know archeologically about households. Significantly for us, we can see no specific reason that this model group would ordinarily or obviously see itself as excluded from the normal activities of the ‘honour game’. We would therefore assume that unless outside forces acted on the group, its identity, activity and moral norms could all be interpreted within that framework.

\footnote{Malina’s contention that only non-family interactions involved honour would not apply in a house-based assembly. Malina (1981: 34).}
1.2 Honour, Face and Boasting: Galatians 6.11-18

We suggest that 6.11-18 is a significant place to encounter what we will argue are key terms for the letter and therefore is an appropriate place to engage with Galatians.

Recent rhetorical analysis on the letter considers Galatians 6:11-18 as a peroratio, functioning as the principal hermeneutical guide to the epistle, containing ‘ein abschließender Summarium der vorausgehenden Partien des Briefes’ and possibly the Galatian situation itself. In identifying it thus we do not diminish the importance of the section, quite the opposite.38 Traditionally the peroratio of an argument functioned as a final attempt to extract the maximum hostility toward the rhetor’s opponents (cf. Cicero De inv. 1.55.106), the format found in Galatians thereby suggests that Paul is not attempting to negotiate a peaceful compromise to this conflict.40

It is interesting that many of the concepts considered traditionally Galatian issues are absent from this passage — δικαιοσύνη, πίστις, and πνεῦμα are all, at least explicitly,

39 Betz (1979: 313n11).
40 NB: The exclusivity of the peace benediction — it is only for ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν (6.16). According to Kriesberg’s model of conflict resolution (Kriesberg (2003: 275f)), Paul’s approach to the conflict here is typical of a distributive outcome (i.e. with a winner and a loser, rather than shared benefits and losses — perhaps typical of Paul’s honour culture?) within which Paul’s statements are an example of a non-negotiated settlement where the victory of one party is the only consider resolution to the conflict. This is in contrast with what we see of the apostle in, e.g., 1 Corinthians (cf. Butarbutar (2007)).
absent. However, these verses do provide an explicit objection, by Paul, to the opponents’ motives in this crisis, which, if 6:11-18 is a paradigm for interpreting the letter, would suggest they deserve both more and a different kind of attention than they have received, especially considering how much ink has been spilled generally discussing Paul’s opposition. As de Boer notes, there are two subunits here — a critique of the opponents and the motive behind their attempts to circumcise the Galatians (6.12-13) and Paul’s summary of his gospel response to this issue (6.14-17). These features have been themes in the letter, naturally, but here they are presented next to each other as an enthymeme, revealing the stakes as Paul understands them. It is our view that our honour model will make sense of these motives, how they relate to the crisis in Galatia, and why Paul perceives it as a threat to the ‘truth of the gospel’.

Central to this contention is the appearance of the two words that interest our study, καυχάμαι and εὑπροσωπέω.

---

41 An example of the problems this causes for traditional interpretations is seen in de Boer (2011: 391) where Betz’ approach is considered ‘overstatement’ on the basis of 6.11-17’s silence about justification.

42 The term ‘agitators’ is increasingly used as a fairly neutral representation of the language used in Galatians (οἱ ταράσσοντες 1.7, ὁ ταράσσων 5.10, οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες 5.12), particularly for those not intending to make a particular point with their nomenclature of choice (cf. Jewett (1971), Barclay (2005: 36f) (who notes a possible OT link in the term, p.36n1), Longenecker (1998: 33)). Historically the term ‘Judaizers’ has been used. Not to mention the problematic pejorative rendering, it is also difficult as it significantly alters λοῦδαζεω from its ancient meaning (cf. our discussion at §6.3.2 (cf. Galatians 2.14, but also Plutarch Cic. 7.5; Esther 8.7 LXX; Josephus B.J. 2.454, 463, and Mason (2007)). Other terms have been suggested in an attempt to read the group in a less biased manner (cf. Teachers: Martyn (1997a: 117), or influencers: Nanos (2002b: 115-131)), but these labels, whilst perhaps helpful, have become attached to those scholars’ positions so using them implies agreement where there might be none. Whilst ‘opponents’ does reflect Paul’s bias somewhat, we only have Galatians, itself biased, with which to reconstruct their identity. ‘Opponents’, rather than importing presuppositions simply reflects Paul’s presentation of this group he opposes, cf. Oakes (2015: 9). Suggestions that biased terms hinder interpretation seem overly paranoid, and also seem to ignore that ‘neutral’ terms are a misnomer for they lean against the direction of letter’s rhetoric, obscuring interpretation. For recent bibliography see Porter (2005).


45 de Boer (2011: 394) — cites Weima’s perspective that the cross and circumcision are paralleled here as the main themes of the letter.


47 cf. Martyn (1997a: 561n50) who suggests that Paul is not interested in motivation except where it affects the gospel.

1.2.1 Boasting amongst Pauline Scholars

Pauline scholarship has rarely considered boasting, and when it has it does so negatively, choosing to focus on theological rather than social concerns. Bultmann’s influential *TDNT* entry reflects this. Boasting, for Bultmann, was an expression of self-sufficiency or the attempt to emphasise the divine-self (*deus in nobis*), and was the opposite of *πίστις*.

‘[In boasting] it becomes clear that the basic human attitude is the high-handedness that tries to bring within our own power even the submission that we know to be our authentic being, and so finally ends in self-contradiction.’

LXX and Philo are Bultmann’s main sources and he appears to set a standard of not seeing Greco-Roman concepts of boasting and self-praise as important — only two paragraphs of the ten pages relate to ‘Greek usage’. C.H. Dodd reflects this position in ‘The Mind of Paul’. Attempting a psychological approach to Paul’s boasting, Dodd considers boasting a Jewish attitude in response to a minority complex as result of Greco-Roman influence on the world. ‘Glorying in the law’ was, however, destroyed upon conversion where Paul realises that his *καύχημα* ‘was gone’. For Dodd, Paul was pridefully ignorant of these implications, so continued searching for things in which to boast, an attitude which only evidences the continuation of his pre-Christian nature — even when that boast is in weakness (2 Corinthians 11.30; 12.5-9).

Dodd’s perspective, however, seems more a product of his own perspective on Paul’s character than exegetical analysis, for whilst Paul rejects some boasting in 1 Corinthians 3, it is simplistic to assume this is his blanket statement on the subject. Similarly, C.K. Barrett prioritises Romans and sees theologically-based national pride at the root of boasting in

---

48 Bultmann (1965: 646).
49 Bultmann (1965: 649).
50 Bultmann (1984: 28). The *Deus in nobis* reference is also from here.
51 Dodd (1953b: 67-82).
52 The psychological aspects of Paul’s boasting are considered in Callan (1986), whilst further general such analysis is famously in Rubenstein (1972: esp. 39-53). Freud (1939: 141) offers a similar opinion to Dodd, although it is interesting to see how Freud’s reading of Paul is entirely governed by perceptions of guilt culture with no consideration of Paul’s actual cultural context.
53 Dodd (1953b: 78).
54 Dodd (1953b: 74-5, 82). This is a particularly difficult position to maintain in light of 2 Corinthians 11:16f, cf. Kowalski (2013: 117, 170f). Dodd’s position was influential however, cf. de Boer (1962: xi).
Paul. Barrett briefly considers Galatians 6.14 before concluding that this is an idealised view of the Christian.  

Hans Hübner’s work on the development of Paul’s idea of law considers boasting, and in particular attention is given to Galatians. However, Hübner also prioritises Romans and applies that perspective to Galatians arguing that rejecting boasting is a ‘decisive mark of the Christian experience’. He concedes that in his late correspondence Paul develops his notion of boasting in God:  

‘The boasting in God of the person who believes in Christ reaches its climax in boasting of sufferings. It is a total reversal of the egocentric orientation of boasting in the works of the Law.’

Hübner holds that this is not present in Galatians where the only acceptable boast is the isolated one authorised in 6.4. With Mussner, Hübner argues that the ‘boast’ in Galatians 6.14 is paradoxical and therefore seemingly not comparable to the self-glorying type of boasting he argues has a blanket rejection at this stage of Paul’s career. Hübner’s insistence that boasting can only be theological causes him to see the late appearance of καυχάμαι (6.13) as evidence of its theological irrelevance. Similarly, although Lauri Thurén rejects Hübner’s disregard for the weight of the peroratio, he broadly agrees that the theme is not important for Galatians. This is unfortunate as many of the right questions are asked, questions about backgrounds and influences, yet the exploration does not take its own rhetorical advice seriously and never ventures beyond a theological answer overly guided by Romans. Part of his difficulty in connecting the boasting theme is that he cannot see a connection between those who are cursed for perverting the gospel in 1.6-9 and those Paul criticises in 6.12f  

55 Barrett (1986: 367), despite 70% of the data being in the Corinthian letters.  
64 The comments about the peroratio are, without strong evidence, ignored for Galatians, Thurén (2000: 174).
Remarkably, Thurén and Hübner are rare in that they do consider boasting in Galatians, even if it does not merit close attention.

Monographs on boasting in Paul are exceptionally rare. J.S. Bosch’s *Gloriarse* remains untranslated from Spanish, perhaps indicating the interest levels. Significantly, given the early date, it rejects Bultmann’s negative view of καυχόμαι, preferring a more neutral reading that implies anything that seeks approval from an applicable group. He hints towards boasting being based on ‘difference’ noting that the exclusion of boasting in Romans 3:29-30 is based on the universality of Christ’s actions rather than an anthropological position. Despite the importance of this to the New Perspective(s) on Paul, his study has not attracted much interest. Conversely, Simon Gathercole’s monograph ‘Where is Boasting?’ adopts, without clear defence, the traditional position from the outset, assuming that boasting relates to Jewish pride and that prioritising Romans is key to understanding Paul on the subject. As a reading pertaining to understand Paul, however, it is problematic. It rarely strays beyond Romans, we note 39 references throughout to 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians, with no mention of 6.14, and it is singularly interested in the Jewish background of boasting in Romans. As a result it strangely involves no discussion of Jeremiah 9.23-24, despite calling it the most famous scripture Paul uses regarding boasting. Obviously a study requires a set range, in this case Romans 1-5, but it is difficult to see how a study of Paul’s boasting can be conclusive with this narrow range. Part of this problem seems to be that the second goal of the project is actually more important to Gathercole than the first, namely his critique of the New Perspective on Paul. He seems to want to utilise the first goal to answer the second, but ultimately it seems the second goal becomes the main intention of the project. For our study what is particularly evident is the lack of engagement with the wider Greco-Roman literature. There are merely 4 references to classical writers

---

68 Bosch (1970: 139).
69 Gathercole (2002: 1f).
70 Gathercole (2002: 6).
71 Gathercole (2002: 10).
72 This becomes very evident in the choice of dialogue partners and in the conclusion, Gathercole (2002: 266).
(Aristotle and Seneca) all listed in one footnote.\textsuperscript{73} The uninitiated reader is given the impression that either the wider world was uninterested in boasting or that Paul lived entirely detached from it.\textsuperscript{74}

While recent scholarship has been quick to criticise Luther and Calvin for setting reformation tradition towards a path that was not sufficiently concerned for historical particularity, it is difficult not to accuse the scholars noted here of the same error given their penchant for ignoring the social background to boasting in the ancient Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{75} Each of them prefer a Jewish theological interpretation of Paul’s concept of boasting. This may well be a valid position, but it is difficult to know how they can be certain given the broad failure to engage with extant Greco-Roman ideas about boasting. Their ethnocentric theological position causes an ignorance towards the social role of boasting.\textsuperscript{76} When scholars have leaned toward contextually-aware studies rhetorical form rather than social background has been the focus.\textsuperscript{77} Betz’ analysis of Paul’s use of self-praise suggested that Paul imitated the style of Greco-Roman literature, although notably his example of these parallels does not reference Galatians 6.14.\textsuperscript{78} The studies of E.A. Judge and Christopher Forbes also wrestled with the rhetorical parallels of the concept.\textsuperscript{79} They both conclude, in contrast to Betz, that Paul must be parodying Greco-Roman boasting due to the unusual things that he boasts in.\textsuperscript{80} More recently, there have been attempts to consider boasting in a context that is more

\textsuperscript{73} Gathercole (2002: 199n9).
\textsuperscript{74} This type of position regarding Greco-Roman influence is also seen in Kowalski (2013).
\textsuperscript{75} e.g. Gathercole (2002: 2).
\textsuperscript{76} Finney (2012: 15). cf. Donahoe (2008: xxvii), ‘Scholars believe they can adequately grasp the perception of “boasting” and self-praise in the Greco-Roman world in a few paragraphs or less.’
\textsuperscript{77} cf. Watson (2003).
\textsuperscript{80} Judge (1968: 47) detects a \textit{corona muralis} allusion in 2 Corinthians 11.33 (cf. Livy 28.48.5). Savage (1996: 63n37) notes that the whole \textit{Peristasenkatalog} of 2 Corinthians 11 might be read as a parody of Augustus’ \textit{Res Gestae}. 23
social than rhetorical or theological.\textsuperscript{81} Andrew Clarke considered the social dynamics involved in the boasting about the Corinthian assembly’s leadership, although, like Bultmann he does not see a favourable side to boasting.\textsuperscript{82} Without stating it explicitly, he does note the effect, if not the purpose, of boasting as a mode of elevating a particular social status amongst the community. Importantly, he retains boasting within its social context and considers Greco-Roman (rather than Jewish) texts to compare with the Corinthian situation, although his approach observes boasting rather than defines what it is doing.\textsuperscript{83}

The focus on form rather than function has hindered studies from reaching satisfactory conclusions. Robert Jewett, however, argues that this can be avoided if we consider the framework of honour competition when analysing Paul’s discussion of boasting.\textsuperscript{84} Further, Mark Finney argues that boasting is a tool for ‘self-aggrandizement’ and that the basis presented for the boast affects whether or not the boaster wins honour or is shamed.\textsuperscript{85} The question of what boasting does as a social phenomenon, and how it relates to questions of honour, for us, has not been suitably considered in Galatians and will, therefore, hold a critical position in our study.

1.2.2 Face amongst Pauline Scholars

Consideration of εὐπροσωπεύω in Galatians 6.12 makes the attention to καυχάμαι appear voluminous. It has been almost entirely ignored, with the exception of the problematic suggestion by Winter, and those who agree with him, that εὐπροσωπεύω references a legal status, an argument we will discuss at §4.2.\textsuperscript{86} We find this general passing over of εὐπροσωπεύω surprising as it forms the basis of Paul’s complaint against the opponents. Furthermore, as we will show in §4.2.3 the language of πρόσωπον is not insignificant in Galatians, adding further weight to the importance of εὐπροσωπεύω at 6.12. The statement at 2.6 that πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὗ λαμβάνει seems, to us,

\textsuperscript{81} Technically, Engberg-Pedersen (2000: 152-155) considers boasting from a social perspective in \textit{Paul and the Stoics}. However, he chooses a very nuanced perspective that is yet to convince the majority, and may hinder the overall acceptance of social perspectives on the subject.

\textsuperscript{82} He sees boasting as a predominately Corinthians issue in the Pauline corpus, Clarke (1993: 96).

\textsuperscript{83} Clarke (1993: 95-99).


\textsuperscript{85} Finney (2012: 15-16).
to play a significant role in Paul’s logic behind many of the positions he holds in Galatians (e.g. 3.28). Remarkably, this statement in 2.6 rarely interests studies in Galatians. Bruce Longenecker’s study of identity transformation makes no reference to the verse,\(^\text{87}\) neither does Mark Nanos’ *The Irony of Galatians* which, again given its interest in identity, is surprising.\(^\text{88}\) A glance at the commentaries will further confirm that πρόσωπον is not seen as important to Galatians.

Outside of Galatians interest in πρόσωπον and its cognates or even just face generally,\(^\text{89}\) is evidenced in only a few places. V.H.T. Nguyen’s monograph on Corinth argued, particularly in relation to the Latin *persona* (which he connects to πρόσωπον) that the concept expressed notions of social identity. This related to how people, within a culture, ‘perceive and identify’ one another.\(^\text{90}\)

This Roman emphasis on *persona* was influenced by the Roman social hierarchy, which stratified society according to rank and status, and by Roman law, which framed and maintained that social hierarchy. Moreover, it was shown that although the Roman stress on *persona* impacted individuals from both the elite and non-elite social strata in the Graeco-Roman world, the concept of *persona* was primarily a traditional and elite ideal, which served to portray and protect the honour and privileges of the elite.\(^\text{91}\)

*Persona* was the outward display of honourable qualities, the result of which, for Nguyen, is that it was a superficial feature of society.\(^\text{92}\) Nguyen, as will be apparent when we consider honour data later (esp.§3.4) fails to understand the ubiquity of honour with his view of it being primarily an elite issue. Furthermore, considering the connection with honour as evidence that *persona* was superficial is to misunderstand the weight Greco-Roman society placed upon honour, and its connection to the values of their society. When it comes to his passing mention of Galatians 6.12, he strangely, and without clarification, considers εὐπροσωπέω as a reference to the ‘social marker’ of

\(^{87}\) Longenecker (1998).
\(^{88}\) Nanos (2002b).
\(^{89}\) We discuss the language of face at §3.3 and §4.2f.
\(^{90}\) Nguyen (2008: 49).
\(^{91}\) Nguyen (2008: 50).
\(^{92}\) Nguyen (2008: 50).
circumcision, rather than as a status resulting from Galatian circumcision.⁹³ We agree with Schmeller, who noted that Nguyen’s failure to really consider the significance of Statuskriterien and its relation to πρόσωπον does hinder the study.⁹⁴

More recently, Stephen Barton has discussed the idea of face as a metaphor within the Pauline letters.⁹⁵ Barton understands the face as a notion of the self particularly within social interactions. The face is ‘where the self receives and expresses its identity, character, and values.’⁹⁶ As a relational metaphor, he considers it primarily a salvific idea connected to ‘transformed identity in Christ’.⁹⁷ Remarkably, in his consideration of Paul’s scriptural background he misses how often face is referenced negatively in relation to the impartiality of God and his disregard for human conventions (cf. Leviticus 19.15; Deuteronomy 1.17, 10.12, 17, 16.19; 2 Chronicles 19.7; Job 34.19; Psalms 81.2; Wisdom 6.7; Sirach 4.22, 27, 35.12-13; 44.1; 1 Esdras 4.39. cf. 1 Samuel 6.7). Furthermore, like Nguyen, he does not really consider the status significance of face, choosing only to show how the Roman social world feared blushing.⁹⁸ That neither of them takes the honour weight of face seriously is remarkable given that they both cite Carlin Barton’s work on the subject.⁹⁹ For our study, however, the terms καυχάμαι and εὐπροσωπέω will be considered from an honour perspective to show how they make sense of Paul’s argument in Galatians 6.12-14 and how that relates to the rest of the letter.

1.3 Outline of this Study

At a basic level, this thesis reads Paul’s accusation against the opponents (εὐπροσωπέω) and his response (καυχάμαι…ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ) in a manner that makes sense within the honour-sensitive culture that would have surrounded the nascent Christian communities of Galatia. We note the lacuna in Galatian studies that results from neither considering the honour nuance implied by καυχάμαι and εὐπροσωπέω nor the correlation of the two terms in Paul’s closing of the letter at 6.12f. Our study will therefore require a

---

⁹⁵ Barton (2015).
⁹⁶ Barton (2015: 137).
⁹⁸ Barton (2015: 143).
consideration of these terms and the social reality to which they likely refer, as well as a consideration of an appropriate model of honour with which to make sense of them.

Naturally there will need to be consideration of many related issues in order to answer these questions, many of them fraught but important issues in most explorations of Galatians, such as faith, the presentation of Christ, Paul’s autobiographical data, the conflict in Jerusalem and Antioch, and the identity of the opponents. Further to this it is well known that the honour model is far from uncontroversial in NT studies — whether discussing models or honour! The validity of approaches like this will, ultimately, be decided both by their contribution and longevity, so it is hoped that, perhaps as a subsidiary issue, this thesis can offer some helpful thoughts towards the wider debate on the use of an honour model in Pauline studies, especially Galatians. Ultimately, however, as Neyrey contended in support of social-scientific models, ‘The test of any model lies in its ability to account plausibly for the most data and to suggest fresh insights and new lines of inquiry.’ This is what we aim to do.

As such we must now turn in Part 1 of our thesis to consider models of honour and how we might select a suitable approach to Galatians. We will need to review and consider honour models and their acceptance within NT studies. This will establish a basis for us to consider a ‘facework’ model as appropriate for our inquiry. This will be the focus of chapter 2. Our attention will then turn to the data from the Ancient Mediterranean world which we will use to confirm the validity of our facework model and also abduct the model with appropriate nuance. As such chapter 3 will consider available data on honour in Galatia and the wider Greco-Roman culture before focusing specifically on the issue of face. From there it will shape an idea of face as public honour expressed through three key areas that are going to be used to shape the examination in Part 2, namely issues of boasting, conflict and competition, and imitation.

100 There will be other issues that do not relate directly to our study that we do not engage yet still consider important discussions for Galatians (in particular we have in mind issues around Jewish/gentile identity).
101 Larry Hurtado asked in his 2013 Graham Stanton Memorial Lecture at BNTC that NT scholars analyse carefully whether their methods are possibly only fashions, or worse, fallacies. Hurtado (2014).
Part 2 of the thesis will return to the text of Galatians, particularly in relation to our two key terms καυχάμαι and εὕπροσωπέω. Chapter 4 will engage directly with εὕπροσωπέω and its implications particularly in relation to honour competition. It will argue for the honour nuance of the term and how it reveals that honour concern is a significant but overlooked feature in Galatia that is concerning Paul. This argument will position us to comment on the perceived threat facing the opponents, and additionally make a proposal as to their identity. Chapter 5 will address Paul’s objection to ‘seeking face’ that was revealed in chapter 4 by considering how his phrase ‘boasting in the cross’ is used to establish a new honour precedence for the assemblies of Galatia. We will consider how the portrayal of Christ in the epistle focuses on his crucifixion, a social degradation, yet does so whilst presenting Christ as an honour-reconfiguring hero for these assemblies. This will be interpreted as foundational to the social impact of what we will term a ‘divine prosopagnosia’.103 Christ’s neutralising of the value of difference which removes the need for the Galatians to ‘seek face’ via the medium of boasting. The final substantive chapter will consider the social impact of our thesis. It will do this firstly by considering how πίστις Χριστοῦ might have a social function for the Galatians as they are required to ‘trust in Christ’ in the face of often overwhelming pressure to conform to the surrounding honour culture. We will then suggest that this social prosopagnosia explains the form and function of Paul’s autobiographical data in the letter by showing him as someone exemplifying the values of Christ. Similarly, these features will then be used to argue that the shape of the so-called ethical section of Galatians (5.13–6.10) makes sense as Paul’s attempt to guide these liminal assemblies away from the threat of re-absorption into the ‘norms’ of wider culture and towards embracing, within the Christian community, values that they saw established by Christ and exemplified in Paul’s own life.

103 Ordinarily prosopagnosia refers to a ‘visual neurological deficit’ that leaves people unable to recognise familiar faces, cf. Sacks (1985: 21).


Part 1

2. Making Sense of Face: Considering Honour Models for Galatians

2.1 Introduction

Our decision to consider honour, and in particular the concept of face and facework, as useful models with which to engage with the language of καυχόμαι and εὔπροσωπέω requires that we do some initial groundwork. Such has been the level of inquiry into honour as both a social-scientific category and its application for NT exegesis that we need to discuss aspects of this field and where this thesis places itself within it. Therefore, our task in this chapter is to consider social-scientific approaches to honour and then the application of honour models to NT texts, which should position us to consider the model of facework that will direct our study.

Analysis of the nature of Mediterranean community unity by cultural anthropologists is ‘virtually coterminous’ with the appearance and development of honour models being used to analyse societies or cultures identified as ‘honour based’. The construction of

---

104 Gilmore (1987a: 2). The development of interest in the late 20th Century towards social-scientific criticism of the NT developed to the point that it was considered ‘widespread and firmly established’ by the early 21st (Horrell 1999: 26). The Context Group’s influence on this is difficulty to overstate, cf. Esler (1993: 251). Their various publications can be found online at www.contextgroup.org [Accessed 1/7/2016] or in the bibliographies of Pilch (2001) and Esler (2004). The ensuing SBL group is discussed in Elliott (2008a), cf. the critique by Horrell (1999: 12f)). Seeking not to simply gather data on a different culture (cf. Gager (1979: 175)), NT social-scientific approaches sought to interpret that data by using hypotheses that allowed the interpreter to relate the biblical texts to the local situation in a way that respected cultural perspectives, values and social-scripts. This approach was initially popularised in Malina (1981), developed in Malina (1986) and thoroughly utilised in a broad range of scholarship. See Elliott (2008a: 30) for a helpful list, or Elliott (1993a) for a bibliography of pioneering works. The essential premise is that any data from an ancient culture is not self-explanatory if the social-system is unavailable to the interpreter (cf. the critique of DeSilva in Malina (1997). We prefer ‘ancient’ to the more specific ‘Greek’ or ‘Roman’, due to often shared cultural attitudes, following Finley (1981: 7). Subsequently it is ‘unethical and immoral’ (Malina (1996: 84)) for the modern reader to approach biblical texts ignorant of the significant cultural differences between the ancient Mediterranean and the contemporary reader (Malina and Pilch (2006: 8)) yet assuming that without an
these models has identified the similarities of honour concern across several millennia and cultures, as evidenced in the extant literature and epigraphy.\textsuperscript{105} Honour’s history, as it were, tells of different cultures’ attempts to define both who is socially valuable, and the reasons for that evaluation.\textsuperscript{106} Despite the debate over the content of an honour model, the requirement of such is often perceived as a necessity with which to make sense of Mediterranean cultures.\textsuperscript{107} This is due to the observed gulf between more common modern-Western cultural realities, replete with their own ‘introspective consciences’, often referred to as ‘guilt-based’ cultures, and that of the more dyadic personality prevalent amongst cultures where concern for honour is said to be either ‘supreme’, the ‘master symbol’, or even a ‘social fact’.\textsuperscript{108} Older perspectives on honour preferred to imagine honour cultures as entirely antithetical to contemporary Western society on the mistaken assumption that the former was motivated by external sanctions whereas the modern Western human was far more interested in internal perspectives and concerns.\textsuperscript{109} Reality is far more complex, yet the simplistic idea that it is merely a contrast of group versus individualistic culture persists. However, this highlights the dual challenge that the student of honour encounters. On one side there is the over-analysis inflicted on the concept of honour, often with the intention of utilising it to establish a new definition for a particular group, that has burdened the idea to the extent that to talk simply of ‘honour’ is often nondescript to the point of being useless.\textsuperscript{110} On the other, the behaviour of those within honour cultures appears bizarre to those shaped by Western ethics and is often summarily dismissed as either backward or uneducated, even in contemporary society.\textsuperscript{111} Meanwhile, the evident pressure on those producing explicit framework their reading approximates to one that would make sense to an ancient reader (Osiek (1992: 108)).

\textsuperscript{105} Oprisko (2012: 7).

\textsuperscript{106} A helpful and thoroughgoing study that exemplifies this is Cairns (1993), cf. Bowman (2006: 15-232).

\textsuperscript{107} ‘Making sense’ as opposed to understanding a text is an imaginative process that resists the idea that meaning is inherent within a text, cf. Adam (1995: 169) (also for ‘Hermeneutic of Verstehen’ (understanding)). Avoiding the need to make authoritative claims to meaning frees the interpreter to see reading as an ‘active creative process’ that engages their skills, tools and relative imagination, Culler (1974: 29), cf. Adam (1995: 170), Kirkpatrick (2005: 4).

\textsuperscript{108} These are the terms used by Peristiany (1965b: 10), Gilmore (1987a: 17), using language from Turner (1969), and Davis (1977: 13) respectively.


\textsuperscript{110} Oprisko (2012: 8).

\textsuperscript{111} Bowman (2006: 18) notes the difficulty Western media have reporting on honour killings as an example of this. Western arrogance toward honour is somewhat ironic given the persistence of ‘tit-for-
Mediterranean ethnographies to discuss honour, even if only in passing, serves to increase the lack of clarity. As a result, a study such as ours needs to rely on a model of honour that is clear and suitably defined in such a way that honour-motivated concerns are not patronised but respected so as to make sense of texts that communicate from within an honour culture.  

2.2 Social-Scientific Approaches to Honour Studies

The consideration of honour within social-scientific research is often presented as though it began in 1965 when J.G. Peristiany edited and released the collection of essays *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Working from the position that societies have rules of conduct, these early studies looked at how honour preoccupied face-to-face societies, how it structured social relations to reflect ideas of worth. Julian Pitt-Rivers’ contribution to these early studies is perhaps best known amongst NT scholars as it is his definition of honour that is most regularly cited by those engaging in the field:

Honour is the value of a person in his own eyes, but also in the eyes of his society. It is his estimation of his own worth, his claim to pride, but it is also the acknowledgement of that claim, his excellence recognised by society, his right to pride.

Whilst it is undoubted that the importance to Mediterranean society of honour concern, as represented in the above quote, was identified in a pioneering manner by Pitt-Rivers and Peristiany, and supported by the likes of J.K. Campbell and J. Caro Baroja, this was not the earliest recognition of the importance of the concept to social-scientific work. Hans Speier’s essays in *Social Order and the Risks of War* predated Pitt-Rivers’ work.
and made some important observations regarding concern for honour as a form of social control.  

Speier deserves mention at this stage as his work identified several issues relating to honour that many in current NT work are less quick to recognise. Driven by the need to develop a group identity on the basis of an ‘us’ that is concerned to differentiate itself from the other ‘them’, Speier argued that a group sovereign must use social planning to shape the values of the group and that this therefore defined honour as a social incentive that controls behaviour through the medium of ‘social esteem or prestige’. Speier also noted that the content of honour varied amongst societies while still functioning to exert social control. The controlling power of honour amongst a society is found in the inequality it creates, what Speier called its ‘qualifying, hierarchizing role’. Honour, therefore, applies a social value to the individual dependent on their position within the spectrum of their society’s stratification that honour itself created. Individuals within these social systems are generally wont to accept these distinctions as they strive to improve their position relative to the scale. Honour, Speier asserted, was therefore not simply the concern of bygone aristocracy as it was often presented after the Enlightenment, but was present in every society in how they apportioned social distinction. Honour is, broadly speaking, the name given to the process by which a society creates its values, defends those values and informs the participants of their place within it and how they might adjust that position relative to others.

Speier presented honour functioning within society in three key stages. Interestingly, given he predates most biblical research in this area, he utilised the narrative of Esther to exemplify this process and show its value for modern social analysis. The three stages are as follows:

117 Speier (1952), many of the essays first appeared during the 1930’s.
118 Speier (1952: 15), this is particularly interesting in relation to our argument in §5.
119 Speier (1952: 18).
120 Speier (1952: 16f).
121 The consideration of Speier’s contribution in Oprisko (2012: 9-12) is both helpful, and the only recent work to note the importance of Speier to the field. cf. Berger (1983: 177).
122 Speier (1952: 17). Economic stratification would be the most obvious honour concern in contemporary Western society, but also national superiority, cf. Bowman (2006: 1-14).
stages are essentially three categories of person within the group, ‘for honor to arise it is essential that there be bearers, bestowers and observers of honor.’\textsuperscript{125} This cyclical process involves the identification from a group leader, of exemplary behaviour in relation to the code of honour, the rules of the group.\textsuperscript{126} This honour is then bestowed upon the bearer on the assumption that they act in a manner that well represents the honour given to them.\textsuperscript{127} This, in turn, when observed, and accepted, by the wider members of the group is therefore granted as public honour for the individual in question as well as an affirmation of the nature of honourable behaviour within the group, particularly in the case of any new or unique factors present in that occasion of honour (cf. §3.4f). This explains how Speier understands honour as a social phenomenon as it functions to define the parameters of group behaviour by determining both the ‘taboo’ and the ‘scale of excellence’.\textsuperscript{128} Robert Oprisko aptly summarises Speier’s definition thus, ‘Honor is axiological and is the imposition of value onto parties to be used as exemplars in order to normalize behaviour’.\textsuperscript{129} Significant for recent debate in this early consideration of honour from a social-scientific perspective is Speier’s assessment of the importance of individual agency in defining the parameters of honourable behaviour.\textsuperscript{130} Honour is not ‘fixed’ but defined in the opinions of the public, the ‘court of reputation’. This, of course, means that different groups will have different perspectives on honour, opening up the likely possibility that individuals might encounter incompatible honour systems laying claim to their existence.\textsuperscript{131} The only consistent feature of honour is its incompatibility with notions of equality.\textsuperscript{132}

Speier’s evaluation of honour fits well with Peristiany’s ideas of a ‘common value language’ whilst also possibly highlighting the subtleties of Pitt-Rivers’ honour definition, given above, that are often missed in contemporary NT scholarship.\textsuperscript{133} Honour does not have a rigid content that can be identified across all societies but rather

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{125} Speier (1935: 76).
\item \textsuperscript{126} Speier (1935: 83).
\item \textsuperscript{127} Speier (1935: 85).
\item \textsuperscript{128} Speier (1935: 84).
\item \textsuperscript{129} Oprisko (2012: 12).
\item \textsuperscript{130} Oprisko (2012: 12).
\item \textsuperscript{131} cf. Pitt-Rivers (1977: 2).
\item \textsuperscript{132} Speier (1935: 88f).
\item \textsuperscript{133} Peristiany (1965a: 173).
\end{itemize}
is an internally defined series of values that are reaffirmed in a recurrent fashion of value claimed and then given.  

‘The argument goes like this: the sentiment of honour inspires conduct which is honourable, the conduct receives recognition and establishes reputation, and reputation is finally sanctified by the bestowal of honours.’

Pitt-Rivers dictum that ‘honour felt becomes honour claimed and honour claimed becomes honour paid’, is not overly dissimilar to Speier’s structure of bestowers, bearers and observers.  

As we might imagine, the right to bestow honour becomes a pertinent concern for those in authority as this is a more effective manner of social control than, for example, the threat of violence.  

Unsurprisingly this does privilege the role of leadership in the support of group values, not only in defining individual honour within the group but also the nature of the group’s external honour also.  

The head of any group symbolises the group and creates an authority that ultimately functions as a moral power. The head represents the group’s honour and sets the standard of fidelity to the honour of the group, thereby showing that, amongst a community, honour and authority are related concepts.  

The leader’s conduct and bestowal of honour defines acceptable behaviour, ‘he’ is the ‘arbiter of right’.  

Significantly, however, for both Pitt-Rivers and Speier’s models of honour is that the relationship between bestower, bearer and observer is carefully balanced as the leader always requires that the group validate their behaviour as honourable.

It is noteworthy that Pitt-Rivers’ definition of honour is found at the beginning of his essay prior to a lengthy discussion about the agonistic nature with which honour groups invariably defend their own sense of value. However, one quote does not make an essay, unfortunately so, given how Pitt-Rivers’ essay has too regularly been treated, at least in biblical social-scientific work, with many criticising the rigidity of his definition in a manner which ironically shows that they have not properly considered the
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134 Hence, Pitt-Rivers’ notion of the ‘honourable beggar’ who can beg without shame as long as he is outside his own group, Pitt-Rivers (1954: 60f).
135 Pitt-Rivers (1977: 2).
137 Pitt-Rivers (1977: 2).
138 See our discussion at §6.4.1.1.
140 Pitt-Rivers (1977: 15-16). One cannot act dishonourably and still be ‘right’, the idea of an independent ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ seems missing from honour cultures.
argument. Pitt-Rivers’ definition is important, but largely because it leaves room for the localised culture to define honour in their own way. In our opinion it is the agonistic and competitive nature of that definition process that is a vital observation. ‘On the field of honour’, so Pitt-Rivers argued, ‘might is right’, thereby showing the extent to which defending one’s behaviour was the vital in the arbitration and definition of honour.\textsuperscript{141}

The successful use of Pitt-Rivers model requires the acceptance that he presents it as a generalised notion of honour, it will require nuancing as a social code is ‘never a homogenous code of abstract principles’.\textsuperscript{142} The model was designed to have ambiguities in order that it continue to be useful, even though this has been the area it has been most criticised for and the feature most ignored when used elsewhere.\textsuperscript{143} The significance of this model for us is seen in the heavy reliance biblical scholarship has placed upon Pitt-Rivers’ model, as J.K. Chance observed,\textsuperscript{144} whilst not always being aware of the development and challenges within the field itself.

\textbf{2.2.1 Objections to Honour Studies}

Criticism of Pitt-Rivers’ model and the work of early pioneers of the field has served to both refine the definitions of honour whilst also affirming its position as a hallmark value of Mediterranean society.\textsuperscript{145} Some objections chose to focus on the problems generated by creating the ‘Mediterranean’ as too narrow an area of analysis which implied that honour was a unique subset within that field.\textsuperscript{146} However, despite the definition of the agonistic pursuit of honour being limited in focus to the Mediterranean, we cannot see any claim within the research that either limits ‘honour studies’ exclusively within this geographic area, or excludes the possibility that other areas will have variant understandings of honour. The nature of the model’s insistence that honour is locally defined seems to ensure this.

\textsuperscript{141} Pitt-Rivers (1977: 4).
\textsuperscript{142} Pitt-Rivers (1977: 16).
\textsuperscript{143} See both the awareness of this and a response in Peristiany (1965b: 10) and Pitt-Rivers (1978: 322).
\textsuperscript{144} Chance (1994: 142).
\textsuperscript{145} Chance (1994: 140).
\textsuperscript{146} cf. Asano-Tamanoi (1987) and Chance (1994: 139-140).
Conversely, the usefulness of honour as a broad category has attracted the most unease, with particular concern being that the ‘massive’ generalisations that defined Pitt-Rivers and Peristiany’s early work became ‘counter-productive’.147 This concern, as voiced by Herzfeld, is similar to our observation about the misuse of Pitt-Rivers’ model, in that by attempting to apply a generalised model to a broad area the necessary peculiarities of the model can be obscured.148 Two particular edited works attempted to address this issue. Firstly, the 1987 collection of essays in David Gilmore’s *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean* where several of the writers proposed ‘simpler’ yet more ‘precise’ glosses on the more ambiguous language of honour, such as Herzfeld’s suggestion regarding ‘hospitality’.149 The approach was further validated by the appearance of a second edited volume from, no less than, Pitt-Rivers and, posthumously, Peristiany in 1992, where they focused on the problem under the banner of honour and grace.150

The challenges across the field of honour have served to warn of the need for an improved level of sensitivity when discussing the concept. However, the continuance of the investigations and that the new ‘glosses’, as Herzfeld refers to them, are definitions within the broader category of honour only serves to confirm the necessity of continuing to explore honour within the social-sciences. As Mark Finney has noted, this more synchronic assessment of the complexity of honour has reaffirmed the importance of honour models, ‘albeit in a more judicious and nuanced’ manner.151 It is also difficult to entirely dismiss the feeling that some of the objections to honour in contemporary scholarship are a result of the inherent lack of political correctness found amongst its aged quest for inequality,152 the progress of ‘civilisation’ supposedly having ‘liquidated’ uncomfortable notions of honour.153
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148 cf. The discussion of these concerns in Kirkpatrick (2005: 26f).
150 Although some might argue they merely created a similar problem now related to grace as they previously had done with honour, cf. Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers (1992: 215).
152 Oprisko (2012: 3).
Our principal concern with Finney’s observation, however, is his claim that honour studies are ‘fraught with danger’. This contention is borne out by many in NT studies, however, it seems to reflect a blinkered and subjective perspective on the field. The major objections to the use of a model of honour for the NT seem to work from the premise that the position taken by Herzfeld essentially ended the applicability of honour concern as a field of study. However, not only can this position not be maintained in the presence of the other essays published alongside Herzfeld’s, it is at odds with the conclusion to the volume, which remains appreciative of the field. Furthermore, and concerningly, it suggests a lack of awareness amongst NT scholars of the continued and growing interest amongst the social-sciences regarding honour that has continued unabated since the publication of the Gilmore volume. We note how most of those we consider in the following section do not appear in the work of recent NT publications that prefer to treat discussions of honour as if they were a two decade investigation long since ‘solved’ and requiring only passing comment.

2.2.2 The Status Quaestionis of Honour Studies

This perception amongst NT publications is in stark contrast to the field itself where the study of honour appears to continue unabated, although not without criticism and response. Recent studies have objected to the narrowing controls such as those suggested by Herzfeld. Oprisko, for example, agrees that recent work has rendered the value of the word ‘honour’ somewhat meaningless, but disagrees that replacing it with more specific glosses devoid of obvious conceptual connections is the correct approach. ‘By aggregating related but unique concepts together as one, the academic discourse on honour is mired in absurdity.’ We would agree. The value of Pitt-Rivers’ early work, when understood as a generalised model, was its applicability to honour culture as experienced more broadly, rather than as a model designed for the particularities of a specific situation. With a subject such as honour we cannot expect to discover a
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157 Esler (2011: 49) is an exception to this. Whilst he notes that more recent anthropological honour work might not be as useful due to the impact of globalisation it is less clear that this is why more recent honour studies are ignored by others in the field.
158 e.g. Finney (2012: 5-12). We anecdotally note how often a student studying honour today encounters subtly ‘rolled eyes’ from their superiors as they engage with a ‘dead’ field.
‘precise general characterization’. W.L. Sessions argues that a model of honour is useful for assessing honour broadly as a *category* rather than the details of an individual occurrence of a *concept* of honour. It seems to be in the blurring of this distinction that honour discussions have become mired in confusion. The initial model of honour needs to be suitably broad in order to first detect the category features of honour occurring in a local situation, and then remain suitably broad in order to identify the various concepts of honour taking place in said situation in advance of a model of the local conceptions of honour tailored to the context. This feature of model work and the social-scientific approach in general seems to have been forgotten by some who would wish for a defined local honour understanding before they begin their work. A model of honour is a fruitful ‘organising principle’ with which to assess how values are used to shape a culture, the continued study of the subject seems to demonstrate that. However, the field seems to have confused itself by, at times, forgetting basic features of social-scientific work, such as the heuristic nature of models and forgetting to maintain the distinction between a category and concept during analysis.

This position seems to be well reflected by recent publications in the field of honour, to the extent that it is no longer possible to argue that it is under-theorised in the field itself, despite NT scholars generally being unaware of these developments. From the turn of this century we note several monographs continuing to refine perceptions of honour, and challenge those who might reject it as a field of study. Sharon Krause, in 2002, supported the usefulness of a model of honour that was aware of universal principles relating to honour that were relativised to the specific roles that the individual
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159 Oprisko (2012: 4).
160 Stewart (1994: 21), who argues that a general model proves that honour is a ‘right’ without specifying what it is a right to.
161 cf. Sessions (2010: 8-9) for the language of concept, conception and category. He argues that a concept is a ‘set of features’ which might share characteristics with other concepts that warrant identifying them more broadly as conceptions of the thing being analysed. However, in the face of regular reoccurrence of certain concepts similarly named the analyst must ask whether it should now be identified as a category given the apparent higher level unity.
162 We have in mind the arguments of Horrell (1996: 17f), cf. §Appendix 1.2.2.
164 Oprisko (2012: 25, 169n147). It may also be an occidental bias that considers honour unimportant, e.g. Japanese studies continue to explore it as a significant cultural category, cf. Ikegami (1995).
might play in various voluntary associations. At the specific level, honour is defined by ‘individual action and character’ that requires public recognition. Brennan and Pettit (2005) argue that honour must continue to be taken seriously as a category due to its influence on identity as a result of the various involuntary associations that individuals belong to (e.g. gender, race, language). Individuals will generally attempt to gain prestige through voluntary associations whilst aiming to mitigate the negative impact of any involuntary associations they might have. Humans, they argue, are an ‘honour-hungry species’. James Bowman’s *Honor: A History* rejects the tendency to internalise honour as a feeling, arguing in a manner reminiscent of Pitt-Rivers that it is always dependent on the group, a particular group with specific perspectives. Although a broadly popular-level book, it is noteworthy that Bowman defines honour as a group phenomenon. Alexander Welsh argued that the quest for honour, as a social fact within a group, is a constant point of motivation for the individual. Similarly, Kwame Appiah holds that moral revolutions significantly affected perspectives of social hierarchies, however, the continued interest in honour shows humanity’s ‘deep and persistent concern with status and respect’. In keeping with all these considered here, however, honour is considered as something nuanced within the context in question. We have already mentioned Sessions’ 2010 study that uses the helpful language of category and concept. However, he also recommends that as a category honour is a ‘universal feature of human life’ that, in contrast to what we find in NT studies, requires further analysis and research. We have also found Robert Oprisko’s 2012 work on honour to be helpful, and as such will engage with it at various points throughout the thesis, but again we find a recent commitment to develop the field that
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170 Brennan and Pettit (2004: 1).
172 Bowman (2006: 4-7).
173 Welsh (2008: 3-4).
175 Appiah (2010: 175).
177 Sessions (2010: xii).
defends honour as a timeless category that is expressed with various different concepts dependent on the specific group in question.\textsuperscript{178}

Naturally these works each offer differing conclusions regarding honour, and furthermore are not attempting to read honour in the same context as this project (generally they focus on political theory). However, they are important in that they show the currency of honour research in contemporary academia. More significantly, however, is their reliance on a generalised model of honour, with the support they seek from Pitt-Rivers’ early model being particularly notable. This would surely support the work on honour in NT studies continuing to reference Pitt-Rivers if it continues to do so in the express understanding that this is a generalised model of honour for face-to-face societies and not a precise model for analysing NT communities.

\textbf{2.2.3 A Social-Scientific Definition of Honour}

‘Honor is a social fact’.\textsuperscript{179} We find it difficult to disagree with Oprisko’s assessment that honour concern is neither a new area of theory, nor a field that has run its course. Concern for honour is pervasive in all societies even if the particularities are significantly and differently expressed amongst rituals, practices and traditions. This position therefore agrees with Pitt-Rivers’ assessment of honour as ‘the value of a person in \textit{his} own eyes, but also in the eyes of \textit{his} society’, but notes that the key emphasis is found in the personal pronouns.\textsuperscript{180} An honour model is not a rigid system that can be used to predict a person’s behaviour in any particular social context, but rather it is a more general process that notes possible distinct ways that an \textit{individual} might respond to situations particular to their own group or wider social context.\textsuperscript{181} Honour is distinct, not only from one context to another, but also within time as it is subject to challenges, revisions and development within the local situation.

\textsuperscript{178} Oprisko (2012: 24). We note even the consideration amongst Christian missiologists who are considering both the applicability of honour research not only in their missionary context but also in how it relates to reading the Bible, NB. Flanders (2011).
\textsuperscript{179} Oprisko (2012: 24).
\textsuperscript{180} Pitt-Rivers (1965: 21) (emphasis added).
\textsuperscript{181} Oprisko (2012: 25).
We find this nuance present, however, in Pitt-Rivers’ definition, suggesting that it still can function as a social-scientific definition of honour, despite many later studies missing the complexities of his analysis. Oprisko’s 2012 study, despite all the interim work in the field, evidences just how functional Pitt-Rivers’ model was, and therefore the naivety of the dismissal of honour from some within the NT field. Despite the near 50 year gap, Oprisko’s contention that regards the continuous nature of setting precedence and then maintaining those values within a group as the honour process is largely compatible with the famous Pitt-Rivers’ quotation. If longevity is truly a mark of validity, then the almost century long focus on refining the social-scientific understanding of honour that has revised that understanding without obsolescence would at very least defend the continued application and testing of an honour model. Consequently, we would hold for this study that an understanding of honour based on Pitt-Rivers’ approach remains a valid approach with which to assess certain patterns of behaviour and the values inherent within them, noting that honouring is the process by which these values are both approved and also established.

2.3 Honour Models and The New Testament World

The history of considerations of honour within NT social-scientific studies can broadly be considered as an application of the foregoing model of honour to NT texts. Whilst the field of ‘Mediterranean studies’ might trace its origins to the Peristiany Honour and Shame volume, similarly many are introduced to NT social-scientific considerations via the notion that honour was also a core value in the ancient Mediterranean world that must be appreciated if contemporary exegesis is to be suitably rooted in cultural and contextual awareness.

Using a model to guide NT exegesis, however, has not been without controversy. The discussion has been protracted and as such will not be repeated here (cf. Appendix 1 —

184 Campbell (1964: 271) cf. Oprisko (2012: 25), ‘Honouring is, therefore, a process of altering social reality through the medium of value.’ Brandes (1987: 131) noted that the one uniting feature of every essay in the volume containing his essay, Gilmore (1987b), was the agreement that honour functioned in manner that controlled and shaped social reality, it is a form of social control. This is exactly what was noted earlier in Speier (1935).
Modelling *Wie es eigentlich gewesen*, for an extended consideration).\textsuperscript{186} We are persuaded, however, that models reflect a human tendency to process what they see and encounter into meaningful patterns.\textsuperscript{187} Social-scientific models filter the data and, as T.F. Carney noted, allow the interpreter ‘to step outside a set of assumptions’ that might otherwise obfuscate,\textsuperscript{188} and make sense of ancient Mediterranean culture. By asking new questions or observing unseen patterns models function heuristically to provide an analytical framework\textsuperscript{189} — their value is in their ability to explain more of the examined evidence.\textsuperscript{190} As Keith Thomas argued well before biblical scholarship listened,

One great incentive for historians to read anthropology is that the anthropologist can offer detailed analyses of phenomena roughly comparable to those which historians are endeavouring to reconstruct with a good deal less evidence.\textsuperscript{191} The hope of this approach is that otherwise ignored social features (e.g. καυχώμαι and εὐπροσώπεω) may now be used to explain aspects of the text, and its interpretation, that have previously proved awkward. This aim, as Leopold von Ranke is said to have described it, is to better portray *Wie es eigentlich gewesen*.\textsuperscript{192} For the model user this involves considering the ‘goodness of fit’,\textsuperscript{193} selecting suitable, simplified, and generalised models that will make sense of the data. Social values, structures, and institutions missed or misunderstood by the ethnocentric or anachronistic reader more easily make sense when considered via a cross-cultural comparative model with ‘goodness of fit’.

This was a core component of Bruce Malina’s *The New Testament World* which marked something of an epoch for culturally sensitive exegesis in the early 1980’s, and was


\textsuperscript{187} Oakes (2014: 1).

\textsuperscript{188} Carney (1975: xiii-xiv, 7). Whilst models are pervasive amongst humans, indiscriminate use of the term could damage its usefulness to scholarship, cf. Elliott (1986: 3).


\textsuperscript{190} Cohen (1991: 35n2), Elliott (1993a: 45).

\textsuperscript{191} Thomas (1963: 12).

\textsuperscript{192} Quoted in Finley (1985: 52).

\textsuperscript{193} Morley (2004: 17), cf. Craffert (2001: 22). ‘Goodness of fit’ is not sufficiently considered in NT social-science work, Carney (1975: 13), (see § Appendix 1.1.1).
significantly influential in the formation of the Context Group and its approach.\textsuperscript{194} Written for the early NT student to ‘aid in fathoming the social-system context of the behavior of the people presented in the New Testament’, the book was hailed as ‘ground-breaking’ by some.\textsuperscript{195} Curiously for a textbook, it appeared before there was widespread acceptance of social-scientific methods within the NT field, preceding Meeks’ \textit{First Urban Christians}, and before, even, Malina’s own more in-depth work on social-scientific methods, \textit{Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation}.\textsuperscript{196} Malina introduced the approach with such success that \textit{New Testament World}, now in its third edition, considerably shaped the nature of social-scientific exploration of the NT over the ensuing decades, and it is rare to find studies in the field that do not rely on it or a work dependent on it.\textsuperscript{197} Furthermore, even those that object to his method, over three decades later, still consider his work suitably significant that it needs addressing.

\subsection*{2.3.1 Concerns about Honour Models}

Malina’s approach in \textit{The New Testament World} was to present a series of social-scientific ‘mid-range’ models, drawing on the work of anthropologists, generally working in the contemporary Mediterranean, to offer an alternative dimension to the interpretation of texts, or more specifically, ‘to hear the meaning of the documents in terms of the social systems in which they were originally proclaimed.’\textsuperscript{198} Understanding a social system, he presumed, would assist both in understanding the NT texts and in allowing the twentieth-century reader to notice and assess the difference between their cultural context and that of the first Christians, thereby avoiding the \textit{a priori} assumption of cultural synonymity that was indicative of many popular (and some academic) readings of NT texts. He argued, borrowing from the anthropologist

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{194} Malina (1981). NB. Elliott (1981) appeared concurrently but without the same popular influence.
\item \textsuperscript{195} Malina (2001: xi). cf. Horrell (2009: 10, 10n13) who notes that some (cf. Hochschild (1999: 225)) have mistakenly assumed, by the textbook nature of the book, that this approach was, at its release, exemplary of the approach’s acceptance.
\item \textsuperscript{196} Malina (1986), cf. Meeks (1983).
\item \textsuperscript{197} Malina (2001: xi). A glance through the bibliographies of Neyrey (http://www3.nd.edu/~jneyrey1/honor.htm [Accessed 1/7/2016]) or Elliott (1993a: 138-174) will show how influential Malina has been, not to mention the rare appearance of a textbook on the NT background that does not contain a chapter on honour.
\item \textsuperscript{198} Malina (2001: xi). We do note, with interest, that Pitt-Rivers himself saw the possible application of his model to biblical texts, cf. Pitt-Rivers (1977: 127-171).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Francis Hsu,\textsuperscript{199} that assuming a level of cultural continuity was a valid approach. Whether Hsu intended his assertion about the general unchanging nature of people to defend a cultural span of two millennia is uncertain, but this has been a particular contention for those who have rejected Malina’s work.

At the beginning of the textbook is Malina’s contention, based upon Pitt-Rivers’ model, that honour was a ‘pivotal’ value of the NT world.\textsuperscript{200} In keeping with his stated intention, he explains the honour model he has borrowed from the Mediterranean anthropologists and how it might work in a biblical context, albeit difficult to track his ‘borrowing’ due to the lack of proper referencing in the textbook.\textsuperscript{201} The alert reader will see Pitt-Rivers’ model, almost verbatim, yet he is only mentioned as a resource for further reading in the chapter’s bibliography.\textsuperscript{202} Some have wondered whether the reader needs to be more aware that models developed from twentieth century Andalusian communities are being used to reconstruct first century values.\textsuperscript{203} Further to this, we note that Malina presents his model in a more rigid manner than Pitt-Rivers does.\textsuperscript{204} As we noted above, honour studies have generally understood honour as a broad cultural phenomenon that is locally defined. Whilst Malina initially notes that honour requires ‘social acknowledgement’, as his chapter develops he defines certain ‘required’ features that leave the model less malleable to local definition and less in keeping with Pitt-Rivers and other cultural anthropologists.\textsuperscript{205}

Malina seems unaware, or at least unconcerned, that individuals and groups within cultures might choose to challenge conformity to a particular system, and regularly do so. Mark Finney and, more vocally, Louise Lawrence have objected to this aspect of his influence, arguing that an overly rigid hermeneutical, rather than heuristic, model of honour does not allow for the identification of localised nuances within a particular

\textsuperscript{200} Malina (2001: 27).
\textsuperscript{201} Malina (2001: 27-57).
\textsuperscript{202} Malina (2001: 56-57).
\textsuperscript{203} Domeris (1993: 292).
\textsuperscript{204} Downing (1999: 57) calls it a ‘simplified form’ of Pitt-Rivers’ work.
\textsuperscript{205} cp. Malina (2001: 27, 52). Whilst his bibliography grows with each edition to include more recent works from the field the chapter itself varies minimally.
cultural context. This is really a problem with Malina’s model usage rather than content, although both would agree with our contention that Malina’s model is not sufficiently aware of localised variations regarding honour, whether ancient or modern. That said, neither of their monographs challenge Malina’s central contention that honour is a pivotal value for the NT world, much the opposite.

F.G. Downing is one of the few who has directly challenged Malina’s representation of honour, in particular his contention that it is in the ancient world both a ‘foreign’ and ‘pivotal’ social value. His concern regarding the purported ‘foreignness’ and the encouragement to unquestioningly accept the model’s content is broadly comparable with one of our main concerns with Malina’s work. Namely that, unusually, Malina’s success rather than his method is the major problem with the book. If anything the book has been too successful. It presents itself so well that a large swathe of a new generation of scholars seem to have largely equated ‘social-scientific’ work with reading *New Testament World*. This is evident when we see Pitt-Rivers’ model appearing in secondary NT works but explained with a rigidity that reflects Malina’s presentation rather than Pitt-Rivers’.

In turn, critics of honour models have often criticised Pitt-Rivers’ model, but the nature of their criticism implies that they are reading Pitt-Rivers via Malina. Downing is less comfortable with honour being positioned as a ‘pivotal’ value preferring an approach that considers honour dominant or pivotal when it is ‘clearly shown to be’. We would partially agree with Downing here. The language of pivotal has been interpreted by some to suggest that this is the only value that we might encounter in the ancient Mediterranean. Consequently, to avoid implications of exclusiveness, considering honour a pervasive value might be more appropriate.

However, Crook is correct to note that expecting a pervasive cultural value to be ‘self-
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207 Downing (1999: 54).
208 Downing (1999: 56).
evident’ in a text is not reasonable. That which is obvious to someone within a cultural context is rarely so to an outsider. As a result, what Downing might reject for not being sufficiently ‘clearly shown’ might only be unclear to him. Ironically, it is for exactly this reason that models are often commended.

2.3.2 Defending the Model

The concerns listed by Downing, Finney and Lawrence are not, however, sufficient to suggest we should stop considering honour. Truthfully, their work only confirms it as a pervasive issue in the NT world. Yet further, their scepticism regarding models of honour seems broadly based on uncritical usage of the model. Rejection, however, seems a strange response to a model that is accused of being untested. Testing, and if necessary, abduction, seems a far more logical approach.

David DeSilva’s work on honour, beginning with his monograph on Hebrews, plots a healthy route forward. His approach both relies on social-scientific models, but abducts them in response to the ‘intricacies and complexities’ of the texts being analysed. The claims that honour is a pervasive value needs to be evaluated, not, pace Downing, in the light of simply what is stated clearly, but rather the ‘rhetorical strategies of the specific texts as well as the wider-ranging discussions of honor and shame in ancient Greek literature.’ DeSilva states his position more clearly in a manner that is informative to our project and, we would argue, a better response than that of Downing, Finney and Lawrence,

Overzealous use of a method should not disqualify the method. Rather, it calls for the discovery of a more careful and nuanced approach to the function and meaning of honor and shame language in New Testament texts, and more realistic expectations as to the results of honor/shame analysis in the interpretation of ancient texts.

\[211\] Crook (2009: 596).
\[212\] cf. Finney (2012: 8f) as an example of this.
\[213\] Especially, as Elliott (2008a) notes, if you continue to use the model.
Malina’s textbook may have generated a trend towards untested models of honour being used in NT hermeneutics, although, to be fair, this is not entirely Malina’s fault. Not only was he purposefully being heuristic, but it remains with those who use his work to notice that such an approach is not indicative of the broader field of honour studies. Even if they do not, this does not invalidate the application of honour models in NT research.

Downing’s concerns about ‘unsupported generalizations’ can be allayed by analysis, although we would argue it requires a model of honour to both begin and guide that process towards its goal, which would be an abducted and refined model of honour. It does seem to us, however, that testing the model against the ancient Mediterranean data is obvious, necessary, and in no way challenges the validity of a model-based method. Whilst this is not as common as might be expected, it seems to us the only sensible way forward despite social-scientific studies of biblical texts all too often failing to mount more than a cursory glance towards contemporary data.

2.4 Facework: Modelling the Public Side of Honour Concern

Therefore, whilst we have no desire to utilise an honour gloss per se (cf. §2.2.1), adopting a model that will offer a focussed guide in our approach to honour in this study seems prudent. The public nature of the conflict in Galatia leads us to anticipate that any honour issues explicated in this epistle will relate to the second part of Pitt-Rivers’ model, namely the focus on a person establishing their value in the eyes of their society, i.e. the public side of honour. Recent attempts to redirect honour studies towards ‘honour virtue’ (e.g. honesty, hospitality) should not, as Esler rightly observes, distract us from noticing how public interactions evidence competitive situations that attempt to preserve or defend someone’s social standing. An approach to understanding the sentiments of honour that relate to a person’s social-standing or reputation — the ‘self as it appears to others’ — is described by some social theorists using the term face. The processes of presenting one’s face or the strategies of face-

217 cf. Lawrence (2002). Lawrence attempts to subvert Malina’s model by noting Pitt-Rivers ideas of honour virtue (690), however, she does not seem to sufficiently delineate between concepts of public (precedence) and private (virtue) honour. cf. Crook (2007).
218 Esler (2011: 50).
concern are known as facework.220 Our attention is initially drawn to a facework model as a way to explore Paul’s use of ἐπιστήμησα and how it relates to honour concern in Galatians 6.12 and wider aspects of the letter.

Although the language of face does occasionally appear in common parlance it is rarely identified for its connection to notions of personal honour.221 Face language represents self-presentation, the ‘impression management’ of people intending to be desirable and appreciated within their group.222 Face is a ‘public property’ granted on the basis of behaviour in contrast to any private aspects of the individual.223 In the social-sciences concepts of face and facework were popularised by Erving Goffman who argued that to study facework is to analyse the rules of social interaction.224 He describes his understanding of face as ‘the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact.’225 Face is not ‘self-orientated’ but a ‘public, inter-personal image’ supported by the judgment of others.226 It is socially constrained to the extent that Goffman holds that face is only ‘loaned’ to the individual from their group for as long as they prove worthy of it.227 This, although similar to Pitt-Rivers’ honour definition is subtly yet importantly different. The complexity being that unlike broader definitions of honour, where it is held on the basis of community evaluation, face requires the individual to act on how they imagine others might perceive them.228 With face any social value is presented concurrent with the claim for honour — the claim and the display are the same. This is what we would expect in the ancient world: face is essentially the level of honour you can ‘get away with’. The claim is the challenge, but if the face is accepted, then the honour is gained. A contemporary facework theory is focused upon the very things that

221 e.g. ‘Saving face’ or ‘losing face’, MacMartin et al. (2001: 222).
222 cf. Brown and Levinson (1978: 76) and also Giddens (2009: 264) on impression management.
224 MacMartin et al. (2001: 222) note that the early work of Durkheim (1915) hinted towards the ideas expressed by face. cf. Tracy (1990) for a survey of the breadth of Goffman’s influence on the field.
225 Goffman (1967: 5-6).
226 Mao (1994: 453, 455), cf. Flanders (2011: 55). Mao is right to note that Western conceptualisations of face tend to be self-orientated, subsequently, some face models are less useful to our study than Goffman’s (e.g. Brown and Levinson (1978)).
227 Goffman (1967: 10).
interest any ancient honour study, specifically the nature of how a person presents themselves in public and what that reflects of both their values and the impression they are attempting to make.²²⁹

Considerations of face are implicit in every social interaction.²³⁰ Goffman argued that ‘almost all acts involving others are modified, prescriptively or proscriptively, by considerations of face.’²³¹ Face is that which is present in the social encounters of those who have a particular status or position that they wish to protect.²³² Navigating social life and concern for status (face-wants) is, according to Brown and Levinson, about managing the tension between ‘positive face’ and ‘negative face’.²³³ Positive face is the universal concern for good social-standing that drives most individuals. The concern for positive face, however, generates the complexity of negative face, the wish that one’s ‘actions be unimpeded by others’, wherein an individual realises that their desire for status requires recognition by those very others from whom the individual seeks autonomy.²³⁴ Essentially, face describes the ‘process of socially valuing individuals as they wish to appear and of appearing as one would like to be valued.’²³⁵ As a result the public nature of face means that it might neither represent what a person thinks of themselves only how they wish to be thought of, nor what others think of the person, only how they treat that person publicly.²³⁶ This is not to say that a person’s face might not be ‘real’ but only that concern for honour will normally overwhelm any internal predisposition.²³⁷ Although face is not always identified as honour-concern its singular focus on positive values, as no-one claims face for negative behaviour, guides any investigation towards the honourable public values of a particular group or culture. As

²²⁸ Scodel (2008: 13).
²³¹ Goffman (1967: 13).
²³² Flanders (2011: 94).
²³⁴ Brown and Levinson (1978: 66). This is the basis for their development of a theory of formal politeness. The theory itself is considered overly individualistic to have goodness of fit for collectivist cultures (cf. Lloyd (2009: 185)), so we will continue with Goffman’s more general description.
²³⁷ Oprisko (2012: 78), cf. Mao (1994: 455). Whether the face is ‘real’ or not is rarely an issue unless a person’s actions are at odds with the identity they desire or claim, Tracy (1990: 215).
almost all analysts of face note, it is a universal social phenomenon that varies across
groups and cultures.\textsuperscript{238}

\textbf{2.4.1 Facework as Honour Concern}

Stella Ting-Toomey notes that ‘everyday linguistic and non-verbal facework practice’ is
closely connected to the honour ideas within any particular group.\textsuperscript{239} This is not
unexpected as face concerns are often most relevant in contexts where there is no
obvious social hierarchy, such as within the leadership of the nascent assemblies of
Galatia. As a form of what Stewart calls ‘horizontal’ honour, face is concerned with the
maintenance of one’s public self in relation to the important dimensions of the group’s
values.\textsuperscript{240} More specifically, face is a core component of honour’s concern regarding
how one is treated. If, continuing with Stewart (although this clearly echoes Pitt-
Rivers), honour is a right to be treated as having a certain worth, then facework is the
process of ensuring one appears to possess the characteristics necessary to claim that
honour.\textsuperscript{241}

As a claim-right, facework is not the attempt to achieve a preferred status, but rather is
to generate the perception that one has an ‘entitlement to a certain treatment’.\textsuperscript{242}
Presenting oneself with positive or good face within the group will generate a ‘debt’ on
others that requires appropriate behaviour in response.\textsuperscript{243} Face, therefore, claims a
particular identity and associate benefits which requires a ‘strong internalization of the
group into the self.’\textsuperscript{244} Consequently, maintaining face in any community requires an
ability to manage the three aspects of honour that we identified in Speier’s study, the
bearers, bestowers and observers.\textsuperscript{245} By this we mean that managing one’s face requires
the individual to defend attacks against themselves, establish the prestigious nature of

\textsuperscript{239} Ting-Toomey (2004: 220).
\textsuperscript{241} Stewart (1994: 21).
\textsuperscript{242} Pitt-Rivers (1965: 21).
\textsuperscript{243} Flanders (2011: 99).
\textsuperscript{244} Oprisko (2012: 81).
\textsuperscript{245} Speier (1935: 76).
their behaviour, and encourage others to see and follow their behaviour as honourable. Face concern creates a compelling pressure towards group conformity.  

‘Face fulfills [sic] the need for a process of socially valuing individuals as they wish to appear and of appearing as one would like to be valued.’  

Face, therefore, is a public appeal for respect. By presenting oneself as ‘acceptable’ or with ‘good face’, a person is making a public appeal for their adherence to honourable behaviour and status. Being adjudged to have ‘good face’ is the peer-based identification of a person being good for the group and the group identity. Face is generally a significant factor in peer groups or cultures where hierarchal views of the world persist.  

Maintaining a particular face is a mark of exclusivity. Even within groups that would be bound by a particular commitment to sameness the face can offer, as we should expect, categories of distinction. Externally, the group will be looking to create a demarcation between itself and the other, whilst internally the values of sameness will be essential to group solidarity.  

Externally the threat will present itself as the unworthy or inferior, whereas internally the threat will be from the rebel, those not sufficiently concerned about ‘making good face’. Face, therefore, hinges on appearance, on presentation, on the adherence to standards, but it also becomes the marker by which a good member might distinguish themselves from a less good adherent within the group.

2.4.2 Face-Saving Conflict

At the same time, however, face generates the possibility of conflict by extending the parameters of honour beyond establishment of face to include the demand that a certain type of behaviour be enacted by others on that basis. When individuals with similar concerns encounter one another, a vigorous defence of face can be expected.  

Facework is rarely used in conflict research, as Tracy observes, despite the language of ‘saving’, ‘restoring’, ‘losing’ or ‘maintaining’ face being common in the field.  
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251 Oprisko (2012: 80).
252 Flanders (2011: 100).
253 Tracy (1990: 216).
conflict is often expected in situations where honour is threatened, it is the public nature of face and its vulnerability to attack that creates something of an obligation to retort to any challenges with a show of strength, whether by violence, insults or teasing.\textsuperscript{254} Equally, a loss of face is what is risked by the attacker in any conflict over honour or status.\textsuperscript{255} Consequently, ‘the man of honour…is always on his guard.’\textsuperscript{256} Face emphasises one’s position within a group, thereby any attack threatens one’s standing both in relation to and within the group.\textsuperscript{257} This is true even in cases where there is only a perceived attack on one’s face. As Oprisko notes, any custom or tradition of maintaining honour (e.g. duelling, feuding) finds its roots in concern for face.\textsuperscript{258} The extent to which individuals will go to correct judgments of their social worth that are incompatible with their intended status shows the extent to which face is ‘a sacred thing’, as Goffman observes, but also it implies a short distance between concerns for face in any context and the honour conflict we encounter in the ancient Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{259}

In 1904 Georg Simmel argued in ‘sociology of conflict’ that groups created a dynamic that influenced its members and generated the need for conflict exchanges.\textsuperscript{260} His assessment of conflict noted that there was often an increase in intensity the more similar those in competition were to one another, leading to group conflict being the most common form.\textsuperscript{261} This is due to the perception that group survival is at stake within the conflict.\textsuperscript{262} However, conflict functions in an important social way to give those within any social context the hopefulness that difficult situations can be modified.\textsuperscript{263} Simmel’s influence was significant in the field of conflict studies, particularly on Lewis Coser.\textsuperscript{264} Coser held that conflict served to ‘establish and maintain the indentity and boundary

\textsuperscript{254} Tracy (1990: 215).
\textsuperscript{255} Goffman (1967: 25).
\textsuperscript{256} Bourdieu (1965: 215).
\textsuperscript{257} Oprisko (2012: 83).
\textsuperscript{258} Oprisko (2012: 83).
\textsuperscript{259} Goffman (1967: 19).
\textsuperscript{261} Simmel (1904: 515).
\textsuperscript{262} Simmel (1904: 519).
\textsuperscript{263} Simmel (1904: 493).
\textsuperscript{264} See the discussion in Fink (1968: 428).
This, understandably, highlights the importance of analysing conflict in NT situations, particularly in assessing what is considered to be at stake. Further, and important for an honour study, Coser notes that conflict will increase in contexts were social mobility is seen as a possibility. Both Simmel and Coser identify, in different language, how issues of status are often a motivating feature of conflict, where having been slighted, or the competition for a particular possession or position, or questions over the legitimacy of distribution of something of value, can all lead to internal group conflict. This highlights the role that change makes in generating conflict. Perceptions of change often generate conflict, whilst conflict itself often leads to change within a group. It is interesting, however, how both Simmel and Coser identify the group-binding effect of conflict, as it strongly functions to either establish or reaffirm group identity against other groups or the wider social world.

However, concepts of conflict in the social-sciences are still ambiguous. As the term gains popularity in NT studies it is often used without an overly apparent concern for a definition. Alternative terms have variously been suggested by those in the field of conflict studies. Rivalry, opposition, antagonism, tension, even ‘diametrical social opposition’ regularly feature yet still without definition. If, however, we are content to work with Louis Kriesberg’s understanding of a social conflict as that which occurs when ‘two or more persons or groups manifest the belief that they have incompatible objectives and act on that belief with the intent to affect the behaviour of at least one party, then we might see the value in Ralf Dahrendorf’s broad use of ‘conflict’ to describe ‘contests, competitions, disputes, and tensions as well as manifest clashes
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265 Coser (1956: 38).
266 Coser (1956: 38).
268 Simmel (1904: 521), Coser (1956: 34, 38).
269 Aubert (1963: 26). The arguments over whether definitions should be broad, vague and umbrella-like or narrow and specific can be seen in Fink (1968: 453).
270 For example, Finney (2012) devotes 2 chapters of his excellent study to defining honour, but assumes a definition of conflict. Similarly, Witherington (1995). Esler (2003: 29-33, 50) offers a brief consideration of group conflict reduction as part of a broader consideration of social identity theory, yet in chapter 4 of Esler (1994: 62) the ‘conflict’ of the essay’s title has become a ‘dispute’ in the body of the text. An exception, to which this study is indebted, is Duling (2011: 154).
271 Fink (1968: 454), who notes the different terms used to translate the same passage in Weber’s Basic Concepts in Sociology.
between social forces.\textsuperscript{272} This perhaps allows us to be a little less precise, although informed in our imprecision, as many terms can be encapsulated under the umbrella of ‘conflict’. A broad definition of conflict may also be important as the behavioural determinants of everyday life are often ‘indistinguishable’ from those observed in a conflict situation.\textsuperscript{273} That is to say, in our facework model, the concern for honour that we expect to be present amongst groups or associations in day-to-day encounters will remain even in more intense conflict contexts. More specifically, we agree with Stephan Joubert that the ‘agonistic ancient Mediterranean culture turned most forms of social interaction, from invitations, meals, public debates, recitals, business transactions, right up to gift-exchanges, into agonistic contests for honour.’\textsuperscript{274} In describing the culture as ‘agonistic’, this is, essentially, to say that whether the actions of slaves at meal times or the victorious king after battle, the extent of the competition for increased honour or the defence of face would be such that an appropriate term to describe many, if not most, day-to-day interactions is ‘conflict’.\textsuperscript{275}

Conflict was additionally difficult in ancient Mediterranean culture due to a ‘cognitive orientation’ described by George Foster as ‘limited good’.\textsuperscript{276} Foster expresses this as follows:

\begin{quote}
[B]road areas of peasant behavior are patterned in such fashion as to suggest that peasants view their social, economic, and natural universes – their total environment – as one in which all of the desired things in life such as land, wealth, health, friendship and love, manliness and honor, respect and status, power and influence, security and safety, exist in finite quantity and are always in short supply, as far as the peasant is concerned.\textsuperscript{277}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{272} Kriesberg (2003: 2), similar to Brown (1957: 136) ‘[Conflict is] the simultaneous arousal of incompatible tendencies to action’. Also Dahrendorf (1959: 135).

\textsuperscript{273} Brown (1957: 136).

\textsuperscript{274} Joubert (2000: 43). Forms of this list abound amongst NT social-scientists, all summaries of the data in Bourdieu (1965: 202-204). NB: Lawsuits, athletics and even poetic competitions were all described as ἀγών, Cohen (1995: 66-67). cf. Malina (2001: 36), ‘Exchange…naturally tends to always lead to competition’ and Bourdieu (1965: 214). Although we would affirm that some honour can be achieved in non-competitive ways, the emphasis is on ‘some’, for even acquired honour requires defending.


\textsuperscript{276} Foster (1965: 296).

\textsuperscript{277} Foster (1965: 296 italics original), cf. (Brandes 1987: 121-122).
If good things are limited and, furthermore, there is no possibility of increasing available quantities of said things, then conflict is a direct threat to the equilibrium of any group as any gain is inherently someone else’s loss. Limited good functions as an ‘active moral principle’ encouraging those within such systems to work towards survival rather than accumulation at the expense of others. The validity of this model, and the associated tension it creates, is especially apparent in such cultures when honour is in view, as the desire to excel in something at the expense of others contrasts against the desired behaviour of a limited good culture. Honour concern, and its various associated issues, when perceived as limited in supply but supremely desirable easily becomes the source of conflict and competition.

Foster’s contention has, however, encountered opposition. David Kaplan and Benson Saler, then John Kennedy, amongst others, raised objections to his model. Their objections, however, appear to mostly relate to a misunderstanding of the nature of a model as they generally object to the idea of ‘limited good’ on the basis of it not applying in every situation they imagine, or Foster’s contention that the model can be valid without those within the system being explicitly aware of it.

The idea of limited good has, following Malina, has garnered much support from NT scholarship working with social-scientific models, to the extent that it is often mentioned without much need for defence. This reflects the strength of Foster’s model. A strong objection to the limited good model from within NT scholarship has come from Lawrence’s complaint that Foster’s model doesn’t fit the evidence we encounter in NT texts. Her primary objection, however, is now familiar to us, in that she expects models to have a level of specificity that they, by nature, cannot provide. More specifically, she claims the model doesn’t work on the basis of the data she
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278 Batten (2008: 68).
280 That this is a model is reaffirmed in Foster (1972: 58).
282 Kaplan and Saler (1966) and Kennedy (1966). A full list of objectors is in Foster (1972: 63n3).
283 e.g. Kaplan and Saler (1966: 203) and (Kennedy 1966:1213, cf. Foster (1972: 59).
encounters in the theology of Matthew’s Gospel which, she argues, evidences a lack of belief in limited good.\footnote{Lawrence (2003: 220).} However, as Crook has rightly noted, Matthew’s aim to introduce his audience to the counter-cultural ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν incorporates a vision of a kingdom without a perception of limited good (e.g. 18.23-35; 19.16-26; 20.1-16).\footnote{Crook (2007: 258).} The result of this is that Matthew’s vision of the kingdom of unlimited good only serves to increase the likelihood that a limited good model does actually represent normal life in his context.\footnote{Crook (2007: 258).} The absence, therefore, of a compelling objection to the limited good model encourages us to consider it applicable to the context and conflict we explore in Galatians.

In addition to the constant and public threat to personal honour created by the agonistic nature of most social interactions, the reciprocity and comparison inherent within the ‘rules of honour’, honour’s perceived status as a limited good, and the pervasiveness of φιλοτιμία meant that the quest for prestige or social standing invariably involved long sequences of conflict.\footnote{cf. Gouldner (1967: 41-77), Kahl (2010: 196-197) and Neyrey (1998: 16f). Black-Michaud quotes Evans-Pritchard as saying ‘a feud goes on forever’. A helpful survey of cultural anthropology findings related to this is Black-Michaud (1975: 63-80).} Since Bourdieu, these ubiquitous patterns of conflict observed within honour culture have been described, using his terms, as ‘challenge and riposte’.\footnote{Bourdieu (1965: 191-242). Malina is often credited for adapting this model for NT scholars, cf. Malina (2001: 33-36) (although the book’s unusual textbook-like form does not make it immediately apparent that it is Bourdieu’s model).} Naturally context will affect content, but Bourdieu modelled the typical components of reciprocal honour conflict in a manner that allows for variety in regards to the honour being claimed or challenged.\footnote{Bourdieu (1965: 215).} This model is helpful for facework, in particular for assessing situations of face-threat.\footnote{The chart in Bourdieu (1965: 215) graphing challenge and riposte is regularly repeated by NT social-scientific studies.} Concern regarding the apparent abstract nature of Bourdieu’s model, and thereby its applicability, can be allayed by noting, as Jerome Neyrey does, the high similarity between the ‘essential dynamics’ of the challenge and riposte model and the ‘provocation and response’ pattern found in the
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ancient rhetorical handbooks, the *Progymnasmata*, and other ancient works (cf. Aristotle *Rhet.* 2.2.1, Seneca, *Ira* 1.3.3, 1.6.5, and Plutarch, *Cohib. ira, Mor.* 454B,C).

### 2.4.2.1 Bourdieu on Challenge and Riposte

In Bourdieu’s generalised model, a challenge and riposte exchange revolves around four components — 1) an implicit or explicit *claim* regarding honour, 2) the claim is *challenged*, 3) the *riposte* to the challenge, 4) the public ratification of the perceived victor. The principal variable in this model is the form of part 3, in which three possible response options face those challenged, much of which is related to their interpretation of the challenge, and more specifically, the challenger. The forms of part 3 can be either to, a) ignore the challenge as unworthy, b) be defeated by the challenge, or c) to riposte with a counter challenge. Option ‘c’ essentially restarts the sequence of challenge and riposte, an exchange which will continue until a victor emerges, with no apparent expiry. We might question whether the silences that Bourdieu notes (‘a’ or ‘b’ above) ever actually imply what he suggests, as more likely they are simply extended breaks prior to the resumption of conflict. It is difficult to imagine, other than in the case of annihilating loss, a challenge that is not eventually responded to in any honour culture, whilst a person’s honour is desecrated by the cowardice of not responding to any challenge. As a result the ‘silence’ is more likely a pause whilst a riposte is organised. Even in challenges that result in the death of one party, invariably family or community members would see it as their honourable duty to respond accordingly. Regardless of this comment on part 3, however, we still find Bourdieu’s model useful for shaping expectations of honour interactions.

One problem that affects use of this model in NT social-scientific work is that it often appears that the ‘challenge and riposte’ model is being cited as Bourdieu’s but is actually sourced from Malina’s *New Testament World*. This is often difficult to

---

294 Pitt-Rivers (1965: 26).
295 This could be the recovery from illness, raising of funds, even waiting for the avenger to come of age. Campbell (1964: 202-203). Notably, even the person who considered himself above the challenge will likely choose to respond in order to ‘destroy’ the one bringing the affront (cf. Cicero *Sull.* 46).
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prove, and probably unnecessary, but two particular notions regarding honour conflict that are widespread in NT work seem to be first connected to this model by Malina, namely the notion that challenge is exclusively the domain of men who are of equal social status. This claim is difficult to maintain on examination of the ancient world. The contention that one’s honour might be safe from those without sufficient honour capital to challenge it suggests a permanence to honour that simply did not exist. It is right to note that the idea of a restrictive code of honour existed to limit unequal challenges, and whilst it was more common for contests to happen between peers, it would be wrong to suggest that honour was always safe from those of different social status. As Barton notes,

[T]here were none so poor or so despised that they could not repay aristocratic abuse with gossip, slander, lampoons, or verses. The humblest could hiss you at the games or piss on your statue.

Similarly, the contention that honour is exclusively male struggles to find support. Downing has noted that this insistence amongst NT scholars ignores the research of anthropologists and the ancient evidence, such as Plutarch’s essay *Mulierum virtutes* (Γυναικῶν ἄρεται) where the ‘glory of a woman’ (τὴν δόξαν…τῆς γυναικός Mor. 242F) is defended. Again, this is clearly a bone of contention for Plutarch, but his willingness to state his position seems to validate Downing’s view that NT scholars’ tendency toward unsupported generalisations about women and honour are ‘obviously unjustified’.

This does not elevate the status of women particularly, but it does serve to prove that, as Valerius Maximus noted, ‘There is no status so low that it cannot be touched with the sweetness of glory’ (8.14.5). For us, this evidences the pervasiveness
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301 Barton (2001: 13), cf. the discussion on pages 171-172 about Cicero arguing with Caesar as if they were equal (Lig. 10.30).
of face concern in the ancient world and the day-to-day possibility of honour conflict. It is difficult to imagine a community, association or group not affected by it.

2.4.2.2 Social Prosopagnosia: Disregarding Face

It is not always clear how facework in a conflict situation might improve an individual’s position as the predominant concern seems to be around minimising the potential loss of face which will impede ‘one’s ability to function effectively’ in that social context. However, it is the case, as Bourdieu’s model would lead us to expect, that the response of any individual will depend on their assessment of the face-threat to themselves and the potential impact of their actions towards the other. Significantly, it is possible that a person might hold a loose concern for face. Whilst they may recognise that they exist within a context that holds certain values, they might see them as relative or superseded by other concerns, such as community needs, conflict avoidance, a perception of equality. Flanders describes this as ‘low level face attachment’, where it could be that someone holds a strong sense of personal status but is ‘unconcerned with their social face’.

One might refer to this disregard for concerns of face as social prosopagnosia. At a social level an oblivion to the concerns of face, status, or honour is common amongst those crossing cultural or group boundaries, unversed as they are in the nuances of their new context. We are concerned, however, to use this term to describe a sort of determinedly ‘face-averse’ position. This comes from an individual’s intentional rejection of particular values and concerns, not due to misunderstanding but rather a desire to reject the values and concerns a particular idea of face represents. Any facework model that considers a group’s conflict interactions needs to be alert to the possible attempt to reject and ignore a particular set of values, often as a precursor to the establishment of an alternative position.
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309 Flanders (2011: 45) uses this term to discuss certain unintentional missiological situations.
2.5 Conclusion

Asserting the usefulness of an honour model sets us up for what Stewart calls an ‘armchair study’. Prevented from doing fieldwork we use the model as a descriptive guide for the texts of cultures likely to reflect the concept of honour that interests us. Prevented from doing fieldwork we use the model as a descriptive guide for the texts of cultures likely to reflect the concept of honour that interests us. Our consideration of honour models argued that not only are they more complex than is often noticed, they continue to offer fruitful results, despite NT scholarship often choosing dated and simplified representations. We also defended the use of models more generally as useful cross-cultural comparative tools for making sense of wie es eigentlich gewesen. Significantly, we noted that scholars who protest against model usage generally fail to offer a definition of honour that differs significantly from the well-used Mediterranean definition initially offered by Pitt-Rivers, inadvertently defending the utility of a model approach. With Kirkpatrick, however, we agree that, "[The] extent the ancient circum-Mediterranean shared cultural traits with the modern circum-Mediterranean societies studied by anthropologists finds its answer in the studies done by classicists and historians as well as biblical scholars familiar with ancient rhetoric." If our social-scientific definition of honour is both valid, i.e. it is a pervasive cultural phenomenon that is locally defined, and applicable to the ancient world it should be proved by it being readily exemplified in extant data. Therefore, rather than simply identifying the presence of honour concern in a society, we should, following Moxnes, ‘decide what a particular society understands as ‘honourable’ and the value that honour holds in that society (or culture)."

We noted that NT social-scientific studies have sometimes failed to consider appropriate comparative texts and we aim to avoid this mistake in our study. Having considered a facework model as likely to have ‘goodness of fit’ for our study due to the presence of καυχάμαι and εὕπροσωπέω at Galatians 6.12, we will now explore honour as it might have been understood by the Galatians. From there we will focus more narrowly on

311 e.g. Finney (2012), Barclay (2014).
understanding how our model of facework might make sense within that context and therefore shape the model that will guide our thesis about Galatians.
3. A Model of Face for the Ancient Mediterranean World

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter we considered how a facework model might fit the data we are considering through an honour lens in Galatians. We also argued that although honour was a pervasive cultural feature it was locally-defined and as such the notion of honour in play in any situation needs to be considered for how it functions within that context. Having criticised some NT studies for failing to consider the available comparative data with which to understand the broader concepts of honour that possibly affected the early Christians, we aim to avoid the same error in our study. As such we will analyse two particular areas of data. Firstly, a consideration of honour generally, beginning with data from Galatia, but also including its representation in extant Greco-Roman texts, before narrowing our focus to the concept of face in this context. This will then allow us to consider how the idea of face ‘works’ as an honour concept. This will involve looking at how boasting, conflict, and emulation function to establish, develop, and defend a concept of face within a community. This will allow us to offer a definition, a model, of honour that bears some resemblance to actual social values and behaviour.

3.1.1 Perceptions of Galatian Honour in the Popular (Ancient) Imagination

It is noteworthy that perceptions of Galatian people in extant literature reveal the ubiquity of an ancient Mediterranean notion of honour — even amongst a region generally antagonistic to Greco-Roman ideals. There is little available data on the


material history of Galatian Asia Minor and indigenous archaeological items have predominately been cultic rather than things useful to understand Galatian daily life, a feature reflected in the few archaeologically focused studies on Galatians. However, there are some interesting documentary sources that help rescue the region from its archaeologically terra incognita status. Discussions around what is ‘Galatian’ are made complex by the Greek terms Κέλτοι, Γαλάτης, and the Latin Galli being used synonymously by ancient writers to describe what modern writers would differentiate as ‘Celt’, ‘Gaul’ and ‘Galatian’. Kahl argues that in Paul’s time these all described ‘a single people of warlike and uncivilised barbarians who had ultimately been tamed and subjugated by Rome.’ This seems to be a fair interpretation of what Strabo presents in his Geographica,

The whole race which is now called both ‘Gallic’ [Γαλλικόν] and ‘Galatic’ [Γαλατικόν] is war-mad, and both high-spirited and quick for battle, although otherwise simple and not ill-mannered. And therefore, if roused, they come together all at once for the struggle, both openly and without circumspection, so that for those who wish to defeat them by stratagem they become easy to deal with (in fact, irritate them when, where, or by what chance pretext you please, and you have them ready to risk their lives, with nothing to help them in the struggle but might and daring)… on account of their trait of simplicity and straightforwardness they easily come together in great numbers, because they always share in the vexation of those of their neighbours whom they think wronged. At the present time they are all at peace, since they have been enslaved (δεδουλωμένοι) and are living in accordance with the commands of the Romans who captured them… (4.4.2).

This representation of the Galatians as conflict-eager but defeated subjects of Rome alerts us to a general perception of Galatian people that reinforces our arguments about the significance of status in the broad region surrounding Paul’s letter, and the likely

319 Kahl (2010: 50-51) is insistent on this singular identity. It is interesting to note how she cites no support from NT scholarship in this part of her argument, suggesting that the NT questions of identifying the Galatians (the north/south hypothesis) actually obscure the situation. However, Oakes (2015: 17f) offers a fairer representation of scholarship on the question.
applicability of an honour model (regardless of whether or not there were ethnic Galatians present in Paul’s congregations). The subjugation might not have been willingly accepted by the Galatians, but it is dominant in the extant literature. However, the passage above highlights a willingness to embrace conflict on behalf of an offence, a brave loyalty to their group, and particularly a need to defend the honour of those within the group. This suggests an existing adherence to generalised notions of honour that predate any Roman interactions with these people.

In *Bibliotheca Historica* (5.25-32), Diodorus Siculus comments variously on this race of strong, tall, sun-bleach-haired, ‘tartan’-clothed barbarians with food-encrusted moustaches and a belief in a form of reincarnation (5.28.2-3, 6; 30.1). Despite his questionable historicity, Diodorus’ observation and representation of values are revealing. Possessing a covetousness (φιλαργύρων καθ ὑπερβολήν 5.27.4) that was only surpassed by their penchant for alcohol (φιλοινίαν 5.26.3) that made them easily manipulated by rogue traders, Diodorus is struck by their love of conflict. In particular, the prominent concern to defend honour. Mealtimes exemplified this status concern. The bravest warriors receive the ‘best meat’ (καλλίσταις τῶν κρεών), whilst even minor offence required a riposte, regardless of the risk to life (5.28.4-5). The extent to which they were prepared to defend their honour meant their hospitality was careless, any unknown visitor was welcomed (5.2.8.5). Unsurprisingly, military combat was fierce. They disregarded death (θανάτου καταφρονόσιν) by fighting without armour or clothes, and shamed their enemy by rushing to challenge them individually in advance of battle. As Diodorus describes it, ‘[W]hen any man accepts the challenge to battle, they then break forth into a song in praise of the valiant deeds of their ancestors and in boast (προφέρονται) of their own high achievements…and belittling their opponent… (5.29.2-3). Enemy heads were further dishonoured by being displayed in homes, with
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322 Predating Paul, but possibly only by between 20-50 years.
323 Diodorus’ style attracted praise from his near contemporaries, Pliny the Elder approved of his simplicity in the preface to his *Natural History*. However, recent scholarship has been less kind to his lack of critical ability. The 1911 *Encyclopædia Britannica* was particularly harsh, whilst Robinson (1999: 135n6) noted he was known as one of the ‘most accomplished liars of antiquity.’ This may be why Diodorus’ is rarely mentioned in studies of Paul’s Galatians, with Kahl (2010: 45-46) a rare exception.
warriors boasting (καυχᾶσθαι) that they rejected an equal weight of gold for the head, showing a ‘barbarous sort of greatness of soul’ (βάρβαρόν τινα μεγαλουσιάν — 5.25.5).

The Galatians were never entirely understood by the rest of the classical world, despite the apparent fascination with them. Some of this, David Rankin argues, is as a result of their ‘archaic ferocity [which] was balanced by innate courage and a certain heroic decency guided by an unpredictable sense of personal honour. Their combative defence of face, with friend or foe, combined with their love of boasting, pompous words, and songs of praise that extol their own achievements (5.31.1-2), are typical of the context. However, Diodorus notes an understanding of honourable behaviour that is distinctly different than that with which he is familiar, noting that their men’s lust for other men is not considered disgraceful or dishonouring, despite it apparently appearing ‘astonishing’ (παραδοξότατον) to Diodorus himself (5.32.7). He is able to recognise certain values considered ‘honourable’ without personally seeing them as such. The values portrayed by Diodorus support the consideration of our model by showing a context versed in honour concerns typical of the ancient Mediterranean. We detect both the pervasiveness of honour as a cultural phenomenon yet the presence of a localised dialect.

3.2 Ancient Mediterranean Facework: ὁ περὶ τῆς δόξης ἀγών
Although generic statements about the importance of honour in the ancient world have become almost a priori in NT studies the extant literature supports the contentions of the model users who argue for honour’s ubiquity as a cultural concern. As Lendon notes:

Honour was a filter through which the whole world was viewed, a deep structure of the Graeco-Roman mind, perhaps the ruling metaphor of ancient society…Every thing, every person, could be valued in terms of honour, and every group of persons…It was fundamentally the same sentiment which had moved Achilles that launched the verbose contests of rhetoricians in second-century AD Smyrna…A revolution of circumstances, of ways of life,

of attitudes in other areas had not uprooted the Greek or Roman sense of honour.  

Lendon’s position reflects Cicero’s comments about youthful games:

How hotly they pursue their rivalries! How fierce their contests and competitions! What exultation they feel when they win, and what shame when they are beaten! How they dislike blame! How they covet praise (laudari)! What toils do they not undergo to stand first (principes) among their companions! (Fin. 5.22.61).

Understandably there were many values and cultural codes that affected this ancient world and it would be unwise to consider ancient society through monochrome lenses, yet, ‘in the solar system of ancient goods and values, honor occupied the place of the sun around which other priorities orbited.’  

We encounter a ‘network of honour’, considered as natural law (Cicero Inv. 2.66), involving any person concerned with their own reputation.  

Even slaves announced their concern for honour on their funerary epitaphs, seeking ‘slavish honour in slavish eyes’.  

Carlin Barton notes that the ‘plebeian was as preoccupied with honor as the patrician, the client as the patron, the woman as the man, the child as the adult’:

The truth is, Vanity (Gloria) drags all, bound to her glittering car, the unknown no less than the well known. (Horace Sat. 1.6.23-24).

Whether the officers of government, members of an association or the slaves of a farm, communities of honour were formed and maintained. Seneca is aware of this, ‘And so you will find the slave who would rather be struck with the lash than the fist, who considers stripes and death more endurable than insulting words’ (Const. 5.1). The fear of losing honour was a motivating influence, the love of praise and fear of shame did more to control citizens than the penalty of law (cf. Cicero Resp. 5.4):
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For there is nobody so boorish that he is not deeply sensitive to reproach (contumelia) and disgrace (dedecus), even though he be less influenced by actual considerations of honour. (Cicero Part. or. 26.91-92).

The ἄγων of honour pushed everything into second place, including life itself. The captured Mucius throws his hand into a fire to prove his honour and, unflinching, announces, ‘See how cheaply men hold their bodies when they set their sights on glory.’ Horrendous, perhaps, to the modern reader, inspiring to the Roman ear. For many the quest and drive for glory or honour ‘set them on fire’ (Cicero Tusc. 1.2.4.),

Nature has made us…enthusiastic seekers after honour (studiosissimi appetentissimique honestatis), and once we have caught, as it were, some glimpse of its radiance, there is nothing we are not prepared to bear and go through in order to secure it. It is from this rush, this impulse of our souls towards true renown and reputation that the dangers of battle are encountered; brave men do not feel wounds in the line of battle, or feel them, but prefer death rather than move a step from the post that honour has appointed. The Decii saw the gleaming swords of the enemy when they charged their line of battle; the fame and glory of death lessened for them all fear of wounds. (Cicero Tusc. 2.24.58-59).

Dio Chrysostom, a notable critic of honour concern, was acutely aware of the hold it had on society noting that men would despise danger and abandon their lives at the possibility of their own statue (Or. 31.16-17), whilst even those who valued their own health and safety considered the loss of reputation (ἀδοξία) to outrank most pains (Or. 16.3).

[Honour] is the reason why brave men are found on the battlefield wounded in front instead of having turned and fled. This is what the poet gives as Achilles’ reason for refusing to grow old and die at home, and for Hector’s standing alone in defence of his city…This is what made a mere handful of Spartans stand in the narrow pass against so many myriads of Persians…this


much is clear, that neither you nor any others, whether Greeks or barbarians, who are thought to have become great, advanced to glory (δόξα) and power (δύναμιν) for any other reason than because fortune gave to each in succession men who were jealous of honour (φιλοτιμία) and regarded their fame (εὐφημία) in after times as more precious than life. (Or. 31.17, 21).

As we might expect, honour did create, or perhaps enforce, a societal hierarchy. In this we see the truth of Lendon’s contention that honour acts as a cloak over other forms of power, thereby becoming a form of power in itself. Prestige demanded obedience because the prestigious defined what was honourable. Oppressive power became socially acceptable under the veil of honour. An inferior would obey a superior simply ‘on account of his being outstanding in prestige’ (Cicero Off. 2.22.).

When men of different contexts came together, their varied claims to rank were assessed based upon their respective honour. ‘A Roman’s status was based on the social estimation of his honour, the perception of those around him as to his prestige’, so claim Garnsey and Saller. Cicero agreed that good fortune in life meant ‘libertate esse parem ceteris, principem dignitate’ (Phil. 1.34). Philo imagined the strangeness of a world of equality where there was οὐκ ἔνδοξοι ἀδόξων (Legat. 1.13), while Pliny the Younger wrote to Calestruis Trio to remind him that honour demanded distinction to ensure its value,

I meant to congratulate you on the way in which you preserve the distinctions of class and rank (discrimina ordinum dignitatumque custodias); once these are thrown into confusion and destroyed, nothing is more unequal than the resultant ‘equality.’ (Ep. 9.5).

335 Although the authorship of this passage is questioned, the principle is likely to still be valid. cf. Lendon (1997: 57).
336 e.g. Sextus Roscious has his qualities exchanged, as it were, to give him an honour rating. Cicero Rosc. Amer. 15-20.
338 ‘Parity in freedom, primacy in prestige’. Lendon (1997: 34n15) lists the following as additional examples of social ranking being judged by honour: Cicero Plane. 32; Mur. 15; Suetonius Vesp. 9.2; Tacitus Ann. 2.33; Dio Chrysostom 31.74; Eusebius Hist. eccl. 2.2. 4; Jerome Epist. 66.7.
The reason for much of the pursuit of status was the privilege that honour allowed. Whether it be in the issue of donations, or in matters of trial, the more honour a person held the better it served them. This created the unusual situation, as Hellerman observes, where most philanthropic activity was motivated by φιλοτιμία rather than the late Victorian ideal of charity for charity’s sake. One’s standing in the public square could be enhanced if the correct benefactions were made — patronage was public status. The extent to which honour was the motivator of charity can be seen in the semantic development of φιλοτιμία into the term for public philanthropy (cf. Plutarch Cic. 8.1, Dio Chrystostom Or. 46.3), while curiously τιμή became synonymous of the statues erected for those benefactors. The poor benefited from charity, but they were not the intended recipients. Wealth, carefully managed, generated honour. Plutarch claimed that to be deprived the opportunity to show wealth is, essentially, to be deprived of the wealth itself (Cat. Min. 18.4). MacMullen noticed that the rich often impoverished themselves in their quest for honour, while Julius Caesar almost bankrupted himself with exhibitions and spectacles designed to win the favour of the people. Even cities contended with one another for the status of primacy (πρωτείον, Dio Chrysostom Or. 38.24). Therefore, while honour definitions might vary across the social spectrum, the ‘communal consciousness’ appears pervaded by that which Dio Chrysostom termed the ‘struggle for glory’ (ὁ περὶ τῆς δόξης ἀγών Or. 66.18).

Some of this struggle related to the perception that there was not enough honour to go round. This meant that another’s success in gaining honour was invariably seen as a threat to one’s own:

344 Hellerman (2005: 177n15). In an inversion of this, Jones (1978: 28) notes that certain cities reused old statues to honour new benefactors in a bid to avoid expense but continue prestige.
And whereas men attack other kinds of eminence and themselves lay claim to good character, good birth, and honour (φιλοτιμίας), as though they were depriving themselves of so much of these as they grant to others. (Plutarch Mor. 787D).

This reflects what we expect of this context when we describe it as limited good.347

It is not explicit what response this observation generates, although elsewhere Plutarch’s description of it seeming as a robbery combined with what we know of the agonistic context makes a competitive response likely.

…but by means of silence and an affected gravity and pose, he seeks to gain a reputation (δόξαν) for poise and profundity; as though commendation were money (χρημάτων τῶν ἐπαίνων), he feels that he is robbing himself of every bit that he bestows on another. (Plutarch Mor. 44B).

Even in situations when honour needed to be granted to another, it was not often done so willingly:348

People do not find it pleasant to honor (τιμᾶν) someone else, for they think they themselves are being deprived (στερίσκεσθαί) of something. But when they are brought around little by little over a period of time, overcome by sheer necessity, they give praise (ἐπαινέται), though even then only reluctantly. (Iamblichus Protr. 2.3 (96.1-97.8)).349

3.2.1 Honour in Public Life

You see what hardships these athletic competitors (τοὺς ἀγωνιστὰς) endure while training, spending money, and finally often even choosing to die in the very midst of the games. Why is it? If we were to abolish the crown for the sake of which they strive (φιλοτιμέομαι), and the inscription which will commemorate their victory at the Olympian or the Pythian games, do you think that they would endure for even one day the heat of the sun[?]…For all men set great store by the outwards tokens of high achievement, and not one man in a thousand is willing to agree that what he regards as a noble deed

347 On ‘limited good’ cf. Foster (1965) and our discussion at §2.4.2.
348 Scodel (2008: 16) notes that status issues in the Homeric context is always perceived as a limited good.
shall have been done for himself alone and that no other man shall have knowledge of it (Dio Chrysostom Or. 31.21-22). 

Honour happened in a public sphere, not a private one. An unknown honour was not an honour as an unknown person cannot be awarded fame and reputation. Apuleius defeats his court opponent with, ‘You are, through rusticity, an unknown’ (Apol. 16). Cicero regretted living in obscurity in a world where one wanted to be conspicuous (cf. Fam. 2.12.2). ‘Honour’, Lendon argues, ‘was mediated through the perceptions of others’, being glorious required public acknowledgement. As Barton comments, ‘for the Romans, being was being seen’, notice that the stance of those honoured by being set in marble are done so in a full-frontal visible way.

Consequently, honour bore a community-assessed nature. In the ancient world something did not inherently possess ‘glory’, it was adjudged so by the community. However, the multicultural exposure of the various communities and groups within the Greco-Roman world to a wide range of cultures, values, and ideas inevitably created a variety of different perceptions of what was and was not honourable. For Pitt-Rivers honour was never a ‘homogenous code of abstract principles’ but a collection of concepts related to one another within a specific social context (age, class, sex, occupation, etc.). Group recognition and approval was the confirmation of honour. Glory found only in one’s own eyes is not δόξα but κενοδοξία.

Dio Chrysostom claimed that the individual came to value their own opinion less than that of the praise (ἐπαινοεί) of the crowd (Or. 77/78.24). Seneca held that,
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352 Lendon (1997: 37, 37n31).
357 ‘The man who would not, or could not, submit his persona to challenges was weightless.’ Barton (2001: 63, 63n151), cf. Polybius 3.81.9.
...this renown, of which you speak, is simply the favourable opinion of good men. For just as reputation does not consist of one person’s remarks, and as ill repute does not consist of one person’s disapproval, so renown does not mean that we have merely pleased one good person. In order to constitute renown, the agreement of many distinguished and praiseworthy men is necessary. But this results from the decision of a number—in other words, of persons who are distinct. (Ep. 102.8).

Life was lived under the perennial ‘gaze of opinion’ where the honour granted was the mark of public opinion.\textsuperscript{358} Few, or in Cicero’s exaggerated words ‘none’, were unmoved by fear of reproach (Part. Or. 26.91.92).\textsuperscript{359} The varying standards of honour meant that individual communities were open to considering alternative conceptions of honour. Travellers had letters of recommendation presenting their community’s view of honour in terms comprehensible to a different social circle (cf. 2 Corinthians 3:1).\textsuperscript{360} While two groups might disagree with each other’s calculations of honour the ‘fundamental structure — the understanding that honour was the appropriate response to esteemed qualities — was largely the same.’\textsuperscript{361}

Loss of honour was unsurprisingly a major concern for members of any group, a concern that would rank higher in the mind than modern concepts of conscience, the community created ‘conscience’ through its ability to bestow or remove honour. The concern regards dishonourable behaviour was not the act itself, but the possibility of being discovered. ‘Very few people are as scrupulously honourable (honestatis) in secret as in public, and many are influenced by public opinion (multi famam) but scarcely anyone by conscience.’ (Pliny Ep. 3.20.8-9). The ancient person, however, was not amoral, rather ‘one’s moral reputation was an integral part of one’s rank in society.’\textsuperscript{362} Honour reinforced legal statutes whilst enforcing non-legislative values.\textsuperscript{363} Honour was the moral code.

\textsuperscript{358} Lendon (1997: 36).
\textsuperscript{359} Hellerman (2005: 43f).
\textsuperscript{360} Lendon (1997: 43).
\textsuperscript{361} Lendon (1997: 43f).
\textsuperscript{362} Lendon (1997: 41).
\textsuperscript{363} DeSilva (2000: 36).
Consequently, certain occupations were considered to be without honour: brothel-keepers, actors, gladiators, convicted felons, slaves essentially those with questionable conduct, obscured face, little control of face, or ‘no sense of shame’.\textsuperscript{364} Whilst the elite wondered whether it was possible to insult the honour of a slave,\textsuperscript{365} the low ranks of society developed their own publicly-affirmed conceptions of honour. Dio Chrysostom observed slaves wrangling over rank (Or. 34.51), while Claudian saw that slave honour-scales could be ranked based upon how often they had changed masters (Eutr. 1.29-31). The lower ranks of society apparently imitated the structures but not the values of elite honour, and as with those nearer the top of the scale, the opinion of others was paramount. It was often noticed that the lower rank associations modelled the more prestigious groups in the hope of attracting a wealthy benefactor (cf. Cicero Leg. 3.31-2, Martial 10.79).\textsuperscript{366}

### 3.2.2 The Court of Reputation

The significance of public estimations of a person’s worth combined with variant expressions of honour converging in physical locations around the known world created the need for a tribunal, of sorts, a ‘court of reputation’.\textsuperscript{367} This is where, at the confluence of conflicting ideas, honour could be adjudicated, and the community ensure they are not simply absorbed by the values of wider society. The community-based court of reputation encouraged the pursuit of group values and the granting of honour on that basis,

Those who begin to show signs of slackening in their commitment to the values of the group out of a growing regard for the opinion of outsiders must be made to feel ashamed by the members of the group and thus pulled back from assimilation.\textsuperscript{368}

DeSilva here reflects the texts. For Cicero the vetting of behaviour is what gave the court significance,

\textsuperscript{364} Lendon (1997: 96).
\textsuperscript{365} Lendon (1997: 96).
\textsuperscript{366} Lendon (1997: 100).
\textsuperscript{368} DeSilva (1999: 6).
For true glory is a thing of real substance and clearly wrought, no shadowy phantom: it is the agreed approval of good men, the unbiased verdict of judges deciding honestly the question of pre-eminent merit. (Tusc. 3.2.3).

Interestingly, Cicero has in mind some parameters of what we might call an honour definition that extend beyond simply the quest for ‘public reputation’ (fama popularis) which he describes as a simulatione honestatis which ‘mars the fair beauty of true honour’ (3.2.4). However, it is difficult to trace his idealistic definition throughout the ancient sources, as the power of fama popularis to define and control people’s behaviour by the threat of shame seems to be a dominant one. Not that Cicero is unaware of this, as he observes, ‘The censor’s judgment imposes almost no penalty except a blush upon the man he condemns. Therefore, as his decision affects nothing but the reputation, his condemnation is called “ignominy.”’ (Resp. 4.6.6). The court functioned, particularly to those of higher status, as a way of reminding a person of the requirements of their rank. ‘Indeed, the greater a man’s honour, the higher his position in society, the more people watched him, and the more he felt his actions hemmed in by his own rank’ (cf. Cicero Part. or. 19.66).

The pervasive influence of the court of reputation is seen when Dio Chrysostom asks whether a man might not just give up, even in the attempt to preserve life or property, if asked to so unrelentingly defend them:

Is not the trial concerning reputation always in progress wherever there are men — that is, foolish men — not merely once a day, but many times, and not before a definite panel of judges but before all men without distinction, and, moreover, men not bound by oath, men without regard for either witnesses or evidence? …Accordingly, whoever is victim of this malady of courting popularity is bound to be subject to criticism as he walks about, to pay heed to everyone, and to fear lest wittingly or unwittingly he give

---

369 Ignominia etymologically implies the loss of good name.
offence to somebody…the fact is, many are so constituted that they are overwhelmed and made to waste away by anything. (Or. 66.18-19). Dio Chrysostom is well-known for his criticism of honour concern, but here we helpfully see the constant nature of analysis in keeping with what we expected of honour codes. We note how judgement is meted by challenge rather than ruling, the verdict depends on the accused’s ability to defend against the criticism. Most variant behaviour could be addressed and controlled by simply reminding the person considered ‘out of step’ of the honour they carried. ‘The unwelcome requests of a distinguished man could be beaten off by sharply pointing out that they did not accord with his dignity.’ It is within this process of social control that we find the roots of the agonistic nature of honour cultures

3.2.3 Disregarding Popular Notions of Honour

At one level, honour was always being challenged and redefined, that was its nature. As we have seen, communities constantly wrestled to prove their honour. When Damonidas was awarded last place in the chorus, he sarcastically remarked, ‘You have discovered a way by which even this place may come to be held in honour’ (Plutarch Mor. 191F). The Spartans, as Plutarch observed, saw honour as continually redefined by courageous men (Mor. 208D-E), it was more complex than tradition or custom (cf. Diogenes Laertius 2.93).

Many noticed the apparent dysfunctions of the honour system — associations battled each other for glory, while those battling on the behalf of the group were also battling within the group for their own individual reputation. The contest system ultimately mitigated against a group culture such as the ancient Mediterranean.
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374 Gouldner (1967: 52).
375 It is interesting to note that Hellerman rejects Rohrbaugh’s contention that the elites of the ancient Mediterranean were ‘quasi-individualists’. We understand Hellerman’s wish to preserve the understanding of the ancient Mediterranean as a collectivist culture, but the nature of the honour system ultimately forced society into ‘quasi-individualist’ context. cf. Hellerman (2005: 177n28).
However, here we consider a deeper level of concern and rejection of honour. For some honour was not just dysfunctional but considered a false consciousness. Philosophers were often critical of the pursuit of honour and the contests involved, regardless of whose definition of honour was in question. The difficulty for the philosopher was, however, a problem of alternatives. What were they to replace the honour quest with?

They had no alternative paradigm to honour to offer their contemporaries, not even a compelling alternative rhetoric of admiration for their own ideas and way of life. Philosophers were doomed to be honoured for their scorn of honour.

No matter how hard the philosophers attempted to flee, honour chased them. The chaste philosopher owning only a bag and a cloak was inadvertently honoured for his virtue. ‘They seek advertisement and publicity for themselves on the very page whereon they pour contempt upon advertisement and publicity’, (Cicero Arch. 26). Tacitus writes that even amongst wise men *cupido gloriae* is the last of the desires to be conquered (*Hist. 4.6*).

Dio Chrysostom is noteworthy in his attempts to criticise the honour quest. Observing the ‘lure’ of a front row seat (66.2), he considers the pursuit of status as the ‘malady’ of foolish men (66.18-19). He notes that the man pursuing honour finds his emotions subject to the whims of the court of reputation,

What, then, is more ill-starred than human beings who are at the mercy of others and in the power of any one who meets them, always compelled to keep their eye on him and to watch his countenance, just as slaves must watch the countenance of their masters? (*Or. 66.13*).

He continues by noting that even a slave has the advantage of only having one master, whereas the slave to honour has many. Dio’s objection to honour seems, in particular, to be the result of his desire for concord within the cities and social
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376 Barton (2001: 9).
380 Dio Chrysostom accuses the philosophers of deceit when ‘gain and glory’ is their true aim, cf. Winter (1997: 49).
groups that the contest system made largely impossible (Or. 39).\footnote{cf. Moxnes (1994: 207), Jones (1978: 78).} Honours were mislaid values,

Do you imagine there is any advantage in market or theatre or gymnasia or colonnades or wealth for men who are at variance? These are not the things which make a city beautiful, but rather self-control, friendship, mutual trust. (Or. 48.9).

Dio suggests a different scale of the important things in life that attempts to remove the value of pursuing reputation. Concord and unity are exemplified as more worthy pursuits than honour (cf. Or. 39.2-5). In De gloria i (Περὶ Δόξης) he recommends a look of scorn (καταφρονέω) upon the pitiable wretchedness of a life spent in pursuit of honour (Or. 66.24.). Although, that Dio chooses to use the idea of scorn shows how difficult it is, even for a philosopher, to reject the culture of honour outright. His bestowal of the virtue of a quiet life seems largely autobiographical as his ultimate criticism of the quest for reputation was his withdrawal from public life.\footnote{Moxnes (1994: 209).}

He will bid farewell to honours and dishonours and to words of censure and of praise uttered by foolish persons, whether they chance to be many or whether they be few but powerful and wealthy. Instead, what is called popular opinion he will regard as no better than a shadow. (Or. 67.3).

Dio holds that the pursuit of honour is akin to a shadow, and were someone to take their shadow as seriously as honour he would be widely ridiculed, yet a man is as much in control of his shadow as he is of his reputation. Ultimately Dio counsels not an abandonment of public life but rather a recalibration of values. He recommends ‘goodwill and friendship’ (εὐνοία καὶ φιλία) over statues and seats of honour, and that people serve their city, not in the hope of glory, but out of concern and that the reward for this serving is mutual love and friendship (Or. 44.1-2).

---

3.3 Facework in Honour Cultures

In light of the foregoing data we now turn to consider how face as a concept within honour cultures helps us make sense of Paul’s paragraph that begins with the εὐπροσώπησαι reference at Galatians 6.12. The importance of perceptions of honour in ancient Mediterranean life we noted above can be understood via the metaphorical notion of face. As it is the public features of honour that concern our study, exploring the concept of face and the components of establishing, developing, and maintaining face will be useful to us. On a broad level, the basic features of ‘concern for face’ are comparable with honour — essentially a ‘ubiquitous human phenomenon’ that pervades society thoroughly but differently dependent on the relational context of the local culture.

More narrowly, however, the concept of face within honour theory is predominately concerned with the establishment, development, and maintenance of one’s position within an honour context. The similarity of these concepts to the interpretation we will offer of εὐπροσώπησε, boasting, and the conflict in Galatians further supports considering face as a useful honour model for our project.

Barton identifies the pervasiveness of face concern within Roman honour culture. Face as the ‘core of one’s social being’ was the canvas upon which emotions were publicly displayed. The imprecision of language used to describe face (e.g. vultus, persona, os, and πρόσωπον) reflects something of its breadth of meaning. Similarly to modern theory, face was understood to represent more than just facies (eyes, cheeks, etc.) but the whole visible representation (forma omnis, Gellius 12.30.2-4). We see a similar breadth of meaning in the NT around the word πρόσωπον where it refers to public presence (Matthew 11.10) and physical face (Mark 14.65). It also references reputation (Matthew 22.16) and physical face in places where it relates directly to
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384 We are not using face as a ‘gloss’ for generalised honour but in reference to the public aspects of facework we introduced in the previous chapter. cf. Herzfeld (1987: 75) on ‘glosses’.
385 Flanders (2011: 78f).
386 Oprisko (2012: 79).
387 cf. Barton (2001). The significance can be seen by how references to face are spread throughout the study.
390 We consider the language of face in detail at §4.2f.
perceptions of honour (Matthew 6.16-17; 2 Corinthians 11.20). It was the concern for honour that was thought to make the physical face react during any contest. The redness (rubor) of the blush, seen as the physiological response to an honour challenge, was often used interchangeably with pudor (shame) such was it connected (Pliny Nat. 11.58.157, cf. purpureus Ovid Am. 2.5.34). Consequently, in discussions about physical face in relation to social interactions honour concern is rarely far away. Ovid’s Rhea drowns herself to avoid the pudor of the blush on her physical face stating, ‘Perish the face (ora) that bears the brand of shame (pudor) and disrespect!’ (Am. 3.4.78) Seneca discussed the equal value of a leader’s oratory and ‘soul-expressing face’ (ipse animum ante se ferebantur Ep. 11.10), whilst for Cicero the face was the image of the soul (imago est animi vultus. De or. 18.60). The face was perceived this way, seemingly as a result of how it so quickly responded, not only to shame, but, so Seneca argued, all strong feeling, making it central to public interactions: ‘For no violent agitation can take hold of the mind without affecting in some way the countenance (in vultu)’ (De Ira. 1.7. cf. Ep. 11.4).

The haven from honour conflict that was friendship, for Aristotle, was marked by the lack of a blush in the presence of the shameful.

For, as we have said, before friends we do not blush for faults merely condemned by public opinion; if then he who blushes for such faults is not a friend, he who does not is likely to be one (εἰ οὖν ὁ αἰσχυνόμενος μὴ φίλει, ὁ μὴ αἰσχυνόμενος φιλοῦντι ἐδικεῖ. Rhet. 2.4.27).

Outside of the circle of friendship, however, those in honour cultures were always face-sensitive, the brazen-face ‘belonged to the stupid and shameless’. For most, the blush would be the normal response to ‘bad conduct in the presence of prestige’.
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393 Kaster (2005: 36).
The fear of ‘loss of face’ so motivated the ancient world, that Barton wonders how much it negated the lack of a centralised law-enforcement.\(^{397}\) It was definitely a strong factor in legal proceedings.\(^{398}\) Cicero noted how much a blush in a legal situation might damage the reputation (Resp. 4.6.6), whilst Porcius Latro’s planned revenge for Cicero’s murder was to extract a blush from the killer, Popillius (Seneca Con. 7.2.1). Barton argues that managing the face required a ‘high degree of behavioural finesse, a sort of social *Fingerspitzengefühl*’,\(^{399}\) whilst besmirching the face of another could be approached in a somewhat more blunt manner. Catullus demonstrates this when chasing a woman who was not forthcoming in returning borrowed items,

‘Dirty drab, give back the tablets, give back the tablets, dirty drab!’
She takes no notice? … We’ve achieved nothing, she isn’t moved at all. You must change your plan and method, if you are to make any headway: so if nothing else is possible, let us at least force a blush from the bitch’s brazen face (ore): ‘Give back the tablets, chaste and honourable maiden!’ (Poems 42.10, 20-24).

The concern for honour that we encounter in the ancient world had to be navigated in a face-to-face culture that required the sensitivity and skills to manage social relations and position in society with careful levels of tact.\(^{400}\) Most social interactions were opportunities to either improve face or suffer devastating loss of face. Despite the appearance of Greco-Roman cultures as literary-based contexts, it was in face-to-face contact that their values are properly seen. The face was the ‘primary mode of cultural orientation’.\(^{401}\) The face was something developed, something made. As Varro notes,

> In its literal sense *facere* ‘to make’ is from *faciesa* ‘external appearance’: he is said *facere* ‘to make’ a thing, who puts a *facies* ‘external appearance’ on the thing which he *facit* ‘makes.’ (Ling. 6.78 - emphasis and Latin original).

Consequently, as something made it was something that needed defending. It was the face that one risked in contest, it was the focal point, the site of honour in the public

---

\(^{397}\) Barton (2001: 18).


\(^{399}\) Barton (2001: 20).

\(^{400}\) cf. Barton (2001: 35), ‘The Romans lived in a face-to-face culture with an acute sensitivity to the bonds (*religiones, obligationes, moenia, and munera*) that defined them.’
arena of the social world of Paul. As a synecdoche for a person’s public reputation it was what was risked in any honour challenge, thereby the face was also the provocation in most competitions for honour as it was ‘the line drawn in the sand.’ The immediate response to those previously honoured who had fallen from society’s good graces was to scratch the face off their statues, while, those who could look at terror and keep face were the brave and heroes of society,

He who, with shame, death, and penalties staring him in the face, yet hangs not back from the defence of the commonwealth, he surely is the true hero (Cicero Mil. 30.82).

This was not lost on Lucan who noticed that the face-obscuring nature of a Roman military helmet protects the honour of its wearer, ‘galeae texere pudorem’ (Lucan 4.706). To ‘lose face’ was unbearable. Consequently, we see the persistent temptation to ‘save face’ by hiding one’s emotions and opinions that made πρόσωπον or persona, with its notion of ‘mask’, an appropriate descriptor. This naturally affected society, the ‘honour sensitive’ went through life studying the faces of peers: ‘Ex oculorum optutu, superciliorum aut remissione aut contractione, ex maestitia, ex hilaritate, ex risu...’ (Cicero Off. 1.146), so they might regulate conduct knowing that someone was always watching (Dio Chrysostom Or. 66.13). Social propriety and general peace is often thought to have been maintained, in Rome, by the ever-present fear of losing face. Whilst these ‘rules’ appear similar to what the contemporary observer might call a law, these are not legal statutes, but unwritten norms.
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401 Goody and Watt (1963: 335). As Barton (2001: 120) notes, however, ‘face became a façade’ when the risk of shame was such that managing your face to be almost expressionless became a social requirement.
402 Barton (2001: 56-57), cites Livy 2.12.9, Seneca Con. 2.4.13, and Suetonius Nero 7.1 as examples.
403 ‘The helmet hides the blush of shame.’ (LCL). The battlefield was a worthy place to gain honour, so note Constantius’ soldiers, who fought without helmets so that they could recognised in person, which proved helpful to obtaining personal glory from the generals after battle. (Ammianus Marcellinus 20.11.12). cf. Lendon (1997: 259-260).
404 Dodds (1959: 18).
405 Barton (2001: 78-79). cf. Radin (1927: 50) for the importance of ‘fear of ridicule’ in social interactions — ‘prestige hunting is at bottom but a defensive mechanism against ridicule.’
406 ‘from a glance of the eyes, a raising or lowering of the brows, a groan, an outburst of joy, a laugh…’ (LCL).
Face, therefore, was an honour concept. However, as Ruth Scodel observes, ‘standard ideas’ about honour are complicated by issues of face ‘because it [face] involves not only how individuals evaluate each other, but how they imagine others evaluate them.’

This position represents our view of the Greek πρόσωπον, with its similarity to the theatrical mask (προσωπείον), which, by the NT period, expressed a person’s portrayal of their desired social character — not what they are but what they desire to be. For Epictetus the πρόσωπον expresses the role divinely given to be played out in life, σόν γάρ τοῦτ᾽ ἐστι, τὸ δοθὲν ὑποκρίνασθαι πρόσωπον καλῶς (Ench. 17). The weight the word carries in relation to status is regularly on show. When Diogenes Laertius has Bion discuss his family origins he describes his father, who was formerly a slave, as ἔχων οὐ πρόσωπον. His low-status comes with challenges to his ability to represent himself honourably, not least because of the συγγραφὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου (4.46). In contrast, Epictetus commends Socrates as the exemplary philosopher as, even in the face of extreme revilers, he maintained his face (ἐν ἔχων προσώπον, Diatr. 1.25.31). V.H.T Nguyen notes that πρόσωπον in the Jewish writings, as the LXX preferred rendering of פָּנָה (cf. Numbers 6.26), shows how it was understood as the public perception of the individual (Sirach 10.5, 19.29-30, 2 Maccabees 6.18), and by the time of Philo it is the most noble part of the person (Leg. 1.12).

We would argue, therefore, that πρόσωπον was a synecdochical way of describing the person in terms of their social status or rank. It was about reputation, the central concern for which is why it unsurprisingly appears in many different social situations.

3.3.1 Making Sense of εὐπρόσωπεω

The preceding discussion regarding πρόσωπον should then inform our attempts to understand how prefixing the word with εὖ- might affect how we understand it. The rarity of εὐπρόσωπεω in texts predating Paul, however, is such that it seems prudent to consider the cognate εὐπρόσωπος also.

---

410 Scodel (2008: 13).
412 ‘For this is your business, to play admirably the rôle assigned you.’ (LCL).
In some texts, particularly earlier ones, the infrequent occurrence of εὐπρόσωπος often seems to relate to issues of physical appearance. In Somnium (Vita Lucianii) Lucian describes an attractive girl as μάλα εὐπρόσωπος (Somn.6, cf. Rhet. praec. 6, Dom. 8, Merc. cond. 42). Creon describes the appearance of the messenger bringing news of misfortune as οὐκ εὐπροσώπως (Euripides Phoen. 1335). However, even in these early cases honour concern might not be far from the mind of the writer, as in Aristophanes’ Frogs, where those peeking at the exposed body of the girl who is described as μάλ’ εὐπροσώπου are described as having shameful behaviour (Ran. 4.10).

As we near the NT period however we see εὐπρόσωπος being used in relation to honour concern in similar fashion to how we saw πρόσωπον used above. Pausanias’ description of the war between the Lacedaemonians and Messenians is explained as only beginning once the Lacedaemonians were able to ‘obtain a pretext’ that allowed them the ‘highest degree of good face’ (τὰ μάλιστα εὐπροσώπου, Descr. 4.4.4). The honour concerns are readily apparent. The wish to engage in war is tempered by the Lacedaemonians’ concern as to how their behavior might be perceived by others. Once they had concluded they could do as they intended and preserve face, the war commenced.

In Praecepta gerendae rei publicae Plutarch advises those looking for a suitable pastime to avoid any thoughts of seeking public office. He likens those doing so to casual sailors who end up with their boat taken out into rough seas. Whilst wishing they were back on shore, convention requires they endure their plight. Into this discussion Plutarch inserts the following poem from Simonides:

λευκὰς καθύπερθε γαλάνας
εὐπρόσωποι σφάς παρήσαν ἔρωτες ναῖς
κλαίδος χαραξίπτοντο δαμνίναν ἐς ὕβριν. (Mor. 798D).414

He then describes the motives of this type of person as that of seeking δόξα yet despite their attempt to present ‘good face’ they only succeed in generating ἀδοξία. That honour is in Plutarch’s mind here is made further explicit in the following passage

414 Over the bright calm sea, the fair-faced loves went past them to the mad outrage of the ship’s oars that plough the deep. (LCL)
where he, in contrast, commends those entering public life due to conviction as honourable (Mor. 798E-799A).

Lucian paints a picture of a conversation between Zeus and Hermes regarding the arrangement of gods wherein the discussion revolves around placing them in correct order on the basis of the quality of their workmanship and material (Jupp. Trag. 8). The difficulty with this, according to Hermes, is that the Greek statues appear to have εὐπρόσωπος yet on closer examination are only made with marble and bronze with the occasional fleck of gold to make them seem other than they are. The face concern in the passage is further clear in the response of Poseidon who insults the Egyptian seated in front of him by calling him κυνοπρόσωπος (dog-faced. Jupp. Trag. 9). Similarly when Hermes and Zeus discuss advertising philosophies in Vitatum auctio the deity instructs that they be suitably groomed so that they have εὐπρόσωπος and thereby would be more attractive to potential suitors (Lucian Vit. auct. 1). In both these cases a first glance might lead to assuming εὐπρόσωπος is simply in relation to appearance, but the impression given seems to relate more strongly to concerns about status and prestige than simply external appearance.

Certain texts are of particular interest to us as we see εὐπρόσωπος functioning in a manner similar to our discussion of πρόσωπον. The rarity of the term limits the list, but the usage in these texts reflects how we think the term may be understood in Galatians.

- Εὐπρόσωπος μὲν οὖν ἡ τοιαύτη νομοθεσία. (Aristotle Pol. 1263b.15). 415
- Ταῦτα μὲν εἶναι δοκεῖ ἃ τις ἢν ὡς ἐν τοιούτῳ ἀπολογήσασθαι καὶ μὴν ἐδόκουν εὐπρόσωπος εἶναι. (Plutarch Mor. 458F). 416
- καὶ λόγους εὐπροσώπους καὶ μύθους. (Demosthenes Cor. 149). 417
- μὰ γὰρ τὸν Διὸ ὦχ ὀρῷ τὴν ἀπολογιάν ἤτις ἢν εὐπρόσωπος σοι γένοιτο πρὸς τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας. (Lucian Apol. 3). 418
- ἔχοι, οὐ πάνυ εὐπρόσωπον ἐκαστὸν αὐτὸν. (Lucian Apol. 11). 419

415 ‘Such legislation therefore has an attractive appearance.’ (LCL).
416 ‘Why, I thought my face was handsome!’ (LCL, cp. Seneca, Ira 3.22.4-5).
417 ‘He concocted a plausible speech.’ (LCL).
418 ‘Indeed I do not see what answer you can make to give you a good face before your accusers.’ (LCL).
419 ‘Such are the pleas one might bring in defence in such a case as this, none of them pretty.’ (LCL).

84
The cognate verb we encounter in Galatians is exceptionally rare. Moulton and Milligan note that its use in the Tebtunis Papyri (2nd Century BCE) predates the next use of the term outside of Paul by ‘some three centuries’.  

Each of these texts, however, are informative for our engagement with Paul’s statement in Galatians 6.12. In the discussion about ownership of property in Pol. 1263b.15 Aristotle notes that it is honourable behaviour to grant favours and support to those that need it, but with a level of temperance. Possessing a liberality with one’s property is a piece of guidance that he describes as being εὐπρόσωπος as it guides the hearer into noble actions. Plutarch plays on the possible dual meaning of the term, physical appearance and honourable status, in his essay On the Control of Anger. Here he lists how honourable soldiers are so described due to their restrained actions in battle. True bravery refuses to poison weapons (unlike barbarians), Spartans play music to avoid fighting angrily, while others refuse to allow rage and revenge to guide their military strategy. The latter is exemplified by Antigonus who, when insulted for his deformed nose retorts that he thought he had ‘good face’. His ensuing actions, to punish the slaves who insulted him but not their masters or the town, are given as evidence that he did have ‘good face’, i.e. he was honourable (Mor. 458D-F). In De Corona, Demosthenes tells of how Aeschines concocted a speech that had εὐπρόσωπος (Cor. 149). By this he appears to mean that the speech seemed as though it had honourable qualities but it contained fabricated data that led to a war with the Locrians (Cor. 150-151).
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420 ‘Which I prepared in order that my beginning might present them “a countenance most fair.”’ (LCL). cf. Pindar Ol. 6.4.
422 ‘You will be right in not diminishing the report compared with the first one, in order that we may make a good show, [and for the rest please hurry on the collection of taxes.]’, Grenfell, Hunt, and Smly (1902).
423 We will discuss the contribution from Winter (2002) regarding this below (§3.3.2).
The three texts listed above from Lucian also show strong evidence of honour concern in the use of εὐπρόσωπος. In his Apology for his essay about salaried posts in great houses, Lucian notes that Sabinus’ objection to the original essay offers him a choice, either to accept the criticism and wear a mask (πρόσωπον ὑποκρίνομαι). Whilst this ‘false face’ would lead to a quiet friendship between the two Lucian prefers to challenge Sabinus as he knows that his essay was valid and generally well-received. As a result he warns his opponent not to be caught reading or using the essay as this will be indefensible, which he frames with the quote above, essentially questioning how Sabinus could maintain an honourable appearance with such clearly conflicted behaviour (Apol. 3). Later, in the same essay, Lucian discusses situations where poverty might cause someone to consider shameful behavior in order to escape their plight. He shows that whilst there are many ways to attempt to justify this, none of them have εὐπρόσωπος, where the term clearly relates to the dishonour of attempting to justify aberrant behaviour (Apol. 11). Finally, as Zeus and Hermes interact the god admits that whilst he had planned a speech that would give him εὐπρόσωπος his nervousness caused him to forget his introduction and face the shame of a tongue-tied speech (Jupp. trag. 14).

The verb εὐπροσώπέω that we encounter in Galatians 6.12 when used in Tebtunis Papyri 19.12 also relates directly to honourable behaviour. Polemon addresses an issue of tax with Menches where the former has discovered an excess has been charged, but in order to preserve the ‘good face’ of all involved, he agrees that they should not contradict the report regarding the initial overcharge. The discussion is less in regard to what is right or even honourable, but entirely in relation to what appears to be least shameful. This is what we should expect in a face encounter. The emphasis focuses on the impression as it is imagined it would be interpreted by others.425

Lucian also uses εὐπρόσωπος in a context that shows how much it refers to the perception of status and relates to our model of face when, in the midst of a discussion about truth’s difficulty in comparison to lies, he notes, εὐπροσωπότερον γὰρ ἐκεῖνο [falsehood] καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἦδον (Hermot. 51). The separation he describes between

424 The nature of his deformity is explain in Seneca De Ira 2.22.4-5
actual and attractive is an important distinction as it reflects how we expect issues of face to operate, with regard only for how something appears in public.

By the time of Philostratus, the Athenian, around the 3rd century CE, εὑρόσωπος is used of the impression created by a person, although we detect a strong pejorative strength added to the term by the writer. While discussing Aeschines’ involvement in the Phocian disaster Philostratus notes that Aeschines had attempted to gain support for his position by confusing his listeners with his εὑροσωπος λόγοι καὶ μύθοι (Vit. soph. 1.18). Here we note that the word has little to do with physical appearance but rather the status that the words intend to achieve, or the appearance of status they intend to convey. Similarly Basil of Caesarea allows us to chart a similar pattern with the idea of εὑρόσωπος being understood in a context similar to that of the ‘mask’ wherein he uses the term to describe a doctrine presented as acceptable (εὑροσωπος) when it actually represents thinking which he describes with κακοδοξία (Ep. 125). Admittedly these two latter texts are late (3rd to 4th Century CE), but they do allow us to see how the term developed into something exclusively focused on issues of status representation. Interestingly, as it relates to our face model, in both these cases the εὑρόσωπος relates to a false appearance.

The honour weight of πρόσωπον, εὑρόσωπος, and the verbal cognate εὑροσωπέω, is also seen by the negative language that connects to it. We noted Poseidon’s insult of κυνοπρόσωπος to the Egyptian (Jupp. Trag. 9).426 An insult that was rooted in honour concern for Poseidon. Κυνοπρόσωπος is also used by Lucian in Dialogues of the Sea Gods to describe Hermes’ questionable behaviour in collaborating with Egypt, something someone of his status should not be encouraging (Dialogi Marini 7.2).

In his essay regarding the paradoxical ideas of stoics Plutarch notes that the stoic sages ignored Odysseus’ physical infirmities and deformities preferring instead to value that which would ordinarily be described as either shameful (αἰσχρός), or ill-favoured (δύσμορφος), and most notably understood as κακοπρόσωπος (Mor. 1058a).

---

425 As we saw in Scodel (2008: 13).
426 After following Paris to Troy with all that ensued Helen refers to herself as κυνόπιδος (Homer, Il. 3.180).
Significant to our reading of εὐπροσωπέω is Xenocrates, in Testimonia, doctrina et fragmenta. In a discussion about how something can be named by combining concepts (i.e. κακοδαίμονας) he uses the example that the shamed face (αἰσχεῖ προσώπου) is referred to as κακοπρόσωπος (239.3). In both of these texts Plutarch and Xenocrates use κακοπρόσωπος in relation to issues of shame further supporting our contention regarding εὐπροσωπέω and honour. It is of curiosity to our argument to note that, although late and in a different language, Jerome uses volunt placer to translate εὐπροσωπέω in the Vulgate of Galatians 6.12. Using placebo, which carries the notion of ‘being approved or pleasing’, implies that Jerome understood the nuance that we are detecting in εὐπροσωπέω.

We would argue, therefore, that the addition of εὐ- to πρόσωπον and cognates does not move the word out of the range of issues that we would describe as face concern. We note that it is often rendered in English with language that suggests simply ‘good looks’, but this seems evident of a modern Western assumption that ‘good face’ must relate directly to beauty as it is represented in this context rather than the more likely ‘honourable appearance’ that makes better sense of the texts we showed above.

3.3.2 Πρόσωπον as ‘Legal persona’: Disputing a Misnomer

Despite the preceding data, attention to the interpretation of εὐπροσωπέω is minimal in NT scholarship, the main exception being the work of Bruce Winter. For Winter, the reading of εὐπροσωπέω is an important part of his thesis that argues for a particular motive of the Galatian-based local Jewish-Christian opponents being their wish to circumcise the Galatian Christians so that they would, at least to the local authorities, appear Jewish.427 By appearing to be under a Jewish umbrella these Christians would be seen to belong to a religio licita and as such would enjoy exemption from participation in the imperial cult, or the punishment normally prescribed to a mixed-association for non-involvement (evidenced for Winter by μόνον ἴνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται. 6.12).428 Much of the defence of his position, and why we reference it here, develops from his contention that εὐπροσωπέω should be understood

427 Winter first argued this in Winter (1994: 123-144), but an expanded version of the εὐπροσωπέω part of the argument is in Winter (2002: 72-75) and is foundational to a further expansion in Winter (2015: 226-249).
as the pursuit of a good ‘legal status’, a reading that connects the verb with its derivative πρόσωπον, which he argues, by the time of Paul, was comparable with the Latin persona, the legal idea of the juristische person. Winter offers the texts we considered in the preceding section as examples of his position: Aristotle Pol. 1263b.15; Lucian Apol. 3; Plutarch Mor. 458F; P Teb. 19.12; Demosthenes Cor. 149; Lucian Apol. 11; Lucian Jupp. trag. 14.

However, if Winter intends these texts to prove the legal connotations of the cognates of εὐπροσωπέω it is unfortunate that they are largely inconclusive — only two texts really imply a definite legal context, Lucian Apol. 11, which he mistakenly references as Apol. 2 and is missing from the 1994 version of the essay where he first developed the thesis, and the Aristotle quotation. However, neither prove the technical legal use of the language as they are both descriptions of a legislative situation rather than evidence of actual legal language or judgements. Winter is apparently aware of this as he introduces these texts tentatively, suggesting that they imply the possibility of a legal situation. However, within a few sentences he presents his argument as the only possible reading. His confidence in the position is based on his insistence that the Greek πρόσωπον, and subsequently εὐπροσωπέω, carry the same legal connotations as the Latin persona. Despite his awareness of Lohse’s argument that the legal sense of face is not present in the 1st Century CE, Winter cites Dionysius of Halicarnassus as proof of his position:
καὶ ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἀναγκαιοτέρων προσώπων ὁ ἁγών καὶ ἐρήμων καὶ ἤττων ὑπεροφθήναι αξίων, οἷς μὴ βοηθοῦντες κακίους ἀν ἐφάνησαν. (Lys. 24).\textsuperscript{437}

He further references Dionysius Dem. 13, and Thuc. 34 and 37 as further examples despite them not being explicitly legal situations. Winter then refers to Nédoncelle’s 1948 study to argue that \textit{persona} in Cicero (106-43 BCE) carries a legal connotation that can also be seen in the Greek works of Polybius (c.200-c.118 BCE). Although Winter fails to mention that, in the section of the study he cites, Nédoncelle is arguing against an early etymological connection between \textit{persona} and \textit{πρόσωπον}.\textsuperscript{438}

The problem for Winter’s argument here is that it is difficult not to see it as a circular reasoning. We cannot accept Winter’s implication that use of a word in a legal context gives the term a legal meaning, much less an exclusive one. As such it is difficult to see his use of Dionysius Lys. 24 as anything other than wrong. This text, problematically for Winter’s argument, is a discussion of events not directly involved in the legal process, but concomitant upon its outcome.\textsuperscript{439} Winter is right to note that each of these texts show concern for issues of \textit{status}. But as our argument regarding honour has shown, public status or face would be of concern in most legal \textit{and} extra-legal contexts in the Greco-Roman world. Further, even if one of Winter’s texts did show that face language was legal terminology the burden of proof lies on him to show that this is the context of Galatians 6.12-13, which he does not do. We would suggest that it is an over-reading to require εὐπροσώπεω to carry legal connotations, and methodologically suspect to do so on the basis of inconclusive supporting texts.\textsuperscript{440}

\textbf{3.3.3 Defending Face as Honour Concern}

Part of the difficulty in this discussion is that while the concept of \textit{persona} has been heavily debated in varied fields,\textsuperscript{441} research on the connection of \textit{πρόσωπον} and \textit{persona} is limited, which may be why Winter can insist upon his legal reading, and perhaps why

\textsuperscript{437} ‘…and that the parties he is supporting are more closely related to him than the accused and are without support and therefore more deserving of his aid, while he would have incurred a loss of face if he had failed to come to their assistance.’ (LCL).


\textsuperscript{439} Hardin (2008: 91n31) attempts to correct Winter’s misreading of this text but still mistakenly insists that the text supports Winter’s legal reading.

\textsuperscript{440} In Winter (2015: 244) he stretches the ‘proofs’ further by arguing, on the basis of one inscription in Ephesus, that the \textit{θέλω} of 6.12 references a legal decree.
many have been unwilling to reject it. The three major studies on πρόσωπον and persona of Schlossmann, Nédoncelle, both of which Winter cites, and Mauss, all predate the second half of the 20th Century. However, whilst each of these works note the eventual development of the legal aspects of persona, they also consider a wider range of history than just Paul’s time period — so the reader needs to be careful of anachronistically applying their findings. The conclusions, particularly of Mauss and Nédoncelle, argue more strongly for the social aspects of persona preceding the eventual legal understanding, that is, the concept’s earlier emphasis on the ‘man in the street’, a perspective that the helpful study of Henry Nguyen finds well evidenced, particularly in Cicero. Similarly, Barton notes the following,

‘The persona was composed of the reputation (existimatio, fama, and nomen), supported by effective energy (virtus), and enforced by a sensitivity to shame (pudor). The persona guaranteed the existence of the will, the driving vitality at the core: the animus….The persona and the role expressed by it were the very boundary and definition of one’s being, the sine qua non of existence.’

The persona was the social ‘mask’, the public-facing side of a person, it was the persona that allowed someone ‘die Rolle spielen’ that they held in their society, association or group. To suggest that persona is the legal status of an individual is to narrow it well beyond its use in the Roman world.

We argue, therefore, that πρόσωπον was a synecdochical way of describing the person in terms of their social status or rank, without direct legal connotations. It was about reputation, the central concern for which is why it unsurprisingly appears in legal proceedings. Barton convincingly argues that Roman legal obligations are best

441 Duff (1938: 1).
442 We will consider some support of his position at §4.2.1.
443 Schlossmann (1906).
444 Nédoncelle (1948).
445 Mauss (1938). The English translation of this essay is in Mauss (1985).
446 Mauss (1985: 1), contra Winter, warns that an overly clear and determined understanding of persona is simplistic.
447 Nédoncelle (1948: 299).
450 Barton (2001: 82, 264).
451 Schlossmann (1906: 19).
understood via ‘a study of their mechanisms of shame and honor’ as legal status was
‘regulated by the warm physical glow of the blush’. 452 J.M. Kelly’s study of Roman
civil judicature concurs that it was the fear of loss of face rather than legal conventions
that ‘sorely preoccupied anyone threatened with a lawsuit’. 453 Litigation was avoided if
the ‘loss of face’ was considered too likely. 454 The strength of honour concern almost
nullified the need for legal sanction — even for the most important social obligations
(cf. Livy 10.9.6; Tacitus Ann. 2.85). 455 Conversely, honour’s importance ensured that
legal proceedings regularly endured irrelevant detours that had no other purpose than to
smear the face, the status, of the opponent (cf. Cicero, Rosc. com. 20). 456 Although the
challenged face was the trustworthy face, the πρόσωπον and persona that endured the
contest common in the Roman agonistic culture was worthy of its honour, as Barton
notes, in this ‘face-to-face’ culture the status of the unchallenged was ‘vanity’. 457 It
would be wrong to argue that legal status had no bearing on issues of honour, especially
for those with title or rank (and perhaps some ordinary citizens), but it was only part of
a complex tapestry of concern for πρόσωπον that affected everyone. 458 It is this
perspective on εὕπροσωπεύω that we will argue should more readily inform the
interpretation of Galatians 6.12 and make sense of the situation.

3.4 Face in Action: Shaping a Model of Public Honour

As Seneca observed, public honour requires acknowledgment (Ep. 102.8). 459 This
generated a symbiotic relationship amongst groups where members were able to
enhance their prestige, but never without the approval of the group’s ‘established system
of competition’. 460 Such was the ubiquity of honour it often appears that concern for

454 Kelly (1976: 96).
455 Greenidge (1894: 67). Barton (2001: 20) notes that having one’s actions declared dishonourable was
the only threat that accompanied the 300BC lex Valeria de provocatione.
458 cf. Lendon (1997: 36) for refs, Greenidge (1894: 1-17), and above §3.2.
459 Compare the observations of Pliny on those attempting to appear of high status (Nat. 33.6.23) or
Martial on people’s attempts to install themselves in prestigious theatre seats (5.8, 5.14) against the
claims of Dio Chrysostom that no-one is willing to perform an act that will go unknown (Or. 31.21-22).
460 Oprisko (2012: 69).
prestige alone supported the hierarchical structures of society. The pressure to be approved by the court of reputation was felt almost from birth. This requirement to seek ratification served to enhance the perception of honour as a rarity, a limited good, which in turn only increased the value of honour and thereby the competition to preserve or gain it. As Oprisko correctly notes, Prestige, as the ‘conception of honour that positively affects an individual’s hierarchical social value’, functions doubly, it both establishes the identity of the group elite, while also defining the process and challenge of social mobility.

The process of establishing, maintaining, and managing face can be traced in situations that are well-represented by Speier’s model of bearers, bestowers and observers. Earlier (§2.2) we noted this cyclical model that traced exemplary behaviour that both defined and affirmed a group’s perceptions of honour thereby determining the parameters of the taboo and the excellent. We trace this process relating to face in the ancient Mediterranean via three particular concepts that are important to our reading of Galatians, namely where honour is bestowed by those approving of a person’s boasting, the bearer attempts to maintain honour in competition, and observers are guided towards approved honourable behaviour.

3.4.1 Bestowers of Honour: Honour-Claimed as Honour-Defined
As we might imagine, rarefied deeds would inherently attract attention that allowed their merit to be exchanged for honour and reputation, but in more normal conditions gaining honour required a level of self-aggrandisement, a public attempt to claim prestige. The regular tool to stake a public claim for honour was boasting, or self-praise. This was a normal method of maintaining and claiming honour, it could be practised inoffensively and without negative connotations (cf. Plutarch Mor. 539A, or

---

462 DeSilva (1999: 3-4).
465 Speier (1935: 76).
466 Speier (1935: 84).
467 Finney (2012: 16). Regarding rarity we note the significance of singularis amongst the inscriptions as it challenges the emulator to go beyond the exemplum, Forbis (1996: 88).
sections 34-35 of the *Res Gestae* of Augustus). We note that the English term ‘boasting’ carries a pejorative nuance that καυχάομαι, as a public claim for honour, doesn’t ordinarily carry, however, as we will encounter later (§5), Paul’s use of καυχάομαι is generally negative so translating it with ‘boasting’ preserves what we think is an intended irony, particularly when encountering Paul’s use of the ‘boasting in the cross’ concept of Galatians 6.14.

Boasting was the vehicle to improve one’s hierarchical social value on ‘the pyramid of honor and power, to gain an advantage over the other, not in solidarity with the other.’ People would likely be well conditioned to ‘read’ the language of self-praise given the exposure to orators, philosophers and rhetors that would have formed part of normal city or town life. Societal elites were particularly invested in self-elevation. As a result the streets of Roman life were filled with public claims to honour, from inscriptions to coins, statues and busts. For those of lower rank some funerary inscriptions, surviving papyri and even graffiti give evidence to parallel concerns to maintain honour even outside of the large urban centres. That these honour claims are also establishing precedence is something often ignored, particularly by those overly committed to a fixed definition of what honour involves. Augustus’ *Res Gestae* is illustrative. Although a boast about the extraordinary achievements of the Caesar it also asserts a Roman vision of exemplary behaviour and virtues.

Boasting established honour as much as it sought to be validated by it. There is a circularity to this, in the first place a boast is submitted, but in the event of the boast

---


469 Kahl (2010: 270) italics original.


being approved by the court of reputation the result is not only the honour bestowed upon the boaster, but the approval of the actions as honourable and thereby their definition of honour is thus modified. This shows the local nature of honour precedence — the community, however that be defined, are able to validate what they consider honourable. Pitt-Rivers noted this in his claim that ‘honour is the value of a person in his own eyes, but also in the eyes of his society’ (emphasis added).\textsuperscript{475} This is too often missed in the regular quoting of Pitt-Rivers. He was not establishing honour as some ‘ontological or metaphysical entity’, instead honour is what the community define it to be, it is a social construction.\textsuperscript{476} ‘Nothing’, as Oprisko notes more recently, ‘is universally excellent’.\textsuperscript{477} Therefore every honour interaction also functions to define honour. In a manner not dissimilar to contemporary legal tradition, public acknowledgement creates precedence. This is why honour must be defended, as to not defend it not only costs the honour lost in battle, but it also questions the validity of the honour still held by the loser.

The importance of boasting, therefore, should be obvious — it is the exceptional that makes the rule.\textsuperscript{478} If honour is, as Neyrey argues, a ‘public acknowledgement of worth grounded on local expectations of value’ then this explains why many inscriptions attempt to give the impression that the qualities expressed by the exemplum are ubiquitous in society, regardless of social level.\textsuperscript{479} Establishing this is part of the process of ensuring that deviant behaviour does not reconfigure community norms. It was, thereby, important to groups that they cultivate and defend their exemplars of the behaviour, attitude or values they sought to promote (cf. Jesus’ discussion with the Pharisees in John 8:12–59). This ensures that feelings or perceptions of self-worth are closely connected to the group’s approved behaviour. Self-worth thereby feels almost ontological but actually functions as a social-control that purposes to mitigate the effect and likelihood of deviant behaviour.\textsuperscript{480}

\textsuperscript{475} Pitt-Rivers (1977: 1).
\textsuperscript{476} Neyrey (1998: 84).
\textsuperscript{477} Oprisko (2012: 48).
\textsuperscript{478} Oprisko (2012: 54).
\textsuperscript{480} Oprisko (2012: 46-47, 98, 103).
Describing the issue of boasting in this way as a tool that both claims and defines group values alerts us to the importance of analysing the appearance of any language of boasting or self-praise. It is not as simple as applying a pejorative conclusion to the subject, as some have done, as this is to miss how boasting can reconfigure group honour — self-praise establishes honourable behaviour. In the case of our study, criticism of certain types of boasting should be understood as an additional validation of the need to be aware of honour concerns, but also, as we will argue in the case of Paul’s ‘boast in the cross’ (cf. §5), encourage us to look at exactly how boasting reconfigures group values.

3.4.1.1 Socially-Acceptable Boasting

The ancient world understood that boasting required the sensitivity and skill to establish behaviour whilst avoiding being considered repugnant by an audience as, if badly practised, it was ‘coarse and invidious’ (φορτικῶτατον καὶ ἐπαχθῆστατον. Dionysius Pomp. 1.11). Boasters were required to justify the necessity of their self-praise, such as the desire to avert pity, a defence against false accusation, a riposte to the slur of an enemy, or in glowing reference to behaviour the audience should seek to emulate.481 If so justified then shame could be avoided (as Radin noted in the 1920’s, seeking to establish one’s prestige is ‘at bottom but a defensive mechanism against ridicule’).482 However, because the successful boast establishes the prestige of the action and thereby the doer, it is worth the risk of opprobrium.

This seems to be the basis for Plutarch’s essay De laude (Mor. 539A-547F), as guidance along the tightrope of boasting is clearly needed:

> In theory, my dear Herculanus, it is agreed that to speak to others of one’s own importance or power is offensive (ἐπαχθῆς ἀποφαίνουσι), but in practice not many even of those who condemn (ψεγόντων) such conduct avoid the odium (ἄηδίαν) of it. (Mor. 539A-B).

482 Radin (1927: 50).
The salient points of *De Laude* are worth considering here.\textsuperscript{483} Plutarch instructs his reader that taking the risk of boasting is necessary to establish himself before his audience (539E). By ‘himself’, however, Plutarch means the actions and values that will develop his reputation. Self-praise well executed is a seed (σπέρµα) that leads to more honourable rewards (καρπός 539F). This is the establishment of precedence that we expect to see in a boasting exchange, not simply the gaining of honour, but the defining of a particular honour.\textsuperscript{484}

The agreement with our model is clearly seen in his claim that the motivation and effect of self-praise is not simply to enhance the boaster’s own standing, but define honourable actions:

> Indeed, it is not as a reward or compensation for his merit that the statesman (τὴν δόξαν ὁ πολιτικὸς ἀνήρ) demands recognition and values it when accorded to his acts: he does so rather because the enjoyment of confidence (πιστεύεσθαι) and good repute (δοκεῖν χρηστόν, cf. Galatians 2.2, 6, 9) affords means for further and yet nobler actions (539F).

This is the perspective on boasting that seems to be missed by many who read *De Laude*.\textsuperscript{485} Whilst Plutarch’s counsel regards the dangers of ill-advised boasting, he is also aware of its uses (540A). Hence this essay, offering guidelines on boasting inoffensively, which we summarise here:

a) One should not boast in order to dishonour another. Boasting should always be avoided if the aim is to rival the honour of another and diminish their reputation or accomplishments (540B), one should simply challenge their claim to status.

b) The boast should have a purpose beyond self-enhancement. Conversely, boasting is allowed if you are defending your name or rejecting a charge (540C) for this is not motivated by vainglory or pride.

c) The boast should not encourage wrongdoing. While any injustice levelled against oneself that can be corrected by boasting to its perpetrators should be, as justice consents to a certain freedom of speech in its defence (541D). Similarly,

\textsuperscript{483} Our introduction noted the work of Betz (1978: 367-393), Clarke (1993: 98-99), Donahoe (2008: 4-17), Watson (2003: 79-81) and Wojciechowski (2006: 99-109) on *De Laude*’s significance for Paul. \textsuperscript{484} This issue of establishing reputation and behaviour is further discussed in *Mor.* 777E-F.
boating of deeds done when the alternative would have been shameful is likewise permitted (541F).

d) The scornful boast should not make the audience similarly complicit. Plutarch’s reader is warned of those who might avoid scorn by making the audience complicit in the boast (542B), or might praise others whose acts are comparable to their own (542C).

e) The boast should attribute some of the success to the gods or at least chance. The person seeking to praise himself is also advised to ‘disburden themselves of some honour’ (φορτίου τῆς δόξης... ἀποτίθεσθαι [cf. Gal 6:5]) to chance or the gods, as exemplified by the victorious Achilles who, having single-handedly killed Hector, announces ‘By Heaven’s will I have slain this man.’ (Homer Il. 22.379).

f) Praise received should be altered to avoid giving the impression that one enjoys the attention, rather the boaster should transfer the praise into more amiable language. The declaration, for example, that someone is ‘eloquent’ (λόγιον) is transferred into an acceptance of having ‘worthy character’ (χρηστός), thereby not riling the audience with envious boasting (543B-D). Alternatively, the boaster can accept the praise given, but temper it with references to their ‘shortcomings, failures, or faults’ (ἐλλείψεις ἢ ἀποτελέσεις ἢ ἀμαρτίας), this causes the audience to respond more positively to the boast (543F).

In addition to these, Plutarch reckons that simply boasting without offence is hardly an admirable aim, rather the boast must have a use (χρήσιμως) or an advantage (ὡφελέμελος), such as the desire to inspire one’s hearers to emulate the exemplified behaviour (ζηλον 544D), or to restrain the headstrong (544F). Furthermore, while boasting to challenge the fame of others for one’s own benefit is disgraceful, if praise (δόξαν) is given and induces the emulation of evil it is not unsound to challenge it by boasting (545D, 547A). Importantly, Plutarch confirms our model in noting that a useful boast (ἔπαινος καὶ ὑφέλίμος), as well as being good, has a didactic quality, it instructs in correct behaviour (διδασκον τὰ χρήσιμα 546B). Plutarch is well aware of the importance of public validation of the honour claim. He notes that the audience must not be left ‘vexed’, citing Demosthenes Cor. 128, as κενοδοξία very quickly

485 Donahoe (2008: 4-6) is able to hold that Plutarch rejects boasting because she skips this text in her
becomes ἀδοξία (547F). In response to this he advises that self-praise is most effective if the hearers can gain an advantage from the boast.

### 3.4.2 Bearers of Honour: Conflict and Competition

Competition functioned at the very heart of the honour systems of the ancient Mediterranean. This was true at all levels, from the games of those in education to the gladiatorial contests, and beyond to the rules of war:

The values of the ancient Romans, especially during the Republic, were overwhelmingly those of a warrior culture. Soldiers of every status competed feverishly for the commendations, the *coronae, hastae*, and *armillae* that recognized their courage and industry.

In particular NT scholarship has struggled to ‘jettison’ anachronistic presuppositions when exploring the motivation of ancient Mediterranean social interactions. Alvin Gouldner noted in the 1960’s that contemporary society has affected our understanding of the social conflict that characterised ancient culture.

While honour could be ascribed through inheritance and the fortune of birth, the fame that ‘made a man memorable’ was acquired by effort. Isocrates claimed it was those capable of action who deserved honour (Isocrates *Or.* 1.131), while Aeschylus observed, of those seeking fame, that the one ‘who acts, shall endure’ (*Cho.* 1.104.313). Honour required striving from its subjects. Ordeals, for the Romans, proved the worthiness of the one seeking glory — *labor, industria, disciplina, diligentia, studium, vigilentia* all functioned to prove a person.

---

488 Barton (2001: 13).
490 Gouldner (1967: 41). Although we do not note that this might be a Western rather than modern ignorance. Retaliation over honour is increasingly attracting the attention of those investigating so-called ‘honour killings’, cf. Ballard (2011). In these cases, establishing honour motivation is paramount (p.130), but as a cultural crime, requires a context that values honour (p.145).
491 Gouldner (1967: 43).
492 Barton (2001: 36).
‘Rank must be preserved’, said Cicero, therefore being ‘acutely sensitive’ to any encroachment on one’s honour was essential (Planc. 15). The burning desire for honour, within a face-to-face culture, made defending one’s honour compulsory (cf. Cicero Tusc. 1.2.4),

‘You will compel me to give thought to my own dignity: no one ever brought the tiniest suspicion on me whom I did not overturn and wreck.’ (Cicero Sull. 46).

As Barton explains, ‘Even the smallest challenge was important in Roman life. The Roman, Horace tells us, will fight over anything: whether the hair of goats can be called wool; whether Castor or Dolichos is more cunning; whether the road built by Appius or that built by Minucius is better for a journey to Brundisium.’

Almost every interaction with a non-family member had undertones of challenge — a perennial social ‘tug of war’ with the winner boasting preserved or improved standing in their group. Conflict established that reality, so Barton continues, ‘Every tiff is a tumult, every wrangle a war’. The most surprising thing, according to Lendon, was how, in this atmosphere of conflict, rarely did the conflicts escalate into riotous violence and bloodshed.

The agonistic culture ensured that honour had a mercurial quality, it was never safe, permanently earned, and rarely left unchallenged. It was a limited good, not an endlessly available abstract concept. This should clarify the reason why honour is not simply battled for within a contest culture, but it shapes the culture itself. The ‘zero sum’ nature of the honour contest confirms this. The loser in an

496 Lendon (1997: 41) notes that the Homeric poems show a decided bend towards violence in pursuit of honour that fades by the first century.
497 Lendon (1997: 90) cf. Barton (2001: 66) - Social and sexual hierarchies could be mitigated as well as reinforced by the Roman’s agonistic mentality, because, within a contest culture, whatever one’s claims to honour, they were perpetually open to testing.
honour contest does not simply forgo a prize, they actually suffer a loss. The competition required the participants to stake their honour on their challenge or defence, the winner gained honour, the loser lost honour. Honour became a game the aim of which was to improve status and the ancient Mediterranean association or group was perennially involved in this game, and the games of everyone with whom they identified.

Undergoing the ordeal (*labor, periculum, discrimin, certamen, contentio, agon*) was the act of defining one’s boundaries, of determining one’s share or portion. It was necessary for one’s sense of being. And because in a contest culture no one’s part was fixed, the *discrimen* established, momentarily, one’s position. It located one in a field, in a pecking order. One gambled what one was.

The competition crossed boundaries of rank and status: it was not limited to equals (cf. §2.4.2.1). So when the slave Eros killed himself it functioned, although in no way between equals, as a challenge to his master (cf. Plutarch *Ant.* 76.4).

However, although Livy lamented ‘that poor judgment of ours which makes us all so loath to be outdone by those closest to us’ (6.34.7), the contest also functioned as a social bond, the challenge occurred because the challenger wanted the praise and honour of the one he challenged.

The challenge is intrinsically an acknowledgement of worthiness, at least from the perspective of the challenger. ‘Tis clear that as tawny gold is tested in the flames so loyalty (*fides*) must be proved in times of stress. (Ovid *Tr.* 1.5.25).

The Roman loved the ordeal, the risk, for in it, face, reputation, and even life, were staked against a chance to prove one’s authenticity. The greater the risk, the

501 ‘A Roman was implicated not only in the endless chain of his or her own contests, but also in the competitions of everyone with whom he or she identified. On the candidacy of his friend whom he has recommended to the Emperor, Pliny the Younger declares, “My sense of honor, my reputation, my dignity is at stake” (*Ep.* 2.9.1).’ Barton (2001: 47n69).
503 cf. Gouldner (1967: 53f). Barton (2001: 86), quotes Bourdieu, ‘To make someone a challenge is to credit him with the dignity of a man of honour, since the challenge, as such, requires a riposte and therefore is deemed capable of playing the game of honour, and of playing it well. From the principle of mutual recognition of equality in honour there follows a first corollary: the challenge confers honour.’
504 ‘As gold is proven by fire, so are we by ordeals (*Minucius Felix Oct.* 36.9).’
greater the glory to the victor. The zero sum high-risk stakes of these contests are
well stated by Seneca, ‘Who scorns his own life is lord of yours’ (Seneca Ep. 4.8).
In most cases it was understood that status was not merely proved by enduring a
trial, somehow the agon created the status, hence its importance. The risk, in this
case, was the risk to face, to persona, to reputation:

The persona was composed of the reputation (existimatio, fama, and
nomen), supported by effective energy (virtus), and enforced by a sensitivity
to shame (pudor).

The face, therefore, representative of the person, led them into conflicts which
disregarded all except the quest for more honour. The involvement of the face
naturally increased the risk of any conflict, any vow or oath automatically risked
contest as it involved one’s honour and thereby one’s face. In much the same
way as the honour of a good man added to one’s honour, an insult detracted. An
honourable man could use his position to undermine another’s claim to honour.
The risk inherent in this type of day-to-day challenge was in the inability to defend
oneself against this challenge.

Who, with the prospect of envy, death, and punishment staring him in the
face, does not hesitate to defend the Republic, he truly can be reckoned a vir
(Cicero Mil. 30.82).

A challenge cannot create a hero if it is not sufficiently risky, nor if it happens in
secret, nor if it does not threaten their existing honour, or if they refuses to play by
the rules. Barton notes how these quotations exemplify this perspective:

The greater the difficulty, the greater the splendour (Cicero Off. 1.19.64).
He has won without glory who has won without peril (Seneca Prov. 3.4).
The greater the torment the greater the glory (Seneca Prov. 3.9).

The acclaim achieved by the victor added great weight to their words, regardless of
their qualification to speak. Victory was enough:

507 cf. §4.2.1-2 for discussion on persona and face.
Because they were not poor or inconsequential men, who said that they had seen two suns shining in the sky, we would do better to seek an explanation for the phenomenon than to withhold credence from their words (Cicero Resp. 1.10.15).

But what of the person who could not defend their honour? What was the outcome for Chaerea, put on the spot by an embarrassing question from Cicero, ‘He blushes; he does not know what to answer; he can’t come up with anything to say on the spot’ (Rosc. com. 3.8)? This pressure made it difficult to preserve face and be oneself, but honour was dependent on the ability to riposte in the face of relentless challenge.512

3.4.3 Observers of Honour: Imitation, Exempla, and Encomia

Imitation was another common feature of Paul’s Greco-Roman world. To an extent imitation or emulation was the positive side of an agonistic culture. It encouraged the competitive community towards approved behaviour rather than destructive envy (Aristotle Rhet. 1388a-b).513 In literature the ideas expressed by μιμέομαι and other cognates are widely used. At a basic level, art was considered a simple imitation of nature (τέχνη τὴν φύσιν μιμουμένη. Aristotle [Mund.] 396b),514 yet imitation language eventually became descriptive of instructive relationships (ἀγαθὸν ἢ εἰναι χρεῶν ἢ μιμεῖσθαι. Democritus Fr. 39.1), parents to children, teachers to pupils (μιμοῦ τρόπους πατρὸς δικαίον. Euripides Hel. 940f, cf. Xenophon Mem. 1.6.3).515 In cultic settings certain ritual behaviour was designed to function mimaically as divine representation (Strabo 10.3.9).516

Plato worried that imitation allowed for unskilled fraud amongst artisans (Resp. 598B), although it was the ability of the imitator to falsely represent truth and knowledge as

515 Michaelis (1967: 662).
their own that was his actual concern.\(^{517}\) Aristotle worried less about the negative aspects of imitation as he saw it as part of human nature,

For it is an instinct of human beings, from childhood, to engage in mimesis (\(\mu\iota\mu\iota\sigma\iota\theta\iota\alpha\iota\)) (indeed, this distinguishes them from other animals: man is the most mimetic (\(\mu\iota\mu\iota\kappa\iota\omega\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\) of all, and it is through mimesis (\(\mu\iota\iota\mu\iota\sigma\varepsilon\omega\varsigma\)) that he develops his earliest understanding). (Poet.1448b).

It seems it was the pedagogic potential of imitation that fascinated Aristotle, the ability to shape and create humans via a piece of rhetoric or a heroic example.\(^{518}\) Examples were easy to understand and an audience could quickly comprehend the point being exemplified, or even inspire them to some beneficent action.\(^{519}\) Imitation, for Aristotle, was not to be viewed pejoratively as Plato did, but rather was the aim of all art as it reproduces its model as faithfully as possible.\(^{520}\) Furthermore, the imitative art becomes instructive as the artist learns about what is copied in the act of copying — the nature of tragedy was understood by the poets by writing a tragedy (1449a4).\(^{521}\) For Plato it was not shameful to imitate values but advisable to follow the example of the ‘better’ to avoid going wrong. (Leg. 732B). It is on this basis that someone might follow and attempt to be like the gods (Leg. 716-718b), the reward of which he shows elsewhere as righteousness, holiness and wisdom (Tht. 176A-B). This ‘hierarchy of imitation’ is particularly interesting as it creates a chain of imitation, particularly beneficial to those who, for whatever reason, are unable to emulate those near the top of the chain.\(^{522}\)

Teresa Morgan noted that the high density of honour language in over 200 of the Ephesian inscriptions published in the Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien series shows that the ‘accent’ of Greek culture’s honorific inscriptions is towards the glory (\(\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\)) of the referent.\(^{523}\) However, Elizabeth Forbis importantly observed that the memorialisation and recognition of character was as important as the publicising of the

\(^{517}\) Castelli (1991: 63) cites, as representative of this, Plato Resp. 602A-B, 603A-605C; Soph. 241E, 264D, 265A, 267B, 268C-D; Pol. 299C-E, 303C; Ep. 5.321E.

\(^{518}\) Brant (1993: 287).


\(^{521}\) Brant (1993: 288).


Inscriptions could claim honour of the individual or family referenced, but also by virtue of the characteristics listed they functioned to encourage virtuous behaviour — they formed part of the *exempla* traditions. Exemplary heroes functioned as idealised models that should be imitated by others. At some level, this was their value to the community, even after their death, as their memory, if emulated, shaped and formed the behaviour of new generations, thereby perpetuating standards for the future: ‘The rarity of honor demonstrates that the primary function of the inscriptions’ honorary language was to present the honorand as an *exemplum* of virtue, rather than to express appreciation for his or her achievements.’ The ubiquitous nature of inscriptions in the ancient Mediterranean gave them educational value, ensuring that their influence was wide and pervasive throughout the various levels of society. The honour dynamics of imitation were still important, however, as they inscribed a hierarchy of value and reflect the court of opinion; it is those honoured that expect to be imitated.

In the following centuries the ideas surrounding the development of concepts of imitation are well represented in the works of Valerius Maximus. Writing roughly parallel with Paul (14-37CE), Valerius produced *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, a rhetorical sourcebook of history and literature that presented various examples of behaviour, both commended and otherwise, to educate the reader in how they might advance in society. As Skidmore notes:

> The glory individual exemplars have achieved encourages readers to imitate their noble deeds. Conversely, those historical characters whose actions brought them infamy are used to deter the reader from a given course of action.

Quintilian similarly insisted on educating students in historical and mythical *exempla* (*Inst.* 12.4), not only for rhetorical guidance but they also appear to be intended as

---

524 Forbis (1996: 2).
527 Forbis (1996: 9).
instructive for values. Valerius follows the likes of Strabo, Isocrates and Plutarch by using examples for moral exhortation — poetry, music, banqueting songs all functioned to tell of behaviour and values worthy of imitation. This is indicative of the Greek world’s preference towards pedagogy based on imitation, an ideal which continued into the Roman period (cf. Strabo Geogr. 1.2.3-8). Humans, Plutarch noted similarly to Aristotle, originally learned all of their skills, whether weaving, building or singing, by imitating nature (Mor. 974A), but he also notes the importance of biographical examples of vice and virtue.

I think, we also shall be more eager to observe and imitate the better lives if we are not left without narratives of the blameworthy and the bad. (Demetr. 1.6). The preference in ancient culture to consider and honour the past and its heroes creates a context wherein examples carry community-shaping influence.

This being accepted, education followed suit, the dominance of the poets and the epics in Hellenistic school level teaching ensured that the example of the ancients was not lost in contemporary life. Such was the power of example that Alexander the Great was referred to by his teacher as a new Achilles (Plutarch Alex. 5.5). Isocrates commended the role of example for the teacher as it allows the educator to ‘expound the principles’ that cannot be taught so that the students can ‘pattern’ (μιμήσασθαι) themselves on their teacher (Isocrates Or. 13.18). Similarly, Dio Chrysostom, recommends imitation for the student. He notes, again like Aristotle, the active and creative role of the imitator:

For whoever really follows (ζηλῶν) anyone surely knows what that person was like, and by imitating (μιμοῦμενος) his acts and words he tries as best he can to

531 Skidmore (1996: xvii). The influence of literary exempla on Roman values can be explored in Litchfield (1914).
534 cf. The Virtues of Women which uses example stories to demonstrate appropriate behaviour in keeping with the exemplified virtues, or how Ancient Customs of the Spartans shows that the wars of the past inspired the current generations to imitation (14, 238A).
537 Fiore (1986: 79-163) notes the common usage in letter writing of example as a behavioural guide.
make him like him. But that is precisely, it seems, what the pupil does — by imitating (μιμούμενος) his teacher and paying heed to him he tries to acquire his art. On the other hand, seeing people and associating with them has nothing to do with the process of learning. (Or. 55.4-5).\textsuperscript{539}

Dodd observes that Dio’s perspective can be seen in Epictetus’ writings when, having been questioned on the possibility of his prescription of a lofty goal he replied, ‘Look at me’ (Diatr. 3.22.46).\textsuperscript{540} Further, Quintilian bestows the importance of moral admonition in teacher’s example (Inst. 2.1-8), Livy describes his own efforts both as exemplary or shameful (1.\textit{proem}.10), while Seneca urged that he be imitated in his quest to be an exemplary figure (\textit{simus inter exempla. Ep. 98}.13). Mitchell is correct to note, therefore, that exempla functioned whether implicitly or explicitly as a summons to imitate the illustrious and avoid the shameful.\textsuperscript{541}

The establishment of honour for those not party to observing the honour claim as it happened was often done rhetorically via the medium of \textit{encomium}. The encomium offered a rough structure within which to provide examples, usually post-mortem, from a person’s life that would highlight qualities that exemplified their honour.\textsuperscript{542} The \textit{progymnasmata} give detailed examples of a variety of rhetorical forms and styles, including encomium, that existed to help the speaker or writer arrange their ideas into an acceptable format that would achieve its intended goal.\textsuperscript{543}

The encomium, although technically an epideictic praise speech (cf. Quintilian \textit{Inst.} 3.4.1-9), functioned in a deliberative manner, as we might expect from our previous chapter about boasting.\textsuperscript{544} The goal of encomium was honour, or so Cicero instructed (\textit{Laudationis finis honestas. Top.} 24.91). In this case, the deliberative aim was to provide an example of the honourable behaviour for others to follow (cf. Aristotle \textit{Rhet.}

\textsuperscript{539} cf. Our discussion of ζηλῶν at §4.4.1.2.
\textsuperscript{540} Dodd (1999: 17). A text that Reinhartz (1987: 395) seemingly ignores in her study as she suggests Paul is unique in his self-presentation as one to be imitated.
\textsuperscript{541} Mitchell (1991: 42).
\textsuperscript{543} Malina and Neyrey (1996: 22). Examples of this can be seen throughout Kennedy (2003).
\textsuperscript{544} Neyrey (1998: 78f).
Quintilian offers the student an exploration of the details involved in producing an encomium (Inst. 3.7.6-24), the most noteworthy being the need to know the audience and what they considered to be praiseworthy (3.7.24). The speaker intending to be exemplary might face two challenges, one would be the perception of the speaker, the other the perception of what they intended as a response from the hearer. In the first place, their ability to move a crowd’s emotions depended on their ability to survive a trial or test. Secondly, as Barton notes, principles were less easily absorbed without exempla, that is, examples of exemplary behaviour had to be described vividly, or carved into a monument, so that ‘they can almost be touched’ (Rhet. Her. 4.49.62), and the behaviour they portray can be imitated. Intrinsic to this type of exempla was not only a preferred type of honourable behaviour, but also the proof that it was achievable.

3.5 Conclusion

Face, therefore, is an important part of a model of honour that hopes to make any meaningful comment about the conduct encountered in an honour culture. Our study so far has shown us that we might expect to encounter in a Galatian assembly, under normal circumstances, people who would ordinarily be concerned about establishing, developing and defending their face in their everyday social interactions. What they would see successfully defended and then praised, or boasted about by others in the group would set the parameters of their own similar behaviour. This confirmed our earlier contention that honour, although pervasive, needs to be understood according to its local nuance.

This also allows us to offer something of a definition of how we understand honour, or rather the working understanding of honour that we will use to continue our study with its particular concerns for issues of face. We offer this definition which we feel reflects both contemporary theory and the ancient data:

545 Campbell (1998: 40).
Honour is the positive social value a person successfully claims within their significant group, and their continued ability to maintain the appearance of possessing said value and be treated accordingly.

This description will work as our overarching model of honour for reading Galatians as we imagine it might have sounded to its initial hearers. In particular, our exploration at §3.4 allows us to return to our initial interest in the concluding paragraph of our epistle (6.12f) and the words καυχάμαι and εὐπροσωπέω. In Part 2 of our thesis we will be guided by the components of the facework idea we considered at §3.4.1-3 to consider our text, and the related issues, in three stages. We will begin by considering εὐπροσωπέω and honour conflict in chapter 4, before moving on to consider καυχάμαι and ideas of emulation in our later chapters.
Part 2

4. Face and the Conflict in Galatia

4.1 Introduction

In Part 1 of this thesis we argued that face, understood as one’s public representation of prestige or honour, was a pervasive, even core, concern amongst groups in the ancient Mediterranean world. This contention is an important step in the overall attempt of this thesis to show that these concerns are important for making sense of the situation in Galatians. From here, Part 2 will begin to utilise that data and model with the intention of showing how it provides a suitable method by which to understand key points of the letter to Galatians.

In this chapter we will show, beginning with the use of εὐπροσωπέω at 6.12, how an honour-conflict lies behind the exigency of the letter to the Galatians and explains the actions of those behind the situation. The contention being that an awareness of the values and social conflict common in an honour-based society allow us to make sense of important, but often ignored, features of Galatians.

We will begin by considering how εὐπροσωπέω functions to frame the honour concern of the opponents and show that ‘face concern’ is more than a passing issue in the letter. This will allow us to consider how the threat the opponents face is to their social prestige rather one of physical harm. From here we will consider Paul’s language regarding the opponents before applying Bourdieu’s ‘challenge and riposte’ model to the letter to show how central concern for honour is to the letter and the situation.

4.1.1 Galatians 6.12-13: The Importance of εὐπροσωπέω

The profile Paul offers of the opponents in 6.12-13 is far from complementary, he is clearly not attempting to negotiate a truce but rather discredit them completely with a serious charge of, what turns out to be, hypocrisy (cf. 2.11). There is possibly a level of
caricature of the opponents here,\textsuperscript{548} or at least high subjectivity,\textsuperscript{549} although we should be careful not to overstate those concerns, for regardless of how accurate these accusations are they show Paul’s perspective either on what they are doing, or, at least, how he can discredit them.\textsuperscript{550} Commentators have traditionally read two accusations (avoiding persecution, and boasting),\textsuperscript{551} or occasionally three (seeking a good face, avoiding persecution, and boasting),\textsuperscript{552} which are then often considered separately. Both verses follow the same construction of a main statement which precedes a ἵνα purpose clause. Together they form a chiastic catalogue of complaints consisting of ‘historically plausible facts’ and ‘unprovable assumptions’ about the behaviour of the opponents.\textsuperscript{553}

A - 12a Ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί,
B - 12b οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι,
C - 12c μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκονται.
C1 - 13a οὐδὲ γάρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουσιν
B1 - 13b ἄλλα θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι,
A1 - 13c ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσονται.

At the heart of this accusation (C) is a derogatory presentation of the opponents presenting them as both false and hypocritical. Whether Paul intends a contrast with his own suffering for the cross (cp. 2.19, 4.13, 6.17 and possibly 3.1) or an echo of Peter’s vacillation over the gospel in Antioch (2.11-14) remains to be seen, but these are harsh accusations. The allegation of hypocrisy in C is framed by further such charges in both A clauses — the opponents are attempting a ‘deceptive cheat’\textsuperscript{554} in that their main concern is themselves and not the Galatians (cp. Paul at 4.16). This is an important observation, as the tendency to break these verses down into several issues gives

\textsuperscript{548} Betz (1979: 314).
\textsuperscript{549} Longenecker (1990: 291).
\textsuperscript{550} It does not serve Paul’s case if his comments are not ‘recognisable and plausible’ to the Galatians, even if exaggerated or emphasised, cf. Barclay (1987: 76). Whilst being fair or balanced towards one’s opponents was not expected in his world (cf. Watson (1991: 212), Kelly (1976: 96f)), and there is a clear attempt to vilify the opponents here (Du Toit (1994a: 157)), to convince the Galatians it is reasonable to assume that he would have had to ‘hit the mark very closely’ to the truth (Hardin (2008: 96)).
\textsuperscript{551} Weima (1994: 162).
\textsuperscript{552} Fung (1988: 304).
\textsuperscript{553} de Boer (2011: 396). cf. Oakes (2015: 186) who does not mention the C clauses of the chiasm, but de Boer seems correct to see the criticism of the opponents as the connection between C and C1.
primacy to questions about circumcision.\textsuperscript{555} Plainly it is a concern (B and B1), but whilst circumcision is Paul’s concern regards the Galatians themselves, these verses have the opponents as the subject of Paul’s complaint.\textsuperscript{556}

The move to detect a variety of motives here, by commentators, often seems to be as a result of their attention being focused on circumcision as the problem Paul has with the opponents.\textsuperscript{557} However, the Galatian problem is unspecified here. Rather Paul’s attack on the opponents shows that circumcision is an apparent solution to a different problem,\textsuperscript{558} and, significantly, not a problem that involves the Galatians themselves (cf. μόνον at 6:12).\textsuperscript{559}

Whilst we would not disagree that Paul offers a multifaceted objection toward the opponents, the structure of the two verses and their similarity in construction supports the argument that there is only actually one charge here.\textsuperscript{560} Specifically, the encapsulating charge (12a/13c) of the verses is that the opponents’ motivation is εὐπροσωπήσατ—this is not, as it might appear, primarily sectarian, rather they are attempting to ‘save face’.\textsuperscript{561} If we can avoid being distracted by the references to ‘persecution’ or circumcision, which in this reading functions to show the Galatians their own location in the conflict, we note that the structure displays the εὐπροσωπήσατ charge as the principal accusation against the opponents. The ensuing clauses all function as explanatory statements, unpacking the εὐπροσωπήσατ accusation for the Galatians, rather than as additional complaints against the opponents.

\textsuperscript{554} Oakes (2015: 187).
\textsuperscript{556} Matera (1992: 225). This feature has not been revealed in the letter until now, and as such is possibly missed by many. Now we discover that the opponents themselves are at ‘risk’, and perhaps it is only them who are at risk, cf. Nanos (2002b: 220).
\textsuperscript{557} In honour related issues motivation is the distinguishing feature of any action. On the surface one behaviour might appear no more honour related than another, it is the motivation that distinguishes it, cf. Ballard (2011: 124f) and his discussion of the ‘litmus test’.
\textsuperscript{558} Esler (1998a: 73).
\textsuperscript{559} Betz (1979: 315).
\textsuperscript{560} Hardin (2008: 87) correctly notes this.
4.2 Reading εὐπροσωπέω in Galatians 6.12

Galatian commentators generally imply that εὐπροσωπέω is unambiguous, requiring, if any comment, little more than a passing reference to the verb’s rarity (hapax legomenon).\(^{562}\) J.D.G. Dunn, despite offering a considered paragraph of background data, remains indicative of the field, ‘[t]he meaning, however, would have been clear from the construction of the word (literally ‘to have a good face’).’\(^{563}\) Whilst we agree that the meaning would have been clear to Paul’s readers, the passing over of the verb implies that the modern scholar is less clear. To be sure, some more recent work has evidenced the influence of NT social-scientific studies by highlighting the likelihood of εὐπροσωπέω being indicative of the preoccupation with honour and shame typical of the ancient world.\(^{564}\) The exegetical and exigent value of this observation, however, is rarely explored.

As we discussed at §3.3.2-3.3.3, Winter’s work on εὐπροσωπέω is a rare consideration of the term and its usage in Galatians 6.12. However, we considered his argument to have several weaknesses, not least of which was its circular reasoning. Principally the argument struggled to convince us because of his insistence that the word was legal terminology on the basis of his observing it occasionally being used to discuss a legal situation, particularly when said situation was clearly discussing a concern for someone’s perceived public status. We suggested that his argument is an over-reading to require εὐπροσωπέω to carry legal connotations, and methodologically suspect to do

\(^{562}\) The shorter commentaries especially pay little attention, which evidences how unimportant it is seen to the exigency — they often simply supply an assumed translation without comment (Fee (2007: 251), Perkins (2001: 120f), cf. even social-science commentaries, Pilch (1983: 26), Osiek (1980: 84f)), or do not even mention it at all (Williams (1997)). Rarely is more than a sentence given. cf. Betz (1979: 314), de Boer (2011: 397), Lohse (1968: 779n1), although we should be cautious of overly Westernised anachronistic assumptions about what that infers.

\(^{563}\) Dunn (1993a: 336).

\(^{564}\) cf. Das (2014) and Witherington (1998: 446). Das cites Hansen (1994: 198-199) in support of this, although it is not clear that Hansen really has honour in mind in 6.12. Unexpectedly, Esler (1998a: cf. 73) does not mention the term. Nanos (2002a) and Kahl (2010) are slight exceptions to this tendency in their wider projects, but whilst more considered in their engagement with honour concerns they do not really make anything of εὐπροσωπέω.
so on the basis of inconclusive supporting texts, and that it is easier to make sense of εὐπροσωπέω as honour, rather than legal, terminology.\(^{565}\)

Winter is right, however, to insist on the importance of εὐπροσωπέω to Galatians and his argument has convinced many of the few who wish to offer more than just an assumed translation. Justin Hardin’s 2006 thesis and, more recently, Alexander Prokhorov’s *JSNT* article have attempted correcting modifications to Winter’s position whilst still defending its core idea.\(^{566}\) Hardin presents counter evidence that Diaspora communities ‘actively participated’ in the imperial cult, thereby suggesting that Winter’s proposal is faulty in further areas than just those mentioned above. Hardin only wishes to modify Winter’s argument, however, in which he proposes a reconstruction that considers the persecution the opponents faced in Galatia as that from local Jews who might report the Galatian assemblies to the authorities on the basis of their civic status ambiguity. In turn the opponents were supposedly encouraging the Galatians to join the Jewish community and remove said legal ambiguity and the persecution they, the opponents, would face on their behalf.\(^{567}\) Strangely, Hardin does note, without expanding, that εὐπροσωπέω more generally has a social rather than a legal nuance, but argues that Winter’s use of texts defend his position which we have shown above to be questionable.\(^{568}\) Prokhorov, meanwhile, suggests that Hardin and Winter both have slightly premature views on the consistency of response to the Emperor across the breadth of Diaspora Judaism, whether rejecting or embracing.\(^{569}\) Rather, circumcision would allow a person a level of ‘legal shelter’ from persecution for non-participation in the imperial cult.\(^{570}\) Prokhorov then advances a somewhat strange theory proposing that, with Paul’s suffering as a defence, the apostle is instructing the gentile Galatians to not seek legal shelter from the persecution they might encounter due

\(^{565}\) In Winter (2015: 244) he stretches the ‘proofs’ further by arguing, on the basis of one inscription in Ephesus, that the θηλω of 6.12 references a legal decree.


\(^{567}\) Hardin (2008: 114-115).

\(^{568}\) Hardin (2008: 91).

\(^{569}\) Prokhorov (2013: 179). Ironically, by p.180, Prokhorov seems to make the same error regarding the Empire’s perspective on early Jewish-Christian relations. Apparently imagining that the Empire could differentiate between the ‘two’ groups (itself a premature concept perhaps, cf. Dunn (2006)), Prokhorov struggles to imagine why Jews would be interested in Christian law observance, something, at least in his reconstruction, Hardin correctly imagines.

\(^{570}\) Prokhorov (2013: 182).
to their ambiguous civic status, but to face it and suffer as Christ did. Despite suffering being a theme that is worth exploring in Galatians,\(^{571}\) it is difficult to see how Prokhorov’s theory is not re-inscribing the very two-tiered system that Galatians is trying to erase — the difference between circumcised and uncircumcised status. In his reading Jewish Christians are legally protected from persecution by the simple good fortune of being Jewish prior to their trusting in Christ, which would include Paul himself, whose only recourse would be to the scars he has acquired in the service of the gospel. It is not clear how this does not contradict the theology of the epistle.\(^{572}\) Prokhorov’s willingness, however, to build from Winter’s position shows how influential Winter’s ‘legal’ position continues to be.

As interesting as these modifications are, neither of them move beyond the main concern we have with Winter’s thesis, namely that his legal reading hangs on an unproven presupposition about εὐπροσωπέω, locating it in a supposed semantic range that is not established by the texts. The argument presents itself strongly to those unaware of the referenced texts or not having detailed knowledge of civic judicature in Roman Galatia. However, this is as a result of being persuaded by the eloquence rather than the detail of the argument. As Brigitte Kahl has pointed out, there is little evidence to suggest that Rome in any way cared about Galatian circumcision.\(^{573}\) Whilst Winter’s insistence on adding the word ‘legal’, or some other related term, to each discussion of status is at odds with much of the recent research on status in Paul’s world. He is right when he states, ‘[t]he addition of εὐ- to πρόσωπον allows for an acceptable public “face” or status in the eyes of other citizens or residents.’\(^{574}\) However, ‘public’ is not synonymous with ‘legal’, which may be why Winter misses that though the sources he cites are about status, they are about public or social, rather than legal, reputation.\(^{575}\) The meaning of εὐπροσωπέω is more obviously located, to the detriment of Winter,


\(^{572}\) It seems also curiously out of line with the testimony of the NT. Paul, likely no huge fan of the Empire (See the essays in Porter and Westfall (2011), although cf. Barclay (2011: 363-388)), is presented in Acts as using his Roman citizenship with the express purpose of avoiding circumcision (Acts 22:25-29).


\(^{574}\) Winter (2002: 74).

\(^{575}\) He also makes this mistake when reading inscriptions that relate to ‘rank and status’, again assuming this is primarily legal rather than social, cf. Winter (2015: 246).
Hardin and Prokhorov’s arguments, as we saw (cf. §3.3-3.3.3), in the issues of day-to-day concern for face in the Greco-Roman world where πρόσωπον was a synecdochical way of describing how a person presented themselves in terms of their social status or rank. Face, as we have argued, was about reputation.

4.2.1 ἔυπροσωπέω as Honour Concern in Galatians

Despite the acknowledged pervasiveness of honour concern, the possibility that ἔυπροσωπέω signals a perceived honour motivation amongst the opponents has escaped scholarly consideration. The strength of this reading of ἔυπροσωπέω is shown by the parallel with 6.13c. Whereas Winter’s proposal recourses to tenuous links with secondary literature, the chiastic structure of 6.12-13 that parallels 12a with 13c highlights the honour concern in the passage. The correspondence between ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑπετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται (13c) and ὅσοι θέλουσιν ἔυπροσωπήσαι ἐν σαρκί (12a) is noted by commentators, yet reading the face-concern and boasting as honour concern is regularly missed. As we showed, boasting, when understood as a public claim for honour, is easily located within the semantic range of honour language (§3.4.1).

Hence, 6.12 can be understood as an accusation that the opponents are intending to increase their own honour by somehow using the Galatians as pawns in a broader honour conflict. This positions honour-concern as a dominant issue in the Galatian assemblies. ‘Face saving’ led many to hide their pursuit of honour (cf. Cicero Off. 1.30.105; Horace Ep. 1.1.60-61), so Paul’s attack here aims to unveil the opponents’ true motives.

This argument for ἔυπροσωπέω in Galatians 6.12-13 is concurrent with what we see of Paul’s face usage elsewhere. In particular, 2 Corinthians 5.12c contrasts ‘masked’ social status against authentic reality:

\[... ἵνα ἔχητε πρὸς τοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ καυχομένους καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ.\]

---

576 de Boer (2011: 396). Hubbard (2002: 210) struggles to see the connection between the two, despite noticing the ‘people pleasing’ theme in the letter.

577 Older English translations understood this with their tendency to translate any of the καύχημα cognates as ‘glory’.

578 This is not particularly remarkable as not regarding the situation of another whilst using them to increase one’s own honour was normal behaviour. cf. Joubert (2000: 57) NB: A similar problem in Philippians 1.17.

Forming part of a discussion stretching from chapter 3, Paul’s argument to the Corinthians is replete with honour issues. Despite this, commentators broadly represent the honour-insensitivity we note in Galatians. Joseph Fitzmyer evidences the difficulty this causes by struggling to see the logical progression of Paul’s argument from the ‘trivial’ issue of συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν (3.1) through a discussion of Moses’ veil and Christ’s face to 5.12 and the discussion about boasting. To those alert to cultural concerns for public status, however, the connection of these parts of Paul’s argument should be obvious. Boasting is a key concern for the letter and later Paul contrasts his boast against the Corinthian troublemakers’ boast κατὰ σάρκα (11.18, cp. εὑροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί. Galatians 6.12). Noting this dominant honour-based theme makes it easy to see how Paul offers a contrasting perspective on social honour redefined by Christ in chapters 3-5. The intertextuality with 1 Samuel 16.7 LXX (…ἀνθρωπος ὄψεται εἰς πρόσωπον, ὁ δὲ θεός ὄψεται εἰς καρδίαν) does not preclude a social reading of the ‘face boast’ Paul rejects in 2 Corinthians 5.12 and, subsequently, supports an honour reading of εὑροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί in Galatians 6.12.

Paul’s use of σάρξ in 6.12 need not add any complexity to our reading. Whilst we noted its use in relation to social appearance in 2 Corinthians 11, in Galatians 6.13 it alludes to circumcision, between 5.13 and 6.10 it references contra-πνεῦμα moral qualities, it can also describe the physical body, or simply a human being’s present life (1.16; 2.16, 20, 3.3; 4.13-14). Famously, Martyn argued that σάρξ was a cosmic anti-God power, although that seems overly-precise and restricted. The personal pronoun ὑμετέρως at 6.13 implies that σάρξ is not always an independent force. Despite these various nuances, in Galatians Paul consistently uses σάρξ to signal the ‘less than ideal’ state of

---

585 Curiously, Winter (2015: 145) considers 2 Corinthians 5.12 a support of his ‘legal face’ argument, but does not explain how it expresses anything other than social status.
anything alternate to καὶνὴ κτίσις (6.15; cp. 1.4).\textsuperscript{587} Contrasts such as this were not uncommon in Judaism (cf. 1QS 1.9-10, 2.1-5 3.15-19).\textsuperscript{588} Connecting σάρξ to εὑπροσωπέω hints towards Paul adding to the already heavy-laden σάρξ-field the notion of honour-seeking. Thereby, here, in 6.12, ἐν σαρκὶ signals that Paul’s position on honour-concern places face outside of the realm of new creation.

That Paul continues to locate face concern, including εὑπροσωπέω, both negatively and within the field of honour can be seen in his use of πρόσωπον in three texts. These support the semantic link, but also reveal something of the significance of εὑπροσωπέω to the epistle: \textsuperscript{589}

2.11 - Ὑπερ ήλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὡς κατεγνωσμένος ἦν.

1.22 - ἦμην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.

2.6 - πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει.

We will consider these now in reverse order of significance to our argument. Unlike Winter’s legal argument for εὑπροσωπέω that relies on tenuous external evidence, an honour reading makes sense of the πρόσωπον usage within Galatians.

4.2.1.1 Galatians 2.11

Galatians 2.11 highlights a scene of honour challenge. The conflict in the setting is unambiguous, marked by the use of ἀντέστην, a military and political term of opposition that is used elsewhere in the NT for charlatans and heretics (Acts 13.8; 2 Timothy 3.8).\textsuperscript{590} Κατὰ πρόσωπον highlights, as we might expect of social challenges in Paul’s world, that there were honour dynamics at play in the situation. Paul’s claim that Peter is ‘self-condemned’ (καταγινώσκω. cp. Josephus B.J. 2.135) underscores that the challenge to his face is designed to illicit a public response rather than a judicial one.\textsuperscript{591} Although we might simply read κατὰ πρόσωπον idiomatically as ‘face-to-face’ this

\textsuperscript{587} Oakes (2015: 95, 103), cf. Hubbard (2002: 211). Reading σάρξ as polemic is difficult to maintain throughout the epistle (1.16; 2.16, pace Russell (1997)).

\textsuperscript{588} Watson (1986: 42, 46).

\textsuperscript{589} A glance through commentators will show how few see any connection at all between these verses and 6.12.

\textsuperscript{590} Betz (1979: 106n443).

\textsuperscript{591} pace Witherington (1998: 151).
minimises the social dynamics Paul implies here (similarly 2 Corinthians 10.1). Das and Esler note how often κατὰ πρόσωπον references unsuccessful military conflict in Septuagint tradition (Deuteronomy 7.24, 9.2, 11.25, 31.21; Judges 2.14; 2 Chronicles 13.7-8; Judith 6.4) which suggests there is more than just simple proximity intended by the phrase. In addition, we note the honour dynamics evident in those conflicts (cf. ἀπολείπεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν in Deuteronomy 7.24), but also regularly present in any ‘face to face’ encounter (cf. 1 Esdras 8.74; 2 Maccabees 7.6; Wisdom 5.1).

Considering the role of face in this scene from Antioch, it is easy to see how Peter is acting with regards to the preservation of his own status in relation to his peers (τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου). Therefore, Paul’s public challenge of hypocrisy (2.13) described as κατὰ πρόσωπον highlights Peter’s face-saving intentions to the reader. The immediate status-threat of an accusation of practising ὑπόκρισις, essentially being accused of having false-face, would powerfully outweigh any possible threat to his honour from Jerusalem. Paul’s use of κατὰ πρόσωπον here, in an explicitly non-legal context, supports our contention regarding εὐπροσωπέω. Paul appears unhappy at Peter considering his own face of greater concern than the ‘truth of the gospel’ (2.14) echoing the disregard for social ‘good face’ that we detected in 6.12-13.

4.2.1.2 Galatians 1.22

Commentators variously consider 1.22 problematic due to the apparent unlikeliness of Paul being unknown in Judea at this point. John Knox argued for a contradiction with Acts 8.3 questioning how those he had previously persecuted would not have known, at very least about, him. It could be argued that this is an issue of the duration of time, reading ἦμην ἄγνοος with de Boer as a periphrastic imperfect tense ‘was being unknown’, or with Das that a more literal understanding of τῶ προσώπω is that Paul was unknown ‘by sight’.

---

593 The weight of hypocrisy challenges is noted in Oakes (2015: 78).
However, avoiding the issues of Pauline chronology, we note that reputation is in view here. In contrast to his previous exceptional life ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ (1.13) Paul is now unconcerned by his status or reputation. His πρόσωπον is insignificant having rejected being a ‘people pleaser’ (ἡ ζητο ἀνθρώπω άρσκεῖ; 1.10). What those assemblies now know about Paul (1.23) results in God gaining honour rather than Paul (ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἴμοι τόν θεόν 1.24). The praiseworthiness of God is so well-established in Judaeo-Christian tradition (e.g. Psalm 22.23, 86.8-12, 113.1-4; Isaiah 24.15-16; Jeremiah 13.16; Sirach 42.16-17; Mark 13.26; Luke 2.9-14; Romans 11.36; Galatians 1.4) that δόξα, and the Hebrew cognate כָּבוֹד, are perceived with a spiritualised nuance that obscures their core sense of ‘honour’ and, subsequently, the social subtlety of 1.24 (cp. Psalm 115.1).

Significantly, Paul’s willingness in 1.22-24 to both remain ‘unknown’ and unimproved in regards his honour is socially anomalous. Honour, as we saw, cannot be obtained in secret, therefore, to be unknown is to be both without honour (Seneca, Ep. 102.8) or motivation (Dio Chrysostom Or. 31.21-22; Valerius Maximus 8.14.6). In a manner that matches the inversion of his behaviour in 1.13, Paul is not only at odds with the expected norms of social conduct, but he shows himself in contradistinction to the opponents at 6.12. Their attempt and motivation of εὑπροσωπέω is antithetical to his unknown, ergo unimproved, πρόσωπον.

4.2.1.3 Galatians 2.6

Although it commands minimal scholarly attention, Galatians 2.6 plays an important role in locating Paul’s rationale for his position in 6.12. For a reading exploring facework 2.6 presents itself as a significantly loaded aside between two insults — a repetition of δοξέω frames a parenthetical double-sided comment.

596 See the comment on Ἰουδαϊσμός at §6.3.2.
599 Oakes (2015: 60) observes the comparable language in 1.13.
600 Mussner (1977: 114).
By describing the Jerusalem στῦλοι with δοκέω (2.2, 4, 9) Paul identifies these apostles for his readers without personally recognising their claim to honour, a not insignificant play in any honour game. Oi δοκοῦντες (‘seeming; of repute’ BDAG 2b) generally requires a contextual decision as to whether it is being used affirmatively (e.g. Xenophon Cyr. 7.1.41; Plutarch Mor. 166B) or disparagingly (Philo Mos. 2.241). Paul’s use in Galatians has been described as honorific (‘Prestige der „Maßgebenden“’), although this seems reminiscent of Jerome and Chrysostom’s reticence to accept that the early apostles disagreed. Similarly, Das rejects a pejorative use of οἱ δοκοῦντες due to a supposed honorific description of ‘the pillars’ in 2.9. However, στῦλοι only really clarifies identity there, notwithstanding the difficulty of maintaining this position within 2.6. In honour culture, to use an honorific title whilst simultaneously rejecting it hints strongly at irony, if not an insult. Betz notes that Socrates uses οἱ δοκοῦντες in exactly this way to identify those thought of as having reputation without agreeing to it himself (Plato Apol. 21B-22B). The irony is perhaps further evidenced in that these ‘leaders’ had no effect on Paul’s gospel (οὐδέν προσανέθεντο).

The two parts of the ensuing parenthetical comment establish that Paul is not honouring the δοκοῦντες. Whether ποτε is emphatic or indefinite in 2.6 the past tense of Paul’s statement remains. What these ‘pillars’ were, even if it refers to their personal knowledge of Jesus, is presently of no consequence to Paul (οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει). Betz argues, alluding to the stoic idea of adiaphora, that Paul is here relativising the status of ‘the pillars’ into a ‘matter of indifference’. This does not create a discrepancy between Paul’s interest in ‘the pillars’ insight (2.2) but disinterest in their

601 Plutarch references sufferers of an insatiable φιλοδοξία that produces ironically dishonourable behaviour (Mor. 540B).
605 Although it is not clear whether Paul thinks the στῦλοι have accepted this title themselves, which would probably be required for it to be an insult.
606 Betz (1979: 87n278).
609 Betz (1979: 94).
social-standing (2.6) as some argue. Rather this is a form of status dissonance. That all social dimensions are not perceived to carry the same weight in every situation is referred to by sociologists in this manner. Petronius’ freed-slave Trimalchio encountered such status dissonance when his wealthy benefactions failed to detach him from his inglorious beginnings (31-34; 75-77). In our case we see Paul’s preference to rate only some aspects of these apostles as significant. Whilst their knowledge of the gospel apparently counted for something, their reputation afforded no privilege. Here we see the extent of Paul’s disregard for status: οἱ δοκοῦντες is not a ‘distancing formula’ from the στῦλοι themselves (contra Dunn), but from the notion of honoured status in general.

However, that this parenthesis is no mere passing commentary for Paul (pace de Boer) is seen in what follows, πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεός ἄνθρωπον οὐ λαμβάνει. This idiomatic formula (λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, κάνειν ἴσον) represents the idea of favour and status being granted by those in authority. In the Jewish textual tradition it is most commonly expressed negatively as a reference to the impartiality of God and his disregard for human conventions (Leviticus 19.15; Deuteronomy 1.17, 10.17, 16.19; 2 Chronicles 19.7; Job 34.19; Psalms 81.2; Wisdom 6.7; Sirach 4.22, 27, 35.12-13; 42.1; 1 Esdras 4.39. cf. 1 Samuel 16.7). Vincent Smiles saw 2.6 as Paul’s ‘paraphrase’ of Deuteronomy 10.17, although the stronger honour issues present here, and the reference to πτωχός in 2.10, imply a closer allusion to Sirach 35.12-13 (cf. Galatians 2.10),

ὅτι κύριος κριτής ἐστιν, καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν παρ’ αὐτῷ δόξα προσώπου. οὐ λήμψεται πρόσωπον ἐπὶ πτωχοῦ καὶ δέθησιν ἡδικημένου εἰσακούσεται.

Regardless of the allusion’s source, Paul’s point in 2.6 is clear — ‘God is not an other-directed (dyadic) personality.’ The surrounding status language (δοκέω, οὐδέν μι

---

610 Dunn (1993a: 103).
611 Hope (2000: 144).
613 de Boer (2011: 116).
615 NT tradition continues this, cf. Luke 20.21; Romans 2.11. The use of προσωπολημψία in James 2.1 is a call to ignore favouritism.
διαφέρει), however, reminds us not to read πρόσωπον as a simple reference to appearance, hence overplaying the 1 Samuel connection, but rather that πρόσωπον is a reference to the social distinction about which God is indifferent.618 Having earlier informed the reader that his gospel (οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον 1.11) and his apostolic calling (οὐκ ἂν ἄνθρωπον οὔδὲ δι’ ἄνθρωπον 1.1) are not affected by human status constructs,619 Paul now provides his rationale for this position — God will not ‘underwrite’ honour distinctions.620 This is in direct contrast to the characteristics (Eigenschaften) of the δοκοῦντες.621 It is also tightly in keeping with the ensuing argument about unity and oneness around 3.28, the logic throughout 5.13-6.10, and Paul’s insistence that ἔμοι κόσμος ἔσταφρωται κάγῳ κόσμῳ (6.14).622 Paul’s position on face is, therefore, not merely a personal disregard for status but a socially-impacting theological strategy shaped after God.

Whilst it is occasionally noted that there are honour concerns present in Paul’s πρόσωπον use here, it is rarely connected beyond this verse either to the situation in Jerusalem or the letter as a whole.624 De Boer is indicative of this approach,

The ‘face’ here is the social role of a person, the ‘mask’ one has on in social affairs…If God is not impressed by considerations of external status, treating everyone the same, the Galatians (Paul implies) should also not be impressed: ‘The status of the acknowledged leaders at the time of the conference thus cannot be used as an argument for — or against — my gospel, as the new preachers would have you think.’625

Yet, having alerted the reader to an awareness of face conventions in 2.6, it appears too easy for scholars to forget this when encountering the cognate language of εὐπροσωπέω in 6.12 which unfortunately misses what we consider to be a cogent moment in Paul’s

620 Oakes (2015: 71). This also makes it unlikely that he has previously honoured ‘the pillars’.
621 Mussner (1977: 114).
623 Neither is it una polemica contro i notabili as Puca (2011: 165) argues.
624 e.g. Das (2014: 180).
625 de Boer (2011: 118).
objection to the opponents.\textsuperscript{626} That which de Boer notes in 2.6, we want to argue is exactly what Paul is alluding to by his use of εὐπροσωπέω at 6.12. By exposing the opponents’ honour-based motivation and showing them to be seeking ‘good face’ Paul has shown their intentions to be entirely incongruent with God who, in 2:6, embraces a form of what we call divine prosopagnosia. With one word Paul performs a rhetorical \textit{tour de force} against the opponents. By seeking a good face when the impartial God (3.20, 28) has no interest in face, Paul has shown them to be, not his opponents but God’s opponents. Εὐπροσωπέω is, therefore, a purposeful description with a loaded social nuance that shows how concerns for face, and more broadly honour, are significant to the exigency of the letter.

\textbf{4.3 The Opponents and Honour ‘Persecution’}

When scholarly attention reaches the ἵνα clause of 6.12c (μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκονται), however, the probable effect of εὐπροσωπέω on the passage, and consequently the letter, is regularly ignored. Rather than exploring how Paul’s initial accusation regarding the opponents’ motives might be explained by this clause, the tendency is to not take honour concern seriously and see εὐπροσωπέω as a sundry issue when juxtaposed with this clause.\textsuperscript{627} Furthermore, \textit{a priori} readings of διώκω as ‘violent persecution’ have escalated this ἵνα clause into priority position and little energy is expended in reconnecting it to ideas about εὐπροσωπέω. As we noted, a few interpreters have attempted to imagine types of persecution within which face-concern would be important.\textsuperscript{628} Invariably, however, even in recent scholarship on this verse, εὐπροσωπέω remains, at best, a secondary concern;\textsuperscript{629} Elmer manages to ignore it entirely when considering 6.12, preferring to focus on διώκω.\textsuperscript{630} Rather than reading μόνον as a priority marker,\textsuperscript{631} however, we would note that the parallel focus in 12a and 12c on the ‘real intentions’ of the opponents implies that we here encounter the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[626] Kahl (2010: 226) is one of the few who notes εὐπροσωπέω as important to this text, although she mentions it is superficial. Significantly she does note that the challenge of the opponents is to abandon the murky identity in Christ for clear and traditional categories of ‘us and them’.
\item[627] Hubing (2015: 213).
\item[628] Further summaries can be seen in, Das (2014: 3-19), de Boer (2011: 50-61), and an earlier German perspective in Mussner (1977: 11-29).
\item[630] Elmer (2009).
\item[631] \textit{contra} Hubing (2015: 213).
\end{footnotes}
explanatory logic of a single (μόνον), interconnected issue.\textsuperscript{632} Essentially, a cogent reading of 6.12 should address how achieving ‘good face’ is concomitant with the concern regarding διώκω.

Winter’s argument that continuing to circumcise Christians would have protected the nascent assembly under Judaism’s religio licita status, does provides a locus to attach the διώκω of 6.12c, namely that non-circumcised adherents would alert the authorities to the fraud of Christians avoiding Emperor cult participation via pseudo-Jewish appearance — thereby inviting persecution.\textsuperscript{633} This is not without problems however. Firstly, the argument appears circular, the only evidence for these repercussions that Winter cites is Galatians 6.12 which he then interprets on the basis of this assumption.\textsuperscript{634} This does not seem particularly compelling. Secondly, he fails to establish a believable case for persecution on the grounds of non-participation in the emperor cult. He cites only Eusebius in support (Hist. eccl. 7.11), without defending the late date of said source, or explaining why Lendon’s study, which he references,\textsuperscript{635} that claims the only crime committed by not-honouring the emperor at this stage of the Empire was ‘ingratitude’, is not worthy of consideration.\textsuperscript{636} Although ingratitude would likely have social implications, they would not be synonymous with what we might consider persecution. Kahl follows Winter in this by assuming that any ‘opt out’ would invite political reprisals,\textsuperscript{637} but this only continues the theme of over-reading that ignores the significance of the social factors involved. It seems more apparent and likely that the threat of social exclusion was the controlling pressure that ensured cultic observances and precluded organised sanctions against non-participants.\textsuperscript{638}

Complementing this is Oakes’ work on Philippi which argues that membership of the

\textsuperscript{632} Betz (1979: 315).
\textsuperscript{633} Winter (2002: 72). Winter softens this position in his 2015 article (see below), but we mention his position here due to its influence on the field (esp. Hardin and Prokhorov).
\textsuperscript{634} Winter (2002: 72). Dunn (1993a: 336f) similarly rejects Oepke (1973: 201) for lack of evidence. However, we note the influence of Oepke’s position extends beyond his commentary as this position influenced (or was influenced by) his entry on διώκω in TDNT (Oepke (1964)).
\textsuperscript{635} Winter (2002: 72). Once again this is badly referenced. The quote he cites is not in the main body of Lendon’s argument on p.163, but in footnote n.285.
\textsuperscript{636} Lendon (1997: 163n285). Philo (Legat. 149-50) also notes that the emperor cult is largely an issue of prestige.
\textsuperscript{637} Kahl (2010: 224).
\textsuperscript{638} This perspective is discussed in Price (1984: 107-114).
Pauline communities would necessitate withdrawal from participation in civic life that effected momentous social and economic ramifications. This does not exclude the possibility that Jews in Galatia would have been concerned about uncircumcised Galatian Christians appearing to be part of the Jewish community thereby affecting their social standing; the Jews were well integrated into civic life in the Galatian region. It does suggest, however, as our main objection, that interpreting διώκω as violent persecution needs to be defended rather than assumed. Not only does it imply much more than is stated, it appears anachronistic in relation to organised persecution of Christians, whilst also not dealing directly with Paul’s claim that it is not the Galatians themselves who are under threat of διώκω, but the opponents.

4.3.1 Defining διώκω
Hardin offers a typical interpretation of διώκω in the ἵνα clause of 6.12c:

Given Paul’s use of διώκω [sic] earlier in the letter — referring both to his former persecution of the church (1.13, 23) and his suffering for disregarding circumcision in his preaching to Gentiles (5.11; cf. 4.29) — Paul is referring to the avoidance of physical persecution in these verses. Paul claims that the agitators were unwilling to endure physical persecution for the cross of Christ (cf. 6.17).

The view, similarly held by many recent works, considers ‘persecution’ a suitable rendering of the threat implied by διώκω. The origin of the so-called persecution varies, whether from civic authorities, as Kahl, Winter, and Prokhorov argue, or from Jewish-Christians, as Dunn, Esler, Elmer, Hubing, Martyn, and de Boer contend, or from Jewish authorities, as Betz, Jewett, Richard Longenecker, and Witherington all propose in differing ways. The consistent feature of these arguments is the lean

641 Hardin (2008: 88). This is unusual in that it does defend the interpretation, however, in his later work this position is assumed, cf. Hardin (2014: 297), and throughout Hardin (2013).
642 Goddard and Cummins (1993), following Baasland (1984), have argued for persecution as a significant theme in the letter without convincingly locating a source of persecution, and also, significantly, mistake the ‘persecution’ as a threat to the Galatians. Hardin (2008: 111) also makes the same error). Eastman (2007: 54n80) is more pessimistic suggesting that it is nearly impossible to reconstruct.
towards, whether implicit or explicit, the undefended position that διώκω references a threat of physical violence from a third party influencing the Galatians, a supposed group not yet introduced to the letter until here. We suggest caution, however, over hasty use of persecution as a rendering of διώκω due to the ‘long shadow’, to use Fredriksen’s phrase, that the events of later history cast backwards onto Galatians. The geographically-broad, organised, sustained, and systematic threat of physical violence, harm, and death to Christians that characterised aspects of the post-NT church should not be used to anachronistically reconstruct a hypothetical parallel situation that is of supposed concern to the Galatian opponents. This is especially the case in Galatians as the only data regarding said physical persecution is the letter’s use of διώκω, about which claims that it must reference a physical violence, much less what later history considers persecution, are less evident than often posited.

In his most recent work on 6.12 Winter concedes, in contrast with his still influential earlier work, that διώκω might carry a ‘dual meaning’ incorporating the notion of ‘to prosecute’. Winter claims that this is ‘the major entry’ in the ninth edition of LSJ, although this is somewhat misleading as ‘prosecute’ is the leading entry only in word count; it is the fourth option as a rendering for διώκω, ranked only above ‘persecute’.

Notions of being pursued, chased, or driven are the initial three definitions offered and most strongly supported. Winter leaves it unclear how he sees this affecting his earlier (and current) argument, but it is a significant adjustment. Firstly, it shows that his

---


Fredriksen (2014: 17-18) warns that the later history of Christian-Jewish relations is an area so ‘historiographically well-established’ that it can compromise reading Paul.


cf. The concerns in Barclay (1987: 73) about that ‘formidable obstacle’ that the one-sidedness of Paul’s presentation of this situation creates, yet at the same time Sumney (1999: 23) insists that the letter be the ‘only primary evidence’ of the opponents - which is surely also true in this case of the conflict itself.


earlier insistence on ‘persecution’ was overstated, as we have suggested. Secondly, it supports our contention that διώκω requires a translation decision. In contrast, Crook suggests that Paul uses διώκω with a ‘subdued tenor’ that has often been ignored by commentators attempting to exaggerate the impact of Paul’s conversion.649 Preferring ‘pursue’, Crook notes that even if persecute is used, ‘there is a spectrum of behaviour that could constitute persecution, ranging from social harassment to violence potentially resulting in death.’650 He continues to note that the tendency to read ‘maximum violence’ into διώκω in Galatians is in contrast with two Christian texts that show a lack of synonymity with notions of death, Barnabas 5.11 and Matthew 23.34. The former uses the modifier ἐν θανάτῳ, whilst the gospel reference notes that διώκω is what is done to the prophets who were not killed or crucified (ἀποκτενεῖτε καὶ σταυρώσετε).651 Similarly, the language Paul associates with διώκω elsewhere is representative of our position. Διώκω can be connected with concepts of being beaten (κολαφίζω), but also with notions of slander, insults, and poor clothing (δυσφημέω, λοιδορέω, γυμνιτεύω 1 Corinthians 4.11-13; cf. 2 Corinthians 4.9, 12.10). This allows, as Hultgren argues, διώκω to incorporate the possibility of oral as well as physical harassment.652 The Greek literature supports our caution about ‘persecution’. If we broaden Crook’s consideration of literature beyond Christian texts our caution about ‘persecution’ is well-founded. Thesaurus Linguae Graecae lists almost 3,000 references to διώκω, between its earliest use in Homer through to the end of the 2nd century CE. The usage supports the balance of meaning represented by LSJ with the predominate usage reflecting notions of ‘chase’, ‘pursue’, or ‘follow’ whether in a vehicle (chariot or boat), on a horse, pursuing an enemy, a prey or a friend.653 Each of these texts require a

651 Crook (2004: 172).
653 This is the case in all the references in Homer (Il., 5.223, 65, 672, 8.107, 339, 439, 10.359, 364, 13.64, 16.598, 17.463, 75, 21.3, 601, 602, 22.157, 158, 168, 173, 199, 200, 230, 8, 23.344, 424, 499, 547; Od., 5.332, 12.182, 13.162, 15.278, 18.409), with the exception of one that could possibly be rendered ‘persecute’ to describe Odysseus being driven from his home, although ‘driven’ does seem to be more appropriate (Od., 18.8). The theme of pursuit (both negatively, as in chase, and positively, as follow) continues through a selection of other Greek texts, Menander Dysk. (82, 85, 118 166, 378), the Sibylline Oracles (1.29, 3.325, 8.158, 14.16-17), the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (3.6.9, 3.16.2, 4.4.1, 4.21.9), Diodorus Siculus (1.67.4, 2.19.9, 2.25.6), Dionysius Ant. rom. (1.35.2, 2.43.1-4), Philo Mos.
contextual decision on the intensity and threat of the pursuit, but in most cases rendering it ‘persecute’ implies a stronger and more specific opposition than these sources suggest.

The Septuagint does occasionally use διώκω to represent violent oppression, or possibly even persecution (Deuteronomy 19.6, 32.30; Jeremiah 17.18, 20.11 LXX). Generally, however, the 112 appearances are in keeping with the Greek literature, and notably none of the Maccabean texts, where we might expect otherwise, seem to reference persecution (1 Maccabees, 2.47, 3.24, 3.5, 4.15, 4.16, 4.9, 5.22, 5.60, 9.15, 10.49, 11.73, 12.51, 15.11, 15.39; 2 Maccabees 2.21, 5.8). The passive usage in the LXX seems to denote a pursuit, requiring an interpretive decision regarding any inherent violence in the context. Human-led pursuit can reference ‘persecution’ (Leviticus 26.36; Lamentations 5.5), but διώκω does not need to have a human source. Whilst the sword functions as a source (Ezekiel 25.13), elemental threats seem more common. Darkness (Nahum 1.8), the sun (Wisdom 2.4), or storm (Wisdom 5.14), rain and hail (Wisdom 16.16) can all ‘pursue’ their victims. Being pursued by nature’s elements leans toward a metaphorical usage of διώκω which is quite explicit in two further occurrences. The possible correction of the rebellious is described as them being ‘pursued by justice’ in Wisdom 11.20 (ὑπὸ τῆς δίκης διωχθέντες), and, in an example of a violent use of διώκω, the Lord’s revenge against the bloodthirsty is described as being pursued by blood in Ezekiel 35.6 (αἷµα σε διώξεται). In advance of the argument below, we should note this metaphorical usage in relation to τῶ σταυρὸν in Galatians 6.12.

---

(1.177.1, 1.178.4), Flacc. (151.5, 188.1), Strabo (5.1.9.18-19), Josephus Ant. (2.272.5, 2.320.4), B.J. (1.65.4, 1.86.4), and I Clement (4.9, 4.13, 5.2, 6.2, 10.1-3, 18.2, 20.4, 22.5, 45.4). The passive usage, such as we encounter in Galatians 6.12, normally infers a chase, commonly involving creatures (cf. Xenophon Cynegicus 5.28.2, 9.8.3, Aristotle [Mir. ausc.] 853b.11, Plutarch Am. Pro. 494E.2, Soll. an. 971C.7).

BDAG has ‘persecute’ as a possible rendering of the no.2 meaning ‘harassment’, although at least one of the cited examples, 1 Maccabees 5.22, would be strange to render persecute. The three other meanings are all from the semantic range of ideas of pursuit. Oepeke (1964: 230) argues that ‘persecute’ is the ‘statistically’ more common NT usage of the verb, but without a clear description of how this is decided, one is fearful of using statistical likeliness as an exegetical guide.
Despite this there seems to be a preference amongst English NT translators to read ‘persecute’ when the verb is encountered in the NT, particularly the Gospels, although this may be more evidence of the ‘long shadow’ problem, as there are several occasions where persecute is not necessarily required by the context. Interestingly, Paul’s use of the verb in Philippians 3.12, directly echoing in meaning and context of Hosea 6.3 is a clear example in LXX and Paul where it cannot convey ideas of persecution. The instruction in Romans 12.13 to τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες is particularly interesting as here the pursuit is of a conceptual nature, specifically, a concept related to issues of honour.\textsuperscript{655} Regardless of this evidence the ‘persecution’ preference has proved resilient in the face of scholarship. As early as 1940, D.W. Riddle argued that even if διώκω related to situations involving violence and death it ‘does not follow’ that the verb absorbs the meaning of the secondary explanatory language.\textsuperscript{656}

Two points can now be made about the use of διώκω. Firstly, the spread of meaning shows that the term is broadly neutral, the context requires the interpreter to make a decision about the nature of the ‘pursuit’ in question. The more common usage that implies a simple chase suggests that in texts where there is no defining context, as we showed above, the burden of proof lies on the interpreter to defend the rendering, but it should undoubtedly not be the more common rendering. Secondly, in light of the discussion above regarding anachronistic readings of persecution, the tendency amongst interpreters and translations to prefer ‘persecute’ is ill-advised.

4.3.1.1 Διώκω in Galatians

This is informative when we turn to the use of διώκω in Galatians (1.13, 23, 4.29, 5.11). The reference in 4.29 to a conflict between Abraham’s sons is unclear as Paul extends the story beyond the scriptural tradition by using διώκω to elaborate the Πρᾶξις/παίζω of Genesis 21.9. Admittedly, there is a Rabbinic tradition that interprets Ishmael’s sin as the shedding of Isaac’s blood (Tg. Ps.-J. Genesis 21.9-11, Gen. Rab. 53.11, t. Soṭah 6.6, Pirqe R. E.l 30),\textsuperscript{657} but the range of the Hebrew verb includes concepts of ‘scorn’ and ‘making sport of’ which would more simply suggest that Paul is using διώκω to

\textsuperscript{655} cf. The studies of Arterbury (2005) and O’Gorman (2010).
\textsuperscript{656} Riddle (1940: 55).
translate the concept of harassment as a fair rendering of the Hebrew verb rather than having to argue that Paul is following a Rabbinic interpretative development to maintain loyalty to a particular reading of διώκω. Similarly, in 5.11 there are no additional markers to defend the reading of διώκω that Hardin proposed above. Whilst we have nothing in Galatians to suggest Paul was suffering from a physical persecution for not ‘preaching circumcision’, we do have references to suggest that there were those who were harassing Paul regarding his ‘freedom’ (2.4-5, 12, 6.17).

Most notable are the references in 1.13 and 1.23. 1.23 with its clear connection to 1.13 will be explained by how we unpack the earlier verse, which is particularly significant as it is the only reference that we can connect to an external source, i.e. Acts 9. Initially this appears to be a case of διώκω implying physical persecution. However, διώκω in 1.13 is adjacent to a comment about Paul’s destructive actions against the Jesus movement (ἐπόρθων αὐτήν) and also modified by καθ’ ὑπερβολήν. Elsewhere Paul uses καθ’ ὑπερβολήν either as an intensifier (Romans 7.13) or an exaggeration marker (2 Corinthians 1.8). Whilst exaggeration is no stranger to Paul it seems unnecessary to read rhetorical hyperbole here if the only purpose is to raise doubts about whether Paul’s actual history included physical violence towards the Jesus movement as Acts claims. However, the hyperbole arguments of Crook, Hultgren and Thurén do support our claim that διώκω in 1.13 does not suitably describe Paul’s Acts 9 actions unaccompanied. The appearance of ὑπερβολή in close proximity with διώκω is unsurprisingly rare in the Greek literature; post-Pauline references are largely quotations of Galatians 1.13. However, in the only pre-Pauline comparisons, Aristotle’s Eth. nic. 7.8.4 and 7.14.2, the structure is used as an intensifier with no implication of

---


658 We will address 5.11 at §4.4.1.1.

659 Hultgren (1976: 108) rightly objects to using Lukan narrative to translate Galatians 1.13, preferring to see this as Paul referencing his ‘intensity of zeal’ against the church.


661 cf. Thurén (2000: 32f) for further examples.


663 In Acts 9.4-5 the intensification of διώκω is provided by the surrounding context (v.1 ἅπειλας καὶ φόνοι). That said we are mindful of the concerns in Hurd (2005: 132) about unnecessary attempts to harmonise Paul with Acts. cf. Knox (1987: 19).
violence or persecution. In both these texts the discussion is in relation to bodily pleasure, with ὑπερβολή and διώκω referencing an unacceptably excessive pursuit of pleasure. The implication being that any violence in Paul’s autobiography in 1.13 is freighted on πορθέω. The καὶ of 1.13 might then signal a hendiadys, with the καθ’ ὑπερβολήν intensifying διώκω and the πορθέω clarifying its content on this occasion. Hence we could read 1.13 claiming that Paul was ‘excessively harassing the assembly of God by trying to destroy it.’

It is to this notion he returns in 1.23 and while it is unproblematic to read διώκω as ‘pursue’ here, and we again note the need for the modifier πορθέω. Consequently, we suggest that διώκω in Galatians does not, on its own, reference a physical persecution, but rather its sentence context or related modifiers define how the verb is being used.

4.3.1.2 Connecting διώκω and εὐπροσωπέω

It is important to consider, therefore, how our reading of εὐπροσωπέω might influence an understanding of διώκω in 6.12. It hardly seems fair of Paul to accuse the opponents of trying to save face if there is an actual threat of physical harm facing them. Many accusations might be levelled against their attempts to use the Galatians as protection from physical threat, but a complaint of superficiality is hardly one of them. Rather than avoid this tension between εὐπροσωπέω and διώκω, as most have done, we prefer to ask how the idea of making a good face is affecting the meaning of διώκω. We noticed above that διώκω was used by Paul alongside concerns such as slander and insult, which are honour issues (1 Corinthians 4.12-13; 2 Corinthians 12.10). We see similar usage in Matthew’s makarisms where διώκω is bookended by the notions of being reviled and lied about (5.10-11).

Nanos is open to this possibility in 6.12 (although he cites no textual defence), suggesting that it ‘could indicate any expression of disapproval, beginning at the level of a simple facial expression, word, or action’. We would agree, although would consider the implications broader than Nanos does. An ‘expression of disapproval’ in

664 Largely due to ὑπερβολή not being particularly common.
666 Neyrey (1998: 187) reads these verses as a description of a ‘total collapse’ of honour.
an honour-based society would invariably be interpreted as an honour challenge, thereby requiring a response with which to ‘save face’. It is unconvincing, however, that face-saving would be understood as a ‘trivialized fear’ by the Galatians as Nanos contends.\textsuperscript{668} To suggest that losing face would ‘feel like’ a persecution is to unduly minimise the serious concern for status in the ancient world.\textsuperscript{669} Acknowledging that social death is less severe than physical death (with Downing)\textsuperscript{670} does not leave issues of honour ‘trivialized’. Perceptions of threat are always relative,\textsuperscript{671} and in this context, challenges to honour were real threats.\textsuperscript{672}

In 6.12, then, is it possible that a connected approach to reading εὐπροσωπέω and διώκω is appropriate? For the adverbial μόνον clause to function emphatically, regardless of whether or not it is exaggeration,\textsuperscript{673} there should be a logical connection between the claim in the first clause and the emphasis in the second.\textsuperscript{674} Might we then argue that the harassment felt by the opponents is in relation to their honour standing? The presence of εὐπροσωπέω and the uses of διώκω we have noted encourage us to reasonably consider this.

This is not a difficult position to hold, however, if we can ignore the pressure of a traditional interpretation. We showed above that the nuance of διώκω is contextually affected. As a result, the honour language (εὐπροσωπέω, καυχάμαι) in 6.12 should be read as the surrounding context in which to interpret διώκω. If the opponents wish to gain honour for themselves, by implication, they must emerge victorious from an honour contest, the result of which would defeat whatever or whoever was challenging them. If, as we have argued, honour is not conceptual, but ‘real’, then the quest for honour will always attract ‘pursuers’, ‘persecutors’ or ‘prosecutors’, it is the nature of a challenge and riposte culture. What we see, therefore, in 6.12 is two sides of one coin.

\textsuperscript{668} Nanos (2002b: 221).
\textsuperscript{669} pace Nanos (2002b: 221).
\textsuperscript{670} Downing (1999: 69f).
\textsuperscript{671} Collins (1984: 69).
\textsuperscript{672} Philo sees shame as one of three causes for ‘flight’ (φυγή), the others being fear and hatred, \textit{Fug.} 546.3.
\textsuperscript{673} Das (2014: 635), Dunn (1993a: 336).
\textsuperscript{674} Longenecker (1990: 270). At least one early scribe saw the harassment as inevitable, cf. the present indicative passive διώκοντας in Ψ\textsuperscript{46}, B, K, and Ψ.
There is still only one motive on display here. The constant conflict for superior status always threatened honour already gained to the extent that the actions involving defending or seeking honour are indistinguishable. Similarly, it is difficult to differentiate motives as to whether a person is largely driven by the quest for more honour, or purely (cf. μόσχον) to avoid shame. As a result of this, not to mention the lack of any further data relating to a violent threat, we suggest that the opponents, in Paul’s representation, are not under threat from a physical persecution, but they are engaged in a pursuit and defence of honour.

4.3.2 The Cross as a Threat to the Opponents’ Face

Further evidence that the threat to the opponents is honour-based is provided by Paul’s use of τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (6.12). As Dunn notes, this is not the first time that Paul pejoratively juxtaposes the opponents with the cross, whether implicitly or explicitly (2.18-21; 3.1-2, 10-13; 5.2-6, 11). Σταυρός, in this context, is being used as a metonym for the offence created by the mixed Christian community. Therefore, whereas the traditional reading of this verse sees Paul awkwardly introducing a real physical threat to the opponents late in the letter, this approach reads 6.12 in conjunction with Paul’s accusations in 4.17, where status rather than violence is the concern.

Our reading repositions σταυρός as the face threat to the opponents. Not as a threat of violence from a third party source, but as a threat of shame before their ‘court of reputation’ (cf. 5.11). Paul’s reading of the cross’s impact on status issues will be the focus of the next chapter, but it suffices here to say that the face-threat to the opponents

---

675 Occasionally this threat has been, without apparent evidence, seen as a threat to the Galatians also, e.g. Kuhn (1982b).
676 Dunn (1993a: 337).
679 This problem is partially caused by a rigid commitment to read τῷ σταυρῷ a priori as causative. However, without a clear system for identifying the subcategory of an instrumental dative, this seems to be an exegetical, rather than grammatical, decision to exclusively read cause over means (e.g. Betz (1979: 315), cf. BDF §196, Robertson (1919: 532), Wallace (1996: 168)). While it may not be overly necessary, or even possible, to precisely delineate ‘means’ against ‘cause’, the rendering ‘because of’ implies a level of motive that may not be always present in the causative. Therefore a causative rendered ‘by’ or ‘on the basis of’ may suffice, cf. Wallace (1996: 167). Further, as Robertson notes (526), precise distinction with the dative in Κοίμη is difficult in the NT period.
is being generated, in Paul’s view, by the cross itself — or more specifically, by what allegiance to the cross will demand of them. This is not unusual Pauline thought. In Philippians the cross even has enemies (cf. 3.17), specifically those who are overly concerned about their δόξα and unwilling to consider good status as σκόταλα (3.8).

The notion of the cross as a threat to honour is evident throughout Galatians, more so than the idea of a third party violent opposition. The issue of benefit (ὤφιλέω) has been raised in relation to Christ’s actions in 5.2, while his death is an intentional challenge to sensibilities in 5.11 (τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ). Two texts in particular are worth considering. In 2.3-5, the ψευδαδέλφοι respond negatively to the gospel’s implications for Titus. Paul recounts in typical ‘challenge and riposte’ manner here by affirming the totality of his victory, for the sake of the gospel, in the situation.680 Similarly, in Antioch (2.11-14), the group from James, likely the ψευδαδέλφοι once more (see §4.4), challenge Peter’s adherence to the gospel, a challenge to which he and Barnabas succumb.681 The ψευδαδέλφοι rightly interpret the honour implications of the cross as a challenge to their perceived superior status and act accordingly, as a result they understand the cross as a challenge to their face, and consequently, we argue, as something which is threatening (διώκω) them. To the Galatians themselves, the cross’s challenge to status was not initially seen as problematic (3.1-4; 4:13-15), but by the time Paul writes this is no longer the case. Given that we have these occasions in the letter where the cross is presented as a threat to issues of status, is it not reasonable to assume that 6.12-13 does not introduce a new set of problems? When we understand 6.12-13 to reference a harassment due to the cross, rather than a persecution because of the cross, it offers an insight into Paul’s perspective on the opponents’ interpretation and their response to his gospel consistent with the letter and what we know of honour culture. Furthermore, it seems an atypically Pauline deflection to frame this opposition to the opponents’ honour as ‘the cross’ rather than ‘my gospel’ (as it was referenced in the Jerusalem agreement, cf. 1.11-12).

We should now note the support for an honour reading of 6.12-13. Connecting διώκω to honour concerns allows us to see this verb and εὑροποσάκεω as related without

ignoring the strength of μόνον. The importance of the cross as an honour threat in Galatians further supports reading σταυρός as that which is threatening the status of the opponents. The possibility that the cross is generating the face concern can be further seen in the boast-worthiness of the cross for Paul. The opponents are pursuing the circumcision of gentile Christians so that they can boast ‘in their flesh’ (ἵνα ἐν τῇ ἑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται). In 6.14 Paul offers the contrasting boast (καυχάσθαι) in the cross. It seems that the cross is often connected to honour for Paul.

4.4 Honour Conflict: Jerusalem and οἱ περιτετμομένοι

One question that requires answering as a result of this, however, is how circumcising the Galatians will deflect this threat to the honour of the opponents. Understanding this requires us to draw together Paul’s implicit connection between the οἱ περιτετμομένοι (6.13) and Jerusalem. Since Johannes Munck a variety of proposals have attempted to argue that περιτετμομένοι references the Galatian audience rather than the opponents. Later Betz claimed it was impossible to be conclusive on an interpretation of οἱ περιτετμομένοι. However, the participle, when read as a middle rather than passive, can be understood as a continued reference to the opponents, thereby including 6.13 in Paul’s accusation from 6.12. The various alternatives depend on detecting an unsignaled switch between opponents and readers in the passage while also ignoring that throughout the letter he has always referred to the Galatians in the second person and the opponents in the third. In light of Paul’s negative comments about circumcision and its relationship to Christ, especially 5.2-4, οἱ περιτετμομένοι reads as a somewhat condescending reference to the opponents. However, care must be taken not to lose the accusation in the midst of the discussion. Using ‘circumcisers’ as a

682 Munck (1959: 87-90, 129-134), although his argument seems motivated to deny the Tübingen school’s argument that the Jewish Church was the original representation of the Church (p.134).
684 de Boer (2011: 398). 𝒉⁴⁶ offers a variant perfect περιτετμομένοι, but the variant in the middle would still refer to the opponents. NA27 cites K A C D supporting the present.
686 A good example of this tendency, although also a helpful summary of the possibilities of this substantive participle is Nanos (2002b: 234-242).
label is most significant as it highlights to the Galatians three important aspects of these opponents.

First, the opponents’ insistence on circumcision should imply their own careful obedience to the law (5.3), but instead they are accused of not doing what they do as part of their ‘keeping of the law’ (NB: the continuous sense of the present indicative φυλάσσουσιν), but (ἀλλὰ) are actually motivated by honour and using the Galatians’ to improve it. This is, contrary to some commentators, not a statement about the opponents ability to obey the law, rather it challenges the assumption that the opponents are being motivated by a ‘zeal for Torah’ by implying that the boast is more important to them (cp. 4:17). Second, the nomenclature emphasises their disconnectedness from Christ (cf. 5.4) and tarnishes their reputation, as they wish to boast in the Galatians, unlike Paul who will not boast, μὴ γένοιτο (6.14), except regarding Christ’s cross (cf. 6.14).

Thirdly it is important to identify the similarity between οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι and the τίνας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου in 2.12 — Paul labels them τούς ἐκ περιτομῆς. This designation parallels the Antioch troublemakers with the Galatian opponents by emphasising the characteristic feature of their respective positions. The similarities in social concern are apparent also. The Galatian opponents are concerned about their face in light of the cross (6.12f), whilst the delegation who arrive in Antioch clearly apply social pressure, whether implicitly or explicitly, to Peter and Barnabas, as a result of their unhappiness with the Antioch assembly’s interpretation of the social impact of the cross (2.11f). Paul’s interpretation of these events show his perspective on the parallel stakes involved. Barnabas and Peter’s concern for their own social standing drags them ‘out of step’ (οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν) with the truth of the gospel (ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) by compelling (ἀναγκάζοντο) the Antioch gentiles to be circumcised (2.14). The

687 Du Toit (1994a: 157, 160) notes that without this reading this statement contradicts what Paul has said throughout about the importance of the law to the opponents, cf. Hardin (2008: 89).


689 ὀρθοποδοῦσιν is likely figurative of norms of conduct, preceding later ideas of ‘orthodoxy’, cf. Bultmann (1955), DeSilva (2014: 39). ἀναγκάζοντο followed by accusative and infinitive often refers to the contention that something is necessary (e.g. Dio Chrysostom Or. 7.106. cf. Liddell, Scott, and Jones (1996: §A.4), Winter (2015: 238)).
similarities are stark. The Galatians’ ‘good running’ according to ‘the truth’ (ἐτρέχετε καλῶς 5.7) is being hindered by another party’s concern for their own prestige (4.17, 6.12). Even if the social status issues in Antioch are ignored, Paul presents his interaction with Peter in 2.11 as an honour conflict situation. It is difficult to read this verse as anything other than a face challenge. In Jerusalem, possibly to prevent conflict, Paul privately meets ‘the pillars’ (2.2) to work out an equality agreement regarding τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας (2.7). In contrast, the public failure to maintain this agreement results in a πρόσωπον challenge to Peter (2.11) on the basis of his inconsistency (2.13) which is difficult to interpret as other than an honour challenge. Implicitly, Paul also accuses Peter of a similar hypocrisy as οἱ περιτεµένοι in 6.13. It is not ‘keeping the law’ (6.13) that concerns him, but, as proved by reneging on the agreed position, Peter is shown to value social prestige over gospel theology.

The phrase ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου and the verb ἀναγκάζομαι also appeared in 2:3-5 when Paul recounted his visit with Barnabas and Titus to Jerusalem to validate his ministry work amongst the uncircumcised (μὴ ποιεῖ τὸν τρέχοντα ἡ ἄδοµον 2.2). The connection between the Antioch and Jerusalem narratives is rarely denied on account of their close proximity, genre, language, and the importance of circumcision in both accounts. We might even note the similar use of perambulatory metaphors (2.2, 14). Whilst Titus did not succumb to be circumcised, even voluntarily, the pressure was evident (ἀναγκάζομαι 2.3), and Paul offers a clear juxtaposition of Titus and the Antiochene gentiles — neither are Jews (cf. Ἑλλην ὁν at 2.3). The logic to Paul’s parallel description of these two situations is clarified during the Jerusalem incident, with identical stakes — a failure to resist the pressure from the ψευδαδέλφοι

---

690 On the possibility that the private meeting was to avoid honour conflict see Esler (1995a: 294).
692 Campbell (2014: 156) argues that the athletic metaphors link Paul’s various opponents suggesting that they may all have a similar Jerusalem source. Whilst athletic metaphor suited the Greco-Roman attitude towards contest (cf. Joubert (2000: 43)), we note the warning in Sumney (1999: 22) about over-reading ‘connecting’ language.
693 For discussion of the suggestion, and the problems it causes for Paul’s wider argument, that Titus voluntarily agreed to be circumcised see Esler (1995a: 295). cf. Riches (2008: 100f) and also Lightfoot (1884: 107f) on the exclusion of οἱ οὐδὲ in a Western MSS of D.
has direct implications for the Galatians, Paul must defend his position on the ‘truth of the gospel’ ἵνα...διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς (2.5). Ὑμᾶς here serves to emphatically drive home the ‘striking’ link Paul intends to draw between Jerusalem, Antioch, and Galatia. The constant references to circumcision and the stakes of the gospel, combined with the use of variants of ἀναγκάζειν in 2.3, 2.14 and 6.12 draw a clear connection between the events in Antioch and Jerusalem and the situation in Galatia. The importance of these parallels can be seen in 5.7 where we encounter an echo of the Jerusalem-Antioch-Galatia language — obedience to the truth, a running metaphor, an allusion to circumcision, and the opponents’ face-concern all appear in relation to the Galatians — Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν [τῇ] ἁλθεῖσθαι μὴ πείθεσθαι. With half of the 10 references to Jerusalem in the extant Pauline letters appearing in Galatians (1.17, 18, 2.1, 4.25, 26), plus the city being referenced as the mother of the opponents, we should, surely, take these connections seriously. The tendency, found as early as Chrysostom, to read the biographical data within Galatians as a defence of Paul’s apostleship unrelated to the letter’s purpose (cf. §6.3.2), is increasingly rejected by modern scholarship. Regardless, the events in Jerusalem and Antioch themselves are still perceived to be loose in relation to the rest of the letter, considered either exemplary or simply related to similar theological issues.

Whilst some have argued that 1.7 and 5.10 imply that Paul is uncertain of the identity of the opponents, it was common to depict antagonists in such a vague way so as to highlight their ‘hidden agenda’, or even refer to them in a derisive manner. Betz

---

696 The close proximity of 5.11-12 ensures the allusion is not missed. It is worth noting that the following μικρά ζόμη quote in 5.9, also appears in 1 Corinthians 5.6, where ‘boasting’ is the focus. Might this further confirm the honour context of 5.7 and the wider narrative?
697 cf. Martyn (1997a: 457f.).
699 cf. Gaventa (1986: 310f) for consideration of these positions. See also Verseput (1993).
argued that Paul did not want to give away any free publicity! In light of our discussion, however, we should ask whether there are too many similarities between the opposition in each situation to only postulate a thematic connection. More explicitly, the language connections we have encountered, when combined with the consistent presentation of the opponents in each situation as a group who are resisting the implications of the cross by emphasising the importance of circumcision for gentiles, encourages us to consider whether the connection between Jerusalem, Antioch and Galatia is that the opponents, the ψευδαδέλφοι, and τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς are one and the same group of people.

The connection between the Galatian opponents and Jerusalem has been postulated since F.C. Baur’s reconstruction of the ‘two missions’ of the Jesus movement established a strong tradition of defending the Jerusalem locus of the opponents and their ‘judiazing’ intentions. More recently the influence of Sanders and the New Perspective on Paul’s questions about Judaism as a meritocratic religion has allowed for ‘more diverse, more cautious, and more nuanced’ reconstructions of the opponents themselves. However, a substantial variety of recent scholars have, with associated modifications, continued to explore the Jerusalem locus of the opponents sufficiently to suggest the position has merit. We find particular agreement with Francis Watson’s argument that not only is this connection ‘most likely’, but that the ‘long explanation of the pre-history of the Galatian crisis only makes sense if the Galatian crisis was a

702 Betz (1979: 49n65). He notes the similar reference to the Paulinists in the Epistle of Peter 2.3 ‘Some from amongst the gentiles’ and the comparable logic in Ignatius (Smyrna 5.3). Interestingly Chrysostom offers an honour logic to the anonymity, ‘that they might not become more shameless’. Du Toit (1994b: 407).

703 Baur (2003: 1.109f). Generally, commentators have been reticent, as was Baur, to strongly implicate ‘the pillars’ or the Jerusalem church itself in this connection. Baur (2003: 1.134). The ‘two missions’ term is from Goulder (1994: 6). The nomenclature ‘Judiazers’ is both wrong and problematic (Dunn (1993a: 9n2)), although it persists amongst scholarship despite the faulty view it perpetuates. See a recent example of this persistence in Wilson (2013: loc.224n4) and Hardin (2013: 153n31).


continuation of the controversy described in Galatians 2. In addition Paul’s insistence that he is repeating himself suggests that he expected this conflict and as such forewarned the Galatians when he visited them (1.9, 5.21).

4.4.1 Challenge and Riposte in Jerusalem, Antioch and then Galatia

Generally attempts to source a Jerusalem connection for the opponents explore the obviously present theological framework. However, the foregoing discussion allows us to use our method to ask questions about the social concern involved and what that reveals about the conflict. The difficulty of focussing on theological conflict in Galatia is Paul’s suggestion that the opponents are not particularly interested in circumcision per se (6.12-13), but its social implications. Ironically it is Paul that attaches the theological implications to circumcision. If there is, as we argue, a connection between these situations, perhaps the better question is to ask how they relate to Paul’s claim in 6.12 that the Galatian opponents are saving-face (ἐὑπροσωπέω) by having the Galatians circumcised?

A particularly useful contribution of Esler’s article ‘Making and Breaking an Agreement Mediterranean Style’ is his application of Bourdieu’s challenge and riposte model to Galatians 2.1-14 and how it might relate to our question here. Esler rightly detects an honour challenge in Paul’s initial visit to Jerusalem, with the uncircumcised Titus serving to challenge ‘the pillars’ in the typically ‘rugged confrontational style’ of Mediterranean culture. The success of this challenge results in the accord between the apostles, despite the ψευδαδέλφοι, culminating in the δεξιά κοινωνίας (2.9, which Esler reads as a mark of the superiority of ‘the pillars’).

We do disagree with some points of detail, however, as the essay often appears to rely on a mirror-reading reconstruction of the content of private conversations. Our main

---

concern is with Esler’s conclusions regarding δεξιά. 713 If the handshake is a condescension of Paul it is unconvincing that an honour sensitive reader would miss this, regardless of Paul’s supposed attempts to blur its meaning. Esler rejects J.P. Sampley’s position that the handshake is a Greco-Roman contract form, arguing instead that the Maccabean literature evidences a more likely source for the behaviour of ‘five Jews in Jerusalem’ (1 Maccabees 6.58; 11.50, 62, 66; 13.45, 50; 2 Maccabees 4.34; 11.26; 12.11-12; 13.22; 14.19). 714 The Maccabean references are read to support his position that ‘giving the right hand’ is always performed by the socially superior character. 715 However, on examination, the texts are not as explicit as Esler suggests, with the giving, taking, or offering of ‘the right hand’ sometimes coming from the person in the situation requiring mercy, namely the defeated (1 Maccabees 6.58; 11.66; 13.50), or the socially inferior (2 Maccabees 4.34; 11.26), or both the superior and inferior (2 Maccabees 13.22). The MT uses a comparable notion (נתן with יד) in 1 Chronicles 29.24 and Lamentations 5.6 that further blurs the social positions involved (2 Kings 10.15; Ezra 10.19; Ezekiel 17.18). Furthermore, in Galatians we find Esler’s reading difficult as Paul has just achieved his intention of having his gospel approved, which is hardly a defeated position requiring mercy. Das seems broadly right that δεξιά κοινωνίας is ‘socially ambiguous’. 716 If δεξιά were a technical term, as Esler argues, then the modifying effect of κοινωνία should not be ignored, as he does. 717 However, Betz and Sampley see κοινωνία as the key marker that 2.9 references the formalising of an agreement of peaceful brotherhood between equals and it is difficult not to agree. 718 Further to this, Esler contends that Paul’s failure to gain an oath on the private agreement in Jerusalem allows Peter to ignore the agreement publicly in Antioch without being considered a liar due to a Mediterranean attitude towards truth-telling (2.11-14). 719 However, Esler’s argument that only modern Western values find this

715 Although Esler (1995a: 299n15) concedes that there is at least one awkward text, 1 Maccabees 6.58.
716 Das (2014: 190).
problematic ignores Paul’s face-challenge of ὑπόκρισις which implies that, at very least, Paul considered Peter’s behaviour problematic.

More important, however, is the ‘goodness of fit’ of Esler’s use of Bourdieu’s challenge and riposte model for Galatians as a whole.720 We argue that its usefulness is even broader than Esler’s argument.721 Whereas Esler traces certain challenge and riposte features between ‘the pillars’ and Paul in Jerusalem,722 we suggest that the entire conflict of the letter shows considerable evidence of there being an ongoing challenge and riposte with the ψευδαδέλφοι.723 The private nature of Paul’s initial interaction with ‘the pillars’, thereby nullifying the honour threat, and that the only apparent reaction to his arrival in Jerusalem is from the ψευδαδέλφοι encourages us to read the conflict differently than Esler.724

Beginning with Paul’s arrival in Jerusalem we note that he faces a challenge to freedom and the ‘truth of the gospel’ (2.4-5). ‘The pillars’, however, are happy with Paul. Yet, by the time Peter and Paul are in Antioch something apparently happens in Jerusalem that allows a group to arrive ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου (2.12) with approval to reject the previous agreement.725 As Bourdieu’s model claims, it is unlikely that any group would accept losing a challenge without looking for an opportunity to quickly respond. Antioch appears to be that response. Having ‘lost’ on their own ground in Jerusalem, for some ψευδαδέλφοι to riposte by gaining the upper hand in Antioch is a significant response. Paul’s response to Peter does not cover the fact that it is those from Jerusalem who remain the antagonists (2.13). Significantly, the accusation of hypocrisy to Peter’s πρόσωπον is accompanied by no mention of a response from Peter. Commentators generally do not consider this significant,726 and neither, interestingly, does Esler. This

720 cf. Appendix §1.3 on ‘Goodness of fit’.
721 We note that Esler is not opposed to the possibility of book-wide application of this model, as he applies it in this way to the book of Judith in Esler (2001: 67-69).
723 Longenecker (1990: 51) notes that the definite article τοὺς here might link the ψευδαδέλφοι to the opponents. Although he only sees a parallel where we see a connection.
725 It is difficult not to make this assumption. cf. Esler (1995a: 304).
726 The exception is Hays (2000: 231), although he reads it as Paul avoiding mentioning that he lost the conflict in Antioch.
is despite both the Greco-Roman texts and Bourdieu’s model interpreting silence as a defeat.

The scholarly tendency is to assume that Paul’s failure to explicitly state otherwise implies that he loses the conflict in Antioch and is subsequently now dealing with the problem in Galatia. However, this logic proves false as Paul’s insistence on his alignment with the Jerusalem apostles would seem weak or unnecessary if he was later unwilling to consider their modifications — why mention Jerusalem in support of his position if they now no longer held said position? Rather, a challenge and riposte reading suggests that Antioch was anything other than a defeat for Paul, signalled both by the silence and it forming the basis for his argument to the Galatians. Importantly, it also provides a reason for Paul still having to deal with the situation in Galatia. Peter’s resounding loss in Antioch, signalled by his silence, implicates the ψευδαδέλφοι in that defeat. Therefore, as they did after Jerusalem, they have gathered themselves for a response and this time pursued Paul to Galatia for a counter-punch. A challenge and riposte model shows the Galatian situation to be the ψευδαδέλφοι riposte to Antioch.

Widening the application of the model to incorporate the exigency of the whole epistle and identifying the sequence of challenges that have happened prior to Paul’s writing does make sense of Paul’s claim that seeking honour via the Galatians is the primary aim of the opponents. Should the Galatians cede to this pressure it would result in a victory for the ψευδαδέλφοι over Paul and his gospel. A loss in Galatia would also


728 Russell (1997: 114n16) argues that seeing Antioch as a defeat for Paul is the result of an overly Western orientation when reading. cf. Silva (2001: 110).

729 Curiously, unlike Theissen (1982: 40) argues about Corinth, the animosity in Galatia directly involves Paul.

730 Notably, each of Paul’s responses to the ψευδαδέλφοι challenges are to seek equality rather than honour. In Jerusalem there is the handshake (2.9), in Galatia he still seeks peace over conflict (6.17), whilst in Antioch he offers a theological rationale to defend unity in diversity rather than segregation via circumcision (2.15-21). Unnecessarily extensive argument has taken place over whether 2.15-21 form part of the Antioch conversation. However, 2.17 suggests that it is part of the speech as it seems to refer directly to Peter’s position, and would not obviously apply to a gentile audience. Rhetorically, however, it seems that it is intended to function as both a response to Peter (formally) and a challenge to
imply that a hierarchal system of status segregation was applicable in the Galatian assemblies. We suggest that the situation in Galatia has good fit for Bourdieu’s model and makes good use of the data. Honour challenges can repeat for extended periods with no apparent limit to the level of escalation. What we encounter here is typical, expected even. ‘[V]engeance is positively valued and triply motivated,’ Cohen notes, ‘Men take vengeance because they fear shame and desire to preserve and enhance their honor…because in such societies it is the only way to deter others from harming them.’

4.4.1.1 On-Going Honour Concern in Galatians 5.11

In the following chapter we will consider how Paul sets himself up in contrast to the opponents in Galatians, which we see clearly in the content of the boasting in 6.13-14. However, we should note here how this reading affects 5.11. This has often been read to suggest that Paul is being accused of still (ἔτι) preaching circumcision in other assemblies. Barclay maintains, however, that this passage does not need to be a refutation of an accusation but rather it is a simple contrast between Paul and the opponents entirely in keeping with the profile we have developed. Unsurprisingly, we reject the idea that this passage refers to the threat of violent persecution. The διώκοω in reference here is exactly the situation we have just discussed, the continuing conflict with Jerusalem. This is evidenced by the reference to the τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. Not only were the implications of the cross the cause of the beginnings of this conflict, the closing line of the Antioch account, 2.21, is synonymous with 5.11. Christ dying δωρεὰν parallels the idea of the nullification of the cross’s offence, both of which would be concomitant on Paul endorsing gentile circumcision. Therefore, the διώκοω of 5.11 is again a reference to those from Jerusalem who are pursuing Paul across the Mediterranean. The ψευδαδέλφοι are still (ἔτι) attempting to regain the honour they lost in Jerusalem, which in Paul’s mind is as a result of the cross. Were Paul to begin

---

731 Esler (1995a: 295) rightly notes that in Acts a murderous mob is the response to some of Paul’s rhetoric (21.27ff, 23.12f).
733 cf. Bruce (1982: 236f) and Howard (1990: 44). A more adventurous suggestion has recently been posited by Campbell (2011) that Paul did once preach circumcision.
promoting circumcision the opponents would interpret that as them having finally achieved what they set out to in Jerusalem and thereby lose their need to continue challenging Paul. For Paul, of course, the stakes are higher than that, for the opponents can also ‘win’ by convincing the Galatians of their message, hence, we argue, Paul pens the letter.  

4.4.1.2 Zeal for Status in Galatians 4.17

The final passage which suggests that honour is a motivating factor in this conflict is 4.17. Having established that the conflict driving the opponents is actually a pursuit of Paul, he can subsequently assert that their behaviour towards the Galatians is dishonourable (οὐ καλῶς). In addition to this, ‘zeal’ (ζηλοῦσιν), particularly towards the law, was a characteristic of Paul’s previous life (1.14) and thereby a marker of a rejected system, which draws a further vilifying contrast between Paul and the opponents.  

Significantly, ζῆλος language is found within the semantic range of honour concern in the ancient world. ‘Zeal for good’ often describes the behaviour of the one ‘fervently dedicated’ to imitating that which is honourable (Dio Chrysostom Or. 55.4-5, cf. §3.4.1.1, §3.4.3). The inscriptions regularly use a ζῆλος cognate to encourage emulation of those honoured. Nanos identifies ‘emulative jealousy’ (ζῆλος) as the regular response of those shamed who are attempting to regain or maintain their social status. The logic of this reading then matches what we have encountered in 6.12-13 and elsewhere in this chapter. The opponents believe that they can regain their standing if the Galatians are sufficiently attracted to their ‘superior’ circumcised status and emulate them by accepting circumcision (note the ironic threat of ἐκκλείσαι). We will consider the issue of imitation later (§6.4.1f), but for now it should suffice to note that this reading of ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς is synonymous with...

---

734 Barclay (1987: 79). More recently Hardin (2013: 153) has advanced this position to suggest that Paul may even be on the attack, aiming to create an ‘impassable gulf’ between the two parties.  
735 We might note the slavery reference in 5.1 which parallels 2.4 further evidencing the connection, perhaps?  
736 Das (2014: 468) also detects an honour reference in οὐ καλῶς.  
737 Du Toit (1994b: 407) notes that this type of denigrating presentation of enemies is common. cf. ἐν σαρκί at 6.12.  
how we have read 6.12-13 but it also follows the pattern we might expect if using the challenge and riposte model to identify the Jerusalem origin of the opponents is valid.

4.5 Conclusion
In this chapter we have considered the possibility that the conflict we encounter in the pages of Galatians is an honour-based conflict typical of those we encounter in the ancient world. We began by suggesting that the primary motive of the opponents in 6.12-13 is that of εὐπροσωπέω. We concluded, against the most popular recent interpretations, that this is a reference to ‘face concern’, the commonly-held desire to preserve public prestige. The close proximity of boasting language supported this connection. As a result, we argued that the opponents were more concerned about their honour than any theological concern for the Galatian gentiles. Rather than hypothesise an anachronistic position on persecution, we defended this reading by arguing that the best way to preserve the sense of the verses in light of the use of μόνον was to argue that ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται referred to the social pressure that the opponents were feeling as a result of the social implications of the cross.

We then considered the unexplained element of 6.12-13, namely the question of how circumcising the gentile Galatians functioned to save face for the opponents. To do this we followed Esler’s use of Bourdieu’s challenge and riposte conflict model, but we applied it more broadly to argue that Galatians tracks a sequence of challenges that can be traced back to Paul’s visit to Jerusalem. Here we argued that the evidence as a result of the model suggests that the opponents now in Galatia are exactly those he has engaged with previously. This reading both identifies the opponents as the ψευδαδέλφοι from Jerusalem as well as implicitly offering an explanation for the presence of the biographical chapters in the letter, meanwhile showing the importance of being honour alert when interpreting the exigence of the epistle. Despite the use of a model to begin this investigation, we also observe that this is a text-based reconstruction.

However, with the exception of the important connection we drew between εὐπροσωπέω in 6.12 and Paul’s theological premise at 2.6 we have not yet explored Paul’s dissatisfaction with the opponents’ intentions and how this honour reading
influences a reading of Paul’s response in Galatians. This will, however, be the focus of the next chapter as we begin to deal with the issue of his ‘boast in the cross’ (6.14f).
5. Cruciformed Prestige: The Christ Who Does Not ‘Take Face’

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter we argued that the tensions in Galatia between Paul and the opponents can be understood as typical of the conflict over honour we might expect in the ancient world. The εὐπροσωπέω wish of the opponents revealed a concern for their own social position rather than any commitment to the religious standing of the Galatian gentiles. From Paul’s perspective, the opponents were unwilling to accept the social implications of the cross and this was an ongoing argument that we traced, referencing Bourdieu’s challenge and riposte model, from Jerusalem through Antioch to the present situation Paul is addressing in Galatians. This was an important step for the thesis as it both defends a core contention of the project, namely that an awareness of honour concern is necessary for an interpretation of the exigency of the epistle, whilst also supporting the ongoing shape of the investigation.

What we have not yet unpacked is why Paul chooses to present his concerns with the opponents in the particular way that he does. We have noted, alongside the majority of scholarship, that Paul had a particular theological problem with the hierarchical intentions of the opponents. Less noted, however, is his problem with their honour-seeking behaviour and the logic of that objection. Unusually, Paul’s issue with the opponents’ attempt to gain honour at his expense is not what we might expect from an honour context. Rather than a predictable defence of his own honour, Paul apparently objects to the whole process of status seeking in his contention that πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἄνθρωποι οὐ λαμβάνει (2.6), thereby he counsels the cross as the only source of pride (6:14). In this chapter we will argue that Paul’s problem with the opponents is beyond
their vendetta against him personally.  Rather, the opponents’ insistence that prestige can be gained by a commitment to a hierarchical model of community (divided into circumcised and non-circumcised) is, in Paul’s mind, evidence of their refusal to trust in Christ and the status-leveling implications of the cross for the gospel. Paul’s insistence that the gospel cannot endorse a ‘two-tiered’ community and survive as a reality requires him to reconfigure the normal understanding of community prestige or honour. We will argue that this position is established in his contention that he will only boast in the cross (6.14). Whilst the locus of the argument in Galatians is focused on circumcised status, Paul relates this localised debate to the wider implications of the gospel and the need to understand how it affects normal community life. To show this we will consider how Paul’s phrase in 6.14, Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ, is a claim to redefine honour on the basis of Christ’s unusual heroic action in facing crucifixion. This behaviour of Christ will then be presented as the basis of Paul’s contention that the Christian community is disinterested in ordinary status distinctions as they have been nullified by Christ for the community. This position is exemplified in the statement in 3.28 but in keeping with a theme we track throughout the letter.

5.2 Ἐὑπροσωπέω as Conflict over Precedence

Returning to 6.12-17, reading Ἐὑπροσωπέω as Paul’s primary complaint against the opponents’ honour concern is further visible when 6.12a-b is juxtaposed with 6.13b-c:

12a - Ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὑπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκὶ
12b - οὕτωι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι
13b - ἀλλὰ θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι
13c - ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκί καυχῆσονται

Here we can note the comparable language. The repeated use of θέλω, ἐν σαρκὶ, and περιτέμνω combined with the thematic similarity of the Galatians’ intended action being the catalyst for the opponents’ status improvement defend the idea that the same concept is simply being repeated. The noticeable difference is the appearance of καυχῆσονται in place of εὑπροσωπῆσαι. Καυχάμαι functioning synonymously with Ἐὑπροσωπέω.

This is an important observation often missed by those who suggest that Paul writes Galatians (esp. 1-2) in defence of his own apostleship. cf. Longenecker (1998: 29n9). Self-defence is uncharacteristic for Paul, e.g. Philippians 1.15-18, cf. Hooker (2000: 488).
further evidences that honour is a concern here.\textsuperscript{742} According to our facework model (§3.4.1) the opponents’ boast attempts to establish honour precedence amongst the Galatians on the basis of circumcised status.

Paul’s fear is not dissimilar to that of the opponents’ apparent concerns about Paul’s gospel, namely that if their behaviour is considered ‘approved’ then they set a behavioural precedent — their actions become honourable and thereby normative. There have been hints of this already in the letter. Paul is concerned about the οὐ καλῶς desires (θέλω) of the opponents in seeking emulation from the Galatians (4.17).\textsuperscript{743} Imitation from the Galatians, in the form of being circumcised, would also serve to validate the boasting of the opponents. This is the cyclic form of honour precedence that we expect from our model — the claim to honour is established and modelled by those wishing to gain status in the group.\textsuperscript{744} This, we will argue, is Paul’s actual concern with the ζηλος of the opponents (4.17) — their wish to have their values established by Galatian scars will validate a ‘good face’ that Paul sees as threatening to the gospel.

Concern to preserve ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (2.5) is a dominant theme in the conflicts recounted in Galatians, from 1.6f and onwards. In addition to the three θέλω references (4.17; 6.12, 13) to the opponents’ honour claims that Paul rejects, in 1.7 their wishes are described as an attempt to modify the gospel. Μεταστρέφω implies a focus on the intended result of the opponents’ wish — that the gospel be adjusted to suit their values, in stark contrast to Paul’s intentions (cf. 2.5).\textsuperscript{745} There are four things the opponents wish (θέλω):

1.7 - θέλοντες μεταστρέψατο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ
4.7 - ἐκκλείσασα ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοίς ζηλοῦτε

\textsuperscript{742} Bligh (1966: 217) and Hardin (2008: 89) notice this synonymity, although not the honour.

\textsuperscript{743} Eastman (2007: 54) wonders whether the opponents might see their zeal and loyalty to Torah as comparably imitable as that which is encouraged for emulation by 4 Maccabees 9.23 and 13.9. Ζηλός includes ideas of ‘passionate commitment’ but also is used in LXX regarding God’s exclusive claim on Israel, cf. Stumpf (1965: 884). In Plutarch Mor. 544D it is also used of emulation (cf. §3.4.1.1).

\textsuperscript{744} We discussed ζηλος as ‘emulative jealousy’ at §4.4.1.2. cf. Nanos (2002b: 108n42), Lappenga (2012: 777).

\textsuperscript{745} Louw and Nida (1989) list μεταστρέφω as ‘to cause a change of state, with emphasis upon the difference in the resulting state’ (13.64).
6.12 - θέλουσιν εὑπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί
6.13 - θέλουσιν ύμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται

It is significant for this argument that when Paul, in the closing of the letter, chose to return to the issue of the opponents’ wishes he describes them in terms of establishing a claim to honour, rather than, as we might expect, the harsher language of threatening the gospel.

Drawing these verses into comparison (1.7; 4.17; 6.12, 13) suggests that the truth of the gospel is not threatened solely on the basis of the Galatians ceding to the circumcision advice of the opponents. Rather, Paul’s accusation that the opponents are not theologically motivated (6.13a), combined with his attack on their honour-seeking behaviour, suggests that a social concern is primary. The gospel is threatened by any attempt to apply differentiated value to variegated status, hence Paul responds by framing their status-seeking behaviour as ἐν σαρκί, thereby further denigrating their standing in relation to the gospel. However, the apparent strangeness of Paul’s response to their claim to honour in 6.14 with a counter-boast ‘in the cross’ is rooted in his understanding of God’s prosopagnosia.

5.2.1 Boasting in the Cross

Paul nearly rejects all boasting behaviour (μὴ γένοιτο), but stops short by offering an exception (εἰ μή), the validation of a singular type of boasting, that which is ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (6.14).

This is noteworthy for two reasons. Firstly, the Romans specifically designed their mode of crucifixion as a status degradation ritual. The cross rather than simply being a brutal torture device was intended as an effective method of social devastation with its ability to continue to dishonour even after death as corpses hung as advertisements, examples of the effects of certain life choices. Tarquinius Priscus evidenced the post-mortem shame potential of a cross by crucifying the bodies of suicide victims (Pliny Nat. 36:107-108), whilst the

747 This is an important observation for our thesis — cp. the more common opinion, that Paul rejects all boasting, in Engberg-Pedersen (2000: 155) and Hübner (1984: 101). There is a possible discussion about whether δι’ οὗ in 6.14 is masculine, referring to Jesus, or neuter, focussed on the cross. However, given that Paul rarely separates Christ too far from the cross (Galatians 2.20, 3.1, cp. 1 Corinthians 1.23), a strong position on this grammar seems unnecessary, pace Bryant (2001: 191n86).
oft posted guard at a crucifixion site was to prevent those loyal to the victims from rescuing their honour by removing them from the cross prematurely (cf. Petronius 111).\textsuperscript{749} To utilise the cross as a \textit{locus} of glory as Paul implies here requires some consideration.\textsuperscript{750} Secondly, boasting, as a ‘tool for socially acceptable self-aggrandizement and public display’, inherently functioned to highlight difference and emphasise the exclusive or hierarchic.\textsuperscript{751} Difference was the basis of any claim to honour, for, ‘if everyone attains equal honour then there is no honour for anyone’.\textsuperscript{752} The hubris common amongst ancient groups was expressly focussed on accentuating difference.\textsuperscript{753} Paul, however, offers an interpretation of the effect of the cross, and the reason for his boast, that is catastrophic for the wishes of the opponents, namely that neither \textit{περιτομή} \textit{τί ἐστιν} \textit{οἶν} \textit{ἀκροβυστία} (6.15). To set a symbol of shame at the centre of a claim to honour and then render the result of that boast to be the negation of the differentiated values is to stand in ‘absolute defiance’ to the position of the opponents.\textsuperscript{754} Paul is making a counter-claim, against that of the opponents, to establish a reconfigured understanding of honour that is defined by Christ’s cross.\textsuperscript{755} This is an attempt that sets both an unusual precedent, the cross as boast-worthy, and expects an unusual result, the devaluation of difference.

\textbf{5.2.2 Content as \textit{crux interpretum} of Boasting}

We have established that the basis of Paul’s boast is a response to the \textit{ἐὑπροσωπέω} of the opponents. It is not our intention to focus overly on the opponents in this chapter, but we note how the opponents ignore Plutarch’s guidelines for self-praise (cf. §3.4.2.1) in Paul’s representation of them at 6.12-13. They are portrayed as having questionable motives and self-serving interests, whilst the negative connotations of their actions upon the Galatian gentile Christians are all framed in a manner that highlights the negativity of their boast. The opponents are trying to establish their claim to honour on the basis of gentile circumcision. However, from the perspective of our model, Paul’s response

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{749} cf. Hengel (1977: 43n9).
\item \textsuperscript{750} Crucifixion used as a positive metaphor seems to be a Christian invention, cf. Aune (1994: 311n48).
\item \textsuperscript{751} Finney (2012: 16).
\item \textsuperscript{752} Finley (1999: 118).
\item \textsuperscript{753} Clarke (1993: 96), cf. §3.2.
\item \textsuperscript{754} cf. Oprisko (2012: 137) on defiance.
\item \textsuperscript{755} This would be broadly in keeping with Robbins (2009: 21) that ‘embedded’ amongst the stories of the earliest Christians were their core beliefs and ideas.
\end{itemize}
aims to both reject that attempt and offer an alternative by way of his riposte. This is what we consider to be the manner of the boast. To establish this we will turn our attention to the content of the boast, for this is how we will understand the perception of honour it establishes.

In contrast with the opponents who are attempting to avoid the implications of the cross of Christ, Paul now places it at the centre of his precedent-setting boast. This invites attention to consider how a boast ‘in the cross’ works as Paul’s response in Galatia. To do so requires us to explore Paul’s presentation of Christ in the epistle and the somewhat tense relationship between the idea of the cross and a claim for honour.

The cross, amongst other things, was a didactic device. Aside from its practical purposes for the Roman empire, crucifixion was intended as an act of social devastation to the victim dually functioning to dishonour them whilst dissuading observers from the actions that might lead them to suffer the same fate. It was, as Cook notes, ‘the final irrevocable rejection’ of the victim from their society.

When we crucify criminals the most frequented roads are chosen, where the greatest number of people can look and be seized by this fear. For every punishment has less to do with the offence than with the example (Omnis enim poena non tam ad delictum pertinet quam ad exemplum - Ps-Quintilian Decl. 274.13).

...[H]e immediately ordered the sixteen cell-mates to be crucified. They were duly brought out, chained together at foot and neck, each carrying his own cross. The executioners added this grim public spectacle to the requisite penalty as a deterrent to others so minded (εἰς φόβον παράδειγμα τοῖς ὀμοίοις - Chariton Chaer. 4.2.7).

56 It may be worth noting that the addition of ‘our Lord’ might be a modification to clarify the distinction between Paul’s view of the cross and that of the opponents. In the previous mention (6.12) ‘our Lord’ was not used.
57 Issues related to the language of cross and crucifixion are well treated in Evans (2006), Gorman (2006), Kuhn (1982b), and Schneider (1965).
58 Cook (2013: 2, 4).
Hengel observed that crucifixion aimed to defame the victim in the public imagination.\(^{759}\) The prominent location of crucifixion sites and the unburied corpses hanging upon them served to further humiliate those already considered inferior, ‘i.e. slaves, violent criminals and the unruly elements in rebellious provinces, not least in Judaea.\(^{760}\) Crucifixion’s humiliation, however, was as serious a threat as its inhumanity in the ancient world,\(^{761}\) it was regularly described as αἰσχύνη or used as a metaphor for shame (cf. Achilles Tatius Leuc. Clit. 2.37.3).\(^{762}\) In a Pompeian baths the graffito in cruce figarus (get fixed to a cross) shows how crucifixion terminology could be used as an insult, whilst Plautus has a pimp say to a slave, i in malam crucem (‘go to an evil cross.’ Pseud. 335).\(^{763}\) This may be similar to the more generic abi domum ac suspende te we also find in Plautus (‘Go home and hang yourself.’ Poen. 309).\(^{764}\)

The shame is located in three aspects of Roman crucifixion. Firstly, it being a manner of punishment perceived to be for those of low status ensured that anyone being crucified was being denigrated by either exposure of their lowly status, or worse, being associated with a status beneath their own.\(^{765}\) It was the death of the defeated, the slave punishment (servile supplicium).\(^{766}\) The social stigma that permitted the deaths of the defeated foe or rebel spy (Diodorus Siculus 14.53.4, Livy 22.33.2) was the same reason Cicero was incensed to hear of the crucifixion of Roman citizens (Verr. 2.63.163).\(^{767}\)

\(^{759}\) Hengel (1977: 87f).
\(^{761}\) Crucifixion is not as ‘bloody’ as it is often considered to be, as this would only serve to speed up death, which does not seem to have been the aim (contra Hengel (1977: 31f)), cf. Kuhn (1982b: 270) which cites the fuller argument in Kuhn (1982a: 695f).
\(^{762}\) The young boy attacked by a bird is said to shamefully ‘look like one crucified’ - καὶ ἔστιν ἄστυρωμένον· καὶ τὸ θάμα ἐστὶν αἰσχύνην. (LCL).
\(^{763}\) Cook (2008: 277), suggests it as comparable to the English ‘go to hell’.
\(^{764}\) Cook (2014: 122).
\(^{765}\) Hengel notes that it is the Romans who narrowed the range to regularly exclude those of higher status from facing crucifixion, Hengel (1977: 86).
\(^{767}\) Although, as this situation evidences, crucifixion of citizens was not completely unknown, cf. Josephus B.J. 2.307-308.
Some have, probably rightly, argued that it would have been perceived as an unmanly death, enhancing its stigma for male victims.\(^{768}\)

Secondly, the physical damage to the body (Diodorus Siculus 33.15.1, Josephus \textit{B.J.} 5.449-451) added to the shame, the pre-scourging, the damage to the face and eyes, and the nudity further denigrating the crucified,\(^{769}\) who were often then left post-mortem to hang and decay without burial.\(^{770}\) Thirdly, the most damaging social aspect was the public spectacle created, intentionally, as a social and ethical lesson. The examples of these ‘human billboards’ are many.\(^{771}\) The crucifixion of 6,000 of Spartacus’ army on the road between Rome and Capua (Appian \textit{Bell. civ.} 1.120), the 2,000 executed by Varus to calm the uprising following Herod the Great’s death (Josephus \textit{B.J.} 2.75, cf. \textit{Life} 420), and these two from Josephus show the social intention:

One incident in this engagement was the capture of a Jewish prisoner, whom Titus ordered to crucifixion before the walls, in the hope that the spectacle might lead the rest to surrender in dismay (\textit{B.J.} 5.289).

\begin{quote}
\ldots his [Titus’] main reason for not stopping the crucifixions was the hope that the spectacle might perhaps induce the Jews to surrender… (\textit{B.J.} 5.450-451).
\end{quote}

Rebels easily become the exemplar par excellence of a competitive system, even if dead, and especially so if killed by the system they oppose.\(^{772}\) Crucifixion combats this by robbing them not simply of life, but of social prestige, of honour. Thus, we encounter slaves crucified alongside their master and even the crucified’s children killed in advance of the crucifixion (Tacitus \textit{Ann.} 13.32, Josephus \textit{B.J.} 2.307). Often described in superlatives, it is the ‘most lamentable of deaths’ (\textit{θανάτων τὸν οὐκίστην} - Josephus \textit{B.J.} 7.203, cf. Cicero \textit{Verr.} 2.5.165), of such terror that even suicide is preferable (Seneca \textit{Ep.} 101.14).

\footnotesize
\begin{footnotes}
\item[768] cf. The discussion in Cook (2012: 76). In light of the comments about female honour above (§2.4.2.1) we are less convinced that ‘unmanly’ equates to ‘feminized’ as Crossley (2015: 137) argues of Jesus’ pierced body.
\item[769] Neyrey (1994: 113).
\item[770] Cook (2011: esp.206f).
\item[771] Smith (2015: 157).
\item[772] Oprisko (2012: 137-139).
\end{footnotes}
The social function of the cross was apparent to the early Christians. We note the public ‘spectacle’ (θεωρία) of Jesus’ crucifixion in Luke 23.48 and the shame encountered in the cross at Hebrews 12.2 (cf. 6.6, 11.26, 13.13). Deuteronomy 21:22-23 appeared to categorically dismiss any idea that God’s anointed one could face such a shameful demise (cf. §5.3.3). Despite this, the mode as much as the fact of Christ’s death has appeared central from the Jesus movement’s beginning. Jesus is Χριστὸν ἔσταυρωμένον, with clear awareness of the difficulty this causes — Ἰουνάκιος μὲν σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν (1 Corinthians 1.23). Later generations were also aware of social power of crucifixion (cf. Augustine on the harsh-sound of crux, Dial. 10.7 cf. Justin on the cross as ‘madness’, Apol. 1.13.4). The discovery on the Palatine Hill of the Alexamenos graffito, whether or not a reference to Christians, at least implies that the image of crucifixion maintained its ability to be used in a mocking, thereby dishonouring, manner beyond the first century.

This discussion alerts us to the paradoxical nature of Paul’s statement in Galatians 6.14. It is not only unusual that Paul objects to what might simply be seen as behaviour typical of the honour culture (ἐὐπροσωπίζει), namely pursuing increased prestige, but to then counter with a claim that posits the most shameful of deaths as a marker of precedence by boasting in the cross is, in context, surprising. The paradox of a boast in the cross is diminished, however, if we insist on reading Paul’s boast without considering what a boast actually does. This has commonly been the approach of scholarship leading to brief assessments that consider the ‘boast in the cross’ little more than a Pauline confession of the gospel’s sufficiency in his life. This is not wrong, but it is simplistic. The term ‘cross’ functions in Paul as a shorthand for ‘the gospel’, as

---

773 There is a tendency to read the shame in Hebrews as that of the anointed one from Psalm 88.51f, and 68.10f (LXX) rather than consider the social evaluation of crucifixion. For a thorough consideration of the shame of the cross in Hebrews, cf. DeSilva (1995; 1999: 162-169).

774 Bryant (2001: 185). Hengel (1977: 11f) and Kahl (2010: 156-158) note that the closest parallel the ancient world has to a ‘crucified god’ is the account of the punishment of the hero Prometheus, who although not technically crucified, has his torture described in crucifixion-like language.

775 Rutledge (2015: 104).

776 See the previous chapter for the discussion of σκάνδαλον in Galatians 5.11, where there is slightly more complexity than this Corinthian reference.

Gorman observes, but as we noted above, the content of the boast is related to the manner. Thus, in the emphatic phrase of 6.14, the καυχᾶσθαι ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ can be interpreted as Paul taking that which is considered loaded with dishonour, the cross, and using it to establish a competing claim for prestige. The paradox, therefore, is not in the content alone but in the combination of content and boast. To ‘boast in the cross’ is more than just Christian pride in Jesus’ willingness to face a shameful death to enable his salvific rescue mission (1.4). Rather it is his riposte to what he perceives to be unacceptable status-seeking behaviour by the opponents who have not understood the cross and its impact (6.12-13). Paul is using the boast to stake a claim for the cross as the redefinition of honourable behaviour within the Christian community. From Paul’s perspective this is not paradoxical: the cross has initiated a break from the differentiated status systems of history (3.28) and established a καινὴ κτίσις that rejects the value of the binaries that the opponents consider important, περιτομή or ἄκροβυστία (6.15).

Paul’s boast will continually remain obtuse if we insist on trying to ask how he can be proud of that which is designed to bring shame — by applying our model, however, this is clarified. Shame is, in itself, simply a negative assessment by a value system that Paul is rejecting, leaving him free to reconsider what is and is not valuable, and to present new claimants to be honoured and emulated. In this case the basis and weight of Paul’s claim to precedence is located, not surprisingly, in the boast being in the very specific crucifixion τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (6.14).

5.3 Christ as Crucified Hero in Galatians

The importance of the crucifixion of Jesus is rarely denied amongst the vast and varied arguments focusing on Galatians. For Käsemann the cross functioned as Paul’s ‘signature’ of Jesus, ‘He

---

780 Notice, in contrast and especially interesting in light of the argument in 1 Corinthians 15, the minimal reference to resurrection in the letter (1.1), Gaventa (2007: 109). Although Andrew Boakye (2013: esp.159-202) has convincingly argued that resurrection is an important theme elsewhere in the letter it still remains secondary to Christ’s death in terms of Christology (cf. 3.12; Boakye (2016)), cf. Kahl (2010: 363n39), Käsemann (1970: 165f.).
possesses no other visage except the countenance of the Crucified’. \(^{781}\) It is, essentially, a shorthand for Jesus’ sacrificial actions and even the gospel itself (cf. 1 Corinthians 1.23). The apparent paradox of this imagery should be plain from the foregoing discussion, and is noted by scholarship.\(^{782}\) However, the cross remains a paradox only if we assume that Paul is working within a fixed and immovable definition of honour. Alternatively, if Paul is setting honour precedence with the cross, it might only remain a paradox outside of the Christian community (cp. 1 Corinthians 1.18f). We are not offering a study or review of the theology of the cross in Galatians or the many related issues. However, we will consider issues relevant to our aim of showing the social significance of the crucified Christ and how that particular mode of death, as much as the death itself, is used by Paul to set a behavioural precedent that rejects the seeking of ‘good face’. We will, therefore, now consider the profile Paul creates of the crucified Christ and how, we suggest, this expresses and defines the content of honour in the Galatian assemblies.

### 5.3.1 Christ as Rescuer: Galatians 1.3-5

Breaking from the customary brevity of a letter prescript in the Greco-Roman world, Paul compacts some complex concepts into the few verses of salutation giving Galatians a thoroughly theological beginning (1.1-5).\(^{783}\) This density has distracted most from asking any social questions of these verses. Whereas the focus on Paul’s status in 1.1 is dominant, the Christological attention in 1.3-5 alerts us to a significant theme for the letter. The χάρις and εἰρήνη that Paul blesses with is presented as a direct result of the heroic actions of Christ.

The grace and peace greeting in v.3 is a Pauline characteristic, as Bryant notes.\(^{784}\) However, having identified reader and writer, he follows the greeting, not with a thanksgiving section, as you might expect, but a twofold amplification regarding the

---


\(^{783}\) Hays (2014: 200). Deviation from epistolary convention was rare, cf. Doty (1973: 12f.) 1 Thessalonians is more stereotypical of the context, Galatians suggests an exceptional freedom in form that was unusual outside of Paul (cf. Romans 1.1-7).

\(^{784}\) The formula is in all 13 NT letters that cite Paul as an author, Bryant (2001: 165).
Christ event, a consideration of both what Jesus did and why he did it. This positions Christ, rather than sender or recipient, in centre frame and adds purpose to the traditional greeting. Both these moves are significant for the shape of the letter.

Shifting attention, and ultimately glory (δόξα 1.5), away from these assemblies is a consequence of Christ’s peace and grace bringing actions. ‘Grace and peace are both key concepts’ for the epistle, so here they are upgraded from greeting to theological statement — they are a direct result of Christ’s endeavour. This expansion from his normal greeting alerts us to the shape of Paul’s upcoming argument in the letter, but also functions as an exemplary introduction to Christ. That it is a break from convention serves to enhance the importance of the elaboration.

Turning to the expansion itself we note how quickly Paul presents descriptive data regarding Christ, specifically his actions or behaviour. Introducing Christ with an undoubted allusion to his death (cf. 2.20-21; Romans 4.25, 5.6; 1 Corinthians 15.3; cp. Mark 10.45), noting he is already raised ἐκ νεκρῶν (1.1), the statement τοῦ δόντος ἐαυτὸν (1.4a) serves to establish an important premise in Paul’s presentation of Christ as hero. ‘Honor always attaches to what is held to be excellent’, Speier noted, echoing the Machiavellian observation that people, especially those in public view, are only mentioned in relation to the worthiness, or lack therewith, of their qualities. With honour, or praise, often afforded to those who had done service for their community, including sacrifice, up to and including their life (μέρη δὲ τιμῆς θυσίαι...κτλ. Aristotle Rhet. 1361a), it is difficult not to see Paul’s use of τοῦ δόντος ἐαυτὸν as an establishment of Christ’s honour. Unlike in Romans 4.25 and 8.32 where Christ is handed over by God, here the initiative is with Christ — his sacrificial action is voluntary. Similarly, it would be easy to assume an obedience here that Paul does not state. In Philippians 2.7-8, Paul draws an explicit line between Christ’s slavery,
obedience, and crucifixion, yet here that connection is more opaque.⁷⁹⁰ Obedience was an uncomfortable subject in the Greco-Roman world, rarely discussed in surviving texts outside of the context of slavery, possibly implying why the subject was often avoided. Where hierarchy existed outside of slave and servant situations, metaphorical language, such a ‘father’ and ‘son’ (Pliny Ep. 4.15.9; Cicero Fam. 13.10.1), was commonly preferred in order to ‘ameliorate the acute discomfort that stark relations of obedience…inspired’⁷⁹¹ Commentators have tended to connect Christ’s actions here to the later clause referencing κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ (1.4c) and subsequently assume God’s active role and Christ’s passive obedience.⁷⁹² However, because 1.4c seems to be more directly related to God’s cosmic intentions (1.4b) and a clarification that the events were to his agreement, we need to be careful not to leave Christ in a passive role. Christ, rather, performs a dual facing role. He cooperates with the Father whilst also actively enacting the rescue (cp. Romans 5.19; Philippians 2.8).⁷⁹³ Furthermore, the reference to Jesus’ death in 2.20 sees the initiative remain with Christ (παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν). To be clear, this is not suggesting a form of christomonism, Christ is clearly not working independent of God’s will, Paul is simply asserting Christ’s active wilfulness.⁷⁹⁴ The significance of this is that by acting of his own choice rather than another’s compulsion, Paul can show Christ’s behaviour to be exemplary and therefore functional in setting a precedent for behaviour.

The focus of this self-sacrifice is ὑπὲρ τὸν ᾠμαρτιὸν ἡμῶν (1.4a).⁷⁹⁵ However, by separating the action from the purpose we avoid missing Christ’s non-passive role that other Pauline texts might lead us to expect (cf. Romans 4.25, 8.32) and the subsequent possible social function of Christ at this early stage of the epistle.⁷⁹⁶ The parallels

---

793 Morgan (2015: 272).
795 The textual evidence is finely balanced between ὑπὲρ and περὶ in 1.4a. The sense of either is broadly similar however (cf. Oakes (2015: 40)), such that Metzger (1994: 589) does not even mention it, whilst BDF (§269) notes its interchangeability.
796 Theissen (1992: 170) notes that the ὑπὲρ, when used regarding Christ’s death, stresses his deliberate acceptance of it.
offered to this behaviour are many. Oakes notes a form of substitutionary atonement here (cf. Leviticus 16, Romans 3.25). Betz connects the self-sacrificing atonement to the Maccabean martyr tradition (2 Maccabees 7.32, 37-38), while Kahl and others detect an intertextuality with Isaiah 53.6. Doubtless Paul might envisage any of these parallels in his language, if indeed it is his language, the key fact, however, for Paul is that Christ has acted. In his death ‘for our sins’ Paul presents Christ’s behaviour as praiseworthy for he has managed to act in a self-sacrificial manner whilst apparently working within the ‘code of honour’ (κατὰ τὸ θέλημα) set by the Father — actions undoubtedly validated by the Father raising him from death (1.1).

The heroic behaviour of Paul’s presentation of Jesus is further emphasised in his framing of the purpose of his death as διὰ τῶν ἐξελήλυται ἡμᾶς (1.4). In language reminiscent of Ben Sira’s praise of God for rescue from Hades (ἐξαίρω, Sirach 51.8, ἐκ καιροῦ πονηροῦ 51.11), Paul prestigiously positions Jesus as cosmic liberator. As Oakes correctly observes, rescue ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνστάτους πονηροῦ is not an introspective or individualistic soteriological position that Paul is presenting here, rather it is a community emancipation (ἡμᾶς). Paul seems to achieve this with the balance between ‘sins’ and τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνστάτους πονηροῦ. Individualistic readings

---

797 Oakes (2015: 40).
799 The resurrection also functions here to ensure that God is not presented as the despotic tyrant who requires the willing sacrifice of his subjects (cf. Speier (1952: 42)), but rather as a co-conspirator with Christ, Martyn (1997a: 91).
800 A Pauline hapax, this sentiment may further cause problems with the idea that this verse is an example of faithfulness to God as Christ’s actions are not towards God but towards rescue. Would the faithful Christian be expected to model this rescuing?
801 Kahl (2010: 265) and Scott (1993: 658) consider the possible allusion to the Exodus, and associated liturgical tradition, in the use of ἐξαίρω with ἐκ. See similar use in Exodus 3.8; 18.4, 8-10; 1 Samuel 10.18; Jeremiah 34.13 [41.13 LXX]; 42.11 [49.11 LXX]; Isaiah 31.5; 60.16; Ezekiel 34.27 variously relating to rescue from Egypt, Babylon and an eschatological deliverance. Harmon (2010: 56n36, 56-66) is less convinced however and suggests that it is a ‘stretch’ to assert more than a ‘possible link’ to Exodus tradition here. He prefers connecting 1.4 to the suffering servant tradition in Isaiah 52.13-53.12. However, δουλὸς in Galatians 4.3 seems to increase the likelihood that Exodus tradition is not too far from Paul’s mind in his consideration of this rescue. The double ἐκ usage in 1.1 and 1.4 reminds of the famous dictum from Jenson (1997: 63), ‘God is whoever raised Jesus from the dead, having before raised Israel from Egypt’.
802 Oakes (2015: 41). In contrast, Sirach 51 has an individualistic focus — ἐξελῆλυτον με (v.11).
803 The awkward word order of this phrase seems to emphasise the evilness over the present age, cf. Bligh (1966: 77), Das (2014: 84).
emphasise the human responsibility in ἁμαρτιῶν, meanwhile apocalyptic approaches tend to absolve human responsibility by blaming ‘the evil age’, yet too often the tendency is for neither to consider the social implications. However, the social aspect is clear if we consider the content of the present evil age when contrasted, at the other end of the letter, with its correlative antonym καινὴ κτίσις (6.15). Whereas the present age is defined by differentiation, Paul’s new creation is a place where the value of the evil age’s binary divisions have been removed, most notably περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία — these are not exhaustive but representative of all of the evil age’s values (6.15, cp. 3.28). If, therefore, καινὴ κτίσις is understood in relation to cultural values and issues of status, it is not difficult to invert that interpretation and conclude similarly about τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ in 1.4. The present evil age is the world as defined by categories whose values have been dissolved by Christ’s death (that Paul never describes the present age as anything other than negatively only enhances the need for rescue from it). The apparent pervasiveness of the Pythagorean insistence that the world is divided into pairs of opposites (συστοιχίαν, Aristotle Metaph. 986a), might hint towards the extent to which Christ’s rescue has altered Paul’s view of reality (Galatians 4.3; cp. Sirach 33.15). This position, as we might expect from our previous chapter and the Antioch incident (2.11f), is entirely in keeping with what we have observed in the letter so far. Naming the present age as ‘evil’ is, therefore, more than simply an apocalyptic statement but a stark criticism of society that contains within its correlative antonym καινὴ κτίσις is Hubbard (2002).


cf. Campbell (2005: 102-108). Support is found across the commentaries for a position that reads the ‘old κόσμος’ as a reference to its values, Lightfoot (1884: 223), Burton (1921: 354), Longenecker (1990: 295), and Martyn (1997a: 564-565). We have purposefully referenced the removal of ‘this evil age’s values’ in contrast to Martyn’s more extreme ‘all religious differentiation (emphasis original)’, Martyn (1997a: 565). It does not seem that Paul abandons all religious differentiation, but rather those relating to the evil age (cp. πνεῦμα and σάρξ). NB. The astute comment from Oakes (2015: 98) regarding the tendency amongst Galatians scholars to avoid implying that Paul makes totalising comments about Christianity.

cf. Campbell (2005: 102-108). Support is found across the commentaries for a position that reads the ‘old κόσμος’ as a reference to its values, Lightfoot (1884: 223), Burton (1921: 354), Longenecker (1990: 295), and Martyn (1997a: 564-565). We have purposefully referenced the removal of ‘this evil age’s values’ in contrast to Martyn’s more extreme ‘all religious differentiation (emphasis original)’, Martyn (1997a: 565). It does not seem that Paul abandons all religious differentiation, but rather those relating to the evil age (cp. πνεῦμα and σάρξ). NB. The astute comment from Oakes (2015: 98) regarding the tendency amongst Galatians scholars to avoid implying that Paul makes totalising comments about Christianity.


805 An extended study of καινὴ κτίσις is Hubbard (2002).

806 cf. Campbell (2005: 102-108). Support is found across the commentaries for a position that reads the ‘old κόσμος’ as a reference to its values, Lightfoot (1884: 223), Burton (1921: 354), Longenecker (1990: 295), and Martyn (1997a: 564-565). We have purposefully referenced the removal of ‘this evil age’s values’ in contrast to Martyn’s more extreme ‘all religious differentiation (emphasis original)’, Martyn (1997a: 565). It does not seem that Paul abandons all religious differentiation, but rather those relating to the evil age (cp. πνεῦμα and σάρξ). NB. The astute comment from Oakes (2015: 98) regarding the tendency amongst Galatians scholars to avoid implying that Paul makes totalising comments about Christianity.

807 Hubbard (2002).


809 The perfect of ἐνίστημι in 1.4 likely indicates ‘conditions contemporaneous with the time of speaking’, DeSilva (2014: 5).
the language of Christ’s rescue the imagination of a ‘transformed social corporeality’. That no other Pauline prescript references a rescue resultant from Christ’s death suggests that Paul is not being bound by confessional formulae but rather forming a purposed introduction to his argument in Galatia within the traditional epistolary introduction. It is the τοῦ ἁϊνὸς τοῦ ἐνεστότος πονηροῦ as a social concern that drives Paul to present Christ as hero in order to exemplify and establish an alternative system of values that are necessary to maintain the gospel in Galatia.

Heroic behaviour invariably attracts praise, therefore the δόξα in 1.5 might appear initially unexceptional. The data earlier (§3.2) leads us to expect praise and glory — convention demands it, as those facing death willingly exemplify the ultimate in honourable behaviour. Yet here Christ’s heroic actions do not elicit his own glory, but rather the glory is directed towards God the Father. To be sure, it would be easy to make too much of this, especially if this observation was used to argue for a lesser developed Christology in Paul or earliest Christian confession. Clearly, and characteristic of the other Paulines (cf. Romans 11.36; Philippians 4.20), it is Jesus’ actions which form the content and reason for the praise. That 1.5 is a traditional doxology (it is identical to 4 Maccabees 18.24), yet Paul incorporates Christ’s action into it suggests a developed Christology. Of course, keeping an eye on the epistle’s closing, as we have been doing, shows a willingness to boast in Christ (6.14), again

810 Oakes (2015: 41), Kahl (2010: 246), both also note, to varying degrees, the likely imperial critique also intended here.
812 Although we note, with Harrison (2010: esp.164-174), that scholarship has not always been quick to note that δόξα language falls within the semantic range of honour concern. Even Danter manages to largely miss this in, Danter (1982), despite its common appearance. Dodd (1953a: 206) is a rare example of alertness to the connection of δόξα to ideas of reputation and honour.
813 Theological readings of δόξα are a priori preferred over social ones amongst scholarship, cf. Piper (2001: 283-285). Whilst Segal’s suggestion that δόξα is connected with the πνεα (visions of a human representation of God) has merit it, it seems unlikely to be primary in Paul’s mind here (Segal (1990: 10, 39-44, 58-71)). Dodd (1953a: 206n2) was uncertain as to how the connection with πνεα developed but noted δόξα could only carry this meaning where a Jewish influence was ‘probable’. Although he also noted in Kittel that only one ref in Philo, and none in Josephus actually showed this influence. The social sensitivity towards prestige would seem to be a more likely influence, as our argument suggests, on Paul’s usage cf. Harrison (2010: 161f.).
814 cf. Hurtado (2003: 152)
815 Interestingly, δόξα, along with 15 other words, is rare in its ability to be used of Christ and the Father, Newman (1991: 163).
implying Paul’s comfort in directing praise toward Jesus, thereby implicitly implying something of what Paul thinks about Christ’s status. What the doxology does do, however, is remain consistent with Jeremiah 9.23-24 in directing praise towards God. Furthermore, Christ’s willingness to obediently act in order to increase God’s glory is a noteworthy feature to remember from our earlier consideration of 1.23 (§4.3.1.1).

This does, however, establish an important principle for Paul, in relation to our model. All of the various comments in 1.1-5 culminate, not in increased glory for Paul, or even, perhaps, Christ, they direct glory exclusively towards God.816 This seems to work again in direct contrast to the behaviour of those who oppose Paul’s singular ‘boast in the cross’ and are concerned to εὐπροσωπήσω in 6.12. Prior to Paul even opening up the question of the opponents, Paul defines the parameters of praise and boasting — it should be directed towards God as a ‘natural’ response to what God did in Christ.817

Prescripts are invariably purposeful in ancient letter tradition, therefore, as DeSilva notes, any expansion or departure from convention should pique our interest.818 Two often highlighted quirks of Galatians can now be mentioned in a context that might suggest they are more than accidental, namely the doxology and the lack of thanksgiving. The Galatian prescript is the only one of Paul’s letters that contains a doxology.819 The doxology reminds of Christ’s actions and highlights the appropriate response, specifically that glory is to be directed away from self and towards God.820 This is a significant point for Galatians which is then highlighted by the unusual lack of a thanksgiving section. Commonly this is referenced as a simple example of Paul seeing very little to be thankful for in Galatia.821 While it might appear that Paul is somewhat depressed at events in these assemblies, our approach suggests that this lack implies a clever rhetorical ploy at play. Paul’s failure to offer a thanksgiving may not be an implicit criticism or condemnation of them, but a window into the level of concern

817 Bryant (2001: 119). cf. Oprisko (2012: 63), ‘Prestige is the process whereby external groups grant honor to a member for achieving or displaying excellence in deeds and attributes considered good by said group (emphasis original).’
819 Martyn (1997b: 105). Revelation is the only other NT document that ends its opening with one (1.6).
he feels for these assemblies. Here is a community creaking under the strain of resisting a group of opponents who are intent on emphasising the privilege of variegated status. To provide this community with a traditional list of thanks, perhaps even if simply highlighting virtues, would hardly serve to help Paul in his goal. Notice that in some letters the thanksgiving even references boasting directly (cf. 2 Thessalonians 1.4). Consequently, in Galatians Paul avoids all semblance or hint of anything that could be mistakenly used to enhance or establish prestige for anyone other than God, and in turn threaten the ‘truth of the gospel’ (cf. 1.6f). The prescript, therefore, is functioning programatically, in both its content and lack of thanksgiving, to identify from the beginning the letter’s primary theme. With this in mind we note that the tenet of 1.4b-1.5 is essentially synonymous with 6.14, Εµοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καινὴθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ. Our position here also speaks to the combative nature of prestige-hunting that we have argued Paul is countering, so we are encouraged to wonder how throwaway the call to ‘grace and peace’ at 1.3 actually might be. The χάρις and εἰρήνη that open the letter appear again at the conclusion in 6.17-18. The grace is referenced explicitly, but in the call that no-one might cause Paul trouble, on the basis of him having Christ-scars (τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ), we can only draw the conclusion that this is a thinly veiled request for peace. The grace wish therefore might not be habitual eulogising, but an opening challenge to the threat of community discord in the pursuit of honour. Paul has bracketed the entire letter between these primary concepts of χάρις and εἰρήνη. Before we look elsewhere to consider Paul’s presentation of Jesus, we should note that Paul has, as yet, not explicitly mentioned the specific mode of Christ’s ‘giving himself’.  

823 cf. Cook (1992: 511-512), who argues that 1.5 is the thanksgiving. Although it may be that Cook is trying too hard to fit Paul into a particular convention, his point about the programmatic purpose seems fair.  
824 Although we do note that this greeting is used of all 13 documents that cite Paul as author.  
Might it be that as Paul is establishing the heroic nature of Jesus, even though, as we will come to see, he is entirely convinced by the epoch shifting nature of the cross, the image of a crucified God is so unimaginable and incomprehensible in context that he holds off on explicit reference to that image at this point in the epistle? Interestingly, despite roughly 25% of the verses of Galatians containing an explicit reference to Christ (38 of the 149 verses), the majority of these texts consider the effect rather than the nature of Christ’s self-giving. In relation to our focus here two further parts of Galatians directly add to the description of the nature of Christ’s rescue in 1.4, namely these are 2.19-3.3 and 3.13-14. We will now turn to these passages to continue to consider how Paul’s uses this data to present Christ as honor-defining hero.

5.3.2 The Strange Hero (1) — Christ Crucified: Galatians 2.19-3.3

Much can be said about this section and its significance for our argument regarding status, not to mention its impact on Paul’s life, but for now we will focus on the Christ data directly related to his heroic rescue. The repetitive mentioning of Christ by name, 11 times over a few verses, in contrast to his comparative absence during the Antioch incident seems to give the reader a rhetorical push in the direction of the important focus of these verses.\footnote{cf. Robbins (1996b: 46-50) for consideration of a text’s repetitive features.} All of the statements made in this section hang on the premise established in 1.4, namely Christ’s self-giving (παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν).\footnote{The use of παραδόντος seems to imply some early Christian usage in relation to the passion narratives. cf. Mark 15.15; Matthew 27.26.} The extent of this is seen in the weighting of Paul’s argument in v.21. The stakes are set high when he argues that Christ’s self-giving, God-glorifying, rescuing death is rendered null (δωρεὰν) in the event of a δικαιοσύνη on the basis of status.

Two new features are added to the description of Christ’s rescue in 2.19-20. The earlier contention that the salvific move was attained by Christ’s self-giving in obedience to the father, is now further explained as resultant from Christ’s love. Furthermore, this is the first explicit mention that the cause of Christ’s death was crucifixion.
Christ’s love is a ‘concrete act of self-sacrifice’ rather than an emotion directed towards Paul in 2.20. Christ’s reconciling death as a representation of his, or the Father’s, love, is frequently connected in Paul (Romans 5.8, 8.32, 35; 2 Corinthians 5.14).

Theissen holds that Paul’s ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ ἢμῶν concept is always expressed in relation to love. Here in 2.20 it extends the motive behind Christ’s self-giving beyond the κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ of 1.4. Gorman’s rendering of 2.20, ‘…the Son of God, who loved me by giving himself for me’, seems appropriate as it does not imply that Christ’s love is separate from his sacrificial giving. Grammatically he reads the structure as a hendiadys where both grammatical items are defining the same event. The use of ἀγαπάω does appear to look forward towards the other, relatively few, appearances of ἀγάπη language in the letter (5.6, 13-14, 22), each of which have elements of Christ’s behaviour here implied in them, suggesting that Christ’s love is being added as a feature to his exemplary behaviour (cf. Ephesians 5.2, 25).

Specifically, it is worth noting how 5.6 sees ἀγάπη as the alternative to the variegated status on the basis of circumcision, which suggests that Paul sees love as a feature of, if not synonymous with, the καινὴ κτίσις in 6.15, itself, of course, in contrast to the ‘present evil age’ in 1.4. Although not always a highlighted feature of 2.20, often commentators make only passing reference, this establishes additional basis for Christ’s heroic action. Specifically, it offers further support to the notion that he is not acting out of self-aggrandisement, as 1.5 anticipates.

Christ’s ἀγάπη is further enhanced by the introduction, by proxy, of Christ’s mode of death in 2.19, and explicitly in 3.1. Love could be seen as the basis for dispensing with concern for status and the adherence towards codes of honour. Despite this, Christ’s willing crucifixion is still shocking, and utilising crucifixion as a positive metaphor appears to be a Christian innovation. As we observed above (§5.2.1),

---

830 Gorman (2009: 58n48).
831 These texts will be considered at §6.2.1 and §6.4.1-2.
834 cf. Aune (1994: 311). We also note, with Kääsemann (1970: 168), that Paul offers little historical data here, or elsewhere (cf. 1 Corinthians 2.8; Philippians 2.6-11). It seems that Paul is more interested that
crucifixion is intended for permanent status degradation, so Christ’s death on a cross
goes beyond a temporary cessation of honour concern on the behalf of a loved one and
hints towards a reconfiguration of values.

This is an important feature for Paul’s explanation of the purpose of Christ’s death in
2.15-21. In terms of his broader argument for equality Paul sets up a zero sum
contention — Christ’s death is null and void if variegated status before God remains
(2.21). To state that Christ’s rescue (1.4) has essentially failed if religious privilege
or the value of status remains is beyond the purview of soteriology for many, but seems
to be Paul’s clear intention here. In utilising the cross as the vehicle of rescue, rather
than shame, Paul shows how little face should matter to the Jesus movement. The irony
should be obvious. Caring about status whilst adhering to a religion that defies social
convention by proclaiming ‘Christ crucified’ is beyond inconsistent. Notably, the
precedence set by the mode of Christ’s death is made explicit when the crucifixion is
introduced to the letter as an exemplary motif, Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαί (2.19). The
cross is more than simply how God has acted, but it also shows a further dimension in
relation to values that is in keeping with what we should have expected.

Were the foregoing not sufficient to convince of the role of the cross in changing the
shape of Galatian values, Paul makes it clear in 3.1-2. The visual presentation of Jesus,
specifically as crucified, should have sufficiently convinced the Galatians of the futility
of trusting a system that inscribed the prestige of ἔργων νόμου. The plain implication
of this outburst from Paul is that he assumes any encounter with the crucifixion of Jesus
should alert the observer to the need to reset their perception of value, worth and
honour. Paul’s outburst in relation the Galatians’ foolishness (ὦ ἄνόητοι Γαλάται) and
their possible succumbing to ‘evil eye’ are probably read correctly by Oakes as ‘counter

———

Christ was crucified than recounting the details. This might confirm to us that the symbolism is more
important than it simply being the way that Christ was executed.

836 cf. 1 Corinthians 120-25, Dunn (1993a: 36).
837 Contra Conway (2008: 73) or Crossley (2015: 137) who argue that Paul avoids the social stigma by
presenting Christ in a more ‘manly’ way.
838 See above and Oprisko (2012: 100-109).
factual irony’, sarcasm in relation to their otherwise irrational behaviour. Neyrey and Elliott have each offered fascinating studies of possible ‘evil eye’ readings of βάσκανω each of which have added colour to our understanding of the social context of the term. However, both would require a substantial reconsideration of the Galatian opponents’ identity, beyond those offered in contemporary scholarship, if we are to believe that Paul is making an actual accusation of witchcraft at play in Galatia. Rather, Paul is using extreme language to highlight the level of deception taking place, particularly as the language contrasts nicely against his claim that Christ was crucified κατ᾿ ὀφθαλμοῦς. Betz suggests a figurative use of βάσκανω based on Plato Phaed. 95B. Whilst the text seems to make the opposite point than Betz intends, it highlights an important connection for us. Cebes is warned by Socrates, ‘do not be boastful (μέγα λέγει), lest some evil eye (βάσκανία) put to rout the argument that is to come’. Admittedly a καυχάμαι cognate would have been preferable for our argument here, yet the connection between self-praise and fear of the evil eye is noteworthy, especially as this is the very behaviour we contend Paul is opposing throughout the epistle. This would allow for the reference to βάσκανω, although still not a reference to what Paul thinks has actually happened, to sarcastically function as a serious reminder of the possible dangers of ignoring Paul’s ongoing assault against the opponents’ self-seeking (εὑροσῳπέω) boastfulness. It is behaviour that categorically ignores the example offered by the crucified Christ. The cross is not, therefore, functioning here as some sort of alternative amulet or fascina (replicas of phalluses) to counter the magic of evil eye, contra Elliott. It is difficult to know how suggesting that the cross functions in

839 For προεγράφη as ‘display prominently’ see DeSilva (2014: 52).
840 Oakes (2015: 102). Similar patterns are seen in 1.6-9 and 4.8-10.
841 Eliott (2011), Neyrey (1988). Eastman (2001) suggests βασκανινο is an intertextual echo of Deuteronomy 28.53-57. However, as Das (2014: 286) rightly notes, that there is only one common word, it is difficult to accept as a proposal even on the basis of her appeal to Hays’, quite generous, criteria. cf. Hays (1989: 29f.).
842 Derrett (1995) makes no reference to Galatians in his study of NT evil eye occurrences.
843 Betz (1979: 131), it is not clear how the other texts he cites relate Plato Apol. 17A and Gorg. 452Ef. cf. de Boer (2011: 170).
844 The studies of Neyrey and Elliott, at very least, show how unlikely it is that βασκανινο could be simply figurative in the way Betz requires, cf. Oakes (2015: 102) for a helpful argument on this.
845 Nanos (2002b: 280) notes how envy is possibly an issue here. Envy and boasting are not overly distant concepts, but Nanos makes the common mistake of overly focussing on the opponents here, when they are not really in view, unless witchcraft really is a factor.
an apotropaic manner is not just a return to the things Paul suggests abandoning in 4.9. Rather, at 3.1, the visual representation of the crucified hero is a reminder of the worthlessness of self-seeking, status enhancing, behaviour, even if that behaviour was the pursuit of ἐργών νόμου. For Paul, it seems, that self-seeking behaviour always implies that the cross has been forgotten.  

5.3.3 The Strange Hero (2) — The Cursed Christ: Galatians 3.13-14

The last comment we will consider in presenting our profile of the Christ who is presented as a hero who embraces rather than avoids the loss of face is the reference to the curse in 3.13-14. As Stendahl famously noted, the Western Christian tradition has predominately interpreted Paul’s theology of the cross from within a matrix of guilt and, we would argue by way of agreement, that as such there has not been a sufficient identification of the importance that the shame inherent in crucifixion has for Paul’s presentation of Christ’s death. As Esler identifies, social realities can easily be drowned out when scholarship remains committed to religious and intellectual traditions. This is often the case on the subject of the cross and atonement. Typically, those who do consider what Paul might mean for Christ to rescue ‘us’ by means of a cursed cross think simply in terms of his use of Deuteronomy 21.23 and what it means to carry God’s curse. This is not to argue that Paul is not engaging, in this tightly packed sentence, with a continuation of the premise he set up in 1.4. Clearly he does mean to show something of the law’s deficiency in its ability to bring a curse upon Christ, therefore, it can even oppose God’s will, as Bryant notes. This deficiency further heightens the paradox of any attempt to trust the law as a way of improving one’s status in Christ.

---

847 While this does not rule out the possibility that there is spiritual forces at work here, it is not necessary to postulate such in order to make sense of Paul’s comment. Pace Longenecker (1998: 26, 153-155).
848 This verse is considered by others as both connected to the section we just considered and a ‘further outing’ of its ideas, cf. Wright (1991: 151).
However, Paul’s assertion that Christ γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα is not a historical comment on the crucifixion, but rather his offering of a first century interpretation of the event’s significance.\(^{853}\) Oakes clarifies how curses and the threat of curses functioned in the absence of effective judiciary to maintain social order.\(^{854}\) We would add that modern judicial concepts are reliant and dependent on a surrounding guilt culture, the lack of which in Paul’s time would largely render them ineffective. The possibility of attracting the wrath of the gods was far more likely to guide behaviour than would modern ideas about guilt and associated correctional facilities. We note, in passing, that Paul’s threat to those attacking the gospel in 1.6-9 is not to play on any concept of guilt or guilty conscience, but rather to offer a curse (ἀνάθημα ἔστω). Cursing is the language and action of honour culture. By this rationale, 3.13-14 is the cross interpreted quite brutally in honour vernacular. Thematically, this is what we should expect. Paul’s reading of Christ is to present him as one happily facing what would normally be interpreted as that lacking in honour. Paul extends his degradation of positive notions of honour by taking the already shameful cross and explicitly adding a curse to it.\(^{855}\) ‘Crucified and cursed’ leaves Christ exiled from any popular notions of positive status.

This is an important highlight in Paul’s presentation of Christ. Christ is not so much on the cross for punishment, as is the common theological interpretation, rather the cross is a sign of disgrace.\(^{856}\) To be sure, this was amongst the various intentions of crucifixion. By quoting Deuteronomy, Paul somewhat theologises the complex social phenomenon of how a community utilises its criminals.\(^{857}\) Understandably, the cursed person becomes a focus of shame, thereby an exemplar of the type of behaviour that should be avoided by society. This, as we have noted already, is what makes the cross so effective, it threatens both at a physical and social level. By adding the cross and the curse together to his presentation of the rescuer that is Christ, Paul clearly redraws his

---

\(^{853}\) McLean (1996: 13).
\(^{854}\) See Oakes (2015: 108) for curse tablets that exemplify this.
\(^{855}\) This position might be supported further by Paul using the LXX reading of Deuteronomy 21.23 which adds the specification of ξύλον to the curse. The MT only requires a suspension rather than specifically ‘on a ξύλον’, cf. Samuelsson (2013: 253). It could be that the dishonour in this particular mode of death is what attracts Paul to this quotation.
\(^{857}\) Oakes (2015: 112).
perception of what we might call a Christian value system. If, to quote Käsemann, ‘Enmity to the cross is the identifying trademark of the world’, then Paul’s hero is at odds with that world, for he is set up as exemplar on the basis of the very status that would ordinarily be used as exemplary of a life to be avoided.858 This, naturally, highlights the ludicrous actions the Galatians are apparently contemplating. If God’s prosopagnosia is such that his Christ is cursed and crucified why should they think that improving social status will enhance their standing before God? Rather, in the one other use of ἐξαγοράζω in Paul, at 4.4, the law is the very thing that Christ’s cursed crucifixion has served to rescue them from. Ironically, it is escaping the law that allows them to gain that which they apparently seek from the law, the blessing of Abraham (3.8-9). By willingly following God’s plan, though it leads to a cross, even a cursed cross, Christ is the exemplar of a different type of social behaviour. Behaviour that the Galatians have not apparently understood. Esler argues that the absence of the curse theme in other locations suggests that this is an ad hoc argument rather than ‘a central Christological idea’.859 This is particularly supportive of our contention that Paul is strategically presenting Jesus to shape honour precedence in Galatia. For this epistle, however, it does serve to show how Jesus is strategically presented to shape honour precedence amongst the Galatian assemblies by distancing him from common notions of honour.

5.3.4 Profiling Christ
Understandably, Jesus’ death on the cross would hardly present itself as a unique christological feature of any NT document. However, we have identified a particular aspect of Paul’s representations of the death of Jesus in 1.4, 2.19-3.3 and 3.13-14. Paul highlights the features of Christ’s death that combine to emphasise what would ordinarily communicate a lack of honour rather than the heroic behaviour Paul identifies as early as 1.4. Paul emphasises, rather than hides, Christ as willingly crucified, highlighting his disregard for honour and status. Naturally, given his obedience to God’s θέλημα (1.4), this connects Christ with the divine prosopagnosia we observed at 2.6. Christ’s act on the cross created, for Paul, a visual image that supported his stated belief that God had no regard for status issues. In teaching the Galatians to understand

the significance of the cross Paul intended them to look beyond the initial appearance of disaster, and beyond even their correct recognition of its saving power. Rather Paul pointed further to its impact upon these assemblies’ perceptions of value and status. The enigmatic and awkward idea of a hero upon a cross provides the basis from which Paul will reconstruct community norms. The death of the Messiah of the God who ‘does not take face’, perhaps then understandably, provides Paul with a basis to reconfigure perspectives on honour and status within the Christian community. This is why Christ’s graphic crucifixion (3.1) is profiled as obedient (1.4), self-sacrificial and actively humble (1.4; 2.20), altruistic (ὑπὲρ ἑμῶν, 2.20), and cursed (3.13-14).

Each of these descriptions rub against the grain of normative heroic behaviour. The death of a messianic or divine pretender would be interpreted in the popular imagination of either Jews or Greco-Romans in a predominately negative manner. For that death to be a shameful crucifixion only makes it oxymoronic to attempt a defence of said person’s heroic identity. For Paul to embrace this image shows not just what the cross has done, but what it symbolises for the social life of the community. It is a scandal, an offence (5.11). To attempt to establish a pursuit of status or face, whether by circumcision or any other distinction, therefore, does not simply mask the offensiveness of the cross or minimise the gospel’s power (pace Bryant), it announces that the cross has failed, or at very least been completely misunderstood (2.21). Rather, the heroic identity of Christ is introduced on the basis that he has rescued ‘us’ from the present evil age, with all that this entails, but specifically from the value of distinction. This is the basis for Paul presenting the cross as the only feature of this new reality in which one can boast (μὴ γένοιτο 6.14), it is the paradigm par excellence of values in καινὴ κτίσις (6.15).

861 Humility is normally passive. Self-humbling would be largely unknown. Hellerman (2005: 143).
862 Seeking the welfare of others via sacrifice or even death is ordinary heroic behaviour, but to suffer degradation on the behalf of others is rare. cf. Oakes (2001: 116), Jewett (2003: 551-574) and Sessions (2010: 53). Interestingly, Paul is explicit here with what Hellerman (2005: 130f) finds implied in Philippians 2.8.
864 Hengel (1977) notes that even suicide was preferable to crucifixion.
Significant to our argument, at 3.1 Paul explicitly identified this paradigmatic function of the crucifixion. The profile Paul presents of Jesus should have prevented the Galatians from becoming concerned about status issues. By presenting Jesus thus, Paul exposes the social lesson he wants them to remember from their encounter with the crucified Christ. The status-rejecting death of Jesus, by embracing the cross, has resulted in status disregard amongst those who would trust him, whether Jews (2.15-21) or gentiles (3.1ff). Which, incidentally, removes distinction and therefore grounds for boasting (cf. Romans 3.27). It is this social feature that seems often missed in many readings of Paul’s presentation of Jesus. Most agree that Jesus is presented paradigmatically, as an exemplar, but for us it is the details that matter, namely that he is presented in apposition to normal heroic behaviour by embracing a death replete with honour-degrading characteristics. The irony should be self-evident, Paul’s uses ‘Christ crucified’ to set an honour precedent despite the cross being intentionally designed to do the opposite.

This explains why Paul contrasts the opponents’ face-seeking behaviour with a ‘boast in the cross’ (6.14). It is not his riposte to an honour challenge, but rather the foundation of a perspective that questions the entire premise of face-seeking. Therefore, we would argue that, for Paul, to ‘boast in the cross’ is to validate the example of Jesus in his crucified, self-giving, status-neutralising death as a pattern for living and thereby rejecting the quest for socially distinct ‘good face’.

866 Aune (1994: 308-312) holds that the philosophical notion of commentatio mortis (preparation for death. cf. Cicero Tusc. 1.30.74) would have provided Paul with a model of ‘death’ as a paradigm for life, although he notes that the commentatio anticipated the philosopher’s own death and not that of another in the manner in which Paul discusses Christ crucified. That said, Paul’s usage of Christ’s model is not obviously a preparation for an afterlife, but a guide for present community life. For καινὴ κτῖσις as ‘current’ reality, see Adams (2000: 227), who, as a result, also notes the social reality of the concept.

867 See Oakes (2015: 75f) for this breakdown of the argument.

868 cf. Wright (1991: 152) where the focus on what this means ‘for Paul’ fails to consider whether a Galatian audience could ever read it in a way so reliant on a particular Jewish hermeneutic.

869 Hays (1989: 225n36) does note that ‘renunciation of privilege’ is a feature of Christ’s example, but not explicitly as an honour concern and it only warrants an endnote.

870 Käsemann (1970: 158) cites Kähler arguing that the cross was the ‘basis and norm for everyday living’, but he does not offer a reference.
5.4 Unity in Diversity and ἡ γένοιτο κανώσθαι

Identifying Paul’s phrase, Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο κανώσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ, in 6.14, as an expression of his disregard for ordinary social honour, value, and status distinctions within the Christian community naturally directs our attention towards the text sometimes known as the ‘Magna Carta of Humanity’, Galatians 3.28. Possibly more accurately reflecting the scholarly tradition, Martyn called it ‘everyone’s favorite plaything’. Martyn’s comment is not unfair, as recent studies show the breadth of interest in this verse, the possible arguments to which it can be applied, as well as the historical precedent for doing this. As D.F. Tolmie’s survey of perspectives on the verse suggests, this tendency is as a result of most interpreters being able to easily see the direct relevance to their perspective on the world in which they live. The verse is seen to have ‘immense existential implications’. Whilst attempting not to ill-advisedly fall victim to a tendency, it is difficult to disagree.

However, whilst Tolmie is right to note the verse’s appearance as an ‘open text’ is considerably affected by the reading perspective, we note two tendencies that are common in interpretations of 3.28. Firstly, there is a sort of double decontextualisation that is inflicted on 3.28. As Neutel notes, it has unusually managed to escape many readings that consider its first century context. The tendency to utilise this baptismal formula to support a particular ideological agenda can have the effect of drawing it further from its first century roots. This type of approach also often adds to the decontextualisation by paying little regard to what the text is doing within the epistle. Hansen’s recent consideration of this verse, and parallels (1 Corinthians 12.13; Colossians 3.11), using a social-scientific model of ethnic social identity construction, whilst helpful, ultimately aims to interpret the concept of 3.28

---

871 Witherington (1981: 593, 602n1).
874 Tolmie (2014: 120).
875 Tolmie (2014: 121).
876 Neutel (2015: 2) although her study only offers 1st C. textual comparatives rather than a social reading. 
rather than what it might be doing in Galatians.\textsuperscript{878} As a result the work fails to imagine how this phrase made sense to its initial audience, particularly if that audience was embedded in Greco-Roman concepts of honour. For us this must mean asking how the claim regarding these three groups of opposites is related to Paul’s contention that the abandonment of face-seeking behaviour is directly related to Christ’s actions on the cross.

Continuing the interest in the existential impact, however, is the second common problem that revolves around the question of what specifically Paul means by his denial of difference in 3.28. Broadly speaking the differing views are debated in relation to the continuation or non-continuation of a person’s identity.\textsuperscript{879} As Hansen notes, the preference amongst those who are undecided is to remain vague, not fully committed to the specifics of the verse.\textsuperscript{880} For those who are decided, however, the preference seems to be, whether fully intentional or not, to think about the verse in terms of an abolition of status. DeSilva holds that these identities are ‘dissolved’ in the community.\textsuperscript{881} Douglas Campbell suggests that the οὐκ ἔντι format that separates the three binaries in 3.28 is a shorted form of οὐκ ἔνεστι to be read as ‘it is not possible to be’ (the verb is supplied), thereby supporting the passage as a call to uniform sameness.\textsuperscript{882} This type of reading exemplifies the problem with taking the verse out of context.

\textbf{5.4.1 Galatians 3.28: The Social Impact of the Cross}

Taken out of context, or even with a scant reading of chapters 3-4, some might expect Paul to be mounting a single argument for the irrelevance of circumcision. However, such a reading inadvertently privileges the gentile over the Jew. This would imply that Paul was simply changing one preferred status for another, which would hardly work with the notion of divine \textit{prosopagnosia} that Paul insisted on in 2.6. Furthermore, a correct reading of 3.28 is framed by 6.15 (cf. 5.6). Having established that the cross removes the purpose of face-seeking within an assembly (6.12-14), 6.15 repeats, from 3.28, the removal of the value of these distinctions, but not the distinctions themselves.

\textsuperscript{878} Hansen (2010: 194-196).
\textsuperscript{879} cf. Neutel (2015: 6f).
\textsuperscript{880} Hansen (2010: 3).
\textsuperscript{881} DeSilva (1995: 231).
Paul is not saying, *contra* Campbell, that it is not possible to be ‘Jew or Greek’, but rather that it does not matter whether you are Jew or Greek. Paul, in contrast to the opponents, is preserving social diversity without maintaining its value. It is the opponents who exemplify a totalising ‘way of life’ that is in direct contradiction with the effects of Christ crucified (cf. 3.26-28) by needlessly insisting that the Galatians must adopt a ‘better’ status. Attempts to think in terms of privileged identity or the replacement of one type of social identity with another ignores Paul’s objection to face-seeking behaviour and as a result fails to take the claims of rescue (1.4) or καινὴ κτίσις (6.15) seriously within the letter. Dunn, more correctly, notes that what we encounter here is Paul relativising these statuses rather than removing them; however, Dunn then adds the caveat ‘before God’. The idea that the breadth of the gospel might not have social impact, however, is difficult to imagine in Paul. The gospel’s ‘singularity’, to use Gaventa’s term, is a total and exclusive claim to all areas of life, not just the spiritual ones. Furthermore, with Oakes, the logic of the three couplets does not make much sense of a purely spiritual reading as these are social categories.

We would argue, therefore, that 3.28 offers a social clarification regarding the cross as an exemplar of Christian social life. Christ’s crucifixion exemplified God’s disregard for face, whereas the value-neutral oneness of human status in καινὴ κτίσις should be unsurprising as God is ‘one’ (ό δὲ θεὸς εἶς ἐστιν 3.20). We then notice that the extent to which Paul intends this to be informative is clarified by his lead into 3.28 encouraging the Galatians to ἐνεδύσασθε Christ (3.27). Clothing, in antiquity, could serve to identify a person’s social group (cf. Aeschylus *Suppl.* 236-237), and therefore an expectation as to their likely character and values. The Galatians are to be the ‘social embodiment’ of Christ. The double reminder that they were ‘baptised into’ and ‘clothed with’ Christ is typical of the all-encompassing gospel that we encounter in Galatians, a

884 Das (2014: 467).
885 e.g. Martyn (1997a: 377).
889 NB: the five direct references to Christ between 26 and 29, Mengestu (2013: 188).
position only supported by the negated value of the three binary couplets in v.28. If the Galatians are ‘all one in Christ Jesus’ much as God is one, then Christ and God’s disregard for face must also then be expected amongst the Galatians.® 892 Whereas uniform sameness can easily become a power construct that eradicates certain identities, Paul’s call to oneness nullifies the value of difference without destroying it, thereby further removing the basis of face-seeking behaviour.

In this formula, then, the Galatians are reminded of the Christ imitating effect of their baptism.® 893 Like Christ-actors they emulate his death and are clothed with his personality and character.® 894 Oakes considers how the baptism rite itself may involve a level of public degradation that would be in keeping with our argument.® 895 In these terms it is the status-nullifying Christ-like social impact rather than the specific details of the binaries in 3.28 that is important. Campbell is right to detect in 3.28 a notion of ‘supply any category’ in place of the three couplets we encounter.® 896 It is their ordinary social status rather than their content that interests Paul. This is shown by the addition of οὐκ ἕνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἕνι ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ to the couplet οὐκ ἕνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην. The only pair that is immediately relevant to the Galatian argument is the first, yet by supplying the others Paul shows that although the locus of this problem is a question of circumcision, there is a larger issue at stake in Galatia.® 897

An issue about social life and conduct in the assemblies. This is in keeping with our contention that Paul’s boast in the cross is not a response to the circumcising behaviour of the opponents but rather their ‘face-seeking’ motivation. Galatians 3.28 shows that ‘uncircumcised’ and ‘circumcised’ are only two statuses amongst others that carry no value in καινὴ κτίσις, but rather that all social categories have had their value nullified. Hence our agreement with Tolmie that 3.28 reveals ‘immense existential implications’.® 898 Paul sees Christ’s mode of death impacting in all aspects of Christian

® 892 The only other use of ‘clothed with Christ’ imagery in Paul, Romans 13.14, also has social purpose, cf. Thompson (1991: 150).
® 894 Collins (2008: 101).
® 897 This position is held, although with different content, by Gaventa (2007: 103).
® 898 Tolmie (2014: 120).
social life. This is why the argument around δικαιοσύνη in 2.16-21 becomes at its core an argument about a manner of life.\footnote{This should not be too surprising as there is not sufficient data in Galatians for a full unpacking of δικαιοσύνη, cf. Campbell (2009a: 518). This suggests he is doing something with it rather than fully explaining it.} We notice that the δικαίωμα language enlarges into existential language at 2.19.\footnote{Gaventa (2014: 194), Oakes (2015: 94).} However, contra Campbell, we would argue that the connection between δικαιοσύνη and life is not restricted to an eschatological reading, i.e. resurrection life, but that as our argument shows, and we think is exemplified in the discussion about ‘Jew or Greek’ in 3.28, Paul has in view the immediate social impact of Christ.\footnote{Campbell (2009a: 686), cf. Harvey (2012: 64).} Similarly, this ‘life’ was available to the Galatians not on the basis of status but via πίστις Χριστοῦ in 2.16-21. There πίστις Χριστοῦ was not only the singular and exclusive means of anyone gaining δικαιοσύνη, regardless of status, in contrast to the status-seeking opponents’ argument, but its impact was more than just soteriological. Πίστις allows Paul’s life to be transformed by the death of Christ (2.20), and by implication, its social impact\footnote{See §6.2.} — furthering the claim regarding God in 2.6.

Consequently, a social reading of 3.28 recognises the present effect of this baptismal ritual. Paul is not holding the Galatians in a liminal space, as the opponents suggest, but this is their new permanent state.\footnote{DeMaris (2008: 20), whereas Meeks (1983: 150f) argues for the Christian remaining ‘liminal’. He is heavily influenced by Turner (1969) and van Gennep (1960) on this.} If Christ, in crucifixion, has adopted a non-prestigious position, this has surely affected concepts of honour within the social context of the community that is ‘in Christ’. Seeking to emphasise a prestigious position other than Christ’s death (cp. 6.13) is only to move oneself away from Christ (cf. κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ 5.4), possibly permanently, by the opponents’ standards, if Paul’s insult is understood (Ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψωνται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ύμᾶς 5.12, cf. Deuteronomy 23.1).\footnote{cf. Dunn (1998: 283).} Galatians 3.28 is showing socially what 2.16-21 argues theologically and the phrase ‘boast in the cross’ seeks to encapsulate. Life ἐν Χριστῷ

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See §6.2.
\item DeMaris (2008: 20), whereas Meeks (1983: 150f) argues for the Christian remaining ‘liminal’. He is heavily influenced by Turner (1969) and van Gennep (1960) on this.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
requires the Christian to enact a community existence that disregards status and boasts only in Christ. 905

5.5 Conclusion
In this chapter we used a model of boasting to show how what is defended as honourable sets a precedent for ongoing honourable behaviour within a community. We noted earlier that this perspective on boasting is rarely considered by scholars who appear not to see the social features of boasting, preferring to consider the possible meanings in terms of ethnic privilege, particularly in terms of Jewish identity (§1.2.1, §3.4.1). Our model encouraged us to consider the phrase ‘boast in the cross’ as an attempt to define Christ’s shameful crucifixion as a paradigm for honourable behaviour for the Galatian Christians. This model explained both the nature of Paul’s portrayal of Christ’s mode of death and its social function for the community. The profile of Christ as crucified functions as an exemplar of the behaviour intended for the community that follows the God ‘who does not take face’. To ‘boast in the cross’ is therefore to accept this profile of Christ and reject other, more ordinary, perspectives on honour. This social perspective on the nature of the crucifixion was then defended by our reading of 3.28, arguing that Christ is functioning as an example of the nullification of values that his death has enacted for the Christian community. Importantly, we did not identify an eradication of values, but rather a nullification of their worth.

In the next chapter we will consider how Paul brings the model of Christ ‘closer to home’ by presenting himself as a model of Christ’s values. This will show how Paul is not simply an example or ‘imitation’ of Christ, but a specific example of Christ and God’s disregard for face — a ‘divine prosopagnosia’. This will then be used to argue that Paul, in 5.13-6.10 is calling the Galatian community to abandon their competition for honour and embrace a trust in Christ (πίστις Χριστοῦ) that allows them to ignore ‘concern for face’ within the Christian community.

_____________________________

905 cf. Romans 3.21-26 where the removal of distinction raises the question, Ποι οὖν ἡ καύχησις; in 3.27.
6. Trusting God’s Prosopagnosia: A Christ-Emulating Social Experience

6.1 Introduction

The final chapter of our thesis has one aim in particular. If our argument so far regarding εὐπροσωπέω (§3) and καυχάμαι (§4) in relation to our notion of God’s prosopagnosia as exemplified in Christ’s crucifixion is correct then we need to consider the actual social effect of this. Face, prestige, and honour are, after all, social issues. We will begin this chapter by considering a social interpretation of the somewhat contentious Pauline phrase πίστις Χριστοῦ, how it might speak to some of the behaviour concerns likely in an honour culture, and how Paul imagines the Galatians might respond to them. From there we will consider two social features present in the epistle. Firstly, Paul’s own life as it is presented in the letter’s relatively high volume of biographical data, and secondly, in Paul’s instructions regarding community behaviour in 5.13-6.10. Our contention is that these show strong evidence of being shaped according to the concerns we have been tracking in the thesis so far.

6.2 Boasting in the Cross as the Social Expression of πίστις Χριστοῦ

If εὐπροσωπήσαι is an invalid mode of behaviour on the basis of God’s prosopagnosia (2.6), then Paul’s insistence at 2:16-21 that status cannot be of consequence to the Jesus movement is consistent with his position. Status concerns were replaced διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, an important phrase that has divided Pauline scholarship. Does πίστις here refer to the act of believing or to the moral quality of faithfulness? For an issue that rarely warrants a footnote outside of anglophone scholarship, English-speakers have enjoyed three decades of energetic, intense and detailed argument over πίστις

Χριστοῦ without consensus. The question presents itself as one relating, ultimately, to what one does with the genitive Χριστοῦ as the means of δικαιοσύνη. The so-called ‘subjective genitive’ reading argues that Christ’s own example of faithfulness, or perhaps, his own faith in God is what enables δικαιοσύνη, a reading that often calls upon the ‘rescue’ in 1.4 for support. The alternative ‘objective’ approach reads the phrase somewhat in the manner of Luther’s sola fide as ‘faith in Christ’. Properly understood, the debate is neither grammatical or linguistic, but is about Pauline theology and not simply the exegesis of Galatians, thereby putting it out of reach of our project. That said, it is difficult not to detect something of a false dichotomy between these two arguments and wonder why more scholars have not considered the positions of Morna Hooker and Sam Williams who argue that both meanings must be inherent in the term and that neither are mutually exclusive (Williams renders the term ‘Christ-faith’, whilst Hooker defends the value of the German Christusglauben). Morgan’s recent substantial study of Roman πίστες and fides use supports their position.

Subjective readings tend to be developed in Romans before being applied elsewhere, exposing the difficulty of defending that position solely from Galatians.

---

908 This was evidenced in the heated discussion following Bruce McCormack’s presentation at the recent ‘Galatians and Christian Theology’ conference at the University of St. Andrews (2012) between John Barclay, McCormack, Richard Hays, and Tom Wright. A consideration of the debate so far can be found in Easter (2010) and Hunn (2009).

909 The seven references in Paul are Romans 3.22, 26; Galatians 2.16, 20, 3.22 and Philippians 3.9. Ulrichs (2007: 71) argues that there is an untranslatable reference (Eine unübersetzbare Genitivverbindung) in 1 Thessalonians 1.3 also.


912 See the conclusions of Ulrichs (2007: 253-254).


914 Morgan (2015: 271n39). This study has not yet been substantially commented on to note its impact on this field.

915 cf. Caneday (2009: 205), Wright (2013: 836). Interestingly, following his paper ‘Jesus and the God of Exodus and Return’ in the Paul seminar of the British NT Conference 2013, Wright admitted that he
Problematically, arguments for either position are often methodologically biased or a *petitio principii*, as Ulrichs notes.\(^{916}\) However, two particular points encourage a primarily objective reading. DeSilva makes the brief comment that ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἡσυόν ἐπιστεύσαμεν (2.16) is an ‘unambiguous expression’ that resolves the ambiguity of the first clause.\(^{917}\) This is compelling for Galatians — that Paul would offer an interpretation at his first use of the phrase, notwithstanding the weakness of arguments about redundancy due to repetition.\(^{918}\) Furthermore, Oakes’ recent observation that the christology of Galatians has an anthropocentric trajectory strengthens the objective argument. Christ acts on the behalf of people, and never towards God.\(^{919}\) The developments that we see in Romans 5 and Philippians 2 are not explicitly present in Galatians and are thereby likely less central to this letter.\(^{920}\) Christ acting on the behalf of people, we would argue, is another way of describing the strange heroic behaviour we noted above.

Oakes and DeSilva both utilise the wider semantic range of options for πίστις Χριστοῦ with the rendering ‘trust in Christ’.\(^{921}\) Not only does this sidestep misconstruals of ‘faith’ as creed, but it better reflects its use in the first century.\(^{922}\) Πίστις involves ideas of fidelity, faithfulness, trust and loyalty, particularly in reference to relationships.\(^{923}\) Dio Chrysostom observes that a king’s leadership is dependent τῆ πίστει τῶν φίλων (*Or.* 3.86), as he will need to πιστεύει them with responsibilities (88). Malina and Neyrey observe that group-oriented people were embedded in social structures that required ongoing trust and loyalty.\(^{924}\) Inherent within an honour-conflict was a question of loyalty to the group and its definition of honour and requirements of behaviour.

---

\(^{916}\) Ulrichs (2007: 253f).

\(^{917}\) DeSilva (2014: 43).


\(^{919}\) Oakes (2015: 88-90).

\(^{920}\) Oakes (2015: 89).


\(^{922}\) Surprisingly DeSilva does not explore these features, despite his earlier work on honour, cf. Harvey (2014: 4). Eisenstadt and Roniger (1984: esp19-42) helpfully discuss the role of trust in interpersonal social relationships.

\(^{923}\) Crook (2004: 209-211).
In Galatians, therefore, our reading of πίςτις Χριστοῦ relates to trusting Christ, and his redefinition of community values and behaviour, in the face of the challenges from the opponents. We note that, in the same way as πίςτις Χριστοῦ is offered as a contrast and solution to the status-seeking distinctions of the ψευδαδέλφοι, ‘boasting in the cross’ is the alternative to the face-seeking divisions of the opponents. Therefore, we suggest that noting this synonymity between ‘boasting in the cross’ and πίςτις Χριστοῦ in Galatians might provide assistance in understanding this awkward Pauline phrase. Our reading of ‘boasting in the cross’ showed how this phrase reconfigured the perspective on honour that Paul is presenting as essential to the Jesus movement. In contrast to regular values based on distinction, Paul ironically places the shameful image of the cross as the only thing in which the Christian should boast. Our identifying this as a form of ‘social death’ should highlight the bravery, loyalty and trust required from the Christian community to willingly engage with this level of rejection of the ‘honour contest’. It is our opinion, therefore, that πίςτις Χριστοῦ is one way in which Paul describes the basis for his willingness to reject status-seeking behaviour.

Rather than engaging in self-promotion and competitive self-preservation, Paul places his trust (πίςτις) exclusively in his belief that Christ has neutralised the value of distinction and thereby removed the need to pursue differentiated status. Πίςτις Χριστοῦ is, therefore, to accept and live by the redefinition of honour enacted by the Christ’s crucifixion. To live trusting in τοῦ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἁγαπησαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἐσαντόν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (2.20) is one and the same as boasting in the cross.

6.2.1 The Cross as the Love that Energises the Trust that Removes Distinction: Galatians 5.5-6

The intended social impact of πίςτις Χριστοῦ, however, is larger than simply an open-door policy on δικαιοσύνη. Rather, as we might expect, Paul’s experience of the life-shaping effect of existing solely by trusting in the crucified Christ, is exactly what the Galatians should expect when they continue in that trust, as Paul clarifies at 5.6. In the densely packed sentences that form Galatians 5.5-6 we encounter Paul’s argument in

---

925 That πίςτις is not just general ‘trust’ but specifically focussed is noted by Bultmann (1952: 316) in regards to 3.2, 5.
926 Curiously, we note that Bultmann (1965: 648) previously argued that πίςτις was the opposite of boasting.
something of a ‘sloganised’ form. Significantly, these verses connect backwards to 2.16f,²⁹⁷ and echo the social effect of being ἐν Χριστῷ from 3.28,²⁹⁸ while they also anticipate aspects of 5.13-6.10.²⁹⁹ Although Galatians resists a clear definition of δικαιοσύνη, as Oakes notes, it is used to define the status-ignoring trust in Christ of those ἐν Χριστῷ as per the previous arguments (esp. 3.8).³⁰⁰ Further it reasserts that δικαιοσύνη is not an intra-community, boundary-marking, competitively-earned ‘honoured’ status, but something requiring trust and patience (ἀπεκδεχόμεθα).³¹

However, whereas 5.5-6a summarise foregoing arguments, the phrase πίστις δι’ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη interests us. Our initial interest is the participle ἐνεργουμένη, often claimed to be middle-voiced.³³² It is normally represented as an active, even by those who note its form.³³³ The passive is generally rejected on the grounds of it apparently lacking an agent.³³⁴ However, this is due to the assumption that ἀγάπη is an ethical reference to neighbourly love.³³⁵ The middle therefore suits the general impression that the verse must mean that faith is worked out in loving action. Despite Paul’s concern for social ἀγάπη, this is not the best way to read 5.6. Ἐνεργέω often references the supernatural or the divine,³³⁶ and some have thereby read this text to support a subjective πίστις Χριστοῦ.³³⁷ However, this does not give full attention to the reappearance of an ἀγάπη cognate for the first time since it described Christ’s paradigmatic status-devaluing crucifixion at 2.20. The implication being that δι’ ἀγάπης at 5.6 is shaped by that definition of love, further establishing the connection of 5.5-16 with the themes of 2.16-21, not least the removal of the value of status. Notably, matching this explanation of ἐν Χριστῷ is the 6.15 description of καινὴ κτίσις, which points to the importance of the criticism of face-seeking in 6.12. The connection is

---

³³² Campbell (2009a: 887).
unsurprising given Paul’s εἰ τις ἐν Ἑρῴθῳ, καὶ θην κτίσις in 2 Corinthians 5.17

Therefore, we suggest that ἐνεργέω relates to divine action, specifically ἀγάπη as a shorthand for the cross and not a specific ethical directive (contra Betz). Rather than choosing a strange moment to interject with the instruction that those in Christ should be kind, the passive ἐνεργέω shows Paul restating and summarising a core argument. Status division has been neutralised in Christ, by his loving action (cf. 2.18-20), however, as this is not an entirely realised hope ‘in the present evil age’, the Christian trusts Christ on the basis of his loving death and rejects status competition in favour of a patient hope that will validate that trust in Christ (ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα 5.5). It is the type of πίστις that concerns Paul here, the πίστις that can ignore face (whether περιτομή or ἀκροβοστίων) on the basis of Christ’s loving death. This suggestion, that reads 5.6 as a claim for status-neutralisation on the basis of trust in Christ, shows the synonymity between this verse and the ideas expressed by πίστις Ἑρῴθῳ but also this verse and the community prosopagnosia imagined by ‘boasting in the cross’. As a result we would supply the following to interpret 5.6:

For in Christ Jesus [New Creation] neither circumcised status nor uncircumcised status has any worth, [the only worthwhile thing] is trust [in Christ which is] enabled by [Christ’s] love [on the cross].

6.2.2 Paul as Ἑρῴθῳ δοῦλος: Galatians 1.10

Related to this, unsurprisingly, is Paul’s own prosopagnosia as he presents it at 1.10-12. These ‘crucial’ verses can now be seen to mirror the accusations he makes in 6.12f. Whilst the actual accusation Paul is responding to here (cf. the inferential γὰρ) need not worry us, the form of his riposte is as we should expect. He makes two claims that are paradigmatic to his understanding of the gospel. He does not seek to please or persuade people (ἀφέσκω, πείθω) and he is Christ’s slave (Ἑρῴθῳ δοῦλος).

---

940 NB: The similarity of 5.5 with 1 Thessalonians 1.3 which may allude to πίστις Ἑρポイ (cf. Ulrichs (2007: 71)).
942 Lyons (1985: 135) devotes 28 pages to these ‘crucial’ verses.
Πείθω in 1.10 is often read as a pejorative reference to Paul as a flatterer.\textsuperscript{944} Understood as an insincere person in rhetorical convention, such an accusation would be easily used in Paul’s time (cf. 2.13, and compare Psalms of Solomon 4) and a suitable insult for those questioning the motivation behind Paul’s circumcisionless gospel.\textsuperscript{945} However, πείθω is not obviously negative in Galatians.\textsuperscript{946} In 5.7-10 the Galatians are supposed to be persuaded by truth (πείθεσθαι, 5.7) and ignore persuasion not based upon calling (cf. The cognate noun πεισμονή, 5.8), whilst Paul is persuaded (πέποιθα, 5.10) that they will make wise choices.\textsuperscript{947} Consequently, it is difficult to imagine Paul responding negatively to accusations that he was trying to ‘persuade’ people, or, for that matter, God.\textsuperscript{948} However, the close proximity of πείθω to ἀρέσκω in 1.10 makes it more likely that the question is one of whom Paul is trying to impress (‘to campaign for favour’).\textsuperscript{949} His negated response to this behaviour does emphasise his later accusation that the opponents are interested in εὐπροσποιέω (6.12). The letter is effectively bookended with a negation of concern for reputation and status.

Confirming this is Paul’s apparent opinion that ‘pleasing people’ is diametrically opposed to his apparently preferred status as Χριστοῦ δοῦλος. This is culturally insightful. Slavery often described the divine-human relationship in the ancient world (cf. Jeremiah 26.27).\textsuperscript{950} As a malleable metaphor it could both express the aspects of identity and dependence found within slavery structures, and the inadequacy of humanity within that relationship in regards to other forces, such as sins or desires.\textsuperscript{951} Χριστοῦ δοῦλος is familiar in the Pauline corpus (1 Corinthians 7.22; cf. Romans 12.11 and esp. 14.18), although often an introductory title (cf. Romans 1.1, Philippians 1.1, [Titus 1.1]). Delaying its appearance until 1.10 emphasises an intentional contrast with people pleasing. Whilst this and the final mention of slavery is positive (cf. 5.13),

\textsuperscript{945} Oakes (2015: 46), Betz (1979: 54-55).
\textsuperscript{946} The only other active use in Paul, 2 Corinthians 5.11, adds no clarity.
\textsuperscript{947} Lyons (1985: 144).
\textsuperscript{948} cf. The survey of these views in Dodd (1996: 90n2). We do note that BDAG (791 §1.b-c) is undecided.
\textsuperscript{949} DeSilva (2014: 11), Martyn (1997a: 139n152).
\textsuperscript{950} Combes (1998: 42). This study corrects the error of some who see Paul’s use of δοῦλος as surprising. cf. Beare (1959: 50) who argues that there are no Greek and Hebrew parallels to support the divine-human relationship as ‘slavery’.
generally it is used negatively (2.4; 3.13; 4.1, 3, 7-9, 30). Socially, slavery was among the worst dishonours that a person could suffer, a form of ‘social death’ wherein the enslaved lost their social and legal existence, having no honour to protect, therein, they were ‘socially dead’. Slavery reveals, to an extent, the perceptions of honour in the ancient world and how much the inequality of humans was considered natural — οἱ μὲν φόσει δοῦλοι οἱ δ’ ἐλεύθεροι, δῆλον (Aristotle Pol. 1.2.20). Therefore, by being ‘Christ’s slave’ Paul has no need to ‘people please’ as successfully doing so would not enhance his status. However, he is also Christ’s slave. As slavery also brought the possibility of upward mobility if, perchance, a slave was owned by a powerful owner, to locate himself as Christ’s slave has the possibility of sounding, to all but those at the top of the social pyramid, like a position of some power and authority. Given the likely social location of the majority of Paul’s hearers, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος may also have carried a notion of a particular privilege. Both nuances of Χριστοῦ δοῦλος cleverly combine to additionally support the logic Paul has been arguing since 1.1 that defends why he is not interested in pleasing people. Self-designating as Χριστοῦ δοῦλος shows the extent to which Paul trusts in Christ, but also represents a paradigmatic assertion of himself and the gospel as face-blind in a manner that shapes his leadership of the Galatians.

6.3 Paul as Exemplar of Divine Prospopagnosia

The driving force behind this social position into which Paul places himself is possible δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἡσυχᾶς Χριστοῦ (1.12) which calls him away from a previous way of

---

953 Further, whilst we do note that slavery was often chosen before death, even an honourable death (‘a livelihood could matter more than respect’, Downing (2007: 884)), if possible, slaves seemed always to work hard towards manumission, Meeks (1983: 20).
956 Conceptually, as Gaventa (1986: 309-310) and then Martyn (1997a: 136) note, the connection between 1.1 and 1.10 is strong. Human status designation is irrelevant. Paul does not do here what we find in 1 Corinthians 7:21-24 where he overturns social norms by elevating the slave above master, cf. Martin (1990: 65).
life, including his regard for a particular type of social status (cf. 1.16). As Gaventa rightly notes, this revelation of Christ has a totalising effect. It is a radical change that does not simply reverse Paul’s life, it turns it upside-down. The result is an almost encomiastic description (cf. §3.4.3) of a life formed according to the pattern of his strange hero, Christ. The mechanics of this ‘imitation’, the Kreuzeswissenschaft, need not concern us here, rather we note how Paul presents his life throughout Galatians as one guided by the standard of honour he observes in Christ’s death, socially-expressed in 3.28. Whilst others have noted Paul’s self-presentation as gospel paradigm here, its prestige-defining significance, though often missed, might justify the space Galatians devotes to it. If Paul is going to rebel against his culture’s honour concern by utilising the implications of his revelation of the crucified Christ to establish new values for the Galatians, he needs to show that those values are achievable in his own life. Furthermore, the significance of being an exemplar of the intended group values is that Paul’s leadership would be validated by the group, thereby guiding Galatian assemblies away from the influence of the opponents.

---

961 We have used the term ‘radical change’ to avoid engaging in the complex discussions over whether Paul was ‘called’ or ‘converted’. Witherington (1998: 107-115) offers a helpful summary, and, of course, Segal (1990: esp.58-71).
962 The data, particularly in chapters 1-2, bears some similarity to an encomiastic speech (προοίμιον, ἀναστροφή, πράξεις, σύνκρισις, and ἐπίλογος). This has been noted by scholarship (Lyons (1985: 130-135), Malina and Neyrey (1996: 35f)), although often without an awareness of the precedent setting function of praise. This commitment to a model above the evidence is exemplary of ‘useful fiction’ (Barbour (1974: 38), cf. Carney (1975: xiv), Cohen (1991: 35n2)).
965 Cultures influenced by exemplary behaviour are always susceptible to the precedent-setting deviant (Oprisko (2012: 135), cf. Sessions (2010: 44-56)). ‘Rebels directly challenge the leadership of the status quo because their absolute defiance against the value system of the group requires the development of a competitive value system that the rebel personifies and defends to the death’ (137).
6.3.1 The Death and Life of Paul: Galatians 2.19-20

To show this, however, we consider Paul’s ‘death’. Pushing beyond the 1.10 description of social death, Paul now offers something of an epilogue to his autobiography in chapters 1-2 by describing another form of death. Although sparse in detail, 2.19-20 is telling in its content.

Whilst the preceding data speaks to Paul’s view of law as something from his ‘former way of life’ (cp. 1.13f, 2.18), it is surprising that he encounters a death ‘to the law’ effected διὰ νόμου! The metaphor implies an immediacy that has puzzled scholars. Conversion theory would lead us to expect a gradual change; Paul, however, never gives the impression of anything other than immediate transformation. Regarding διὰ νόμου, Bruce and de Boer have argued that as it was Paul’s devotion to Torah that led him to persecute the Jesus movement, thereby encountering the revelation of Christ, he is able to say his death was ‘through the law’. This reading accords well with Novenson’s rendering of Ἰουδαῖος in 1.13, and, if whilst zealously enforcing Torah Paul encountered Christ, it might follow to describe himself leaving that life διὰ νόμου (cf. 3.24). There is also an implicit irony here that matches the general ‘upside-down’ logic pervading the narrative: Paul’s quest for status via destroying the Jesus movement is what leads to his own shameful death. That the encounter with Christ was the mechanism for this change is made explicit in the second reference to death in the verse, Χριστῷ συνεστάρωμαι.

---

971 Oakes (2015: 93), who notes the influence of Kim (1982: 335), who argued that the immediacy of the Damascus experience was such that ‘...only when this insistence of Paul is taken seriously can we really understand Paul and his theology’.
974 This reading seems to also work well with the παιδαγωγός in 3.24, cf. de Boer (2011: 160). Complaints about the negative or positive role of παιδαγωγός (pace Das (2014: 269)) miss that the main usage of the term is to highlight its interim role, cf. Gordon (1989).
It is interesting that in Paul’s most explicitly cross-centric epistle\(^\text{975}\) we first learn of Christ’s mode of death as a result of this being said of Paul himself, which speaks to the paradigmatic intention here.\(^\text{976}\) The reader encounters the cross as ‘place of radical identification’ with Christ, rather than, perhaps expectedly, as an atonement metaphor.\(^\text{977}\) The passive συνεσταύρωμα implies that Paul is not the agent here (similarly 6.14), much like his earlier call and revelation.\(^\text{978}\) Yet the perfect shows the ongoing effect of this crucifixion with its inherent value redefinition,\(^\text{979}\) hinting that the effect of πίστις Χριστοῦ for the Christian requires them to ‘live to God’, as Christ is ἐν ἐμοί. The metaphorical language intends actual social consequences.\(^\text{980}\)

In 2.19-20 Paul clarifies that, as it has done for him, the cross defines both Christian ‘death’ and Christian ‘life’.\(^\text{981}\) Paul’s exemplary aims are highlighted, in these few verses, by the strong focus on ‘life’. The various conflicts narrated in chapters 1-2 evidenced the ‘life’ Paul gave up (1.13), culminating in his argument here regarding the nature of δικαιοσύνη. It is in the midst of this argument that we encounter this heavy usage of life language,\(^\text{982}\) although notably, when Paul discusses ‘life’ the δικαιοσύνη language disappears briefly.\(^\text{983}\) Oakes and Campbell both observe this apparent connection between ideas of life and ‘righteousness’ that continues in 3.11-12.\(^\text{984}\) However, Paul is also paralleling contrasts from earlier. The ‘formerly-now’ contrast in 1.13-16 was effected by the revelation of Christ ἐν ἐμοί (1.16). Similarly, now the former has died and Christ now lives ἐν ἐμοί (2.20). Notably, this life is still defined by the dishonour of the cross. This new life to which Paul refers is enabled ἐν πίστει, the

\(^{975}\) Paul uses σταυρός and cognates 17 times. Of these, 7 are in Galatians (2.19; 3.1; 5.11, 24; 6.12; 14[×2]). The other 10 are Romans 6.6; 1 Corinthians 1.13, 17, 18, 23; 2.2, 8; 2 Corinthians 13.4; Philippians 2.8, 3.18, cf. Samuelsson (2013: 252n74).


\(^{977}\) Oakes (2015: 94).

\(^{978}\) By 5.24, however, there is an active requirement expected, cf. Aune (1994: 311).

\(^{979}\) Dunn (1993a: 144).

\(^{980}\) Aune (1994: 311) strangely does not see the social impact of this. cp. Oakes (2015: 93). We agree with Das (2014: 269) against Burton (1921: 134f) who argued that Paul’s use of ζάω cognates fluctuated between references to ethical conduct or soteriology in chapters 2 and 3. Both senses seem to be in mind for Paul here.


\(^{982}\) The verb ζάω appears five times in the 24 words that compose 2.19-20.

\(^{983}\) cf. Harvey (2012: 64).

nature of which is clarified by an allusion to Christ’s death — παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.

Returning now to 2.19-20, a further comparison with 6.12-14 is often missed. In contrast with those who wish εὐπροσωπῆσαι and boast in the Galatia ns, Paul offers a contrasting boast ‘in the cross’ (6.14), implying the sort of reconfigured values suggested by a life defined by ‘the son of God who loved me by dying for me’ (2.20). Whereas Paul’s self-designation in 2.19 is Χριστῷ συνεσταυρώματι, in 6.14 he explains that ἐμὸς κόσμῳ ἐσταυρώτατι κἀγὼ κόσμο. The net result of this is that distinction is shown as unimportant (οὔτε γὰρ περιτομὴ τὶ ἐστιν οὔτε ἀκροβυσσῖα 6.15) and replaced by καὶνή κτίσις, which, if the echoes of the final chapters of Isaiah are detected, is a form of life more ‘in tune’ with God.

6.3.2 Biography of Reconfigured δόξα: Galatians 1.13-2.14

In our view, therefore, Paul’s Galatian ‘autobiography’ narrates his death to a status conscious ‘way of life’ in favour of a life trusting in the dishonour of the crucified Christ. Paul’s former life, as defined by status-pursuing competition and advancement (προκόπτω 1.14), gives way to a new life defined by slavery and crucifixion, essentially social death. The selection of data Paul recounted in the autobiographical section leads us to suggest that the plot is intentionally structured to paradigmatically create this comparison. This position avoids some of the difficulty of clarifying the purpose of the autobiographical data. Rather than an either/or debate about the possible rhetorical defensive nature of the section, we refer to our earlier observation that there is a challenge and response thread throughout the narrative that presents Paul paradigmatically whilst defending himself. This was not uncommon in ancient rhetoric (cf. Rhet. Alex. 1432b, 1436b-1437a).

985 Dunn (1993b: 5) does make the connection.
986 The individualisation of this that Aune (1994: 311) notes here, in our opinion is what disqualifies the argument of Martyn (1997a: 564) that the world itself has ended.
988 The influence of Betz (1979: 24) is such that nearly 4 decades later commentators still reference his defensive argument, cf. Oakes (2015: 276). However, Gaventa (1986; 2007: 86), Lyons (1985: 112-119) and Schütz (1975: 128) were amongst the first to challenge this defensive approach preferring to see an integrated purpose to the section of Paul as a ‘model’. Although now cf. Esler (1998a: 59f) and Witherington (1998: 27). More recently Hardin (2014) argued that, contrary to being defensive, Paul is actually attacking in Galatians (Although his position was anticipated by Schütz (p.128)). Given that
This is noted from 1.13 where Paul introduces his past as τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳσμῷ. Ἀναστροφὴ here shows that the purpose of the ensuing is to exemplify a manner of life, but not the ‘manner’ that Paul began with. Notably, Proverbs 20.7 (LXX) translates יָלַ with ἀναστροφή which, in light of ὀρθοποδέω at Galatians 2.14 and περιπατέω at 5.16, Paul’s use here might not be incidental. En τῷ Ἰουδαίῳσμῷ is much more problematic however. In the extant texts Ἰουδαίϊς only appears in the Maccabean literature prior to Galatians (2 Maccabees 2.21; 8.1; 14.38 (twice); and 4 Maccabees 4.26). Often interpreted as a reference to a proselytising process, present scholarship generally prefers to see it as the practices involved in adherence to the law. Oakes avoids the difficulty of a translation with the paraphrase ‘a way of life characterized by practices that Jews generally saw as being proper.’ More recently Matthew Novenson, rejecting a proselytising reading, has argued for further refinement that sees Ἰουδαίϊς as a defensive activism that, beyond ‘general’ observance of the traditions, included a willingness to ‘fight for the cause of judaization’. Thereby Paul is presenting himself as of exceptional status in his previous ‘way of life’. He is not simply Jewish, i.e. observant of the traditions, but ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳσμῷ, i.e. exceptionally committed to ensuring the traditions are observed. This is broadly in keeping with what

Galatians is not formal rhetoric, we do wonder if the benefits of these approaches justify their exertions (cf. Hester (2002: 181), Oakes (2015: 28)).


991 cf. Das (2014: 124), Dunn (1993a: 56), who both also cite 1 Kings 6.12 as evidence, despite LXX omitting vv.11-14.


994 Oakes (2015: 53). Oakes uses the term ‘Jew’ with qualification (p.15). We agree with Oakes, and Mason (2007: 511), that much of the time the term is used with an ethnic group in mind. However, Mason and Esler are correct to note that technically the term Judean is a more accurate translation and less likely to be mistakenly connected to later religious ideas. cf. Esler (1998a: 3-4; 2003: 63-74; 2007, 2012). There have been accusations of anti-Semitism levelled, unfairly in our opinion, at this approach, cf. Reinhartz (2014), an online essay that shows that even scholarship is not exempt from Godwin’s Law. Esler’s response in the comments section notes much the same.

we might expect from the ‘pre-Christian Paul’ (esp. Wright’s Shammaite description). However, the rarity of Ἰουδαίσμος, as Mason notes, generates limited opportunity to apply it correctly, namely, when in contrast with ‘some other cultural pull’.

Significantly, this life was in conflict with τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. The combative, competitive values of his previous life (καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον, προέκοπτον, and περισσοτέρως ζηλωτῆς, 1.13-14) contrast strongly with his co-crucifixion. Προκόπτω, resultant perhaps of Paul’s zeal for Ἰουδαίσμος, is a concept typical of an honour climate, it is a term of direct comparison. This is further enhanced by the comparison being made against συνηλικιώτης, for it is with one’s contemporaries, ‘those of the same age’, that you would normally compete. With implicit irony, Paul presents his honour gains on the basis of his ecclesial attacks as an antitype of life in Christ, it is the life of ‘seeking face’. Προκόπτω is, therefore, being used ironically in contrast to Paul’s later admission that he only boasts in the cross, whilst alluding to the opponents’ present ‘way of life’.

In contrast (ὅτε δὲ, 1.15), Paul has now abandoned honour contest due to Christ’s revelation ἐν ἐμοί (1.16; cp. 1.12). Translating this requires caution. It would most normally be rendered ‘to me’. However, even though we reject an introspective ‘in me’ for all the reasons that Stendahl presented some decades ago, and the temporal ‘in me’ de Boer prefers, because it does not represent Paul’s missional purpose, ‘in me’ does represent Paul’s paradigmatic relationship with Christ. This is how ἐν ἐμοί works at 2.20, a signal verse for our understanding of Paul’s role as exemplar of Christ. The idea that Paul believes this is further supported in 4.6, 8-10, 4.14, and 6.17, and

---

998 Whilst de Boer (2011: 87) suggests this was a geographically focussed attack, Oakes (2015: 54) is more likely right that this is a reference to the singularity of the church that Paul argues for theologically throughout the letter (e.g. 3.28). Malina and Neyrey (1996: 39) read it as plural.
1000 Stählin (1968: 714).
1001 Betz (1979: 68).
1002 Stählin (1968: 714). Προκόπτω is used favourably in Philippians 1.25 and 1 Timothy 4.15.
1003 de Boer (2011: 92) offers a survey of the options.
possibly even 3.1. We would, therefore, argue that ‘in me’ best represents Paul’s understanding that Christ is seen in him and functions through him to reach gentiles. This is exemplified in 1.24, as Eastman notes (pace Martyn), when the assemblies hear about the impact of the gospel ‘in’ Paul’s life. Carey Newman connects 1.16 with the ἐν σοι δοξασθήσωμαι in Isaiah 49.3 as a reference to the self-manifestation of God in the prophets. He argues for a semantic connection here between ἀποκαλύπτω and δοξάζω. From this perspective, the purpose of the revelation of Christ in 1.16 can then be seen as validated in 1.24 by the response of the assemblies. To be sure, the use of δοξάζω brings to mind the effect of Christ’s death and resurrection in 1.4-5, implying that Paul, as Christ-exemplar, is encountering similar effects as did Jesus, thereby proving the revelation of Christ ‘in’ him.

Paul’s exemplary death and life are therefore each effected on the basis of him abandoning a status conscious ‘way of life’ in favour of a life trusting in the dishonour of the crucified Christ. The engagements in Jerusalem and Antioch that we considered earlier serve to further embed the idea of Paul as a ‘crosscutting authority figure’ which seems to be important to the message he wants to impart to the Galatians, most likely so that they can stay loyal to his innovative gospel that rejects the face-seeking exemplified by the opposition. He took Titus to Jerusalem κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν (2.2) and proved in his resistance to the ψευδάδελφοι (2.4) that the value of status has been nullified by the gospel (2.6), thereby rendering the στύλοι as only οἱ δοκοῦντες so (2.6, 9), and validating the need for a gospel mission to gentiles and Jews (2.7). The granting of κοινωνία in 2.9 not as an approval of Paul but as a recognition, γνώντες τὴν χάριν,

---

1008 It may also be worth noting that whilst it is not entirely unknown for a patron to seek out a beneficiary it is not prototypical, cf. Crook (2004: 175). The possibility remains that even Paul’s presentation of God redefines certain honour/status expectations.
1011 cf. Newman (1991: 206-207) for a broader defence. We are not commenting on Newman’s proposal that Paul reads his encounter with Christ from the perspective of mystical Judaism.
1012 We might also note that it was the churches that were ἐν Χριστῷ (1.22) that knew how to appropriately respond to Paul’s story.
stands to confirm this for Paul, despite his earlier distance from Jerusalem. The narrative, therefore, functions excellently as a paradigmatic account of the extent to which the gospel does not respect face — Jerusalem itself is not exempt, neither is Peter. This does, helpfully, provide a reason for why Paul is willing to publicly criticise the Jerusalem apostles and their assemblies.\footnote{The concern regarding this in Lyons (1985: 161).} The vividness of his opposition to Peter in Antioch being κατὰ πρόσωπον ὧντὸ ἀντέστη (2.11) emphasises the extent to which Paul is convinced by this. Whilst Peter vacillates in his behaviour towards Paul and the gospel due to fears about status, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς (2.12), Paul’s action and behaviour throughout this narrative serves as an example par excellence of ‘boasting in the cross’.

These parallels show us the close connection between Paul’s autobiographical narrative and the situation in Galatia, thereby providing the logic for the shape of the data — a narrative example writ large of Paul’s εὐπροσωπήσαι complaint and response in 6.12f. Furthermore, the neutralisation of the value of distinction was the signal issue for Paul throughout, stated most explicitly at 2.6, πρόσωπον [ό] θεός ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει, and made available via πίστις Χριστοῦ in 2.16f. Paul narrates his own life as changed by, and a paradigm of, the redefinition of honour generated by Christ’s crucifixion.\footnote{The narrative’s frequent negations are not necessarily then a refutation of a story told about Paul by the opponents but a rejection of their values, pace Watson (2007: 115n42).}

### 6.3.3 Three Graphic Portrayals of Christ

Having considered that the selectivity of the autobiographical data was to exemplify Paul’s value comparison with Christ,\footnote{cf. Wiarda (2004: 243).} we should expect to encounter allusions to this theme elsewhere.\footnote{cf. Haslam (2001: 66f). Dunn (1993b: 5).} As such we note three places where Paul intends to be ‘maximally representative’\footnote{For leadership as ‘maximally representative’, cf. Haslam (2001: 66f). Dunn (1993b: 5). In light of the distinction Esler and Piper (2006: 33-34) draw between prototypes and exemplars, we consider Paul an exemplar as he is an ‘actual person’ embodying the intended values for the group.} of the reconfigured honour established in Christ’s death, 3.1, 4.14 and 6.17. In each of these we see not simply a reference to Paul as an example of Christ, but examples shaped in the values our study would lead us to expect.

---

\footnote{1014 cf. The concern regarding this in Lyons (1985: 161).}  
\footnote{1015 The narrative’s frequent negations are not necessarily then a refutation of a story told about Paul by the opponents but a rejection of their values, pace Watson (2007: 115n42).}  
\footnote{1016 cf. Wiarda (2004: 243).}  
\footnote{1017 Dodd (1996: 99).}  
\footnote{1018 For leadership as ‘maximally representative’, cf. Haslam (2001: 66f). Dunn (1993b: 5). In light of the distinction Esler and Piper (2006: 33-34) draw between prototypes and exemplars, we consider Paul an exemplar as he is an ‘actual person’ embodying the intended values for the group.}
6.3.3.1 Christ προγράφη as Crucified: Galatians 3.1

The use of προγράφη has indicated to some that Paul is making a reference to a text the Galatians are aware of in 3.1. To be sure, this is how Paul seems to use it in Romans 15.4 (and Ephesians 3.3), and how Josephus apparently intends it in Ant. 11.6.12. However, Longenecker is probably correct to note that κατ᾿ ὁφθαλμοῦς directs us towards the more appropriate rendering ‘publicly portray’. Quintilian is aware of a tradition of submitting drawings of events in a courtroom (depictam in tabula. Inst. 6.1.32), but it is unlikely that this also is what has happened in Galatia. The traditional scholarly consensus seems to be that this is ‘undoubtedly’ a reference to Paul’s gospel preaching.

Betz argued that rhetorical convention encouraged the speaker to do more than just present sound logic, but to entertain the audience in such a way that they could imagine the events happening right before their eyes, something rhetors were skilled at achieving (cf. Dio Chrysostom Or. 12.65). Quintilian positively encourages this. Whether it is unkempt clothes, bloodied swords, or even body parts and uncovered wounds, if they enhance the rhetorical display they are approved. He notes how the image of Caesar lying on his funerary bier in the blood-stained toga he was murdered in creates the impression he is being murdered there and then (Inst. 6.1.30-35). This may well represent what happened when Paul preached the gospel in Galatia.

However, the epistle’s second reference to crucifixion (ἐσταυρωμένος) coming also in the perfect form, shortly after the first (2.20) where the cross was used to describe Paul’s imitation of Christ, opens up the possibility that Paul is doing more than just ‘preaching’ here. As he argued in the earlier verses, Paul is an example of the revelation of Christ and what that looks like (1.16). Rather than describing Paul’s vivid storytelling ability, κατ᾿ ὁφθαλμοῦς stresses the visual nature of his presentation of Jesus. The presence of the two references to the crucifixion shows Paul’s intention to communicate that they somehow encountered ‘the living Christ in

1019 Das (2014: 287) notes that it could be in reference to Galatians 2, but that hardly works as the previous chapter does not do what is being suggested.
1020 Longenecker (1990: 100). Davis (1999: 194) notes that the first ‘written’ option is almost unanimously rejected by scholarship and cannot apply to this verb here.
1022 Oakes (2015: 100) notes that choosing whether to connect 3.1 to the preceding or following texts is difficult to be conclusive on.
the dying Apostle, that is the life of Christ was manifest in Paul’s suffering. ¹⁰²⁴ Downing argues that Paul’s self-description elsewhere suggested that he considered his life an appropriate ‘spectacle’ of an imitation of Christ thereby allowing him to publicly present the crucifixion. ¹⁰²⁵ Furthermore, Paul implies in 2 Corinthians 4.7-12 that his experiences are analogous to Christ’s — πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντας (4.10). ¹⁰²⁶ This suffering he encountered in his gospel ministry, Hays notes, likely created scars that would serve as ‘a powerful visual aid for his preaching of the cross.’ ¹⁰²⁷ Therefore, being crucified with Christ, and its physical implications for Paul, serves to allow him to be a bodily example of the reconfigured honour the gospel proclaims — his own body, as a visual reminder of Christ’s shameful death, is what brought the Galatians to first trust the message of Christ. The subsequent sections on 4.14 and 6.17 support this; for clarity we will treat them in reverse order.

6.3.3.2 Τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ: Galatians 6.17
Paul makes explicit here what we saw implied in 3.1. Paul participates in Christ such that his own body is a visual reminder of Jesus’ suffering. ¹⁰²⁸ The plural τὰ στίγματα, a NT hapax legomenon, makes it unlikely that Paul is directly alluding to a single ‘slave brand’, although we note that 1.10 makes it impossible to rule out the symmetry. ¹⁰²⁹ Rather more obviously are the echoes of 1:16, 2:20, and 3:1 (cf. 4:14) which suggest that for Paul, living Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμα (2.19) has resulted in his body looking somewhat like how he imagines Jesus’ did. ¹⁰³⁰ Whilst Paul discusses events likely to cause scarring elsewhere (2 Corinthians 11.21-27), the connection here does not seem to be directly towards any personal events, but rather his scars’ emulative value. ¹⁰³¹ Paul’s body is evidence of Paul’s cruciform trust in Jesus. ¹⁰³² Therefore, without denying

¹⁰³⁰ Moss (2010: 27). This is also the only use of Ἰησοῦ without a modifier in the letter, possibly highlighting the actual or physical nature of what Paul is saying, Das (2014: 654).
¹⁰³¹ We do note that in 2 Corinthians a similar outcome is reached as a result of the retelling of the various difficulties, namely a redefined attitude to boasting (cf. 11.30f).
¹⁰³² cf. Gorman (2001: 147). We note this use of Ἰησοῦ without Χριστός is unique in Galatians. Whether or not this alludes to remembered Jesus tradition or not is difficult to establish.
Paul’s rhetorical ability, his physical state functions as a message borne out in the ‘way of life’ of the messenger.\(^\text{1033}\)

Interestingly, Paul claims that he ‘bears’ (\(\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}z\alpha\)) rather than ‘has’ these marks. This is reminiscent of the Suffering Servant’s activity in Isaiah 53.4 LXX, and the same term that appears in Luke 14.27 in relation to the bearing of a cross as the mark of a true disciple (cf. Galatians 6.2; John 19.17).\(^\text{1034}\) The emphatic \(\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omicron}\) echoes the \(\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omicron}\) emphatics that showed Paul’s life following the Christ pattern in 2.19-20. For Paul, if there is a status that counts, or rather a scar that matters, it is that of co-crucifixion, a way of life that trumps circumcision.\(^\text{1035}\) By highlighting the socially ‘discrediting features’\(^\text{1036}\) of his \(\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\) \(\tau\omicron\;\\Upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\omicron\) against the opponents’ circumcision of Galatian flesh, he continues the contrast between their face-seeking behaviour and his own disregard for the same. Despite the varied use of \(\sigma\tau\gamma\mu\alpha\) in the ancient world, the one constant seems to be it is generally regarded as a mark of dishonour to be concealed where possible.\(^\text{1037}\)

Davina Lopez observes a theme of Paul’s ‘conquered state’ in Galatians, that is here seen in Paul drawing attention to his defeated state by referencing his scars. Roman men would normally avoid non-heroic visual self-portrayals.\(^\text{1038}\) This verse, therefore, speaks to our primary contention that in Galatians Paul is counselling the rejection of conflict over honour, based on the pattern of the ‘strange hero’ that is Christ crucified. The rejoinder that he bears ‘Jesus scars’ is connected to the wish that he not be involved in trouble (\(\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\)). He insists one last time that boasting in the cross alone really should require the abandonment of competition.

### 6.3.3.3 You Received Me…\(\omega\;\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\): Galatians 4.14

That, we would argue, is what happens during Paul’s initial visit to Galatia. It is uncertain what the specific \(\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}n\acute{\eta}\alpha\;\tau\acute{\iota}\acute{\zeta}\;\varsigma\alpha\rho\kappa\acute{\omicron}\) (4.13) is that brings Paul to Galatia,\(^\text{1039}\) but it is notable that Paul presents himself not as a ‘ravaging and persecuting’ conqueror

---

\(^{1033}\) Davis (1999: 209).


\(^{1037}\) cf. The data in Betz (1971: 658).

\(^{1038}\) Lopez (2008: 138).

\(^{1039}\) Das (2014: 455-462) surveys the options.
who conquered the Galatians, but someone who came in weakness. For our discussion, however, it is the Galatian response that interests us. Eastman is correct that ‘conformity to the cross’ seems an unlikely selling point. Yet this account paints the Galatians’ response to Paul’s arrival in glowing terms. For even though Paul’s appearance (cf. 6.17) presented itself as a challenge to them (πειρασμός), they did not ‘spit’, which is a more literal translation of the onomatopoeic ἐκπτύω than most English translations choose. Drawing initial attention to what would normally be considered a discrediting feature is, as Goffman notes, socially unusual behaviour, as a ‘tainted attribute’, a stigma, would normally be hidden. Paul’s openness not only shows a lack of concern for social norms consistent with the letter, but also subtly reveals Paul’s lack of hypocrisy (cp. 2.13) in that he does not hide behind a pretence.

In this social context the response to the arrival of a person presenting signs of ἀσθένεια would rarely be positive, as it would not be immediately apparent whether the person was under the influence of illness, or the demonic, neither of which would be welcomed amongst the community. The reference to spitting suggests a presumed fear of the ‘deleterious effect’ of the evil eye which the Galatians ignored, instead they did Paul ‘no wrong’ (οὐδέν με ἡδοκήσατε, 4.12) choosing to show hospitality (ἐξασθένεια, 4.14). However, rather than simply describing the Galatians’ cultural unboundedness, Paul adds a Christ imitation dimension to this account by noting that the Galatians welcomed him, not simply as a messenger, but ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. This statement might seem individually somewhat innocent, a ‘complimentary hyperbole’ or ‘exaggerated comparison’ in reference to the pleasant behaviour of these Christians. However, the close relationship between the gospel and Paul’s own life and body we have identified so far suggests it is not an over-reading to see Paul’s weakness, despite its social

---

1040 cf. Lopez (2008: 139). For further discussion of ‘weakness’ as a key theme in Paul’s leadership, cf. Black (1984), Sumney (1993), although we note that the connection with weakness as an inverted term of social inferiority is rarely discussed.
awkwardness, interpreted by the Galatians as an embodiment of the gospel revealed ‘in him’. Therefore, their response to the gospel is a direct result of Paul’s ministry generating a direct encounter with the cross in his person. Paul considers his body as transformed into what Luther called the ‘ugly shape of the cross’, which emphasises the blurred lines, for Paul, between his existence and that of Christ.

Notably, each of these three representations of Paul’s Christ-exemplifying life is highlighted by what would have normally been considered a dishonourable feature. Whether it be crucifixion (3.1), weakness (4.14), or scars (6.17), Paul consistently presents himself paradigmatically in keeping the pattern of reconfigured values of the cross. Christ’s neutralisation of the value of status is so effective that Paul has no need to defend his own comparable status. Broadly stated, this is the paradox of weakness that Gorman detects throughout Paul (esp. Philippians 2.5-11), the pursuit of power and honour has been happily exchanged for weakness and shame. The purpose of this, for the Galatians, is stated explicitly in 4.19, that μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν.

6.4 Forming a Faceless community

In continuing to consider the intended social effect of our argument, it is likely unsurprising that we see our argument as instructive for the so-called moral instructions of Galatians. We say ‘unsurprisingly’, as, agreeing with Appiah, moral change always requires a reconfiguration of perceptions of honour if it is to be established within a community. Therefore, as Christ exemplified, and now Paul echoed, the social impact of the crucifixion has not simply created an overarching soteriological theology for the Galatians. Rather more close to home, and to the exigency of the situation, it has created an underlying rationale for new social behaviour within the Christian community, one which is at odds with ‘face-seeking’ and, in reconfigured honour language, referred to as ‘boasting in the cross’. It references a manner of life that trusts exclusively in the claim that Christ has devalued status and thereby removed the need for competitive πρόσωπον-enhancing behaviour within the Christian communities.

1051 Appiah (2010: xii), Cunningham (2013: 118).
However, Paul does not simply suggest this theoretically, nor does he only provide his own exemplification, but he explicitly directs the community towards this.

6.4.1 ‘Become like me’: Galatians 4.11-20

That Paul has community-forming intentions for his autobiographic presentation is clarified by his first ‘substantial instructional imperative’ of the letter, a call to imitation — Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ (4.12).\(^{1052}\) The lack of a μιμέομαι cognate has led some to reject this as a call to imitation from Paul.\(^ {1053}\) However, Gaventa seems to make sense of the phrase by arguing that the breakdown in relationship has led to Paul being more cautious with his imperatives than we normally expect.\(^ {1054}\) Additionally, we would argue that Paul is not looking to be directly imitated himself. Rather as the selectivity of the autobiographical narrative showed us, Paul’s story is more about the status-neutralising gospel than it is about Paul, thereby the Galatians will hear a call to imitate Paul as a call to imitate the ἐν Χριστῷ Paul who died with Christ (2.19) and they recognised as Christ initially (4.14). This is to say, they are to imitate Paul in his response to the gospel. His values rather than his story are to be re-enacted (cf. 1 Corinthians 11.1).\(^ {1055}\)

However, the second part of Paul’s imperative in 4.12 works to ensure that the autobiographic connection is not missed — ὅτι κἀγώ ὡς ὑμεῖς. This elliptical part of the phrase is not some sort of mimetic loop. Rather, as W. P. de Boer argued, the second clause is a statement of fact offered to justify Paul’s imitative imperative.\(^ {1056}\) The Galatians are considering adopting a ‘way of life’ that ironically is the way of life Paul abandoned in order to proclaim the gospel to them! The autobiographic data served to show the Galatians that Paul had abandoned ‘time-honoured’ values and traditions on the basis of the revelation of the cross.\(^ {1057}\) Here he is encouraging them to adopt his

\(^{1052}\) Oakes (2015: 144) is one of the few who notes that there are earlier imperatives in 1.8, 9 and 3.7, but this is the first that really instructs the listeners. cf. Lyons (1985: 165), Dahl (2002: 134).

\(^{1053}\) Michaelis (1967: 672n29).


\(^{1055}\) cf. Gaventa (2007: 96), Dodd (1999: 162n114). There is also a subtle reference to the gospel’s singularity here, in that Paul’s ‘crucifixion’ results in life in Christ, implying that a Galatian Christian could imitate Paul’s death and the result would be them ‘living to Christ’.

\(^{1056}\) de Boer (1962: 191-193).

\(^{1057}\) Lightfoot (1884: 174).
indifference to status on that basis.\textsuperscript{1058} This also relates to their mutual experience of the opponents. In 4.8-10, Paul framed the threat facing the Galatians as a turning back to slavery, having just established that οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος ἄλλος ὑιός (4.7). This echoes the concerns in his autobiographical comments regarding the intentions of the \textit{ψευδαδέλφοι} (2.4). Paul and the Galatians have a ‘commonality’ as a result of their encounters with the opponents.\textsuperscript{1059} Becoming like one another need not be a ‘call to sameness’ (\textit{contra} Castelli)\textsuperscript{1060} but a reminder that at the core of Paul’s gospel was the abandonment of differentiated status, so there is no distinction between Paul, formerly ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳμο (1.13), and the Galatians, formerly ἐδούλευσατε (4.8), because now they know God, or rather are known by him. They have a ‘shared existence’.\textsuperscript{1061} The way that Paul appeared in Galatia in weakness, as he immediately reminds the Galatians (4.13f), exemplifies not a dynamic of power and assimilation, but a mutual and social ‘downward mobility’ into the pattern of Christ’s death.\textsuperscript{1062} Therefore, 4.12 is further evidence of the reconfiguration of honour inherent in Paul’s presentation of Christ — even traditional power relationships are dramatically reordered.\textsuperscript{1063}

This reordering of hierarchy is such that Paul, the expectant mother (τέκνα μου… ὡδίνω), hopes for one particular result from his interactions with the Galatians and his call for them to ‘become like him’, specifically that μορφωθῇ Χριστῷ ἐν ὑμῖν (4.19).\textsuperscript{1064} Paul intends to bring forth, not models of himself, but of the one he models, which, by implication, ultimately removes their need for Paul.\textsuperscript{1065} (We note consistency with 4.6 where τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ὑιοῦ brings about a Christ emulating cry of αββα ὁ πατήρ. The use of a maternal metaphor (ὡδίνω) potentially limits further accusations regarding power and domination against Paul. It cleverly sidesteps patriarchal ‘father’

\textsuperscript{1058} Dodd (1999: 164).
\textsuperscript{1059} Lopez (2008: 140).
\textsuperscript{1060} cf. Castelli (1991: 89).
\textsuperscript{1061} Eastman (2007: 29).
\textsuperscript{1062} Lopez (2008: 141).
\textsuperscript{1063} Eastman (2007: 29).
\textsuperscript{1065} Barentsen (2011: 25) identifies that preparing for succession, particularly the transition of a ‘succession object’ to the successor, e.g. teaching, inheritance, or even leadership. Curiously, we note how Paul is both identified ‘as Christ’ by the Galatians while he hopes that Christ would be ‘formed’ in them.
language,\footnote{Bartchy (2003: 143) notes that ‘father’ might not need to include authority roles, but could signify encouragement and instruction.} while it also connects to 1.1 where Paul notes the primary authority of the ‘Father’ God.\footnote{cf. Oakes (2015: 38, cf. 46-47).}

Paul’s ministry to the gentiles is seen clearly here, as well as his own paradigmatic function. In the same way as he now has Christ living in him and he lives on the basis of trust in Christ (2.19-20), such is his belief in the singularity of the gospel that he expects the exact same Christ-likeness in the Galatians, which will display itself in their rejecting of the value of differentiated status. Therefore, 4.19 provides important nuance to understanding the imitation imperative at 4.12. What we see here, that works with the theology and social presentation of the letter, is not the imitation of Paul, but Paul as an exemplar of the reconfigured honour present in *imitatio Christi*.\footnote{Castelli (1991: 89f, 116-117). cf. Boyarin (1994: esp.12, 17), Marchal (2006: esp.113f) and the positive comments in Ehrensperger (2007: 137-154). Prior to Castelli’s study, Reinhardt (1987) on apostolic defence, and Shaw (1983) on manipulation, anticipated some of her concerns. cf. Talbott (2010: 102f).}

### 6.4.1.1 Imitation as Leadership in a Conflict Situation

Whilst our position here is broadly within the stream of scholarship that argues that Paul uses imitation as a pedagogical technique,\footnote{ Pace the impression Moss (2010: 27) gives that imitation is a minor feature of Galatians.} we do differ from some with our argument that Paul’s exemplarity is, ultimately, of God’s *prosopagnosia*, rather than his own biographical features.\footnote{There are several studies offering this perspective, each with effective bibliographies, cf. Betz (1967), de Boer (1962), Fiore (1986), Stanley (1984), and more recently the excellent study of Harrison (2012).} However, concurrent with this approach to Pauline imitation has been the suggestion that it is an establishment of authority, with his primary aim being his assemblies’ obedience to that authority.\footnote{e.g. Dodd (1999: 21).} Castelli criticised scholarship for not paying sufficient attention to the power dynamics at play here, arguing that whilst Paul may have meant his mimesis language to function pedagogically, the effect was to place Paul in a privileged position in regards to these assemblies and his ability to assert that power over them.\footnote{This view is present in Michaelis (1967).} The space between
meaning and effect is important for Castelli as she is unconcerned with Paul’s own intentions, rather with the effects of his words and what they imply.\textsuperscript{1073}

Castelli utilised Foucault’s analysis of power constructs to argue that Paul was growing assemblies with a ‘hierarchical economy of sameness which both appropriates the members of the early communities and reinscribes Paul’s privileged position as natural.’\textsuperscript{1074} As such scholars were accused of describing Pauline imitation in a way that lacked content, therefore, without due regard to the ‘static hierarchical structure’ that Paul used to reinforce his own power.\textsuperscript{1075} Whilst we would concede that there are issues of authority at play in Paul’s language of imitation, there are problems with Castelli’s approach.\textsuperscript{1076} At a broad level the hermeneutic of suspicion is, in itself, assumed. Can Paul really be said to be using rhetoric of imitation to enforce his own power purely on the basis of him being an authority figure?\textsuperscript{1077} Furthermore, her focus on effect highlights the extent to which her model is enforced rather than discovered within the texts she analyses, making it difficult to ignore the suspicion that the model represents more about Castelli’s background than the social realities facing Paul and the Galatians.\textsuperscript{1078}

Paul’s world was a ‘complex network of authority’\textsuperscript{1079} and it falls to us to assess how his approach to power compares to his contemporaries. In relation to Galatians directly,

\textsuperscript{1073} Castelli (1991: 89f, 120).
\textsuperscript{1074} Castelli (1991: 117).
\textsuperscript{1075} Castelli (1991: 32), Ehrensperger (2007: 143). Castelli seems to base this position on a misreading of a quote from Furnish (1968: 223). Ironically, Furnish’s point supports our position as he argues that the imitation of Paul seems to be based upon Jesus values rather than any data from his earthly life. This is decidedly not ‘contentless’ it just is not the content that Castelli apparently expected.
\textsuperscript{1076} cf. Thiselton (1995: 140-142) for an early critique. He notes how Clarke (1993) considers the alternate view of authority created by Paul in Corinth, whilst also identifying monographs that show alternate approaches to Paul’s authority that are not simply about conformity and control, e.g. Mitchell (1991) and Pogoloff (1992). A thorough critique of Castelli is also in Copan (2007: 181-218), but scholars have been reticent to critique her, cf. Clarke (1998: 332).
\textsuperscript{1078} cf. Harrison (2003: 315n99), ‘In viewing Pauline imitation from a Foucaultian perspective — and not from its Hellenistic civic context - Castelli distorts the apostle’s social and ethical stance’, and also Kahl (2000: 45n17) who rejects Castelli’s position on the basis that it reflects ‘much more the post-Constantine history of Pauline interpretation than Paul himself.’
Castelli’s work is problematic in that her concerns regarding the supposed empty content of Paul’s imitation and the assertion of sameness differ from what we have seen: the content of Paul’s imitation is Christ and his values. Furthermore, as we have been arguing, the redefinition of values that Paul finds in Christ also resists attempts to hierarchically promote any one status over another (cf. 5.6, 6.15). Ironically, Castelli’s concerns are applicable to the totalising intentions of the opponents regarding circumcision (contra 3.26-28). Paul’s goal is decidedly not ‘sameness’ or ‘uniformity’, as this would reinscribe one particular ingroup value over another. Rather, with Oakes and Kahl, we would see the call to imitate Christ as one that emphasises ‘oneness’ and ‘unity in diversity’. Our reading of Paul’s call to imitation is, therefore, not ‘an instrument of domination and control’ but rather another example of the gospel’s redefinition of the normal hierarchical values of Paul’s contemporary culture (contra Castelli).

The call to imitation in 4.12f is a call to return to the particular values that Christ exemplifies to the nascent assemblies. Rather than an authoritarian attempt to dominate and enforce sameness on the Galatians, this is an example of how, even in early Christian leadership, the Christ pattern was prevalent throughout Paul’s social relationships and assembly structures. Obviously, at one level, leadership is just another way to discuss authority. However, particularly in a post-modern context, it does not carry some of the pejorative baggage that bothers the term ‘authority’. Haslam’s definition of leadership, ‘the process of influencing others in a manner that enhances their contribution to the realization of group goals’, would suit the goals that we are detecting in Galatians, not only in 4.12-19, but throughout the letter.

---

1080 Clarke (2008: 174) notes that Castelli’s argument would need considerable revision if it could be shown that there is content to Paul’s imitation, especially if that content mitigates privilege and celebrates diversity.

1081 Das (2014: 467).


6.4.2 Warning vor κενοδοξία gegenüber dem Bruder: Non-Competitive Community Norms

If, as Oakes argues, μορφωθη Χριστος έν ύμιν is not a static condition but a developmental process, we would expect Paul to offer guidance at a more detailed level as to how the community should outwork this. The text at 5.13-6.10, we would argue, does exactly that. These verses have generated much discussion amongst those attempting to offer a rationale for their form and content. This debate has been rehearsed elsewhere as a result of which the question asked of this section has transitioned in recent scholarship. Representative of the current state of the discussion, Susanne Schewe argues for the broad consensus that Galatians is a einheitlicher Paulusbrief and thereby 5.13-6.10 must be understood as integral to the epistle. This, she suggests, alerts us to the following questions that require consideration:

1. Wie ist der thematische Zusammenhang zwischen Gal 5, 13-6, 10 und dem Rest des Briefes zu bestimmen?

2. Welche Funktion hat der Abschnitt im Rahmen der Gesamtwirkabsicht des Briefes?

Schewe considers three models she terms theological, rhetorical and historical as representative of the scholarly approaches, many of which, despite their intentions, still treat these verses as a Fremdkörper within the letter. However, as Hays and Wilson correctly identify, too many attempts to read Galatians as a unified text have resorted to using a hypothesis about the situation in order to make the connection between theology

---

1088 Early questions about the connection of this section to the rest of the letter can be seen in O’Neill (1972) (an approach which resurfaced in Witulski (2000; 2002: 61f)). This approach echoes Dibelius’ difficulty in seeing Christian ethics as in any way unique or situationally exigent (Dibelius (1976: 1-11)). Although the citation in Übelacker (2004: 321) suggests he may have later, regarding Hebrews, considered a theology-ethics connection). On this issue in the Pauline field generally, cf. Furnish (1968: 208f), Schrage (1988: 167f). Others that struggled to see the connection saw these verses as evidence of Paul fighting on two fronts against e.g. legalists and libertines (Ropes (1929)), or against one group with a double-headed problem, such as Jewish-Christian Gnostics (Schmithals (1972)) or Hellenistic libertinism and partial law-observance (Jewett (1971)).

1089 Considerations of the debate’s history should consider Barclay (2005: 9-26), but also Wilson (2007: 2-16) for comments on recent discussion.
1090 Schewe (2005: 15).
1091 Schewe (2005: 15).
1092 Schewe (2005: 15).
and ethics. More recently attempts have been made to consider how the ‘ethical’ section of Galatians can be read in a more contextually-sensitive way, and even making use of social-scientific models. This seems an essential approach if we are to avoid readings that, whilst they might answer later church questions, are difficult to imagine making immediate sense in the Galatian assemblies. As Barclay rightly noted, we should imagine Paul’s concerns being in relation to community life and not a individualistic Bultmannian existentialism.

In specific relation to our thesis, we also expect the content of 5.13-6.10 to reflect our argument for divine prosopagnosia. This would be in contrast to Betz’ suggestion that this so-called paraenetic section contains no specifically Christian ethic and asks the Christian ‘…to do no more than what would be expected of any other educated person in the Hellenistic culture of the time.’ He argues that Paul adapts generic material for the situation. Betz is apparently unaware of the tension created by suggesting that the Galatians should attach soteriological hope to the value-redefining cross but live out regular Hellenistic ethical and cultural ideals. Are we really to imagine Paul promoting an ethic so divorced from his gospel, as he has explained it? Could Paul’s crucified Christ have so insignificant a social impact?

However, identifying this section as paraenetic, ethical or moral may form part of the difficulty in analysing it and belie the interpretive challenge. As Furnish rightly presents it, the systematic requirement of ethics, properly understood, as an investigation into the ‘nature, forms, principles, and goals’ of conduct does not really describe what Paul does in his letters. The current popular use of ‘ethics’, as a way of describing good behaviour, similar as it is to the meaning of ἔθος and ἰθος in Koiné, is better represented as an idea of customs or expected norms of conduct (e.g. 1

---

1094 This would be our main concern about Barclay (2005: 7, 73).
1096 Betz (1979: 292).
1097 cf. Furnish (1968: 68f) for similar views.
1099 Furnish (1968: 209).
Whilst these expectations might become normative, this is still some way from a systematic consideration of ethics, and definitely not what we see evidenced in Galatians. It appears to us that couched within a description of passages such as 5.13-6.10 as ethical or paraenetic is a tendency amongst those interested in Pauline theology to unwittingly embrace the Dibelian idea that these are popular generalised maxims disconnected from the preceding argument. By so identifying them, the pressure to incorporate them into a coherent reading of the letter is diminished.

To be clear, resisting a definition of 5.13-6.10 as ethics *per se* does not force us to accept a ‘generalised maxims’ position, but rather allows us to consider how the ideas in these verses are ‘integrated’ into the epistolary aim of the individual letters. Our social reading of the Galatian situation expects more than a theological response. Equally, we do not anticipate a comprehensive ‘manual to life’. Instead, we should expect to encounter community *norms* established on the basis of the foregoing examples from Christ and Paul. Norms are behavioural, but particularly in relation to group-defining behaviour, in contrast to ‘personal ethics’. The data of the letter considered so far directs expectation towards a shaping of behaviour that will delineate Paul’s idea of a gospel community from that of the status-seeking influence of the opponents. To a large extent, if our model is valid, Paul’s claim to ‘boast in the cross’ as the assertion of a new understanding of community honour, in contrast to the face-seeking of the opponents, requires Paul to introduce some behavioural data to support his utilisation of Christ, and himself, as exemplary.

Barclay’s recent work, joining that of Kahl and Esler, has considered a contextual situation that takes better account of how the Galatians themselves might have

---

1100 Furnish (1968: 208-209).
1103 Esler (1996: 228) and Hays (1989: 18) note that the shaping of community seems to be Paul’s primary aim for both his theology and his ‘norms’.

---
interpreted these verses in question. Each of these scholars, in differing ways, have noted that 5.13-6.10 shows evidence of concern regarding ‘competition for honour’. Barclay’s study corrects the limitations of his early work by considering how Paul might be responding to the threat ‘from the destructive forces of their contest-culture’. Barclay admits that he is not overly concerned about the specifics of the local scenario, but rather how these texts related to a larger theological concern about Paul’s understanding of grace. He is right to argue that ‘grace’ has developed considerably more baggage in contemporary theological debate than χάρις carried within first century concepts of reciprocity. However, it does seem difficult to imagine his detailed consideration of gift, even with its contemporary parallels, being a primary concern in the initial contexts where Galatians was read.

Comparably, Kahl offers a brief comment on Galatians 5-6 from the perspective of her wider arguments on ‘unity in diversity’, asserting that within these chapters Paul ‘deals with a reorganization of community in a nonhierarchical, nonantagonistic, nonexclusive way as horizontal mutuality and solidarity, as noncompetition, noncombat, nonconsumption of the other’. In principle many of these points Kahl makes are broadly compatible with our perspective. The logics behind this, however, are less convincing. Kahl rests her contention regards these verses on a perceived eradication of hierarchical values as part of the gospel’s rejection of Roman imperialism. It seems unfortunate that her comments on 5.13-6.10 can be easily rejected on the basis of the reader being unconvinced by her larger argument.

Methodologically we find most agreement with Esler who considers Greco-Roman texts within a model of family honour. Esler argues that this section of Galatians when analysed in terms of group boundaries and inter-group conflict is defining identity rather than offering ‘ethical maxims’, the moral ‘norms’ contained within it are only

---

part of the larger concern which is to form a third identity for the Jesus movements that is distinct from Jew and gentile.\textsuperscript{1110} Whilst we agree that Paul intends a community ‘distinct from both Jew and gentile’ (5.6, 6.15) we are cautious about a third identity and would prefer to see the concepts of Jew and gentile as present within the Jesus movement but without hierarchical value as a result of the cross as exemplified by Paul.\textsuperscript{1111}

In relation to Schewe’s questions regarding this section of Galatians, our position is that Paul intends to adjust social behaviour to reflect his understanding of the gospel. Broadly speaking we agree with the conclusions of Barclay, Esler and Kahl who, although for differing reasons, essentially describe the contents of 5.13-6.10 as non-competitive community norms. However, our basis for a ‘non-competitive’ reading is shaped by how we have read 6.12f and the letter itself. The structure and content of 5.13-6.10 seem to reflect Paul’s rejection of concerns about εὐπροσώπευο and offer guidelines on intra-group behaviour for a community that rejects face-seeking in favour of a ‘boast in the cross’. This, we would contend, relies more prominently on the data within Galatians without recourse to wider aspects of Paul’s theology (Barclay), imagined imperial context (Kahl) and yet reaches beyond just 5.13-6.10 into the whole letter (Esler).

Ironically we find agreement with Mussner’s statement that Galatians 5.13-6.10 contains a particular ‘Warnung vor κενοδοξία gegenüber dem Bruder’\textsuperscript{1112} We say ironically as Mussner sees no connection between this statement and the situation of the letter. In contrast, we would argue that the content of this section ‘pushes in the same direction’\textsuperscript{1113} as our argument and shows how the social impact of Christ’s values in Paul’s life matches what he expects to see amongst the Galatians, namely their Christ-trusting rejection of competitive face-seeking. We note, therefore, that throughout this section the themes and concepts we saw exemplified by Christ or reflected in Paul are related to the Galatians.

\textsuperscript{1110} Esler (1996: 238).
\textsuperscript{1111} contra Hansen (2010: 201).
\textsuperscript{1112} Mussner (1977: 395).
6.4.2.1 Mutual Slavery as Freedom: Galatians 5.13-15

The headline (5.13a), perhaps unsurprisingly, of this section is a reminder of the call to freedom. Freedom is that which has been threatened throughout the conflict over the gospel’s status-neutrality (2.4), and importantly for a section like 5.13-6.10, it does not include the law (5.1-4).1114 Καλέω appears for only the fourth time in the letter, but, consistent with the others, is used to reference the move away from and contrast with a status-sensitive life (1.6, 15, 5.8). The stakes of the Galatian situations, and perhaps all life, are alluded to with his reminder that freedom is susceptible to σάρξ (5.13b).1115

Here, as it has throughout the letter ([2.15-21], 3.3, 4.21-31, 6.12), σάρξ, or the allusions to it, denotes that which is outside of and against new creation (see §4.2.3), but particularly in relation to the quest for status. The ἀφομην τῇ σαρκὶ is the likely opportunity, created within the community that accept Paul’s upcoming advice, to exploit the mutuality and emphasise status, in this case in the form of circumcision.1116

To counter this Paul offers the seemingly paradoxical prescription of διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλους (5.13c). Paradoxical, yet grounded in his christology.1117 This oft-cited Pauline expression is less-often recognised for how well it summarises Paul’s community advice, particularly in relation to the threat of competitive face-seeking destroying the gospel community. Διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης echoes the prosopagnosia of the new creation community described at 5.6, where we noted (§6.2.1) that ἀγάπη was being interpreted in relation to the crucifixion in 2.20. A Galatian imperative preceded by διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης is difficult not to read as an instruction to emulate Christ. Love is ‘messianic practice’, as Kahl notes,1118 but we want to ensure that this is read as the specific honour-redefining practice of his crucifixion, particularly as understood socially by Paul in 2.20.

1114 de Boer (2011: 334).
1115 Esler (1996: 232) notes the comparison with 3.3.
The imperative δουλεύετε might appear surprising given the negative slavery connotations of much of the argument (2.4; 4.8-9, 25; 5.1). However, this recalls the initial reference at 1.10 where Paul rejected face-seeking in favour of being Χριστοῦ δοῦλος. This defined the gospel’s freedom not as an autonomy to ‘be the best’ but as face-disregard based upon trust in Christ’s prosopagnosia. This loyalty is now focused horizontally upon ἀλλήλων. This word appears seven times in the ensuing verses (5.13, 15, 17, 26; 6.2) giving a curious shape to a community that would be more used to instructions to ‘overturn and wreck’ the other (Cicero Sull. 46). This other-regard both negates the influence of the ancient Mediterranean contest culture, but also fulfils Torah (5.14). The community instruction towards mutual other-regarding slavery is a surprising yet obvious corollary to the rejection of εὐπροσωπέω. The creativity of this as a solution to the constant threat of honour concern is seen, as Barclay notes, in how it ‘continually inverts a hierarchical order’, the community take it in turns, as it were, to emulate Christ to one another. The social influence of 5.6 should be obvious here, incidentally showing how Paul’s theology and ‘ethics’ are mutually enforced.

The tension of this ‘social reorientation’ is seen in the subsequent two comments (5.14-15) that again speak to the threat from Jewish law and agonistic culture. On one hand, a practical non-engagement with Torah is possible via a Christ-emulating other-regard. Similarly, the practical non-engagement with the δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθείετε inherent in honour competition will avoid the inevitable destruction of ἀλλήλων. 5.15 rarely garners much attention, but its position here shows that the destructive forces of honour concern are of utmost concern to Paul. The failure of the community,

1121 cf. The discussion in Horrell (2005: 204-245) on other-regard.
1124 Oakes (2015: 171).
1125 The difficulties of this verse are discussed in de Boer (2011: 343-350), where he opts for ἀγαπήσεις as future indicative. Oakes (2015: 171) rightly notes that Paul would need to be more explicit to rework Leviticus 19.18. The complexities of whether this refers to the whole law or the moral elements are well avoided by Barclay (2015: 430) who notes that the law has lost its authority to the gospel.
1126 This does not need to reference the actual situation in Galatia (Betz (1979: 277)), but is so indicative of normal Greco-Roman community life it is not unlikely that it does.
thereby raising questions about new creation and the truth of the gospel, is the net effect of not combating face-concern. 5.15 reminds the reader of the stakes of not being attentive to the following.

6.4.2.2 Κενοδόξια or Crucifixion: Galatians 5:16-26

In a clarifying section (5.16-18), Paul lines up his language to show how he uses νόμος (18) and σάρξ (16-17) interchangeably to describe that which creates the conflict (ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται) with the ‘countersphere’ of the πνεύμα community. Significantly, Paul describes the contrasting effect of the Spirit with περιπατέω. To reference ‘walking’ here, reminds of 2.2 and 2.14 where this metaphor described staying within the ‘truth of the gospel’ in the face of status challenges. It is also important that this alludes to language that figuratively describes obedience to Torah. It is difficult not to see the transformation of 5.14, where the Spirit life fulfils Torah and takes over its language, but also prevents the desires of σάρξ from being fulfilled (τελέω 5.16). The πνεύμα as that which is against σάρξ therefore must by implication remove its adherents from being ‘under’ νόμος. The echo of 2.15-21 and 5.5-6 is strong and important — the one who trusts in Christ (πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως 5.5) does not practice ‘works of the law’.

The allusion back to 2.15-21 is strengthened, as Esler notes, with the introduction to the vice list of τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς (5.19). The vice list was a familiar form in the Greco-Roman world, and in this one references familiar data (cf. φανερός and the προλέγω comment in 5.21). Betz erroneously maintained that the form here in Galatians 5.19-21 showed how the Jesus movement attempted to be morally

1129 NB. Philippians 3.17 and the call to co-imitate (συμμιμηταί) and walk (περιπατοῖται) according to Paul’s example (τύπον) and not walk (περιπατοῦσιν) as the enemies of the cross.
1130 Longenecker (1990: 244).
1131 Oakes (2015: 173-175) provides a helpful consideration of the wider complexities of this passage.
1132 Esler (1996: 234). He also notes that the term ‘vice’ should not be read with its individualist leanings in this community section (235n10).
conventional with its surrounding context. This results from a focus on form and not content. This list’s similarity to some Hellenistic lists should not distract from its intention to establish values different from the community’s previous experience. Whilst this list contains many acts we might expect to be condemned by a Jewish writer of this period (πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἁσέλγεια, εἰδωλολατρία, and φαρμακεία, cf. 2 Corinthians 12.21), it is well noted that the list is completed with actions that impinge heavily on community harmony. Whilst some of the acts (ἐρις, ζῆλος) appear elsewhere, those unique to Galatians fit our expectations as condemnations of competitive life (ἐχθραί, διχοστασία, αἱρέσεις), and those obviously linked to honour concern (ἐριθεῖα, φθόνοι) are rare elsewhere (cf. Romans 1.29; 2 Corinthians 12.20-21) — Barclay recently noted that µέθαι and κῶμοι were seen in Roman society to damage social relations. This list describes the reverse image of the Christian. These self-centred acts are treated to the same type of disdain that Paul normally reserves for σάρξ, ἔργα νόμου, and εὐπροσωπέω, in this case that they disinherit from the βασιλείαν θεοῦ (cf. 3.29). In contrast Paul provides a list in keeping with the alternate behaviour we have seen argued for throughout the letter (5.22-23). In the place of self-centred, community-destroying πορνεία we encounter a list headlined with an other-regarding ἀγάπη reference. We argued above (§6.2.1) that ἀγάπη is shaped in Galatians by Christ’s honour-redefining death (2.20), but here we see it joined by competition-rejecting and community-enhancing qualities. These qualities are sourced directly from the Spirit, ergo Paul is not promoting self-improving status-enhancing attitudes, and as such they cannot be affected by νόμος (5.23).


1135 Thompson (2011: 91).


1138 ἐριθεῖα also could mean ‘office-seeking’, e.g. the gathering of benefactors or patrons to support promotion to an honourable position (DeSilva (2014: 122)). For φθόνοι cf. Aristotle Rhet. 2.10.

1139 Barclay (2015: 432n26). Μέθαι relates to drunkenly losing control (cf. ἐγκράτεια v.23), whilst κῶμοι although difficult to differentiate from μέθαι originally referred to a festival honouring Bacchus, God of wine (DeSilva (2014: 123)).


The relation of 5.13-6.10 to our ideas of social prosopagnosia are made more tangible in the three sentences of 5.24-26. Verse 24, for Oakes, is one of the sharpest points of the letter.\textsuperscript{1142} By this point in our thesis the parallels and significance of a sentence like this should be obvious. In keeping with Paul’s theological views and as he found true in his own life (2.15-21), the crucifixion must be the controlling influence on the life of the community,

…through identification with a Jewish craftworker at the point of his shameful execution…the Christian moves downwards to virtue through identification with the dying Christ in the shameful ritual of baptism…in the social dislocation of abandoning former life and social connections in favour of the humble life of the house church.\textsuperscript{1143}

Verse 24 confirms our argument about how the cross is functioning for Galatians. Without repeating the preceding argument, we note how 5.24 instructs the Galatians in a manner opposed to the behaviour of the opponents. They seek εὑπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί whilst the Galatians aim for σᾶρξ is to crucify it. Philo argued, in a symbolic reading (σύμβολον), that circumcision represented the ‘excision of excessive and superfluous pleasure’ (Philo Spec. 211.9), for Paul the cross, and co-crucifixion, has replaced circumcision (6.17).\textsuperscript{1144} For the Galatians the evidence of their trust in Christ (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) is allowing the passions and desires for face, status, prestige, and honour to die. Whilst this separation from expected values and norms is enabled by the cross (2.19; 3.27; 6.14), the active voice shows us that the Christian has to ‘demonstrate and actualize the change that has taken place’.\textsuperscript{1145}

5.25 essentially frames the text from 5.14, although we now learn, following from the active ἐσταύρωσαν above, that this new behaviour is not entirely self-powered, which is hardly surprising given what self-regard can lead to. Rather the Spirit is both the means of life and the guide to the Galatians.\textsuperscript{1146} If, that is, they accept the Spirit’s order and

\textsuperscript{1142} Oakes (2015: 177).
\textsuperscript{1143} Oakes (2015: 177).
\textsuperscript{1144} cf. Colossians 2.11, Boyarin (1994: 26f)
\textsuperscript{1146} Barclay (2015: 429n20).
arrangement (στοιχ ὁμεν) in contrast to the alternative τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (4.3). The life crucified to self is ‘entirely shaped by the spirit’. We agree with Barclay that this is beyond concerns of indicative or imperative, the reality of the new life is shown as true in the behaviour of the community.

Our study so far makes 5.26 unsurprising. As Esler identifies, if the list in 5.19-21 was typical of ‘Mediterranean man’, here Paul demands that atypical behaviour become normative for the crucified community. Echoing 5.15 this instruction seeks to remind the community (ἀλλήλων) that have ‘rejected face’ that the on-going challenge and riposte contest (προκαλέσω) culture has no place in their midst, as such, envy must be abandoned (φθονέω, cf. 5.21). The opening instruction to avoid κενοδοξία is significant. The instruction to avoid boasting without basis (κενοδοξία) has an expanded reach in light of Paul’s redefinition of boasting via Christ’s cross (6.14), all boasting has been emptied of value in the crucified community that does not seek face. We would not, therefore, read this as a boundary/identity issue (pace Esler) that avoided competition within a family group, but rather that the community understanding of honour has been redefined via the cross.

6.4.2.3 Gentleness and the Law of Christ: Galatians 6.1-10

The continuity of thought through 6.1-10 has often proved difficult for scholars, often seeing it as only loosely connected. However, we read 6.1-5 as continuing in the form of the 5.13-26 and the argument we have been tracing throughout the letter, namely, they continue to direct the community into the alternative mode of behaviour effected by the cross. Whilst these verses do focus on the individual, it is the individual within the community.

---

1147 DeSilva (2014: 128) notes this connection. For στοιχ ὁμεν as ‘order’ see de Boer (2011: 372).
1148 Kahl (2010: 270).
1151 Oepke (1965: 662).
1153 Differing examples of this can be seen in Betz (1979: 291) and Oakes (2015: 178).
Whereas the disadvantage of a fellow group member would ordinarily instigate a clamour to gain an advantage at their expense, Paul announces that the occasion of a member doing wrong (παραπτώματι, 6.1) actually serves to mark out ‘those of the Spirit’ (οἱ πνευματικοὶ). The community must act in this situation, but there is a positive peer-pressure to act in a manner consistent with the letter’s norms. The person is restored rather than judged, treated in a manner representative of the ‘fruits’, ἐν πνεύματι προάντιτος, rather than dishonour. Notably Paul is not concerned about the specifics of the fallen person but exclusively the attitudes of the restoring community. Meanwhile, those who do this are marked out as contra-σάρξ by their descriptor, yet still they are warned of their own vulnerability, implicitly advising against any thoughts or boasts of superiority. This sentence is a practical example of the mutual slavery in love introduced in 5.13.

Similarly, 6.2 enhances this mutuality with the concept of shared burden-bearing (Ἀλληλῶν τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε). Cicero discusses how honour and its pain is borne alone by the one pursuing it (Tusc. 2.58). In contrast to the individual bearing honour, the assembly bears burdens mutually. The revolutionary community concept of burden-bearing is often overlooked due to the second half of the sentence, however, it is only when face concern is eradicated and boasting nullified that an individual could contemplate sharing the burdens of those with whom they would normally compete to gain advantage. That burden-bearing was ordinarily slave work further connects this image to the various δοῦλος references (1.10, 5.13).

---

1155 Barclay (2015: 430) argues that this is a new honour position, but it seems more likely to simply reference the opposite of the ‘fleshly’ person. Barclay (2011: 105-115) does admit it is an unclear term (p.214).
1159 There may be an allusion to this concept in the Christ-imitating call of later Christian tradition (cf. Luke 14.27 — βαστάζει τόν σταυρόν ἐαυτοῦ).
Such a connection might be easier to draw if we follow Hays’ suggestion that τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ references the paradigmatic self-giving of Christ. Thereby, burden-bearing is understood via the example in 2.20. Understandably, we would look favourably on this position as the honour-redefining ‘burden bearing’ is being motivated by Christ’s honour-redefining death (1.4). The uniqueness of the phrase does make translation awkward, but we would maintain that the idea that ‘the law of Christ’ is a reference to the way Christ’s death has been presented throughout Galatians makes sense of a dense phrase and dropping it into the broad semantic range of the other difficult phrases of Galatians, such as πίστις Χριστοῦ and ‘boasting in the cross’. Were Paul to be redefining Mosaic law through Christ, it would, contra Dunn, be a thoroughly confusing and dangerous move for Paul should the Galatians also find it a dense phrase. However, the earlier moves in relation to the law (e.g. 2.15f; 5.14, 25) have left the phrase vacant for Paul to redefine as an objective standard in light of the Christ-event. Naturally, for us this means redefinition of status. Thereby we draw the comparison to Paul’s disregard for status issues for the sake of the gospel in 1 Corinthians 9.19-23 in which he remains ἔννομος Χριστοῦ (9.21).

The rejection of status-seeking competition continues to be the focus of 6.3-5. It is hard not to think of the conflict with ‘the pillars’ at 2.2, 6, and 9 when encountering δοκέω at 6.3 — implying that the Jerusalem narrative was paradigmatic of rejected behaviour. This is also a reminder of the central importance of avoiding κενοδοξία, particularly within earshot of an echo of 2.6. The reconfiguration of καύχημα is completed in 6.4 where boasting is essentially annulled by it only being allowed to be practised privately. A private boast is not a boast in its normal understanding, thereby by following this advice the only boast that would be practicable is the boast in the cross, which as we argued is worked out through ‘trust in Christ’ in the very non-competitive

1166 cf. Martyn (1997a: 550) for this reading, contra de Boer (2011: 382f) which is difficult to make work with the wider context.
community norms we are considering here. The ‘showcase of the self’ has no place in the church, hence the instruction to not inflict one’s own load (φορτίον) on the other. The lexical difference between φορτίον and βάρη in 6.2 is not obvious. The context should clarify, however, that the βάρη relates to other-regard whilst the φορτίον would be in reference to one’s self. The reason that boasting is private and a φορτίον is borne individually is probably seen in 6.7 where we learn that, in contrast to the hypocritical world of false face, it is reality or content that matters to God for he is the true court of reputation. This is not to forget, of course, that πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὗ λαμβάνει (2.6), as such God will judge on the basis of ‘what is sown’ rather than ‘what is boasted’. This liberates the community from the pressure of envy, competition and κενοδοξία (5.26) to focus on mutual love.

Whilst 6.6-10 become a little more haphazard than the foregoing, we note Paul reminding the Galatians of why they do what they do. In the honour culture, the rewards are obvious — elevated status, improved life-quality, and, of course, honour. However, the Galatians are involved in their community to avoid corruption (φθορά 6.8) and gain eternal life (ζωὴ αἰώνιον 6.8). Although it presents as a tiring challenge (6.9), the Galatians should continually invest in mutuality (τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας 6.10), especially amongst those also trusting in Christ (µᾶλις τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πιστεως), so as to avoid the destructive forces of honour competition.

6.5 Conclusion

By rejecting the competition for honour and self-enhancement Paul and, so he hopes, the Galatians show themselves to have imitated God’s prosopagnosia as they saw it evidenced in Christ’s heroic death, and as such neither of them are concerned to ‘make

---

1169 Bryant (2001: 218).
1171 The caveat in relation to the teacher at 6.6 may be an attempt to see-off concerns that that the removal of honour-superiority does not destitute those committed to growing the community. Quite how the teacher is supported is unclear — does Paul’s approach mitigate the newfound complexity of having a benefactor of substance or is this too supplied by the mutuality of the community? On rich benefactors, cf. Winter (1988), Forbis (1996: 29).
1172 A mutual-trust reading of this text makes far more sense of it than Campbell’s attempt to read ‘households of the faithful one’, cf. Campbell (2009a: 894).
a good face’. To do this, however, is remarkably brave when surrounded by a culture that evidenced an opposition to values such as these. The Christian community does singularly ‘trust in Christ’ both theologically but, as we have shown, also socially. Foundational to this is how Christ’s crucifixion redefined ἀγάπη within the community and neutralised ideas of inflated status via the notion of being Christ’s slaves. In this chapter we were then able to use this suggestion to make sense of Paul’s autobiographical data as it is presented in the letter. Rather than simply being an informative piece of early Christian history, this data showed substantial evidence of being shaped in order to show Paul’s imitation of Christ’s values in his own life, suggesting that Paul understood the precedent-setting nature of Jesus’ death. Furthermore, we noted that, having shaped his life in this manner, Paul intended to use his own emulation as a model for the Galatians to follow as he led these assemblies through the crisis that caused him to write. This, we suggested, then provided the logic to the shape of 5.13-6.10. Rather than an isolated piece of text we read this section as an attempt by Paul to provide community norms specifically relating to the issue we identify as core to Galatians — the need to ignore the competitive pressure to seek face.
7. Conclusion: Face in Galatians

7.1 Conclusion

Honor is not dead with us. It has hidden its face, moved to the back regions of consciousness, been kicked out of most public discourse regarding individuals (though it remains available for use by nation-states to justify hostility); it can no longer be offered as a justification for action in many settings where once it would have constituted the only legitimate motive. But in spite of its back-alley existence, honor still looms large in many areas of our social life, especially in those, I would bet, that occupy most of our psychic energy.\textsuperscript{1173}

W.I. Miller

The test of any model lies in its ability to account plausibly for the most data and to suggest fresh insights and new lines of inquiry.\textsuperscript{1174}

Jerome H. Neyrey

The predominant silence of scholarship regarding εὐπροσωπέω in Galatians 6.12 means that our decision to take this word as important for understanding the situation in Galatia pushes our thesis into somewhat rarefied space and has allowed us to offer comments and perspectives on this epistle that are at times quite different to previous opinions. We made use of a model of face that considered the public representation of honour to see the correlation between the terms καυχάμαι and εὐπροσωπέω that we encounter towards the end of this epistle. With this we have aimed to make sense of Paul’s claim in 6.14 that he only boasts in the cross and of how that response to the crisis in Galatia might have been understood amongst the assemblies of Galatia, both in relation to the threat from the opponents and their ongoing community behaviour.

\textsuperscript{1173} Miller (1993: x).
\textsuperscript{1174} Neyrey (1988: 99).
In Part 1 our opening investigation into the suitability of a model of honour (§2) showed that honour models are often derided in certain corners of NT research without realising the ongoing development of that field outside of biblical studies. However, we asserted the usefulness of a model for exploring *Wie es eigentlich gewesen*, particularly if the model used accounted for local definitions of ‘honour’. As our thesis was asking questions about καυχάμαι and εὐπροσωπέω we were drawn to a facework model as its interest in establishing, developing and defending aspects of public honour in social interactions seemed to suit our Galatian data. We then tested the model against extant data from the ancient Mediterranean world. Specifically, after considering a generalised idea of honour in context, we focussed on the notion of face and how as a representation of the public-facing side of honour it shaped social behaviour. In particular, this was in relation to three key features of our model that were well represented in that ancient context, boasting, competition around honour, and imitation. We argued that a suitably nuanced model of honour needed to understand that what a group or community saw successfully defended and then praised, or boasted about by others in that group would set the parameters of their own similar behaviour. This allowed us to offer the following definition of honour:

Honour is the positive social value a person successfully claims within their significant group, and their continued ability to maintain the appearance of possessing said value and be treated accordingly.

Importantly, this research and definition allowed us to approach Galatians not expecting to encounter a rigid or fixed definition of honour operating in the community, nor did we need to expect Paul to be subject to an immovable notion of what might be considered honourable.

Part 2 introduced our most critical contention at the beginning of our exploration of the Galatian data at chapter 4. Assisted by our model we affirmed our rejection of Winter’s popular argument regarding εὐπροσωπέω in 6.12 and argued that it only makes sense as an honour term, and that significantly, it should be connected with the πρόσωπον language of 1.22, 2.6, and 2.11. This allowed us to highlight how Paul cleverly positioned the opponents, with their concern for good face (6.12), in direct contrast to God and his *prosopagnosia* — cf. πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἃνθρώποι οὐ λαμβάνει (2.6). This observation of the honour features in play at this stage of the conflict alerted us to consider how the often assumed violent persecution facing the opponents at 6.12 might
better refer to the threat perceived against their own honour if the implications Paul argues regarding the cross are established, namely that the cross will nullify the quest for superior status or good face, achieved via the circumcision of the Galatian gentiles. The repetition of key language from 6.12 throughout the epistle led us to suggest that an ongoing honour conflict between Paul and the ψευδαδέλφοι was part of the cause of the crisis in Galatia (§4.4). The Galatians were essentially pawns in a bigger game, the stakes of which, for Paul, were not related to his honour, but to ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

We then turned, in chapter 5, to address the question of why Paul was so strongly opposed to ‘face seeking’ behaviour amongst the opponents. Here we argued that the opponents’ insistence that prestige can be gained by a commitment to a hierarchical model of community (divided into circumcised and non-circumcised) is, in Paul’s mind, evidence of their refusal to trust in Christ and the status-levelling implications of the cross for the gospel. In response to this Paul offered an alternative καύχημα, a precedence-setting boast that placed the socially-abhorrent concept of Christ crucified at the centre of Paul’s notion of prestige — the shamed Christ is the hero of the gospel. This event proved the extent to which his contention regarding divine prosopagnosia was true (2.4) and in doing so it reshaped the Christian perception of honour. The ‘boast in the cross’ questioned the entire premise of face-seeking dominant in the surrounding culture by validating Jesus’ crucified, self-giving, status-neutralising death as a pattern for living and thereby rejecting the quest for socially distinct ‘good face’. This opens the way for the status-neutral καινὴ κτίσις (6.15) that Paul sees inaugurated in status-neutralising baptism (3.28).

In our final chapter (§6) we considered how our argument might help make sense of three features of Galatians about which much ink has been spilled, namely the issue of πίστις Χριστοῦ, the purpose of Paul’s autobiographical data, and the intention of the section 5.13-6.10. Whilst a decision on πίστις Χριστοῦ is not a crux interpretum for our thesis, we did note the synonymity between this and the idea of ‘boasting in the cross’ as both concepts relate, ultimately, to the notion of divine prosopagnosia. Thereby, for Paul, to live πίστις Χριστοῦ required rejecting the quest for status improvement and in its place trusting that Christ had redefined notions of prestige and value by his death. This allowed him to live as though ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωσαι κάγῳ κόσμῳ (6.15; 2.19).
Consequently, we argued that Paul’s autobiographical data was a select biography that spoke directly to his newfound disregard for status, ultimately presenting himself as a ‘graphic portrayal’ (3.1) of the redefined values of Christ. From here Paul issued a call to the Galatians (§6.4.1) to join him in this manner of life. However, these values are so distinct from ‘normal’ that Paul has to instruct the Galatians in what a Christ-shaped social prosopagnosia might look like. This accounts for the broad content of 5.13-6.10 which is, as we noted, in essence a Warnung vor kenoôξia gegenüber dem Bruder in which Paul guides this nascent community towards alternative social norms.

In sum, our thesis has attempted to do four things. (1) Whilst the position of honour models is well established, we have attempted to speak to the necessity of continued engagement with the wider social-sciences so that the latest developments are noted in our own field. It was doing so that alerted us to a facework model and its possible application in Galatians, which also, hopefully, adds further support for ongoing model usage and honour consideration of the Pauline letters. (2) Remarkably, given the attention Galatians has garnered over the years, we have found a lacuna of scholarly attention regarding εὐπροσωπέω. We hold that our honour reading correctly locates the term to illuminate the immediate context (6.12) but also the letter. However, even if that fails to convince all, alerting the field to an unexplored spot amongst the few chapters of this letter hopefully contributes importantly to our field. (3) In contrast to the theological attention given to καυχάμαι our reading aimed to show how Paul’s ‘boast in the cross’ is a thoroughly social contention with far-reaching, community redefining implications. Given the context of its use in the letter, our model has aimed to show how it is difficult to justify reading it in any other way. Rather than insisting that Paul and his communities be singly motivated by theological questions, this approach leaves open the possibility that the Galatians assemblies, much like churches throughout history, might primarily be motivated by the question of what it looks like, socially, to be Christian. (4) Finally, although reticent to offer yet more kindling to the debates surrounding the autobiographical data and the community advice in 5.13-6.10, we hope that our reading makes good sense in a social context that would struggle to imagine other than the hierarchical society that surrounded them. They needed some help to see καινὴ κτίσις.
To seek face is to seek status. This is not the path that Jesus revealed to Paul (1.16), nor the ‘truth’ that the Galatians began in (3.1-3; 5.7), nor something that has any value to the God who has prosopagnosia (2.6). In contrast to seeking face, Paul offers the Galatians a death. A death to the law (νόμῳ ἀπέθανον 2.19), to flesh (τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν 5.24), to the world (ἐμοί κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κάγω κόσμῳ 6.14), with Christ (συνεστάρωμαι 2.19), a social death founded on an exclusive trust in Christ (ἐν πίστει ζω τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἐκατόν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ 2.20), and a death to which he testifies with his own scars (τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 6.17; προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος 3.1). In Galatians, crucifixion is much more than the means of theological salvation as it is also the mode of a value-neutralising social revolution (3.28). The cross stands strong for Paul as the enduring image of the reconfigured shape of the community that lives by its values. If the cross, as the apostle argues, has rendered vain all attempts to enforce the values of the ‘present evil age’, the Galatian assemblies must remain, via the truth of the gospel, as communities shaped after God’s prosopagnosia with no other option than to boast in the cross.
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Appendix 1: Modelling *Wie es eigentlich gewesen*

**Appx.1.1 Models and the Myth of Immaculate Perception**

Models are a feature of human perception. Humans unconsciously process what they see and encounter into meaningful patterns. This is a limited, selective and culturally-affected procedure that generates conceptual maps to help us to make sense of otherwise meaningless ‘facts’ that we encounter in any given situation — by allowing an organisational framework, shaped by the various ideas about personality, behaviour, values, beliefs etc., that are accepted by our group. In a more developed manner, as Carney noted, social-scientific models allow the interpreter ‘to step outside a set of assumptions’ which might otherwise obfuscate, in our case, ancient culture. Carney describes using models as a cognitive process of ‘filtering’ (actual data), and ‘mapping’ (making sense of it). By asking new questions or observing unseen patterns models function heuristically to provide an analytical framework. It is not their truth, but their explanation of the data that validates their use. On this basis it is somewhat moot to argue about model usage itself given the unavailability of what Carney dubbed the ‘immaculate perception’. Rather, with Esler, it is more important to acknowledge that we do not have the option of abstaining from model use but by being alert to the existence of our own cognitive mapping processes we can be more aware of the difference in others and the need to use critically-assessed models that might help us make sense of previously ignored features in other cultures.

---

1175 Oakes (2014: 1).
1176 Rohrbaugh (1987: 23). This, argues Carney (1975: 3-4), is why definitions of reality are social — for they are based on the accepted wisdom of our group.
1178 Carney (1975: 3).
1181 Carney (1975: 3-4).
The explicit use of models offers three notable benefits. Firstly this transparency can be tested and validated at the level of both theory and results.\textsuperscript{1183} This makes it considerably easier to falsify than ‘putative common sense’ which is often mistakenly assumed to be somehow more objective than a scientifically testable model.\textsuperscript{1184} Scholarly intuition, unlike testable models, often results in inconclusive ‘recontextualization’ rather than verifiable theory.\textsuperscript{1185} Secondly, explicit model usage shows how, from the available data, the interpreter selected the investigative strategy,\textsuperscript{1186} rather than giving the false impression, replete with ‘unrecognised pre-judgements and assumptions’,\textsuperscript{1187} that data can be intuitively gathered and viewed objectively.\textsuperscript{1188} Barbour is right to argue that data has to be theory-laden as otherwise it is difficult to imagine how it is even collected without guiding theories being used to form a model. As much as the scientist may wish for ‘bare data uninterpreted by theory’ the very act of observation entails a perspective, a context, a model.\textsuperscript{1189} Explicit models make clear the interpretive process and the data that will be investigated.\textsuperscript{1190} Finally, being aware of how models help filter and restrict perception in a beneficial way gives the investigator a distinct advantage and, ironically, a more objective position.\textsuperscript{1191} The explicit model user finds objectivity in selectivity — not whether to use a model, but rather choosing a model on the basis of whichever is best suited for their interpretative task.

\textbf{Appx.1.1.1 \textit{Wie es eigentlich gewesen: Defining Models}}

Leopold von Ranke, so argues Finley, achieved his elevated status as a historian by carefully selecting data that portrayed ‘how it really was’ (\textit{Wie es eigentlich gewesen}).\textsuperscript{1192} For the model user this involves considering the ‘goodness of fit’, selecting suitable, simplified, and generalised models that will make sense of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1183} cf. Elliott (2008a: 30) and Meeks (1983: 5).
\item \textsuperscript{1184} Meeks (1983: 5).
\item \textsuperscript{1185} Malina and Pilch (2000: 21), cf. Malina (2001: 6).
\item \textsuperscript{1186} Barbour (1974: 47) calls this restricted selectivism a ‘critical realism’ approach to models.
\item \textsuperscript{1187} Esler (2005: 31).
\item \textsuperscript{1188} cf. Elliott (1986: 9).
\item \textsuperscript{1190} Elliott (1993a: 40). Where data is limited some prefer a ‘social description’ approach (cf. Meeks (1983: 1-7)), however, these are still models, simply more ‘skeletal’ than the robustly tested models used to develop full theories (Riley (1963: 14-15, 26-29, 33-77), Elliott (1986: 9)).
\item \textsuperscript{1191} Carney (1975: 5).
\end{itemize}
data. Even heuristic model usage that fails to take account of issues of commensurability will quickly be considered to be a bad ‘fit’. Rather than being a haphazard process, however, it is a scholar’s responsibility to critically consider the model they use. In examining the goodness of fit of any model, questions should be asked about type, its particular characteristics, and how it is to be refined and then applied to the field in question.

Carney’s *Models of the Past* describes how the best model for studying antiquity outlines the general features of the phenomenon being studied in such a way that the priority and significance of its components can be seen, including how they relate and vary. Models are ‘big picture’, purposefully selective, approximate, limited, and blinkered to ignore peculiarities and explore the generalities of that which is being observed *en route* to developing a theory. This is why the ‘truth’ of a model is irrelevant, it is not ontological, it cannot offer enough detail to be true and remain a model, it is either heuristic or it is not. Thus Barbour’s description of a model as ‘a symbolic representation of selected aspects of the behaviour of a complex system for particular purposes’ is helpful. For our study we would be marginally more specific and define our models as a simplified representation of selected social aspects of the behaviour of a complex system, constructed on the basis of social-scientific study, for the particular purpose of analysing text.

---

1192 Finley (1985: 52).
1194 Holmberg (1990: 108).
1195 Carney (1975: 7).
1196 Morley (2004: 9), Morris (2002: 8-9), and Osiek (1992: 108) note that those who favour general principles over detail and complexity have a tendency to prefer model-based approaches. cf. Although this ‘personal preference’ may need to be tempered, cf. ‘kit bashing’ in Malina (1986).
1198 Barbour (1974: 6). Morley (2004: 17) offers two alternative, but similar descriptions: In social-scientific terms, a model is ‘an intellectual construct which simplifies reality in order to emphasise the recurrent, the constant and the typical.’

An alternative characterisation is as: a simplified structuring of reality which presents supposedly significant relationships in a generalized form. Models are highly subjective approximations in that they do not include all associated observations or measurements, but as such they are valuable in obscuring incidental detail and in allowing fundamental aspects of reality to appear. This selectivity means that models have varying degrees of probability and a limited range of conditions over which they apply.
This type of conceptual homomorphic model is often preferred by social-scientists as it models only selected and important features in an abstract and generalised way allowing focus on regular patterns, typically human behaviour in groups. Conceptual models create the ‘researcher’s image’ of a social phenomenon, narrowing focus to allow an alternate perspective from which to deal with complex data and assess whether the novelty of the model ‘adds to our understanding of that reality.’ A model properly considered for its ‘goodness of fit’ should generate ‘speculative fertility’. Not to be confused with poor modelling theory or indiscriminate application, as a heuristic process it is the degree to which a model can prove or clarify the investigator’s theory or, alternatively, the exploratory weight of the model to unveil and interpret the examined social phenomenon (behaviours, values, structures etc…).

Model selection for our study is simplified somewhat by both the immediately apparent geographical, cultural and historical distance between reader and text, and the presence of possible honour concern in our initial text (Galatians 6.12f). This requires a cross-cultural comparative model, to use Malina’s nomenclature, suitably aware of the social location of the examined and the examiner to make sense of particular behaviours, attitudes, social conventions, beliefs or even cultural roles.

A cross-cultural comparative model rests upon two other foundational models, ideal-type and cross-cultural. Ideal types, according to Max Weber, are ‘utopian’ constructions that envisage how a particular system would react and respond were it endowed with ‘completely rational, empirical and logical “correctness”’ and

---

1200 According to the scheme in Carney (1975: 9-11). It contrasts the minutiae-focussed isomorphic model, or the analogue model which is tested against ‘real world’ data. It is difficult to see how analogue models, despite claims otherwise (see Horrell below), which require testing to produce new data for analysis, can be used to study historical texts (e.g. The NT).
1201 Riley (1963: 7).
1202 Riley (1963: 7).
1203 Carney (1975: 9). He argues that when frameworks are used unconsciously they ‘control us, we do not control them’ (5).
1204 Carney (1975: 9).
“consistency”. As an abstraction they aim to be heuristically useful rather than rationally possible, or ‘normatively correct’. ‘Its function is the comparison with empirical reality in order to establish its divergences or similarities, to describe them with the most unambiguously intelligible concepts, and to understand and explain them causally.’ Cross-cultural models develop this approach by being specifically guided by a series of assumptions about what the culture in question thought about a particular cultural issue, and how that particular issue was supposed to function. Data is used to corroborate or ignore various idiosyncratic constructions of a cultural feature and develop a model from the evidence. This allows for the shaping of a model that helps differentiate between area-specific aspects and those which are normative in every area. Discovering that certain ideals are not ‘universal’, or vice-versa, can instigate a ‘culture shock’ in the investigator which is a particular benefit of cross-cultural models; they challenge familiar and accepted opinions and assumptions.

Meanwhile, the cross-cultural model also functions well in contexts often unfamiliar to the New Testament investigator, namely where the particular area of society under question (e.g. non-elite craftworkers) has not provided much in the way of examinable historical data. This approach allows for guided assumptions using data from comparable cultural areas to fill out the gaps in knowledge and avoid modern cultural assumptions. By using what is known of other societies, comparable norms can hopefully be seen in the examined society and allow for the development of a model. Further, cultural change can be analysed by the model using synchronic (the difference across cultures from the same period) or diachronic (the movement within one culture) approaches.

1207 Weber (1949: 42).
1208 Weber (1949: 43).
1209 Weber (1949: 43).
1210 Carney (1975: 15).
1211 Even a partial idea of a particular cultural feature can be enough to know what to expect, or to identify ideas of meaning and variation, and, importantly, anachronistic assumptions (Carney (1975: 16)).
1212 Interestingly Carney (1975: 17) notes that it takes between 20 and 50 years of cross-cultural analysis in a particular field before there is widespread understanding of the concepts investigated.
1214 Carney (1975: 307).
Appx.1.2 The Validity of Models

This is why a model is not validated by being true, but by its ability to explain more of the examined evidence — both in terms of quantity and thoroughness.\textsuperscript{1216} As Thomas argued well before biblical scholarship listened,

One great incentive for historians to read anthropology is that the anthropologist can offer detailed analyses of phenomena roughly comparable to those which historians are endeavouring to reconstruct with a good deal less evidence.\textsuperscript{1217}

The usefulness of a cross-cultural comparative model in NT work is established by the extent that it is able to achieve two goals. Firstly, how it articulates the researcher’s imagination about the specific area being studied, whilst secondly, its ability to explain the considered social phenomenon and assist in interpreting it. It should reveal and explain the connections between social features and identify how, when, and in what way, they are functioning in relation to the expected norm, whether regularly or irregularly.\textsuperscript{1218} The hope being that otherwise ignored social features may now be used to explain aspects of the text, and its interpretation, that have previously proved awkward. Social values, structures, and institutions missed or misunderstood by the ethnocentric or anachronistic reader more easily make sense when considered via a cross-cultural comparative model with ‘goodness of fit’.

Appx.1.2.1 Model Pitfalls

‘The price of using models’, as Carney is oft quoted as saying, ‘is eternal vigilance.’\textsuperscript{1219} Model users must be aware of the hazards of both overcommitment to a particular model and procrustean data use.\textsuperscript{1220} Some model users become more interested in their model than the data or results thereby ignoring that the utility of models is the ability to deliberately and freely choose to use them. Alternatively, narrowing the data to apply the model is a dangerously different scenario to that in which the model narrows the focus to produce results. However, the explicit, speculative, and heuristic nature of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1216}Cohen (1991: 35n2).
\item \textsuperscript{1217}Thomas (1963: 12).
\item \textsuperscript{1218}Elliott (1993a: 45).
\item \textsuperscript{1219}Carney (1975: 37) The importance of this position is insisted upon by many in the field, cf. Garrett (1992: 93), Elliott (1986: 3-9).
\item \textsuperscript{1220}cf. Elliott (1993b: 94).
\end{itemize}
well-applied models should guard against this by enlarging our areas of study not forcing them into narrow generic patterns.\textsuperscript{1221}

Carney himself identified three major methodological dangers in model usage, namely selective perception, subjectivity, and interpretation.\textsuperscript{1222} \textit{Selective Perception}: If a model is naively rather than intentionally selective in its focus it runs the risk of ignoring important data. A model should be constantly consciousness of the ‘iron law of perspective’ it generates to ensure purposed and methodological selective perception rather than naive blinkers.\textsuperscript{1223} \textit{Subjectivity}: Without consideration of fit, models can distort the data and produce overly-subjective results. Models must remain speculative as the lack of social laws ensures that the importance of any social feature will normally be a matter of conjecture.\textsuperscript{1224} Therefore, the heuristic value of a model will be evident from the results it produces. Whilst models are not ‘automatically transferrable’,\textsuperscript{1225} NT work does have the additional advantage of being able to consider commensurability via other comparable social-scientific examinations of antiquity. \textit{Interpretation}: The selectivity of models precludes their results from producing holistic theories or rounded interpretation. Models fail when this is expected of them, rather they gather selected data from which the research must construct an interpretation, preferably aware of the findings of different approaches and previous interpretations.\textsuperscript{1226}

\textbf{Appx.1.2.2 Challenges to Models from New Testament Readers}

Not all objections to model use in NT studies take the form of caution over their mis-application, some resist the method entirely as valid scholarly work. Despite the longevity of models the consistent and persistent complaints about the apparent difficulties of models prevent any \textit{a priori} model use in NT texts.\textsuperscript{1227} Some object to

\textsuperscript{1221} Carney (1975: 37).
\textsuperscript{1222} Carney (1975: 34). Challenges to model usage often fail to note Carney’s awareness of the ‘pitfalls’. This implies a contention that I hold throughout that all too many of the engagements with social-science theory in NT work have not engaged first-hand with some of the key theorists.
\textsuperscript{1223} Carney (1975: 34), cf. Barbour (1974: 41) on selectivism as a positive.
\textsuperscript{1224} Carney (1975: 35). Despite the arguments to the contrary, there are few in the social-sciences who currently adhere to an extreme position of structuralism that involves the idea of social laws.
\textsuperscript{1225} Carney (1975: 36).
\textsuperscript{1226} Carney (1975: 36).
imprecise terminology regarding ‘models’, while others complain that the models are not being sufficiently tested to be reliable. The dominant concern seems to be the procrustean fear that unsuitable frameworks are distorting the data. The most common ‘solution’ to this perceived problem has been for social-scientists (although these type often erroneously prefer ‘sociologists’) to suggest an ‘interpretive’ rather than model-based approach to the texts.

Susan Garrett claims that model use is ‘nomothetic’, producing results under the illusion that ‘social groups follow laws or law-like patterns’. Models, in her opinion, blithely apply ‘symbolic forms’ no regard to preserving meaning neither identifying the incommensurability between cultures. The alternative is an interpretive approach of a Geertzian ethnographical ‘thick description’ based on an interpretation of symbolic forms coming from the ethnographer’s immersion in the culture being examined. This approach, she argues, highlights both the ‘specific details of a particular culture’ and the awareness of the incommensurability of context free data, something that models do not sufficiently do and thereby introduce ethnocentric ideas into interpretation at the expense of cultural particularity or the ‘natives’ point of view.

Similarly, David Horrell echoes many of Garrett’s concerns, further contending that models fail to achieve their intended avoidance of empiricism as a result of them being not a precursor to empirical research but a result of it. Consequently, models are a remote caricature of the phenomenon they describe and highly susceptible to imported ideologies. He argues that the heuristic approach cannot help but shape the data due

---

1228 Martin (1999: 130). To be fair, a more unified position would help. Elliott (1986: 3-4, 7) argues that Malina’s structural functionalism and conflict ‘models’ are actually theoretical perspectives, which Malina then uses to build actual models (Honour and shame, patronage etc.) Domeris (1993: 292) contends that the conflict model is a model, but that what Malina uses is not a conflict model, but a subcategory of the structural functionalist model. Meanwhile, Horrell (1996: 18) argues that many models are actually theoretical frameworks needing rescue from false identification as models.


1230 Despite them often using a much wider range of the social-sciences than just sociology.


1232 Her position seems influenced by a larger question about the validity of the ‘social-sciences’ as a science, Garrett (1992: 91).


to the considerable distance between the reader and context. Rather, Horrell insists that:

[A] self-conscious choice of questions and priorities, and a theoretical framework, carefully elaborated, may further our understanding of the New Testament more than a particular ‘model’ based upon a very different cultural context.

Additionally, he questions whether social-scientific work is sufficiently aware that model use is imported from the natural sciences where they are used to predict, compare, and control, all of which are features which might adjust data more than NT researchers might accept.

More recently, Lawrence has argued that social-science models are too inflexible and rely on overly outdated views of culture to be useful in NT studies. Like Horrell and Garrett, Lawrence worries that models are unavoidably deterministic, and become overly committed to proving their own legitimacy. Lawrence’s contribution to these objections, however, rests in her contention that the Geertzian structuralism that informs the approach to culture that the Context Group rely upon has been replaced. Structuralist cultural anthropology, she argues, reads culture as an entity that cannot adequately deal with the uniqueness and non-determinist nature of human agency. Behaviour is voluntary, from an agency perspective, and only appears structured as a result of common behaviour. As a result, Lawrence struggles to accept the utility of models as they are commonly used in NT social-science work because they insist on a

---

1236 Horrell (1996: 16). Downing (2000: 13) concurs, ‘it has been all too easy for social anthropologists’ models to be imposed on the ancient sources, rather than deployed heuristically as research tools.’


1238 Horrell (1996: 17). To be fair he does accept that models, although not sufficiently critiqued, have offered ‘alternative perspectives from which to view texts which have all too often been interpreted in the light of sub-consciously theological and ecclesiastical commitments.’ Interestingly, however, all sciences tend towards model usage, cf. Morley (2004: 15).

1239 Lawrence (2003: 3), a view shared with Downing (2000: 13), who worries that, ‘it has been all too easy for social anthropologists’ models to be imposed on the ancient sources, rather than deployed heuristically as research tools.’ Elliott (2008a: 28) accuses them of being ‘muddled’ in their understanding of models.

1240 Lawrence (2003: 22f).

general perspective on culture from a structured position, they cannot, so it is claimed,
deal with issues of diversity and difference.\textsuperscript{1242}

Appx.1.2.3 Ripostes on the Behalf of Models

These challenges have attracted responses.\textsuperscript{1243} Interestingly, these objections rarely offer the revealing critiques the authors expect, we noted above that Carney was aware of the possibility of ‘determinism’, ‘prediction’ and ‘incommensurability’.\textsuperscript{1244} So the objections are something of a straw man, whilst technically fair concerns, they are rarely evidenced by NT model users.

Whilst many model users subscribe to Weberian ideas about social regularities and argue that recurrent patterns of social behaviour are both meaningful and, to an extent, predictable, this is not ‘nomothetic’.\textsuperscript{1245} Rather than support the idea of social laws, most NT social-scientific approaches make explicit statements to the contrary.\textsuperscript{1246} Models reveal conventional behaviour and often offer an explanation for otherwise obscure, or previously misinterpreted, situations.\textsuperscript{1247} Ironically it is the lack of predictability rather than the positivism of ‘social laws’ that requires the tools used by the social-scientist. The social-scientist, to echo Marx, looks for the ‘tendency’ of behaviour rather than expecting a deterministic law, as humans are always capable of change.\textsuperscript{1248} Models do not seek self-verification, rather their interest is in how the data, the ‘tendency’, can enhance the social-scientific imagination.\textsuperscript{1249} Horrell’s complaint that models shape evidence to fit the data is simply an unfair reading of their intentional selectivism. As Finley notes, ‘the familiar fear of a priorism is misplaced’ for by

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{1242} Lawrence (2003: 41, 45).
\item\textsuperscript{1244} Carney (1975: 34f).
\item\textsuperscript{1245} cf. Elliott (1993a: 14), Esler (2005: 14).
\item\textsuperscript{1246} Compare the early position of Elliott (1981: 9-14) with the recent position of Crook (2006) to note how this has been consistently adhered to.
\item\textsuperscript{1247} Crook (2006: 92).
\item\textsuperscript{1248} ‘Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please…’ Marx (1968: 97), cf. Morley (2004: 14-15).
\item\textsuperscript{1249} Esler (1998b: 256).
\end{itemize}
necessity models adjust their shape, not the data. To imply that this is a negative quality suggests a misunderstanding of models and human ability to process data. Furthermore, it is difficult to see how Horrell’s proposed ‘self-conscious choice of questions and priorities, and a theoretical framework, carefully elaborated’ is not a model. Arguing, with Mandelbaum, that cultural anthropologists risk less data distortion by rejecting heuristic models and working from the ‘ground up’, Horrell contends that a Geertzian ‘thick description’ is better achieved by ‘participant observation’ or ‘deep immersion’. However, it is not certain that a NT social-science is, per se, cultural anthropology, rather it is reliant on the results of cultural anthropological study. It is difficult to see where the field work that Horrell claims should replace a model can take place for the NT reader. Furthermore, with Esler, it is difficult to see how Horrell’s method of interpretivism works when the culture in question is ‘known only fragmentarily from extant texts and other remains’. It appears not so much an issue of the validity of Horrell’s concerns, but rather whether they are applicable to the type of work happening amongst NT social-scientific inquiry. Meanwhile, many of Lawrence’s objections founder on her claim that model building reflects an outdated structuralist view of culture. The field is neither so polarised, nor has it swung from structuralism to agency. Rather, as Crook notes in his various critiques of Lawrence, that the commoner discussion is one of the balance of the ideas from within structuralism and agency, whilst the categories themselves are

---

1251 Esler (1995b: 4), prior to their arguments, lists Horrell amongst the model users.
1253 Kuper (1992: 2) notes that ethnographic field work is a rite de passage, in contrast with most NT social-scientists experience.
1255 Esler (1998b: 254). It is not entirely clear how ‘deep immersion’ avoids the model ‘issues’ of selective perception and anachronistic ethnocentrism. Is the researcher exportable to an ancient Mediterranean context? At least models are acknowledged thereby easier to observe where they might be overly particular.
1256 Horrell’s description of his method sounds akin to Carney’s ‘analogue Homomorphic model’ tempting us to argue that this is a language issue. Carney (1975: 10f). Perhaps this is a question of type rather than method?
1257 Crook (2007: 254n8) notes the polarities are variously described as ‘determinism vs. voluntarism, Naturwissenschaften vs. Geisteswissenschaften, subjectivity vs. objectivity, individual action vs. cultural order.’
considered ‘red herrings’. Bennet Berger, rejecting the ‘either/or’ choice, holds that humans have freedom within particular confines, so behaviour is not determined but delineated. Crook notes that this position is held by many in the field (he cites Bourdieu, Giddens, Sahlins, Swidler and Ortner) and has been for some time.

**Appx.1.3 The Need for Models that Fit**

Many of these objections can be circumvented by better understanding and application of models. The lack of sufficient emic data for NT social analysis seems to require the etic categories inherent to models, thereby, if sufficiently acknowledged and balanced with available emic data, offering informative readings of distant culture. The alternative, however much it protests, is not the rejection of models but of explicit acknowledgement of their use. Our position is in keeping, however, with conventional view amongst anthropologists that ‘ethnographic research yields findings which can be reinterpreted in different analytical frameworks and compared with similar data collected elsewhere’. Theory and ethnography must work together.

NT social-science deserves some of this criticism, however. Models regularly read cultures with far more sophisticated approaches than they are credited with. Some NT model proponents give the impression of model usage being ‘just a bit of fun’ and are possibly responsible for the general suspicion it received or the accusations of it being ‘non-scientific’. Whilst Esler rightly insists on the heuristic potential of models, if misunderstood, this can imply that the model is less important than it is. Similarly, Malina’s well-informed, carefully-crafted theories and approaches are diminished by describing it as *Kitbaschierung*. Kitbashing implies a lack of precision that is not reflected in Malina’s work or his description of the method as gathering ‘a highly

---

1261 Geertz (1983: 69) calls this ‘continuous dialectical tacking’. See a fuller defence of this in Feleppa (1986).
1264 Kuper (1992: 2).
1266 Malina (1986: iii).
selective collection of social-science models’ and constructing them in a way that reveals some of the implicit meanings in the behaviour encountered in the NT.\textsuperscript{1267}

However, whilst every anthropologist, ethnographer, or the likes is aware that human life does not happen at the level of ‘generality’, we assert that the purpose of social-scientific inquiry is lost (or defeated)\textsuperscript{1268} if the research is done at such a detailed level that it cannot be utilised elsewhere (Descola’s ‘cognitive apartheid’),\textsuperscript{1269} or if it is so cornered by relativism that it loses the confidence to say anything meaningful (Geertz’ ‘epistemological hypochondria’).\textsuperscript{1270} Models overcome the problem of incommensurability by requiring a level of generality and selectivism to guide their approach as they attempt to make sense of that which is normal and regular in a different culture without making anachronistic and ethnocentric interpretive claims.\textsuperscript{1271} This is, perhaps, the problem. Too many NT scholars are only concerned with the unique, the historical, the rare, and as such social-science approaches, models particularly, appear problematic. Making sense of the social world of the NT, conversely, demands interest in the regular and repeatable, and the models we use are often refined to ignore the irrelevant or unique and understand that which is common.\textsuperscript{1272}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item 1267 Malina (1986: iii). Ironically, Malina himself bemoans the lack of precision in model building elsewhere, despite his method appearing to encourage it. Malina (1982: 241)
\item 1269 Descola (1992: 108). The current postcolonial insistence on not stereotyping The Other, as Crook (2007: 265) notes, can dissuade many from robust anthropology as highlighting difference has often implied value judgements that are not implicit to social-scientific model work.
\item 1270 Geertz (1988: 71). cf. the helpful discussion of this in Esler (1995b: 5).
\item 1271 Crook (2007: 262).
\item 1272 Finley (1985: 56-57).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}