

objective"); im Röm meine die Genitivverbindung durchweg ein Attribut des richtenden Gottes (97.256). Dem daneben vorkommenden absoluten Gebrauch, der Assoziation mit δικαιος und δικαιοῦ soll das Zauberwort "dynamisch" Rechnung tragen. Es handle sich um ein "attribut dynamique, par lequel Dieu justifie l'homme coupable" (97). Diese Auffassung passt natürlich ausgezeichnet zu einer Deutung, die den Röm weithin als Theodizee nimmt. So etwas ist in 9,14-21 unbestreitbar. Doch liegt Paulus sonst an dem umgekehrten Vorgang, nämlich dass Gott den Menschen rechtfertigt. So geht es m.E. etwa in 1,18-32 nicht darum, "die Gerechtigkeit Gottes (v. 17) zu verteidigen", indem die Schuld der Menschen aufgewiesen wird (109). Das vertrüge sich eher mit einer *iustitia retributiva*. Es soll vielmehr die Notwendigkeit der Gerechtigkeit von Gott dargetan werden, wo die Menschen unter der Sünde sind (also derselbe Gegensatz wie 2 Kor 5,21). Einen anderen traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund hat wieder 3,3-8: den Rechtsstreit, in dem Gott sich aber selbst Recht verschafft (anders 217 "un procès dans lequel Dieu doit être défendu"). Hier erkennt L. ja auch ausnahmsweise die biblische Implikation des "châtiment divin" (97). Bei 3,24-26, wo L.s dynamische Konzeption am ehesten Anhalt findet, wird Tradition und Redaktion nicht deutlich von einander abgehoben. Zwar nimmt der Kommentator hier "un héritage plus ou moins important" an, der Text sei aber im Rahmen des paulinischen Denkens auszulegen (263). Hier lehnt L. übrigens einen typologischen Bezug zur atl. *kapporet* ab. Gott habe Christus als Sühnemittel hingestellt (ein Vorschlag, der Diskussion verdient). Auch sonst ist L. vor sich zurückhaltend mit atl. Modellen (vgl. 451-452 zur Paradiesgeschichte in Röm 7,11; 504 gegen Exodustypologie in 8; 549-550 zum Opfer Abrahams in 8,32; 576 gegen Echo von Ex 32,31-32 in 9,3). So sehr es zu begrüßen ist, dass L. das theologische Profil des Apostels herausmeißelt; es hätte vielleicht, doch nie und da an Schärfe gewonnen, wenn er sein Verhältnis zur atl. jüdischen, aber auch zur urchristlichen Tradition expliziter dargestellt hätte. Freilich muss man hier oft mit Hypothesen arbeiten.

L. weigert sich auch, mit psychologischen Erwägungen gedankliche Lücken bei Paulus aufzufüllen. Z.B. würde man gern erfahren, warum das Gesetz die Sünde vermehrt (5,20). Für L. ist das "Erkennen" der Sünde durch das Gesetz ein reiner Wissensprozess (447-448 zu 7,7). Dass das Verbot das Verbotene um so begehrenswerter erscheinen lässt und geradezu das Begehr erregt, wird 449 nicht in seinem psychologischen Mechanismus ausgeführt. Im übrigen stimmt der Rezensent mit fast allem, was L. zum Gesetz sagt (Vieldeutigkeit des Begriffs in 3,27; 7,21-25; 8,2; Christus als Ende des Gesetzes 10,4), überein. Ein anderes Beispiel: das "Eifersüchtigmachen" 10,19; 11,1,13, unzweifelhaft eine psychologische Kategorie. L. möchte hier jeden Rekurs auf Erfahrung ausschalten (698), die Idee spielt auch in 11,25-32 keine Rolle mehr (754). Das scheint mir fraglich, wenn gerade das Hereinkommen der "Fülle der Heiden" die Rettung ganz auslöst. Auch schreibt sich m.E. Paulus daran, mithin am Eifersüchtigmachen Israels, einen größeren persönlichen Anteil zu, als L. ihm zugestehen will (766). Nicht nur die Kollekte, sondern auch die Spanienmission ist hier unbedingt zu nennen, um die Zukunftsvision des Apostels zu konkretisieren. Bei L. bleibt das "Geheimnis" in seinem Wie mysteriös. 11,33-36 bezeugt das Scheitern jeglicher Spekulation (747-748;

vgl. dagegen meinen Kommentar 200-201 zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang zwischen der Enthüllung eines Geheimnisses und dem Lob der unergründlichen Wege Gottes). Zwar soll auch meiner Meinung nach das Zitat 11,26-27 nicht dieses Wie lüften. L. liest hier eine Initiative Gottes (nicht Christi! durchaus bedenkenswert; die Deutung von U. Luz u.a. auf den schon gekommenen Christus wird gar nicht erwähnt) heraus, die aber was Zeit und nähere Umstände angeht, unbestimmt und "tout spirituel" bleibt (730-731). Andererseits ist die Naherwartung (ebd. mit 13,11-12) nicht zu erkennen (obwohl 11,15 nicht auf die Auferstehung der Toten geht: 707-708). Und Paulus mag sich – wenn auch illusorisch – durchaus von seiner Ausbreitung der Botschaft bis in den äußersten Westen (925) eine Wirkung auf die schon missionierten (10,14-21), aber ungläubig gebliebenen Juden versprochen haben. Eines ist jedenfalls bei dieser Auffassung mit L. gegen F. Mußner festzuhalten: Paulus sieht für Israel keinen "Sonderweg" zum Heil vor, der um den Glauben an Jesus Christus herumkäme (728.753.756; vgl. schon 305 zu 4,12; 314 zu 4,16).

So bleibt der Kommentar nüchtern, dem Text verhaftet. Er zeigt zwar theologisches Problembewusstsein, verzichtet aber auf jede Art von Aktualisierung. Nur einige Exkurse geben hermeneutische Winke zu anstößigen oder schwer verständlichen Aussagen des Apostels (137-138 "Dieu à l'origine des perversions humaines"; 753-756 zu Röm 9-11; 818-822 zu 13,1-7). Der größte Nutzen dieser Auslegung besteht m.E. in der Transparenz ihrer philologischen Entscheidungen. Positiv ist auch, dass die Stimmen der Väter und der Reformatoren zu Wort kommen. Dagegen ist die Auseinandersetzung mit der Sekundärliteratur in den Anmerkungen auf das Nötige beschränkt. Oft kann L. auch auf seine eigenen Kommentare in dieser Reihe verweisen. Obwohl die Bibliographien reichhaltig sind, fehlen doch einige neuere Monographien (H.-J. Eckstein, D.-A. Koch, D. Sänger ...). Aber Vollständigkeit ist hier unmöglich zu fordern. Freuen wir uns also über einen eigenständigen und lehrreichen Kommentar, der auf der Höhe der Forschung ist, und drücken wir ein Auge zu wegen der doch relativ häufigen Fehler, vor allem in den Stellenangaben, bei der Umschrift des Griechischen und – anscheinend unvermeidlich – in der Wiedergabe der deutschsprachigen Titel.

Schillerweg, 4  
D-65346 Eltville

Dieter ZELLER

Mark D. NANOS, *The Irony of Galatians. Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2001. 376 p. 14 × 21

In attempting to interpret a polemical text like Galatians, it is necessary to understand the origin and nature of the dispute of which it is a part. Our difficulty in doing this is that we are only able to access the dispute through the text, and hence from Paul's perspective. We have to use his letter as a mirror in which we see reflected the people and arguments whose influence he intended to counter. This exercise is unavoidable, but also hazardous. Precisely because in reading Galatians we hear only one side of the debate,

we are in danger of misunderstanding what is said or implied about the identity and arguments of Paul's targets.

In this stimulating and provocative study, Jewish scholar Mark Nanos argues that such misunderstanding has persistently dogged the interpretation of Galatians. The attempts of Pauline scholars to mirror-read the letter have been fatally flawed. It is not true, as the majority suppose, that Paul was attempting to counter the influence of Jewish Christian evangelists from outside Galatia who advocated to Gentile believers a gospel of Christ that included full observance of the Law. Rather, those influencing the Gentile believers were non-Christ-believing representatives of local Galatian synagogues. They were encouraging the Gentile believers to become proselytes, the males receiving circumcision as a key rite of passage. This was the traditional path to the recognition by Jewish communities of Gentiles as included among the righteous of God. For the Galatian believers, this gracious offer was attractive. It would provide them with access to an established community that was recognised by the authorities as legitimate and that had significant social and material resources. They would be relieved of an uncomfortably marginal social identity that left them neither conventionally Gentile nor fully Jewish in the eyes of others. Yet Paul is enraged. This is not because he has any critique of Jewish identity or practice as such. He is fully Torah observant and considers that such is necessary for all Jews, including believers in Christ. His anger stems rather from the conviction that the new age has dawned in Christ and that one of its primary features is the inclusion of Gentiles who remain Gentiles among the righteous of God. They come into a full relationship with God through faith in Christ rather than as proselytes via circumcision. If this is not the case then Christ's cross is rendered pointless, its eschatological purpose void.

In support of this reading of the situation in Galatia, Nanos draws a helpful distinction between our use of 'situational discourse' and 'narrative discourse' in order to mirror-read Galatians. By the former he means text that relates directly to the situation in Galatia itself, by the latter material such as the autobiographical section (1,13–2,21) that does not. We should not, for example, assume that we are able to deduce features of the Galatian situation from the Antioch incident. Paul must consider events in distant Antioch relevant to the Galatian situation in some way, but this does not mean that we can use them to identify those influencing the Gentile believers. Nanos here makes a valid methodological point. However, the traditional view of the influencers as Jewish Christian evangelists is based primarily on texts that qualify as 'situational discourse', especially 1,6–9 and 6,12–13. It is once this key identification is made that features of Paul's 'narrative discourse' are used to supply other compatible details. If Nanos is to succeed in overturning previous readings he must show that these vital situational texts have been misinterpreted. The core of his argument is therefore the exegesis of these texts.

Nanos suggests that previous interpreters have failed to appreciate fully the ironical nature of Paul's polemic in 1,6–9. Paul is not surprised at the Galatians' fickleness, but in accordance with an established rhetorical form of ironic rebuke uses the verb θαυμάζω to express disappointment (1,6). His reference to a different gospel does not mean that the influencers proclaim an

alternative message about Christ, but simply that the Gentile believers imagine being circumcised and becoming proselytes to be compatible with their faith in Christ. Paul wants to alarm them by showing that it would in fact be a defection from the gospel. In doing so, he does not always use the term εὐαγγέλιον as short hand for 'gospel of Jesus Christ'. Paul is playing ironically on the everyday use of the word in relation to various other types of good news. The contrast is not between two different messages about Christ, but two different messages of good. The difficulty with Nanos's argument here is that while Paul may indeed employ an ironic rebuke, of itself this does not determine the nature of its target. The irony could be that what is ostensibly a message of good news about Jesus Christ from Jewish Christian sources is in fact not good news at all. Paul's warning that the Galatians should not believe alternative gospels even if the source is Paul himself or an angel from heaven suggests that this is indeed the case (1,8–9). Paul is scarcely telling the Gentile believers not to heed him should he preach a message of good that makes no reference to Christ. In such a circumstance they would have little difficulty in spotting his inconsistency. Paul's insistence that they hold fast to the gospel in precisely the form that they received it suggests concern about plausible impersonations of the gospel from credible sources, not messages of good that make no reference to Christ.

Nanos's exegesis of 6,12–13 is also unconvincing, with a very strained reading of Paul's accusation in v. 12 that those seeking to persuade the Galatians to be circumcised are motivated by a desire to avoid persecution for the cross of Christ. Nanos argues that the Gentile Galatian believers are compromising relationships between local Jewish communities and wider Gentile society. The believers claim the prerogatives of Jewish status, opting out of the worship of other deities, thus aggravating local civic authorities who consider that such privileges only properly belong to those who conform to traditional definitions of Jewish identity. This results in pressure on Jewish leaders to put their house in order, who in turn seek to persuade the Gentile believers to become proselytes lest the entire Jewish community be persecuted for the cross of Christ. Yet even if one regards this scenario as historically plausible, it makes no sense of the rhetorical function of Paul's statement. It would be entirely natural for Jews who did not believe in Christ not to wish to be persecuted on account of him and his cross. Paul could hardly blame them for it or use it to discredit them with the Gentile believers, yet this is exactly what he does. The same problem applies to the suggestion that in the next verse Paul does not criticise those influencing the Gentile believers for failing to keep Torah as they themselves understood it. Instead, he criticises them for failing to do so on the basis of his interpretation of it, in which love of neighbour now demands full acceptance of Gentiles as Gentiles. Again, it is difficult to see how Paul could use this to discredit them with the Gentile believers. The traditional interpretation that Paul is here criticising Jewish Christian advocates of circumcision simply makes better sense of the available data.

As a whole, therefore, Nanos's argument fails. It nevertheless has several features of some value. Even if those attempting to influence the Gentile believers are indeed Jewish Christians, there is still a need to explain the Galatians' apparent openness to their arguments. Despite the generally hostile

attitude towards circumcision within Graeco-Roman culture, Paul's many solemn warnings scarcely suggest that it was inconceivable that the Gentile believers might accept it. He knows that he must work hard if he is to win the argument. The suggestion that becoming proselytes offers the Gentile believers a solution to the difficulties inherent in their marginal social identity is a plausible explanation for the appeal that circumcision seems to have held for them. Nanos's discussion of rhetorical conventions is also helpful, as is his discussion of the generally pejorative manner in which those attempting to influence the Gentile believers have been characterised in the history of scholarship. The tendency to stereotype Judaism in general, or early Jewish Christians in particular, is well known. Even for interpreters who ultimately share Paul's perspective, it is unhelpful prematurely to internalise his polemic. If we are not willing to consider why those against whom Paul argues consider themselves to be acting correctly, then our mirror-reading and ultimately our interpretation of Paul's texts themselves may be inaccurate.

Nanos himself makes a contribution to the avoidance of stereotyping by reminding us that first century Jews who did not believe in Christ were not necessarily hostile to his followers. Not all would have applauded Paul's pre-conversion persecuting activities. Although the available evidence suggests, contrary to Nanos, that the particular situation in Galatia involved Jewish Christians, it is plausible that there existed Jewish communities prepared to welcome as proselytes those Gentiles who believed in Christ. The problem is that the significance of this is explored only fitfully, and somewhat confusingly. On the one hand, there are the terms in which Nanos couches his argument that those influencing the Gentile believers can not have been Jewish Christians. Such people could not hope to persuade the Gentile Galatian believers to become proselytes as they would "transparently lack sufficient loyalty to the norms of the Christ-believing coalition so as to avoid suffering for what they believe in, the crucified Jesus" (222). It seems that a Jewish Christianity defining its norms in terms of both faith in Christ and obedience to Torah is impossible, and that Paul's argument in Galatians reflects historical reality as well as trying to shape it. On the other hand, Nanos suggests that his reconstruction of the situation in Galatia should help interpreters to avoid "the seemingly ineluctable conclusion that Paul denigrated Jewish identity and behaviour in view of the meaning of Christ" (282). Paul is trying to modify expectations within Jewish communities in view of the dawning of the new age, not to create a new religious institution over and against them. His approach is reforming rather than sectarian.

At one level, these two aspects of Nanos's argument seem contradictory. His apparent denial of even the historical possibility of any middle ground on which Jewish Christianity could stand seems to imply a gulf between Pauline Christianity and Judaism. Yet, at another level, the very assertion of this gap makes tolerance possible. As he is not arguing against Jewish Christians, Paul is not directly criticising the role played by Torah observance in their communal identity. His critique of Torah observance within Judaism is limited to its application to Gentiles. Similarly, Nanos's hypothetical synagogue leaders are not attacking faith in Christ as such, but simply rejecting it as a norm by which the righteous ones of God are to be defined. What would be the consequences of the adoption of such attitudes in the contemporary world?

Undoubtedly a more tolerant relationship between Christian and Jewish communities would follow, with central components of the identity of each more positively perceived by the other than has traditionally been the case. This sounds desirable, and in many respects is desirable, but there remain deep divides that tolerance alone is unable to overcome.

For Torah observance is acceptable to Paul, and perhaps even in some cases obligatory, so long as it does not challenge faith in Christ as the core component of communal identity. The righteous of God are defined as such by faith in Christ not Torah observance. Similarly, faith in Christ is acceptable to Nanos's hypothetical synagogue representatives so long as it does not challenge Torah observance as the core component of communal identity. The righteous of God are defined as such by Torah observance not faith in Christ. The unresolved and irresolvable issue, pregnant with significance for Jewish/Christian relations, is which has priority, Torah observance or faith in Christ? For Paul it must be faith in Christ, or Christ died for nothing (2,21). For those convinced that it embodies God's will for his people, Torah observance must define that people or God's will is simply ignored. From either perspective, tolerance by the other is not enough since what is being merely tolerated, and hence implicitly downgraded in significance, is what each believes God has declared of central importance. It is precisely this dilemma that another Jewish interpreter of Galatians, Daniel Boyarin, explores in his book *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Contraversions 1; Berkeley, CA 1994). One wishes that Nanos had engaged more with Boyarin's work, which receives a single cursory footnote. Although Nanos is primarily concerned with historical reconstruction of the Galatian situation whereas Boyarin is not, such engagement might have helped Nanos to draw out more fully and clearly the significance of his historical argument. As it is, one is left with the impression of energetic scholarship, motivated by deep goodwill, that somehow fails to grapple with the profoundly different nature of the visions of God's dealings with humanity that collided in Galatia.

International Christian College  
110 St. James Road  
Glasgow G4 0PS

Stephen CHESTER

Dieter KREMENDAHL, *Die Botschaft der Form. Zum Verhältnis von antiker Epistolographie und Rhetorik im Galaterbrief* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 46). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000. x-324 p. 16 × 25,5. € 72

Die Lektüre der 1999/2000 in Marburg angenommenen Dissertation ist eine spannende Angelegenheit, und dazu trägt bei, dass der Autor, Kremendahl (=K.), das Handwerkszeug der Althistorik zu nutzen weiß. Die Thematik ergibt sich forschungsgeschichtlich vor allem aufgrund des wichtigen