

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe 4

Seyoon Kim

The Origin of Paul's Gospel



Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Begründet von Joachim Jeremias und Otto Michel

Herausgegeben von
Martin Hengel und Otfried Hofius

4

The Origin
of Paul's Gospel

by

Seyoon Kim

2. edition, revised and enlarged



J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen 1984

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Kim, Seyoon:

The origin of Paul's gospel / by Seyoon Kim. –

2. ed., rev. and enl. – Tübingen: Mohr, 1984.

(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen

Testament: Reihe 2; 4)

ISBN 3-16-144836-7

NE: Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen

Testament / 02

978-3-16-157134-3 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019

1. edition 1981

2. edition 1984 revised and enlarged

© J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen 1984.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Ohne ausdrückliche Genehmigung des Verlags ist es auch nicht gestattet, das Buch oder Teile daraus auf photomechanischem Wege (Photokopie, Mikrokopie) zu vervielfältigen.

Printed in Germany. Offsetdruck Gulde-Druck GmbH, Tübingen. Einband Heinrich Koch, Großbuchbinderei Tübingen.

To the Memory of My Parents

Vorwort

Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments kennt keine Grenzen, sie will alle Menschen ansprechen. Darum kann sich auch die wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit diesem einzigartigen Buch nicht auf einige wenige Völker und Kulturen beschränken, denn die darin enthaltene Wahrheit hat universale Geltung und ist unteilbar. Es ist deshalb heute sehr begrüßenswert, daß die wissenschaftliche Auslegung des Neuen Testaments nicht mehr ein Vorrecht der Theologen des westlichen Europas und Nordamerikas bleibt, sondern dieselbe zur – im vollen Sinne des Wortes – ökumenischen Aufgabe wird.

Vielleicht hat es in diesem Zusammenhang zeichenhaften Charakter, daß die Botschaft von dem gekreuzigten und auferstandenen Christus erstmals in einem Lande verkündigt wurde, das schon in der Antike wie auch noch heute zu Asien gerechnet wurde, das aber zugleich in unmittelbarer Nähe der Grenze zwischen Asien und dem afrikanischen Kontinent liegt. Der erste 'Heidenchrist' war – noch vor dem Römer Cornelius – ein Afrikaner, der Minister der Königin Kandake aus dem damaligen Äthiopien, dem Reich von Moroe am Oberlauf des Nils, der als Neugetaufter 'fröhlich seines Weges zog', d.h. zurück in seine äthiopische Heimat (Apg 8, 39). Wenige Verse später folgt der lukanische Bericht über die Berufung des Saulus-Paulus vor der syrischen Metropole Damaskus, im Anschluß daran macht der Neuberufene vermutlich seine ersten Missionsversuche in 'Arabien' (Gal 1, 17). Dieses die Weltgeschichte bewegende Ereignis bildet den Ausgangspunkt der vorliegenden Arbeit des jungen koreanischen Neutestamentlers Dr. Seyoon Kim, es markiert zugleich den Anfang jener universalen weltweiten Mission, deren Aufgabe auch heute noch nicht abgeschlossen ist. Die von Lukas und Paulus selbst berichteten Ereignisse geschahen Jahre bevor das Evangelium nach Europa vordrang und in Rom und Griechenland erstmals Fuß faßte. Wenn darum heute nach nun bald zweitausend Jahren die wissenschaftliche Auslegung des Neuen Testaments den längst zu eng gewordenen traditionellen Raum der alten europäischen Kultur überschreitet, so vollzieht sie nur nach, was von Anfang an zur innersten Intention der urchristlichen Botschaft gehört hatte und was Paulus in Römer 10, 18 mit einem Wort aus Psalm 19 umschreibt:

‘in allen Lande ging aus ihr Schall
und ihr Wort bis an die Enden der Erde’.

Dr. Seyoon Kim erwarb sich mit dieser Arbeit, die unter der Anleitung von F.F. Bruce geschrieben wurde, den Grad eines Doktors der Philosophie an der Victoria Universität in Manchester. Ihr Thema ist die christologische Mitte des paulinischen Evangeliums, das nach dem Selbstzeugnis des Apostels diesem durch die Christophanie vor Damaskus geoffenbart wurde. In eindringlicher, minuziöser Arbeit, die für einen jungen koreanischen Theologen allein schon aus sprachlichen Gründen eine beachtliche Leistung darstellt, versucht Dr. Kim die Christologie des Apostels als eine Frucht seiner Berufung durch den auferstandenen und erhöhten Herrn selbst verständlich zu machen. Er verarbeitete hierzu nicht nur die wesentliche neuere Literatur zu diesem in der Forschung heftig diskutierten Thema, sondern griff darüber hinaus auf die zeitgenössischen jüdischen und hellenistischen Quellen zurück, die den religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der paulinischen Vorstellung beleuchten können. Die Arbeit bietet so dem Leser nicht nur vielfältige Information über die spannungsreiche Diskussion in der Forschung, sondern sie bringt zugleich in betonter Weise den eigenen – gegenüber den in der deutschen Forschung vorherrschenden Meinungen durchaus kritischen – Standpunkt des Verfassers zur Geltung. Daß Dr. Kim bei aller Eigenständigkeit sich in erster Linie mit den bisherigen Deutungen der Berufung des Heidenapostels und seiner Christologie auseinandersetzt und nicht etwa neue religionsgeschichtliche Quellen einführt bzw. grundsätzlich neue Gesichtspunkte vertritt, hängt mit seiner besonderen Situation zusammen. Er mußte sich ja zunächst in einen ihm sehr fremden Wissenschaftsbereich mit zahlreichen, für ihn neuen Sprachen einarbeiten. Darum war er in erster Linie bemüht, in einer verwirrenden Forschungssituation einen eigenen, in den Quellen begründeten historischen und theologischen Standpunkt zu finden. Dies ist ihm in durchaus überzeugender Weise gelungen. Schließlich wird man noch betonen müssen, daß er seine wissenschaftliche Arbeit als Ausleger des Neuen Testaments bewußt als Dienst in der Kirche versteht. Sein wertvoller Beitrag zum theologischen und historischen Verständnis des christologischen Zentrums der paulinischen Theologie verdient als Zeugnis eines jungen Exegeten aus der dritten Welt unser besonderes Interesse.

Martin Hengel.

Preface

This book is a revised version of my Ph. D. thesis submitted to the University of Manchester in August 1977. On the whole I do not yet feel any need to revise the work substantially, so that the revision work was limited mainly to stylistic improvement. But at a couple of places I feel I could have developed my theses more thoroughly and convincingly. They are the sections dealing with the question of 'the Son of Man' (pp.239–252) and the question why faith is the means of justification (pp.297–307). I hope to take these matters up in future researches, but at present I have to be content with adding a few lines to the original version of my work for a greater clarity. Back in Asia, where the library facilities are still very inadequate, I have found it practically impossible to consult the literature that has appeared since the completion of my thesis at Manchester. I humbly beg readers for understanding about this.

Now it is a pleasant duty to thank all those who helped me during the years of my research for this thesis. I would like especially to thank Prof. F.F. Bruce who supervised my work throughout with great patience and unfailing helpfulness. His encouragement and guidance were most valuable. I am indebted also to Rev. S.S. Smalley who gave generously of his time in the initial stage of my work. For almost three semesters Prof. Otto Betz acted as my *Doktorvater* in Tübingen with unfailing kindness. Even after I returned to England, he kept an interest in my work so that he read all but the last chapter of this thesis and gave me encouragement and helpful criticisms. Prof. M. Hengel and Prof. P. Stuhlmacher also made available to me several sessions for discussion on various aspects of my thesis. Prof. P. Beyerhaus' personal friendship and encouragement were also of great value. Prof. E.E. Ellis both in Tübingen and later on in Cambridge gave generously of his time in reading my thesis and discussing with me some aspects of it.

The personnel at the University Libraries of Manchester, Tübingen and Cambridge, at John Rylands Library, Manchester, at the Library of the Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät, Tübingen, and at the Tyndale Library, Cambridge, are to be thanked for their ready help with literature.

I am grateful to Professors M. Hengel, J. Jeremias and O. Michel for their acceptance of this work for publication in the series of WUNT 2. Prof.

Hengel has given me some helpful editorial suggestions and voluntarily contributed the *Vorwort* to this book, and for the help and the honour he has rendered I am especially grateful.

I would also like to thank Herrn Georg Siebeck (jun.) for his friendly correspondence and ready help. Mr. S.C. Leong of Sam Boyd Enterprise, Singapore who typeset this book and the printers in Tübingen are also to be thanked for their dedicated labour.

This research could not have been carried out without the generous financial assistance of the following institutions: Fong Shien Trust, Overseas Missionary Fellowship, Albrecht-Bengel-Haus (Tübingen), and Clifton Theological Fund (Bristol). I owe further to Albrecht-Bengel-Haus for their generous provision of the *Druckkostenzuschuß*. I can hardly thank all these institutions adequately.

Among many friends who have helped me with the production of the book, I would especially mention Prof. O. Betz and Dr. H. Lichtenberger for careful proofreading, Miss Mildred Young for thorough checking of my Greek accents, and Misses Songhee Hong and Unsoon Kwon for compiling the indices. Their sacrificial labour has spared me many errors, and I would like to record my sincere gratitude to them.

Finally, I record affectionately the debt of love that I owe to Mr. & Mrs. David H. Adeney who took care of me as my spiritual parents during the years of my sojourn abroad.

Seoul, May 1979 – January 1980

Seyoon Kim.

Preface to the Second Edition

For this new edition, besides correcting many printing errors, I have appended a postscript. With my answers to some important questions and criticisms raised by a few reviewers, this postscript will, I hope, serve to clarify and strengthen my theses further. I am especially glad that it has given me an opportunity to deal with the challenge of H. Räisänen and to respond, to some extent, to the suggestion of several reviewers, namely an interaction with E.P. Sanders' major works on Paul which have appeared since the completion of this book in early 1977.

I am once again indebted to Prof. M. Hengel, especially for persuading me to write a substantial postscript. I am grateful also to both publishers, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen and Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, for undertaking this new edition.

Easter 1984

S.K.

Contents

<i>Vorwort</i> by Prof. M. Hengel	V
Preface	VII
Preface to the Second Edition	VIII
Table of Contents	IX
Abbreviations	XI
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter I PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS	3
Chapter II PAUL THE PERSECUTOR	32
1 Paul before His Conversion	32
2 Paul the Persecutor	44
Chapter III THE DAMASCUS EVENT	51
1 'Preparations'?	51
2 The Vision of the Risen Christ	55
3 The Apostolic Commission	56
Chapter IV PAUL'S GOSPEL: A. THE REVELATION	67
1 The Revelation of the Gospel	67
2 The 'Mystery'	74
Chapter V PAUL'S GOSPEL: B. CHRISTOLOGY	100
1 Introduction	100
2 Christ, Lord, Son of God	104
Chapter VI PAUL'S GOSPEL: B. CHRISTOLOGY	137
3 Christ the <i>εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ</i>	137
1) The Texts	137
2) Various Suggestions on the Origin of the Conception	159
3) Hypotheses on the Origin of Adam-Christology	162
4) Christ the <i>εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ</i>	193

a) The Linguistic Data	195
b) Epiphany Visions	205
c) The Damascus Christophany as the Source of the Conception of Christ as the <i>εικὼν τοῦ θεοῦ</i>	223
Excursus: The Antithetical Typology between the Sinai Theophany and the Damascus Christophany	233
d) Tradition-Historical Consideration of the Throne- Theophany Visions and the Figue <i>כבר אנש</i>	239
e) The Throne-Theophany Tradition and the Concep- tion of the Church as the Body of Christ and as the True Israel	252
f) The Son of God and the <i>εικὼν</i> of God	256
g) Two Lines of Development of the <i>εικὼν</i> -Christology	257
h) Wisdom-Christology	258
i) Adam-Christology	260
j) Conclusion	267
Chapter VII PAUL'S GOSPEL: C. SOTERIOLOGY	269
1 Justification	269
Excursus: Paul and the Grace of His Apostleship	288
2 Reconciliation	311
3 Sonship, Transformation, and New Creation	315
CONCLUSION	330
POSTSCRIPT TO THE SECOND EDITION	336
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	359
INDEXES	384

Abbreviations

I. Reference Works

Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich	W.F.Arndt & F.W.Gingrich, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> (E.T. & ed. of W.Bauer's <i>Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch</i>) (Chicago, ⁴ 1952)
B-D	F.Blass & A.Debrunner, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature</i> , tr. & ed. R.W.Funk (Chicago, 1961)
BDB	F.Brown, S.R.Driver, & C.A.Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (London, 1953)
<i>Beginnings</i>	<i>The Beginnings of Christianity</i> , ed. F.H.Foakes-Jackson & K.Lake, 5 vols., (London, 1920–1933)
<i>Begriffslexikon</i>	<i>Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament</i> , ed. L.Coenen, E.Beyreuther & H.Bientenhard, 3 vols. (Wuppertal, 1967–1971)
Liddell-Scott	H.G.Liddell & R.Scott, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th ed. H.S.Jones & R.McKenzie (Oxford, 1968)
Moore i, ii, iii	G.F.Moore, <i>Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era</i> , 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. 1927–1930)
Moulton i, ii, iii	<i>A Grammar of the New Testament Greek</i> , I. <i>Prolegomena</i> by J.H.Moulton (Edinburgh, ³ 1908); II. <i>Accidence and Word-Formation</i> by J.H.Moulton & W.F.Howard (1929); III. <i>Syntax</i> by N.Turner (1963)
<i>RGG</i> ²	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> , 2nd ed. H.Gunkel & L.Zscharnack, 5 vols. (Tübingen, 1927–1932)
<i>RGG</i> ³	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> , 3rd ed. K.Galling, 6 vols. with Register (Tübingen, 1957–1965)
Str.-Bill.	H.Strack & P.Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</i> , 6 vols., (München, 1922–1961)
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , E.T. by G.W. Bromiley, 9 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1964–1974), of <i>ThWb: Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> , ed. G.Kittel & G.Friedrich (Stuttgart, 1933–1979)
<i>ThHAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> , ed. E.Jenni & C.Westermann, 2 vols. (München, 1971, 1976)

<i>ThWAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> , ed. J. Botterweck & H. Ringgren, I, II – (Stuttgart, 1973–)
W. Baumgartner,	<i>Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament</i> , I, II (Leiden, 1967, 1974)
J. Jastrow,	<i>A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmuds, and the Midrashic Literature</i> (New York, 1926)
L. Köhler & W. Baumgartner,	<i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros</i> (Leiden, 1953)
S. Krauss,	<i>Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum</i> , 2 vols. (reprint: Hildesheim, 1964)
I. Levy,	<i>Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim</i> , 4 vols., (Leipzig, 1876–1889)
C. F. D. Moule,	<i>An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek</i> (Cambridge, 2 nd 1968)

II. Periodicals and Serials

As listed in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976), pp. 339–344, except:

BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
<i>EvTh</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>ExpT</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
NCB	New Century Bible
NLC	New London Commentary on the New Testament (= NICNT)
<i>StTh</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
TED	Translations of Early Documents
<i>ThLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>ThZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>TynB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>ZThK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

III. Others

<i>AnBib</i> 17 (1963)	<i>Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus internationalis Catholicus</i> , 1961, Vol. I, <i>An Bib</i> 17 (1963)
<i>EVB</i> i, ii	E. Käsemann, <i>Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen</i> , i (Göttingen, 5 th 1967); ii (2 nd 1965)
E.T.	English Translation
FS	Festschrift

Introduction

What is the origin of Paul's gospel?

In his preface to the second edition of his epoch-making work *The Epistle to the Romans*, K. Barth raises some fundamental questions of Scriptural exegesis, which are still of great relevance today. In the course of his confrontation with the exegesis current in his day, Barth launches a scathing attack upon the exegetes:

Taking Jülicher's work as typical of much modern exegesis, we observe how closely he keeps to the mere deciphering of words as though they were runes. But, when all is done, they still remain largely unintelligible. How quick he is, without any real struggling with the raw material of the Epistle, to dismiss this or that difficult passage as simply a peculiar doctrine or opinion of Paul! How quick he is to treat a matter as explained, when it is said to belong to the religious thought, feeling, experience, conscience, or conviction, – of Paul! And, when this does not at once fit, is manifestly impossible, how easily he leaps, like some bold William Tell, right out of the Pauline boat, and rescues himself by attributing what Paul has said, to his 'personality', to the experience on the road to Damascus (an episode which seems capable of providing at any moment an explanation of every impossibility), to later Judaism, to Hellenism, or, in fact, to any exegetical semi-divinity of the ancient world!¹

In many ways much of today's exegesis continues the kind of work that is attacked by Barth. Just as in Barth's day, so today also many interpreters of Paul rest content with drawing out alleged parallels between Paul's theology and the thoughts of the ancient Mediterranean world. When they have analysed Paul's theology and suitably assigned its various elements to this or that background of Paul, 'to later Judaism, to Hellenism, or . . . to any exegetical semi-divinity of the ancient world', they presume to have *explained* the origin of Paul's gospel and the gospel itself. But are they right? Have they explained what is the ground of Paul's belief and proclamation; what is the factor or factors that shaped Paul's gospel so that it might become what it is; and, ultimately, what is Paul's gospel?

One does not immediately know how Barth would have judged the sort of

¹K. Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans* (E.T. Oxford, 1933, 1968), pp. 7f.

question that we are setting for our enquiry in this thesis, namely the origin of Paul's gospel, which will of necessity involve much historical as well as exegetical work on the Pauline epistles. However, we are convinced that when we have answered the question after listening carefully to Paul's own testimony, we shall be able to understand much better the theological truths that Paul expounds in his letters — which surely is Barth's concern and should be the concern of every sincere Scriptural exegete.

Paul's testimony is that he received his gospel 'through the revelation of Jesus Christ' (Gal 1.12). His gospel is not a 'human' gospel, for he did not receive it from man, nor was taught it (Gal 1.11), but received it when on the road to Damascus God 'was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I might preach him as the content of the gospel among the Gentiles'. Having thus received the gospel and the apostolic commission, 'I did not confer with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem . . . but went away into Arabia . . . ' (Gal 1.16f.).

In some ways it is paradoxical that quoting himself the two clauses of Gal 1.17 at the head of his afore-mentioned preface Barth condemns the tendency of the exegetes of his day to attribute some elements of Paul's theology to his Damascus experience. But even with a slight acquaintance with the tendency of the exegetes at the turn of the century to make the Damascus event 'capable of providing at any moment an explanation of every impossibility' by means of psychologizing and romanticizing we can well understand the sharp criticism of Barth and readily agree with it.

When in the following pages we enquire of the Damascus event, we do so not because we would like to continue the work already condemned by Barth and others, but because we feel obliged to take Paul's own testimony seriously. So in the study that follows we strictly exclude a psychological and romanticizing method and concentrate on listening to Paul's own testimony with a strictly historico-philological method, but at all times with the theological alertness that is required of a Scriptural exegete.

Chapter I Preliminary Considerations

It is often said that while the author of the Book of Acts repeats the account of Paul's conversion and call three times at length (9.1–19; 22.3–16; 26.4–18) Paul himself mentions it only in a few places and all too briefly¹. This is said to be due to Paul's deep reserve about his experience². For this reason, says G. Bornkamm, Paul's experience on the road to Damascus should not be placed at the centre of his life and thought³.

1) It is generally recognized that these few places, at which Paul mentions his experience of conversion to Christ and call to apostleship, are 1Cor 9.1; 15.8–10; Gal 1.13–17; and Phil 3.4–11. Now it cannot be so lightly said that these are only a few places if it is taken into account that these passages represent about half of the churches to which Paul wrote a letter. But these are not the only places; there are many more places in his letters, including those which are not mentioned above, in which he refers or alludes in varying degrees of explicitness to his experience on the road to Damascus.

2) Rom 10.2–4 is recognised by many interpreters⁴ as one such passage. It has been noted that what Paul says of Israel in Rom 10.2–10 corresponds

¹U.Wilckens, 'Die Bekehrung des Paulus als religionsgeschichtliches Problem', *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit: Paulus Studien* (1974), p.11: 'nur an wenigen Stellen . . . und auch dort nur in aller Kürze – gleichsam im Vorübergehen –'. Similarly but more negatively G.Lohfink, *Paulus vor Damaskus* (1966), p.21: 'an ganz wenigen Stellen, in aller Kürze'. Still more negatively G.Bornkamm, *Paulus* (1969), p.39: 'überraschend selten'. Cf. also G.Bornkamm 'Paulus', *RGG*³v, c. 169.

²G.Lohfink, *op.cit.*, p.21.

³G.Bornkamm, *Paulus*, p.39.

⁴F.F.Bruce, *Romans*, An Introduction and Commentary (1969), pp.200f.; O.Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, (131966), pp.253f.; U.Wilckens, 'Bekehrung', p.14: 'Was heißt bei Paulus: "Aus Werken des Gesetzes wird kein Mensch gerecht"?', *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit*, pp.98–104; W.Grundmann, 'Paulus, aus dem Volke Israel, Apostel der Völker', *Nov T* 4(1960), pp.268f.; P.Stuhlmacher, 'Das Ende des Gesetzes', *ZThK* 67(1970), pp.30ff.; E.Käsemann, 'Paulus und Israel', *EVB* ii, p.195; H.G.Wood, 'The Conversion of St. Paul: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences', *NTS* 1(1954/55), p.279; cf. Bornkamm, *Paulus*, p.40.

with his autobiographical statements especially in Phil 3.4ff¹. He understands the tragedy of Israel in the light of his conversion experience. Just as Paul was zealous for God before the Damascus experience, Israel also has a zeal for him. However, it is an unenlightened zeal. For while God through Christ has put an end to the law as a way of obtaining righteousness, Israel is still zealous for the law; while God grants *his* righteousness to everyone who has faith, Israel seeks *its own* righteousness on the basis of the works of the law. But in the Christophany on the road to Damascus Paul received the knowledge of Christ as the end of the law. So he surrendered all his righteousness based on the law to receive God's righteousness which comes from faith in Christ. But Israel at present remains still in the state in which Paul was before his conversion.

3) Many scholars have also recognized in 1 Cor 9.16–17 Paul's allusion to his call to apostleship on the road to Damascus². Paul, who in Phil 3.12

¹Wilckens, 'Was heißt bei Paulus.', pp.102ff.; E.Käsemann, *op.cit.*, p.195; Stuhlmacher, *op.cit.*, pp.30ff.; F.F.Bruce, *op.cit.*, pp.200ff.; cf. also Grundmann, *op.cit.*, pp.268f.

²A.Robertson & A.Plummer, *The First Epistle of St.Paul to the Corinthians* (31929), p.189; H.Lietzmann & W.G.Kümmel, *An die Korinther I/II* (51969), p.43; A.Schlatter *Paulus der Bote Jesu* (31969), p.276; H.Conzelmann, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (11969), p.186, n.26; F.W.Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, (1972), p.209; C.K.Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (1968), p.209; F.F.Bruce, *1 & 2 Corinthians* (1971), p.86; J.Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (1959), pp.22f; L.Cerfaux, 'La vocation de S.Paul', *Euntes Docete* (1961), pp.8f.; J.Reumann, 'Ολκονομία—Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*', *NTS* 13(1966/67), pp.158f.; H.Kasting, *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission* (1969), p.56; J.Dupont, 'The Conversion of Paul and Its Influence on His Understanding of Salvation by Faith', *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, F.F.Bruce FS (1970), p.192. Cf. E.Käsemann, 'Eine paulinische Variation des "amor fati"', *EVB* ii, pp.233f. Käsemann appears to reject the interpretation that ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπικραται alludes to the forceful call of Paul the persecutor to apostleship, which came to him in an irresistible way. But when Käsemann says, "ἀνάγκη liegt auf mir" sagt man vom Schicksal, das einen ergreift, nicht von Gefühlen, die uns beseelen, oder von einer Pflicht, der wir zu genügen haben', his differentiation of 'Schicksal', 'Gefühl' and 'Pflicht' seems in this case unnecessary. And his next statement, 'Die Erinnerung an Damaskus aber taugt als Illustration, jedoch nicht zur Interpretation, weil Paulus nicht einen Rückblick auf vergangenes Geschehen und dessen Auswirkungen wirft, sondern von der Gegenwart seines Dienstes spricht', is difficult to understand. When Paul says, ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπικραται, certainly he refers to his present service, but his present service which was determined by the forceful commission of the past. The perfect πεπρωμεναι in v.17 expresses precisely this, i.e., that ἀνάγκη is laid upon or presses upon (cf. Robertson-Plummer, *1Cor.*, p.189) Paul because he has been entrusted with an οἰκονομία.

says he was 'seized' (κατελήμφθην)¹ by Christ, says here similarly that he has been entrusted with a commission so that necessity or divine constraint (ἀνάγκη)² presses upon him to preach the gospel. Paul 'was conscripted into the service of Christ on the Damascus road'³, so that he is now under compulsion to preach the gospel.

4) 2Cor 3.4–4.6 is the next passage that shows allusions to Paul's experience of the Christophany on his way to Damascus. Many scholars have seen in 4.6 an allusion to it⁴. H. Windisch, who thinks the view worthy of consideration, raises, however, three points for caution⁵: a) Paul here describes no 'individual but a typical experience'⁶; b) He describes 'no vision, but a purely internal seeing'; and c) 'The words can also be understood without a view to an experience as it is described in Acts 9'. The first point depends on who is the subject in 4.1–6. If the subject 'we' is ἡμεῖς πάντες of 3.18, then it can be said that Paul here gives a typical conversion experience of a Christian. But the subject of 4.1–6 must be different from ἡμεῖς πάντες of 3.18. For, first, the ἡμεῖς πάντες, all the Christians, who are contrasted with the Jews in the Synagogue, cannot be said to have τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην (4.1), i.e. the apostolic ministry of the new covenant (cf. 3.6); and, secondly, it is clear from 4.5 that Paul distinguishes 'ourselves' (ἑαυτοὺς) from the Corinthian Christians. So the subject 'we' of 4.1–6 must, as in 3.1–6, be limited to Paul and his co-workers, especially to Paul alone⁷. Windisch recognises the change of subject between 3.18 and 4.1, but thinks that in 4.6

¹Cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, s.v.

²Cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, s.v.; W.Grundmann, ἀνάγκη, TDNT i, p.346; E. Käsemann, "amor fati", pp.233f.

³Bruce, Cor., p.86.

⁴A.Plummer, *The Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (51948) p.92; R.V.G. Tasker, *2 Corinthians* (1958), pp.71f.; P.Hughes, *Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (1971), pp.133f.; Bruce, Cor., p.196; C.K.Barrett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (1973), p.134; M.Dibelius & W.G.Kümmel, *Paulus* (1964), p.55; W.G.Kümmel, 'Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus', *Römer 7 und das Bild des Menschen im NT* (1974), pp.146f.; *Die Theologie des NT* (21972), p.198; R.Bultmann, 'Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als Hermeneutischer Methode', *Exegetica* (1967), p.374; O.Kuss, *Paulus* (1971), p.283; Stuhlmacher, "Ende", p.25; Cerfaux, *op. cit.*, p.8; H. – J. Schoeps, *Paul* (1961), p.54.

⁵H.Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (91970), p.140.

⁶Cf. Schlatter, *Der Bote.*, p.530.

⁷So Plummer, *2Cor.*, pp.110,120 (but cf. p.121); Strachan, *2Cor.*, p.92. See further K.Dick, *Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus* (1900), pp.95ff., who maintains that 'we' in 2Cor 3–6 is a literary plural for Paul himself. Cf. Bruce, Cor., p.194; Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.134. Paul frequently involves his co-workers when he makes assertions primarily

'we' is once again widened as in 3.18¹. But there is no reason to think so. The *ὅτι*-clause in v.6 provides the reason why Paul preaches not himself but Christ Jesus as Lord (v.5)². In this context it is difficult to think that the 'we' in v.5 refers to Paul (and his co-workers) and 'our' in v.6 refers to Christians in general. However, if Windisch is right in taking *ἡμῶν* in v.6 as referring to all Christians, all the apostles or at least Paul's co-workers, as many commentators think, it must be understood that in v.6 Paul is describing a typical conversion experience by means of his own³. The second point of Windisch refers to Paul's expression *ὁ θεός . . . ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν* This is reminiscent of Paul's report of the Christophany on the road to Damascus in Gal 1.16: . . . *ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί* There seems to be no more serious debate whether the Damascus event was a purely subjective, internal experience or an objective event, and it seems widely accepted that not only the author of Acts but also Paul himself lets his readers understand it to be an objective appearance of the risen Christ (1Cor 15.8). From this the phrase *ἐν ἐμοί* in Gal 1.16 has often been taken to stand for the simple dative⁴. But H. Schlier observes that *ἀποκαλύπτειν* normally takes the simple dative and appears nowhere else with *ἐν* (cf. 1Cor 2.10; Eph 3.5; 1Pet 1.12). So he suggests that 'with *ἐν ἐμοί* the intensity of the unveiling of the Son is expressed, an unveiling

about himself (see Strachan, *2Cor.*, p.xxxv), so that he may be doing the same here. It is not probable that 'we' here means 'we apostles' because Paul is not contrasting 'the apostles' with another group in the Church but defending himself and his gospel against the charges of his opponents who, especially if they are the same ones as those in 2Cor 10–13, may have claimed apostolic status for themselves (cf. 2Cor 11.5,13). However, it is not necessary to conclude from this that Paul claims such an experience as described in 2Cor 4.6 and such a commission as described in 2Cor 4.1–6 only for himself and denies them to other apostles whom he recognised as genuine apostles of the new covenant (cf. Gal 2; 1Cor 4; 15). He sees his Christian existence as typical and often uses his Damascus experience to describe conversion of others (*infra* pp.231, 288ff.; cf. Stuhlmacher, 'καὴν κτίσις', pp.27f.), so that what is said primarily about his own Damascus experience in 2Cor 4.6 can apply to all other Christians.

¹Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.131.

²See Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.119 and Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.138 for not taking v.5 as a parenthesis. But both recognize close connection between vs. 4 & 6. It may thus provide also the ultimate reason why Paul's gospel is not veiled, but, on the contrary, issues illumination (v.4).

³So Kümmel, *Theologie*, p.198; cf. Bruce, *Cor.*, p.196.

⁴B—D, § 220.1; cf. C.F.D.Moule, *An Idiom-Book of NT Greek* (1968), p.76; A.Oepke, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (21957), p.33.

which penetrated into the innermost part of the apostle's life'¹. A somewhat similar interpretation seems possible also in 2Cor 4.6. The Christophany on the Damascus road was an objective vision of the risen Lord. This affected Paul to the innermost part of his life, creating the conviction in the seat of his understanding, thought, feeling and will² that what appeared to him was Christ, revealed by God in glory. This fact seems to be expressed by the phrase *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν*³. If this is so, Paul is not here describing 'a purely internal seeing' (whatever it may be) but God's objective disclosure of the risen Christ which 'touched' the heart (in its Biblical sense!) of Paul⁴. As to Windisch's third point, it will be shown in the following that the words of 2Cor 4.6 can be better understood if it is supposed that they refer to the Damascus event.

The aorist *ἐλαμψεν* refers back to a definite point of time in the past, the moment of the Damascus event. God, the Creator, shone in Paul's heart on the road to Damascus *πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ*. Nowhere else in his letters does Paul mention explicitly light or glory in connection with the Christophany on the Damascus road. But that the risen Christ must have appeared to Paul as clothed in glory can be deduced from his other testimonies. For he claims that the risen Christ appeared to him (1Cor 15.8; also 9.1). He characterizes the body of resurrection as that of glory (1Cor 15.43)⁵ and explicitly calls the body of the Lord Jesus Christ 'the body of glory' (Phil 3.21)⁶. In the Bible *δόξα* normally means 'divine and heavenly radiance' or the 'divine mode of being'

¹H.Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (141971), p.55; cf. F.Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief* (1974), pp.86f.

²Cf. Baumgärtel and Behm, *καρδία*, *TDNT* iii, pp.606–613.

³Schlier, *Gal.*, p.55, refers also to Phil 3.12. Paul may be expressing the same fact by *κατελήμφθην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* there.

⁴This interpretation fits in well with Plummer's observation that Paul here gives both a subjective and an objective element in his conversion experience: *ὃς ἐλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν* describes the former, and *ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ* the latter (Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.122; cf. also Dibelius-Kümmel, *Paulus*, p.55).

⁵Cf. 2 Bar. 50.1–51.10; M.Thrall, 'The Origin of Pauline Christology', *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, Bruce FS, p.309.

⁶These verses make it clear that Paul is not just reproducing a Jewish idea, such as that in 2 Bar. 50.1–51.10, that the resurrection body will be gradually transformed into glory. 2 Bar. conceives of a hiatus between resurrection and transformation. The hiatus is said to be necessary for the identification of the resurrected by the living. But Paul does not seem to conceive of such a hiatus. Cf. W.D.Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (1970), pp.305ff. for a comparison between Paul's conception of the risen body and

made visible as radiance¹. So the risen Christ must have appeared to Paul accompanied by the radiance of light which was perceived by him as the divine glory. Now this is precisely what the three accounts of the Damascus event in Acts relate: in his encounter with the risen Christ Paul suddenly saw the heavenly light shining round him (Acts 9.3; 22.6; 26.13). Thus the motifs of light and glory in 2Cor 4.6 point to the Damascus event². It is significant that Paul fixes the divine glory 'in the face of Christ'. By this he may be contrasting the permanent and unveiled glory in the face of Christ with the fading and veiled glory in the face of Moses (3.7ff.)³. But more certainly he is thinking of the radiant face of Christ which he saw on the Damascus road (cf. 1Cor 9.1)⁴. It is probable that this experience led him to make a contrast between the ministry of the old covenant and that of the new in the present passage.

Paul compares God's shining light to him on the Damascus road with his creation of the light. Bultmann sees here the equation *Endzeit* = *Urzeit*,⁵ but thinks that here the parallelism is not between creation and Paul's conversion, but between creation and the apostolic office. For the emphasis lies upon the statement of purpose: *πρὸς φωτισμὸν κτλ*⁶. But the parallelism between creation and Paul's conversion intended by the construction of the sentence:

ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπών, Ἐκ σκοτὸυς φῶς λάμψει,
ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν κτλ.

is unmistakable⁷. Moreover, along with Paul's actual experience of the light on the Damascus road, the traditional idea of conversion as transference from darkness into light⁸ may have led Paul to cite Gen 1.3 here⁹. God, who

that of the Rabbis. Paul's conception of the risen body both as a 'spiritual body' (over against the Rabbinic crude physical conception) and as the 'body of glory' may be a modification of the Rabbinic conception in the light of his experience of the risen Christ, who appeared to him as a spiritual reality in the radiance of glory on the Damascus road.

¹G.von Rad & G.Kittel, *δόξα*, *TDNT* ii, pp.233–252.

²Cf. Acts 22.11; Schoeps, *Paul*, p.54.

³So Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.140; Schlatter, *Der Bote*, p.530.

⁴So Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.121; Bruce, *Cor.*, p.196.

⁵Cf. also Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.139.

⁶Bultmann, 'Ursprung', pp.374f.; cf. also Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.135.

⁷Cf. Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.139; Hughes, *2Cor.*, p.132.

⁸Cf. Acts 26.18; Rom 2.19; Eph 5.8; 1Th 5.4f.; 1Pet 2.9. For the evidence drawn from Jewish and Hellenistic material, see Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.139; also H. Conzelmann, *φῶς*, *TDNT* ix, pp. 325f., 332.

⁹Cf. Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.139. Paul cites Gen 1.3 not literally but according to sense.

created light over the primeval *chāos*, shed light into the darkness of Paul's heart. So Paul's conversion was an act of God's new creation (cf. 2Cor 5.17). However, God's shedding light in Paul's heart was not for its own sake, but it was for Paul to disseminate the light (*πρὸς φωτισμόν κτλ*). Paul, who has experienced the light of the new creation at his conversion, is to convey it to others through his proclamation. His apostolic office is an instrument through which God shines light to others. In their experiencing the light through Paul's proclamation, i.e., in their conversion, the new creation takes place in respect of them. So Paul's apostolic office is an instrument of God's new creation activity. To that extent, there is also a parallelism, if secondarily, between Paul's proclamation and God's creation.

It is difficult to understand precisely the phrase *πρὸς φωτισμόν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. τῆς γνώσεως* could be a subjective genitive (the knowledge of God's glory illuminates)¹, an objective gen. (the knowledge of God's glory is illuminated)², or an appositional gen. (illumination consists in the knowledge of God's glory)³. However, the parallelism between this phrase and the phrase in v.4 *τὸν φωτισμόν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ*⁴ makes it more probable that it is to be taken as a subj. gen. God shone in Paul's heart 'with a view to (*πρός*)⁵ illumination with the knowledge of God's glory'. The implied object of *φωτισμόν* may be *ἡμᾶς*⁶: God shone in Paul's heart to illuminate him with the knowledge of God's glory in the face of Christ⁷. Through God's revelation on the Damascus road Paul came

His wording may have been influenced by such OT texts as 2Sam 22.29; Job 37.15; Ps 18.28; 112.4; Isa 9.2. He may have emphasized *ἐκ σκοτῶν* in order to make the parallelism of creation and his conversion clearer (cf. Plummer, 2Cor., p.120).

¹Plummer, 2Cor., p.121; Windisch, 2.Kor., p.140; Bruce, Cor., p.196; apparently also NEB.

²Lietzmann-Kümmel, Kor., p.115; cf. also H.D.Wendland, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (121968), p.187.

³Barrett, 2Cor., p.134.

⁴Plummer, 2Cor., pp.120f.; cf. also Windisch, 2.Kor., p.139f. Lietzmann-Kümmel, Kor., p.115, sees the sense of *φωτισμός* changed from an active sense in v.4 ('the gospel illuminates') to a passive sense in v.6 ('the *γνώσις* is illuminated by the light of God which shines in our hearts'). This view is bound up with Lietzmann's taking *τῆς γνώσεως* as an obj. gen. But it seems unnecessary to see such a change in the sense of *φωτισμός*.

⁵Plummer, 2Cor., p.121; Barrett, 2Cor., p.134.

⁶Cf. Lietzmann-Kümmel, Kor., p.115; RSV.

⁷This amounts almost to the same meaning which Lietzmann-Kümmel, Kor., p.115, makes out of the verse, taking *τῆς γνώσεως* as an obj. gen; 'die *γνώσις* wird vom Licht Gottes, das in unsere Herzen strahlt, erleuchtet, . . . so daß mir leuchtend aufging die Erkenntnis der *δόξα*, die ich auf Christi Antlitz (. . .) strahlen sehe'. 'God's glory

to know Christ exalted and glorified by God. It is instructive to compare this verse with Phil 3.4–11, where also Paul describes his conversion experience as a process of knowing Christ¹. However, probably the implied object of φωτισμόν is not primarily ἡμᾶς but 'men' or 'hearers' in general: God shone in Paul's heart 'with a view to illuminating men with the knowledge of the glory of God'². For v.6 would suit the context better if it describes not just Paul's conversion but his commission as well, as in the context Paul is concerned with establishing the rightness of his apostolic ministry. God revealed Christ to Paul so that he might proclaim him (cf. Gal 1.16). There is no doubt, however, that here Paul is interpreting the Damascus event in terms both of conversion and call. God revealed Christ to Paul, so that he might first know him and then illuminate others with this knowledge. This knowledge of the glorified Christ constitutes the gospel of Paul and so Paul preaches Christ Jesus as the exalted Lord (4.3–5). This is exactly the same thought as that in Gal 1.11–16, where Paul implies that the Son of God³ revealed by God to him is the gospel that he received by revelation. Paul is commissioned to illuminate men with the gospel, the knowledge of the Christ exalted and glorified. There is probably an echo of the call of the יהוה עבד in Isa 42.6f. and 49.6: the Servant is called by Yahweh εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν and 'to open the eyes that are blind'. It seems that in the present passage Paul is describing his apostolic commission in terms of that of the Servant of Yahweh. This is highly probable since elsewhere (Gal 1.15) also he describes his call in terms of that of the Servant⁴. This may also explain his description of the unbelievers as blind to the light of the gospel in v.4. He is conscious of having been commissioned 'to open the eyes of the blind' (Isa 42.7) with the gospel.

in the face of Christ' is 'the glory of Christ'. For God, to whom glory essentially belongs, has bestowed his glory upon Christ, so that it may shine in his face. In other words, God has glorified Christ, so that Christ now has glory. The variation from τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ to τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ is caused by Paul's reference to God, the creator of the light and author of the event described in this verse, to whom glory essentially belongs (cf. Windisch, 2. Kor., p.140). It would be awkward if 'the glory of Christ' instead of 'the glory of God' stood here, as if Christ had himself an inherent, not bestowed, glory.

¹Cf. Stuhlmacher, "Ende", p.31.

²Plummer, 2Cor., p.121; so also Bruce, Cor., p.196; Barrett, 2Cor., p.134.

³Just like κύριος, the title 'Son of God' implies the exaltation of Jesus – cf. Rom 1.3f., where interestingly both titles are found side by side in the definition of the gospel; also 2Cor 1.19.

⁴Munck, Paul, pp.24ff; T.Holtz, 'Zum Selbstverständnis des Apostels Paulus', ThLZ 91(1966), 324ff.; J.Blank, Paulus und Jesus(1968), pp.224ff.; Cerfaux, 'La vocation de Saint Paul', pp.12ff.; H.Windisch, Paulus und Christus(1934), p.137.

Some, however, persist in their unbelief. This proves not that he has exercised his apostolic commission untruthfully or that his gospel is 'veiled', but rather that their minds have been blinded and kept in blindness¹ by Satan, so that they may not see the light of the gospel. If it is correct to see an echo of the call of the Ebed here, the parallelism between this passage and Acts 26. 16–18 is remarkable².

Thus it is clear that in 2Cor 4.3–6 Paul alludes to his experience of conversion and call on the Damascus road. But the allusion to the Damascus event is not limited to the four verses. It is in fact already made in 4.1. The aorist *ἡλεήθημεν* of the verse points to a definite moment in the past in which Paul received the *ἔλεος* (cf. 1Tim 1.12f.). It was of God's *ἔλεος* that Paul, the persecutor, was called into the ministry on the Damascus road³. 'This ministry' refers to the ministry of the new covenant, of which Paul was qualified to be a minister (3.6)⁴. Like *ἡλεήθημεν* in 4.1, the aorist *ικάνωσεν* in 3.6 also refers to Paul's call on the Damascus road⁵. Since he persecuted the Church of God, Paul knows that he is 'not fit (*ικανός*) to be called an apostle' (1Cor 15.9; 2Cor 3.5). Nevertheless God has qualified him to be a minister of the new covenant.

Some scholars have seen also in 2Cor 3.16 an allusion to Paul's conversion experience⁶. In the verse Paul refers to Ex 34.34a:

ἦνίκα δ' αὖν εἰσεπορεύετο Μωυσῆς ἔναντι κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ,
περιηρείτο τὸ κάλυμμα ἕως τοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι,

but with a few variations⁷: a) In 2Cor 3.16 the subject is lacking; b) *εἰσεπορεύετο*. . . *ἔναντι κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ* of Ex 34.34 is replaced by *ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς κύριον*; and c) the imperfect *περιηρείτο* is changed into

¹This gloss seems called for in the context. For all would be blind without the illumination of the knowledge of the exalted Christ. But while some among them receive the illumination by faith, others persist in their unbelief and so are kept in blindness.

²Cf. Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.121.

³Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.127; Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.110; cf. 1Tim 1.13, 16; also 1Cor 7.25. In view of his activities as a persecutor of the Church, Paul regularly underlines that his call to apostleship is purely of God's grace – e.g. 1Cor 15.9f.; Rom 1.5; 15.15f. There is a parallelism between the *ἐλάβομεν χάριω καὶ ἀποστολήν* in Rom 1.5 and *ἔχοντες τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην, καθὼς ἡλεήθημεν* here (*χάρις* and *ἔλεος* being synonymous, and *ἀποστολή* and *διακονία* being likewise synonymous).

⁴Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.131; Bruce, *Cor.*, p.190; Hughes, *2Cor.*, p.121.

⁵Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.85; Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.109; Blank, *Paulus*, p.191.

⁶Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.102; Hughes, *2Cor.*, p.112; W.C. van Unnik, '“With Unveiled Face” (2Cor III.12–18)', *Sparsa Collecta* (1973), p.206.

⁷Cf. Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.123.

the present *περιαίρεται* as *εἰσπορεύετο* into *ἐπιστρέψῃ*, and d) the phrase *ἕως τοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι* is removed. These changes indicate, first, that Paul is drawing out a general principle from the particular episode of Moses in Ex 34¹, and secondly that the principle drawn out is of conversion². To this day when the Torah is read in the Synagogue³ a veil lies upon the hearts of the Israelites, so that they are not able 'to realise the transitory character of the Mosaic order and to recognize the unfading glory of the gospel dispensation'⁴. 'But when a man⁵ turns to the Lord⁶ the veil is taken

¹Cf. Bruce, *Cor.*, p.193. Failing to understand this, I.Hermann, *Kyrios und Pneuma* (1961), p.38, regards v.16 not as a citation of Ex 34.34 but as 'a free play with a well-known idea from the OT', 'a completely new statement . . . which remains in the sphere of the idea of the OT *Vorlage* only through free association of words'. Against this J.D. G.Dunn is correct in classifying v.16 in the category of a Christian *pesher* ('2 Corinthians III.17 – "The Lord is the Spirit"', *JTS* 21(1970), pp. 314ff.).

²See esp. the second change *ἐπιστρέφω*, which is almost a *term. techn.* for conversion in the LXX and the NT when it is not used for spatial turning. Cf. Bertram, *ἐπιστρέφω*, *TDNT* vii, pp.722–29; Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.123; Hughes, *2Cor.*, p.114; Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.200; Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.122.

³Cf. Acts 15.21.

⁴Bruce, *Cor.*, p.192; so similarly also Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.101; Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.122; Hughes, *2Cor.*, p.111; van Unnik, *op. cit.*, p.205. See the last named, pp.202ff., for an illuminating analysis of the passage (2Cor 3.13–16).

⁵The unexpressed subject of *ἐπιστρέψῃ* seems most likely to be *τις*: 'anyone in the Synagogue', 'any who hears the Law read' (Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.101; cf. also van Unnik, *op. cit.*, p.207; Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.122; Hughes, *2Cor.* p.113; Hermann, *Kyrios*, p.38).

⁶In view of the parallelism between this verse and v.14c the *κύριος* here is to be taken as Christ. As he does frequently elsewhere, Paul here transfers to Christ the title *κύριος* which in the OT belongs to Yahweh (see F.F.Bruce, "Jesus is Lord", *Soli Deo Gloria*, W.C.Robinson FS(1968), pp.23–36). In our present passage Paul is no longer thinking of Moses but of the Jews in the Synagogue. They have no need to turn to Yahweh. So Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.102; Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.112; Wendland, *Kor.*, p.183; Hermann, *Kyrios*, pp.39ff. Against this generally accepted view, recent attempts by Dunn (*op. cit.*) and his teacher C.F.D. Moule ('2Cor 3.18b, *καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος*', *NT und Geschichte*, Cullmann FS, pp.231–37) to see the *κύριος* in 2Cor 3.16–18 as referring not to Christ but to Yahweh are not convincing. In spite of his recognition of the changes that Paul introduces in his citation of Ex 34.34, Moule fails to understand that Paul is here drawing out a general principle from the particular episode of Moses in Ex 34. Thus Moule tries to read v.16 as though it were standing in Ex 34 and referring to Moses. But Paul is speaking of the Jew's turning to the Lord *now* (*ἐπιστρέψῃ-περιαίρεται!*). While emphasizing that the decisive factor in such a discussion as this is the context, Dunn (and also Moule) nevertheless totally fail to give any weight to the parallel statement in v.14. Their arguments from Paul's use of *κύριος* are nullified by their own citations of three or more 'exceptions' each time. At any rate, they were already met adequately and rejected by Hermann, *Kyrios*, pp.40f. Moule and

away'¹ (2Cor 3.16), so that he 'sees the glory of the Lord and reflects'² it with unveiled face' (2Cor 3.18). When Paul so contrasts the state of the Jews in the Synagogue with the state of the converted to Christ, he must be speaking out of his own experience. When he saw the glory of the Lord on the road to Damascus (3.18; cf. 4.6) he realised that his understanding of the Torah had been wrong. The encounter with Christ was like removing a veil from his mind that had hindered his true understanding of the Torah and acceptance of the gospel³.

5) Commentators have seen also in 2Cor 5.16 an allusion to Paul's conversion⁴. ὥστε in v.16 indicates that v.16 is a consequence of the foregoing. So ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν may refer to the time since Paul arrived at the judgement (the aorist part. κρίναντας) concerning the significance of Christ's death as expressed in vs. 14f., i.e., the time since his conversion⁵. Or it may refer to the eschatological situation brought about by the death and resurrection of Christ (vs.14f.)⁶. But since this objective turning-point from the old aeon to the new is made real in an individual's life at the moment of his conversion,

Dunn notice neither that Paul usually speaks about the Christian's transformation into the image of Christ rather than of God (Rom 8.29; 1Cor 15.49; cf. also Phil 3.21; Gal 4.19, one apparent exception being the disputed Col 3.9) nor that the language of 2Cor 3.16–18 together with that of 2Cor 4.4–6 is to be seen in the light of the Damascus Christophany. On this last point, *infra* pp.229–239.

¹ περιαιρείται is taken by most commentators as passive. The agent of the removing is 'the Lord'. But Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.122, takes it to be middle and its subject 'the Lord'.

² κατοπτριζόμενοι may be rendered either 'beholding as in a mirror' or 'reflecting as a mirror'. Commentators are evenly divided on this. The correct rendering seems to depend on the understanding of the context. If ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες in v.18 is contrasted with Moses in v.13, then the latter is obviously the meaning. If however it is contrasted with the Jews, the former is meant. It is difficult to decide which contrast is intended. It may be that Paul intends both contrasts. For the appropriateness of the word here, *infra* p.232. Cf. Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.127; also Plummer, *2Cor.*, pp.104f.

³For an antithetical typology between the Sinai Theophany to Moses (Ex 33–34) and the Damascus Christophany to Paul that we perceive underlying 2Cor 3.1–4.6, *infra* the excursus on pp.233–239.

⁴Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.184f.; Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.127; Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.177; Hughes, *2Cor.*, p.197; Bruce, *Cor.*, p.208; Stuhlmacher, 'Erwägungen zum ontologischen Charakter der καὶ κτλ. bei Paulus', *EvTh* 27(1967), pp.4f. Cf. G.Friedrich, 'Die Gegner des Paulus im 2.Korintherbrief', *Abraham unser Vater*, O.Michel FS, eds. O.Betz, et al.(1963), p.214.

⁵Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.176; Hughes, *2Cor.*, p.197; Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.170; cf. also Moffatt translation; NEB.

⁶Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.205; Bultmann, 'Exegetische Probleme des zweiten Korintherbriefes', *Exegetica*, p.310.

the ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν of v.16 still refers also to the time since Paul's conversion¹. κατὰ σάρκα is to be taken with the verbs (οἶδαμεν and ἐγνώκαμεν)² rather than with the objects (οὐδένα and Χριστόν)³. For Paul could hardly mean that since his conversion he knows 'no one in so far as he is of fleshly nature' or 'who lives still in flesh'⁴. Paul means rather that since his conversion he knows no one in a fleshly way, according to worldly standards⁵.

V.16b is a special application of this principle⁶. Among the various interpretations of this statement⁷ the best seems to be that 'to know Christ in a fleshly way' means to know him or judge him according to the conception of the Messiah which was current at that time⁸. Many commentators feel that there is a polemical note in the statement, but they define the exact nature of the polemic differently according to their various interpretations of the statement⁹. Paul may be directing his polemic against his Jewish opponents who used particular features of the historical Jesus in order to protect their own views and claims¹⁰. Probably the opponents judged Christ from Jewish viewpoints and categories¹¹, and while boasting of their relation to him (cf.

¹Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.205; Stuhlmacher, 'κωή κτίσις', p.5. Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.184, takes ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν without further ado as referring to conversion. Similarly also Wendland, *Kor.*, p.202.

²Schlatter, *Der Bote*, p.559; Wendland, *Kor.*, p.202; Burce, *Cor.*, p.208; Barrett, *2Cor.* pp.170f.; O.Michel, '“Erkennen dem Fleisch nach” 2.Kor.5, 16', *EvTh* 14(1954), p.23; C.F.D.Moule, 'Jesus in NT Kerygma', *Verborum Veritas*, G.Stählin FS, ed. O. Böcher u. K.Haacker(1970), pp.17f.

³Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.176; Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.125; cf. Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.185, who thinks it impossible to differentiate between the two.

⁴Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.185; cf. Wendland, *Kor.*, p.203; Moule, *op.cit.*, p.18.

⁵Cf. Wendland, *Kor.*, p.202; Bruce, *Cor.*, p.208; NEB; RSV.

⁶Windisch, *2.Kor.*, pp.184f.

⁷For the various interpretations, see Windisch, *2.Kor.*, pp.186ff.; also Plummer, *2Cor.*, pp.177f.; E.Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr*(1966), pp.284ff., who attacks strongly the view that Paul is here rejecting a knowledge of the historical Jesus, but whose view that 2Cor 5.16 is a Gnostic gloss (following W.Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth*(³1969), pp.286ff.) is hardly tenable.

⁸Cf. O.Michel, *op.cit.*, p.26; Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.171; F.F.Bruce, *Paul and Jesus*(1974), pp.22–25.

⁹See Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.177; Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.188; Schlatter, *Der Bote*, pp.563f.; Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.125; Wendland, *Kor.*, p.203; Strachan, *2Cor.*, p.110; Michel, *op.cit.*, pp.26f.; Güttgemanns, *op.cit.*, pp.282–304.

¹⁰Michel, *op.cit.*, p.26.

¹¹E.g., as the Jewish national Messiah. Cf. *ibid.*, pp.26f.; Schlatter, *Der Bote*, pp. 561, 563. From the Jewish point of view the crucified Messiah is, of course, a contra-

v.12), they perhaps insinuated that Paul had hated him and persecuted his followers¹. This may explain why in the present passage Paul rejects judging Christ in a fleshly way on the one hand and emphasizes at the same time the idea of reconciliation on the other. At first, Paul concedes that, like his opponents², he judged Christ according to the Jewish conceptions of Messiah, and became, unlike them, a persecutor of the adherents of Christ, because he thought that they were blasphemously proclaiming Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, the man who as the pretender to Messiahship was helplessly condemned and crucified under God's curse³. This was a fleshly judgement, however. Now that he came to perceive the significance of Jesus' death, he no longer entertains such a fleshly judgement of Christ.

ὥστε in v.17 introduces a statement parallel to v.16 as a consequence of Christ's dying for all so that the living may live for him (vs.14f.)⁴. At the same time, however, v.17 seems to be building upon v.16⁵. The new creation has taken place in the death and resurrection of Christ, in which all have participated (vs.14f.). But 'it is when a person comes to be *in Christ*, that is,

diction in terms (cf. Gal 3.13f.), a scandal (1Cor 1.23). But convinced of Jesus' resurrection and therefore of God's exaltation of him, the Jewish Christian opponents may have seen Jesus as the Davidic national Messiah. Cf. Acts 15.16–18 (on this passage, see Bruce, *NT History*, p.269; *This is That* (1968), p.79); Rom 1.3f. (on this passage *infra* pp.109ff.). This is suggested by the contrast between knowing someone *κατὰ σάρκα* and being *καὶ κτίσις* in Christ. Rom 2.25–29; 4.1ff.; 9.3ff.; 1Cor 10.18; Gal 4.21ff. make it clear that Paul looks upon the Jews and their claims in terms of the 'flesh' over against the divine promise and the Spirit. In Gal 6.12–16 Paul invalidates the Jewish glorying in the circumcision in the flesh, i.e., in being part of the covenant people, Israel, by pointing to a 'new creation', the true 'Israel of God' made up of the believing Jews and Gentiles (cf. also Gal 3.26–29). So, it is probable that as in Gal 6.12–16 so also in 2Cor 5.16f. Paul is invalidating the Jewish nationalistic claims with regard to the Messiah by asserting that what matters is God's *καὶ κτίσις* in Christ which transcends the old *heilsgeschichtliche* division between Israel and the Gentiles. In view of the *καὶ κτίσις* in Christ, Israel and their claims can only be designated as *κατὰ σάρκα*.

¹Cf. Friedrich, 'Gegner', p.214. But Friedrich's doubt about Paul's persecution of Stephen and his friends in Jerusalem cannot be based on Gal 1.22. *Infra* pp.48f. So his conjecture that the account of Paul's persecution of Stephen and the 'Hellenists' may have arisen from the later estrangement between the 'Hellenists' and Paul, is unconvincing.

²Cf. Michel, *op. cit.*, pp.26f.

³Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.177; Schlatter, *Der Bote*, p.562; Michel, *op.cit.*, p.26.

⁴Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.179; Schlatter, *Der Bote*, p.564; Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.126; Michel, *op.cit.*, p.23; Stuhlmacher, '*καὶ κτίσις*', p.5.

⁵Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.189; Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.179; Michel, *op.cit.*, p.27; cf. Bultmann, 'Exegetische Probleme', *Exegetica*, p.310.

on his conversion, that in respect of him the new creation . . . takes place'¹. Paul gained this theological insight in his experience on the road to Damascus. That on the Damascus road God's act of new creation took place in respect of him, he already implied in 2Cor 4.6. There he said that God, who let light shine at the first creation, shone in his heart driving darkness out of him. Although in the present verse, 2Cor 5.17, Paul speaks of 'being in Christ' as being a new creation gnomically in general terms (τις), he thinks primarily of his own case. This is clear from the context: v.17 is a part of Paul's apologetic polemic, and he speaks mainly of himself both before and after the verse². 'Being ἐν Χριστῷ' begins with baptism³, in which one dies and rises with Christ (cf. vs.14f.)⁴ and becomes incorporated into the Body of Christ, the Last Adam⁵. But Paul uses the same word-group καλεῖν for his apostolic call and for the call of an individual to be a Christian through baptism⁶, thus indicating that his Damascus call was the call to be ἐν Χριστῷ as well as to be an apostle of Christ. At the Damascus call Paul was crucified to the (old) world through the cross of Christ and the (old) world to him (Gal 6.14), so that he can say, 'I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me . . . ' (Gal 2.20). Thus at the Damascus call Paul became a *καὴν κτίσις ἐν Χριστῷ*⁷.

¹Barrett, 2Cor., p.174.

²The first person plural in vs. 11–20 should be taken throughout as referring to Paul (and secondarily his colleagues). So Plummer, 2Cor., p.182; cf. also Schlatter, *Der Bote*, pp.565ff. Güttgemanns, *Apostel*, pp.313f. Some see ἡμᾶς in v.18 as referring to all Christians and ἡμῖν (similarly also ἐν ἡμῖν in v.19) to Paul and his colleagues (e.g., Barrett, 2Cor., p.175; cf. also Windisch, 2.Kor., pp.193f.; Bultmann, 'Exegetische Probleme', p.309). But, then as Barrett (*loc. cit.*) recognises, the change from 'us Christians' to 'us ministers' within a verse is 'abrupt and difficult'. Taking ἡμᾶς in v.18 to refer to Paul (and his colleagues), of course, does not mean that Paul is saying God reconciled only him (and his colleagues) to himself through Christ. The universal scope of God's work of reconciliation is expressed in the immediately following verse (v.19). The reason why Paul singles himself out as having been reconciled by God to himself, can be well understood in the context. See the immediately following. See further p.5 (n.7) above.

³Cf. Bultmann, 'Exegetische Probleme', p.310(n.23); F. Neugebauer, *In Christus* (1960), p.112(n.63a); Stuhlmacher, 'καὴν κτίσις', p.28.

⁴Cf. R.C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ* (1967), p.66, who finds v.14 to be a variant formulation of the motif of dying with Christ; cf. also Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.126; Windisch, 2.Kor., p.189.

⁵Cf. Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.205; Wendland, *Kor.*, p.181; Windisch, 2.Kor., p.189; Tannehill, *op.cit.*, p.69.

⁶See Stuhlmacher, 'καὴν κτίσις', pp.27ff.; A. Satake, 'Apostolat und Gnade bei Paulus', *NTS* 15(1968/69), pp.96ff. *Infra* pp.288ff. for the significance of this.

⁷*καὴν κτίσις* is in Paul a cosmological, *heilsgeschichtlicher*, collective term for 'new

If Paul's reference to Christ's representative death (vs. 14f.) and the ἐν Χριστῷ formula thus provide us with a ground for the inference that here Paul is thinking of the Damascus call as God's act of new creation in respect of him, in 2Cor 5.18ff. he clearly explains that indeed God's act of new creation took place in respect of him on the Damascus road. It is clear from the opening words of 2Cor 5.18ff. that Paul is explaining how he was made a *καὶ κτίσις*, since τὰ δὲ πάντα refers to the fundamental changes that he has been talking about in vs. 16f. Paul says that he was made a *καὶ κτίσις* by God, who reconciled him to himself. At this point Paul may have in mind the Rabbinic idea which compares forgiveness and atonement for sin on the New Year's Day or on the Day of Atonement with a new creation (בריאה חדשה)¹. Paul's concept of *καὶ κτίσις*, being eschatological, in that it designates the new being in the new aeon inaugurated by Christ², cannot simply be identified with the Rabbinic concept, which is largely a pictorial expression for changes in the religio-ethical sphere³. However, this difference between the Rabbinic concept of בריאה חדשה and the Pauline concept of *καὶ κτίσις* is only a natural consequence of Paul's belief that the forgiveness and atonement in Jesus Christ is the eschatological consummation of that which had to be repeated in Judaism⁴. If the forgiveness and atonement on the Day of Atonement or any other day effected renewal which could be described

creation' (Gal 6.15; cf. 2Cor 5.17b) (cf. Stuhlmacher, '*καὶ κτίσις*', p.20). But in 2Cor 5.17 the anthropological, individual dimension ('new creature') is also implied, if it does not come to the fore (note the individualising *τις*). So Tannehill, *op.cit.*, p.68; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, s.v.1 b.

¹Cf. Str.-Bill. ii, pp.421f.; iii, p.519; Moore i, pp.334f.; E.Sjöberg, 'Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palästinischen Judentum', *StTh* 3 (1950/51) pp.45ff. Sometimes forgiveness in general without any connection with the New Year's Day or the Day of Atonement is compared with a new creation: e.g., Lev.R.30.3 (to Lev 23.40); Midr. Ps. 18.6 (Str.-Bill. iii, p.519). See Sjöberg, *op.cit.*, pp.58f., 67f.

²Cf. Stuhlmacher, '*καὶ κτίσις*', pp.20ff.

³Cf. Sjöberg, *op.cit.*, pp.62ff.; Stuhlmacher, '*καὶ κτίσις*', p.22.

⁴Cf. Midr. Ps.102.3(216a) in Str.-Bill. ii, p.422. For this reason the Qumran idea of cleansing and renewal at the entry into the eschatological community of the new covenant as a new creation, to which passages like 1QH 3. 19–22 and 11.10–14 (cf. also 1QS 11.13f.) seem to allude, may offer a closer parallel to Paul's concept here than the Rabbinic idea does (cf. Stuhlmacher, '*καὶ κτίσις*', pp.12ff., 16,20; Sjöberg, 'Neuschöpfung in den Toten-Meer-Rollen', *St Th* 9(1956), pp.130ff.). However, it must be pointed out that in the above noted passages from Qumran the word 'new creation' itself does not appear.

Stuhlmacher, 'Zur neueren Exegese von Röm 3,24–26', *Jesus und Paulus*, Kümmel FS, pp.315ff., argues that in Rom 3.24ff. Paul accepts the pre-Pauline interpretation of

pictorially as a new creation, the forgiveness and atonement in Jesus Christ effects the eschatological and therefore real, new creation. Now the motif of reconciliation in 2Cor 5.18 clearly refers to the Damascus event¹. Up to that moment Paul was acting as an enemy of the adherents of Christ, therefore of Christ and ultimately of God. But by grace God forgave him and reconciled him to himself (cf. Rom 5.10). That the Damascus event meant for Paul God's forgiveness as well as his call to the apostolic service, Paul expresses repeatedly by recalling his past persecution of the Church and by using the word *χάρις* for the call, as we have seen above. It is also suggested by the fact that Paul interprets his experience of God's call at the Christophany in the light of the call of Isaiah at the Theophany (Isa 6)², in which Isaiah is forgiven and atoned for (כפר) in a cultic setting which is reminiscent of that of the Day of Atonement (cf. Isa 6.6f. (also v.4b) with Lev 16.12f.).

Thus Paul was made a *καὴν κτίσις* through God's reconciliation of him to himself on the Damascus road. With this Paul replies to his opponents who boast of their relation to Christ, estimating him in Jewish categories, and insinuate that Paul hated him. Paul, who had estimated Jesus in a fleshly way and persecuted his followers, has now become a new creature in Christ. All old value-judgements and relations have ceased to matter; they have chang-

the atoning work of Christ as the eschatological antitype to the atonement on the Day of Atonement in Judaism. He thinks that Paul's idea of the reconciled man as *καὴν κτίσις* (2Cor 5.17) also suggests this. Whether in Rom 3.24ff. Paul thinks of Christ's atoning work as the antitype to the atonement on the Day of Atonement, depends on the question whether *ἱλαστήριον* there refers to כפרת or simply has the general sense of 'a means of propitiation'. Over against E.Lohse, *Martyrer und Gottesknecht* (21963), pp.149ff., Stuhlmacher argues for the former. But he seems not to be aware of the arguments for the latter advanced by L.Morris, 'The Meaning of ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ in Romans III.25', *NTS* 2(1955/56), pp.33ff. However we interpret Rom 3.24ff., there is no doubt that there as elsewhere (e.g., Rom 4.25–5.11; 2Cor 5.19) Paul sets forth the atonement in Christ as final. When Paul speaks of his becoming *καὴν κτίσις* through God's reconciliation through Christ in 2Cor 5.17ff., he need not have had the forgiveness and atonement specifically on the Day of Atonement in mind. For, as noted above (in n.1, p.17) and also suggested by 1QH 3.19–22; 11.10–14, in Judaism forgiveness and atonement without any connection with the cultic ceremonies on the Day of Atonement was also compared with a new creation.

¹Cf. Schlatter, *Der Bote*, pp.565ff., emphasizes that in the present passage 2Cor 5.16ff. Paul has his own experience in mind.

²*Infra* pp.91ff. 2Cor 5.17b seems to allude to the contrast of 'the former things' – 'new things' in Isa 42.9: 43.18f.; 48.6 (cf. also 65.17; 66.22). See Stuhlmacher, '*καὴν κτίσις*', pp.10ff. for the view that Deutero-Isa. is the source of the apocalyptic concept of *καὴν κτίσις*. Is Paul thinking of the call of Isaiah together with his in 2Cor 5.16ff.?

ed¹. This has been brought about by God's reconciling him to himself. So there is no point of talking about Paul's past as an enemy of Christ and God any longer. God's reconciliation of Paul to himself is already an act of pure grace, but there is still more: God has not only reconciled Paul to himself but has also given him the ministry of reconciliation and entrusted to him the message of reconciliation². This is the climax of Paul's apologetical polemic³.

In the NT only Paul uses *καταλλάσσειν/καταλλαγή* of the relation between God and man. Even outside the NT the religious use of the term is rare. In Hellenistic Judaism, where it is used, though infrequently, and in Rabbinic Judaism, where its Hebrew or Aramaic equivalents (רצן/רצן and פליים / פליים) are used, it means invariably God being appeased or reconciled to

¹Cf. Barrett, *2Cor.*, pp.174f.; Foester, κτίζω, κτλ, *TDNT* iii, p.1034.

²*καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν* in v.19 is not to be taken as parallel with *μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς*, both subordinated to *ἦν . . . καταλλάσσειν*. For a) the change in the tense speaks against the construction (Büchsel, *καταλλάσσειν*, *TDNT* i, p.257); b) it is difficult to force the sense of a pluperfect upon *ἦν θέμενος* (Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.178); and more fundamentally c) it is not easy to see how Paul's ministry of preaching can be put on par with Christ's death and resurrection as constituting together God's work of reconciliation. 'Die Predigt gehört selbst mit zum Heilsgeschehen' (Bultmann, 'Jesus und Paulus', *Exegetica*, p.228; cf. also p.312), only in so far as it is the means through which individuals are made aware of God's objective work of reconciliation and appropriate it. It is wrong, therefore, to blur the distinction between God's objective work of reconciliation in Christ and the preaching as Bultmann does (cf. also Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.178). So Büchsel, *op.cit.*, suggests taking *θέμενος* as an instance of a participle continuing a construction begun with a finite verb (cf. B-D, §468.1). May it be that *καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν* is to be taken as parallel with *δόντος ἡμῶν* in v.18? If so, *ὡς ὅτι . . . τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν* of v.19ab would be a parenthesis, describing the ground of the *διακονία* τῆς καταλλαγῆς. For *ὡς ὅτι* see B-D, §396; Moulton i, p.212; and commentaries by Plummer (p.183), Windisch (p.191) and Barrett (pp.176f.). According to Schlatter, *Der Bote*, p.566, Paul begins the sentence of v.19 with *ὡς* because he compares his own experience with what God has done for the world. However, since the particle alone does not adequately express the relation between the two as the latter is the ground of the former, he adds *ὅτι* to *ὡς*. If this is correct, it supports the view that *ὡς ὅτι . . . τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν* is a parenthesis.

The nom. *θέμενος* instead of the gen. *θεμένου* may appear here under the influence of the endings — *ος* either of *λογιζόμενος*, *δόντος* and *καταλλάξαντος* or of *θεός* of v.19 (F.F.Bruce tells me that the latter is more likely).

³Cf. Plummer, *2Cor.*, p.182. Failing to see this context, Barrett, *2Cor.*, p.175, speaks of Paul returning 'to deal more directly with the theme of the apostolic ministry entrusted to him' from v.18 onwards, and Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.126, say that there is no 'erkennbarer Gedankenfortschritt und klarer Zusammenhang' in vs. 18f. See further Güttgemanns, *Apostel*, pp.312ff., for the perplexities of various commentators in their unsuccessful explanation of the connection between vs. 18ff. and the foregoing. But Güttgemanns' own explanation of the connection is hardly plausible.

man by man's prayer, confession or sacrifice¹. But for Paul it is not God who is reconciled to man, but man who is reconciled to God. Certainly the idea that Christ's death was an atoning sacrifice and that it was God who provided it as the means of atonement, was pre-Pauline (1Cor 11.25ff.; 15.3; cf. also Rom 3.24ff.)². So the material was already there for the Pauline doctrine of reconciliation. However, it may well be that it was Paul who for the first time in *Religionsgeschichte* used the theologumenon καταλλάσσειν/καταλλάγη in the significant sense of God's reconciling rebellious mankind to himself; and he did so out of his own experience on the Damascus road, where he was reconciled to God while he was acting as his enemy (cf. Rom 5.10)³.

6) Eph 3.1–13 is the next passage, where Paul speaks of his call⁴. This

¹Cf. Büchsel *op. cit.*, p.254; H. Vorländer, 'Versöhnung', *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum NT* ii/2(1971), pp.1309ff.; Str.-Bill. iii, pp.519f.; L.Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*(31965), pp.215ff.

²It is widely recognized that Rom 3.25 is a pre-Pauline quotation. See Bultmann, *Theology of the NT* i (1965), p.46; E.Käsemann, 'Zum Verständnis von Röm 3,24–26', *ZNW* 43(1950/51), pp.150ff.; *An die Römer* (1974), pp.88f.; Lohse, *Märtyrer*, pp.149ff.; Stuhlmacher, 'Zur neueren Exegese von Röm 3,24–26', pp.315ff. Against this view, see C.E.B.Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans* i (1975), pp.200f. (n.1).

³This view contradicts E.Käsemann's view that the 'reconciliation' motif stems from the doxology of the Hellenistic community and 2Cor 5.19–21 is 'ein vorpaulinisches Hymnenstück' ('Erwägungen zum Stichwort "Versöhnungslehre im NT"', *Zeit und Geschichte*, Bultmann FS, ed. E.Dinkler(1964), pp.48–50) and also P.Stuhlmacher's view which, while rejecting Käsemann's view on the whole, still takes v.19ab as 'ein (hellenistisches) Zitat' (*Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus*(1966), pp.77f.). Stuhlmacher's reasons for taking the other verses as Pauline are sound enough. But his acceptance of Käsemann's arguments for taking v.19ab as a quotation seems unfortunate: a) it is not certain whether ὥς ἔτι is an *Einleitungsformel*(see the literature cited in n.2 on p.19; Stuhlmacher himself says that ὥς ἔτι in 2Cor 11.21 is not one); b) the presence of participles does not necessarily show a liturgical style(cf.v.18); c) Paul uses the plural παραπτώματα also in Rom 5.16; and d) the idea of the universal reconciliation of v.19 fits in well with that of our reconciliation in v.18, the former being the basis of the latter (cf. Windisch, *2.Kor.*, p.191). God's objective work of reconciling the world in Christ is the basis of an individual's reconciliation to God, i.e., an individual's reconciliation takes place when he appropriates to himself the reconciliation that God has wrought for the whole world. So on the basis of God's work of reconciliation of the world(v.19), Paul appeals to individuals to be reconciled to God(v.20). Cf. Kasting, *Anfänge.*, p.141; Lohse, *Märtyrer*, pp.159ff.; Büchsel, *op.cit.*, pp.256f. On the other hand, v.19ab shows positively two uniquely Pauline elements καταλλάσσειν and λογίζεσθαι (cf. Heidland, *λογίζομαι TDNT* iv, pp.286–292). Cf. Kasting, *Anfänge.*, p.141(n.49) for a criticism of Käsemann's view.

⁴See W.G.Kümmel, *Introduction to the NT*(1977), pp.357–363, for a summary of the arguments against Pauline authorship of Eph., and M.Barth, *Ephesians*(1974), pp.

section is an excursus in which Paul explains how he was made a servant of Christ for the Gentiles. He assumes that the readers have heard of his apostolic commission and the gospel that he received by revelation (εἰ γε ἠκούσατε . . . vs.2f.). While this general sense of vs.2f. is unmistakable, the exact meaning of *οἰκονομία* in v.2 is confusingly disputed. C.L. Mitton argues that, while in Col 1.25 it means Paul's 'assignment', in Eph 3.2 it has the sense of 'God's planned economy' or 'strategy'¹. This alleged difference in the sense of *οἰκονομία* between Col. and Eph. provides him with one of the arguments for the conclusion that Eph. is non-Pauline². Others think that *οἰκονομία* in Eph 3.2 means Paul's apostolic office as in Col 1.25, although in Eph 1.10 & 3.9 it means God's plan of salvation³. J. Reumann argues, however, that in Col 1.25 it means primarily God's plan or administration and secondarily Paul's apostolic office⁴. He argues that *οἰκονομία* is similarly used for God's 'administration' in Eph 1.9; 3.2,9, and that in Eph 3.2,9 as in Col 1.25 there is also implied the role in the divine administration given to Paul as an apostle, to make it known⁵. H. Schlier thinks that *οἰκονομία* in all three verses of Eph. means the divine 'Heilsveranstaltung'; not the divine 'Heilsplan' but the

3–50; and A. van Roon, *The Authenticity of Ephesians* (1974) for the latest defences of Pauline authorship.

¹C.L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (1951), pp.92ff.; cf. also E. Lohse, *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (14¹⁹⁶⁸), p.117; H. Merklein, *Das kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrief* (1973), p.174.

²Mitton, *op.cit.*, p.245; also Kümmel, *Introduction*, p.360.

³O. Michel, *οἰκονομία*, *TDNT* v, p.152; M. Dibelius & H. Greeven, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, An Philemon* (3¹⁹⁵³), p.73; J. Roloff, *Apostolat – Verkündigung – Kirche* (1965), p.113.

⁴J. Reumann, 'οἰκονομία-Terms', p.163. Reumann's three reasons for the view that *οἰκονομία* in Col 1.25 has 'the nuance of God's plan or administration' are: a) In Hellenistic world the phrase *οἰκονομία τοῦ θεοῦ* denoted God's administration of the universe; b) the subjective gen. *τοῦ θεοῦ*; and c) the preposition *κατά* 'implies a plan, rather than an office'. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (13¹⁹⁶⁴), p.80, also argues on the basis of the preposition *κατά* that it means 'Rat-schluß Gottes', 'Heilsplan Gottes' rather than 'Amt'. But Reumann seems to concede that the participial phrase *τῇν δοθεῖσάν μοι* demands also a sense of 'office' here, if only secondarily, and accepts Masson's rendering of the verse: 'according to plan of God, the execution of which has been conferred upon me in that which concerns you' (*L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens* (1950), pp.111f.). Cf. also J.T. Sanders, 'Hymnic Elements in Eph. 1–3', *ZNW* 56 (1965), pp.230f.; C.F.D. Moule, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (1957), p.80; even Michel, *op.cit.*, p.153, concedes that in Col 1.25 & Eph 3.2 'there is room for doubt whether *οἰκονομία* denotes office or the divine plan of salvation: the two are closely linked in the Prison Letters'.

⁵Reumann, *op.cit.*, p.164f.

'execution of the divine arrangement'¹. Interpreting χάρις in Eph 3.2 as the grace of the apostolic office (as in Rom 1.5; 12.3; 15.15; 1 Cor 3.10; Gal 2.9)² and the genitive τῆς χάριτος as *gen. obj.*³ or *explic.*, Schlier explains Eph 3.2 to mean: 'The Gentile Christians, to whom Paul writes, have heard of the divine undertaking which concerns the grace that was given to Paul together with apostleship. This divine undertaking consists in giving this grace to Paul and Paul's passing it on'⁴.

As in Rom 12.3; 15.15; 1 Cor 3.10; Gal 2.9 so in Eph 3.2, 7 & 8 the formula χάρις + the aorist passive form of δίδωμι + μοι indicates God's call of Paul to apostleship. This call has two sides: the revelation of the gospel and the commission to proclaim it (cf. Gal 1.15f.). Eph 3.3–6 explains the former and Eph 3.7ff. the latter.

ὅτι in v.3 introduces an explanation of v.2⁵. The divine οἰκονομία of calling Paul to apostleship took place in the revelation of the mystery to Paul. The mystery is the mystery τοῦ Χριστοῦ (v.4). This mystery is further defined in v.6⁶: 'that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, members of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Jesus Christ through the gospel'. C.L. Mitton has argued that μυστήριον in Eph 3 has an entirely different sense from that in Col 1.26f.⁷ But he overlooks a) that just as in Col 1.27 so in Eph 3.4 also μυστήριον is equated with Christ (if τοῦ Χριστοῦ in v.4 is a *gen. of apposition*)⁸ or at least it concerns Christ (if τοῦ Χριστοῦ in v.4 is a *gen. obj.*)⁹; and b) that in Col 1.27 μυστήριον is not simply Christ or 'the indwelling of Christ in his people, whether Jews or Gentiles'¹⁰ but 'the Christ

¹H.Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser*(⁷1971), p.148. Similarly M.Barth, *Eph.*, pp.86ff., 328f.

²*Infra* pp.25f., 288ff.

³Also T.K.Abbott, *The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*(1897), p.79; M.Barth, *Eph.*, p.328

⁴Schlier, *Eph.*, p.148. With this interpretation Schlier agrees with Reumann in seeing in Eph 3.2 both God's administration and Paul's role within it. Cf. also M.Barth, *Eph.*, pp.358f.

⁵Abbott, *Eph.*, p.79; Schlier, *Eph.*, p.148.

⁶The infinitive εἶναι is exegetical. So Abbott, *Eph.*, p.83; Schlier, *Eph.*, p.151; cf. also M.Barth, *Eph.*, p.336.

⁷C.L.Mitton, *Epistle*, p.89; cf. also Kümmel, *Introduction*, pp.359f.

⁸Schlier, *Eph.*, p.149; M.Barth, *Eph.*, p.331. Mitton, *Epistle*, p.89, takes (τὸ μυστήριον) τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Col. 4.3 as *gen. of apposition*. But without considering the same phrase in Eph 3.4 he concludes on the basis of Eph 3.6 & 1.9 that whereas in Col μυστήριον is equated with Christ, in Eph. it is not.

⁹Abbott, *op.cit.*, p.80.

¹⁰E.F.Scott, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians*

preached among the *nations*¹. The *μυστήριον* is not simply 'the eschatological redemptive act of God in Christ'² but that saving act that includes the Gentiles among the recipients of its benefits³. Thus both in Col 1.26f. and in Eph 3.4,6 *μυστήριον* has the Christological and *heilsgeschichtliche* or ecclesiological aspects⁴; the difference in the use of the word in the two epistles is one of emphasis: while in Col 1.26 the former is emphasized, in Eph 3 the latter comes to the fore⁵.

H. Merklein shows that the *μυστήριον* in Eph 3 stands for the *εὐαγγέλιον* in Gal 1.12,15f.⁶ As Paul says in Gal 1.12 that he received the gospel *δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, so he says in Eph 3.3 that the *μυστήριον* was made known to him *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*⁷. Just as in Gal 1.12,15f. the content of the gospel is Jesus Christ, so in Eph 3.4 the content of the mystery is Christ⁸. But the further definition of the *μυστήριον* in Eph 3.6 shifts its emphasis to the *heilsgeschichtliche* and ecclesiological nature. However, there is no contradiction but a logical connection between the Christological 'gospel' in Gal 1.12,15f. and the ecclesiological 'mystery' in Eph 3.6⁹. For Gal 1.15f. says that God revealed his Son to Paul so that Paul might proclaim him as the content of the gospel among the Gentiles. This means that the inclusion of the Gentiles among the beneficiaries of God's saving act in Christ was part of the content of God's revelation of Christ or at least its integral

(⁹1958), p.34. Mitton, *Epistle*, p.98, quotes Scott with approval.

¹E.Lohse, *Kol.*, p.121(emphasis by me). The problem whether *ἐν ὑμῖν* should be rendered 'within you' or 'among you' does not affect the point here being made. But the latter seems to be the better rendering. See Lohse, *Kol.*, pp.121f.

²Kümmel, *Introduction*, p.359.

³Cf. E.Schweizer, 'The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ', *Neotestamentica* (1963), p.327: 'The preaching of the gospel to the world, Christ among the Gentiles, is . . . the mystery hidden for ages, now revealed. It is the eschatological fulfilment of God's plan of salvation(1.26f.)'.

⁴Cf. Moule, *Col.*, p.82f.; F.F.Bruce, *The Epistle to the Colossians*(1957), pp.218f.; M.Barth, *Eph.*, p.331; Merklein, *op.cit.*, p.209.

⁵Cf. Bruce, *Col.*, pp.218f.; Merklein, *op.cit.*, p.209; G.Bornkamm, *μυστήριον TDNT* iv, p.820.

⁶Merklein *op.cit.*, pp.193–209, esp. 208f.; cf. also Dibelius-Greeven, *Eph.*, p.74.

⁷Merklein, *op.cit.*, pp.196–199, observes, however, the difference of accent between Gal 1.12, 15f. and Eph 3 reflected in their different formulations.

⁸Merklein does not make this point.

⁹*Ibid.*, p.208. Against K.M.Fischer, *Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes*(1973), p.99.

consequence¹. Eph 3.6 emphasizes this part as the content of the mystery revealed². Merklein thinks that with the term *μυστήριον* and its definition in terms of 'Christ who is proclaimed among the Gentiles' Col 1.26f acted as 'catalyst' for the ecclesiological interpretation in Eph 3.6 of the revelation of Christ in Gal 1³. Though the metaphor 'catalyst' seems unfortunate, it seems correct to see a line of development from Gal 1 to Eph 3 in the shifting of emphasis from the Christological to the ecclesiological definition of the revelation — the line that passes through Col 1.26f.⁴

The divine *οικονομία* consisted not only in revealing the gospel, the mystery, to Paul, but also in making him a servant of the gospel (v.7)⁵. The statement that Paul became a servant of the gospel is reminiscent of Rom 1.1 where he interprets the significance of his call to apostleship in terms of the commission to preach the gospel⁶. Paul's self-description *ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἀγίων* in v.8 is reminiscent of *ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων* in 1 Cor 15.9 and alludes to his past as a persecutor of the Church of Christ before his call⁷. God's call of Paul to apostleship was for the Gentiles

¹L.Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul* (1959), p.176.

²Merklein, *op.cit.*, p.208: 'Der Inhalt des Mysteriums Eph 3, 6 ist die ekklesiologische Interpretation der Offenbarung Jesu Christi in ihrer heilsgeschichtlichen Konsequenz. Indem der Verfasser die heilsgeschichtlichen Konsequenzen der ἀποκάλυψις Jesu Christi (Gal. 1) zum Gegenstand der ἀποκάλυψις selber macht, bekommt sein Mysterium ekklesiologischen Inhalt'.

³*Ibid.*, pp.208f.

⁴There may be another line of development from Gal 1 through Col 1.25ff. to Eph 3: Gal 1 speaks of the gospel — Col 1.25ff. speaks of the gospel and mystery and identifies them — Eph 3 speaks only of the mystery (in the place of the gospel in Gal 1). In Eph 3.1–13 Paul emphasizes that the mystery of the Gentiles' sharing in God's salvation in Christ was revealed to him and the grace of the apostolic office for the Gentiles was given to him. This accords well with other Pauline passages like Gal 1 & 2. But a problem arises because Paul says also that the mystery was revealed *τοῖς ἀγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι*. Could Paul, who had many troubles to get his *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας* accepted by the other apostles (Gal 1–2), say that it was revealed to 'the apostles and prophets' as a body? In view of Paul's emphasis that it is he who received the gospel by revelation, it may be that in v.5 Paul is pointing to the later acceptance of his gospel by the apostles (cf. Abbott, *Eph.*, pp.82f.).

⁵V.7 takes up v.2 and begins to explain the other side of the event of Paul's call to apostleship, namely the actual commission to proclaim the gospel.

⁶Cf. Lohse, *Kol.*, pp.110f.

⁷The intensification of self-degradation in Eph 3.8 in comparison with 1 Cor 15.9 is often seen as betraying the deutero-Pauline tendency to paint the pre-conversion Paul darker and darker (cf. 1 Tim 1.15). So Fischer, *op.cit.*, pp.95ff. But cf. Abbott, *Eph.*, p.86; Schlier, *Eph.*, p.152; M.Barth, *Eph.*, p.340.

(v.3): it was for Paul to preach the gospel to the Gentiles (v.8), so that through his preaching they might share in the salvation in Christ (v.6f.); and thus Paul was commissioned to bring to light the divine administration of the mystery (v.9)¹.

Finally, it may be added that the aorist forms of *δίδωμι* in connection with the *χάρις* given to Paul (vs.2,7,8) and the *ἐγνωρίσθη* in v.3 fix the revelation of the mystery and the call upon the Damascus event.

7) In the course of the exegesis of Eph 3.1–13 the parallel passage Col 1.23c–29 has constantly been drawn into discussion². This indicates that in Col 1.23c–29 too, Paul speaks of his apostolic commission³. First of all, as in Eph 3.7, he says that he became a servant of the gospel (v.23c). As such he became also a servant of the Church (v.25). This he became 'according to the plan of God, the execution of which was conferred upon'⁴ him for the Gentiles. The purpose of God's commissioning Paul was that he should 'carry out to the full the preaching of the gospel'⁵. The word of God, i.e., the gospel, is identified with the *μυστήριον*, and the *μυστήριον* in turn with *Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν*. The significance of this has been already observed above in connection with Eph 3. It is Christ whom Paul proclaims to all men (v.28; cf. Gal 1.16).

8) There is a series of the aorist forms of the verbs that refer to the call of Paul to apostleship on the Damascus road. It has already been noted that in Rom 12.3; 15.15; 1 Cor 3.10; Gal 2.9; Eph 3.2,7,8 Paul uses the formula⁶ *χάρις* + the aorist passive form of the verb *δίδωμι* + *μοι* to indicate God's apostolic commission of him on the Damascus road. As in Eph 3 so in Rom 15.15f. he expands the formula to explain the purpose of the grace of his apostolic commission: 'that I should be a minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, discharging the priestly ministry of the gospel of God, so that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable, consecrated by the Holy Spirit'. A variation of the formula appears in Rom 1.5. Here also the verb (*λαμβάνω*) is in the aorist form,⁷ indicating a definite point of time when Paul received

¹Accepting the reading that omits *πάντας* after *φωτίσαι* (X*, A, 1739, etc.).

²See Merklein, *op.cit.*, pp.159f. for a comparison between Col 1.23–27 and Eph 3.1–7.

³Lohse, *Kol.*, p.111, gives the passage Col 1.24–2.5 the heading 'Amt und Auftrag des Apostels'.

⁴*Supra* p.21, n.4.

⁵Abbott, *Eph.*, p.233.

⁶Cf. O.Michel, *Römer*, pp.296, 364; Käsemann, *Römer*, pp.317, 374.

⁷The plural *ἐλάβομεν* is, as often in Paul's letters, a literary plural. So Michel, *Römer*, p.40; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.11.

the apostolic commission¹. Here by adding ἀποστολή to χάρις thus forming a hendiadys² Paul clearly indicates that the χάρις means the χάρις of apostleship. A statement about the purpose of Paul's apostolic commission follows here also: to bring about the obedience that consists in faith³ among all the Gentiles for the sake of the name of Jesus Christ. The fact that Paul uses χάρις to denote his apostleship indicates that he perceived the call to apostleship as an act of God's pure grace for him, the persecutor of the Church (cf. 1Cor 15.10)⁴. The same thought appears in the two passages that have already been observed: ἔχοντες τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην, καθὼς ἡλεήθημεν . . . (2Cor 4.1)⁵; and (ἀλλ' ἡ ἱκανότης ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ), ὃς καὶ ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καωῆς διαθήκης . . . (2Cor 3.6). And as observed above it lies also behind 2Cor 5.18: τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς. (See also καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς in v.19).

Challenged by the Corinthians, Paul reminds them of the apostolic authority that the Lord gave him (2Cor 10.8; 13.10). Here again he uses the aorist ἔδωκεν indicating his apostolic commission on the Damascus road⁶. The purpose of God's commissioning him with the apostolic authority was for the building up of the Church and not for its pulling down. Another instance of the aorist form of δίδωμι used for Paul's apostolic commission is, as already observed, Col 1.25, where it is used with οἰκονομία as the object. Paul says that Christ sent him (or commissioned him as an apostle — ἀπέστειλεν) to preach the gospel (1Cor 1.17). Again, an aorist verb appears in Gal 2.8 in the context in which Paul defends the legitimacy of his apostleship: 'God who worked (ἐνεργήσας) for Peter to make him an apostle to the circumci-

¹Cf. Michel, *Römer*, p.40.

²B-D, §442.16; Bruce, *Romans*, p.74; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.12; cf. also Michel, *Römer*, pp.40f.

³Taking πιστεως as appositional. So Bultmann, *Theology* i, p.314; J.Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (1970), p.13; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.12. But cf. Michel, *Römer*, p.41; Bruce, *Romans*, p.74.

⁴*Infra* pp.288ff. for a discussion of the significance of this fact.

⁵Cf. 1Tim 1.12f., 16; and also 1Cor 7.25. A comparison of 2Cor 4.1 with 1Cor 7.25 is helpful in clarifying the force of the aorist tense. Whereas in 1Cor 7.25 through the perfect ἡλεημένος Paul is concerned to bring out the present effect, i.e., his trustworthiness (πιστός εἶναι), of his receiving the Lord's mercy on the road to Damascus (cf. Robertson & Plummer, *1Cor*, p.151), in 2Cor 4.1 through the aorist ἡλεήθημεν he emphasizes the event itself of his receiving the Lord's mercy for the ministry of the new covenant at a definite point of time — i.e., the event on the Damascus road.

⁶Cf. Plummer, *2Cor*, p.281.

zed, also worked (*ἐνήργησεν*) for me to make me an apostle to the Gentiles¹. This is a parenthetical remark giving the ground for the statement *πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς* in Gal 2.7 only, and not for the entire verse². Whereas *ἐνήργησεν* in v.8 and *δοθεῖσαν* in v.9 fix the attention on the Damascus event, the perfect *πεπίστευμαι* in v.7 brings to the fore the continuing effect of the event: Paul has the gospel as the result of God's entrusting him with it on the Damascus road (cf. 1Cor 9.17). However, in 1Th 2.4 the moment of God's entrusting Paul with the gospel becomes the centre of attention (cf. 1Tim 1.11; Tit 1.3).

9) Finally, the opening verses of Rom.; 1 & 2 Cor.; Gal.; Eph.; and Col. may be added here as alluding to God's call of Paul to apostleship on the Damascus road. Paul introduces himself as 'called to be an apostle' (Rom 1.1; 1Cor 1.1) and 'set apart for the gospel of God' (Rom 1.1)³ 'through the will of God' (2Cor 1.1; Eph 1.1; Col 1.1). In Paul's becoming an apostle a human will or mediation is excluded. This is emphasized in Gal 1.1 anti-thetically, and it seems that the narration of his call and career thereafter in

¹Cf. NEB: 'For God whose action made Peter an apostle to the Jews, also made me an apostle to the Gentiles'. Commentators usually interpret the verse as if Paul were arguing here for the legitimacy of his apostleship on the basis of the success of his missionary work which shows that in it God was at work. So, e.g., Mussner, *Gal.*, p.116; Schlier, *Gal.*, p.78. Cf. RSV for an extremely loose rendering of the verse on the basis of this interpretation. But this interpretation fails to observe the force of the preposition *εἰς* before *ἀποστολήν*. It expresses purpose or goal (Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p.264), so that *εἰς ἀποστολήν* means "for or unto the creation of", i.e., "so as to make him an apostle" (E.Burton, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (1921), p.94). It is strange that Burton, who correctly interprets the phrase *εἰς ἀποστολήν*, adopts the view under question after considering the alternative (*ibid.*, pp.93f.). Does Paul mean here that God was at work in his ministry to make him an apostle? Did the success of his missionary work make him an apostle? The aorists (*ἐνεργήσας & ἐνήργησεν*) are better understood as referring to God's work that resulted in the apostolic commissions of Peter and Paul or directly to God's work of commissioning them rather than to God's work in their missionary activities so far (against Mussner, *Gal.*, p.117). God's work for Peter and Paul (Πέτρῳ and ἐμοί are *dat. commodi*) need not be 'the inner experience' of them (cf. Burton, *Gal.*, pp.93f.); in Paul's case it would be God's revelation of Christ on the Damascus road.

²Cf. Burton, *Gal.*, p.93. Commentators seem often misled on this point, and this leads them to interpret Gal 2.8 as they do. Again Mussner, *Gal.*, p.117, provides the best example of this mistake. Cf. also Schlier, *Gal.*, p.77.

³Does *ἀφωρισμένος* refer to God's setting Paul apart before his birth or 'to the effectual dedication that occurred in the actual call to apostleship and (indicate) what is entailed in the call' (Murray, *Romans*, p.3)? A comparison with Gal 1.15 seems to point to the former. So Michel, *Römer*, pp.35f.; Bruce, *Romans*, p.71; Käsemann, *Römer*, p.4. But unlike Gal 1.15 Rom 1.1 has *ἀφωρισμένος* after *κλητός*. This seems to suggest the latter. So K.L.Schmidt, *κλητός*, *TDNT* iii, p.494; Kasting, *Anfänge*, p.56.

Gal 1.11ff. is a demonstration of the statement made in Gal 1.1.

These observations show that the references to Paul's conversion and call on the Damascus road abound in his letters. Certainly they are brief and are often in the nature of allusion bringing out the consequences of the event, rather than being an explicit narration of the event itself. This differentiates Paul from the author of the Book of Acts. But this gives no ground for the assertion that Paul shows deep reserve about his Damascus experience¹ or that it should not be placed at the centre of his life and thought². The reason why Paul does not narrate it in his letters as Acts does is to be found elsewhere. It is for this reason, that whereas Luke was writing history, Paul was writing letters to the churches which had already heard of it. The word *ἠκούσατε* in Gal 1.13 (cf. also Eph 3.2) suggests that the Galatian Christians already knew the details concerning Paul's pre-conversion past. That they came to know them and also to know of the Christophany on the Damascus road through Paul's own report rather than indirectly through hear-say or tradition³ is suggested by 1Cor 15.3–8, where Paul includes the Christophany to him together with the other resurrection appearances in the gospel that he delivered to the Corinthians⁴. Even if *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν* (1Cor 15.1) is to be limited to 1Cor 15.3b–5, there is no doubt that in his preaching Paul attached to 'the gospel' the reports of the resurrection appearances (vs. 6–7) including the Christophany to himself (v.8) as evidence of Christ's resurrection. This was inevitable. For when Paul preached that Jesus was raised from the dead he must have depicted the evidence of the resurrection in detail as far as he could, including his encounter with the

¹Contra Lohfink, *Paulus vor Damaskus*, p.21.

²Contra Bornkamm, *Paulus*, p.39.

³Cf. Burton, *Gal.*, p.44; Schlier, *Gal.*, p.49; Roloff, *Apostolat*, p.42.

⁴Cf. Lietzmann-Kümmel, *Kor.*, p.77; B.Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript* (1961), pp.299f., sees 1Cor 15.3–8 set out as 'a series of *simanim*'. *סימן* is the Rabbinic term for a title or heading which summarises a piece of teaching or tradition in a key-word or catch-word. It was used as a technique of memory (*ibid.*, pp.143ff., 153ff.). On 1Cor 15.3–8 Gerhardsson says: 'each individual part is a short, heading-like designation for some passage of the tradition about Christ' (p.299). J.Roloff, *Apostolat*, p.48, accepts this view. P.Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium* i (1968), pp.266–276, esp. pp.274f., similarly thinks that 1Cor 15.3–7 is a 'credo that concludes a catechetical lesson' and that as such it 'speaks in a highly abbreviated form of God's saving work in Christ which has become history', i.e., it is 'a summary of historical news'. The early Church knew to which concrete historical realities the abbreviations referred. Stuhlmacher thinks further that Paul expanded the tradition to include the Christophany to him: 'Denn für die Gemeinden, in denen sein apostolisches Wort Autorität besaß, ist die Geschichte Gottes mit dem Apostel Paulus eben Teil der Geschehnisse, die es als konstitutiv zur Kenntnis zu nehmen galt'. (p.275).

risen Jesus, in order to convince his hearers of the truth of Jesus' resurrection — the truth which was hitherto unheard of by his hearers and not easily believable to them. If B. Gerhardsson and P. Stuhlmacher are right, as it seems they are, in thinking that each part of 1Cor 15.3–8 stands for a tradition that was unfolded in catechetical lessons, the tradition represented by v.8 must have been of the same kind as that of three reports of the Damascus event in Acts (9.1–19; 22.3–16; 26.4–18), including Paul's pre-conversion past, the circumstances of the Christophany, the Christophany itself and its consequences¹. Having thus made his churches acquainted with the Damascus event as an integral part of his gospel, in his letters Paul needed only to refer to it briefly whenever he felt it necessary to remind them of it. Against this background must be understood not only the brief *siman*-like reference to it in 1Cor 15.8 and the reference in Gal 1.13–17, which are both explicitly prefaced as being a reminder (1Cor 15.2; Gal 1.13 (ἡκούσατε); cf. also Eph 3.2), but also the question *ὄχι Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐώρακα*; in 1Cor 9.1. Seen against this background the question appears to be a rhetorical one which presupposes the Corinthians' knowledge of the Christophany to Paul and therefore their affirmative answer. Paul needed to remind his churches of the Damascus event, however, not for its own sake, but in order to re-affirm the divine origin and therefore the authenticity of his gospel and apostleship. Hence in his letters he did not recount the event in detail, but only referred to it in connection with his gospel and apostleship².

10) The fact that the Damascus event formed part of Paul's preaching and catechetical tradition explains not only the stereotype form in which Paul's conversion and call is referred to in his letters, but also the preservation of the tradition in other writings: 1Tim 1.11–14³; Acts 9.1–19; 22.3–16; 26.4–18⁴. Against the earlier attempts to see different traditions behind the

¹*Infra* pp.91ff., 223ff.

²The rather lengthy descriptions of Paul's past in Judaism in Gal 1.13f. and Phil 3.4ff. do not contradict this statement. In Gal 1.13f. it was called for by the situation in which a demonstration was necessary that Paul could not possibly have received his gospel from man before he received it by the revelation of Christ. Similarly in Phil 3.4ff. Paul mentioned his privileges and achievements in Judaism not because the Philippians needed anew to be informed of them but because his confrontation with the Judaizers required him to mention them in order to show that their way was mistaken.

³That is, if 1Tim. is not Pauline but deutero-Pauline. Two recent authors rather convincingly argue for the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Letters: B.Reicke, 'Chronologie der Pastoralbriefe', *ThLZ* 101 (1976), 81–94; J.A.T. Robinson, *Redating the NT* (1976), pp.67–84.

⁴Stuhlmacher, *Evangelium*, pp.73, 275.

three accounts of the Damascus event in Acts¹, nowadays most scholars agree that they are based on one tradition². Except for the episode of Ananias, they agree with one another on the whole, and the variations are of little significance as they are limited to the area of expression³. On essential points they agree also with Paul's own accounts in his letters⁴: a) Paul persecuted the Church; b) the change took place in or before Damascus; c) Christ appeared to him; d) he appeared in the light as the exalted Lord; and e) he commissioned Paul to be the apostle to the Gentiles⁵. Besides, Acts 26.16–18 and 9.15–16 show allusions to the same passages of the call of the Ebed Yahweh and the prophet Jeremiah as those to which Paul alludes in his accounts in his letters⁶. In Acts 26.4–18 Luke may have left the Ananias episode out either because he felt it to be irrelevant for the occasion or because giving the gist of what Paul actually said before King Agrippa he remembered that Paul did not include it in his speech. If the former was the case, Luke may not have been of very different opinion from Paul in estimating the role of Ananias in Paul's conversion and call⁷. In spite of the modern tendency to give little historical value to the speeches in Acts, the latter possibility is not excluded. At any rate, the similarities between the accounts

¹E.g., E.Hirsch, 'Die drei Berichte der Apostelgeschichte über die Bekehrung des Paulus', *ZNW* 28(1929), pp.305–312 and K.Lake, 'The Conversion of Paul and the Events immediately following it', *The Beginnings of Christianity* v, ed. F.J.Foakes-Jackson & K.Lake (1933), pp.188–191.

²Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (1st 1968), p.276; G.Stählin, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (10th 1962) pp.309f.; H.Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (2nd 1972), pp.66; Lohfink, *op. cit.*, pp.29f.; S.G.Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (1973), p.161; Ch.Burchard, *Der dreizehnte Zeuge* (1970), pp.120f. (but in pp.125, 128f. he seems to contradict himself when he unsuccessfully tries to distinguish between one 'überlieferte Geschichte von Paulus Bekehrung' and another 'überlieferte Auffassung von Paulus Berufung' (p.129) and assigns Acts 9.1–18 to the former and Acts 26.12–18 to the latter).

³Cf. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p.161.

⁴J.Jeremias, *Der Schlüssel zur Theologie des Apostels Paulus* (1971), p.21; Lohfink, *op. cit.*, p.18.

⁵The problem of whether Luke thought of Paul as an apostle cannot be discussed here. See Roloff, *Apostolat*, pp.199ff., 232ff.

⁶See Munck, *Paul*, pp.24–33 together with our comment on 2Cor 4.6 in pp.10f. above.

⁷The fact that Luke was able to narrate Paul's conversion and call without mentioning Ananias shows that for him Ananias was only a dispensable mouthpiece of the Lord. This militates against G.Klein's view that Luke introduces Ananias as the mediator of Paul's call through whom Luke subordinates Paul to the ecclesiastical tradition and the Twelve (*Die Zwölf Apostel* (1961), pp.144ff.; cf. also Conzelmann, *ApG*, p.67; for sound criticisms of Klein's view see Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp.163ff. and Roloff, *Apostolat*,