ALIENATION AND RE-IDENTIFICATION AS PRAGMATIC STRATEGIES IN GALATIANS

ABSTRACT
Working with a combination of rhetorical criticism, speech act analysis and reception criticism, the strategies of alienation and re-identification in Galatians are investigated. The occurrence of these two interrelated strategies is traced throughout Galatians. Paul applies various kinds of vituperatio to estrange his Galatian readers from his Galatian opponents. Likewise, he varies his devices to encourage the Christians of Galatia to re-identify with him. Praise (laudatio) is, however, used most sparingly.

1 PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS
When Paul writes his letter to his Galatian convertees, not only the future of his Galatian ministry, but also the set of religious convictions and values it represents, is at stake. For that reason he can be expected to apply every theological argument at his disposal and every relevant rhetorical strategy to resolve this crisis.

The argumentative situation in Galatians can be characterised as one of conflicting convictions and, directly connected to this, one of conflicting loyalties. This paper deals with the latter. It intends investigating how, within this given situation, Paul handled the strained relationship between himself and the Galatian Christians. In the handling of this relationship two interrelated strategies, which I would prefer to call those of alienation and re-identification, play a decisive role.

The interrelatedness of these two phenomena must be underlined from the outset. They constitute the indispensable counterparts of a two-edged strategy. To persuade the Galatians to re-identify with Paul and his gospel cannot be severed from estranging them from his Judaizing opponents.

In a certain sense this is what the whole of Galatians is about. However, this paper is much more modest in scope. Since Paul’s theological argumentation and his use of other persuasive devices are investigated in other papers, I am dealing only with his more specific rhetorical strategies to estrange his audience from his adversaries and to regain their association with him.

Here a caveat must be registered. It has been said ad nauseam that the point at issue in Galatians is Paul’s apostleship. One of the latest proponents of this erroneous conviction is Bradley Mclean (1991:67-76) who, in spite of Paul’s clear statement that he went to Jerusalem for the sake of the gospel (2:2 cf 2:5,7),
maintains the primary point at issue to be Paul's apostolic status. Paul’s apostolic status is clearly important, but then only in as far as it’s legitimacy concurs with the trustworthiness of his gospel. The real point is not Paul’s apostleship nor his person, but the truth of the gospel (Lategan 1988:411-430; Du Toit 1990:155-156). For our theme this implies that severing the Galatians from the Judaizers and regaining their loyalty should not be seen as a goal in itself, but as a means of regaining their allegiance to the one and only true gospel. Or to put it differently: Ultimately the loyalty Paul is fighting to regain is not a loyalty to himself, but loyalty to Jesus Christ and the gospel of Jesus Christ as Paul proclaimed it (cf also Koptak 1990:103f). This should be kept in mind in this paper wherever mention is made of loyalty to Paul.

Methodologically our paper deals with the pragmatics of Galatians. Reception criticism, speech act analysis, classical rhetoric, as well as the new rhetoric, all deal, in one way or another, with the pragmatic thrust of texts and have their own apparatus, more or less refined, to deal with and describe the way in which a writer/speaker seeks to manipulate his readers/audience towards a certain goal. In our analysis an eclectic use of these approaches has been made, since each of them contains strong points as well as deficiencies. Even the classical rhetorical schemes, no matter how rudimentary and scientifically deficient they may have been, can provide us with valuable clues, especially since they reflected in many respects the cultural context within which the Pauline documents emerged. It should also be accepted, as I have argued elsewhere (1989:193-196), that Paul at least possessed a basic knowledge of Graeco-Latin rhetoric. It should also be kept in mind that the latter had, to a considerable extent, only identified and formalised certain strategies basic to all human interaction. And recently Classen has argued convincingly that the ancient rhetorical categories can be applied to Paul's writings independent of the question whether he knew them or not (1991:2-3). Coupled with these insights, drawn from various models, I have applied, what I would like to call a common sense approach to the dynamics of interpersonal reciprocity.

The reference to classical rhetoric also triggers questions such as that regarding the relationship between New Testament epistolography and rhetoric, and whether Galatians belongs to one of the three main rhetorical genres (juridical, deliberative or epideictic). Since I have dealt with these matters elsewhere (1990:156-158), I shall refrain from once again explaining my position. Suffice it here to state my conviction that Paul basically adopts and adapts the Hellenistic letter scheme, while at the same time he, inter alia, makes use, within this scheme, of all rhetorical strategies and devices at his disposal.

It must be accepted that, without sacrificing epistolographic protocol and its letter character, Galatians shows some undeniable analogies to the broad scheme and certain prescribed phases of Graeco-Roman rhetoric. But this is a far cry
from forcing rhetorical schemes on the text or analysing Galatians in terms of classical rhetoric (cf also Classen 1991 for criticism of Betz’ position). While therefore agreeing in many respects with Longenecker (1990: CXI-CXIX) regarding Paul’s use of classical rhetoric, I am convinced that his overall characterisation of Galatians in terms of rhetoric is stretching this insight too far.

Two methodological remarks regarding Paul and his readers, or, rather, his audience, since his letters were intended to be read publicly in the congregation, should be made. Firstly: Reception criticism has taught us to differentiate between, on the one hand, the implied or encoded writer and the implied readers, both of whom are constructs of the writer, and, on the other hand, the real-life writer and readers. A pragmatic approach intends studying how the real writer, by encoding himself and his readers in a way corresponding to the needs of the occasion, endeavours to manipulate the latter by means of the text to react in a desired manner. This important distinction should be constantly kept in mind. In my presentation, however, I shall not belabour it pedantically. In speaking of Paul I mean the encoded Paul, Paul as he represents himself in Galatians. The same applies to the Galatian Christians. At the same time I do not imply that I believe that the real-life Paul and the real-life Galatians were such totally different persons. Such a conclusion would overlook the degree of overlapping which must have existed between the real-life author and the encoded author on the one hand, and the real-life audience and the implied audience on the other hand, should the Maxim of Quality (say what you believe to be true, be sincere) within the Cooperation Principle be upheld (Levinson 1983: 101; Leech 1983: 85ff; Brown and Levinson 1989: 95). Brown and Levinson call this conversational principal ‘perhaps the most basic principle of human language usage’ (1989: 221). The audience of Galatians must at least have been able to recognise themselves, and the Paul they knew, in the text. Otherwise another maxim of the Cooperation Principle, namely the Maxim of Relevance, would have been flouted.

The second remark concerns the composition of Paul’s audience. Lategan (1992) concludes that this audience was of a complex nature. Firstly there were those uncircumcised Christians who considered having themselves circumcised (5:2). Secondly, there probably were, according to Galatians 2:15, certain Jews by birth: ‘Paul can be speaking to Jews who were genuine members of the Galatian churches, or he can be speaking through them to those who are sowing confusion and who are trying to distort the gospel (1:7)’ (1992). And, thirdly, Paul may also be addressing the universal audience as illustrated by the generic first person of 2:17-20. Paul’s audience may indeed have been a complex one, but in my opinion we do not have the means to deduce that from our text. The term ‘Jews’ of 2:15 is used rhetorically and need not refer to actual readers of the Galatian correspondence. At the same time we do not have any indication that Paul wishes to address his adversaries, not even in 1:9 (cf infra). As far as a
'universal audience' is concerned, this concept, which Perelmann developed in order to distinguish between 'persuade' and 'convince', is not clearly defined and it is doubtful whether or how it might be applied to New Testament letters (cf also Vorster 1991:57-59). Paul at any rate does not seem to address a universal audience here; he rather uses the generic first person to influence his Galatian audience in a rhetorically effective way. However complex the composition of the Galatian churches may in fact have been, the text allows us to say no more than that Paul presents his audience as a rather homogeneous group of uncircumcised believers who have previously accepted his gospel, but are now moving towards yielding to the demands of Judaizing activists, i.e. Jewish Christians stressing the need for circumcision and observing certain aspects of the cultic calendar (Longenecker 1991:XCV-XCIX). The rhetoric of Galatians does not even allow us conclusions regarding the percentage of the Galatian Christians which was endangered.

Because of the dynamic interplay between the phenomena of alienation and rapprochement in our text, I am not going to deal with them under separate headings. Moreover, due to space and time limitations, I shall have to concentrate on the most prominent manifestations of these features.

The flow of the text will be followed. The argumentative, sectional and colon division of the Pauline group of the New Testament Society of South Africa, as appended to this publication, will be used as basis. In the few instances where my own division differs from that of the Pauline group, this will be pointed out explicitly (cf Du Toit 1990: 155ff; 1991: 214ff).

2 ALIENATION AND RE-IDENTIFICATION IN THE TEXT OF GALATIANS

2.1 Letter-opening (1:1-5 = P1 = C1-4)

As is to be expected and indeed prevalent in discursive communication intent on influencing, introductory sections function on the pragmatic level to create a positive climate between sender and recipients. In using the term *ethos* in this regard the classical rhetoricians meant that a speaker should, by presenting himself positively, create an 'Affektbrücke' between himself and his audience (Lausberg 1960, 1:141). The initial stage should, in the terminology of Perelman, bring about a 'meeting of minds'.

For a successful *captatio benevolentiae* different devices, displaying what Brown and Levinson call 'positive politeness' (1987:101-129), can be applied, some of the most popular being that the speaker should present his own person as acceptable to the audience, display a positive attitude towards them, assure them of his appreciation of and concern for them. Another device was to point out identity markers to stress common ground, that is to affirm that they belong to the
same in-group.

All of these devices can be illustrated from Pauline letter-opening and thanksgiving-sections elsewhere. In Galatians, however, these techniques are applied remarkably sparingly. Identity markers do occur (cf the use of the inclusive first person plural deictic ἡμεῖς in combination with God the Father, with Jesus Christ the Lord, with God’s saving act). And the writer shows his positive attitude by greeting them with God’s grace and peace. But that is about it. Paul even refrains from his customary thanksgiving section!

At first glance this reserve seems strange. One would expect him to be anxious to recapture the goodwill and loyalty of his audience as quickly as possible. The reason for this reticence lies in the stern reprimand of 1:6ff. At this stage of the ‘battle of minds’ a too positive attitude on the part of the apostle would, in the light of his dismay expressed in 1:6, be experienced as hypocritical, or, at least, insincere. Or to formulate this in terms of modern pragmatic theory: To portray oneself as appreciative of one’s audience when one is on the verge of rebuking them severely, would be to apply the Politeness Principle (more specifically the Approbation Maxim) at the cost of the Cooperation Principle (more specifically the Maxim of Quality) (cf Leech 1983:8-18; 79-149; Levinson 1983:97-166; Brown & Levinson 1989: especially 101-227).

Instead of attempting a captatio benevolentiae in the letter-opening, and, as a matter of fact, even in the immediately following sections of the letter, Paul promptly moves in medias res by skilfully setting the rhetorical stage by means of his very first sentence. By qualifying his apostleship as deriving not from human beings — note the rhetorical effect of the unanticipated double negation οὐκ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δλ’ ἀνθρώπου — but from Jesus Christ and from the almighty God who showed his power by raising Jesus from the dead, Paul asserts that in this controversy there exists only two positions: that of God, who authenticated his mission and message, and the mere human one, with which, by implication, his opponents are to be associated. Those who opt for Paul and his gospel therefore have the living Jesus and the almighty God on their side; those who choose the opposite position, can boast of nothing more than mere human insight and endeavour. It would therefore be totally insufficient to read this statement only on the informative level as has happened so often in the past, for it contains, on the pragmatic level, an implicature inviting the audience, on the one hand, to sever bonds with those advocating mere human, and therefore erroneous insights, and on the other hand, to join ranks once again with God’s authentic messenger. The implicature may even contain a hint of a warning, preparing for the thunderbolt which is to follow in the next section.

2.2 Transition to the letter-body (1:6-10 = P2 = C5-12)
Pragmatically the dramatic content of this section (which, in my opinion, should
also include v10 — cf my argumentation in Du Toit 1990:161; 1991:218f) can perhaps be best explained in terms of a clash of expectations. On the part of Paul, his use of the strongly emotive \( \text{θαυμάζω} \) expresses the effect of a clash between positive expectation and negative experience. But on the part of the audience, this clash of expectations would be equally great, and this is what the encoded writer is exploiting. With the evidence at our disposal, we know that the omission of some kind of formula valetudinis occurred fairly often. But that does not alter the fact that, in line with the usual epistolary convention, and especially in a letter from the founder of the Galatian churches to people belonging with him to the family of God, some kind of formula valetudinis, conveying his positive feelings and wishes (prayer) for their well-being, would have been a fair expectation. This expectation is, however, shattered, not only by the omission of any kind of formula valetudinis, but also by the scathing introductory \( \text{θαυμάζω} \). To be sure, the use of an expression of amazement at the beginning of a transition to the letter-body can be substantiated from several other letters (cf especially Roberts 1991). But even so, this was more the exception than the rule. It is precisely against this background that the perlocutionary force of Paul's expression of amazement is to be evaluated.

It is also important to pay attention to the place within the macrostructure of Galatians in which this reprimand occurs. The initial and concluding slots of any given utterance carry the strongest pragmatic force. Here Paul uses the very first slot available to 'make his statement'. It is certainly not by chance that the classical rhetoricians recommended an ‘Ausdruck des Staunens’ (Lausberg 1960:153) in the prooemium as a valuable technique for capturing the attention of the audience.

What was Paul's perlocutionary goal with this 'statement'? In other sections of Galatians the audience is portrayed as being in some kind of stupor (vide infra). But the idea may already be in the background here. The anti-Pauline passage in the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitiones, which clearly hints at our passage, refers directly to the work of a magician: 'Why are you so easily snatched away? Why are you led headlong by the most miserable men who are deceived by a magician?' (1,70:2). Paul is intent on shocking the Galatians to reality. Catching them, as it were, off-balance was a prerequisite for working positively at approachment. The statement that the Galatians 'are so soon deserting Him who called' them (1:6), motivates Paul's amazement. The medium form of the verb \( \text{μετατίθημι} \) was widely used for a switch in loyalties and was mostly used with a pejorative connotation, even in the sense of deserting, being a turncoat (cf Schlier 1965:36 n 1).

The participial phrase \( \text{ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι (Χριστοῦ)} \) is usually understood as a reference to God who called the Galatians, and not to Paul. Paul's use of \( \text{καλέω} \) in this kind of context certainly confirms this understanding.
(cf Burton 1948:20; Schlier 1965:37; Betz 1979:48; and especially GI 1:15). But in this specific context, as also in 5:8, the question remains whether what we have here is not a word-play including Paul as God's agent who made the actual summons on God's behalf. Whatever may be the case, from this formulation it is quite clear that the ultimate loyalty which Paul is battling to regain, is loyalty to God. As God's ἀπόστολος he has an important role, but at the deepest level he is only the instrument, the go-between.

The fact that Paul does not hesitate to confront the Galatians head-on shows what he believes to be at stake here. Pragmatic theory has shown how important the 'saving of face' is in this kind of communication (Brown & Levinson 1989: passim). Threatening your addressee's 'face', causing him to 'loose face', is an extreme measure, risking the termination and failure of the whole exercise. Because the stakes are so high, Paul is even prepared to take this risk. He is not going for half-measures. When man's relationship to God is at stake, it is all or nothing. This is more or less the implicature of his reference to pleasing men or God in 1:10.

In the second half of our present passage the strategy of alienation is at work (1:7-9). According to Graeco-Roman rhetoric, the main technique for estranging an audience from one's opponents was that of vituperatio, that is of representing them as negatively as possible.

This device of vilification is certainly a universal: it occurs in all kinds of oral as well as written communication. One needs hardly to be reminded of the 'flattering' way in which someone like Calvin used to refer to his adversaries. Quintilian mentions two kinds of vituperatio, one which is severe, the other ludicrous in nature (intra haec — the techniques just mentioned — enim est omnis vituperatio: quae si gravissi posita sit, severa est, si levius, ridicula; Institutio Oratorica VI, 3:37). But no doubt the concept of vituperatio would include all shades of denigrating one's opponents.

I have already pointed out that Paul did not shrink from threatening the 'face' of his audience. But he was also aware of the importance of what might be called, in terms of modern pragmatic theory, 'face maintenance' (Brown & Levinson 1989:61-64). Assuming his Galatian audience's vulnerability in this regard, Paul now deftly, by means of a transitional correctio (ὁ οὖν ἔστω ἄλλο, ἐν μὴ τινὲς εἴσον κτλ — ν7), shifts the bulk of the blame onto the Judaising agitators. They are the real scapegoats. In this way he provides his audience with the opportunity and even invites them to opt out.

He refers to his opponents as τινὲς (1:7). At face value this reference might be understood as a vague cover-term indicating that the agitators were few in number, that their names were unknown or not worth mentioning (Mussner 1974:57). But if we read this reference from a pragmatic viewpoint, there might be more to it. The real point probably is that the vagueness of this reference is
deliberate. Betz sees this as a rhetorical device to avoid providing the agitators with free publicity (1979:49 n65;268). Even mentioning their names might give them a certain recognition. But there might be even more to this deliberate vagueness. It probably is a rhetorical means of portraying the Judaizers as inco­
nito persons, as shadowy characters, working, as it were, in the dark, as agitators prefer to do. We also have other contexts in Galatians where \textit{τινὲς} is used in the same pejorative sense (cf infra).

We now return to the remaining indications of \textit{vituperatio} in Gl 1:6-10. The activities of the \textit{τινὲς} are characterised by two participial phrases in the present tense, indicating that they are still engaged in them. In the first place they are ‘causing commotion’ (\textit{ταράσσοντες}) among the Galatian churches. \textit{Ταράσσω} carries strong connotations. According to Louw and Nida (1988, II s v), it may mean: (1) ‘stir up’; (2) ‘cause a great distress’; (3) ‘cause a riot’. The Judaizers are vilified as serious troublemakers. Secondly they are ‘trying to pervert the gospel’ (\textit{θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον}). The older rhetoricians recom­mended that in his \textit{prooemium} a speaker should vilify his opponents and cause his audience to lose sympathy with them, inter alia by pointing out that they act basely (\textit{spurce}), with bad intent (\textit{malitiose}) (Cic \textit{Inv} 1,16:22; \textit{Rhet ad Her} 1,5:8). This is exactly what Paul is doing here.

The repeated curse of 1:8-9 has ample religio-historical analogies (Betz 1979:50-52) and also appears in Graeco-Roman rhetoric (Betz 1979:46). The threat it contains was a well-known device, although Quintilian considered it to fall outside the art of oratory (\textit{Inst orat} 4,1:21-22). The double \textit{ἀνάθεμα} has often only been interpreted at face value i.e., as a dire warning to the adversaries and to anyone who would pervert the gospel as they did. But Gl 1:8-9 should be primarily read on the performative level. Its real addressees are the Galatian Christians, and not the perverters of the gospel (\textit{contra Betz} 1979:52).

From the double curse at the beginning of Galatians and the blessing at its end (6:18), Betz infers that this inclusive framework (also) stamps Galatians as a magical letter. Paul therefore does not only rely on the ‘art of persuasion’, but introduces the dimension of magic to force the Galatians to chose between salvation and damnation (1979:25). But this is an overstatement. Paul indeed uses magical metaphors. And he hands out dire threats as well as blessings. But this does not render Galatians as such a magical letter. The magical references should be read within the framework of rhetoric. The severe double curse is a deliberate attempt to dislodge Paul’s audience from any association and possible infatuation with the Judaizers. Would anybody dare to identify with people who will be damned by God? Certainly not.

Interestingly enough we find this same application of vilification in Mt 23. In a most interesting article Sean Freyne has pointed out that at surface level the ‘woes’ of Mt 23 are directed against the scribes and Pharisees, but in reality the
vituperatio is intended as a stern warning to his own Christian community (Freyne 1985:137-138).

2.3 First argument (1:11-2:21 = P3-6 = C13-61)
Applying Burke's concept of consubstantiality, Koptak (1990) has done substantial work on the process of re-identification in this part of Galatians. I must limit myself to a few pointers. In this mainly narrative section (which according to the Pauline group already begins with v10 — cf, however, supra) we can expect that the strategies of rapprochement and alienation will work more indirectly, that is by means of the story-line itself. In consecutive narrative episodes the audience is invited to identify with the strong and exemplary hero, Paul, who before his conversion surpassed his peers (1:13-14), who thereafter obeyed God unhesitatingly (1:16-17; 2:2), who was positively accepted by the Judean Christians and their leaders (1:24; 2:6-10), who put the interests of the gospel before his own (2:2-5 especially C33bc, 36; also 2:14), who, like God, is not impressed by human ranking (2:6), and who stood his ground unflinchingly against his opponents, no matter how respected they were (2:5,11,14ff). Paul was indeed the one who fought for the gentle cause from the very beginning. He had their interests at heart (Koptak 1990:109) and struggled to keep them free (2:4-5). It is especially in pericope 6c (2:19-21: C55-61) that the hero role of Paul reaches its climax. Having been crucified with Christ, he has died totally unto the law. He now lives only for God. His own self has died and Christ lives in him. The motivation for this is the selfless saving love of Christ. The hero depicted is no hero in the ordinary sense of the word. He can boast of no merit. What he is and did, is a response to God's grace.

The Judaisers, on the other hand, are vilified in order to put pressure on the audience to dissociate from them. The vituperatio technique in this section operates by means of implicature. Nowhere a direct link is created between Paul's opponents in the story and the Judaizers in Galatia (cf, however, προς ἵμας in 2:5, where the cat is let out of the bag). The readers knew, and knew that Paul intended it to be so, that in playing off his earlier antagonists against himself, he was also denigrating those with whom they were now fraternising.

It is indeed revealing to note how strongly the vilifying process is operating in this section. In 2:4-5 those advocating the circumcision of the gentiles are depicted as stark black characters. As make-believe Christian brothers (φευδαδέλφοι) they 'have furtively crept in to spy on the liberty we enjoy in Christ Jesus' (Jerusalem Bible). And they are doing it with the intent to 'enslave' (ινα...καταδουλώσουσι) the believers. They are undercover agents, spying (cf παρεμάκτως, κατασκοπήσαλ) with evil intention (cf Bauer 1988 s.v; Betz 1979:90f). One should keep in mind the emotive value of a verb such as καταδουλώσουσι in first century Graeco-Roman society in order to understand its
pragmatic force (cf also 4:8-11, 21-31; 5:1-6).

Whereas Paul used mainly 'military language turned into political metaphors' (Betz 1979:90) for his *vituperatio* in 2:1-10, in 2:11-21 (the Antioch episode: P 6) he uses terms mainly derived from social conduct. Peter is depicted as acting cowardly (cf *ὑπέστελλεν; φοβοῦμενος*); his behaviour, together with those following him, is denounced as hypocritical (cf 2:13).

We have already referred to what we interpret as a pejorative use of *τιμῶς* in 1:7. The same is probably the case in 2:12 (the plural is the better reading) where *τιμῶς* refers to those people, coming from James, who have induced Peter and his followers to apply double standards. Paul's audience would have caught the implied negative reference to the Judaising agitators in their own midst. But perhaps the sharpest thrust against the Judaizers and those sympathising with them occurs in 2:21, which is also an excellent example of interactional implicature: 'I do not shove aside (disregard) the grace of God'. The implication of this is that there are indeed those who shove aside God's grace, thereby nullifying the significance of Christ's death (2:21c—C61b). And these are quite easy to identify. But the implicature goes even further: Should the Galatians stick to these people, they would be guilty of the same grave sin. Much rather should they identify with Paul who refrains from doing this, who has, in fact, proven his insight into and loyalty towards the gospel to be superior even to that of Peter! He is, as a matter of fact, *honouring* God by living, as an act of gratitude, totally for God in Christ (2:19-21). Here we can clearly see alienation and rapprochement functioning as the negative and positive counterparts of the same interactional process.

2.4 Second argument (3:1-4:11 = P7-13 = C62-121)

In this section (which, in my opinion, should also include 4:8-11 — cf Du Toit 1991:226) the strategies of alienation and rapprochement operate more on the theological than on the rhetorical level. Since my paper deals with the latter, I shall limit myself to the few relevant instances.

In discussing the transition to the letter-body we have already seen that Paul deliberately portrays his audience as the victims rather than the culprits. In this way he helps them to 'save face' and enables them to opt out. We have also asked whether he does not intimate that their capabilities for rational thinking have become blurred. In 3:1,3 he now openly calls them *ἀδικότοι*. The verb *ἐβάδοκανεν* goes even further: they have been bewitched (cf Elliott 1988 on the 'evil eye'). They are in a kind of trance. Paul here uses the device of rhetorical 'enchantment' (Betz 1979:131 n33). The tenor of the five asyndetically connected questions, fired as it were like a salvo of shots (3:1,2,3,4,5), is to shock them to reality. In the interrogation at the conclusion of this section (4:9) the same technique surfaces: To turn back to the 'weak and meager elements' and to become
their slaves once again, is mere stupidity. Why do you not realise this and react positively?

The opponents, on the other hand, are once again vilified. The τις question again reflects the technique of deliberately depicting them as vague figures. But this time the theme of magic and superstition is applied. These characters are magicians who have lured the Galatians into their spell. Paul’s argumentation is directed at helping his audience to realise what has happened (3:7,15,17,19,21; 4:1). Only in this way can the spell be broken, and will they be able to break away from these conjurers.

2.5 Appellative section (4:12-6:10 = P14-20 = C122-203)
Thus far Paul’s attempts at re-identification have been mainly negative and implicit. It is significant that the ‘familiar’ appellation ἀδελφοί has up to now been used only twice (1:11; 3:1). From now on it occurs no less than seven times, starting with 4:12 (also: 4:28,31; 5:11,13; 6:1,18). The appeal in this appellation, designating Paul and his audience as fellow members of the household of God, children of the same Father, cannot be missed. It is a fine example of applying the strategy of ‘in-group identity markers’ as persuasive tool (Brown & Levinson 1989:107).

4:12-20 presents a strong attempt at rapprochement. Reproaching remarks are tuned down. We find Paul, the apostle (sic!), pleading (ἐκμαθώ: 4:12) with his ‘brothers’ to renew their former positive relationship. Shortly he will become a mother pleading with her children (4:19-20).

This passage presents us with considerable difficulties. But we must agree with Betz and Longenecker that its style is not as erratic as is sometimes supposed (Betz 1979:220-221; Longenecker 1990:188-189). It is also quite clear that, in rhetorical terms, Paul has now moved from ἡδονή which addresses the milder feelings and is more permanent, to πάθος which is intended to stir the emotions (Lausberg 1960:143). To merely characterise this section as an emotional outburst (cf e g Musser 1974:188), is to overlook the fact that this passionate display should not be interpreted in terms of the author, but in terms of its effect on the audience, i.e its perlocutionary goal.

A glance at the thematic markers, and especially at the personal deictics, in this section already shows that, contrary to previous sections, ‘I’ and ‘you’ references dominate. The relationship between Paul and his Galatian convertees as such is now under scrutiny.

Although it may be questioned whether all his examples are really applicable, Betz has in my opinion done enough to prove that Paul is applying the popular friendship topos here (Betz 1979:221-233). But he applies it in a non-formal way.

In the earnest request that the Galatians should become like Paul, as he became like them (4:12), the appeal that they should re-identify with him is clear.
Friendship implies a certain mutuality of beliefs and attitudes. As Paul originally copied the Galatians in that he became a Christian ‘outside of the Jewish Torah’ (c Betz 1979:223; cf Longenecker 1990:189), they should now copy him and refrain from accepting the Torah as requirement for salvation. Reciprocity is at the heart of true friendship. Betz aptly quotes Cicero who, reflecting common conviction, defined friendship as ‘nothing else than an accord in all things, human and divine, conjoined with mutual goodwill and affection’ (Betz 1979:222; Cicero De amicitia 20).

4:12b - 15 (C124-129) embellishes the initial, most friendly attitude of the Galatians towards Paul. For the first time in Galatians Paul now uses praise as a rhetorical tool. The statement οὐδέν με ἤδεικνύατε is puzzling. The Jerusalem Bible translates: ‘You have never treated me in an unfriendly way before’. Betz sees it as an epistolary cliché ‘belonging to the friendship topos’ (1979:223). It should, in my opinion, be understood as a litotes: In no way have you wronged me; on the contrary, you have been very kind to me.

But it is especially in 4:13-15 that Paul applies praise as a pragmatic instrument. In Graeco-Roman rhetoric the laudatio was the counterpart of vituperatio. Up to now we have had a lot of vituperatio; now for the first time the Galatians are praised. According to classical rhetoricians, such virtues as justice, courage, self-control, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, practical and speculative wisdom could be foregrounded in the laudatio (Aristotle Rhet 3,19:1; Cicero De Orat 2,43:182; 2,11:45f). The generous way in which the Galatians have refrained from despising or rejecting Paul in his physical ailment, but have welcomed him ‘as an angel of God’, and their willingness even to sacrifice their own ‘eyes’ to help him (v15), certainly provides evidence of their magnanimity and liberality. That Paul uses hyperbolical language is part of the rhetorical tradition. The pragmatic aim of this laudatio is clear. The reminder of their former, most positive attitude serves as an urgent invitation to renew it. The question ποῖ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἵππων refers to the grounds for the praise which Paul’s audience previously rightly deserved: ‘What happened to these wonderful virtues, to your former positive attitude towards me? Are you going to do something about it?’

The rhetorical question in 4:16 reveals Paul’s dilemma. He realises that rebuking them has brought their relationship to breaking point. But it was at risk anyway. Restoring the relationship requires for emergency procedures. The implicature of his question is that speaking the truth to a friend, even if it hurts, belongs to true friendship. It distinguishes the real friend from the ‘flatterer’ (Betz 1979:228-229). Will they therefore recognise Paul as a true friend and prove themselves to be worthy of this relationship?

In 4:17 the vituperatio of the opponents is resumed. They are defamed as grabby characters who ‘court’ (cf ζηλοῦσαι) the friendship of the Galatians for
their own egoistic goals (Betz 1979:229-230). To accuse the opposite party of vile intentions was considered an important part of vituperatio (Cicero De Orat 2.43:182; 2.11:45f; Inv 1,16:22). The phrase εκκλείσων ιύμισυ clearly depicts the mutual exclusiveness of the loyalties which are at stake.

In 4:19 the appeal becomes even more intense. The metaphor of spiritual motherhood does not only signify the original closeness of the spiritual bond between Paul and his audience, but functions, on the pragmatic level, as a strong emotive appeal to revitalise it. Paul's reference to his renewed birth pangs also functions on this level. Verse 20 is perplexing. It clearly contains the πόθος motif. It expresses the yearning of the writer to exchange his epistolary παρουσία for his real presence. But the 'change of voice' is difficult to explain. It has been attributed to the difference between epistolary and actual presence (cf the overview in Schlier 1965:215). But there is certainly more to it. It also has to do with the modulation of his voice. Perhaps his intense, pleading tone would have persuaded them, could he have been there in person.

The concluding statement ἀπορούμενον ἐν ιύμιν is a rhetorical master-move. Betz states: 'By confessing his own perplexity in 4:20 Paul removes himself from the haughty position of one who has all the arguments and knows all the answers' (1979:237). Paul's statement of desperation not only allows his audience to 'save face', but contains an implicature: Would you come to my rescue?

The allegory of 4:21-31 functions on the level of theological argumentation and is treated elsewhere. Here I only wish to call attention to the Scriptural quotation in 4:30. Schlier denies that the command to 'drive away the slave-girl and her son' has anything to do with the Jewish-Christian opponents in Galatia (1965:227). But within the rhetorical situation of Galatians this should most probably (also) be understood as a subtle suggestion regarding what should really be done with the Judaizers (cf Mussner 1974 ad loc).

In the section 5:7-12 the strategies of alienation and re-identification are once more active. The Galatian audience is once again praised, although in comparison with 4:13-15 the laudatio is somewhat tuned down (5:7a). As in 1:7 they are exonerated and the blame put squarely on the shoulders of the opposition (5:7). This time the activity of the latter is not characterised in terms of witchery (3:1), but of deliberately obstructing (ἐνεκούσει) athletes in their race (Betz 1979:264).

The τίς enquiry most probably does not refer to a single person, e.g. the leader of the opposition, but is a reoccurrence of the technique of 'blurring' the opposing party (cf 1:7; 3:1) by means of a vague reference. The enquiry is not really intended to clarify the identity of those who hinder the Galatians in the race they have been running so well (cf the imperfect ἐπέκρετε). Its perlocutionary goal is to depict the Judaizers as sinister figures. The same vilifying intent is at work in the implicature of 5:8 where an oblique reference to them is made. This strategy is continued up to 5:12 (cf ὁ παράσωπος, οὕτως ἐὰν ἡ and again οἱ ἀναστα-
Apart from being depicted as obscure figures who act as obstacles, the Judaizers are also working against the truth (v7b); they are a bad influence affecting everyone (v9), trouble-mongers (cf ταράσσων — v10), agitators (cf οἱ αναστατούντες — v12). Once again vilifying the opposition is a device intended to neutralise sympathetic feelings towards them.

The tone of this section seems somewhat milder than that of 1:7-9. Instead of being cursed, the trouble-makers and, by implication, also the Galatians, should they close ranks with the latter, are only threatened with God’s judgement (v10b). But this last possibility now seems less imminent than before. Paul is now more positive: He suggests that his audience will identify with his position (v10). The expression δοθεὶ αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ is a polite form, applying the Maxim of Tact (Leech 1983:104ff). It is probably also a litotes, indicating positive agreement. The encoded writer is intimating that he is gaining the upper hand in the argument — in itself a pragmatic tool. The biting joke of 5:12, however, shows that the argument is not yet won. The satiric ἀποκόψωντα expresses even more emotion than the word-play in Phlp 3:2. The pragmatic force of this grim joke should not be underestimated.

2.6 Letter-closing (6:11-18 = P21-22 = C204-217

Betz contends that the letter-closing of Galatians corresponds to the rhetorical peroratio (1979:313). But it does not really contain an enumeratio (or: recapitulatio), summarising the main points of the argument as we for instance have in the letter of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians (62-63). His statement that this section ‘should be employed as the hermeneutical key to the intentions of the Apostle’ (1979:313) is therefore misleading.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that this section does contain some features which are typical of the rhetorical peroratio. This is true of the strongly personal and emotional character of the letter-closing. Lausberg (1960:238) reminds us that the peroratio was the very last occasion for influencing the judge (or the public) in favour of one’s own party and against the opposition. For this reason the peroratio was characterised by a strong and direct appeal to the emotions. As a matter of fact, all the ‘emotional sluices’ (Lausberg 1960:238) would be opened at this stage. The indignatio was aimed at rousing the feelings of the audience against the opposing party, while the conquistio or commiseratio was directed towards clinching the favour of the audience by winning its sympathy for oneself (Lausberg 1960:239).

Traces of both these devices can be discerned in Gl 6:11-18, although they are not concentrated in two discrete sections (contra Betz 1979:324 who wishes to locate the conquistio in 6:17). Paul is definitely casting doubt on the motives of the opposition at the same time as he is endeavouring to win sympathy for his person and cause.
In verse 12 the motives of the opposition are questioned. They act out of self-interest. They are intent on persuading the Galatians to be circumcised in order to make a good showing in the flesh. But their ultimate aim is to avoid being persecuted for the cross of Christ. We do not know exactly what these people preached. Most probably they preached the cross plus works of the law, e.g. circumcision (cf Betz 1979:315f). In that case they were Jewish Christians who feared the consequences of Jewish religious zealotism. The fact that they preached circumcision, thereby incorporating their convertees into Jewry, would make them acceptable to the synagogue, thus eliminating the threat of persecution. Once again it would be inappropriate to deduce, from the vague reference to the Galatian agitators (οἱ οὕτω), that Paul did not know their identity. At the same time I do not imply that he did know them. The vagueness of the reference is simply rhetorically determined and not suited to answering historical questions. We have here another instance of the deliberate blurring of one's opponents. They are faceless characters with whom nobody would like to associate. And were it to happen, surely one would dissociate oneself from them again as quickly as possible and associate with those playing open cards and whose integrity is established beyond any doubt.

Verse 13 has caused many exegetical headaches. On face-value Paul states that the Judaizers do not keep the law, and this has led to many laboured explanations (cf e.g Burton 1948:351-354; Betz 1979:316f; Longenecker 1990:292f). I would suggest that we have here one of those interesting hyperbolical contrasts which, under Semitic influence, also appears elsewhere in the New Testament (cf Du Toit 1986:178-186). If that is the case, the tenor of these words would be, not to deny that those who have been circumcised (want to) observe the law, but to make a comparison: what is much more important to them than the upholding of the law is their hidden agenda to score a positive point: to be able to boast of the fact that the Galatians have succumbed to circumcision.

The personal reflections in this section are not so much directed towards rousing the pity of the audience; it is rather aimed at confirming, by means of an argumentum ad personam, Paul's integrity.

This already begins in verse 11. The reference to Paul's own handwriting would certainly be to authenticate the letter, as well as to highlight the importance of what is said. But there may be more to it. The 'large letters' function, within the given context, to indicate that Paul's physical state, which makes it impossible for him to write as neatly as a καλλιγράφος, proves his existential commitment to his gospel. If this interpretation is correct, verse 12 contains a double implicature: Paul, with his huge (or 'clumsy' — cf Deissman 1923:132) letters, does not make a good outward show; he, in contrast to the Judaizers who are shirking it, has indeed been persecuted for the sake of the cross, as is confirmed by his physical condition. Paul is not ashamed of the cross. On the con-
Alienation and Re-identification

Contrary, he has no wish (μὴ γέροντο) to boast of anything else (as his opposition aspire to do), except in the cross (v14); as a matter of fact, his own σταυροσθανι is a proof of his identification with the cross of Jesus Christ. What really counts is not being circumcised or uncircumcised, but whether one is a new creation (v15). That he, Paul, is indeed such a new creation is proven by the fact that, through Jesus Christ, he has been crucified to the world and vice versa (v14).

Verse 17 concludes this trajectory: The sigh, perhaps even a groan, ‘let henceforth nobody cause me trouble’, as well as its motivation ‘for I bear the marks of Jesus in my body’ (v17), is the outburst of a weary veteran yearning to be no longer pestered by trouble-mongerers. At the level of persuasion, these words serve as endorsement of Paul’s bona fides. He has no base motives. He has given his everything for the gospel. His integrity and that of the gospel he has preached, should not be doubted. Betz aptly quotes Quintilian who mentions, as one of Cicero’s most effective rhetorical plays at this stage of his plea, to point out the defendant’s ‘worth, his manly pursuits, the scars from wounds received in battle...’ (cf Betz 1979:323). The στίγματα τοῦ Ἱσραὴλ are indeed Paul’s battle-scars, his tattoo-marks, inflicted on him while serving our Lord Jesus Christ. They testify to his integrity. He can be trusted unhesitatingly. To re-identify with him and with the gospel that God in Christ has entrusted to him, is the one and only sensible thing to do.

The double curse of 1:8f is balanced by a double blessing in the letter-closing (6:16,18). But the penultimate blessing (6:16) is conditional: it is limited to those who live according to ‘this rule’ (τῷ κανόνι τοῦτῳ) and to ‘the Israel of God’. The κανός is the rule established in verse 15, but refers by implication also to the gospel as presented by Paul in the whole of Galatians. We must refrain from discussing the vexing question of the identity of the ‘Israel of God’. What is important to our theme is the pragmatic force of the mentioned limitation. It functions in a triple direction: those still aligning themselves with the opposition should realise that they exclude themselves from this blessing and are, in fact, identifying with those cursed in 1:8f. Those already aligning themselves with Paul, should know that they are on the right track. And to those still wavering, it contains an urgent invitation to opt for those on whom God’s peace and blessing have been bestowed.

The personal deictic ἀδελφοί in the final blessing is unique to Galatians. It is not only filled with both anguish and hope, but, on the pragmatic level, it is a final emotive appeal, on the ground of their mutual bond in Christ, to reaffirm their solidarity.
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DISSOCIATION IN THE LETTER TO THE GALATIANS
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ABSTRACT

From the perspective of modern rhetoric, this article proposes the technique of dissociation as an alternative to approaches in which the antithesis featured predominantly. The technique of dissociation is applied, not only to the person of Paul, but also to the related question of what being a real Jew entails. It is indicated that the technique of dissociation should be seen in relationship to the pragmatic argument. Seen from this perspective, the letter to the Galatians is an attempt at the confirmation of status.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the interpretation of the letter to the Galatians, and, for that matter, also in the interpretation of the Pauline studies as such, the antithesis has always reigned supreme.\(^1\) It has been pointed out in different ways that this state of affairs was mainly due to Lutheran Pauline interpretation which contrasted law and gospel. While Dunn (1983) quite correctly praises Sanders (1977) for breaking this mould by his emphasis on 'covenantal nomism', he equally correctly criticises him for still adhering to a viewpoint which maintains a radical distinction between Judaism and Paul's religion. Thus Sanders (1983:207) concludes that there are two points at which the break with Judaism becomes visible, namely the Jewish doctrine of election and Paul's denial that acceptance of the law ensures entry into the people of God. Although Dunn criticises Sanders for having Paul jump from one system to another and also indicates that Paul's argument takes place within the realm of the covenant, he too does not seem to avoid the supremacy of the antithesis [cf also Räisänen's (1985:547) criticism of Dunn]. In his explanation of Gl 2:16, Dunn finds 'antithetical opposites' (his formulation) in 'justification by works of law' and 'justification by faith in Jesus'. He writes:

Indeed it is quite likely that Gal. 2.16 reflects the step by which Paul's thinking hardened these two propositions into a clear-cut antithesis....Perhaps, then, for the first

\(^1\) Antithesis is here used in a very wide sense. There are, of course, various kinds of antitheses in the letter to the Galatians, but it is a moot point whether the elements of an antithesis can be used to substantiate an existential, historical antithesis.
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