Mnemonic Reference to the Spirit as a Persuasive Tool
(Galatians 3:1-6 within the argument, 3:1-4:11)

H R Lemmer

Abstract
In this part of the argumentatio section of the letter, the author by means of a sudden emotional outburst — not devoid of logic though, employs all kinds of persuasive strategy not only to resolve the issue about the validity of his gospel, but also to allay a situation of exigence in which the readers found themselves, due to being persuaded to not only doubt the veracity of the message first heard, but to actually accept identity markers of Judaism, the Torah and circumcision, and thereby denying the foundation of their Christian faith. The apostle cogently reminds them of their undeniable experience of the Spirit which came as a result of their trust in Christ, and not as a result of any effort on their part. In this he uses all kinds of contemporary strategies. His argument about the Spirit supplies them with 'empirical' proof of their present status. This experience is even analogous to the exemplum of Abraham, therefore they are both sons of Abraham and of God.

1 Preamble

Ω ἀνόητοι Γαλάται...τοῦτο μόνον ὑὲλαμβανεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἔργων ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα ἑλάβετε ἵ ἐξ ἂκοῆς πίστεως; This sudden evocative vituperation against the Galatians even jolts a present-day reader to attention.

Clearly, the apostle is mustering every means of rhetoric, logic and emotive strategy to dissuade the readers from embracing certain convictions. It is especially his mnemonic reference to their experience of God's Spirit — his aiding of their memory with regard to their reception of the Spirit — that should furnish them with the indubitable proof of the truth of his argument, that is: the message they originally embraced, the proclamation by him, is the true gospel.

The main aim is to investigate and to put into perspective the recollection of the readers' experience of the Spirit (3:1-6) by the author as part of his persuasive strategy — to determine the possible force (illocution and perlocution) of what Paul communicated to his readers, particularly the questions about: τὸ πνεῦμα

1 Wales (1989:232-234 & 346-348, especially 348) points out that it is not always easy to distinguish between these two effects, i.e. where illocution stops and where perlocution begins.
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Some attention will be given to a possible rhetorical situation and its constitu­tives and then I will focus on Galatians 3:1-6 from the points of view of: mode of persuasion (strategies and topoi) employed; discoursive elements and on the content of the argument.

A number of analytical steps is called for, the methodology of which will be remarked on seriatim when considered necessary. The following assumptions constitute the basis for this article:

(i) The Galatian readers found themselves in a situation which may be de­fined as rhetorical (cf discussion in 2 below);
(ii) This letter is essentially written to germanely and propitiously respond to that situation;
(iii) The rhetorical discourse of the author along with the situation addressed are, by presupposition, both located in reality, but to finally determine the

---

2 Lategan (1992) distinguishes as follows: ‘in the rhetorical situation, attention is directed in the first place to the strategies used by the writer to effect persuasion. In the argumentative situation, the emphasis is on the issue for which persuasion is sought.’

3 Since the rhetoric is contained both in what he says as well in how he addresses his readers and verbalises his argument to them. Martin (1974:11) also makes this distinction: ‘Nun besteht ja die Rede aus dem Inhalt und der Form, den res und den verba, dem Stoff, wie der Redner ihn erfasst und dem Hörer näherbringen will, und der sprachlichen Form, die sein Argumente noch glaubwürdiger und bestimmter machen soll.’ (In this way the first serves the inventio and the last the elocutio.) Ultimately, it remains a tenuous exercise to separate these aspects, since the how and the what are inextricably linked.

4 Cf Bitzer 1968:13 for the use of this concept. It implies that every rhetorical situation evolves to a timely moment for the fitting or apt response.

5 It has to be decided — presuppositionaly — whether the realities dealt with in this text are situated only within the ambit of the socio-cultural, linguistic and psychological spheres of reality or also within the religious. One may obviously even define the religious in such a way that it is dissolved into the former aspects of reality. Or it may be decided that although such numinous realities exist, because they can only be perceived through human perception they need not be brought into account, in which case one is back to square one. While acceptable to some, to others this leads to a reduction of reality. On the other hand it may be decided that in spite of all the difficulties that epistemology is fraught with, Paul dealt with the numinous dimension as a very real dimension, to him and to his readers. A dimension which, however intertwined with cultural situations and social conventions, nevertheless remained a reality. It may also be decided that that reality is still constitutive of this ‘religious text’. Therefore, that reality is not altogether dissolved in the rhetorical elements and other aspects of the text; neither then nor now.
'objective' historic realities underlying this reality will always remain elusive;\(^6\)

(iv) Although a mirror reading construal of the rhetorical situation is deceptive, we basically only have the text and it is from this information that such a situation should be proposed;

(v) Rhetoric is applied and understood in its broadest sense of persuasion. Therefore, a functional eclectic method will be followed in which various approaches to rhetoric will be applied.\(^7\)

2 ARGUMENTATIVE AND, OR RHETORICAL SITUATION\(^8\)

2.1 Introduction

It is commonly\(^9\) accepted that Galatians is a text in which the author is endeavouring to persuade\(^10\) his readers. To determine what he wanted to accomplish or perform with the content and mode of his argument one needs to focus on the rhetorical situation.

\(^6\) However, in line with the idea propounded in note 5, Wright (1989:204) in a lengthy review on Watson remarks with reference to the sociological approach: ‘New Testament scholarship should abandon, not theology indeed, but the philosophical idealism which has provided the framework for so much Pauline theology, and should embrace, not indeed materialistic reductionism, but a realism in which belief and life are held firmly together.’

\(^7\) This will be done very much in line with what Longenecker (1990:cix) calls a compositional/synchronic rhetorical criticism in which emphasis is laid ‘on the argument on its own, classifying its stages of development in terms of general, more universal modes of persuasion.’

\(^8\) Reference was made in note 2 above, to the distinction drawn by Lategan between the argumentative and rhetorical situations. It appears that Vorster (1990:126) makes a similar distinction but uses the descriptors differently, respectively rhetorical and speech situation. It is imperative to opt for the one or other set of descriptors. Since the definitions of Bitzer have been used here, also used so by Vorster, it is easier to refer to rhetorical situation = situation of exigence (see below); and speech situation = strategies employed in the act of persuasion.

\(^9\) It was especially the epochal commentary of Betz (1979) that gave impetus to this approach and set a debate into motion that has definitely not abated. Although disagreement exists on the extent to which Paul utilised, ‘sub genres’, techniques and categories of ancient rhetoric, Betz at least made N T scholars aware of this possibility and even probability of the role of ancient rhetoric in the letters. Much has been written on which possible ‘sub genre’of rhetoric may be found in Galatians. Final consensus cannot be reached, also because there can be no final agreement on the extent to which Paul may have used classical rhetoric categories. For all practical purposes, it is here decided by nature of the argument in Galatians, that there are elements which are predominantly deliberative; but that forensic ways of reasoning as well as epideictic cannot be ruled out completely.

\(^10\) The obvious interaction between persuasion and argument is presupposed. Vorster (1990:118) defines it lucidly: ‘Argumentation can be seen as a rational, verbal form of social interaction, which usually has a definite beginning and cause and which has the purpose to persuade.’
Bitzer (1968) defined the rhetorical situation as:

a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about significant modification of exigence.

From this workable definition he extricates three constituents which have to be examined in order to determine a specific rhetorical situation, namely: exigence, audience and those constraints which influence the rhetor and can be applied to the audience in order to move them to the desired position. However, he (1968:8) also identifies two further constituents: 'When, the orator, invited by the situation, enters it and creates and presents discourse, then both he and his speech are additional constituents.' (italics — HRL).

According to Bitzer (1968:3-5) it is a particular situation which generates rhetorical discourse, because it invites such discourse, which discourse is pragmatic and it wants to alter existing realities. ‘Finally, the situation controls the rhetorical response....Not the rhetor and not persuasive intent, but the situation is the source and ground of rhetorical activity....’ (1968:6).

Bitzer’s observation that the speech is also a constituent is all the more important, since in New Testament studies it is evident that by and large we mainly have the texts (the speech) at hand to construe such a rhetorical situation. This approach, often lacking in other conclusive historical information, renders such a construal preliminary, provisional and conditional. For this article one would have to construe an approximated situation of the readership in Galatia. A further complication (according to current literature theory) is that one has to take into account that:

(a) We can only construe the encoded/implied author — the real author provides information of himself, by himself, deduced from the situation into which he projects himself, by his speech, on account of the exigence of his readers;

(b) The exigence, as it emerges from the text, is already a construal by the rhetor/author. It is his perception of that situation; and through his eyes, the perception of that exigence by the audience; it is not even their own perception,

11 Bitzer (1968:1-14) mainly uses examples from contemporary political speeches. Nevertheless, his theory is universally applicable to persuasive situations and this definition is rather seminal.

12 This exercise demands a substantial effort which lies outside the range of this article, since all possible reader responses, etc, should be assimilated.

13 Although these observations are really old hat, the observation of Vorster (1991:53) reiterates a valid caution: ‘the rhetorical situation is epistemologically only possible through perception....[one has] to rely on perspectivistic interpretation; on inference....’ (brackets — HRL).
but the author's reaction to, and interpretation of that perception;
(c) The readers themselves are also the implied readers (cf Lategan 1989:171-173) as perceived by the author and projected by him in the text, and not the real readers.

2.2 Constitutives of the rhetorical situation
It is imperative to give some attention to the following constitutive elements:

2.2.1 The exigence in Galatians
According to Bitzer (1968:6) exigence that can be modified is part of the rhetorical situation. This exigence is a defect, an obstacle; it is a situation 'which is other than it should be.' From this exigence emanates the causa/quaestio (Vorster 1990:118), or simply the issue. For all practical purposes it is here deduced that whereas the issue is the defence of the true gospel vis à vis a propounded other gospel (1:6-9), the actual exigence of the missive to the Galatians lies deeper and involves more than cognition.

This situation or urgent need, is that the readers (at least some of them) are unwittingly finding themselves in an impending spiritual existential crisis. There are those (opponents) who are applying coercion and unsettling the readers (e.g. 4:17; 5:7, 12; 6:12) and it this which lead to the crisis (5:2-4). This crisis is functioning on different levels:
(i) There is the risk of the denial of: the actual message from God (1:6-19); experience of faith (3:1-5); God Himself (1:6; 3:5; 5:8); of the object of their faith, the Christ himself (5:4);
(ii) These believers of the gospel proclaimed by him are on the verge of accepting an inferior and specious message and value system, at least as far as Paul is concerned;
(iii) Closely related to this, is the possibility of severing the significant and meaningful relationship with God's own emissary to the Gentiles. It appears as if these opponents were driving a wedge between the readers and Paul (if one takes the rhetorical questions in 1:10 as a possible reason (cf e.g Watson 1986:70) why Paul should be rejected along with his message (cf also 4:16-17);
(iv) They may be under siege to yield to social pressure, since they do not possess the correct identity markers in order to belong to the people of God, the Torah with other concomitant regulations and circumcision (hence their relatedness to Abraham is questionable — he was the first to be circumcised; this

14 There is generally little doubt about the actual issue, cf for example Hall's (1987:287) proposition that the overall argument in the letter can be identified as a deliberative style of rhetoric, one can summarise the argumentative situation as a persuasion of the "...Galatians to cleave to him [Paul] and his gospel and to repudiate his opponents and their gospel." (brackets — HRL).
would inevitably involve their relationship with the God of Abraham. Whether these opponents would have applied more social than religio-psychological pressure is uncertain. The power of deviant groups does not only reside in social coercion, but also in psychological pressure, exerted on the consciences of those who are keen to do the right thing. This clearly plunges the readers into an identity crisis and thus into a crisis concerning their true status before God.

(v) Power politics: becoming the objects of expedience to others, may indeed have played a decisive part. Paul’s concern was for their spiritual well-being; the motives of the opponents were to please their egotistical ambitions. This much should be clear from 4:16-20: notice his sudden change in tone: τεκίλα μου, οὐς πάλιν ὠδίνω μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν...ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν (because I am so worried about you!). See also 6:13b ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὕπερτερᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωμαι; and then of course 6:14: ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· ἵππῳ Χριστοῦ.

(vi) Instability, with consequent tensions would be ripe in the communities as a result of the former ((i)-(iv)) elements of exigence. In fact, whether the threat was from outside or from the inside, the entire issue could result in a split of the community. Of necessity some members must have seriously considered embracing the ‘new gospel’, hence 6:1-3. (See also the injunction in 5:13-15: ...ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἁγίας δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις...γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ πεπληρωμένος ἐν τῷ ἁγιάσματι τοῦ πληροῦσαι ὑμᾶς σεαυτοὺς...εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκυσετε καὶ κατεσθάνετε, ἔλεγεν μὴ ὑπ’ ἀλλήλου ἀναλωθῆτε.

(vii) The readers are facing religious slavery. The undeniable emphasis on slavery and freedom (cf 4:1-4:11, and the injunction in 5:1ff to preserve that freedom) indicates that this potential danger was part of the urgent need to make the readers realise that they were being threatened in this realm of their existence.

The Galatian situation is clearly tied up with the elements Bitzer (1968:11) refers to: a complexity of persons, objects, events and relationships which generate rhetorical discourse. Whereas the actual issue (quaestio/causa) was the distortion of, and hence the defence or proof of, the true gospel. The need or exigence, operated on a far deeper level: it affected the readers existentially — they indeed had much more to lose, than merely to be proven wrong, cognitively.

2.2.2 The audience

In the opinion of Bitzer (1968:7-8) the audience plays an indispensible role in the process of the rhetorical situation, since the: ‘rhetorical audience must be capable of serving as mediator of the change which the discourse functions to produce.’ (italics — HRL). Vorster (1990:120) similarly observes that because argumentation always functions interactionally the audience decisively constitutes the argumentation of a discourse. Thus, the ‘process’ constitutive for a particular
The rhetorical situation would resemble something such as

```
  \text{exigence} \quad \text{rhetor} \quad \text{discourse} \quad \text{audience} \quad \text{change of exigence} \quad \text{solution}
```

The argumentative nature of Galatians compels one to accept this to be true of its readers, that theoretically they could have effectuated change by means of the discourse addressed to them.

Precise knowledge of the historical readers of Galatians, would have facilitated present understanding, but since this is not available, the following propositions will have to provide the framework. The audience of Galatians is of an undeniably complex nature (Lategan 1992, see also 1989) and this of course implies a complexity in argumentation as is portrayed in in the above schema (cf Bitzer 1968:11-12).

Lategan (1992) identifies at least three possible audiences in the reader circle:

(a) Those who were clearly from a Gentile background (5:2; 4:8; 3:14);
(b) Those who were Jews by birth and not Gentiles (2:15-16);
(c) Those who were probably Jews by birth, but who opposed Paul’s view of the gospel — these are the ‘Judaisers’ and opponents (e.g. 1:7, εἰ μὴ).

The actual process is vastly more complicated than this — see, for instance, Vorster’s (1990:121-122) discussion of the audience a la Perelman and Olbrecht-Tyteca and also see the schema of Webb referred to by Vorster (109-110). This clearly indicates an infinitely intricate process taking place, even in the construal of the audience by the rhetor and as he in tum construes his message for their particular exigence.

Via the Paul-and-the-law debate and some sociological applications, hypotheses have emerged about the possible composition of these readerships: e.g. the work of Watson 1986.

Although brief, this discussion indicates the complexity of construing these audiences. It may be possible to divide the second audience into those who were Jews by birth, and a separate entity indicated in the text as the opponents — see above.

Difference of opinion exists on the identity of the opponents, e.g.:

(i) Whether they existed at all: Cf e.g. Lyons as referred to by Suhl (1987:3067, note 1): ‘We do not know precisely how Paul’s Galatian opponents are to be identified....Perhaps the Galatians innocently inquired of Paul,...’ and the letter is then a response to this inquiry. This implies the denial of the existence of the opponents.

(ii) Another tack followed is that by Bouwman (1987:3140) who concludes that: ‘Die eigentlichen Gesprächspartner des Paulus sind also heidenchristliche Mitglieder der galatischen Gemeinde, die sich von den Jerusalemer Evangelisten hatten beredten lassen, die Beschneidung anzunehmen....’ The opponents are then a faction within the Galatian church communities.

(iii) Others still maintain that these opponents could have been from Jewish-Christian
Having to interact with all these 'audiences' in Galatians on the various required levels, is what complicates the argument. These 'audiences' also shared both in a diversity of cultural backgrounds as well as in the common religious value 'system' of Christianity. Even Judaism by itself was complex within this situation, since it bore a different significance to the respective parties.

2.2.3 Constraints within the rhetorical situation

Constraints are identified as that variety of elements that has the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence (Bitzer 1968:8). Furthermore, the rhetor entering into the situation not only harnesses constraints given by the situation, but he provides additional constraints — 'for example his personal character (ethos), his logical proofs (logos) and his style.' (Bitzer 1968:8 — brackets HRL). It would appear as if the ethos of the readers is being questioned by Paul in 3:1-5. Furthermore, proper and improper constraints should be separated.

In Galatians a number of constraints operating as motives and motifs can be identified: personal character (ethos) of both the author as well as the audience plays an important role. Paul shows no reticence in establishing the soundness of his action and resilience of character in similar circumstances (cf again Koptak circles, from similar groupings as those referred to in Acts 15:1 and 15:6. See the conclusions reached by Russell (1990:348 and 350 respectively): '...it is reasonable to conclude that the Acts 15 and 21 troubleurs shared a common origin....'(348) and although the last 70 years of scholarly inquiry have brought a more balanced view on the traditional Judaizer identification, it has not effectively overturned this identification as Judaizers (350). See also Neufeld (1986:93-100) who lists: the Gentile theory, the Gnostic theory, the Two Front theory, the syncretist theory but then comes down on the side of the traditional view — Jewish-Christians.

19 Understood as the RSV translates — those from the circumcision party. One should not underestimate the factor of consubstantiality (=to stand together with) (cf Koptak 1990:90-115) in the mind of the apostle, when he describes this incident. This notion (defined by Burke employed by Koptak) basically refers to that rhetorical technique in which the author causes his hearers to identify with him. In the narrative section of Galatians parallels are to be seen in every respect, both in the example set by Paul, but also parallels in the actions of those who formerly harassed him, and those who are now inciting the Galatians not to believe his gospel.

20 Bitzer (1968:11-12) pointed to the complexity that can be found when the structure is composed of the number of other elements of the situation (culture, language, etc).
'Logical proofs' abound, especially in the second main argument (3:1-4:11). These proofs draw from both Hellenistic (rhetorical techniques) and Jewish modes of reasoning. Motifs operating as *topoi* such as honour-shame (e.g., εἰκόνα in 3:4 and 4:11), consistency in logic (e.g., the argument in 3:1-5, cf. 3.3.2.1, below), are present.

Propriety in observing constraints, also demands that an author should keep a common frame of reference in mind. Reference is here made to that fund of ideas and concepts drawn from, which should be shared by both audience and speaker for communication to take place. Considering the number of allusions and direct introduction of new topics in Galatians, one may assume that this constraint was observed.

The 'God-motif' (or divine agency and instrumentality) in Galatians is clearly of great importance. The author is overtly and covertly at pains to expose the ostensible failure of the Galatians to not sufficiently regard *God's role* in their Christian existence. The following are examples: God's calling (1:6, 3:5 and 5:8; ultimately these refer to God); experiencing God's favour (1:10; 5:4); Christ's gospel (1:12) God shows no partiality (2:6); God is the One who supplies the Spirit (3:5); the promise was made without an intermediary — directly from God (3:20).

2.2.4 The speech situation

Both the constraints, defined by Bitzer, as well as the *speech situation* identified by Vorster (1990:107-130; cf. 126) belong to the rhetorical situation, this implies an overlapping between the constraints and the speech situation. The speech situation is linked to the 'argumentation as a rational, verbal form of social interaction...’ (1990:118). In this way the reciprocal validity between the argumentation and speech, inasmuch as the latter is used to effectuate the former in turn, serves to intensify adherence to premisses and convictions.

Analysis of the speech situation may be approached variously: for example, speech act and other conversational analysis, classical rhetorical or new rhetorical analysis may be applied. The present approach will be functional, with some attention to classical rhetorical elements.

2.3 Summary

It was chosen to draw a profile of the exigence by grouping together those references in the text where an existential threat to the readers was indicated. Various audiences are probably involved, but the primary audience is that group which are directly adversely affected by the exigent situation — after all, they would

---

21 Those sections where Paul may be more directly applying rabbinic modes of interpretation, and where he may consequently be aiming much of his argument against opponents with Judaistic arguments, are especially found at 3:7-20 and again at 4:21-31.
read/hear the letter.

It is assumed that in the communication of this letter that set of values and conceptual constraints that were mutually consonant to author and readers, were operative. One has to assume that the same constraints of formal communicative conventions were observed, such as for example the use of diatribic elements (in 3:1-6, cf 3.3.2 below), if communication was to succeed. All these elements together with the speech situation (cf 3.2, and to some extent, 3.3 below) constitute a highly complex situation, the rhetorical situation.

3 FOCI ON GALATIANS 3:1-6 (PERICOPE 7 – SEE ADDENDUM)

3.1 Introduction
Firstly, the mode of persuasion techniques in P7/3:1-6 (3.2) will be investigated. Thereafter, focus will be directed to the structure and discourse of the argument and its position within Galatians, as well as within P7 itself (3.3). Lastly, the content of the argument (what) will have to be analysed (3.4).

3.2 The mode of persuasion in 3:1-6/speech situation

3.2.1 The nature of persuasion: pathos/logos
Having established his bona fides (ethos) by his own mode of action in P4-6/1:13-2:21, the ensuing argument contains both appeals by means of emotional 'outbursts' (pathos) as well as appeals to reason (logos, see 3.2.2.3(iv), below). Thus the persuasion in P7 operates on two levels at the same time.

3.2.2 The techniques of persuasion
3.2.2.1 Diatribic style in P7?
In the light of the persuasive didactic of the diatribe, it will be a gross oversight to neglect viewing the dialogical style of Galatians 3:1-6. It is sometimes (e.g. Longenecker 1990:99; Betz 1979:130) classified as diatribic style of reasoning.

---

22 These terms are used more in a functional than technical sense. By ethos, reference is made to the establishing of an author/speaker of his bona fides; by pathos, the rousing of emotions, and by logos, the appeal to reason is in focus.

23 Cf the plausible interpretation of Koptak (1990:97-115) on the basis of the Burke's idea of consubstantiality; that within this 'autobiographical' section Paul is precisely establishing his credentials (in 1:13-2:14), although with a view to persuade the readers to follow his example under similar circumstances.

24 It is impossible to determine to what extent Paul avails himself of Hellenistic and to what extent of Jewish means of argumentation. Longenecker (1990:cxi) has probably observed correctly, that Gl 3 and 4 reflects 'more Jewish rhetorical conventions', than Hellenistic. This is supported by the fact that these chapters abound with rabbinical exegesis (etc). In spite of this P7/3:1-6 could still contain elements of the Greek diatribic style of reasoning.
however, defining Graeco-Roman diatribe is not an altogether simple exercise, because of the many forms in which the diatribe were used outside the New Testament (Malherbe 1986:129). Whether the various occasions in Galatians which resemble diatribe should be classified as such, depend on how strictly one applies various criteria.

Stowers (1981) made a substantial effort to define and apply this mode of dialogue to Romans. He identifies a number of characteristics which he divided into (a) formal aspects (1981:85-93), and (b) thematic and functional similarities (1981:100-110).

(a) Formal aspects: The one characteristic that should clearly be present in the diatribe is the fictitious interlocutor (Stowers, 1981:85-93), such as is clearly displayed in Romans (cf Rm 2:1). This imaginary person is usually addressed in the second person singular with a vocative of some sort and 'the author speaks as if to an individual who stands before him rather than to his actual audience' (85). Galatians ostensibly does not contain an address to this imaginary interlocutor (except possibly for 4:726). Nevertheless, the following concurrence of most other elements of formal aspects (italicised below) of the diatribe in P7/3:1-6 is remarkable:

(i) A sudden turn to address the imaginary interlocutor (1981:85-86): The dialogical opponents (in this case the Galatian readers) are (i) suddenly addressed by means of vocatives: *Ω...Γαλάται and (ii) berated as ἄνθρωπος. The unexpected apostrophe is noteworthy because of the sudden change in the nature of discourse (compare P6/2:15-21 with P7/3:1-6) — from a meditative exposition to a direct address. By his addressing of the readers, the author may well be addressing the ‘actual opponents’ in the rhetorical situation.

(ii) In P7 there is no immediately preceding objection (1981:86) as such, but the outburst in P7 comes in response to the preceding discourse (see 3.3.1) — a rejoinder in the sense that the apostle suddenly relates presently held convictions by the readers to the datum about the crucified Christ expounded in P6/2:11-21 (especially 2:15-21).

25 In 1980 Malherbe (1980:231) referred to the fact that Bulmann’s (1910) — Der Stil der paulischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe — was still the best general description of diatribic style. Since then Stowers (1981) and Schmeller (1987) did substantial investigation into this dialogical type. Schmeller’s work, Paulus und die Diatribe. Eine vergleichende Stilinterpretation, was discovered at a rather late stage and could therefore not be assimilated here.

26 Attention was drawn to the latter instance by Stowers (1981:84). In support of the possibility that Paul may be addressing an imaginary interlocutor one could observe the use of the singular δοῦλος, ἱός and ἱλαρονύμος, within the context.

27 One could suggest that in Galatians (particularly 3:1-6) the opponent of the teacher is not a fictitious person, but the actual pupils/hearers/readers themselves; thus, the style is used in an implied sense; as if referring in a diatribic mode to the Galatians as the dialogical opponent, whereas they are in actuality those in the role of pupils/hearers.
(iii) The sentence beginning a diatribic address is in the form of an *indicating rhetorical question* (1981:86). This is apparently the most common beginning of such an address and is clearly found in notice C62/3:1: τίς ίμας ἐβάσκανε, ὁπεκατ' ὀφθαλμούς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος; there is a *definite pejorative connotation* in ἐβάσκανε (cf 3.3.2.2), and the element of *indictment* in the censure — Who has bewitched you? — should not be overlooked. All those among the readership who were guilty of accepting another message, were guilty of *allowing themselves* to be bewitched.

(iv) The fourth characteristic element of the diatribe (1981:88), is notably present in P7. In a diatribe, after turning to address the interlocutor, 'one or a series of rhetorical questions in an indicting or didactic tone follow.' (italics — HRL). This clearly happens in C63-68, with the ensuing five questions after C62.

(v) The opening question is usually *followed by two kinds of rhetorical questions* (1981:88-89):

One, those employing *expressions that imply lack of perception*, clearly present in C63, τούτῳ μονον βλέπεις μαθεῖν ἀδικίαν τιμᾷ, an aspersion on their cognitive competence; C64, οὔτως ἀνόητοι ἐστε; (and implied in the ensuing argument); and two, questions highlighting *wrong opinions and logic* also implied by the ensuing inferences in P7.

Although, P7 does not include (1981:90-93): a list of vices; an address to a figure of history 28 or the personification of the interlocutor, yet a number of formal elements in C62-70 appear to concur with that of the diatribe.

(b) *Thematic and functional similarities* (1981:100-110): It appears that the particular *topos*29 of *inconsistency* underlies the diatribe (1981:101-110). This implies that the speaker/author would endeavour to show inconsistency between philosophy and life.

The following elements of inconsistency are prominent in Galatians 3:1-6, and this also underscores concurrence30 with the diatribe:

(i) The tropical use (cf 3.3.2.2, below) of βασκαίνω along with the relative clause

---

28 Unless one could see that in the reference to Abraham in C69-70. It would appear that this reference to a figure in history, is usually applied as a negative example (1981:90-91).

29 Stowers (1981:101ff) and Vorster (1989:123-126) clarify this sometimes misunderstood concept. The latter points out that the *topos* is a tactical aid or move which occurs at distinct places or locations in a discourse, where a line of argument is suggested. Furthermore, *topoi* are *abstract* and general categories which function during the creation of argument.

30 An application such as the following may appear to be forced. But even the specific applications of Stowers to the Letter to the Romans (110-118) appear different in some respects to that of the examples from classical authors cited as theory, and this would obviously be the case, inasmuch as the Christian gospel, as a 'philosophy', operates differently from its contemporary philosophies. One major concurrence exists though, that of *dissonance* between a particular philosophy and its application.
The impact of this circumlocution in which the readers are presented as those to whom the message about the crucified Christ was so vividly portrayed, and then switched to their present deviation from this message, makes it appear as if someone (τοις) has actually bewitched them. This is an inconceivable inconsistency; how can those to whom the crucified Christ was so vividly communicated, even think of negating what they heard and embraced by faith?

(ii) The irony contained in all the rhetorical questions: These six questions clearly contain strong elements of irony. The mutual exclusivity of the respective elements in the binary oppositions makes this clear. The fact that the readers were unthinkingly prepared to link these mutually exclusive notions, reveal an untenable lack of logic.

(iii) The discrepancy between the experience (past and present) of the Galatians and their present convictions: Although this observation overlaps with that in (i) and (ii), it functions on a different level. The emphasis on experience (τοσοῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ that is positive experience — sensu bono) and the question whether this could actually be in vain, along with the ‘doubting affirmation’ (cf 3.3.3, below) that it was not in vain (εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῇ) indicates a grave inconsistency on the part of the readers. A certain hypocrisy is implied: Even now, while they are experiencing the working of the Holy Spirit, by the agency of God Himself (ὅ ὦν ἐριχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα...ἐνέργων δυνάμεις...ἐγρώ), they are acting in this incongruous way.

By means of a certain heuristic in the argument of the author in (i) through (iii), a topos of inconsistency seem to be indicated in the thinking of the readers.

Conclusion: The use of certain diatribic elements in 3:1-5 and 4:7 is clear: (i) a sorites of rhetorical questions; (ii) the notion of invective and apostrophe and (iii) the portrayal of the dialogical opponent as obtuse (ἀνόητοι). It appears that the question of diatribe in Galatians should remain open.

Although not overtly addressing the imaginary interlocutor, the technique of indictment protreptic is nevertheless employed. By means of this Paul guides his readers cognitively, in P7, in order to expose contradiction, error and ignorance in their thinking; by means of accusation he endeavours to lead the

31 E.g: ἔργων νόμου — ἀκοῆς πίστεως; ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι — σαρκί ἐπιτελείσθε; ἔργων νόμου — ἀκοῆς πίστεως

32 Cf Stowers 1981:105ff for an explanation of this technique. In general protrepsis was designed to win over someone to a particular enterprise by demonstrating its superiority (Malherbe 1986:122). This may exactly be the case as Paul reasons the superiority of faith over against the mode of human effort.

33 Whilst being aware of the danger of mirror reading (cf Barclay’s, 1988:38-41 warning in this regard), the possibility cannot be ruled out that some of the rhetorical questions in the letter reflect questions posed by either the readers, or the opponents. This would make
readers to the realisation of the absolute validity of the message originally embraced by faith.

3.2.2.2 Other elements of persuasion in Galatians 3:1-6

The use of vocatives: ὁ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται. The use of ὁ along with the ensuing vocatives as oratorial or dialogical address (Liddell and Scott 1968:2029) in this case clearly becomes an evocation. This sudden direct address (cf Louw and Nida 1988:91.14) effectuates a contrast with the preceding discourse accentuating what follows.

Cronje (1986) identifies this technique as defamiliarisation, by means of which an author deviates from the usual or customary, to the unusual. The paucity of usage of this technique, lends particular salience whenever it is used. Of course in the wake of ὁ follows the use of frank, well-nigh insulting, language: ἀνόητοι...οὐτῶς ἀνόητοι ἔστε; and this further effectuates defamiliarisation.

The indictment of being bewitched (βασκαίνω): According to Cronje (1968: 224-225), the use of ἀπάξ λεγόμενα is another means of creating communicative defamiliarisation; in the New Testament, βασκαίνω is exactly such. The objective is obviously to stop the readers in their tracks when being confronted by this seemingly untoward indictment: τις ὑμᾶς ἐβασκαίνει...; As an indictment this has to be understood as Arichea and Nida (1975:53) do: 'He is more likely using "bewitched" in a metaphorical sense, and he probably means by it "...to lead astray"...the focus is upon the condition of the Galatians and not upon who caused the trouble,...'; thus on allowing themselves to become bewitched.

The question, nevertheless, arises whether Paul made any allusions to somebody actually bewitching the readers in ways customary at the time, such as with the evil eye.

good sense here, since if this communication was only a head-on confrontation with the readers, the author might have put them off for ever. However, if they knew he was referring to arguments levelled at his gospel, this line of reasoning would facilitate them to identify the opponents' premises as false.

34 The only other times that this is used in Paul is: Rm 2:1, 3; 9:20, 11:33; 1 Tm 6:11, 20.
35 One should not minimise or domesticate (to our world and age) the alien features of the Bible texts, yet to link these carefully to parallels in the Bible texts. Moore-Crispin writing on the use and abuse of parallels, provides some useful principles (1989:220-223) to facilitate decisions about parallels, one being the question: 'Are the supposed parallels speaking of objective (if abstract) realities?'
36 Elliott's (1989:262-273) appeal to take seriously an 'understanding of the word of God in all its historical and cultural peculiarity...to...comprehend the texts as products of and witnesses to their own historical,...' social and cultural contexts, is indeed laudable. But his suggestion (1989:269-270) that this reference has to do with an accusation from the opponents, which is rejoined in C62/3:1 by the counter-accusation that: the opponents are in fact the ones who cast a spell on the readers, not Paul, may depend too much on a mirror reading.
The following points to the contrary:

(i) A figurative understanding suits the communicative process best. If reference was made to somebody actually casting a spell on the readers, this indictment would not have the same communicative effect. If it was to be understood literally that the Galatians came under the spell of the evil eye of opponents who were magicians (or alleged to be), then the indictment would have been of little consequence. Also if there was a definite mutual attack and defense about bewitching or injuring with the evil eye (as proposed by Elliott 1989:270) one would expect more explicit pronouncements in this regard.

Nevertheless, that the readers would understand this notion as something pejorative is clear.

(ii) If \( \text{ βασκαίνω } \) is taken literally, then \( \text{ προεγράφη } \) should also be taken literally and this is unlikely. Louw and Nida (1988:33.191) indicate that the latter refers to a vivid description, rather than a theatrical demonstration of some kind.

(iii) Although Louw & Nida (1989:53.98 and 88.159) leave room for both possibilities, a literal (to bewitch, to practice magic on) and a figurative (to deceive a person by crafty means) understanding, ultimately there is sufficient support for the figurative understanding which makes the better sense. The observation of Longenecker (1990:100) sums this up succinctly and conclusively:

The verb...was commonly used in the Greek world in a figurative sense to mean ‘fascinate by casting an evil eye’....It was part of the rhetoric of the day for characterising opponents and their strategies....It is more probable that the word, while carrying a reference to magical arts, was used by him tropically....(italics —HRL).

Conclusion: Thus \( \text{ βασκαίνω } \) is here used descriptively of the unthinkable. How could the readers deviate from the way in which the crucified Christ was portrayed before their very eyes, resulting in the commitment of faith they had; deviating from this would mean that they must have been as it were come under an evil spell! The ‘Galatians must have been quite shocked to hear that they have been bewitched into a “new Gospel”.’ (Cronje 1986:224-225).

3.2.2.3 Rhetorical questions

Rhetorical questions occur at several stages in Galatians and of the nineteen questions found in this letter, six are found in P7, namely:

(a) \( \text{ C62 (3:1)} \) \( \text{ Ὡ ἀιώντοι Γαλάται, τὸς ὑμᾶς ἐβασκαίνειν, ὡς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος } \)

(b) \( \text{ C63 (3:2)} \) \( \text{ τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἔργων ἰόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως } \)

(c) \( \text{ C64 (3:3)} \) \( \text{ οὕτως ἀιώντοι ἐστε } \)

(d) \( \text{ C65 } \) \( \text{ ἐναρξάμενοι πνεῦματι ὑπ' σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε } \)
Besides the basic function of the questions within the possible diatribe (3.2.2.1), it is ultimately the pragmatic effect that is important.37

Pragmatic effect of the questions
Pragmatically and communicatively these questions facilitate the author’s argument as follows:

(i) They clearly demarcate the end of the first main argument — the narrative section — and introduce the second: In spite of their unexpected position, these questions fulfill some anaphoric function. The emotional ‘outburst’ voiced by means of these, can be seen as the author’s reaction, to what he views to be the readers’ shunning of the gospel preached to them before. He reiterates this gospel in the immediately preceding discourse when he dissertates on the crucified Christ.

When Paul employs these questions, it is often indicative of a heightened state of emotion indicating that he is perturbed (Cronjé 1986:219). This phenomenon of ‘emotional’ sections to be found amidst more ‘rational’ sections, is a certain stylistic strategy that heightens more effective communication, and is linked to the literary technique of defamiliarisation (Cronjé 1986:223).

(ii) These questions cataphorically open the second main line of argument and prove to be placed very strategically: Lategan (1989:176) indicates that a combination of rhetorical questions can be very effective in demolishing all resistance in the reader. Potentially this full and specific complement of questions, arranged in the particular order (whether consciously or unconsciously), could demolish all cognitive resistance. This along with the strategic positioning of the questions, serve to shift the blame38 and to transfer the burden of proof at the beginning of this argument on to those in disagreement; it provides the author with a psychological advantage.

37 A number of authors in antiquity mastered the art of using rhetorical questions in a rather sophisticated way. Attention was drawn to this by the useful article of Watson (1989:301-318). A verification of the original classical authors bore this out. Although it is obviously not always certain in what measure this was intentional in New Testament usage, it is imperative that one should observe this sophistication in the classification of rhetorical questions.

38 This does not necessarily imply any deviousness on the side of Paul. According to the preceding (P6) argument, he was existentially convinced of his convictions. By means of these questions he is ingeniously shifting the responsibility of this conviction of faith (once held by his readers) on to the readers, for reappropriation. They now should, as it were, say why they have left that conviction they are on trial, not him!
(iii) The questions are also employed informatively. Dynamic equivalent translation theory would advocate the transformation of these questions into statements to determine their full impact, this was a technique even advocated in classical usage as Cronjé (1986:219) points out, when referring to Demetrius. When considering the pragmatics of the intended answers to all these questions, the author clearly wants the questions to be understood as statements.\footnote{Cronjé (1986:218-219): 'Paul is not really asking questions; he is making statements by means of questions — rhetorical questions (ἐρωτήματα).'} Thus besides their stylistic function, rhetorical questions are also used to structure reality (Lategan 1989:175):

...questions rest on social values or norms, which can be either challenged or confirmed....Their main function is to concentrate attention on one point and to effect crucial changes in the flow of the discourse.

(iv) But the questions also furthers the logos of the author on another level, in that the author is in fact carefully structuring his argument by means of these:

The nature of the logic employed should be identified. Although there is some relationship between syllogism and enthymeme, they are in fact confused at times (Clark 1957:118-119). Referring to Aristotle, Clark (1957:121) points out that one basic difference between syllogism and enthymeme, is that the latter is satisfied to let its proof be understood, so that one could deduce that enthymemes are incomplete syllogisms. Furthermore, enthymemes are also employed to refute fallacious reasoning. This is usually done by deducing the inevitable (Martin 1974:102). Of relevance here is the understanding that, 'When it is shown that, certain propositions being true in consequence, whether invariably or usually, it is called a syllogism in dialectic and an enthymeme in logic.' (Clark 1957:118) (italics — HRL).

The questions in 3:1-6 undoubtedly do not merely function on an affective level, but also contains rational coercion. Assuming that this argument is by definition an enthymeme, it is suggested, that by inference the readers will not only see the fallacy of their reasoning after 3:1-3/C62-65, but through the line of reasoning will arrive, with the author, at the consequence of their present opinion by means of his further question and exclamation in C66-67/3:4 — all their experience has been in vain!

Summary: By means of these questions which logically form a progressive argument, the author also elicits a response from the readers by creating a heightened emotional tenor.

His message is no longer on the stand, the readers are, they must answer to a number of very pertinent questions. Furthermore, the questions are used to subtly

39 Cronjé (1986:218-219): 'Paul is not really asking questions; he is making statements by means of questions — rhetorical questions (ἐρωτήματα).'}
recondition the readers and to reassert formerly held convictions as true and valid.

### 3.2.3 Summary and conclusion on the mode of persuasion/speech situation

Paul intuitively or consciously employs formal diatribical elements in P7 by means of which he is responding to possible objections. Beginning his address by means of an indicting rhetorical question he follows this up by a series of rhetorical questions expressing an indicting tone and also questioning the cognitive competence of his readers. He is at pains to point out the inconsistency in their logic. He uses enthymemic reasoning to guide his readers to the realisation that all their spiritual experiences have been in vain, if they pursue their present course of belief.

The use of vocatives effectuates a certain retardation by means of the literary device of defamiliarisation. This results in intensified perception at this particular point where attention is especially desired. Besides the negative overtones, however, the fact that Paul dares to use this language, reveals a familiarity indicative of a certain closeness and soundness in relationship between him and his readers.

### 3.3 3:1-6 from a structural point of view

#### 3.3.1 The general discoursive framework of Galatians

P7/3:1-6) constitutes the beginning of the second argument (P7-13/3:1-4:11) of the first main section of the discourse. This argument provides further proof for the authenticity of the author's proclamation.

The second argument is coordinate but different to the first (P3-6/1:10-2:21). Both of these are proofs of the authenticity of Paul's gospel. The beginning of the second argument is broadly parallel to the end of the first, it contrasts the readers' reaction to that of Paul, respectively, when both were challenged regarding their convictions of faith. However, after P7/3:1-6, the second argu-
ment unfolds further those themes already introduced. Grounds are provided in the first two main arguments (cf C1 and C2 in the macrostructure) for the appeal\(^{44}\) (C3, P13-16 in macrostructure) not to revert back to the former religion which is not only untenable, but would cause the readers to become slaves all over again.

3.3.2 3:1-6 within the second main argument

The demarcating of the beginning (P7) of the second argument is clearly indicated by a definite structural break, suggested by: the sudden use of vocatives in C62/3:1 ("Ω ἀνώτατος Γαλαται"); the deictic shift to address the readers and the switch to a new semantic field (πνεύμα...πνεύματι...πνεύμα...ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις). However, it is difficult\(^{45}\) to indicate the end of this second main argument. Along with Du Toit (1990:160 and 162) it is decided to demarcate the end at P13/4:8-11, for the following reasons:

It appears that the discourse in the second argument operates on two levels at the same time. There is the particular appeal on the level of their 'personal relationship' (expressed by pathos). This is apparent from the way in which Paul accuses them of being bewitched and the way in which he strongly intimates that their former and present experiences (C63/3:2; 3:5/C68) seem to have been in vain (τοσαυτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ; εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῇ, C66-67/3:4).

A similar appeal emerges in P13 (especially C119-121/4:9-11): ἀνῶθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε,...φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς μὴ πῶς εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς. Thus εἰκῇ frames the argument along with other personal and emotive appeals.\(^{46}\)

Du Toit points out that C122/4:12 (P14); γνωσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὥστε κατώ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί provides a more appropriate beginning for the next section, than P13 (C118). Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν οὖν εἰδότες θεοῦ (κτλ).

The conclusions drawn in C80/3:14\(^{47}\) and C114/4:6, are important for the

---

\(^{44}\) The ‘third argument’ is more appelative than argumentative (cf Du Toit (1990:160).


\(^{46}\) This the altercation is resumed by means of rhetorical questions in C119c-120 (4:9-10).

\(^{47}\) P8/3:7-14 is not directly related to the mnemonic reference to the Spirit in P7; nevertheless, it does make an important link between the Gentiles and the blessing of Abraham through Christ; which is the promise of the Spirit. P8 unfolds the fact that it is faith that constitutes sonship of Abraham, whereas relying on the law results in being under a curse. Thus, P8 is coordinate and additive to P7. In P8 Paul explains how he manages to link Abraham, promise, law, Christ and Spirit. Christ became a curse (vis à vis blessing), to redeem from the curse of the law, so that the promise of the Spirit’s
logical line of argumentation on the Spirit. P12 contains circular reasoning and views the argument about the Spirit from a 'theological' rather than a practical side: As authentication of sonship, God send his Spirit into the readers' hearts (C114/4:6; ‘ΟΤΙ 48 δὲ ἐστε υἱοὶ κτλ).

3.3.3 The structure and discourse of 3:1-6
It is not clear where P7 as discourse unit ends. 49 The renewed deictic focus in C71.1 (Γενώσετε) indicates a new pericope,50 this implies that P7 ends at C70/3:651. C69-70 is a hinge; resuming the notion of faith from C68d/3:5 and introducing the new theme: Abraham, whose relationship is the epitome of a relationship with God based on faith, not works. Since the second main argument (P7-13) deals with both the Spirit as well as Abraham, it is logical that its matrix (P7) would contain both elements. The implication of this is that P7 should end at 3:6 since only then both the elements have been introduced.

P7 comprises four larger thought units (Clusters A-D, cf appended discourse portrayal), related as follows:

CIA/3:1-2 and CIB/3:3 do not cohere strongly with one another, since CIB does not link up52 with any particular element in CIA, but repeats CIA in an equivalent way; C64-65/3:3 being coordinate to C63b-63c/3:2b, adding a different nuance in C65a/3:3b:

blessing made to Abraham could come to the Gentiles (C80). The promise of blessing made to Abraham is thus metonymical for the Spirit. The argument set forth in P8 makes no direct contribution to the mnemonic aspect of the reference to the Spirit in P7.

48 A moot point is whether 3:2 and 3:14 actually provides a theological basis for a two-stage reception of the Holy Spirit; or whether 4:1-7 (esp 4:6) suggests a receiving of the Spirit after embracing the Christian faith. Although this is a very important theological issue, suffice it to say, that for the original argument it was important to establish that it was the reception and operation of the Spirit that authenticated sonship of God and nothing else or nothing more. It is not ruled out that in the experience of the readers there was a lapse of time between responding by faith and the actual experience in the Spirit — as is often indicated in Acts — the emphasis here is on the authentication of sonship indicated by the causative translation of ΟΤΙ (δὲ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν κτλ) cf the RSV: 'And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His Son...'. Cf the lucid discussion and reasoning by Pelser (1978:42-48) on this issue. He concludes that the Spirit is obviously present at the coming to faith, and yet in this instance (as well as in Paul in general) the readers received the Spirit only after they believed (1978:44).


50 Paul generally introduces the topic for new themes at the end of former units, in Galatians.

51 The UBS text (1975) divides the text after C70 (3:6).

52 The function of οὕτως in C64 is to intensify the rest of the clause — and not to link it directly to any element in what precedes. Louw and Nida (1988:78.4) defines οὕτως as indicating an intensification of degree, in this case of stupidity — Are you so very stupid?!
Thus C65a and C65b are respectively, semantically, parallel to C63c and C63b.

The recurring notions of πνεύμα ἐλάβετε (past experience of the Spirit, CIA) and ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεύμα (present experience of the Spirit, CID/3:5), as well as εἰς ἀκοῆς πίστεως in C63c/2:2 and C68d/3:5 respectively, establishes coherence. These two clusters are coordinately linked; both contain reference to the binary opposition: faith-works. CID adds to the argument in CIA, although touches on different aspects.

In spite its apparent unrelatedness to the surrounding discourse, CIC(3:4) is cohesive with the rest of the pericope. This ostensible syntactical and structural unrelatedness indicates a certain salience a, 'punch line', whereby this segment forcefully brings home the final implications of the readers’ stupidity — it was all in vain! Although it occurs in the middle of the pericope, CIC is nevertheless, regarded applicable to the entire argument in P7/3:1-6. Understood thus, CID/3:5-6 strengthens the idea expressed in the question and exclamation in CIC: Even what you now experience seem to be in vain!

Specific description53 of the discourse within the clusters is necessary:

In CIA (C62/3:1) the addressees are further qualified by means of the relative clause: αἰς κατ' ὀφθαλμοῖς Ἡρωδίας Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἑσταυρωμένος. Coordinate to this is the rhetorical question in C63/3:2 dyadic (contrastive) in its relatedness to the question in C62: these who have now been bewitched (ἐβάσκακαν: C62a) once received the Spirit (τὸ πνεύμα ἐλάβετε). C63b & C63c contains the content of the event θέλω μαθεῖν in C63a, arranged dyadically in a contrastive sense: εἰς ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεύμα ἐλάβετε ἢ εἰς ἀκοῆς πίστεως.

Cluster B consists of two rhetorical questions, the latter being accentuated by means of an antithetic chiasm:

65a εἰς ἔργων νόμου (τὸ πνεύμα ἐλάβετε) (C63b)
65b εἰς ἀκοῆς πίστεως; (C63c)
65a εἰς ἔργων νόμου πνεύματι (C65a)
65b νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθη; (C65b)

Cluster C contains a rhetorical question and coordinate to this a 'remark/exclamation': Ἐπάθετε is rather sensu bono than sensu malo.54 Opinion differs on the semantic force of εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῆ, but the conclusions of Longe-

53 This is only done where the description may clearly elucidate persuasion.
54 It is nonsensical to understand Ἐπάθετε as referring to persecutions, when the author again refers to experiences of the Spirit in the ensuing argument.
The adverb εἰκή...expresses futility. [In effect Paul asks whether their positive spiritual experiences are of no significance now that they are faced by this choice to turn to the Jewish law.] The added words εἴ τ' γε καὶ εἰκή ("if indeed, it really was for nothing") are of the nature of a parenthetical exclamation, expressing the hope that the situation is not yet irretrievable...[Paul] hopes better things of his converts. Εἴ γε leaves a loophole for doubt, and the καὶ widens this, implying an unwillingness to believe on the part of the speaker....([brackets — HRL).}

Although, ostensibly, only doubt is expressed, it is believed that this expression is almost an affirmation of the author's fears, but with a particular pragmatic purpose in mind. The possibility that the author may be using litotes here, is supportive of this degree of doubt. This implies that the overt locution is an understatement, with a view to a situation that is in reality infinitely more severe/intense than that expressed.

Vorster's (1991:128) reference to Leech (1983:147) is extremely useful in this regard, since the litotes is described as 'a salutary tactic...to restore credibility by using descriptions which so obviously fall short of what could be truthfully asserted that they cannot be supposed exaggerated.' It is pointed out that litotes can be used to minimise negative connotations, underplaying aspects which are pragmatically disfavoured, thus providing positive connotation.

Pragmatically this implies that the author knows, that since the readers would similarly detest the idea that all their spiritual experiences could have been in vain, he nevertheless suggests this possibility; yet himself expressing doubt about this and thus strengthening aversion to this idea.

The occurrence of εἰκή in C66-67/3:4 has to be related to that in C121/4:11, φοβομαι ὡμᾶς μή πως εἰκή κεκοπ[α]κα εἰς ὡμᾶς. In the latter the apostle similarly affirms his fears. All this confirms the idea that the use of βασκαι[ιν] in C62 and εἰκη (as part of litotes) in C66-67, is a kind of 'shock tactic' — from the readers' point of view it is unthinkable to apply these indictments to them.

In CID a dyadic comparison is made between the experience of the readers (C68/3:5) and Abraham (C69-70/3:6). The readers' initial receiving of the Spirit and present endowments and operations are equal to the experience of Abraham, confirming the validity of faith: God who now works and authenticates a relationship of faith in Him, then also reckoned faith as righteousness.

Summary and conclusions: It is assumed that the second argument contains

---

55 Cf also the translation of Louw and Nida (1988:89,54): 'in vain, to no avail, with no result' (footnote — H R L).
56 It is also imperative to read the reference to the ministry of the Spirit referred to in the second main part of the discourse (from C170 onwards) in the light of all the pro-
logical (*logos*) and emotional (*pathos*) appeal. This could be indicated both in the surface as well as the deep structure. These appeals broadly constitute two frameworks. The logical appeal operates by means of several themes, not least that of the Spirit: The beginning of this aspect in the second main argument is apparent in P7/3:1-5 and this line ends in CI14, proving both sonship to God (C114/4:7) as well as to Abraham (C69-70/3:6). Thus the line on the Spirit provides a basis for both a logical and emotional appeal:

* On the basis of this the author can appeal to the readers’ past and present spiritual state (logical);
* It provides a basis for indictment, as regards his efforts of labour amongst them (more emotional appeal);
* The pneumatological argument serves as logical basis for eliminating any ‘identity crisis’ of whether they belong to Abraham or whether not (C80c-d/3:14);
* It constitutes the basis for final evidence that they are God’s sons on the basis of his Son (C114/4:6).58

* Particular structural and discoursive aspects of P7 also add to the persuasion exerted by the author; note the following:

** Repetition of various lexemes: ἐξ ἔργων νόμου...τὸ πνεῦμα...ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως...ἐραξάμενοι...πεύματι...εἰκῇ...ἐπιχορηγῶν...τὸ πνεῦμα...ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις...ἐξ ἔργων νόμου...ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως...ἐπίστευσει, lends a certain weight to these aspects in the argument;

** The structural position of P7 indicates the ludicrousness of the position taken by the readers — everything was in vain!

** After having shunned the essence of the gospel, the crucified Messiah who gave himself for them, it must be inferred that the readers must be bewitched;

** The full communicative significance of the present experience of the readers regarding the Spirit (C1D), has to be read in the light of CIA (their past experience of the Spirit). The mnemonic reference to their initial receiving of the Spirit is further confirmed by their present experience of the Spirit’s operations.

** The mnemonic reference to their initial and present experience of the Spirit, is further amplified by the fact that their experience is an emulation of the experience of Abraham — in both cases by the response of faith, there was an attestation by God: Abraham’s was reckoned as righteous; the readers received the
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3.4 The content of the mnemonic reference: the Spirit

Although the mode of expression of the author's argument is intertwined with its content, nevertheless, to adequately recognise the significance of what is being said, specific attention has to be given to the latter.

Reminder by rhetorical questions, to a past and present experience receives congency to negate the amnesia of the readers, only if it is distinct and undeniably real. What phenomena could the author be referring to in (C63b): τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε and: (C68a-b) ὅ...πειρασμῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν? To answer this attention should be given to the following:

3.4.1 Kerugmatic elements

Although the endeavour to 'standardise' the kerugmatic elements in the Pauline letters is fraught with difficulty, this does not negate the actual existence of this undeniable datum. As in other of his letters (e.g. 1 Th 1:6; Philp 1:12) reference is made to the gospel, in fact it is the issue in Galatians. The most essential and undivided element is the initial (and subsequent) proclamation of the Christ (cf C5-16/1:6-12 and Cl8d-18e/1:16, ἀποκάλυψαι τὸν ὦν αὐτὸν... ὅνα εὐαγγελίζωμα αὐτὸν). Usually the one or other aspect about the Christ is accentuated, not least that he died or that he is the crucified One, as is the case in Galatians (cf C57-61/2:20-21).

Unfortunately the letters do not provide much, or any, recording of the actual events that construe the setting in which the proclamation with its concomitant experiences took place. These have to be construed on the basis of kerugmatic events and patterns, recorded elsewhere in the corpus of the New Testament, such as from the Acts. Although even this is no simple task (cf Bruce

59 According to C80/3:14 this was that which Abraham did not yet receive, but which was then a blessing by promise: cf C7-73/ 3:8b-9 and C80c-d/3:14: Ἐν τῷ αἰῶνα ὑπὸ ὄντα ἐνεργοῦσαι... ἐν κόσμῳ ἔκτικτικσ. And so, the readers' receiving the Spirit is, in any case, a confirmation of their relatedness to Abraham.

60 It appears that opinion about the operations of the Spirit in this passage is threefold: (i) Those who would propose that Paul is busy with a theological construct/doctrine, i.e. referentially there is no specific events in mind, but the theological implications of receiving the Spirit and the basis thereof is what is at stake; (ii) The view that suggests that he is referring to definite events, but these are impossible to identify (e.g. Barclay 1988: 85); (iii) The opinion that there is reference to phenomena similar to that described elsewhere in the NT, such as in Acts. This would of necessity be linked to the 'kerugmatic core' to be extrapolated from other writings in the NT. From a persuasive point of view it is suggested that (ii) and (iii) would make the best sense here.

61 Diversity characterised earliest Christian kerugma (cf Dunn 1977:1-32) and attempts to extrapolate a core kerugma, is fraught with difficulties and inevitably meets with disagreement. The accuteness of the problem can be seen when comparing the more recent proposition of Lemcio (1988:3-17) with the earlier treatment of Dunn (1977).
(1984:2579-2582), since the actual history of Paul recorded in Acts and that in the letters are sometimes at variance, one can only assume that some of the "theological nomenclature" between the letters and the Acts does correspond. On the basis of this tenuous datum, one has to postulate that the kerugmatic settings (patterns and concomitant experiences) in Acts characterise that which underlies the letters, also Galatians.

3.4.2 The setting of receiving the Spirit in Galatians

Thus it is assumed that the setting indicated by τὸ πνεῦμα ἔλαβετε in 3:2/C62 denotes the initial reception of the Spirit, similar to that in Acts, where 'receiving the Spirit' is undeniably concomitant with the proclamation.62

In his major work on Pneuma in Paul's letter to the churches of Galatia, Lull (1978) remarks as follows (57): The '...setting of the experiences of the Spirit in Galatia was the occasion of proclamation.' (See also his further discussion and substantiation in pp 58-68). He concludes on the settings (101): 'The Spirit, as an agent of salvation is clearly closely connected in Galatians with proclamation, faith and God's act of sending...conversion to Christianity in Galatia is portrayed by Paul as an ecstatic experience of the Spirit.'

It is suggested that there is a temporal link between the moment when the προεγραφὴ ἐσταυρωμένος (C62b) took place (accompanied by the consent of faith) and τὸ πνεῦμα ἔλαβετε (C63b), Lull (1978:58) also implies this, and adds that ἄκοντι πίστεως is also indicative of missionary preaching, understanding it as the response of faith evoked by proclamation (62).

3.4.3 The nature of the experiences

According to Lull (1978:56-57, see also 83-94) to obtain a profile of this, one has to link together the references in 3:2 (receiving) as well as 3:5, the working of power/miracles, to the Spirit who responds (cries: κραζον) ἈΒΒΑ ὁ πατήρ (4:6/C114).63 When dealing with the historicality64 of the Spirit (1978:105), 'The term πνεῦμα...denotes divine reality whose presence and activity is manifest in the churches of Galatia in the form of ecstatic phenomena during worship.' Smit (1986:21) favours a similar interpretation: 'Bij het begrip "dynamis" kunnen

---

62 A cursory study, within their contexts, of these references to receiving the Spirit, will bear this out: Acts, 2:4 and 38; 8:15-17 and 19; 10:44-47; 11:15 and 17; 19:2 and 6. There are settings in which cognate expressions, e.g. being filled with the Spirit, or the Spirit falling upon, et cetera, are also connected to the initial proclamation.

63 He (1978:83) refers to the possibility that the Abba-cry may be similar to the event taking place in Acts 10:44-45 (q.v).

64 The issue of whether these phenomena are to be expected today, or whether similar phenomena currently claimed, by pentecostals and charismatics, are essentially the same as that in NT times, is outside the orbit of this paper.
wij het best denken aan "gaven van de geest"65, zoals glossolalie, exorcisme, genezing, profetie enz.; vgl 1 Kor 12,8-11. 28-30.’

The weight of scholarly opinion undeniably favours a tangibly real experience (see also Longenecker 1990:105). Dunn (1975:202) sums this up effectively: ‘In Paul, as elsewhere in the NT, the Spirit is understood as something “whose reception may be verified.”’ He (1975:202) observes further: ‘...Paul speaks (Gal.3.2ff) “as if the reception of the Spirit was something as definite and observable as, for example, an attack of influenza” ’. Ostensibly Schweizer (1968:423) lays no restriction on the form of these manifestations, yet stresses the reality of the Spirit’s presence in the reception of the Spirit.

Although the exact manifestations cannot be reconstructed, the nature of the operations of the Spirit provides the author with ‘empirical evidence’ of the legitimacy of his gospel without the law (Lull 1978:68). These operations may be audibly and visibly perceived manifestations of the Spirit, embued with the ecstatic and a sense of the numinous. The decisive use of the Spirit as a theologoumenon indicates that to both readers and author, the Spirit was a primary datum of experience (Lull 1978:105).

3.4.4 Ongoing experiences
It is virtually beyond cavil that C68a-b/3:5 does not only refer to the experience of the Spirit at the time of Paul’s missionary visit, but also to that in the ongoing life of the community (Lull 1978:58). In this way, ‘...subsequent experiences of the Spirit were also closely connected with proclamation.’ (Lull 1978:58).66

Scrutiny of the structure of the discourse (3.3.3) already indicated a reciprocity between τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε (C63b) and ο...ἐπιχορηγῶν ἤμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν (C68a-b). Besides the temporal difference (past vis à vis present), semantically, God is the agent in both, and the Spirit is the object in both. This implies: The first mention of the Spirit to the readers, conjured up that initial setting and reception of the Spirit. The second reference to the Spirit (C68a-b) both confirms the first event, since by nature it is the same, but it also serves as further appeal since these phenomena were presently occurring in the life of the community. The stress on God as the Agent (Longenecker 1990:105-106, undeniably so), adds further weight to the argument. God was operative through the Spirit at the time of the letter. Thus the appeal becomes empirical

65 There is agreement that these are the kind of phenomena in mind when referring to the attestation by the Spirit, on account of their faith: Arichea and Nida (1975:55); Ridderbos (1953:112) ‘We are to think of those special operations of the Spirit by which in the early period of the Christian church the acceptance of the gospel was sometimes accompanied and confirmed....’
66 For a similar opinion see: Fung 1988:130, ‘It is more natural, however, to take the participles as referring to God’s present supply.’ This opinion is shared by Longenecker (1990:105).
proof to the readers; Paul's argument is valid.

Summary and conclusions: This mnemonic reference would register in the minds of the readers as an undeniable reality, implying that the course presently considered, is futile. The point at stake is that the mode of pleasing God and experiencing his favour, is not by the fulfilling of the demands of the law, but by believing. This also provides the basis for his second main argument, that of establishing their sonship of God, \( (C69\rightarrow 117/3:6\rightarrow4:7) \), in which he is arguing *a minori*: it was faith that resulted in their undeniable receiving of the Spirit; *ad maius*: resultant reception of the Spirit, does more, it attests their sonship of God.

The actual mnemonic reference may be identified as a clear tangible, unmistakably real experience, still being perpetuated in the midst of the Galatian communities. Therefore, past and present experiences of his readership offers Paul an Archimedes point of reasoning in the light of which the readers are made to see the utter ludicrousness of their present wavering.

4 MNEMONIC REFERENCE TO THE SPIRIT AS PERSUASIVE TOOL IN THE LETTER TO THE GALATIANS

4.1 Orientation
The exigence (cf 2.2) inter alia entailed: (i) The *risk of the denial* of several important cornerstones of the readers' faith, especially the Object of their faith; (ii) *Being coerced to accept an inferior message* and value system; (iii) *Being severed from the significant and meaningful relationship* with God's own emissary — the apostle; (iv) *Being under siege to yield to social pressure*, since they found themselves in an identity crisis; (v) *Becoming puppets in power politics*, objects of expedience; (vi) *Experiencing instability, with consequent tensions within the communities*; and finally (vii) *Facing the threat of religious slavery*.

The question whether the rhetorical exigence could have been allayed by the employment of the mnemonic reference to the Spirit (and if so, which aspects of the exigence), will now be answered. Since this article only deals with one persuasive tool in a complex argument, arising from a complex rhetorical situation, it can be assumed that only some elements of the exigent situation would have been addressed by this persuasive tool.

4.2 The speech situation: winning the argument thus offending the readers or gaining them?
It may be postulated that once the readers recognised the method of address in 3:1-6, the diatribic style, they did not experience this so *intensely* as a vituperation. Instead of the style of the *indictment protreptic* causing them to either reject Paul (and his gospel) or to merely withdraw into themselves, the probability exists that this style of communication helped them to protreptically come to cognitive soundness. This took place when Paul guided them by means of en-
thymemic reasoning, to come to realise the authenticity of his gospel, namely that God indeed gives the Spirit and operates through him on account of faith and not human effort.

Paul leads the readers to cognitive consistency which is confirmed by existential reality (see following section), and on the grounds of this reality launches into the theme of belonging to Abraham (C69-70). The mood in which the persuasion takes place, is clearly that of a vituperation, yet it is this very candour and frankness, and also his ultimate concern for the readers, that causes him not to lose them.

4.3 The reference to the Spirit
The Spirit becomes a beacon of association, a hallmark, of everything represented by Paul's gospel, received by the readers. To deny the contingent basis on which the Spirit was received, which is also the basis for God's present operations amongst them, is to deny their experience of the Spirit Himself; and that is to deny their very Christian existence. The suggestion by means of litotes that their experiences are to no avail, should strengthen their conviction of the value of their experiences of the Spirit. This, further confirmed by the reality of the Spirit, could re-establish in their minds the grounds — the faith elicited by Paul's gospel — for the reception of the Spirit. This proves the validity of Paul's message. If this issue is resolved much of the contingencies (in the exigent situation) resulting from doubting Paul's gospel, would drop away.

4.4 Final conclusion
Through the 'blame' element expressed semantically and in the form of the diatribe, Paul 'exonerates' his message, and by the reminder of the Spirit proves the undeniable validity of his gospel. Thus the situation of exigence could be allayed. It is obviously impossible to tell what effect the mnemonic reference to the Spirit actually had. The following could have happened. Through the ratiocination of Paul and the consequent persuasion of the readers:
* The risk of the denial of the very essentials — of Christ himself, could be avoided.
* The readers should recognise that the message that brings the Spirit is superior and thus the imputed righteousness of which the Spirit is an authentication, can also become an imparted righteousness.
* This would restore the ethos of Paul, and potentially re-establish the relationship between Paul and the readers.
* Realising that they have received the very authentication of sonship of God and of Abraham, should prove to them that they have all the identity they need and should not yield to pressure to conform, in order to gain identity and status.
* Above all they need not yield to a new form of religious slavery.
This being established, provides the basis for Paul to prove that the motives of those who are upsetting their faith is egotistical.

Their possession of the Spirit also provides the means to combat instability in their midst with its consequent tensions and rifts.
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