Paul's Allegory of the Two Covenants (Gal 4.21–31) in Light of First-Century Hellenistic Rhetoric and Jewish Hermeneutics

STEVEN DI MATTEI

Section des Sciences religieuses, École Pratique des Hautes Études, 45–47 rue des Écoles, 75005 Paris, France

Galatians 4.21–31 opens with a brief allusion to events recounted in Genesis 16–17, to which Paul aptly appends the following comment: ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα **(4.24). Through a re-evaluation of the meaning of the verb** ἀλληγορέω **in the context of Hellenistic rhetoric and by setting Paul's own hermeneutic in the context of Jewish hermeneutical norms of the first century, this paper argues that Paul's allegory of the two covenants is more reflective of Jewish reading practices which sought to escha-tologize the Torah, such as Paul's reading of Gen 16.1 through its *haftarah*, Isa 54.1, rather than Christian typology.**

[22]For, it is written that Abraham had two sons, one from his handmaid and one from his freewoman. [23]But whereas the one from the handmaid was born according to the flesh, the one from the freewoman through a promise; [24]these things are said allegorically. For these women are two covenants . . .

I. Introduction

Paul's use of the participle ἀλληγορούμενα in Gal 4.24 has certainly attracted a wealth of commentary. From Origen to modern day New Testament scholars commentators have grappled with the meaning and intention behind Paul's use of this particular term. Origen, for example, claimed to have found in the apostle's words – ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα[1] – the justification for his own interpretive agenda: namely, that all of the historical narrative of Scripture is to be read allegorically.[2] Whereas Antiochene exegetes, quick to check and even

---

[1] *Contra Cels* II.3.8, IV.44.28; *De prin* IV.2.6; *Philocalia* I.13; *Comm Matt* X.14.43, XVII.34.78; *fr Comm ad 1 Cor* 35.28; *Comm Joan* XX.10.74. *Hom Gen* VI.1.25, VII.2.19, X.2.42, X.5.22.

[2] Origen quite regularly cites Gal 4.24 and 1 Cor 10.11 (ταῦτα τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν) together (*Contra Cels* IV.43–44; *De prin* IV.2.6; *Philocalia* I.13; *fr Comm ad 1 Cor* 35.28). Cf. also *Contra Cels* II.3.8 and IV.44.24, where Origen clearly accentuates his intention: those who *read* the Law (οἱ τὸν νόμον ἀναγινώσκοντες) ought to be reading it allegorically – a minor departure,

chastise Origin's understanding and application of Gal 4.24, claimed, to the contrary, that what the apostle really meant to say was that 'these things are τυποί': the apostle improperly called the 'type' 'allegory'.[3] Modern critiques have more or less followed their Antiochene predecessors alleging the same or similar: what Paul *really* intended to express at Gal 4.24 is a typology,[4] or an allegory which gives way to typology.[5] Such views, however, not only continue to undermine what Paul actually wrote, but furthermore reflect fourth-century hermeneutical predispositions that may not have been present in Paul's own exegetical interaction with Scripture. We often neglect to notice that even if the Antiochene school was justified in its critique of Origen as misreading and/or misappropriating Paul's words to suit his own hermeneutical agenda, the Antiochene exegetes themselves likewise sought to impose their own Christian exegetical practices of reading Scripture onto Paul's reading of Scripture. Their emphasis on the historicity of the Old Testament 'type' and their distrust of Alexandrian allegory, which, we might add, has nothing to do with Paul's use here, are a direct reaction to Origen's apparent neglect of the *historia* of Scripture. This, we should bear in mind, is the

---

to say the least, from Paul's own wording: οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι (Gal 4.21). Some later manuscripts, D G ps lat sa, have rendered Paul's question at Gal 4.21, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;, as ʼτὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀναγινώσκετε; I suspect that this is directly influenced by Origen's use of the same verb.

3 John Chrysostom *Comm Epist ad Gal* IV.710 (PG 61.662): Καταχρηστικῶς τὸν τύπον ἀλληγορίαν ἐκάλεσεν.

4 F. Pastor, 'Alegoria o tipologia en Gal 4,21–31', *Estudios bíblicos* 34 (1975) 113–19 (118); C. K. Barrett, 'The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians', in *Rechtfertigung. Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann Zum 70. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1976) 1–16 (14); R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University, 1989) 116. Cf. the Origenian approach of E. Cothenet, 'À l'arrière-plan de l'allégorie d'Agar et de Sara (Ga 4,21–31)', in *De la Tôrah au Messie. Études d'exégèse et d'herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles* (ed. M. Carrez, J. Doré, and P. Grelot; Paris: Desclée, 1981) 457–66, who maintains that typology and allegory are not different (462). See also L. Goppelt, *Typos. Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939), English trans. by D. Madvig (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1982) 140.

5 For example, J. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (London: A. & C. Black, 1993) 244; G. Wagner, 'Les enfants d'Abraham ou les chemins de la promesse et de la liberté. Exégèse de Galates 4,21 à 31', *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 71 (1991) 285–95 (285); S. Légasse, *L'Épitre de Paul aux Galates* (Paris: Cerf, 2000) 351. Cf. G. W. Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts* (JSNTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989) 141–54: typology supplemented by allegory (214); D. Gerber, 'Ga 4,21–31 ou l'indéfinissable méthode?', in *Typologie biblique. De quelques figures vives* (ed. R. Kuntzmann; Paris: Cerf, 2002) 165–76: 'construction typologique sur un arbitraire allégorique' (176); and likewise that of R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002², 1959): 'Typology has here been strained and distorted in an unconvincing but highly Rabbinical fashion into allegory; that is all' (82).

polemical bedrock upon which typological exegesis was constructed.[6] Furthermore, that this hermeneutical grid continues to shape our understanding of Paul's Old Testament exegesis seems to me a bit surprising considering that for the last 30 years or so Pauline scholarship has attempted to revamp its image of Paul through a New Perspective which has sought to present a Paul more attuned with the Judaism of his day. Yet when it comes to understanding Paul's exegesis of the Old Testament, we are still very much guided by third- and fourth-century post-Pauline Christian apologetic and hermeneutical agendas.[7] It is my impression that we still have not grasped Paul's exegetical method. What I hope to establish in the following pages is a reading of Gal 4.21–31 which attempts (1) to shed light on Paul's exegetical method by comparing it to Jewish hermeneutical norms of his milieu, and (2) to understand why, in the apostle's own words, Genesis 16–17 speaks allegorically of two covenants. In simpler terms, this paper argues that what the apostle *really* meant to say is what he said: ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα.

II. The Technical Aspect of Paul's allegory

The verb ἀλληγορέω and its participle ἀλληγορούμενα: A reassessment

It should come as no surprise that the answers we seek of a text are usually governed by the questions we pose to that text. At least since R. P. C. Hanson's discussion of Gal 4.21–31 in his *Allegory and Event*, which first appeared in 1959, it has become customary among commentators to raise the same question that Hanson had raised (80–84) concerning Paul's allegorical method: Does it adhere more to Alexandrian allegory or Palestinian allegory? This dichotomy leaves us to choose between Philonic allegory and some sort of Midrashic allegory, whatever that may

---

6 This deserves more space than can be allowed here, but briefly the emphasis on the historicity of the type does not enter into the Christian exegetical discourse until the fourth century. Justin Martyr's famous distinction between *logoi* and *tupoi* (*Dialogue* 114; cf. 90, 92), for example, is not a distinction between words and historical events or personages, but between what the prophets *said* which pre-announced Christ, and what the prophets *did* which pre-figured Christ. In general this is true also of other pre-Antiochene exegetes, such as the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas*.

7 Modern assessments of typology have not greatly changed since Leonhard Goppelt's *Typos*, which first appeared in 1939, and which still remains the foundational monograph on typology for modern scholars. A critical reading of Goppelt's analysis, however, would reveal a work full of interpretive prejudices and even laced, here and there, with discriminating remarks about modern Jews' failure to read their own Scripture correctly. In fact, the aim of Goppelt's study, as he himself states on occasion, is to provide his historical milieu with the 'correct' way of reading the Old Testament – that is, typologically. Moreover, it is Paul who is evoked time and again as the founder of this post-Pauline apologetic. This is none other than a continuation of the same hermeneutical agenda which preoccupied the early Church.

be. Furthermore, this dichotomy is actually shaped by our own conceptions or misconceptions of what allegory is or should be. When we think of allegory, we quite naturally envision the brand of allegory practiced by Philo and the Stoics, where allegorical exegesis served as an apologetic tool which allowed the exegete to claim that the text under examination in its entirety was one big allegory containing hidden philosophical doctrines. It is this apologetic which is often mistaken for allegory itself.[8] On these grounds, Paul's usage certainly does not square with Philo's apologetic. And although 'some form of Midrashic allegory' has gained more adherents among Pauline scholars, it still leaves much unanswered as far as defining Paul's method.[9] In short, the question whether or not Paul's allegorical method adheres more to Alexandrian allegory or Palestinian allegory imposes a false dichotomy. I suggest, therefore, that we throw it out, and that we furthermore reshape our understanding of what allegory is, not by considering its apologetic and/or polemical usage, but rather its definition, which can be found in the Hellenistic rhetorical treatises of the first century BCE and CE. It is here that we shall find an adequate base from which a fuller understanding of Paul's use of the participle ἀλληγορούμενα can be ascertained.

Among those authors who use the word ἀλληγορία in the period we are concerned with, there are only two, from our Greek sources, who actually define the rhetorical trope for us: Tryphon, an Alexandrian grammarian of about the late first century CE, and Heraclitus, another Alexandrian of about the same period, who is perhaps better known for his Homeric allegories.[10] Tryphon actually provides us with a good number of tropes, 14 in all. Of the trope ἀλληγορία he writes: '*Allegoria* is an enunciation which while signifying one thing literally, brings forth

8 For example, 'Paul is not here [Gal 4.24] trying to emancipate the meaning of the passage from its historical content and transmute it into a moral sentiment or a philosophical truth, which is almost *the invariable function of Alexandrian allegory*' (Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, 82 [my emphasis]). I would contend that this is rather the invariable function of the apologetic, or how allegory is used in the service of such an apologetic.

9 For a discussion of some of these problems see: R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Dallas: Word Books, 1990) 209–10; and Hansen, *Abraham* 201–9. Briefly, what has been defined as the midrashic feature here in Gal 4.21–31 is the verbal analogy (*gezerah shawah*) upon which Isaiah's citation is used in conjunction with Genesis (see in particular Barrett, 'The Allegory') and the wordplay on Hagar. Yet one need not resort to Rabbinic methods for understanding Paul's verbal analogies; the rhetorical definition of the trope *allegoria* properly explains this. See above.

10 Other sources include: Dionysius Halicarnassus, who uses the word four times; Demetrius's *On Style* devotes a paragraph to the trope and provides us with some significant information on its usage in the mysteries. Plutarch (only two occurrences: *Moralia* 19f and 409d) provides us with some valuable information but as with his use of the verb ἀλληγορέω, Plutarch is not a great fan of the word. Longinus (*On the Sublime* 9.7) interestingly enough mentions the trope once and in connection with the Jewish lawgiver. And of course there is Philo of Alexandria, who makes abundant use of the word, 19 times in all.

the thought of something else'.[11] Likewise Heraclitus, giving us the more formal etymological definition writes: 'The trope that says one thing but signifies something other than what is said is called by the name *allegoria*'.[12] We need not construct or postulate other sources than these definitions, which were a part of Hellenistic rhetorical education, to properly understand Paul's methodology. In fact, we cannot get any clearer than this: Paul speaks of one thing, παιδίσκη and ἐλευθέρα, but intends something other than what is said, two covenants. Additionally, if we understand Tryphon's definition that the trope signifies one thing literally while signifying something else to the mind, it might be possible to see that indeed the words παιδίσκη and ἐλευθέρα do signify one thing literally, Hagar and Sarah, yet something else allegorically. I shall return to this idea further below. Presently, the meaning of the verb ἀλληγορέω also needs some preliminary remarks.

Most commentators have not hesitated to note that the verb ἀλληγορέω can mean either 'to speak allegorically' or 'to interpret allegorically'; and most if not all of these same critics have referred their readers to Büchsel's article in the *TWNT*.[13] But a closer examination of the sources themselves yields a more refined picture. For there are relatively few instances where the verb is used with the meaning 'to interpret allegorically'. In fact, upon surveying our ancient sources – Demetrius,[14] Strabo,[15] Heraclitus,[16] Josephus,[17] Philo of Alexandria,[18] and Plutarch[19] – we learn that ἀλληγορέω is predominantly used by these authors in the sense 'to speak allegorically', in which case it is usually the author or the personified text itself which speaks allegorically. This reflects, of course, the verb's original application in the first century CE: to speak allegorically – that is, to speak or declare (ἀγορεύω) by means of the trope ἀλληγορία. The only exception to this usage is to be found in the writings of Philo of Alexandria, and perhaps additionally the

---

11 *De tropis* 1.1: Ἀλληγορία ἐστὶ φράσις ἕτερον μέν τι κυρίως δηλοῦσα, ἑτέρου δὲ ἔννοιαν παριστῶσα.

12 *Homeric Allegories* 5.2: Ὁ γὰρ ἄλλα μὲν ἀγορεύων τρόπος, ἕτερα δὲ ὧν λέγει σημαίνων, ἐπωνύμως ἀλληγορία καλεῖται.

13 'ἀλληγορέω', in *TWNT*, I, 260–4.

14 *On Style* 151; 285.

15 *Geog.* I.2.7.

16 *Homeric Allegories*: 1.1; 5.5, 10, 12; 6.2; 13.5; 15.2; 22.1; 23.2; 24.2, 5, 8; 29.4; 41.5, 12; 42.1; 43.1; 59.1; 60.1; 61.3; 68.2; 69.12; 70.1, 11, 13.

17 *A.J.* I.24: 'Some things our legislator cleverly speaks enigmatically about and other things allegorically in a majestic manner' (τὰ μὲν αἰνιττομένου δεξιῶς, τὰ δ᾽ ἀλληγοροῦντος μετὰ σεμνότητος).

18 *Leg.* 2.5, 10; 3.4, 60, 238; *Cher.* 25; *Post.* 51; *Agr.* 27; 157; *Ebr.* 99; *Migr.* 131; 205; *Mut.* 67; *Somn.* 1.67; 2.31, 207; *Abr.* 99; *Ios.* 28; *Decal.* 101; *Spec.* 1.269; 2.29; *Praem.* 125; 159; *Contempl.* 28; 29; *Hypoth.* 197.

19 *Moralia* 362b; 363d; 996b.

two examples found in Plutarch. Moreover, out of the total 26 times that Philo uses the verb, the number of occurrences where the verb means 'to interpret allegorically' is rather slim.[20] The *Homeric Allegories* of Heraclitus, however, just may be a better source in determining a more accurate picture of the verb's usage in antiquity. Despite the relatively small size of the treatise, especially when compared with the Philonic corpus, the author uses the verb significantly more than any other writer of his time period, on average three times per page of Greek text compared to Philo's once every 92 pages of Greek text![21] Heraclitus employs the verb ἀλληγορέω a total of 26 times, *all* of which either express the idea that Homer speaks allegorically when speaking about the gods, or that a specific element in the text was spoken of allegorically. In light of this precision, I cannot see how Paul's participial use can possibly mean anything but 'are spoken allegorically'.[22]

20 Admittedly, deciding whether ἀλληγορέω, especially in its participial form, means 'to speak allegorically' or 'to interpret allegorically' within the Philonic corpus is not cut and dry. Nevertheless, one can proceed on the assumption that the verb means 'to speak allegorically' in all of its 26 occurrences, albeit with different meanings depending on the verb's subject. For example, *Leg.* 2.5, 10; *Ebr.* 99; and *Somn.* 1.67 all present Moses as the subject of the verb in its active present tense or active present participle. There is no ambiguity here: Moses speaks allegorically (cf. *Migr.* 131: ἔοικεν ἀλληγορεῖν). *Cher.* 25; *Ios.* 28; *Praem.* 125; 159; and *Contempl.* 29 present Scripture in general or a specific passage as the subject of the verb in its passive third-person present tense: 'These things (τά)/this passage is spoken allegorically'. There are, however, ten occurrences (*Leg.* 3.60; *Agr.* 27; 157; *Migr.* 205; *Mut.* 67; *Somn.* 2.31, 207; *Spec.* 1.269; *Contempl.* 28; and *Abr.* 99 in the genitive, ἀλληγορούντων) where the active present participle in the plural nominative (ἀλληγοροῦντες) is used accompanied by a third person plural verb, six of which are the verb φημί – thus the expression ἀλληγοροῦντες φαμεν. Should these ten occurrences be translated as 'speaking allegorically' or 'interpreting allegory'? Literally: 'We, speaking allegorically, say . . .' Yet the meaning clearly expresses that Philo is *interpreting* allegorically, since obviously if he is speaking allegorically about something then he is interpreting that something allegorically, at least this would seem so from our perspective. Yet perhaps Philo saw himself emulating Moses, so that ἀλληγοροῦντες φαμεν depicts the idea that like Moses who spoke allegorically of this or that, we/I also speak allegorically of the same things. Curiously enough, we never find the participle accompanied by the verb ἀναγιγνώσκω ('to read/interpret allegorically'), nor for that matter the adverb ἀλληγορικῶς.

21 The corpus of Philo in its modern Loeb edition contains approximately 2,400 pages of Greek text. F. Buffière's edition of the *Homeric allegories* (Paris: Cerf, 1962) has 87 pages of Greek text. Each author uses the verb 26 times. Thus in comparison, Philo rarely uses the verb.

22 Contra Longenecker's 'these things are [now] being interpreted allegorically' (*Galatians*, 208); Dunn's 'such things are to be interpreted allegorically' (*Galatians*, 247); and Hays' 'these narrative entities are to be interpreted allegorically' (*Echoes*, 113). Besides going against the data presented above, such interpretations raise a certain amount of suspicion since they inescapably reveal these commentators' typological presuppositions, especially when *their* typology claims, as all three of these commentators argue, that Scripture is prefiguring the events in Galatia. These translations are just one example of our own hermeneutical prejudices being brought into the interpretive process.

Additionally, 'are spoken allegorically' makes perfect sense of the verb with respect to its usage in the Hellenistic rhetorical treatises of the first century.

Concerning Paul's own expression – ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα – it should be observed that the passive present participle is used as a substantive in the predicate. The relative ἅτινά, which refers to those things just recounted, is thus the subject which takes the predicate ἀλληγορούμενα – literally, 'these things are spoken allegorically'.[23] The use of the participle to modify an element that has been spoken, written, or presented allegorically in a textual narrative is not new. Heraclitus, for example, has a penchant for using the passive aorist participle, not as a predicate as Paul does, but as a participial adjective modifying its noun. Thus in general he can speak of 'those things having been said/written allegorically concerning the gods' (τὰ περὶ θεῶν ἠλληγορημένα, 6.2), or the myth which has been spoken of allegorically (ἠλληγορημένον τὸν μῦθον, 22.1). He can also speak of Odysseus's wanderings which have been spoken of allegorically (πλάνην ἠλληγορημένην, 70.1), and so on. This same usage is also found in Demetrius' rhetorical treatise *On style*, wherein Demetrius cites a source which speaks allegorically of a weak city in terminal decline as a 'hag' (γραῦν ἀλληγοροῦν, 285). It is exactly in this same manner that Paul uses the participle; although, since there are a plurality of subjects (τινά) which are spoken of allegorically, Paul uses the relative ἅτινά to say that 'these things are said allegorically'.[24]

We should additionally specify how allegory works as a rhetorical trope as opposed to the apologetic aims of its usage. Progressing as such, it will become clear that allegory in Philo, for example, is exactly the same as allegory for Paul. In other words, despite the particular apologetic aims of the exegete, the allegorical operation rests the same. Thus, in the example just cited by Demetrius, it is the word γραῦς which the poet uses: literally it means 'hag' but allegorically it signifies a weak and declining city. In the works of Philo we find the same procedure. Commenting on Gen 2.19 Philo states that 'Moses, speaking allegorically, has called the intellect "heaven"' (*Leg.* 2.10). It is clear how the rhetorical this-for-that plays itself out: Moses says 'heaven' but the word signifies the intellect (νοῦς). At Exod 32.17 Philo claims that 'Moses, speaking allegorically, calls the body "the camp"' (*Ebr.* 99). And to take one last example: commenting on Gen 2.18 – 'And the Lord God said: It is not good that the man should be alone, let us make for him a helper' – Philo states that 'Moses is speaking allegorically'; for the helper of the intellect (an allegory for Adam) is the faculty of sensation (*Leg.* 2.5). In all of these examples the allegorical principle is identical, and it is precisely this principle

---

23 Cf. E. Burton, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921): 'which things are allegorical utterances' (253).

24 Thus the question of agent is significant. If these things have been said allegorically, then by whom? Moses, Paul, God?

which properly defines these authors' allegories as allegory. Paul's allegory is no different; it also displays this same rhetorical this-for-that:[25] Hagar and Sarah are allegorically two covenants. Note that in accepting Paul's allegory as allegory, since its definition properly explains his use of the participle ἀλληγορούμενα, we have concluded nothing about the *historia* of the passage, nor have we taken anything away from its *historia*. Paul merely states that Genesis 16–17, in speaking about Hagar and Sarah, speaks allegorically of two covenants.[26]

Hagar: an allegory of the covenant that bears children from Sinai into servitude

The sheer number of commentaries and differing opinions on 4.25, as well as its textual variants, bear witness to the complexities of Paul's Greek or more so to the thought behind it. Nevertheless, one can detect a clear line of reasoning in Paul's development, which is furthermore completely in line with an allegorical procedure. Having just declared that these two, the handmaid and the freewoman, allegorically represent two covenants, Paul then proceeds to detail one of these two covenants:[27]

> μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἁγάρ. τὸ δὲ Ἁγὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ· συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ· δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. (4.24b–25)

Addressing the textual difficulties as they appear, we should first note that the postpositive μέν in v. 24b already sets up a forthcoming 'other' (δέ) which apparently never comes.[28] The phrase additionally lacks a primary verb, which is quite easily resolved by adding the implied 'to be', thus yielding, 'one is from Mount Sinai, bearing children into servitude'. Yet this particular translation separates the

---

25 By way of comparison, R. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1974), 28, 54 refers to the recurring expression עַל פִּשְׁרוּ in Qumran *pesharim* – 'the interpretation of this is', 'this refers to' – as a 'this is that' fashion of fulfillment exegesis (39). Paul's use of the participle ἀλληγορούμενα would thus seem to serve the same purpose. See below.

26 It may additionally be asked if Paul is actually (re)interpreting Scripture here; or, is he merely using Scripture to speak allegorically of a contemporary situation – a question worth serious consideration. Cf. Kugel (J. Kugel and R. Greer, *Early Biblical Interpretation* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986] 81), who asks the same question with respect to *pesher* exegesis: 'Is the author of this *pesher* [Nah 3.6] actually seeking to understand the meaning of a biblical text, or is he simply *using* that text to give authority to one particular view of things?'; and C. Roth, 'The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis', *VT* 10 (1960) 51–68 (51): 'It [*pesher* exegesis] does not attempt to elucidate the Biblical text, but to determine the application of biblical prophecy or, rather, of certain Biblical prophecies and the application of these Biblical prophecies in precise terms to current and even contemporary events'.

27 The textual tradition adopted herein is that of the United Bible Societies.

28 Thus also Légasse, *Galates*, 353; and J. L. Martyn, *Galatians* (New York: Doubleday, 1997) 436.

phrase into two parts – ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ and εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα – and I wonder whether or not Paul was actually thinking along different lines. For instance, the feminine subject μία (i.e. the one covenant) and its present participle γεννῶσα enclose within themselves the expression ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ εἰς δουλείαν: 'from Mount Sinai into/for servitude'. Could it have been Paul's intention to claim that this very covenant bears or produces offspring *from* Sinai for servitude?[29] It is certainly tempting to conceive of the phrase as such especially given Paul's forthcoming justification for his allegory: Hagar is (allegorically) the covenant bearing children from 'Hagar' (i.e. Sinai) into servitude. Whatever may have been Paul's intention, it seems clear that those engendered from Sinai or belonging to its covenant are born into the servitude of this covenant. There need not be anything offensive nor heretical in these remarks. That the covenant of Sinai demanded submissiveness is not unknown to Judaism.[30]

The relative clause at the end of 4.24, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἁγάρ, seems best taken if we imagine that Paul is in dialogue with his 'stupid' Galatian brethren and needs explicitly to inform them which one of the two women, the handmaid or the freewoman, is this covenant which he has just depicted. They would unhesitatingly respond: 'Well this is Hagar'. In other words, Paul has just connected the allegorical meaning of παιδίσκη, the covenant bearing children from Sinai into servitude, with Hagar, its literal meaning. We should additionally bear in mind that it is not Hagar herself who is identified with Sinai, but rather with the covenant. The feminine terms which find their termination in Hagar make this quite clear: διαθήκη, μία … γεννῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἁγάρ. Moreover, there is a general progression in Paul's thought which is discernible through the pronouns of 4.24. The plural neuter pronoun ἅτινά specifies that all those elements which Paul has just mentioned – handmaid, freewoman, and the manner through which each one of their sons is born, κατὰ σάρκα and δι᾽ ἐπαγγελίας respectively – are said

---

29 In this case the preposition ἀπό with the verb γεννάω would express birth from a source or origin. See Liddell and Scott.

30 In opposition to Hays' comment: 'Paul's association of the Law with slavery is offensive and heretical' (*Echoes*, 115). It may be questioned, however, if Paul actually associated the Law with 'slavery' since this is quite different than what Paul actually wrote, εἰς δουλείαν, which I have rendered 'into servitude' – a notion certainly not contradictory to Judaism. Furthermore, 'being born into servitude', that is, the servitude of the law, is a basic tenet of Jewish theology, especially within the literature of the Second Temple period (see, e.g., the canonical Psalms and the Thanksgiving hymns at Qumran – Ps 115.16: Ὦ Κύριε, ἐγὼ δοῦλος σός, ἐγὼ δοῦλος σὸς καὶ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης σου). Moreover, Paul's point does not seem to be a distinction between Jewish slavery and Christian freedom (*contra* Dunn, Hays, Hansen, *et al.*), but rather between the desire on the part of the Galatians to resubmit themselves to an existence *kata sarka*, and thus to become enslaved to the Law and/or to the elements of the cosmos, *after* already living in the liberty of the spirit – a liberty procured through Christ (Gal 3.3, 13, 25; 4.2–5, 7, 31; 5.1, 18; 6.8).

allegorically. Then Paul narrows the scope and says that these two (αὗται) are two covenants. Thus at this point the allegorical substitution is complete. We can now reread what Paul has just declared and get: 'Abraham had two sons, each one born from two different covenants'. The logic is clear considering that Paul is faced with the problem of letting his Galatian brethren know how they fit into the covenant promises made to Abraham and his seed. At this point, Paul continues to articulate with greater detail one (μία) of these two covenants. And then he transfers the allegorical sense back to its literal by accentuating the fact that this covenant (ἥτις) is Hagar. The reasoning behind this allegorical identification comes in 4.25, the *crux interpretum* as Betz labeled it.[31]

From what I can make out of the critical apparatus from both the Nestle–Aland edition of the New Testament and the United Bible Societies' edition, plus the different manuscript versions of 4.25 cited in Burton's commentary (259–60), it seems that the article τό, which commences this verse, is conserved in all of the manuscripts. This may be in fact one of the surest elements in the phrase, yet paradoxically one of the most neglected. The article clearly indicates that the subject of this phrase is the name or the word Ἁγάρ[32] – provided that one has retained 'Hagar' as the subject. This brings us to the other textual problem: the seemingly dual subject, Hagar and Sinai. It is clear that ὄρος is the predicate, regardless of whether or not one has omitted Hagar[33] or kept her. Some commentators, however, have sought to render a solution by taking Sinai in apposition to Hagar, and thus preserve both subjects – a Hagar–Sinai amalgam.[34] 'Hagar–Sinai' is just not an acceptable rendering of the Greek; it fails to take into account the article τό. Rather, it is the *name* 'Hagar' that must be understood as the subject of the phrase. Then what of Sinai? I propose that we take Sinai not in apposition to the subject, but in apposition to the predicate of the clause, ὄρος: 'For[35] the name "Hagar" is a mountain, Sinai, in Arabia'. Since Σινᾶ is undeclinable, this would make sense of the Greek, and may have even been Paul's intention: 'The name "Hagar" designates a mountain in Arabia, namely, Sinai'. It should additionally be emphasized that if this is Paul's justification for the allegory he has just proposed – Hagar is allegorically the covenant from Sinai because the name 'Hagar' designates Sinai – then the allegorical this-for-that is

---

31 H. D. Betz, *Galatians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 244.

32 Thus also Légasse, *Galates*, 354; Hansen, *Abraham*, 148.

33 For example Légasse, *ibid.*

34 For example Dunn, *Galatians*, 242. The interpretation, however, is suspicious on the grounds that it seems guided by underlying typological presuppositions. Hagar–Sinai clearly emphasizes, if not creates(!), a typological correspondence. Cf. Hansen's critique (*Abraham*, 147–8); and M. De Boer, 'Paul's Quotation of Isaiah 54.1 in Galatians 4.27', *NTS* 50 (2004) 370–89 (375).

35 γάρ is largely attested in the manuscript tradition.

constructed on a wordplay and not on a historical personage as typology would demand.[36]

Concerning 4.25a, there are already a good number of articles which discuss the problems of this verse.[37] The evidence seems to indicate that the name 'Hagar' might have been used as a designation for Mount Sinai.[38] The evidence from the Targumic tradition also suggests that already in the Jewish communities of the first century there existed a wordplay between הגר and חגרא,[39] the mountainous region wherein Hagar found herself in servitude with her children – Hagra of Arabia.[40] This association furthermore emphasizes the geographical location 'in Arabia' which is relative to both Hagar and Hagra–Sinai. It seems plausible there-fore to imagine that Paul knew and made use of this contemporaneous piece of Jewish trivia: the name 'Hagar' is a mountain, Hagra, in Arabia. In any case, even if Paul's wordplay remains enigmatic to us, there is no denying that the allegory itself is constructed upon the name or word 'Hagar'.

How, then, does Paul's allegory work as an allegory? We have already seen in Demetrius' *On Style* that the word γραῦς ('hag') allegorically signified a city in

36 As Hansen rightly points out, given the fact that Paul's allegory rests on the name 'Hagar' it 'is not an historical correspondence' (*Abraham*, 211). This does not, however, threaten the views of those commentators who see here in Gal 4.21–31 an allegory which gives way to a typology. For many of these commentators are willing to accept an allegory here but a typol-ogy in 4.28–30.

37 See H. Gese, 'τὸ δὲ Ἀγὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ (Gal. 4, 25)', in *Das Ferne und Nahe Wort. Festschrift für Leonhard Rost* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1967) 81–94; G. I. Davies, 'Hagar, el-Heğra and the location of Mt Sinai', *VT* 22 (1972) 152–63; M. McNamara, 'τὸ δὲ (Ἀγὰρ) Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ (Gal. 4, 25a): Paul and Petra', *MS* 2 (1978) 24–41; M. G. Steinhauser, 'Gal 4,25a: Evidence of Targumic Tradition in Gal 4,21–31?', *Biblica* 70/2 (1989) 234–40; and P. Borgen, 'Some Hebrew and Pagan Features in Philo's and Paul's Interpretation of Hagar and Ishmael', in *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism* (eds. P. Borgen and S. Giversen; Aarhus: Aarhus University, 1995) 151–64.

38 McNamara writes: 'Hagar, in fact, would be a very suitable designation for Sinai, and would be all the more appropriate if Sinai were believed to be in the vicinity of Petra, associated in the Targums with the dwelling place of Hagar . . . There was also a place named Hagra or Hagar (with an initial *heth*) in that area, and this name may have also been read or pro-nounced as Hagra or Hagar. In fact, it is quite conceivable that this very place, Hagar, was regarded in some sections of Jewish tradition as the mount of revelation' (cited in Longenecker, *Galatians*, 212).

39 Concerning the arguments pro and con between the ה of Hagar and the ח of Hagra, see the secondary literature above, n. 37.

40 The *Targum Onkelos* and the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Gen 16.7. The targumic tradition replaces the Biblical שׁור (Gen 16.7) with חגרא. M. Aberbach and B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis. A Critical Analysis Together with an English Translation of the Text* (Denver: Ktav, 1982) 97, comment that חגרא could have designated two possible locales, one of which would have been the Transjordan called Hagra of Arabia (חגרא דערבא, Git. 2a), thus in effect corroborating McNamara's thesis that Hagar–Hagra was identified with the area around the Nabatean capital Petra.

ruins. The similitude upon which the allegorical substitution rests is rather apparent: the image of an old hag conveys the image of a rundown city (note also that the gender of city, πόλις, aids in the allegorical substitution). We furthermore saw that Philo's allegory of Eve as the faculty of sensation rests upon the similitude of Eve as helper (βοηθόν) to Adam, and sensation as helper (βοηθόν) to the intellect (again the gender of the terms aids in the allegorical substitution).[41] Stoic allegory rests on an etymological similitude: the goddess Hera is air, because the word Ἥρα means 'air'. In all these examples the fundamental principle behind allegory – the this-said-for-that – remains the same despite the fact that allegories themselves may be constructed on different similitudes (of image, of gender, of sound, etc.), and may be used for different purposes. Paul's allegory functions no differently. The allegory of Hagar as the covenant from Sinai rests on the wordplay which Paul inherently saw in the name 'Hagar'.

It must additionally be stressed that such views as 'Paul claims that the Jews are the sons of Hagar' not only accord a view onto Paul which is foreign to his thought process, but actually violate the rules of allegory. What Paul specifically says is that αὗται (i.e. παιδίσκη and ἐλευθέρα) are two covenants. In this manner, the two expressions 'the son of the παιδίσκη' and 'the son of the ἐλευθέρα' (4.22) literally yield, within the context of the Genesis narrative, 'the son of Hagar' and 'the son of Sarah'; the son of each woman is provided through the literal context of the narrative, Ishmael and Isaac respectively. Plugging in the allegorical covenants for the original expressions, 'the son of the παιδίσκη' and 'the son of the ἐλευθέρα' yields: 'the son(s) of the Sinai covenant/present-day Jerusalem' and the 'son(s) of Jerusalem above'. Who are the sons of each covenant? The response must be drawn from the appropriate context: the Jews under the Sinai covenant, and Paul's righteous ones (pagans and Jews alike), heirs of the heavenly Jerusalem. An expression such as 'the Jews are the sons of Hagar' misreads the allegory by mixing literal and allegorical contexts. 'Hagar' is drawn from the literal narrative, whereas 'Sinai' is its allegorical sense; 'the Jews' are likewise part of this allegorical narrative, and thus properly 'the sons of the Sinai covenant'. Mixing literal and allegorical signifieds fabricates something that is not there in Paul's own thought. Correctly, 'the son(s) of Hagar' speak allegorically of 'the sons from Hagra (i.e. Sinai)'.[42]

Finally, Paul's allegory is a rhetorical operation; that is to say, it is inherently attached to language, and not to historical 'types'. The son(s) of Hagar (ὁ υἱὸς τῆς

---

41 Philo also provides the additional similitude that as Eve was created later than Adam, so too sensation is posterior to the intellect (*Leg.* 2.5).

42 This equally holds true if we wish to see all the components that Paul presents as an allegory, thus leaning more on the first half of 4.24, ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα. The result is the same. Literally, 'Ishmael son κατὰ σάρκα of Hagar' and 'Isaac son δι᾽ ἐπαγγελίας of Sarah' are spoken allegorically of 'the flesh and blood Jews of the Sinai covenant/present-day Jerusalem' and 'the faithful in Christ, heirs of the heavenly Jerusalem through a promise'.

παιδίσκης) allegorically becomes the sons of Sinai, which correspond to the sons of present day Jerusalem, through a figurative play on the word 'Hagar'.[43] Likewise, the allegory of Sarah does not rest on a historical type, but rather on the verbal and thematic allusions already present in Isa 54.1.

III. The Exegetical and Functional Aspect of Paul's Allegory

Paul's Use of Scripture (1): Isaiah 54.1

The hermeneutical key to unlocking Paul's allegorical exposition of the narrative of Genesis 16–17 lies in the passage's *haftarah*, Isa 54.1:[44]

> Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and shout, thou that does not travail: because many more are the children of the desolate than of her that has a husband.

43 That the expression υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης comes to designate the sons of present-day Jerusalem may not seem as startling as we would expect. The expression was already in use in the Second Temple period as a Jewish covenantal self-designation. For example Ps 115.16 (LXX): ῏Ω Κύριε, ἐγὼ δοῦλος σός, ἐγὼ δοῦλος σὸς καὶ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης σου; Ps 85.16: 'Look thou upon me and have mercy upon me: give thy strength to thy servant and save the son of thine handmaid (τὸν υἱὸν τῆς παιδίσκης σου)'; and Wis 9.4–5: 'O God of my fathers, and Lord of mercy . . . give me wisdom that sitteth by thy throne, and reject me not from among thy children: for I am thy servant and son of thine handmaid (ἐγὼ δοῦλος σὸς καὶ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης σου)'. The expression depicts the suppliant's submissiveness to the Lord as one of his humble and pious vassals, a self-designation which portrays the servant's fidelity to and steadfastness in Yahweh's covenant. Cf. the expression בן־אמתך in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QH 7, 26; 1QS 11, 15; 4Q381 fr. 33; 4Q381 fr. 15). Who is Yahweh's handmaid? Psalm 115 mentions Jerusalem within its context, which indeed seems to be our best candidate (cf. the Amarna letters wherein we learn of four cities (Byblos, Sidon, Tyre, and Gezer), each of which is called the *'amah* of the Egyptian king (F. Charles Fensham, 'The Son of a Handmaid in Northwest Semitic', *VT* 19 [1969] 312–32 [318]). The expression υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης σου may therefore have been in use in the Judaism of Paul's day to designate the children of Jerusalem, the children of the covenant which Yahweh made to the flesh and blood seed of Abraham.

44 Scholarly consensus does not accredit the first century with a *haftarah* liturgical reading practice due to lack of any explicit evidence dating from the period; thus, to speak of a *haftarah* reading in Paul would seem unwarranted. However, it is not coincidental that Paul cites from the Torah (rather paraphrases Gen 16–17) and then from Isa 54.1, which in the Palestinian triennial cycle is the *haftarah* reading. Furthermore, L. Schiffman, 'The Early History of Public Reading of the Torah', in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue* (ed. S. Fine; New York: Routledge, 1999) 44–56, suggests that even post–70 texts, notably Acts 13.13–15 and Luke 4.16–21, lend themselves to the conclusion that a Torah–Prophet reading was practiced prior to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE (47–8). Cf. M. Fishbane, 'Introduction', xxi, *The JPS Bible Commentary: Haftarot* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002); and Renée Bloch, who notes that such midrashic interpretations as the technique of *gezerah shawah*, as we find here in Paul, largely originate from liturgical reading practices (cited by G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* [Leiden: Brill, 1961] 7).

Already inherent in the passage's liturgical reading which immediately followed Gen 16.1 – 'Now Sarah, Abraham's wife, had not borne him any children' – is the implicit connection between the barren Sarah and the barren Jerusalem. It is precisely in this context that Paul cites Isa 54.1: to confirm scripturally (γέγραπται γάρ) that Sarah (ἐλευθέρα) is, allegorically, the Jerusalem above. The apparent *double entendre* in Paul's use of the term ἐλευθέρα in 4.26, as it denotes both 'free' and the 'freewoman' from the preceding verses, can only be rendered in English by an awkward: 'But the Jerusalem above is (the) free(woman)'. Most commentators, however, have insisted that Paul cites Isa 54.1 as the justification of the relative clause ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν.[45] Yet the *haftarah* is used by Paul to justify his alignment of the barren Sarah of Gen 16.1 with the barren Jerusalem of Isa 54.1 – the two being furthermore designated by the same term, ἐλευθέρα.[46] In fact, it might even be conjectured, certainly after having already demonstrated how παιδίσκη is allegorically related to present day Jerusalem, that the primary referent of ἐλευθέρα here in 4.26 is that of Sarah: 'But the Jerusalem above is the freewoman, which is our mother'.[47] The citation from Isa 54.1 thus reaffirms and supports Paul's allegory. In fact, Isaiah's own allusion to Sarah as 'the barren one' already embraces Paul's allegorical assimilation of Sarah to the barren Jerusalem. It suggests that the only novel component that Paul adds to the reading of Sarah as Isaiah's 'barren one' is the term by which he calls this, 'allegory'. Conversely, however, it would seem that Paul goes a step further with his allegorical ingenuity by reading the Jerusalem above as Genesis' Sarah! We shall return to this idea momentarily.

45 The double signified inherent in the term ἐλευθέρα seems unmistakable to me, especially after having already been introduced to Paul's portrayal of Sarah through the term ἐλευθέρα in 4.22 and 23 (cf. 4.30 and 31). Why this has not been commented upon by other critiques remains puzzling, but I suspect that this is partly due to an overemphasis of the antithesis slavery/free. Cf. C. H. Cosgrove, 'The Law has Given Sarah no Children (Gal. 4:21–30)', *NT* 29 (1987) 219–35 [230 n. 41]), who like myself also sees Sarah implied in the term ἐλευθέρα here in 4.26; and Longenecker, *Galatians*, 215.

46 Barrett, 'The Allegory', 12 (reproduced in Longenecker, *Galatians*, 215; F. S. Malan, 'The Strategy of Two Opposing Covenants. Galatians 4:21–5:1', *Neotestamentica* 26 (1992) 425–40 [434] etc.) sees the analogy here built upon the Midrashic technique *gezerah shawah*, the term being στεῖρα from Gen 11.30 and Isa 54.1. But Gen 11.30 is quite removed from the context at hand; curiously enough, Barrett cites the annual Babylonian liturgical reading, wherein Isa 54.1 is the *haftarah* of Gen 11.30. Yet, here it is the Palestinian triennial reading cycle which is followed wherein Isa 54.1 is the *haftarah* of Gen 16.1, perhaps constructed on the thematic and verbal analogy between οὐκ ἔτικτεν (Gen 16.1) and ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα (Isa 54.1) – more apparent in its Hebrew original: לֹא ילדה in both passages.

47 Cf. the two expressions: (1) Paul informs us that one (μία) of these two women, namely παιδίσκη – ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἁγάρ; whereas (2) the other, ἐλευθέρα – ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν. Cf. Burton, *Galatians*, 263.

Thus far, then, Paul is safely working within his own Jewish heritage in seeing a reference to Sarah in Isa 54.1.[48] But what about Paul's reading of Isa 54.1 in general? Commentators have alleged that Paul's reading of Isaiah's desolate Jerusalem is anything but in line with Jewish tradition, and is rather quite typical of his violent appropriation of Jewish scripture in general.[49] Yet this is not the case. First, that Isaiah's prophetic announcement refers to the end of days, and that therefore Isaiah's desolate and barren Jerusalem refers to the New Jerusalem (i.e. Paul's Jerusalem above), properly recall contemporary Jewish exegetical practices.[50] Second, since Paul and his community had envisioned themselves as living in the end of days, it was only natural to see in Isa 54.1 a prophetic announcement which spoke of their own particular community as Isaiah's righteous ones.[51] The Gentiles are thus seen as the heirs of the New Jerusalem because, according to Paul's reading of Isaiah, this is exactly what the prophet speaks of at every turn of the page: the Nations shall be justified and assembled in the end of

---

48 Thus also: Betz, *Galatians*, 248; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 215; Dunn, *Galatians*, 255. See also M. Callaway, *Sing, O Barren One: A Study in Comparative Midrash* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1986) 59–71.

49 For example, Wagner, 'Les enfants d'Abraham', 294: 'En citant ce passage, Paul rend la succession d'images encore plus incohérente. Il s'agit de la nouvelle alliance, mais pas comme Esaïe l'a imaginée. La Sara d'Esaïe n'est plus à présent la mère d'Israël et Jérusalem n'est plus à Jérusalem!' This last phrase is cited by Légasse who labels Paul's hermeneutic here as a 'remarquable gauchissement . . . [sans] scrupule' (*Galates*, 361). Cf. Hays, *Echoes*, 120; Gerber, 'Ga 4,21–31', 175. On the contrary, as we shall see, Isaiah's Jerusalem rests Isaiah's Jerusalem in accord with contemporary Jewish reading practices; this is precisely why the apostle cites Isaiah in favor of his exegesis. Likewise, Isaiah's 'Sarah' rests as the mother of Israel.

50 We need merely recall the exegetical practice of *pesher* at Qumran, wherein the Prophets were read as though they were speaking of the events of the final generation. 1QpHab7 particularly highlights this hermeneutic: 'And God told Habakkuk to write down that which would happen to the final generation' (trans. Vermes). More germane to the interpretation above is 4Q164 fr.1, where Isaiah's desolate Jerusalem is interpreted eschatologically as the New Jerusalem (I owe this note to the anonymous reader on the editorial board of *NTS*). Cf. M. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 1979) 125; and in general D. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (Missoula: Scholars, 1975); R. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 6–35; and Roth, 'The Subject Matter', 52. This eschatological hermeneutic seems also applicable to the Torah by means of, principally, *haftarah* reading practices. See Fishbane, 'Introduction', xxv; and C. Perrot, *La lecture de la Bible. Les anciennes lectures palestiniennes du Shabbat et des fêtes* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1973) 184. Cf. Paul's own hermeneutical conviction: 'And these things [Exod 14–16; 32, etc.] were written for our instruction, on whom the end of ages has come' (1 Cor 10.11). See also Rom 15.4 and 5.14c: 'Adam is a model of what shall come' (Ἀδὰμ, ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος).

51 The emphasis on community as the *Sitz im Leben* of this type of exegesis is the common feature among Jewish exegetical practices of the Second Temple period, whether by Qumran exegetes (see Patte, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, 213; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 259) or by Paul (see in general Hays' thesis [*Echoes*]).

days.[52] Moreover, the prophet himself declares at 54.3 that 'Jerusalem's *seed* shall inherit the Nations'.[53] Accordingly, Paul reads Isaiah's righteous ones, οἱ διώκοντες τὸ δίκαιον (51.1), as referring to οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (Gal 3.9) – the exegetical link found in Hab 2.4: ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.[54] There is nothing here in Paul's exegetical method that could be labeled as non-Jewish. What is innovative nonetheless is that he likewise claims that the Abrahamic narrative of Sarah and Hagar proclaims these very same events, albeit allegorically.

   'Rejoice, thou barren one that bearest not!' In the face of what looks like desolation and sterility, Isaiah encourages Jerusalem and her righteous sons, to rejoice. Why? Because contrary to present appearances, God's covenant with Jerusalem has not been breached![55] This motive of rejoicing is a fundamental link between Paul's allegory of the two covenants and Isaiah's own portrayal of God remembering his covenant with Jerusalem. Within this exclamation is itself embedded the covenant promises made by God, not only to the heirs of Jerusalem, but specifically to the descendants of Abraham and Sarah. For instance, Isaiah encourages the righteous to recall Abraham and Sarah in the midst of Jerusalem's barrenness (LXX 51.1–3):

> Hearken to me, those who pursue righteousness and seek the Lord: Look to the solid rock which you have hewn, and to the hollow of the pit which you have dug. Look to Abraham your father and to Sarah, who was in labor with you: that he was one, and I called him, and blessed him, and loved him, and multiplied him. And now I will comfort thee O Zion; and I have comforted all her wilderness; and I shall make her wilderness as the Lord's paradise.

Deutero-Isaiah's exclamation to rejoice at 54.1 is directly connected to the calling, blessing, and multiplying of Abraham. The righteous exiles, who are descendants of Abraham's seed, are encouraged to remember whence they came and to where they are destined according to what was promised Abraham.[56] The author of Deutero-Isaiah, therefore, clearly links the Zion tradition and its eschatological fulfillment to the promises made to the patriarch Abraham! Is this not what the

---

52 Isa 2.2–3; 14.2; 25.5–7; 51.5; 52.15; 54.3; 55.4–5, etc.

53 Already in Paul's head as he penned: Καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός (Gal 3.16)?

54 There is another important connection between Isaiah's οἱ διώκοντες τὸ δίκαιον and Paul's οἱ ἐκ πίστεως: namely, their relationship to Abraham. See below.

55 See especially Isa 54.7–10.

56 The Greek of the LXX (Isa 51.1–3) is barely comprehensible in the larger context of the passage and it varies considerably from the Hebrew. The reader therefore misses the reason why the author of Deutero-Isaiah appeals to the figure of Abraham. For example, 'the solid rock which you have hewn' (τὴν στερεὰν πέτραν ἣν ἐλατομήσατε) makes no sense; properly it is 'the rock *from which* you have been cut' (אֶל־צוּר חֻצַּבְתֶּם), and likewise not 'the hollow of the pit which you have dug' (τὸν βόθυνον τοῦ λάκκου ὃν ὠρύξατε), but 'the hollow of the cistern *from which* you were hewn' (אֶל־מַקֶּבֶת בּוֹר נֻקַּרְתֶּם). There are other differences within these verses as well, such as the emphasis on God's love for Abraham.

apostle himself has done in his allegorical exposition of Genesis 16–17? Paul's hermeneutic must be seen in light of Isaiah's own use of the Abrahamic promises.[57] It would seem then that Paul sees in Isaiah a prophetic exclamation of the present eschatological fulfillment of the covenant which hearkens back to Abraham and Sarah: 'To Abraham and his seed the promises were said' (Gal 3.16). It is through Isaiah's portrayal of Jerusalem (above) as barren and through his linking together the theme of Zion's joy, since soon this barrenness will show itself as plentitude, with the covenant promises made to Abraham and his seed, that Paul is able to see in Genesis 16–17 an allegory of two covenants. Isaiah's exhortation to Jerusalem to rejoice in the new covenant is allegorically represented in God's proclamation to Abraham and Sarah that she shall not go childless.

What Paul's hermeneutic seems to be doing, then, is allegorically reading Isaiah's heavenly Jerusalem in Genesis' Sarah. Cosgrove suggests that Paul's reading of Isaiah allows him to see (allegorically) a Sarah that has remained barren until Christ.[58] This gets right to the point. Through the figure of Sarah, Torah allegorically prophesies the same eschatological events proclaimed by Isaiah. The covenant of Zion and her heirs are thus read back into the Abrahamic narrative, as Paul perhaps saw Isaiah himself doing. But this is not all. There are other parallels even more striking in Paul's allegory of the two covenants. For instance, in the Genesis narrative God makes a covenant with Abraham and his seed: 'one (οὗτος) coming forth from you, he shall be your heir' (15.4); 'on that day, the Lord made a covenant (διαθήκη, ברית) with Abraham' (15.18). Sarah, however, is barren, and almost as if she understands God's promise to Abraham to exclude her as mother, since she is indeed sterile, she gives her handmaid to Abraham to be his wife, so that she might bear children through her (16.1–3). Hagar is thus presented as the *temporary*[59] solution to Sarah's barrenness. Moreover, from the limited perspective of Abraham and Sarah, it looks as though Ishmael is the

---

57 Even though the term 'promise' is not evoked by Isaiah, scholars have noted that this is exactly the function of the appeal to Abraham (51.1). The figure of the patriarch evokes the promises of land and descendants, seen here eschatologically. See J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55* (AB 19a; New York: Doubleday, 2000) 327; and K. Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah. A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 347.

58 Cosgrove, 'The Law', 231. To append a further thought to this idea, and by no means am I convinced that Paul himself employed this connection, Paul's use of the verb συγκλείω ('to keep closed', 'to shut up') finds an interesting echo in Gen 16.2, wherein the Lord has 'shut up' (συνέκλεισεν) Sarah's womb so that she cannot bear children. In Gal 3.22, Paul uses the same verb to express that Scripture has kept (συνέκλεισεν) all things under sin in order that the promise from faith in Jesus Christ be received among the faithful. Cf. Rom 11.32: 'God has kept (συνέκλεισεν) all in disbelieve so that all may be freed'.

59 Temporary in Paul's and our own reading, since indeed we know the narrative's outcome. But for Abraham and Sarah this privileged and omnipresent viewpoint is not yet apparent. See, for example, Gen 17.18–21.

fulfillment of the covenant made by God to Abraham.[60] Next (16.7), we read that by the spring beside the road to Hagra – reading the targumic interpolation – an angel of God reveals himself and establishes a 'covenant' with Hagar and her seed. In Gen 17.2, the Lord again appears to Abraham to reconfirm his covenant with him, and to stipulate the decree of circumcision. It is not until Gen 17.19–21 that Abraham understands that the covenant promises made in Genesis 15 are not with Ishmael but with Isaac, the promised offspring!

Through the influence of *haftarah* reading practices which eschatologized Torah, Paul, it would seem, sees an elaborate allegory here in the Abrahamic narrative. Genesis' angel of God, who reveals himself to Hagar at Hagra (16.9) to establish a 'covenant', allegorically speaks of the revelation at Hagra (i.e. Sinai in Arabia), whereupon the angels of God mediate a covenant, the Law, to Moses (Gal 3.20). But as Hagar's 'covenant' is but temporarily established and does not alter God's predestined promise to make a covenant with Sarah's future and promised son, so too the giving of the Law at Sinai; it does not abrogate the covenant promises made beforehand to Abraham (Gal 3.17). 'Rejoice, thou barren one that bearest not!' Like Isaiah who encourages the exiled Jews in their current plight to recall the promises made to Abraham, so too Paul encourages the Galatians in their present plight to recall the promises made to Abraham and his seed, of which they are a part. The function of Paul's allegorical use of the Genesis narrative therefore is thus also in imitation of how Paul might have envisioned Isaiah using the same narrative.[61] It should additionally be noted that Paul's exegesis does not reverse the Genesis narrative, nor does it claim that the Jews are the sons of Hagar and the Gentiles the 'true' or 'spiritual' sons of Sarah.[62] More correctly, the narrative

60 At this point in the narrative, that Sarah will bear a son is totally absent; and indeed Abraham and Sarah are both presented as if the covenant has been fulfilled in Hagar's seed. Abraham assumes, and perhaps the reader unfamiliar with the story, that God here speaks of the 'covenant' made to Ishmael (Gen 16.11–12), and that Ishmael is the one (οὗτος).

61 Barrett's thesis ('The Allegory'), that Paul uses the Genesis narrative because his opponents had used the same narrative to advance their own position, has enjoyed quite the popularity among modern commentators. Yet it is still a hypothesis. I have suggested above a different reason behind Paul's use of the Genesis narrative, one which is furthermore completely of his own initiative: namely, in imitation of how he read Isaiah's use of the same narrative.

62 *Contra* Longenecker, *Galatians*, 215: 'Sarah is spiritual mother to Gentile Christians in Galatia'; T. Löfstedt, 'The Allegory of Hagar and Sarah: Gal 4.21–31', *Estudios bíblicos* 58 (2000) 475–94 (485): cf. 'Paul's point is that spiritually they [Jews] are descendants of Hagar' (491). Cf. Hansen, *Abraham*, 149. The equation 'speaking allegorically' = 'spiritually' is an Origenian hermeneutic; it is not from Paul. Origen asserted, the Christian exegetical tradition followed, and modern commentators persist, that what Paul was endorsing through such passages as Rom 7.14 (ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν), 1 Cor 2.13 (ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες) and above all 2 Cor 3.6 (τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτέννει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῳοποιεῖ) was an allegorical hermeneutic. Concerning the latter passage in its larger context, there are now present many good monographs and articles which have successfully demonstrated otherwise.

presents itself to Paul as an allegory of two covenants. Sarah is seen, through the aid of Isaiah, as an allegory of the Zionic covenant made to Abraham and his seed through a promise. Hagar is seen as an allegory of the covenant from Sinai, from which Abraham's flesh and blood offspring have been born. Paul thus sees Genesis 16–17 proclaiming allegorically, in the same manner that Isaiah prophesies, the fulfillment of the covenant promises made by God to Abraham and his seed.[63]

Paul's Use of Scripture (2): Genesis 21.10

The only citation we get from Genesis during Paul's whole exposition is 21.10: Ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας (Gal 4.30). What is Paul's purpose in citing this verse? Why Gen 21.10? The response from commentators have varied widely, anything and everything from claiming that Paul gives a direct broadside against all Jews in general,[64] to a command to expel the perverters from the Galatian community.[65] Together with the preceding verse (4.29) – ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτως καὶ νῦν – critiques have unanimously claimed that Paul is interpreting Scripture typologically inasmuch as Isaac's (ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα γεννθεὶς) persecution by Ishmael (ὁ κατὰ

---

63 Some commentators have stressed that there is but one covenant for Paul (Dunn, for example). This view certainly clashes with what Paul himself gives us: an allegory of two covenants. Yet this does not mean that Dunn is off the mark. Paul's emphasis is that the promise made to Abraham is *the* covenant, and not the pact made at Sinai. Curiously enough, this is the same theology we find in the Priestly redactors. D. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 1969) 161, concludes that the priestly editors distinguished two types of covenant: ברית ('covenant') in its strict sense is only used to designate God's promises made to Abraham (Gen 17.7), whereas עדת, literally a 'written pact' is used for the covenant at Sinai (Exod 25.22, etc.). I would furthermore propose that this Priestly hermeneutic, which also seems to be reflected in Isaiah's recalling of the covenant made to Abraham as the Zionic eschatological promise, might be a fruitful avenue to pursue with respect to the place of the Law and the Abrahamic covenant within the theological reflection of Paul. Again, his theology seems rooted in the Judaism of his milieu.

64 Burton, *Galatians*, 267; Betz, *Galatians*, 251. Cf. Légasse, *Galates*, 365.

65 Hansen, *Abraham*, 149; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 217; Malan, 'The Strategy', 436; Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 172; Löfstedt, 'The Allegory', 488; Geber, 'Ga 4,21–31', 175. This view, however, is in no way supported by the text, and, consistent with the imposition of a typological hermeneutical grid onto *our* interpretive process, actually distorts Paul's own exegetical, and thus theological, point. That the expression υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης comes to designate, for these commentators, the Judaizers in Galatia clearly goes against what Paul himself has written; the expression speaks allegorically of the sons of the Sinai covenant. Cf. Légasse, who makes the same observation: 'Ne voir ici [v. 4.30] qu'une expulsion des judaïsants de Galatie est certainement faux. Les Juifs qui persécutent les chrétiens (v. 29), les descendants d'Abraham *kata sarka*, sont ici indiscutablement visés' (*Galates*, 365 n. 1).

σάρκα γεννηθεὶς) – referencing the targumic tradition on מצחק – becomes the 'type' for the Galatians' own persecution at the hands of the troublemakers. However, there is simply no indication in the text that this is indeed what Paul intended; and again, I would argue that such claims reflect post-Pauline hermeneutical agendas. Rather, Paul seems to be setting up a temporal analogy by highlighting a then–now correspondence: as Scripture spoke τότε of the persecution of the one(s) born *kata pneuma* (i.e. ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἐλευθέρας) at the hands of the one(s) born *kata sarka* (i.e. ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης) so also it speaks allegorically of the same persecution νῦν. In other words, Paul's use of Scripture again reflects contemporaneous Jewish exegetical norms, wherein Scripture is read as disclosing current eschatological events. Our comprehension of Gen 21.10 must therefore follow from an understanding of the expression υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης both in its literal sense (τότε) and its eschatologized allegorical sense (νῦν).

With his slight modification of the Septuagint text, Paul's citation of Gen 21.10 echoes the initial terms of his allegory: ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης and ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἐλευθέρας (Gal 4.22). Only now in 4.30–31 these terms carry with them a double signification, which I believe Paul intends to be heard: '*Throw out the handmaid and her son; for, the son of the handmaid will not inherit with the son* of the freewoman'. Literally, we are to understand Gen 21.10 within its context, namely, that Sarah has just commanded Abraham to throw out Hagar and her son; for they shall not inherit with Sarah's son, Isaac.[66] Yet Paul clearly intends, above all, for the allegorical meaning to resonate through, which following from the preceding allegorical exposition can only be rendered as: 'Throw out the Sinai covenant and her sons(!); for the sons of the Sinai covenant/present day Jerusalem will not inherit with the sons of the Jerusalem above'. This seemingly shocking allegorical sense is unavoidable given the fact that Paul has already allegorically defined the term παιδίσκη as the covenant from Sinai (4.24–25), and consequently ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης as the son(s) of the Sinai covenant.

That the Sinai covenant/Law is to be cast out may seem startling at first, but the idea is not foreign to the rest of Paul's epistle to the Galatians, nor to the larger perspective of his allegory of Genesis 16–17. It will be recalled that as soon as God's covenant promise to Abraham and Sarah had been accomplished through the birth of Isaac, the position which Hagar and her son enjoyed as temporarily fulfilling the covenant by providing Sarah with offspring is rendered useless and she and her son are thus cast out. At several points, Paul's theology of the Law reflects, allegorically, this narrative: 'The Law was added until the seed which is evangelized came' (3.19). 'With the coming of faith, we are no longer under our pedagogue' (3.25). And 'Those who do the works of the Law, they will not inherit the

---

66 Contextually this is itself significant. Hagar, the wife of Abraham (Gen 16.3), and her son were indeed entitled to a share in Abraham's inheritance (see Fensham, 'The Son', 316).

kingdom of God' (5.21). 'The inheritance does not come through the Law' (3.18). The inheritance which Paul envisions here must be seen in light of the Zionic promises made to Abraham and his seed; in other words, it is the inheritance of the heavenly Jerusalem above which Paul is speaking about. This is furthermore to be contrasted with the inheritance which was promised through the Sinai covenant, namely, present day Jerusalem. In this context, we immediately see that what Paul denies the Law and thus the Sinai covenant is the ability to grant the inheritance of eternal life in the heavenly Jerusalem,[67] which only comes through the covenant promises which harken back to Abraham and Sarah.[68] The Sinai covenant is therefore to be cast out 'so that from faith we (all) are made righteous' (3.24).

Paul's exegetical claim, therefore, is that Scripture, in speaking of the events of then (τότε), discloses, allegorically, the events which are now (νῦν) currently being revealed. On a comparative level, we may conclude by noting that, as *pesher* exegesis applies prophetic texts to the current eschatological present, and as *haftarah* liturgical reading practices make use of prophetic texts to read Torah eschatologically, so too it would seem Paul's exegetical method reads Genesis 16–17 and 21.10 as speaking allegorically of what shall befall those living in the final generation, but not through historical 'types' – the apologetic of a later generation – but rather through the divine word. It is God who, in speaking of the events of then, discloses the mysteries of what shall befall those living in the final generation. Paul's use of the participle ἀλληγορούμενα emphasizes this very fact: 'these things are *spoken* allegorically'. It is precisely this 'this-for-that' rhetorical substitution as expressed through the verb ἀλληγορέω, together with Jewish exegetical practices which sought to eschatologize Torah passages by reading them through the lens of Prophetic passages, that best captures Paul's exegetical method here in Gal 4.21–31.

67 And perhaps rightly so. The Pentateuch of Moses (the Law given at Sinai) does not discuss, present, or even concern itself with salvation in the sense of an eternal afterlife. This is perhaps exactly what Paul might have meant in claiming that the Law has not the power to make alive (3.21); the inheritance (i.e. of eternal life) does not come through the Law (3.18). This eschatological soteriology is foreign to the Torah and only surfaces in the literature of the Second Temple period in an attempt to eschatologize the Torah – thus Paul's hermeneutic on Gen 16–17. This thesis, of course, deserves an entire monograph on its own, and cannot be treated here.

68 Again, recall Deutero-Isaiah's own appeal to the promises made to Abraham and his seed (51.1–3) in view of the eschatological fulfillment of the eternal city Zion.