

The Trinitarian Shape of πίστις: A Theological Exegesis of Galatians

DAVID W. CONGDON
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Abstract — This article is a theological contribution to the debate over the contested Pauline expression πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. I begin by assessing Karl Barth's christological conception of faith in his *Church Dogmatics*, focusing on the themes of history, obedience, and imitation. Except for a significant passage in *CD* 2/2, Barth consistently employs the objective genitive, but his christocentric pisteology enables it to do the same work accomplished by the subjective genitive argued for by Richard Hays. Barth, however, does not connect his trinitarian theology to the text of Galatians, and Hays does not give sufficient attention to the life of Christ or to the agency of the Spirit. In the bulk of the paper, therefore, I explore the missional-trinitarian shape of faith through a theological exegesis of Galatians in order to supplement the insights of Barth and Hays. I argue that Paul presents a missional narrative in which Father, Son, and Spirit are each involved in actualizing the faith of the community. We can thus speak of the faithfulness of the Father, the faith of the Son, and the faith-producing Holy Spirit. A trinitarian interpretation of Galatians is able to ground the distinction between the objective and subjective dimensions of faith in the mission of the triune God.

Key Words — *Galatians, faith, Trinity, missio dei, Karl Barth, Richard Hays, imitation, correspondence*

This article attempts to look afresh at the contested Pauline expression πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ by (1) briefly assessing the contribution of Karl Barth's mature theology to the longstanding debate and (2) exploring the trinitarian shape of faith through a theological interpretation of Galatians. By and large, the debate over the "faith of Jesus Christ" has been confined

Author's note: I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their very helpful comments. I also extend my gratitude to Shane Berg and Travis McMaken for their comments on an earlier draft of this essay. I am particularly indebted to Berg's guidance and encouragement for making this essay possible.



EISENBRAUNS

Offprint from:

Journal for Theological Interpretation 2.2 (2008)

© Copyright 2008 Eisenbrauns Inc. All rights reserved.

to NT exegetes. Although many have raised theological questions, few have consulted the wide array of theological literature in an attempt to move beyond the current exegetical impasse. Despite Richard Hays's attentiveness to theological concerns in his seminal work, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*,¹ a major lacuna in the debate is any serious engagement with theologians who have addressed these Pauline expressions *qua* theologians.² Barth's theology, in particular, contains many fruitful possibilities for future dialogue. Like Hays, Barth stresses a strong christological conception of faith, grounded in a thorough engagement with Pauline theology and a robust trinitarian theology. When exegeting Galatians, however,

1. Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002). In a follow-up essay (now an appendix) to this book, Hays presents a list of the theological questions that he thinks are at stake in the debate over how to interpret the contested Pauline expression πιστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: (1) the relation between christology and soteriology in Pauline theology, (2) the affirmation of Jesus' true humanity against modern docetic threats, (3) a theology of "individual religious experience" versus a "narrative account of salvation," (4) the cruciform character of Christian obedience in correspondence to the faith-obedience of Christ, and (5) the nature of God's righteousness as "covenant-faithfulness" (292–94). Each of these concerns is of fundamental importance. This paper seeks to offer some constructive remarks regarding the first and fourth concerns raised by Hays.

2. In addition to the works of Karl Barth, a significant omission from the literature is the 1961 essay by Hans Urs von Balthasar, "Fides Christi: An Essay on the Consciousness of Christ," in *Explorations in Theology*, vol. 2: *Spouse of the Word* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1991), 43–79. In this essay, Balthasar examines the "faith of Jesus" question from biblical, theological-historical, and eschatological perspectives. Among contemporary figures, he engages Rudolf Bultmann and Ernst Fuchs. Especially noteworthy is his discussion of how faith was viewed by the medieval scholastics. Balthasar concludes by arguing that the *fides Christi* is the incarnate form of the *fides Dei*; in Christ, "God's Covenant of fidelity became one with humanity," since he is "the ontic bond between God and world" (78). As a result, the faith of Jesus Christ *is* the faith of the church—both ontologically and eschatologically—prior to our own faith in Christ. Balthasar develops his understanding of faith in his 1967 essay, "The Faith of the Simple Ones," in *Explorations in Theology*, vol. 3: *Creator Spirit* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1993), 57–83. In this later essay, he augments his earlier argument by focusing on the obedience of Christ which "now discloses itself as the fundamental element of Christology" (p. 66). Human faith is "an act of permitting oneself to be inserted into" Christ's obedience (p. 70); it is a sharing in the "perfect obedience of Jesus" demonstrated in the "event of Christ's Cross and Resurrection" (p. 79). Balthasar takes up the issue again in 1978 in *Theo-Drama III: Dramatis Personae: Persons in Christ* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1992), 170–72. One of the great virtues of this later treatment is the fact that he discusses the faith of Jesus in the context of the triune mission of God. In addition to Balthasar, another theologian often overlooked is Gerhard Ebeling, who wrote about this topic in *Word and Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963), 201–46, 288–304. Hays quotes Ebeling briefly, but only to raise the theological question about how christology and soteriology relate. Ebeling's essay, "Jesus and Faith," however, is a sophisticated work that integrates textual, historical, and theological insights regarding the relation between the historical Jesus and faith. He argues that faith "as something that concerns the whole of existence" is "the decisive gift of Jesus" and finds its source in his "vicarious obedience" (pp. 238–39). He concludes with six theological theses about the nature of faith.

both Barth and Hays focus upon the relation between christology and soteriology without adequately addressing how these two *loci* relate to a trinitarian framework in the Pauline text.³

In the theological exegesis that forms the bulk of this paper, I build upon the contributions of Hays and Barth in order to construct an alternative account of faith. I argue that Galatians connects the christological (or objective) and anthropological (or subjective) dimensions of faith to a trinitarian account of divine faithfulness in the context of the *missio dei*, in which the faithfulness of the Father, the faith of the Son, and the faith-producing Holy Spirit actualize the being and life of the community in correspondence to humanity's redemption and adoption in Jesus Christ.⁴ With Barth, I attempt to articulate a thoroughly trinitarian theology, while doing so in relation to the text of Galatians. With Hays, I wish to avoid any notion that "Christians are saved by their own Herculean faithfulness," but instead of focusing solely on the fact that "we are saved by Jesus' faithfulness,"⁵ I propose that, in light of the Galatians text, we situate Christ's faithful obedience within the faithfulness of the triune God to the mission of redemption and adoption. A missional-trinitarian

3. At stake in this debate is the role of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father and the Son. In this paper, I argue that a missiological context is the most helpful in elucidating Paul's view of the Spirit in Galatians; I would suggest the same holds for Barth's trinitarian theology. I am unconvinced by those who accuse Barth of implicit binitarianism or at least of giving insufficient attention to the Spirit. See, most notably, Robert Jenson, "You Wonder Where the Spirit Went," *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1993): 296–304. For defenses of Barth's pneumatology, see George Hunsinger, "The Mediator of Communion," in *Disruptive Grace: Studies in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 148–85; and John Thompson, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick, 1991). Hays is much less satisfying on the Spirit, in that he consistently speaks of the Spirit as a "gift" but not as an active agent in the divine economy. The Spirit is an "object," rather than a "subject." I address this in more detail later.

4. I follow David Bosch (and others) in viewing the NT as a "missionary document," one in which the mission of God and the corresponding mission of the church must be taken into account. Bosch in particular devotes a substantial portion of his seminal work to Paul's apocalyptic gospel of mission, though his focus is primarily on the Jew-Gentile dilemma and not on the trinitarian *missio dei* in the Pauline text. See David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991), 15–55, 123–78.

5. Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 293. Hays equates the faith/faithfulness of Jesus with his death on the cross. He writes, "for Paul, πίστις Χριστοῦ refers to Jesus' obedience to death on the cross . . . not [to] the whole ministry of Jesus of Nazareth. This narrower punctiliar sense — focused on the cross — is the only meaning supported by Paul's usage" (p. 297 n. 58). This "narrower punctiliar sense" is far too limiting, and while it makes sense within the context of Galatians alone, there are grounds for arguing that Paul is not always so limited in his other epistles. In my own exegesis of Galatians below, I seek to find a place for Jesus' life within the life of the one who lives by Christ's faith (Gal 2:20). I thus argue for a strong sense of *participatio Christi* in Paul's understanding of faith, but one that embraces the entirety of Christ's history.

interpretation of faith in the letter to the Galatians most accurately captures the complex relation between the faith of Christ and the faith of the community.

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SHAPE OF ΠΙΣΤΙΣ IN
KARL BARTH'S *CHURCH DOGMATICS*

The Faith of Christ

Barth's understanding of faith changes significantly over the course of his *Church Dogmatics*.⁶ In *CD* 1/1, Barth is concerned with knowledge of God. Faith in this context is "the making possible of knowledge of God's Word that takes place in actual knowledge of it."⁷ The event of faith is the one reality that makes possible and constitutes the actual knowledge of God. Interestingly, at this early stage, Barth interprets the phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as a *genitivus mysticus*, emphasizing a spiritual union between the believer and Christ.⁸ Barth expands his conception of faith beyond the epistemological in *CD* 2/1, where he defines it as "the total positive relationship of man to the God who gives Himself to be known in His Word."⁹ Though Barth does not define faith in abstraction from the person of Jesus Christ, he still places faith on the subjective human plane. The event of Christ's *assumptio carnis* defines "the truth and life of human being,"¹⁰ while faith is "our relationship to this event."¹¹ Faith is the subjective correlate of the objective death and resurrection of Christ. Jesus Christ is the "object and foundation of faith," and thus faith is "in Jesus Christ."¹² In doctrinal terms, faith occurs within the anthropological-ecclesiological

6. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* (13 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956–75). Hereafter *CD*. When I make use of the German original (*Die kirchliche Dogmatik* [Zurich: TVZ, 1947–70]), I use the notation *KD*.

7. Barth, *CD* 1/1 (2nd ed.), 228.

8. Ibid. The "mystical genitive" was proposed by Adolf Deissmann in *Paulus: Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1911); ET: *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* (New York: Doran, 1926). Balthasar registers his agreement with this position: "we cannot simply interpret the genitive as an objective genitive. . . . Nor can we simply hold the view that it is a subjective genitive either, seeing it as the act of faith of Christ himself. Rather it is a third term towering over both. A. Deissmann . . . suggests that we speak here of a mystical genitive" (Balthasar, "Fides Christi," 57–58). Balthasar finds confirmation for this position in the fact that the medieval mystics understood faith in a more appropriate way than the scholastics. For more on Deissmann's position, see Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 3–4, 144.

9. Barth, *CD* 2/1, 12.

10. Ibid., 153; translation modified.

11. Ibid., 166.

12. Ibid., 156, 155.

realm in correspondence to the christological event that we participate in by the Spirit who realizes faith within the human person.

As Bruce McCormack has demonstrated,¹³ a decisive turn takes place in Barth's doctrine of election in *CD 2/2*—a turn made clear in his conception of faith. Barth's central thesis in this volume is that Jesus Christ is both elector and elected, both the subject and object of election. In this light, Barth develops a christological grounding of faith through an exegesis of Gal 2:19–20:

“I am crucified with Jesus Christ. I live, yet now not I, but rather Christ lives in me, for the life which I now live in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me” (Gal. 2:19f).¹⁴ The fact that I live in the faith of the Son of God, in my faith in Him, has its basis in the fact that He Himself, the Son of God, first believed for me, and so believed that all that remains for me to do is to let my eyes rest on Him, which really means to let my eyes follow Him. This following is my faith. But the great work of faith has already been done by the One whom I follow in my faith, even before I believe, even if I no longer believe, in such a way that He is always, as Heb. 12:2 puts it, the originator and completer (ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτής) of our faith, in such a way, therefore, that every beginning and fresh beginning of our faith has its only starting-point in Him, indeed, the only basis of its awakening.¹⁵

In the same way that Jesus Christ is both the subject and object of election, he is also now the subject and object of faith. Election and faith are conjoined in Christ: his election is “the promise of our election,” and his faith is “our

13. See Bruce L. McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development 1909–1936* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 455–63.

14. The German text reads: “*Ich bin mit Jesus Christus gekreuzigt. Ich lebe, aber nun nicht ich, sondern Christus lebt in mir. Denn was ich jetzt lebe im Fleisch, das lebe ich in dem Glauben des Sohnes Gottes, der mich geliebt hat und hat sich selbst für mich überliefert*” (*KD 2/2*, 620). The English translation of the *Church Dogmatics* uses the KJV for every biblical citation, which often obscures Barth's meaning. This is particularly problematic when examining the Pauline passages in which faith and Christ are related in such a way that either a subjective or objective genitive is grammatically possible. The KJV translates the ambiguous Pauline expression as a subjective genitive, while virtually every twentieth-century translation favors the objective genitive. Barth himself generally uses the objective genitive (*im Glauben an den Sohn Gottes*), but on a few occasions (as in this passage), he uses the subjective genitive; the only way to know for sure is to check the German. Here in *2/2* is one of the very few instances in which the German text and the KJV match, but I have chosen to translate the German myself for accuracy and readability.

15. Barth, *CD 2/2*, 559; translation modified. It is worth noting here that Barth alludes to the “awakening” of faith, which he will take up in more detail in *4/1* as the work of the Holy Spirit. In this passage, he makes it clear that the Spirit's awakening work has its “basis” in the faith of Jesus Christ.

summoning to faith.”¹⁶ Jesus Christ thus constitutes in himself both divine and human activity. In contrast to *CD* 1, faith in *CD* 2/2 and following is christologically determined. Barth now has a christocentric conception of πίστις. He has actualized faith by establishing it in the life of Jesus Christ, who “really accomplished both His own and our justification and glorification.”¹⁷ The “great work of faith” has been accomplished by Christ, and our own faith, consequently, is a following-after the faith of Christ. In Barth’s mature theology, therefore, pistology is first and foremost christology.

The History of Christ

In *CD* 4, we find “both a massive recapitulation and a thorough revision of Barth’s entire dogmatics,”¹⁸ and this is especially noticeable in the way he historicizes christology. Barth shifts his emphasis from the “life of Christ” to the “history of Christ.” Christ’s history is our history by virtue of humanity’s election in the person of Jesus Christ: “[God] does not allow His history to be His and ours ours, but causes them to take place as a common history.”¹⁹ For this reason, Barth says that to be human is “to be with Jesus.”²⁰ More importantly, Barth describes the history of Christ as a history of “humble obedience,” defined by the Son’s obedient mission into the far country. This is important for Barth’s pistology, because even though the subjective genitive (faith *of* Christ) that first appears in *CD* 2/2 gives way to a consistent emphasis on the objective genitive (faith *in* Christ), Barth maintains his grounding of faith in the person of Jesus Christ by redefining faith as “the humility of obedience.” In other words, the history of Christ’s obedience is the history of Christ’s faith²¹ which establishes the faithfulness of the human creature: “in spite of the unfaithfulness of every man He [Jesus Christ] creates in the history of every man the beginning of his new history, the history of a man who has become faithful to God.”²² Barth then describes human faith as an act of humble obedience that corresponds to the history of humble obedience in Jesus Christ.²³ Human faith thus corresponds to Christ’s faith. This

16. *Ibid.*, 106.

17. *Ibid.*, 558.

18. Eberhard Jüngel, *Karl Barth: A Theological Legacy* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 46.

19. Barth, *CD* 4/1, 7.

20. *Ibid.*, 145–46.

21. Barth even states that the Pauline expression ὑπακοή τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 10:5) must be read as both a subjective and objective genitive (*CD* 4/1, 194).

22. *Ibid.*, 21.

23. Cf. *ibid.*, 635: “when we call faith humility, the obedience of humility, we say the most positive possible thing. . . . For in this way it imitates Jesus Christ in whom it believes, it corresponds to Him.” See also Douglas Harink, *Paul among the Postliberals* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2003), 52–54.

historicizing of christology and piteology is significant because of the way Barth is able to use the objective genitive favored by the Reformers while still incorporating the material insights of the subjective genitive. He can say that “faith is in Jesus Christ” *and* that faith “is also the work of Jesus Christ who is its object.”²⁴

The Imitation of Christ

After the christocentric “turn” in 2/2 and the historicizing of faith in 4/1, Barth’s conception of human faith assumes the shape of *imitatio Christi*: “we have to say expressly that in faith in its character as justifying faith we do have to do with an *imitatio Christi*.”²⁵ Faith is the proper response to the faith of Christ; it is the necessary anthropological correlate to Jesus Christ’s life of faithful obedience *pro me*. Faith, we might say, is ethically noetic: it is noetic in that it *acknowledges* an ontic reality in Jesus

24. Barth, *CD* 4/1, 744. At times, this balancing of subjective and objective leads to some ambiguous interpretations of πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This is particularly evident in Barth’s extended small-print exegesis of Galatians at the end of his doctrine of justification in §61 (*CD* 4/1, 637–42). Barth refers to the Greek phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ three times in this section, twice with reference to Gal 2:16 and once with reference to Gal 3:22. The fact that he uses the Greek perhaps indicates his desire to retain the grammatical ambiguity and theological complexity of Paul’s phrase. In the first use, Barth identifies the πίστις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (2:16) as that to which Paul and the Galatians are awakened, over against “a justification ἐξ ἔργων νόμου” (p. 638). The second mention of this contested phrase, again with reference to Gal 2:16, is more directly an objective genitive: “it is the faith in which man knows and apprehends his justification, the justification which can be known and apprehended and realised only in this work” (p. 639). Faith here is a human work, not a divine or christological reality. The third and final mention directly follows the second, and this time Barth references Gal 3:22, which states: “But the scripture imprisoned all under sin, in order that the promise might be given through the faith of Jesus Christ (ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) to those who believe (τοῖς πιστεύουσιν).” In commenting on this verse, Barth makes a surprising interpretive move. Instead of speaking about the promise *through* πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, he speaks instead about “the promise of the [*die Verheißung der*] πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” (p. 640; emphasis added). He follows this by asserting that those who have received this promise are able “simply to believe [*einfach glauben*].” While not entirely clear, Barth seems to be avoiding the “ponderous redundancy” (Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 158) that an objective genitive forces upon the text by strongly distinguishing instead between the objective event of the πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and the subjective event of Christian belief—between the promise given and the promise received.

25. *Ibid.*, 634. The emphasis on imitation is especially apparent in Barth’s exegesis of Galatians in *CD* 4/1, 637–42 (cf. n. 25). His thesis in this section is that Jesus Christ is the foundation and center—the “formative norm”—of justification and faith (p. 637). In other words, for Barth, soteriology and piteology are equally grounded in christology. In this context, he states that faith is a following-after the Living One, an *imitatio* of humble obedience: “this faithfulness of the apostle [Paul]” is one “in which he follows the faithfulness of God” (p. 639). It is worth noting that Barth is more critical of *imitatio Christi* in his discussion of discipleship in *CD* 4/2 (§66.3).

Christ that goes before us—establishing our justification—and it is ethical in that it then *follows* this christological reality in humble obedience. Faith obediently follows the lived history of Christ which precedes the believer.²⁶ Subjective (or anthropological) faith thus corresponds to objective (or christological) faith. According to Barth, faith is a “concrete correspondence” to the living Christ, whose “great humility” impresses itself upon the “lesser humility” of the one who believes in him. Jesus Christ’s humble obedience becomes the “pattern” by which those “who believe in Him should follow.”²⁷

Barth’s Contribution to the πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate

The primary strength of Barth’s mature theology is his grounding of faith and justification—pisteology and soteriology—in the living Jesus Christ. Faith takes on a robust christological shape. While Barth affirms traditional Protestant categories, such as “faith in Christ,” “justifying faith,” and “justification by faith alone,” he has recast these categories, grounding them in the event of liberation accomplished in Jesus Christ. Hence, even though Barth prefers the traditional forensic imagery over cultic or apocalyptic metaphors, his conclusion is nearly identical to that of J. Louis Martyn: “the gospel is not about human movement into blessedness (religion); it is about God’s liberating invasion of the cosmos (theology).”²⁸ As a result of his christocentrism, Barth is able to speak of *imitatio* without falling into pietism or modern ethical Christianity. Here he has much in common with Hays, who argues that the subjective genitive is able to ground Pauline ethics christologically in a “pattern of correspondence between Jesus and the believing community.”²⁹

Barth goes beyond Hays in at least one important way: he is able to speak about the life of Jesus as determinative for Christian faith. Where Hays focuses solely on Jesus’ death, Barth focuses on Jesus’ entire history of humble obedience as constitutive not only for justification and faith, but for human history in its entirety. Barth and Hays both fall short, however, in connecting the christological interpretation of faith to a larger trinitarian framework in the Galatians text. Although Barth has a robust

26. Cf. *ibid.*, 742: “Faith is simply following, following its object. Faith is going a way which is marked out and prepared. Faith does not realise anything new. It does not invent anything. It simply finds that which is already there for the believer and also for the unbeliever. . . . The ‘object’ of faith, the objective *res* subjectivised in faith, is Jesus Christ.”

27. *Ibid.*, 636.

28. J. Louis Martyn, “The Apocalyptic Gospel in Galatians,” *Int* 54 (2000): 255.

29. Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 294.

trinitarian theology, his interpretation of Galatians follows the pattern of the Reformers by focusing solely on the relation between christology and soteriology. And in his discussion of pneumatology and faith (§63), Barth only references two verses from Galatians, neither playing any significant role. The advantage of articulating faith's trinitarian shape in Galatians is located in the way it connects the christological and the anthropological to a triune narrative of divine faithfulness. Accordingly, Christ's mission of redemptive faith and the church's mission of following faith both originate in the eternal *missio dei*—the former (Christ's mission) as the constitutive center and the latter (church's mission) as the necessary corollary of the divine mission of reconciliation.

THE TRINITARIAN SHAPE OF ΠΙΣΤΙΣ IN GALATIANS

Without simply repeating the exegesis of others, I wish to clarify the nature of faith in the text of Galatians by examining the mutual involvement of Father, Son, and Spirit in the missional shaping of faith. Following Barth, my procedure is christocentric in nature, because Jesus Christ is the “formative norm” of the triune mission *ad extra*. I argue that the trinitarian shape of faith in Galatians³⁰ confirms the christological insights of both Hays and Barth while at the same time providing a more robust account of divine agency that clarifies the relation between the christological and the anthropological.³¹ Furthermore, this theological interpretation of Galatians will demonstrate that Barth's mature trinitarian theology has a solid basis in the Pauline text.

30. For a detailed examination of the trinitarian formulae in Galatians, see Joseph Maleparampil, *The “Trinitarian” Formulae in St. Paul: An Exegetical Investigation into the Meaning and Function of Those Pauline Sayings Which Compositely Make Mention of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995), 117–43.

31. To be sure, Paul does not have a doctrine of the Trinity; he is often more binitarian than trinitarian. Even so, Paul's letters present the problem to which the later dogma of the Trinity provided the appropriate answer, an insight I owe to Bruce McCormack. Francis Watson's trinitarian reading of Paul is certainly interesting, but I find his argument that Paul has a being-in-act ontology to be a stretch, at best. Watson places this “equation of divine being and action” over against the interpretation of Dunn, but he builds this thesis on the basis of Hans Frei's “intention-action description” of personal identity, in which a person's narrativ identity is constituted by what that person does. While I share many of Watson's theological views, it is questionable whether one can attribute such an ontology to the Apostle Paul himself, especially when it is grounded in a narrative theory that is external to the biblical text. The present essay is an attempt to “theologize *with* Paul,” as Dunn himself puts it, rather than to reconstruct Paul's theology. See Francis Watson, “The Triune Divine Identity: Reflections on Pauline God-Language, in Disagreement with J. D. G. Dunn,” *JSNT* 80 (2000): 100 n. 2, 105–8; J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 24–25.

The Faith of Jesus Christ

For the purposes of this paper, I accept the argument of Hays and others that the subjective genitive is a faithful interpretation of the text.³² The goal of this section is not to defend one side in the exegetical debate but rather to throw fresh light on the text by examining it from a missional perspective. Against any “detheologization” of the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate,³³ I hope to broaden the scope of the dispute by offering a thoroughly theological reading of the Pauline text informed by Barth’s own trinitarian theology. My analysis in this section will examine the faith of Christ as (1) a missional faith, (2) an obedient faith, (3) a justifying faith, and (4) a living faith.

(1) *The faith of Jesus Christ is a missional faith.* Although the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ is the controlling center of christology, the narration of the christological drama within Galatians begins with the sending forth of the Son on a mission. The central text is Gal 4:4–5, where Paul writes, “But when the fullness of time came, God sent forth his Son (ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ), born of a woman, born under the law, in order that he might redeem (ἐξαγοράσῃ) those who were under the law, that we might receive adoption as children (υἱοθεσίαν).” According to this text, the trinitarian *missio dei* establishes the incarnate history of the Son as a divine mission for the redemption of enslaved humanity and their adoption into a newly constituted family of faith. The mission of the Son takes place in the fullest identification with sinful humanity.³⁴ In solidarity

32. This study focuses on the work of Hays because of its centrality to the debate over the “faith of Christ” and its theological sophistication. That said, Hays is building on the prior work of others worth mentioning, including Greer M. Taylor, “The Function of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ in Galatians,” *JBL* 85 (1966): 58–76; George Howard, “On the ‘Faith of Christ,’” *HTR* 60 (1967): 459–65; idem, “The Faith of Christ,” *ExpTim* 85 (1974): 212–15. Though my engagement with Barth focuses on his *Church Dogmatics*, many have noted the importance of Barth’s insight in his *Epistle to the Romans* that “faith is the faithfulness of God” (*The Epistle to the Romans* [London: Oxford University Press, 1933], 98).

33. R. Barry Matlock, “Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective,” *NovT* 42 (2000): 1–23.

34. In addition to the Gospel accounts, Gal 4:4 has been used traditionally to support the full humanity of Christ against the gnostic and docetic views of people like Valentinus, who said that the Son received nothing from Mary (cf. Barth, *CD* 1/2, 185–86). There is famously, of course, no hint of the virgin birth anywhere in Paul’s letters. Barth takes this verse a step further by arguing that the Son assumes a *fallen* human nature. Here the clause “born under the law” takes center stage, alongside other controversial statements by Paul in Rom 8:3; 2 Cor 5:21; and Phil 2:7. See, in particular, *CD* 2/1, 397: “Like all men He was born of a woman (Gal. 4:4). But what does it mean to take the place of man, to be Himself a man, to be born of a woman? It means for Him, too, God’s Son, God Himself, that He came under the Law (γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμου), i.e., that He stepped into the heart of the inevitable conflict between the faithfulness of God and the unfaithfulness of man. He took this conflict into

with humankind, the missional faith of Christ liberates from the law in order to actualize the being-in-faith of the missional community. The “faith of the Son of God” (Gal 2:20) is thus an apostolic faith: a faith that originates in the Father’s will to redeem and adopt, that is actualized in a concrete human history under the law, and whose *telos* is the redemption and adoption of sinful humanity for the sake of inaugurating a new creation and a new people of God.

Paul fleshes out this missional narrative in Gal 3:23–29, which begins by describing the coming of faith: πρὸ τοῦ δεῖ εἰλεῖν τὴν πίστιν (v. 23). That this faith is christological in nature is made doubly clear by its context. First, the faith mentioned in v. 23 is the very faith mentioned in the previous verse: the πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is promised to those who believe. Second, the coming of faith in v. 23 is parallel with the coming of Christ in v. 24: in the former, we are imprisoned under the law until the coming of faith; in the latter, we are under the instruction of the law until the coming of Christ.³⁵ The interrelatedness of faith and Christ in this narrative suggests that Paul would have us see the coming of faith as the coming of Christ—the *adventus fidei* as the *adventus dei*—such that faith is best understood christologically within the triune mission of redemption and adoption.³⁶ Faith takes the shape of Christ, and Christ likewise comes as the bearer of faith in the midst of our unfaithfulness, as the one faithful to the mission of God in our place and on our behalf.³⁷ As in Gal 4:5, the

His own being. He bore it in Himself to the bitter end. He took part in it from both sides. He endured it from both sides. . . . If He really entered into solidarity with us—and that is just what He did do—it meant necessarily that He took upon Himself, in likeness to us (ὁμοίωμα), the ‘flesh of sin’ (Rom 8:3). He shared in the status, constitution and situation of man in which man resists God and cannot stand before Him but must die.”

35. This parallel is reinforced by the relation between vv. 24 and 25, which both state that the law was our παιδαγωγός until something came—Christ in v. 24 and faith in v. 25. The parallel is maintained and deepened in vv. 25–26. In v. 25 the coming of faith is what liberates us from the instruction of the law, and in v. 26 our adoption as children of God is based on the fact that we are “in Christ Jesus.” In other words, the coming of faith (as the coming of Christ) is what both liberates us from our imprisonment under the law and effects our adoption as the children of God.

36. See Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 202–3. Ebeling makes this point explicitly: “According to Gal. 3:23, 25 the coming of Christ is the coming of faith” (*Word and Faith*, 204).

37. Although Hays, Dunn, and others focus on T. F. Torrance’s early exegetical article, “One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith” (*ExpTim* 68 [1957]: 111–14), it is worth examining Torrance’s more mature theology of Christ’s vicarious faith because of its similarity to Barth’s theology and the way it picks up on some of the themes in the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate. In particular, see *The Mediation of Christ* (rev. ed.; Colorado Springs: Helmers & Howard, 1992), 82: “We must think of Jesus as stepping into the relation between the faithfulness of God and the actual unfaithfulness of human beings, actualising the faithfulness of God and restoring the faithfulness [of] human beings by grounding it in the incarnate medium

telos of Christ's mission of faith in 3:26 is our adoption as "children of God through faith (υἱοὶ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς πίστεως)." Liberation from the παιδαγωγός and adoption as children are the two soteriological foci of the divine mission actualized in Jesus Christ as the faithful Son of God. Through this mission, God brings into being the apocalyptically new creation (Gal 6:15; 2 Cor 5:17), which is given concrete form as the new sociopolitical kingdom community in which all are one in Christ Jesus (Gal 3:28). As an eschatological reality constituted by the event of reconciliation, faith takes on the cruciform shape of Christ's mission that destroys social divisions and transcends political boundaries for the sake of a unified community of "heirs according to the promise" (Gal 3:29). The *adventus fidei* is therefore the eschatological *adventus regni*—the coming of God's reign.

The mission of God accomplished in the faithful self-giving of Christ is thus an *apocalyptic* mission. The missional narratives in Gal 3:23–29 and 4:4–5 are bracketed by Gal 1:4 and 6:15, in which Paul states that Jesus Christ liberates us from the "present evil age" (ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ) and for the "new creation" (καινὴ κτίσις).³⁸ The redemption and adoption of humanity are the twin christological "moments" within the larger apocalyptic *missio dei*. The triune mission of reconciliation accomplished in Jesus Christ is a divine event that definitively destroys the old age in order to usher in the new. Moreover, the self-giving of Christ is

of his own faithfulness so that it answers perfectly to the divine faithfulness. Thus Jesus steps into the actual situation where we are summoned to have faith in God, to believe and trust in him, and he acts in our place and in our stead from within the depths of our unfaithfulness and provides us freely with a faithfulness in which we may share." In spite of Torrance's christocentric theology, here we see an example of what differentiates Torrance and Barth. Whereas Torrance locates the faithfulness of Christ in "the incarnate medium" of Christ's human nature, Barth locates faith in the *history* of Christ. Torrance uses the language of "actualization," but for him the act follows the being, whereas for the later Barth, the act or history determines the being. According to Barth, the human person "does not first have a kind of nature in which he is then addressed by God. He does not have something different and earlier and more intrinsic, a deeper stratum or more original substance of being. . . . He is a being which is summoned by the Word of God and to that extent historical, grounded in the history inaugurated by the Word" (*CD* 3/2, 150). The history of the Word, Jesus Christ, *is* the history of humanity's faith—actualized in a particular, concrete event: "In the existence of Jesus Christ it is a matter of the *common* actualisation of divine and human essence" (*CD* 4/2, 115). Torrance helpfully emphasizes the vicarious nature of the Christ event, but his emphasis on humanity as an essence that is acted upon by the Word results in a quasi-Apollinarian theology rooted in a substantialist, rather than actualistic, ontology. For a helpful discussion of Barth's actualistic doctrine of faith in relation to Torrance, see Benjamin Myers, "From Faithfulness to Faith in the Theology of Karl Barth," in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical and Theological Studies* (ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle; Carlisle: Paternoster, forthcoming).

38. For a discussion of Paul's apocalyptic dualism in relation to Gal 1:4, see J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians* (AB 33a; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 97–99.

central to this apocalyptic mission. Galatians begins in 1:4 by stating that Christ “gave himself (δούς ἑαυτὸν) for our sins” in order to deliver us from the “evil age.” This foreshadows the central thesis in Gal 2:20 that the “faith of the Son of God” is defined by the fact that he “gave himself (παραδούς ἑαυτὸν) for me.” Christ’s self-donation is the event of faith that actualizes our liberation, redemption, and adoption. It is the apostolic and apocalyptic event of the new creation that fulfills “the will of God” (1:4) and establishes God’s reign.

(2) *The faith of Jesus Christ is an obedient faith.* Faith takes the form of Christ not only in his being sent on the divine mission, but also in his obedience to the mission. The close interrelation between faith and obedience in the christological form of faith is the *analogans* to which the anthropological form of faith is the *analogatum*; obedience is properly christological before it is anthropological, as Barth insists.³⁹ The relation between obedience and faith is only made explicit in Romans (Rom 1:5; 16:26), where Paul speaks of the ὑπακοή πίστεως which is being brought about among all the Gentiles.⁴⁰ In light of these verses, Bultmann argues that faith appropriate to the gospel of Jesus Christ naturally and necessarily takes the form of obedience.⁴¹ The definitive and constitutive form of this

39. Cf. Barth, *CD* 4/1, 770: “the substitutionary being and activity of Jesus Christ Himself (as the *analogans*) . . . mark[s] the beginning and end of the way on which the life of the Christian—the one who recognises Jesus Christ in faith—will become and be the *analogatum*, the parallel, the likeness—no more but no less—of His justifying being and activity.” Regarding the analogous use of πίστις by Paul, see Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 297.

40. Cf. Barth, *CD* 2/1, 37. After referencing Rom 1:5; 16:26; 2 Cor 10:5; and Acts 6:7, Barth then writes: “It certainly cannot be the intention of all these New Testament passages to replace or even to complete the concept of faith by that of obedience. . . . The only alternative is to understand faith as obedience. . . . In all the passages cited above it is a question of child-like, seeing and free obedience, and hence the obedience of faith.”

41. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; New York: Scribner’s, 1951–55), 1:314–17; Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 152. Bultmann notes the parallel between Rom 1:8 and 16:19, as well as the references to obedience in 10:3, 16. Bultmann, of course, would not support identifying *Christ’s obedience* as faith, since Bultmann defines faith anthropologically as the “the obedient submission to the God-determined way of salvation . . . in which the new self constitutes itself in place of the old” (1:316). Eberhard Jüngel criticizes Bultmann (and Karl Rahner) on this point for making faith a human deed in which a person decides about one’s own being. Although he affirms the importance of obedience, Jüngel then writes, “faith is not some sort of self-reconstruction of the new nature in the act of decision, by which the Self decides about itself. If you are dying of thirst and drink from a fresh spring you are doing something other than fulfilling obedience. . . . By responding with a heartfelt *Yes* to God’s effectual justifying judgement, we are affirming that a gracious decision has already been made concerning us and that the justified and thus new nature is already established by this effectual divine decision” (*Justification: The Heart of the Christian Faith* [London: T. & T. Clark, 2001], 240–41 [see pp. 239–41]). For an insightful counterargument, see Benjamin Myers, “Faith as Self-Understanding: Towards a Post-Barthian Appreciation of Rudolf Bultmann,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 10 (2008): 21–35.

obedience of faith is made manifest in the obedience of Jesus Christ. In Romans, Paul speaks of the πίστις Ἰησοῦ in 3:26 as the manifestation of the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (3:22) and as the source of divine justification. Then, in 5:18, Paul speaks of the ὑπακοή of Christ, the Second Adam, as the basis for δικαιοσύνη ζωῆς. Justification and righteousness are thus connected to the faith of Christ and the obedience of Christ, or rather to the faith of Christ *as* the obedience of Christ.

Although Paul does not use the term ὑπακοή in Galatians, the connection between faith and obedience in relation to Jesus can nevertheless be discerned in this letter. According to Paul, ἡ πίστις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (2:20) is demonstrated by the fact that Christ “loved me and gave himself for me” (ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ). In other words, the faith of the Son of God is made manifest in the historical act in which he gave himself up for humanity on the cross. That this is an act of obedience is clarified by Paul’s introduction to the letter, in which he states that Christ “gave himself for our sins” in accordance with “the will of God” (τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ; 1:4). As Paul writes in Philippians, the faith of Christ is an obedient faith in that he “became obedient (ὕψηκος) to the point of death—even death on a cross” (2:8, NRSV). Jesus obeyed the will of the Father in going to the cross. Because he “became a curse for us” (Gal 3:13), Christ redeemed humanity from the curse of the law in accordance with the mission of the Father to free humanity from τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου for the sake of our adoption as God’s children (4:3–4). On the basis of these passages, Paul shows that Christ’s faith takes the shape of obedience to the will of God—an obedience that involves giving himself up to death on the cross for a sinful and enslaved world as the concrete realization of divine love (2:20).

(3) *The faith of Jesus Christ is justifying faith.* The most important and straightforward statement by Paul on the relation between faith and justification comes in the “thesis” of Galatians in 2:16, where he opposes the notion of justification by or through the works of the law (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου; cf. 3:21; 2:21: ἐκ/διὰ νόμου) with justification by or through the faith of Christ (ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ/διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). In this statement, Paul directly connects justification to the faith of Christ; he denies the efficacy of ἔργα νόμου to bring about justification and instead declares that a person is justified through the faith of Christ.⁴² Justification is therefore actualized

42. Although an objective genitive translation is certainly possible on grammatical grounds, the subjective genitive makes sense of Paul’s distinction between the verb (πίστευω) and the noun (πίστις). The distinction is most evident in 2:16, in which Paul juxtaposes the fact that “we believed in Christ Jesus” (ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν) with the consequence that “we might be justified by the faith of Christ” (δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ). Those who argue for an objective genitive end up viewing the verb and the noun as saying the same thing in different ways, and so conclude, with Dunn, that Paul repeats himself “to

in the history of Jesus Christ, and not in the history of the individual human being who seeks to be righteous through faithfulness to the law.

James D. G. Dunn asserts that the parallel between the works of the law and faith in this passage—“*pistis* as the opposite of *erga nomou*”—actually favors interpreting faith as “something on the human side of the salvation process.”⁴³ But as Martyn has convincingly shown,⁴⁴ and as Barth would argue on theological grounds, the central conflict in Galatians is not between two human possibilities—between Two Ways, as in the *Didache*, for example—but between an old world and a new world, between a human way and divine way, between the “present evil age” and the “new creation” (1:4; 6:15). In other words, Dunn has failed to read 2:16 in light of 6:15, in which Paul declares: “For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything, but only a new creation (καινή κτίσις)!” By making faith a human work, Dunn’s argument essentially replaces the terms “circumcision” and “uncircumcision” with “works of the law” and “faith in Christ,” where Paul’s argument actually identifies “works of the law” with both circumcision and uncircumcision (as human works) and places the “faith of Christ” on the side of the new creation—the reality accomplished by God alone. Dunn’s view of justification is bourgeois where Paul’s is apocalyptic; that is, where Dunn sees a human possibility, Paul sees only a divine possibility. When we read the opening of Paul’s argument in light of its conclusion, we get a much clearer picture of what is at stake in his letter.

Moreover, the close parallel between Gal 2:16 and 3:24⁴⁵ mutually clarifies (1) the missional grounding of the law/faith distinction in the former passage and (2) the christological dimension of faith in the latter (through an implied πίστις Χριστοῦ). In 2:16, Paul speaks of justification coming through the “faith of Jesus Christ” over against the “works of the law”; in 3:24, he speaks of justification coming with the missional advent of Christ over against the law as our παιδαγωγός. Together, these two verses

reinforce the claim being made” (Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 269). It makes much more sense, however, to see in these verses a subtle distinction between the christological and anthropological forms of faith. The verb appears in three important verses: 2:16; 3:6; and 3:22 (not including 2:7, which is unrelated to the topic). Galatians 3:6 concerns the faith of Abraham, which prefigures that of Christ, while in 2:16 and 3:22 the verb is juxtaposed with the contested noun form. Like 2:16, 3:22 makes much more sense if we differentiate between Christ’s faith and human believing: “so that the promise might be given through the faith of Jesus Christ to those who believe.” Without such a distinction, one is left trying to explain the apparent redundancy of Paul’s statement by distinguishing between giving *through faith* and giving *to belief*. But such explanations are strained, at best.

43. J. D. G. Dunn, “Once More, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,” in Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 270.

44. See Martyn, *Galatians*, 325, 530–34; idem, “Apocalyptic Gospel,” 247–51.

45. Compare the two statements in Greek:

ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ (2:16)

ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν (3:24)

reciprocally reinforce the relation between the coming of Christ and the event of justifying faith, between Christ's mission and the liberation from the law. On the basis of 3:24, we can say that the coming of Christ—implying the whole narrative of Christ's life and death—is the actualization of our justification by faith. And on the basis of 2:16, we can say that this justification is accomplished by the faith of Jesus Christ in contradistinction to the law: his faith in the place of and on the behalf of our own faith in him. By connecting 2:16 and 3:24, we are able to see how justification is not dissociated from the christological mission of liberation and adoption. The law/faith distinction in 2:16 establishes the framework for justification, while the same distinction in 3:23–26 is the basis for humanity's redemption from the power of the law and adoption as children and heirs. When these two passages are read in isolation or in opposition, one ends up missing how justification and adoption are different aspects or “moments” of the same reconciling mission of Christ. Both of them find their grounding in faith: in 2:16, the faith of Jesus Christ that justifies; and in 3:24, the faith that came when Christ arrived to liberate and adopt us as children of God. Together, these verses reveal that the faith of Jesus Christ is not only justifying faith, but this justification is also intrinsically related to the liberating *missio dei* accomplished in the faithfulness of Christ.

(4) *The faith of Jesus Christ is a living faith.* My argument heretofore has sided closely with Hays's conclusions. What remains unclear in his position, however, is why he refuses to allow Paul to say anything more about the life of Christ than his death on the cross. To be sure, this is an understandable conclusion. In Galatians, as in his other letters, Paul is thoroughly focused on the Crucified One. He writes that he has been “crucified with Christ” (2:19), that Jesus Christ was “publicly portrayed among you as crucified” (3:1), that Christ became a curse for us by hanging on a tree (3:13), that he boasts only of the cross of Christ (6:14), and finally that he bears the “marks of Jesus” on his body (6:17). So while it is true that, in Galatians at least, Paul does not concern himself with the historical life of Jesus, it is not true that the life of Jesus finds no place in Paul's letter.⁴⁶

46. There are passages outside Galatians that could build a case for Paul's interest in the historical life of Jesus beyond the cross and resurrection. Romans 5:19, e.g., speaks of the obedience of Christ (cf. Phil 2:7–8). Hays thinks this verse refers only to Christ's obedience in going to the cross. Although this is certainly a well-supported interpretation, it should not rule out the possibility of referring to the obedience displayed throughout his earthly ministry. That said, passages like 2 Cor 5:16, Rom 14:8–9, and the connection between Rom 4:25 and 5:10 seem to indicate that, for Paul, the earthly life of Jesus has been replaced by or sublimated into his resurrected life, which includes his life in and through the community (Gal 2:20). This need not prevent the theological exegete from recapturing the importance of Jesus' earthly life, perhaps through a doctrine of the *totus Christus*.

The key verse again is Gal 2:20: “I no longer live, but Christ lives in me (ὁ ἴδιος θεὸς ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός). And now the life I live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.” Paul existentializes the life of Christ in his radical account of divine and human agency. In the event of new creation, the sinful human ego is dead and buried and the righteous ego of Christ, the new “I,” becomes the life of the one who believes in Christ.⁴⁷ Paul is quite clear: “I” no longer live—i.e., the old self bent on self-justification has been definitely killed—and instead Christ lives and reigns as the new self where I once did. Our new life is not only a life *in* Christ; it is, in fact, the life of Christ himself. Our life is outside of us (*extra nos*) in that it comes from without, but it is also within us (*in nobis*) in that Christ becomes our new human existence. And the latter depends upon the former: Christ is only our life if we are outside ourselves, i.e., dead to ourselves (cf. Gal 6:14).⁴⁸

Almost certainly, Hays himself would agree that Paul existentializes the life of Christ. In reference to Gal 2:20, Hays speaks of Christ as the “acting subject” of the one who lives by faith.⁴⁹ Hays, however, seems to bifurcate Christ’s existence into a past tense obedience of faith on the cross and a present tense life in and through the believing human person. The objective cross is “there and then,” while the subjective life is “here and now.” Barth’s own theology—and, I suggest, Paul’s—is more radical, in that the objective and subjective occur together, in the same Christ-event.⁵⁰ According to Paul in 2:19–20, “I have been crucified with Christ, and I no

47. Commenting on Gal 2:20, Hans Urs von Balthasar calls this the “unselving” of the human person: “Faith’s effect of ‘unselving’ us creates a ‘vacant space’ that is occupied by Christ” (*Theo-Drama V: The Last Act* [San Francisco: Ignatius, 1998], 334).

48. Eberhard Jüngel, *God as the Mystery of the World* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1983), 182–83: “Without a fundamental *extra nos* (‘outside ourselves’) faith knows of no *deus pro nobis* (‘God for us’) and certainly no *deus in nobis* (‘God in us’).” Cf. idem, *Justification*, 213: “the justifying Word remakes our human existence anew, by relating us to Jesus Christ and there bringing us to ourselves, outside ourselves. Thus this external reference is not something inferior or superficial, but a relationship which defines us in our inmost being.”

49. Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 154–55.

50. On this christological unity of the “here and now” and the “there and then,” see Barth, *CD* 2/1, 262: “[God’s revelation] is not, therefore, an event which has merely happened and is now a past fact of history. . . . But it is also an event happening in the present, here and now”; 3/2, 466–68: “the yesterday of Jesus is also to-day”; 4/1, 223: “[the divine judgment] took place in Him, in the one man, and therefore there and then, *illic et tunc*, and in significance *bic et nunc*, for us in our modern here and now”; 4/1, 291: “His being and activity in contemporaneity with us, and our being in contemporaneity with Him”; 4/2, 503: “He is the same there and then as He is here and now”; 4/3.1, 216–17: “He does not exist only primarily in His *illic et tunc*, but also secondarily with this man in His *bic et nunc*.” In *CD* 4, Barth speaks of Christ’s history and our history as primary and secondary history. In commenting on Paul, Barth writes: “while it is primarily the history of Jesus Christ, [it] is secondarily and as an irresistible consequence [Paul’s] own history, and the obvious history of all those who have discovered

longer live, but Christ lives in me.” The present-tense “I” of Paul is included within the past-tense crucifixion of Christ in the first half of this statement. The “here and now” is contained within the “there and then.” Then, in the second half, Paul reverses the direction by including the past-tense life of Christ within the present-tense life of Paul. The “there and then” is contained within the “here and now.” To say that Christ is the “acting subject” of this life is certainly correct, but it does not go far enough. If Paul’s death is identified with the death of Christ, there is no reason not to affirm that Paul’s life is identified with the life of Christ—the historical life in which Jesus testified to and actualized the kingdom of God. The concept of *participatio Christi*⁵¹ thus includes the whole ministry of Jesus as the eschatological realization of true humanity—i.e., as the event of justifying faith.

Hayes understandably limits Paul’s usage of πίστις Χριστοῦ to the cross of Christ,⁵² because this is Paul’s primary focus in the Galatians text. But

or will discover Jesus Christ, and themselves in Him. The life which he now lives in the flesh, as he tells us in Gal. 2:20, he lives ‘by faith in the Son of God [*im Glauben an den Sohn Gottes*], who loved me, and gave himself for me.’ The old has passed away in Him, and he is a new creature (2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15). ‘I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me’ (Gal. 2:20). These statements have a typical and not merely an individual significance. They are the necessary self-declaration of all Christians. To be a Christian is *per definitionem* to be ἐν Χριστῷ” (4/2, 277; translation modified). We might say that, in secondary history, the past history of Christ becomes an existential history in which we live with the Living One, thus “participating in His history as the history of the salvation of the world and our own salvation” (4/1, 320). While the resurrection is pivotal for both Barth and Paul as the bridge between Christ’s “there and then” and our “here and now,” in Galatians Paul places greater emphasis on the power of the Spirit as the existentializing force within the triune economy. For more on the contemporaneity of Christ in Barth’s theology, see R. Dale Dawson, *The Resurrection in Karl Barth* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 65–82.

51. Cf. Bruce McCormack, “Participation in God, Yes, Deification, No: Two Modern Answers to an Ancient Question,” in *Denkwürdiges Geheimnis: Festschrift für Eberhard Jüngel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Ingolf Ulrich Dalferth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 347–74. As McCormack shows, according to Barth, the *unio hypostatica* establishes the participation of the divine in the human and the human in the divine in such a way that “God is what God does—and humanity is what Jesus does” (p. 351). Moreover, God’s participation in humanity is active, while humanity’s participation in God is receptive—and both are actualized in the history of Jesus Christ. While this describes Barth’s theology, I would argue that Paul’s own theology in Galatians moves in this same participatory-actualistic direction. Galatians 2:19–20 describes a two-sided participation in which, on the one hand, God in Christ *actualizes* faith in the history of his loving self-donation and, on the other hand, humanity *receives* justification and new life through participation in this faith. Paul does not have a *doctrine* of the incarnation, but he clearly presupposes an ontological participation of the human in the divine, governed by the faithful obedience of Jesus which brings redemption from the law and adoption as God’s children.

52. See above, n. 5.

there remain important textual indications that our participation in Christ includes the entire scope of his incarnate existence. Paul, for example, connects faith with “life in the flesh” (2:20), a life of freedom (5:1), and works of love (5:6). In each of these, human faithfulness corresponds to Christ’s own faithfulness, in accordance with what Paul calls the “law of Christ” (6:2). Similarly, the negative dimension of “crucifying the flesh” (5:24) coincides with the positive dimension of “living by the Spirit” (5:25)—a life that corresponds to the Spirit-led life of Jesus himself. These passages reinforce the fact that Paul sees the life of the believers as a life grounded in and identified by the life of Jesus. While Paul views Christ’s life through the lens of the cross—so that his existence is defined in terms of a self-giving, self-emptying love—this should not lead us to assume that Paul is exclusively interested in the cross. We are better off saying that Christ’s life is itself cruciform, rather than dissociating his life from the cross. The cruciform justifying faith of Christ “there and then” thus includes our own justifying faith “here and now,” which is cruciform by way of participation in the humanity of Christ actualized *pro nobis*.

The life of the new human person is therefore a life lived “by the faith of the Son of God.” Since this faith is a *justifying* faith, we can say that the new human lives because of the justification accomplished in Christ—or, again, the new human lives because of Christ who is our justification.⁵³ At the same time, the faith of Christ is not only justifying faith; it is also a *living* faith defined by Christ’s loving self-donation throughout his incarnate history.⁵⁴ The faith of Christ has a specific form shaped by the fact that Christ “loved me and gave himself for me.” The self-donation of Christ is a missional act of obedience that analogically provides the shape for human existence. We see this connection in the relation between Gal 2:20 and 5:6. Just as, in the former passage, the faith of the Son of God is defined by love (τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με), so too in the latter passage the freedom of a Christian is marked by “faith working through love” (πίστις δι’ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη).⁵⁵ But this anthropological faith is not autonomous human action; imitation does not arise from the individual’s own resources. The one who lives “in Christ Jesus” is concerned not with circumcision or uncircumcision—that is, with human works—but rather with the love-shaped faith of Christ who now “lives in me.” Christian freedom is “faith

53. The latter is preferable because it stresses the primacy of the person. This is a point emphasized by T. F. Torrance: that we are saved not by the work of Christ, but by the person of Christ in his saving work. I owe this insight to George Hunsinger.

54. On the basis of Rom 5:18 (δικαίωσις ζωῆς) we might more accurately say that *because* it is justifying faith, the faith of Christ is also a living faith.

55. Cf. Hung-Sik Choi, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 5:5–6: Neglected Evidence for the Faithfulness of Christ,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 467–90.

working through love” because it is Christ who lives in me, and it is Christ’s faith that worked through love in order to bring about the death of the old self and resurrection of the new human person (cf. Rom 4:25).

The relation between Christ’s love-shaped faith and the believer’s love-shaped faith is reinforced by the textual parallel between Gal 5:6 and 6:15.⁵⁶ In the latter, Paul contrasts opposing human realities—circumcision and uncircumcision—with the apocalyptic reality of the new creation. The event of the new creation is the event of justification, which has its foundation in the faith of Christ (2:16). Thus, it is Christ’s faithfulness in loving us and giving himself up to death for us that accomplishes the *καὶνὴ κτίσις*. In 5:6, Paul makes an almost identical contrast, but in this case instead of “new creation,” he writes “faith working through love”—the love-shaped faith defined by Christ’s life of self-donation. By reading 5:6 in light of 6:15 and 2:20, therefore, we are given the basis for interpreting the faith of the Christian community as the faith of the Living One, Jesus Christ, living in and through the community so that the reality of the eschatologically new creation—the new humanity, the new “I”—makes its presence felt here and now.⁵⁷ We might paraphrase Gal 2:20, therefore, in the following way: I no longer live, but the new creation—i.e., the apocalyptic reality of faith—lives in me. Christ’s living faith constitutes and includes our faith, and via a moment-by-moment actualization in the Spirit, Jesus Christ encounters us and makes the new creation an existential reality.

The ramification of seeing Christ’s faith as the faith that animates and controls the life of the community is that the concept of *imitatio Christi* will need to be reexamined. The general thrust of imitation language is that one thing externally corresponds to another. But this fails to capture the sense of Gal 2:16–20, in which Paul argues for a radically new reality. Paul does not say that he now imitates Christ, but rather that he has died and Christ now lives in his place; Gal 2:20 is ostensibly not about correspondence but substitution.⁵⁸ And yet, in other passages, Paul is quite comfortable with the language of mimesis (1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; 1 Thess 1:6; Eph 5:1). So how is one to create a coherent picture out of these seemingly

56. Galatians 5:6: “For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love”; Gal 6:15: “For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything; but a new creation is everything!” (NRSV).

57. See Martyn, *Galatians*, 472–74. Martyn compares Gal 5:6; 6:15; and 1 Cor 7:19. He notes that in the two verses from Galatians, the “third member of the formula is a single entity”—faith and new creation. The point, according to Martyn, is that “at its base, daily life in God’s church is not many things, but rather one thing: faithful and dynamic love.”

58. Cf. Balthasar, *Theo-Drama V*, 334: “Being thus dead and risen to new life is not an external attribute of our self, however: death and resurrection *change* it.” Instead of “substitution,” Balthasar speaks more dramatically of the “abandonment of the self.”

competing passages? We will need a fully trinitarian framework in order to grasp how human faith relates to the faith of Christ. For now, we can at least see that for Paul it is not an either-or but a both-and. Substitution and imitation are both integral to his understanding of the relation between Christ and the community. When speaking of the faith of Christ, however, the stress must be on substitution. In the cross of Christ, we have been crucified to the world and the world to us (6:14); indeed, we have died. Paul does not water down the radical nature of our participation in the history of Christ, and neither should we.

The Faithfulness of the Father

After examining the christological shape of πίστις in Paul's letter to the Galatians, we need to look briefly at the role of the Father in the shaping of faith. Here, admittedly, we have little with which to work. Galatians is a thoroughly christocentric letter, and God the Father enters the picture at only a few points, but they are important for the purpose of linking the justifying faith of Christ with the faith-producing work of the Spirit. My argument here unfolds as follows: (1) the Father is faithful in raising Jesus Christ from the dead, (2) the Father is faithful in sending the Son into the world, and (3) the Father is faithful in sending the Spirit into the hearts of the newly adopted children of God.

(1) *The Father is faithful in raising Jesus Christ from the dead.* In order to speak of the Father's faithfulness, we must begin with the self-revelation of the triune God in Jesus Christ. The heart of this christological narrative is the death and resurrection of Christ: the death as the climax of Christ's own faithfulness and the resurrection as the manifestation of the Father's faithfulness. Paul himself only speaks of the "faithfulness of God" (πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ) in Rom 3:3, where he argues that God's faithfulness to the covenant cannot be nullified, even by our own unfaithfulness.⁵⁹ The letter to the Galatians, however, is not concerned with Israel as the covenant people; instead, Paul is concerned with the relation between christology and soteriology, with the former as the basis for the latter. The central event is the crucifixion, in which, by virtue of Christ's death, Paul himself is crucified and the new creation is established (2:19; 6:14–15). Within this christocentric drama, Paul narrates the primary action of the Father in the very first verse. He describes himself as an apostle "through Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." The Father's central

59. Barth uses this verse as a kind of hermeneutical key to the rest of Romans in his *Epistle to the Romans*. Even though this results in a mistranslation of the text—πίστις as the "faithfulness of God"—it is an inspired mistake, one that gets to the heart of Paul's theology, even if it departs from the text.

act of fidelity to Godself is in raising the Son from the dead. The faithfulness of God the Father is a subjective genitive; it is the faithfulness proper to God, but not a faithfulness enclosed in the divine being and distant from the world. On the contrary, the Father's faithfulness is precisely the faithfulness of God to the covenant of grace. God faithfully accomplishes the "verdict of the Father"⁶⁰ upon the faith of Christ by raising him from the dead. In this act, the Father pronounces the divine Yes upon Christ's self-offering and thus authorizes the history of Christ as the event of the new creation.

(2) *The Father is faithful in sending the Son into the world.* According to Gal 4:4-5, "When the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children." Looking backwards from the resurrection of the Son, we arrive eventually at the sending of the Son into the world. Behind the sending there is a sender; behind the faith of Christ there is a faithful Father who sends the Son on a mission of redemption and liberation and receives the Son back along with a family of the redeemed and liberated.⁶¹ The Father is the one who sends the Son on a mission that culminates in the Son's self-offering on the cross and the adoption of the ungodly as the children of God (cf. Rom 5:6). The Father is faithful in sending the Son on a mission of faith characterized by obedience, which the Father faithfully vindicates in the resurrection of the Son from the dead. Jesus Christ accomplishes his life of faithful obedience only as the one sent by the Father and raised by the Father. Apart from the faithfulness of the Father, Christ's faith would not be the justifying event of the new creation.

(3) *The Father is faithful in sending the Spirit into the hearts of the newly adopted children of God.* The Father not only sent the Son, but according to Gal 4:6, God the Father also "sent the Spirit of his Son (ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ) into our hearts, crying out, 'Abba! Father!'" The close parallel between vv. 4 and 6 is striking and serves to confirm the Father as the one who sends.⁶² The Father is the "source," so to speak, of both Son and Spirit,⁶³ who each fulfill different parts of the one mission

60. Barth, *CD* 4/1, 283, 333.

61. Cf. Maleparampil, "Trinitarian" *Formulae in St. Paul*, 117.

62. Compare the two statements in Greek:

ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (4:4)

ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (4:6)

63. Galatians offers an interesting way beyond the ecclesiastical impasse created by the *filioque*. The text affirms the East in clearly identifying the Father as the origin of the Spirit, but the text affirms the West in defining the Spirit wholly in relation to Christ and not as an independent agent.

of reconciliation: the Son accomplishing the justification and adoption of the ungodly (cf. Rom 5:6–11), and the Spirit confirming and preserving God’s adopted children in the freedom achieved for them in Christ (cf. Rom 8:14–17). The fidelity of the Father is thus made manifest in the trinitarian mission of divine faithfulness.

The Faith(fulness) of the Spirit

My account of the Spirit in Galatians seeks to ground the relation between Christ and the community in the fructifying work of the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ sent by the Father for the purpose of (1) confirming the missional faith of Christ and (2) producing the fruit of faith in the community as the existentialization of Christ’s objective history of redemption and adoption. The Spirit accomplishes this (3) as the operative agent within the new creation.

(1) *The faithfulness of the Spirit confirms the faith of Christ.* The faithfulness of the Spirit is the Spirit’s fidelity to the Father’s will. The Spirit is sent by the Father as the Spirit of Christ, as “the Spirit of the Son of God” (Gal 4:6). The Spirit is not sent on a second mission by the Father, nor is the Spirit necessary in order to complete what the Son began. On the contrary, there is one mission of reconciliation and adoption, and the Spirit is the Spirit of the living Jesus Christ who already accomplished that mission in his faithful obedience to the point of death on a cross. Consequently, the Spirit does not complete or augment the salvific faith of Christ; rather the Spirit subjectively confirms what was objectively fulfilled by Christ’s faith. The Spirit, we might say, is the existential realization of Christ’s historical actualization of adoption. The Spirit confirms the work of Christ by moving within the hearts of the adopted, awakening them anew each moment to the reality of the redemption accomplished by Jesus Christ.⁶⁴ By crying, “Abba! Father!” the Spirit existentially awakens the adoptee to her identity as the child and heir of God (4:7).⁶⁵ As Paul clarifies in Rom 8:15b–16, “When we cry, ‘Abba! Father!’ it is that very Spirit bearing

64. Here I am drawing upon Barth’s language for the work of the Spirit in relation to faith. Barth specifically calls the Holy Spirit the “awakening power” within the Christian community (CD 4/1, 740). Unfortunately, Barth speaks very little about the Spirit beyond this basic affirmation. That said, to Barth’s credit, his “understanding of faith is Trinitarian in shape. . . . The Trinitarian character of his theology is a working out of the concrete way in which God grasps us in Christ by the Spirit [*sic*] power. It is important that Barth treats faith as a powerful predicate of the Holy Spirit” (William Stacy Johnson, “The ‘Reality’ of Faith: Critical Remarks on Section 63 of *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*,” in *The Reality of Faith in Theology: Studies on Karl Barth Princeton-Kampen Consultation 2005* [ed. Bruce McCormack and Gerrit Neuen; Bern: Peter Lang, 2007], 212–13).

65. Cf. Barth, CD 4/1, 750–51.

witness with our spirit that we are children of God” (NRSV). The Abba-cry of the Spirit subjectively confirms—i.e., bears witness—that we have indeed been objectively adopted as children of God in Jesus Christ.

(2) *The faith of the Spirit produces the fruit of faith.* The faith of the Spirit is the fruit of faith that the Spirit brings about in the community of believers. According to Paul, the καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος is πίστις (Gal 5:22). On this basis, I argue, it makes sense to speak of the “faith of the Spirit.” To speak of the Spirit’s faith is not to inappropriately anthropomorphize the Spirit’s work, but rather to speak of the faith that the Spirit causes to flourish as the fruit of the Spirit’s presence in the community. The expression “faith of the Spirit” is thus neither a subjective nor objective genitive but a *genitivus auctoris*—the faith effected by the Spirit.⁶⁶

The fructifying Spirit of Christ is the awakening and empowering agent of the community’s existence-in-faith. In the faith of the Spirit, the Spirit of God existentializes and concretizes the objective reality of Jesus Christ’s mission of redemption and adoption. According to Barth, faith “consists in the subjectivization of an objective *res*,” in which this objective other—viz., Jesus Christ—remains “independent of and superior to” the human subject of this faith.⁶⁷ Concordantly, “faith does not realize anything new,” since faith does not realize a new object, nor does it even realize a new relation to that object; faith is simply “following its object,” an object that, as divine subject, has already established the irrevocable ontological relation to the human subject in the covenant of grace. Accordingly, in Galatians, the Spirit does not “realize anything new” but rather subjectivizes the objective reality of Jesus Christ. The Spirit existentializes the ontic reality of the new creation through the Spirit’s fructifying presence in the community. Our new being-in-faith is one in which “I no longer live, but Christ lives in me” (2:20), yet at the same time we “live by the Spirit” (5:25). By bringing these two Pauline statements together, we can say that the objective reality of Jesus Christ is our new life, but it is a life made possible through the moment-by-moment empowerment of the Spirit as the one who subjectivizes and concretizes the history of Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, as the one who existentializes the missional faith of Christ, the Spirit is also the fructifying agent of freedom. According to Gal 5:1, “for freedom Christ has set us free,” and hence the Spirit who

66. This, of course, is not to deny that the “genitive of authorship” applies also to the “faith of Christ.” Since the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, the faith effected by the Spirit is identified with the faith accomplished in Christ’s history of obedience. Both Hays and Martyn allow for the subjective and authorial genitives in interpreting πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 154; Martyn, *Galatians*, 251 n. 127.

67. Barth, *CD 4/1*, 742.

confirms Christ's mission is the agent of this liberated existence. The ontic reality of our freedom in Christ is existentialized by the Spirit of freedom. The Spirit is thus the existential realization of our liberation from the law (5:18) and for imitation (5:22–23). By the Spirit, we live lives of freedom, both freedom-from and freedom-for: from slavery and for obedience, from the law and for faith, from the flesh and for fruit, from *imitatio mundi* and for *imitatio Christi*. In the abstract, the fruit of imitation is a life of obedient freedom in correspondence to the obedient freedom actualized in the history of Christ. Concretely, this means the fruit of the Spirit as articulated in Gal 5:22. Because “there is no law” against the Spirit's fruit, the concrete form of existence defined by the Spirit is an existence-in-freedom: an existence which freely and joyfully follows the Lord, having been liberated from all condemnation (Rom 8:1–2). The fruit of the Spirit—i.e., the fruit effected by the Spirit (*genitivus auctoris*), including the fruit of faith—is the “concrete correspondence”⁶⁸ of human faith to the Living One, Jesus Christ. The fructifying agency of the Spirit thus effects the historical correspondence of faithful obedience between Christ and the community, between the Liberator and the liberated, between the One who loved in freedom by going to the cross and the ones who love in accordance with their freedom in Christ as “slaves of righteousness” (Rom 6:18)—who “fulfill the law of Christ” (Gal 6:2) by following Christ in humble obedience to the point of death (Phil 2:10). Faith, according to Galatians, as the faith of the Spirit of fruitful freedom, has a rich pneumatological shape.

Here, at the end, we can begin to answer the question that has motivated this entire theological-exegetical analysis of faith: What is the relation between the christological and the anthropological, between the faith of Christ and the faith of believers in Christ? In Gal 5:25, we read, “If we live by the Spirit, let us also follow by the Spirit (πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν).” While the protasis indicates that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ—the one who existentializes the life of Jesus Christ as our life in accordance with Gal 2:20—the apodosis indicates that the Spirit is the Spirit of *imitatio*—the one who concretizes the life of Jesus Christ as the divinely elected form or shape of our historical existence in correspondence to his history. To “live by the Spirit” is to have “Christ live in me,” while to “follow by the Spirit” is to follow the faith of Christ through works of love in the freedom of the Spirit's fruit. Substitution and imitation are, therefore, both dependent upon the Spirit as their agent: in terms of substitution, as the one by whom “Christ lives in me”; in terms of imitation, as the one by whom we follow Christ in humble obedience. The anthropological dimension of existence-in-faith—in which substitution and imitation are both constitutive elements—is thus pneumatically driven.

68. Ibid., 636.

To conclude, we live “by the Spirit,” but we live “in Christ.” The life of faith is empowered by the Spirit, but since the Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus Christ, the faith actualized by the Spirit in each new moment retains the shape of Christ’s own faith. As a result, human beings are conformed to Christ through the agency of the Spirit. Human faith mirrors and corresponds to Christ’s faith. His faith is missional, so we too are sent by the Father as apostolic witnesses to God’s reconciliation of the world; his faith is obedient, so we too are called to a life of humble obedience in response to God’s command; his faith is justifying, so we must discover ourselves as those liberated and adopted by God’s justifying word of grace; his faith is living, so we must live cruciform lives of loving self-donation under the aegis of God’s eternal reign. All of this becomes an existential reality by the concretizing power of the Holy Spirit, who brings about the fruit of faith in the lives of those who follow Christ as participants in the new creation. Faith in Galatians is therefore not simply christological or pneumatological in shape, but rather fully trinitarian—grounded in the sending of the Father, the obedient history of the Son, and the fructifying power of the Spirit.

(3) *The Spirit is the operative agent within the new creation.* I conclude this exposition of the role of the Spirit in the triune mission of redemption and adoption by arguing that the Spirit is the operative agent within the new creation. The Spirit subjectivizes the objective reality of the new creation established in Jesus Christ. The Spirit is thus the power of the new life actualized in Christ’s mission of reconciliation and communally embodied in those whom the Father adopts as children by grace. In other words, as Martyn states, the Spirit is “the church-creating Spirit of Christ,” the “supra-human actor” within the new creation who shapes and guides the apocalyptic community in faithful obedience to the “law of Christ.”⁶⁹ According to Paul, the “cravings” (ἐπιθυμίας) and “works” (ἔργα) of the flesh (5:16, 19, respectively) are opposed to the Spirit, and thus incompatible with the βασιλεία θεοῦ (5:21). By contrast, the Spirit brings about the fruit of the kingdom that corresponds to the fact that we have been “crucified with Christ” (2:20; cf. 5:24). To live in the Spirit is not only to live in conformity to Christ; it is also to live as heirs of the βασιλεία θεοῦ (4:7; 5:21) and as adopted υἱοὶ θεοῦ (3:26; 4:5). Finally, in light of Christ’s faithful actualization of the new creation, the Spirit existentializes the new creation within the community of those who, by the power of the Spirit, obediently follow Christ with their own faith in anticipation of the *parousia* when the new creation will be manifest for all. The Spirit is thus the fructifying agent of hope within the cruciform reality of God’s reign.

69. Martyn, *Galatians*, 392.

The twofold intent behind this theological exposition of the Spirit's role in shaping faith in Galatians has been (1) to connect a pneumatology informed by Barth's trinitarian theology to the Galatian text, and (2) to adjust the exegesis of Hays in order to give a fuller account of the Spirit's work. Although Barth's theology is thoroughly trinitarian, he does not seem to recognize the possibilities for trinitarian reflection in his interpretation of Galatians. This is evidenced by the fact that Barth places his only extended exegesis of Galatians in *Church Dogmatics* at the end of his treatment of the doctrine of justification.⁷⁰ The role of the Spirit is an important aspect that is often overlooked in this particular letter, and, although Barth offers a rigorously christocentric conception of faith, it is my conviction that a more self-consciously trinitarian approach to the Pauline text significantly helps in articulating the relation between the faithful obedience of Christ and the faithful obedience of the Christian community.

Hays's account of the Spirit is more problematic. Hays argues in his dissertation that there is a "narrative substructure" in Galatians, which he elucidates in order to clarify the various agents, aids, objects, and subjects involved. The advantages of this approach are numerous, but there is one major disadvantage in that it leads Hays to reduce the Spirit to an object rather than recognize the Spirit as an active subject. Although his focus is only on Gal 3:1–4:11, Hays does nothing to indicate that this portrayal of the Spirit is incomplete on its own. He writes that the purpose of Christ's work was "to enable us . . . to obtain the Spirit for ourselves."⁷¹ And again, "Spirit, promise, blessing, life, righteousness: all these seem to function as virtually interchangeable terms for the benefits of salvation."⁷² The Spirit becomes a benefit of salvation and an object for possession. Hays thus ends up overlooking the active role of the Spirit in 4:6, in which the Spirit is both the one passively sent into our hearts by the Father and the one who actively cries out, "Abba, Father"; and in 5:25, where the Spirit is the guiding agent within the community of faith. Although Hays correctly observes that the Spirit is a *gift* of God,⁷³ he does not identify the Spirit as the *gifting* God.⁷⁴

70. Barth, *CD* 4/1, 637–42.

71. Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 100.

72. *Ibid.*, 115.

73. Cf. *ibid.*, 181–83.

74. Barth captures this nicely in *CD* 4/2, 359: "[The Spirit of Jesus] awakens true knowledge and faith and confession because, proceeding from the man Jesus exalted at the right hand of God, poured out and given, He is not merely the gift of the Father and the Son and therefore of God, but is Himself God with the Father and the Son, and therefore the Giver and source of truth, *Creator Spiritus*."

CONCLUSION

My proposal is that, while a christological account of faith, as articulated theologically by Barth and exegetically by Hays, is an essential element in the scriptural witness to the nature of faith, it is incomplete on its own and needs to be incorporated into a trinitarian account of faith. I have sought to address this oversight by attending to the missional character of Paul's text in relation to each of the divine persons—Father, Son, and Spirit—in an attempt to more carefully ground the relation between the person and work of Christ and the being and life of the community. Although it would be going too far to say that Paul has a doctrine of the Trinity, it is nevertheless the case that his exposition of the gospel reveals an intricate trinitarian framework, in which Father, Son, and Spirit are each involved in the one divine mission of reconciliation for the sake of redeeming humanity enslaved under the law, adopting them as children of God, and actualizing a new creation of freedom within which we are gifted by the Spirit to bear fruit as the community of humble obedience.