πίστις Χριστοῦ issue also are included as appendices. In the original work, Hays analyzes Gal. 3:1-4:11, combining structural methods and exegetical procedures to elucidate how the narrative of Jesus the Messiah sustains Paul’s thought. The book is divided into six chapters, starting with a historical overview of narrative interpretations of Paul (Chs. I-II) before offering a structural analysis of several kerygmatic formulations in Gal. 3:1-4:11 (Ch. III). Next, the book turns to exegetical methods to confirm the results of the structural analysis (Chs. IV-V). It concludes with a discussion on the book’s implications for the broader field of Pauline interpretation (Ch. VI).

The “Introduction to the Second Edition” admits that there have been many changes in Pauline scholarship since the book’s original publication and thus it offers three suggestions on how to interpret the book in light of some of these changes. First, the main thesis of the book is discovering the narrative roots of Paul’s thought. The methods used in discovering the roots are secondary to the message found in the text itself. Second, participation in Christ is fundamental to Paul’s soteriology. Hays writes, “In a mysterious way, Jesus has enacted our destiny, and those who are in Christ are shaped by the pattern of his self-giving death. He is the prototype of redeemed humanity” (xxix). The importance of the πίστις Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ is the role it plays in
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explaining the participatory nature of Paul’s gospel. Third, the book assumes certain characteristics about Paul ministry and it makes more sense if the reader perceives of Paul as a preacher engaged with an audience that knows Paul and his gospel well. Thus, Paul does not need to retell the gospel from scratch, but can draw on a narrative framework he shares with his readers. The task of this work, then, is to locate the allusions and trace their connection to the narrative framework shared by Paul and the Galatians.¹

In the first chapter, Hays identifies three approaches commonly employed in Pauline scholarship to uncover the core of Paul’s thought: the quest for a systematic doctrinal crux [e.g. Schweitzer and Käsemann]; Paul’s doctrine as an extension of his mystical experiences [e.g. Deissmann and Bousset]; and interpreting Paul within existential categories [e.g. Bultmann]. Hays, however, find these different approaches deficient² and proposes, “The framework of Paul’s thought is constituted neither by a system of doctrine nor by his personal religious experience but by a ‘sacred story,’ a narrative substructure” (6). For Hays, the core of Paul’s thought was the story of Jesus Christ and this particular story “provides the foundational substructure” (7) upon which Paul’s occasional writings and particular arguments build. Thus, the story of Jesus is the driving force of Paul’s discourse – “the constant elements” (6) of Paul’s gospel – and “he deals with the ‘variable elements’ of the concrete situation (for instance, the challenge of his opponents in Galatia) by interpreting them within the framework of his ‘sacred story’” (6). The underlying story, however, is not simply retold in the discourse but is manifested through fragmentary allusions. Thus, one must identify these allusive phrases and the story they are recapitulating for

¹ The footnotes of this review contain a number of other clarifications Hays offers in the introduction.
² Hays considers Bultmann to be “the great adversary whose shadow looms over” (xxv) the book and Hays identifies two fatal flaws in Bultmann’s reading of Paul. First, he longed to “de-narrativize” Paul and he comprehended Paul’s gospel as a message essentially concerned with human decision or self-understanding (xxvi, 47-52).
the discourse to become intelligible. In Ch. III-V, Hays tests this thesis through a meticulous examination of Gal. 3:1-4:11.

Before Hays offers his own analysis of the narrative elements of Paul, Chapter II reviews and critiques, the contributions made by scholarship to the venture of detecting the narrative nature of Paul’s gospel. Hays briefly appraises Bousset, Schweitzer, Cullman, Käsemann, Dodd, and Via, as a representative cross-section of how New Testament scholars have dealt with narrative elements in Paul. He positions the mentioned scholars across a spectrum ranging from minimizing the narrative elements [Bousset, Schweitzer, Bultmann], to ambivalence towards narrative elements [Käsemann], to being convinced narrative elements are crucial to understanding Paul [Cullman, Dodd, Via] (70). Hays obviously aligns his work with the latter group, but not without accentuating the differences between their work and his. Nevertheless, he uses them as the foundation upon which his contribution builds.

In Chapter III, Hays analyzes Gal. 3:13-14 and 4:3-6, two passages intimately but strangely related in order to discern in them a narrative structure. He chose these passages not only because of their peculiar relationship, but also because they contain Christological formulations that seem to be reasonably fixed units of tradition that the Galatians would have known already and accepted as authoritative (73). Hays contends that these Christological formulations are central and Paul introduces them precisely because they are recognizable and authoritative. In addition, “in spite of their differences, [they] share a common narrative structure and they illuminate the center of Paul’s gospel story” (74).

---

3 Hays acknowledges the debate surrounding the origin of these formulations, but states that his analysis does not depend on substantiating any particular claim about their origin (73-74).
A rudimentary model based on A.J. Greimas’ theoretical research on narrative structures is adopted to describe the constitution of Paul’s gospel as presented in Gal. 3:13-14 and 4:3-6.\(^4\)

Briefly outlined, all stories have a “narrative grammar” that allows one to discover the relation of syntactical units in narrative texts. In Greimas’ structure, stories contain three sequences which each contain a scheme of “actanial roles.” The three sequences – the initial sequence, the topical sequence, and the final sequence – form a narrative’s plot line. The initial and final sequences relate in a specific way because the final sequence is the fulfillment of an aborted initial sequence. The topical sequence is the portion of the plotline in which the subject of the story executes the tasks of the initial sequence, often through the introduction of a helper that enables the subject to be successful (82-90). The actanial roles in a story define the network of relationships between all the participants in a particular sequence. According to this theory, any narrative sequence presumes or exhibits six actanial roles: 1) the Sender who gives a task or mandate; 2) the Subject who receives the task; 3) the Object is that which the Sender wants the subject to communicate; 4) the Receiver is the figure for whom the Object is meant; 5) the Opponent is the figure or force who desires to prevent the Subject from carrying out the task; and 6) the Helper is the figure or force that aids the Subject in carrying out the task (90-93).

The figure below is a diagram representing the relationship of the actanial roles.

\[\text{Sender} \rightarrow \text{Object} \rightarrow \text{Receiver} \]
\[\downarrow\]
\[\text{Helper} \rightarrow \text{Subject} \rightleftharpoons \text{Opponent}\]

\(^4\) Hays admits that he used structural methods reluctantly in his dissertation. He writes, “Candidly, I thought even then that structuralism offered a singularly mechanistic and barren approach to reading texts, but Professor Boers strongly encouraged his graduate students to work with these methods” (xxvii). Even though he found the model more useful than he had imagined, he writes, “Since departing from Emory I have not used structuralist methods in my subsequent exegetical work, nor do I expect that I shall do so in the future” (xxvii).
Applying Greimas’ scheme to the Christological formulations in Gal. 3:13-14 and 4:3-6, both narratives are accounts of a topical sequence. God is manifested as the Sender and Christ fills the role of the Subject whose actions enable God to communicate the Object [freedom, adoption, blessing of Abraham, and Spirit] to the Receiver [Jews and Gentiles]. The law, and its curse, function as the Opponent. In Gal. 4:3-6, there is no Helper mentioned in Paul’s narrative, but Gal. 3:14 provides the Helper in the phrase διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Hays writes, “Christ’s mission of delivering freedom, blessing, and the Spirit to humanity is achieved through the aid of πίστεος; thus, πίστεος fills the role of Helper” (105). The figures below diagram the narrative structure of Gal. 4:3-6 and Gal. 3:13-14 according to Greimas’ schema.

**Gal. 3:13-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Those under the law (Jews)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blessing of Abraham</td>
<td>Us (Gentiles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πίστεος</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curse of the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gal. 4:3-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Those under the law (Jews)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>Us (Gentiles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law, τὰ στοιχεῖα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The narrative analysis of these two passages reveals, according to Hays, that the two Christological formulations do fit within a single narrative of Jesus the Messiah; “they are united, at the level of Paul’s usage of them, in a single story-structure” (111). Additionally, a narrative analysis of Gal. 3:21-22 reiterates the point that πίστεος is the power that enables Christ to carry out his mandate. This passage also incorporates the theological language of δικαιοσύνη providing “important clues about the relation of the gospel story-structure to Paul’s theological
language about “justification” (116). Namely, the “salvation-creating power” (115) is associated with πίστις, not with δικαιοσύνη. Thus, a closer examination of the meaning of πίστις in the narrative structure of Galatians is required.

Galatians, since the time of Luther, has been the proof-text for those arguing that believers are saved by faith in Jesus Christ. In this argument, faith is the activity of an individual by which one secures acceptance before God. The narrative readings of Gal. 3:13-14 and 4:3-6, however, make this reading problematic because the texts do not seem to speak of πίστις as a human activity or a gift given by God to humanity. Rather, πίστις is the power or quality, which enables Christ to fulfill the tasks given to him by God. Thus Chapter IV examines Gal. 3:2, 3:11 and 3:22 to ascertain what πίστις means and how it functions in the narrative. The bulk of the chapter consists of translating πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Galatians 3:22. But, before moving to this discussion Hays examines the meaning of ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως in Gal. 3:2 and Paul’s citation of Hab 2:4 in Gal. 3:11. He argues that ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως in Gal. 3:2 is not referring to the human activity of hearing with faith, but is best understood as the divine activity of proclamation of faith. Correspondingly, in 3:11 the quotation of Hab. 2:4 [ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται] does not depict how the righteous acquire life, but how the righteous one shall live by faith. Hays writes, “Thus all are justified through his faith” (141 – italics in text). From this perspective, the recurring allusions to Hab. 2:4 in Gal. 3 reference primarily the faith of Christ and not to the individual’s justifying faith in Christ.

---

5 The translation of πίστις Χριστοῦ, much to Hays disdain, has been the sole focus of many scholarly responses to the book. Hays, however, considers this problem of translation as only playing “a subsidiary role in the larger argument” (xxiv) of defining the narrative elements sustaining Paul’s thought.

6 It should be noted, as it is often neglected, Hays does not deny that Paul speaks of Jesus Christ as the object of faith. “The question is whether this observation determines the meaning of Paul’s expression πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ so that it must be read as equivalent to πίστις εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν” (123)?
In the final section of Chapter IV Hays enters the debate over the genitive construction of πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Gal. 3:22. He examines the phrase from three perspectives: the grammatical issues; the theological issues; and the phrase in other relevant texts. He asserts that even though it is impossible to resolve the issue on strictly grammatical terms, the balance of the evidence favors the subjective reading [faith/fullness of Jesus Christ]. Nevertheless, the objective reading [faith in Jesus Christ] has won widespread acceptance and should be revaluated. Hays theologically examines Paul’s use of Abraham [Gal. 3:6] as an example of having faith, even though his faith was not directed towards Jesus Christ. Thus, the doctrine of justification by faith lacks an integral connection with Christology. Hays writes, “If we are justified by believing in Jesus Christ, in what sense is Abraham’s theocentric faith a precedent of ours, or in what sense is our christocentric faith analogous to his? If Abraham could be justified by trusting in God, why should we need to believe in Christ to be justified” (150-1 – italics in text)? Hays maintains that the passage, and in fact the entire discussion of justification makes better sense when read as a representative Christology. In other words, like Abraham Jesus Christ is justified ἐκ πίστεως and consequently we are justified in him through his faith. Translating the phrase subjectively places Paul in line with other New Testament writers [e.g. Hebrews], and as Hays will argue in Chapter V, presents a more coherent understanding of Paul’s argumentation in Galatians. Finally, Hays evaluates Gal. 2:20b and Rom. 3:21-26 and shows how the subjective reading fits within these texts. In the case of Romans 3, which Hays considers “more hospitable territory than Galatians” (156), the subjective reading produces a more cohesive argument. Hays writes, “The faith(fulness) of Jesus was manifested in his death on the cross, which, as a representative action of human faith, brought about redemption and which at the same time manifested the
faithfulness of God” (161). The examination of the translation of πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Gal. 3 has substantiated the findings of his structuralist methods of the previous chapter: πίστις is the Helper of Jesus Christ in fulfilling the tasks given to Him by God.

Chapter V demonstrates how the narrative substructure outlined in Chapter III and the function of πίστις expressed in Chapter IV relate to the overall logic of Gal. 3:1-4:11. The logic of the argument in Galatians 3-4 is very difficult to unpack. For example, many struggle to understand the seemingly different soteriologies present in 3:6-9, 3:10-14, and 3:16-29. Nonetheless, Hays finds the point of coherence for the argument in 3:1-4:11 “in the story of the Messiah who lives by faith” (207). According to Hays, Paul grounds his reflections on the Law, Abraham, promise, inheritance, and adoption in the gospel story. Thus, Hays can summarize the two main points of the logic in this passage. First, Jesus Christ performed the obedience of faith and Christians are justified by participation in him. Second, Abraham is a “typological foreshadowing of Christ himself, a representative figure whose faithfulness secures blessing and salvation vicariously for others” (166). Paul’s argument is shaped and authorized by this gospel story and Christians join this narrative through participation in him and thus “the Christian’s life is a reenactment of the pattern of faithfulness revealed in Jesus” (203).

Hays’ work concludes by drawing several implications of this study for the broader field of Pauline scholarship. The first relates to Paul’s soteriology and suggests that the faithfulness of Jesus Christ is central for Paul. Christ’s faithfulness, not a faith in Christ, is the precondition for salvation, and faith in Christ is the response to what Christ has already given (211). Faith in Christ is the Christian’s mode of participation, which leads to a second implication: Paul’s
gospel is ethical because it is grounded in the story of the Messiah. It conceives a new world in which Christ’s story steers the story of Christians as Christ’s faithfulness creates the mandate given to Christians. Returning to Greimas’ three sequences in a story, Hays asserts that Christians become agents [the Subject] in the final sequence of the story, enacting the work done by Christ in the topical sequence. In other words, participation in Christ means participation in Christ’s mode of existence – giving himself up, becoming a curse, and taking the form of the servant (222-223). Hays also asserts that this reading situates Paul within the historical “theological trajectory that extends from the Philippians hymn through Hebrews and on into those patristic interpretations, particularly in Irenaeus and the Eastern Fathers, which portray the atonement as a great drama in which Jesus Christ triumphs over the powers of Sin and Death in order to give life to humanity” (217). Furthermore, if Paul’s gospel is story based, relying on the continuous narrative of Christ’s crucifixion, pre-existence, and incarnation it may be seen as cooperating in the early development of the gospel genre. Therefore, Paul may not be as distinctive from his contemporaries or out of line with the ensuing Christian tradition as once though. Finally, accepting Paul’s language as established in narrative and highly allusive means “Paul’s language is less univocal and more ‘poetic’ than the Western theological tradition has supposed” (227). Interpreting Paul thus becomes less about eliminating ambiguity in search of a certain doctrinal account of Paul, and more concerned with “tracing attentively its various overtones and ranges of implications. Such an approach, if applied consistently, would significantly alter the character of Pauline interpretation” (228).
Discussion Questions:

1. If humanity (Christians) becomes the active agents (the Subject) in the final sequence, what is the Object they are communicating and who is the Receiver?

2. If adoption is only for the Gentiles, how do we account for Romans 9:4?

3. Hays uses the terms faith of Jesus Christ and faithfulness of Jesus Christ interchangeably, but are these terms equal? Or, do they carry different connotations, which must be accounted for?

4. Is this type of narrative reading able to be sustained throughout Paul’s writings? Are there other narrative sequences that present different soteriologies? Are there specific criteria for identifying kerygmatic allusions?