Calling and conscience: Paul as an example

Paul’s calling presents a conundrum to which many have proposed varied solutions. Not trying to solve the conundrum in toto, this study investigates the existential dynamics of Paul’s calling as narrated to the Galatians within the context of their apostasy. The model used is Heidegger’s understanding of conscience as a call towards authenticity and away from inauthenticity. Rhetorical analysis assists in identifying Paul’s new understanding of authenticity, by analysing the propositio, especially its expositio, which contains soteriological peculiar existential first-person singular expressions. Paul’s preaching of his gospel and his letter to the Galatians are in turn also to them, a call to authenticity and away from inauthenticity. His preaching thus resembles the phenomenological idea of conscience. Thus, Paul’s gospel cannot be separated from his calling. Both are about the same understanding of authenticity. It is at the same time a new self-understanding: to have been crucified with Christ and therefore Christ living in him and the faithful (Gl 2:19–20).

This is a concise formula of soteriology as symbolised in baptism. Such calling is never completed: it remains a dynamic process, a tension and movement between authenticity and inauthenticity. This is reflected in the Galatian apostasy and Paul’s letter calling them back to authenticity. The study underlines the crucial importance of soteriology for kerygma and baptism, but especially for understanding a person’s call to faith or ministry.

Intradisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary implications: The model is suitable for studying the religious phenomenon of calling in religious texts and in life.
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The conundrum of Paul’s calling

Paul’s account of his calling (Gl 1:11–24) is cast in mystical language (Betz 1984:71), as being neither according to the flesh (Gl 1:11) nor as received or learnt from humans (Gl 1:12). It is described as a revelation of Jesus Christ (Gl 1:12); as Paul being chosen from before his birth; as him being called by the grace of God; as revelation received from God of his Son in Paul and as a calling to proclaim the gospel to the nations (the non-Jews) (Gl 1:15–16). By using the terminology such as ‘revelation’ and ‘calling’, Paul ascribes the highest possible authority to his gospel (Kertelge 1992:340). On the other hand, there seems to be an anomaly in this description as this gospel which he received from Christ resembles the kerygma of Hellenistic Christianity. This kerygma has marked differences with that of the Judean Christian gospel, from which side it received serious objections (Bultmann [1948]1983:187–189).

How is it then that Paul’s revelation from God is cast in the mould of Hellenistic-Christianity preaching? How should one unravel this conundrum?

Anthropologically, Paul’s call experience can be explained as an altered state of consciousness, of the same kind as a later revelation of Paul to visit Jerusalem a second time (Gl 2:2) (Malina & Pilch 2006:331–333). However, Paul himself makes no mention of any mysterious ecstatic promptings in Galatians 1, nor that such revelations might ever be more important than the tradition of the apostles (Bornkamm [1969]1975:20). Paul’s story is an exceptionally concise narration, suggesting behind it the presence of a fuller account which we do not possess. Paul’s narration in Galatians also seems to contradict his other account of the appearance of the risen Christ to him in 1 Corinthians 15:1–11, and it differs markedly from other traditions found in Acts 9 and the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 17.19.4 (Betz 1984:64–65). These accounts should not be reconciled with the version in Galatians (Bornkamm [1969]1975:24) as Sanders (1991:15–16) proposes. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that Paul recalls events of long ago in an abbreviated form, without giving any detailed descriptions of exactly what had occurred (Betz 1984:64). Another detail that should not be overlooked is the presentation of the narrative. While Paul seems to view his revelation to be exclusively his own, his version has analogies with Old Testament vocation accounts. In this way, Paul is cast in the image of a prophet, especially like the great prophet Isaiah. Being a prophet was
deemed by early Christian society to be a role of a higher status than that of an apostle (Malina & Rohrbaugh 2006:186–188). To this should be added the view from ancient wisdom traditions concerning the source of authentic truth. With Paul’s claim not to receive his gospel from humans, he stands in the ancient Greek wisdom tradition which claimed that authentic truth cannot be taught by others. Such authentic truth should be deduced by oneself from experience like Socrates did and Philo suggests (Betz 1984:62–63). Another important aspect not to overlook regarding Paul’s form of argumentation, is that Greco-Roman rhetoricians suggested a specific and detailed order for argumentation. To this order and its prescripts, Paul’s letter to the Galatians adheres very strictly, especially the order formulated for use in law cases. In this regard, Paul treats the Galatian apostasy as a charge against his gospel, which he defends as if in court, with every possible means in his possession (Betz 1984:24 contra Vorster (1992:300), who views Paul as a plaintiff who accuses the Galatians of corrupting the gospel with adherence to Judaic prescriptions. Rhetorically speaking, Paul’s account of his calling is part of the narratio, which should be a statement of the facts that has a bearing on the accusation. The only specific requirement for the narratio’s content is that the occurrences narrated should be lucid, brief, and plausible to effectively convince the judge of their credibility. Therefore, the facts themselves and their presentation are open to partisan interest (Betz 1984:60). The point of Paul’s narrative strategy is thus more important than the strategy itself and as the related occurrences. It is faith in the crucifixion of Christ which is the soteriological centre of his gospel, and in this regard, Paul’s person becomes the normative criterion for this truth (Vorster 1992:309).

In his narration, Paul creates a narrative world (Petersen 1985:14–17) with himself as the protagonist who has the role of defending the truth of his gospel. Jewish Christianity is cast as the antagonists (especially with the narration about the second visit to Jerusalem and even more so with the presentation of events that occurred in Antioch). Jewish Christianity is represented by their leaders Peter, James, and even Barnabas (in Antioch) is included in their midst. In addition, there are the ‘men of circumcision’ (Gl 2:11–13), ‘false brothers’ (Gl 2:4) and ‘those perverting the gospel in Galatia’ (Gl 1:7), whom he treats as his accusers. Their accusation against him is that Paul preaches his own gospel, which his opponents regard as grossly insufficient. Circumcision and law, which guarantee the validity of the promise to Israel, are lacking in Paul’s gospel (Kertelge 1992:348). ‘Arabia’ refers not to the Arabian desert east and southeast of the Gulf of Aqaba, but to the Kingdom of Nabataea, which was called ‘provincia Arabia’ in the Roman Empire. Petra, Bostra and other cities excavated between Petra, Gaza and El-Arish were like Damascus, eminent centers of Hellenism in Paul’s lifetime. They were then under the rule of the Nabataean king Aretas IV (Betz 1984:73–74). These Hellenistic centres stand in stark contrast to Jerusalem as the centre of the apostles and of the oldest Christian congregation (Keck 1982:5). The narrative starts with Paul describing himself as receiving his gospel directly from the risen Christ (Gl 1:11–12), and proceeds to his visits to Arabia and Damascus, and of his visit 3 years later to Peter in Jerusalem for a 2-week period. Events narrated then move swiftly to his second visit to Jerusalem 14 years later, on account of a conflict from God to defend his gospel. The narration steadily builds up to the vindication of Paul’s gospel in Jerusalem, the centre of the antagonists. The story ends with the last episode set in Antioch-on-the-Orontes, another important Hellenistic centre in north-western Syria. Paul victoriously corrects and shames Peter, the antagonist leader, as departing from the truth of the gospel (Gl 2:11–14). The setting underlines the victory of the Hellenistic-Christian gospel and its representative apostle over the Jewish-Christian version of the gospel and its main representative. Furthermore, Paul shows that he no longer acknowledges the authority of Jerusalem to the same extent as was evident on his first visit to Jerusalem. There is thus a gradual development in the narrative presenting Paul’s moving away from Jerusalem’s authority (Dunn 1982:473). On the other hand, although Paul sets store by his independence of Jerusalem, he fails in freeing himself completely from it. He does need the relation to Jerusalem, even though he presents it as not being on the same level as the revelation of Christ (Kertelge 1992:341). With this narrative strategy, Paul calls the Galatians back to his alternative world, to authentic self-understanding (Lategan 1992:273).

In the narrative, Paul uses several rhetorical strategies to convince the Galatians. Paul uses the technique of dissociation when he describes his incompatibilities with Jewish Christianity (Vorster 1992:298, 300–309) and in so distances himself from his Jewish past. The strategies of alienation and re-identification are used much to the same avail (Du Toit 1992:279–294); another powerful tool Paul employs is his assertion of revealed truth (Gl 2:5 and 14). This strategy effectively excludes any questioning of Paul’s gospel (Kertelge 1992:341). He strengthens his position even more by asserting his obedience to these revelations from Christ (Gl 1:12) and God (Gl 2:2), to his instatement as apostle by Christ (Gl 1:1–2, 15–16 and 2:8) and to the gospel (Gl 2:14), and he strategically opposes it to any attempt to win the favour of men, implying the Jewish-Christian leadership and the Galatians who favour them. The persuasive power of Paul’s gospel and argument specifically stem from this divine authority which he obeys (Gräbe 1992:353–356). Paul even uses the strategy of emotive argumentation when he pronounces his utter perplexity with the Galatians’ apostasy (Gl 1:6) (Roberts 1992:329–338). Furthermore, Paul begins his letter with a repeated curse on those preaching a different gospel than his (Gl 1:8–9), and ends his letter with a conditional blessing upon those remaining loyal to his gospel. These techniques place the letter within the well-known ancient epistolary genre of a magical letter and thus introduce the dimension of magic: curses and blessings are to be feared or desired as inescapable instruments of God (Betz 1984:25).

Judged from both narrative strategy and from rhetoric, Paul defends his gospel in the strongest possible way against the Galatian apostasy. He does this not only to vindicate his gospel and himself as apostle, but especially to win the
Galatians back to his gospel (Lategan 1992:277–261). His strong defence should also be understood within the context of the Galatian apostasy being the first radical questioning of Paul’s gospel by Christians themselves (Betz 1984:28).

All these strategies which Paul employed and the events of which they narrate reveal Paul’s existential engagement with his gospel in reference to his calling, the meaning of life, and the motivation of his ministry: his gospel has become the meaning of his whole life. This paper argues from this premise and focusses on understanding the existential dynamics of Paul’s calling rather than debating the historical facts or comparing the various traditions about it. It is a phenomenological study about Paul’s radical existential change and the contribution of his conscience in this regard.

It remains, however, important to remember that strictly speaking, Paul’s narration refers not to a conversion, but to a calling (Sanders 1991:8–9), although Paul knew the term and spoke of the Galatians’ and Thessalonians’ conversion (Gl 4:9; Th 1 1:9) (Dunn 1982:326). As Christianity was then still a faction within Judaism, Paul switched parties within Judaism when he was called, namely from Pharisaic Judaism to Hellenistic Christianity (Borkamm [1969]1975:20–24). His calling therefore can be accounted for in terms of Judaism and should not be seen as a conversion from Judaism to Christianity (Betz 1984:64). This begs the question: what is the existential relationship between Paul’s calling and the content of the kerygma revealed to him and the gospel as preached within Jewish Christianity? Should one separate Paul’s calling from the gospel that was revealed to him and which he preached, as Betz suggests (Betz 1984:64)? In addition, one has to consider the important question regarding the specific content of Christ’s revelation to Paul, as his theology and soteriology is in no sense a recapitulation or a further development of Jesus’ preaching. Rather, it seems to reflect the theology of Hellenistic Christianity (Bultmann [1948]1983:187–189) and seems to be at odds with that of Jewish Christianity, even though nothing was added to his gospel at the Jerusalem conference (Gl 2:6–14; Dunn 1982:473). Another question which relates to the understanding of the phenomenon of calling in this study is the calling of God to the Galatians through Paul’s kerygma and letter: is it to be understood existentially speaking as of a different nature than Paul’s calling or not?

These questions are investigated by utilising the German existential philosopher Martin Heidegger’s phenomenological understanding of the concept of conscience (Heidegger [1926]1996). Paul’s reference to the faithful being called to faith by Paul’s preaching and his letter to them can be viewed as a calling them back to Paul’s gospel, will be compared to the results gained from the study of his own calling. Paul’s statement about him dying and Christ living in him (Gl 2:19–20) will be utilised as an existential summary about Paul’s view on authentic living, as well as about the essence of Paul’s understanding of soteriology (Betz 1984:69). This study and its results may not solve the conundrum of Paul’s calling in toto, but may unravel an intricate and central part of it.

Conscience as calling

Heidegger’s phenomenological understanding of conscience is explained from his perspective of being as Dasein, as described in Sein und Zeit (1926). Dasein is an understanding way of being: towards oneself, others, and one’s world. Only two modes are available to Dasein: to be authentically oneself or to be inauthentically determined. Adhering to other people’s way of being is therefore to live inauthentically. Because one’s Dasein has the potential of authentically being oneself, the call to such authentic being must come from within one’s own Dasein itself. Authentic living is attained only when listening to and following one’s own conscience by breaking away from the safety of the collective conscience and its prescribed and commonly accepted ideas and behaviour (Heidegger [1926]1996:40, 49, 136, 246–249). In this way, Heidegger differs from the common idea of conscience as a judge, warning not to transgress, or judging past transgressions. He understands conscience as calling one towards an authentic future by showing one’s Dasein its lack of being, as well as revealing its own possibilities of being. This lack of being is the result of Dasein being thrown into existence and experiencing its own uncanniness as a not at homeness, as being naked and vulnerable in the nothingness of the world. Conscience calls into this state of anxiety towards the possibility to realise authentic living. This implies Dasein being able to hear the call and to choose whether to adhere to the call or not. It is at the same time the chance to have a conscience and being true to one’s innermost self. The call of conscience is a call to care, and it speaks to the core of Dasein, which is care. The primary aspect of care is being ahead of itself towards its potential. As such, the basic constitution of Dasein is that there is constantly something still to be settled, something still outstanding in one’s being about which there is care. Therefore, conscience is always calling Dasein forward caring to choose authenticity and caring to live authentically. The process is never completed, because as soon as there is nothing more outstanding (death), Dasein has for this reason become obsolete, a ‘no longer-being-there’ [Nicht-mehr-dasein]. Its being has ended, just as Dasein reached wholeness. Its gain has become its loss: its total loss of being in the world (Heidegger [1926]1996: 246–255, 264–271, 279–280) (see Figure 1).

This understanding of conscience as calling towards authenticity will be used as a model to investigate Paul’s calling, as well as his call to the Galatians through his kerygma and letter. It is especially relevant, because in 1st century Mediterranean honour-shame societies, the social group provided its members with an external collective
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**FIGURE 1:** Heidegger’s understanding of conscience calling.
conscience that supported or restrained their member’s choices of behaviour and their sense of self within a socially accepted understanding of the meaning of life and one’s role within it (Malina & Pilch 2006:375–376).

**Calling and conscience**

**Paul’s calling**

To apply the phenomenological model of conscience to Paul’s calling, one needs to understand to which idea of authentic existence Paul was called, and the existence which he came to view as inauthentic and from which he was called. When Paul’s letter to the Galatians is viewed with Quintilian’s rhetorical prescripts in mind, the propositio part of Paul’s argument in Galatians answers both these questions. Placed after the narratio (Gl 1:12–2:14), the propositio (Gl 2:15–21) sums up the narratio’s material content without being part of it and shows it to be its logical conclusion. The points of agreement (Gl 2:15–16) are set forth, which in this case summarises the doctrine of justification by faith, which is shared with Jewish Christianity. The points of disagreement with Jewish Christianity (Gl 2:17–18) follow, and then four theological theses (Gl 2:19–20) appear (the expositio), culminating in the refutatio (Gl 2:21) as a sharp denial of the charge. The propositio thus sets up the arguments to be discussed later in the probatio (Gl 3 and 4) (Betz 1984:114).

For this study, the expositio is crucial. It summarises Paul’s own theological position as soteriology, which is elaborated in the rest of the letter. Peculiarly, Paul uses the first person singular here, thus rendering these soteriological remarks as statements about the radical change in his own existence and making himself a prototypical example of the existential essence of Pauline Christians (Betz 1984:121) and thus statements about his view of authentic existence. Paul’s existential shift is described in a powerful way: as dying to the law. The Judaic law has irrevocably lost its importance for Paul (Oepke 1964:62). How it came to be, is clarified vividly as Paul being crucified (dying) with Christ. The change which occurred is described as the start of a ‘living for God’; as himself not living anymore (the old self before faith as being dead) (Lietzmann 1971:17), but as Christ living in him, which is further described as faithfully living for Christ who died for Paul (Gl 2:19–20). Christ in this way becomes the essential content of life (Van Stempvoort 1951:57). This radical change in Paul is described in baptismal terms (Lietzmann 1971:18) (cf. Oepke [1964:64], who views it as mystical terms) and may suggest a hint towards Paul’s own baptism as the ritual symbolising the change to authentic existence in terms of soteriology (Betz 1984:122–124). Baptism symbolises a new birth into a Jesus group and as such denotes a change of status from being an outsider to being part of the body of Christ (Malina & Pilch 2006:333–334). In Romans 6:1–10, Paul uses the first person plural when using baptism as an example and motivation not to sin. He, at first, argues in a generalised way about the implications of baptism for the faithful, of which he is a part, before addressing them directly in 6:11 (Wilckens 1980:8). In Galatians 2:19–20, he uses the first person singular, making soteriology a powerful existential statement about authenticity (cf. Lietzmann [1971:17], who interprets it as if plural, meaning ‘us’, ‘Pauline Christians’) to convince the Galatians to return to this authenticity of Paul’s and follows it up by referring to the Galatians receiving the Spirit (referring to their being baptised) (Oepke 1964:67) because of their faith in the gospel, not because of their adherence to the law (Gl 3:1–3).

The propositio concludes with the refutatio (Gl 2:21), which contains Paul’s refutation of a charge made by his opponents, namely that he nullifies the grace of God, which refers to the law and circumcision. In Paul’s refutation, grace refers specifically to the salvation by faith in Christ (Oepke 1964:64). The implication is that if justification was by adherence to the law, the death of Christ would lose its salvific character and the charge against Paul would be justified. As Paul preaches the opposite, the charge is false (Betz 1984:126–127). Thus, Paul reiterates authentic existence as stemming from only faith in the salvation in Christ by God’s grace (Paul’s soteriology) and denounces those who oppose this view of existence. In fact, his refutation turns into an accusation against his opponents (Lietzmann 1971:17), which is repeated in the peroratio (Gl 6:12–13), as is expected in this rhetorical style (Betz 1984:126–127).

There is a close relationship between Paul’s calling and the revelation of Christ and his gospel to him. Rather than a vision of the risen Christ, the revelation Paul experienced can be better understood as an apocalyptic term, which refers to a world-changing event. Through Christ’s death and resurrection, God inaugurated a new Aeon (Bornkamm [1969]1975:21), which is of much more significance than the mere sacrificial expiation of sin. To this new soteriological existence in God’s new Aeon, Paul was called and it is this new existence which Paul proclaimed. The old Aeon of adherence to the Jewish law belongs irrevocably to the past thanks to Christ. Only faith in Christ grants one access to this authentic life, which is the essence of the new Aeon.

Viewed through the lens of Heidegger’s understanding of conscience, authentic living in this case can be described as a being dead to oneself and any claim on one’s achievement. This dying is not and cannot be initiated by oneself but is affected by a call to accept the death of Christ as a loving gift of God and not for oneself. It materialises through faith in Christ, who has died for one’s sake. This Dasein sums up Paul’s concept of Christian existence, soteriology, and ethics (Betz 1984:122). To this existence Paul was called (Figure 2).

---

**FIGURE 2:** The existential dynamics of Paul’s call.
Inauthentic living, hence, is the Jewish claim of achievement by adherence to the law. It is a self-reliant existence. From this existence, Paul was called to total reliance on Christ, which ended this mode of existence. As in actual death, this old Dasein has reached its end and became the total loss of its being in the world. A new Dasein has begun, in which there is no room for the old Dasein. Inauthenticity is replaced by new, true authenticity. What has once seemed authentic is deemed as irrevocably past. Towards this authenticity, his conscience will keep on calling him when inauthenticity beckons.

Conscience calls from within the core of Dasein, which is care (German: Sorgen). It is a call to care. The call comes from oneself, yet also over oneself and against one’s will and expectations. It originates because of one’s throwness into existence, causing anxiety, which one alleviates by fleeing to the supposed freedom of the ‘they-self’. Conscience calls as a voice unfamiliar to the ‘they-self’ like an alien voice. ‘My Dasein itself is the one calling from the ground of its being and at the same time I am the one summoned and uncannily pursued ...’ (Heidegger [1926]1996:254–255). This correlates with the way Paul describes his calling as God calling him by grace and revealing to him God’s Son, and as being put aside by God from before his birth (Gl 1:15–16). It also correlates with Paul mentioning that his call was by a revelation of Christ and not by a person (Gl 1:11–12). It is a call towards a new existence: knowing God’s Son, (having his existence determined by him) and proclaiming him to the non-Jews. It is a call to become one who calls others to authentic existence through Christ.

Despite not receiving the call or the gospel from a person, Paul’s theology is not cast in the same terminology as that of Jesus, but that of Hellenistic Christianity (Bultmann [1948]1983:187–189). Understanding Paul’s calling, revelation and mission should be dictated by the subject matter of his theology (Bornkamm [1969]1975:22). As persecutor of the Hellenistic church, he must have had knowledge of their kerygma and the charges made against them. This suggests that subconsciously, Paul’s knowledge of the Hellenistic church’s theology has played a significant role in what Paul narrates as his ‘calling’. It seems one cannot separate Paul’s calling from his gospel, as Betz suggests (Betz 1984:64), nor from the kerygma of Hellenistic Christianity.

The Galatians’ being called

Paul initially preached his gospel to the Galatians (of Celtic origin) (Conzelmann 1980:199) when he became ill in Galatia (Lietzmann 1971:28; cf. Oepke 1964:105–106). They took care of him (4:13-16), although they could superstitiously have rejected him as illness was seemingly caused by demons (Betz 1984:224–225). Paul was accepted with great joy as if he was Christ himself, echoing Paul’s existential formulation of authenticity (Van Stempvoort 1951:118). They accepted his gospel and formed several congregations. He describes these events as God calling them through the grace of Christ (Gl 1:6) through the gospel (Oepke 1964:20–22) and as himself preaching Christ so vividly that they could almost see him on the cross (Gl 3:1). Thus, God called them through Paul’s preaching. Paul refers to their baptism at that stage as a beginning with and receiving of the Spirit when coming to faith (Gl 3:2–5) (Oepke 1964:67–68). Theirs was a call away from idolatry, which Paul describes as the slavery of adhering to inferior religious legalistic rules and festivals (Gl 4:8–10), setting Judaism and paganism on the same level (Van Stempvoort 1951:111–112). It was a call to obedience to the truth: faith in Christ (Gl 5:7–8) as Paul proclaimed his gospel to them (Betz 1984:264–265), freedom to love one another (Gl 5:13–14) and to bear the fruit of the Spirit (Gl 5:22–25). Paul contrasts this call to authenticity with the Galatians’ flagrant misconduct when they were free from the law, when they became believers, as well as their current recourse to the law (Betz 1984:273).

The calling of the Galatians and their positive adherence to the call made through Paul’s kerygma reflect the same existential change as experienced by Paul: from the inauthentic existence of self-reliant religious practices to the authenticity of faith in Christ as saviour and being a new person in Christ (Gl 6:15), of faith becoming deeds of love (Gl 5:6). It is a radical change symbolised by baptism as a dying with Christ and being born anew to a life for God with Christ, a life as Christ would live (Gl 2:19–20).

Not long after Paul departed from them (Gl 1:6–7), a group of ‘Judaizers’ attacked Paul’s version of the gospel and started to preach the necessity of adherence to the Jewish law (Gl 3:2) and circumcision (Gl 5:2–6) (Malina & Pilch 2006:178–179). For them, Moses was the mediator as lawgiver (Gl 3:19–21), and the law mediated God’s Spirit (Gl 3:2) (Conzelmann & Lindemann 1980:201). Paul calls their version ‘another gospel’, and denounces it as non-existent as there is only the one true gospel. For this, he curses them twice (Gl 1:7–9) (Kertelge 1992:339). This ‘other gospel’, Paul describes as the teachings of Jewish Christianity (Gl 2:11–14) in contrast to Paul’s teaching freedom from the law (Conzelmann & Lindemann 1980:197).

Their departure from the Pauline gospel back to reliance on religious practices is a return to inauthenticity and necessitates Paul calling them again to true authenticity. This pattern confirms that heeding the call to authenticity is never completely done. There is always the possibility of moving away from authenticity to a seemingly safe place of self-reliance and traceable performance. Therefore, there is frequently something outstanding. In this instance, it is the lack of faith, which would be understood as externally manifested emotional loyalty, commitment and solidarity (Malina & Rohrbaugh 2003:359), in this case to Christ as the essence of authentic existence. There is always movement away from authenticity towards self-reliance and self-centeredness. In the Pauline gospel, this is called sin and is in close relationship with ‘flesh’ and relying on efforts of the ‘flesh’ (self-reliance and the trust in transitory things) (Bultmann [1948]1983:239–240). From this inauthentic life, this delusion of authenticity, Paul’s letter calls the Galatian churches back to the true authenticity they once lived and which their baptism symbolised.
Conclusion

Heidegger’s model for conscience effectively assists in understanding the existential dynamics at work in Paul’s calling and the calling of the Galatians, as well as the necessity of the repetitive nature of the call. It also demystifies the understanding of Paul’s and the Galatians’ call as a call through the Christian kerygma and baptism, of which soteriology is the essence. The model therefore underlines the crucial importance of soteriology for kerygma and baptism, but especially for understanding a person’s call to faith or ministry.

Acknowledgements

Competing interests

The author declares that they have no financial or personal relationship(s) that may have inappropriately influenced them in writing this article.

Author’s contribution

G.J.M. is the sole author of this research article.

Funding information

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability

The author confirms that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and are the product of professional research. It does not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated institution, funder, agency, or that of the publisher. The author is responsible for this article’s results, findings, and content.

References


Malina, B.J. & Rohrbach, R.L., 2003, Social-science commentary on the Synoptic Gospels, Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Oepke, A., 1964, Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater, Berlin, Evangelische Verlag.


