

STEPHEN WESTERHOLM

Law and Ethics  
in Early Judaism and the  
New Testament

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament*

383

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL) · Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

383





Stephen Westerholm

Law and Ethics in Early Judaism  
and the New Testament

Mohr Siebeck

STEPHEN WESTERHOLM, born 1949, studied at University of Toronto (BA, MA) and Lund University (ThD); Professor of Early Christianity in the Department of Religious Studies, McMaster University; since 2017, Professor Emeritus.

ISBN 978-3-16-155133-8 eISBN 978-3-16-155669-2

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproduction, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by epline in Böblingen, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany

*For Monica*

יברכך יהוה וישמרך



## Table of Contents

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements .....   | IX  |
| Chapter 1: Introduction: Old Skins, New Wine.....  | 1   |
| Chapter 2: Law in Early Judaism .....  | 23  |
| Chapter 3: Torah, nomos, and Law: A Question of “Meaning” .....                            | 39  |
| Chapter 4: Paul’s Anthropological “Pessimism” in<br>its Jewish Context .....               | 51  |
| Chapter 5: Four Maccabees: A Paraenetic Address? .....                                     | 85  |
| Chapter 6: Law in the New Testament .....  | 113 |
| Chapter 7: Law and Gospel in Jesus and Paul .....  | 129 |
| Chapter 8: Jesus, the Pharisees, and the Application of Divine Law ..                      | 145 |
| Chapter 9: Hearing the Gospels of Matthew and Mark .....                                   | 163 |
| Chapter 10: Pragmatism and the Gospel Tradition .....                                      | 179 |
| Chapter 11: The “New Perspective” at Twenty-Five.....                                      | 195 |
| Chapter 12: Finnish Contribution to the Debate on<br>Paul and the Law .....                | 237 |
| Chapter 13: The Righteousness of the Law<br>and the Righteousness of Faith in Romans ..... | 251 |
| Chapter 14: Paul and the Law in Romans 9–11 .....  | 265 |
| Chapter 15: On Fulfilling the Whole Law (Gal 5:14) .....                                   | 289 |



|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Chapter 16: The Law and the Just Person (1 Tim 1:3–11) . . . . .        | 297 |
| Chapter 17: Letter and Spirit: The Foundation of Pauline Ethics . . . . | 315 |
| Chapter 18: Righteousness, Cosmic and Microcosmic . . . . .             | 337 |
| Chapter 19: St. Paul and Knowledge of the Natural Law . . . . .         | 355 |
| Chapter 20: The Judaism Paul Left Behind Him . . . . .                  | 369 |
| Chapter 21: Is Nothing Sacred? Holiness in the Writings of Paul . . . . | 385 |
| Chapter 22: Canonical Paul and the Law . . . . .                        | 397 |
| Indexes . . . . .   | 413 |

## Acknowledgements

Apart from the opening, introductory chapter and Chapter 10, each chapter in this book has appeared in a previous publication, as listed below, and appears in this volume with the kind permission of the publishers.

2. "Law in Early Judaism," in *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 3. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008, 587–594. Copyright © 2008 by Abingdon Press, an imprint of The United Methodist Publishing House. Used by permission. All rights reserved.
3. "Torah, Nomos, and Law: A Question of 'Meaning,'" in *Studies in Religion* 15 (1986): 327–336. Used by permission.
4. "Paul's Anthropological 'Pessimism' in its Jewish Context," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole. London: T.&T. Clark International, 2006, 71–98. Used by permission of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
5. "Four Maccabees: A Paraenetic Address?" in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, edited by T. Engberg-Pedersen and James Starr. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004, 191–216.
6. "Law in the New Testament," in *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 3. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008, 594–602. Copyright © 2008 by Abingdon Press, an imprint of The United Methodist Publishing House. Used by permission. All rights reserved.
7. "Law and Gospel in Jesus and Paul," in *Jesus and Paul Reconnected: Fresh Pathways into an Old Debate*, edited by Todd D. Still. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007, 19–36. Reprinted by permission of the publisher; all rights reserved.
8. "Jesus, the Pharisees, and the Application of Divine Law," in *Eglise et Théologie* 13 (1982): 191–210. Used by permission.
9. "Hearing the Gospels of Matthew and Mark," in *Mark and Matthew II: Comparative Readings: Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics, and Theology*, edited by Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013, 245–258. Copyright © Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. Used by permission.
10. "Pragmatism and the Gospel Tradition." Unpublished paper, given at the first annual meeting of the International Reference Library for Biblical Research, Fort Worth, Texas, March 2006.
11. "The 'New Perspective' at Twenty-Five," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Vol. 2: *The Paradoxes of Paul*, edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004, 1–38. Copyright © Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. Used by permission.
12. "Finnish Contributions to the Debate on Paul and the Law," in *The Nordic Paul: Finnish Approaches to Pauline Theology*, edited by Lars Aejmelaeus and

- Antti Mustakallio. London: T & T Clark International, 2008, 3–15. Used by permission of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
13. “The Righteousness of the Law and the Righteousness of Faith in Romans,” in *Interpretation* 58 (2004): 253–264. Used by permission.
  14. “Paul and the Law in Romans 9–11,” in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*, edited by James D. G. Dunn. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996, 215–237. Copyright © Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. Used by permission.
  15. “On Fulfilling the Whole Law (Gal. 5:14),” in *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* 51–52 (1986–87): 229–237. Used by permission.
  16. “The Law and the ‘Just Man’ (1 Tim 1,3–11),” in *Studia Theologica* 36 (1982): 79–95. Copyright © Studia Theologica, reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis Ltd., [www.tandfonline](http://www.tandfonline) on behalf of Studia Theologica.
  17. “Letter and Spirit: The Foundation of Pauline *Ethics*,” in *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 229–248.
  18. “Righteousness, Cosmic and Microcosmic,” in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5–8*, edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2013, 21–38. Used by permission of Baylor University Press.
  19. “St. Paul and Knowledge of the Natural Law,” in *Journal of Law, Philosophy and Culture* 3 (2009): 433–444. Used by permission.
  20. “The Judaism Paul Left Behind Him,” in *The Making of Christianity: Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions: Essays in Honor of Bengt Holmberg*, edited by M. Zetterholm and S. Byrskog. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012, 353–370. Used by permission.
  21. “Is Nothing Sacred? Holiness in the Writings of Paul,” in *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism in Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen Schuller. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013, 87–99. Copyright © Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. Used by permission.
  22. “Canonical Paul and the Law,” in *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity*, edited by Susan J. Wendel and David M. Miller. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016, 207–222. Reprinted by permission of the publisher; all rights reserved.

## Chapter 1

### Introduction: Old Skins, New Wine

Pious Jews of the first century, as later, sought to conform their lives to Torah, the law God had given Israel.<sup>1</sup> Differences in circumstance and temperament meant that some Jews displayed more zeal in the attempt than others (cf. Gal 1:14). Different sects among them interpreted the law, and assigned competence in its interpretation, differently.<sup>2</sup> The pursuit itself, however, was a common one – so common that it invited hypocritical imitation, as the Synoptic Gospels are wont to point out. Yet the New Testament itself bears witness to the nobility of the endeavor: Zechariah and his wife Elizabeth were “both righteous in the sight of God, blameless as they walked in all the commandments and requirements of the Lord” (Luke 1:5–6).

Proper observance of commandments presupposes their proper interpretation. In *Jesus and Scribal Authority*, I noted that the Pharisees understood the prescriptions of Torah as “statutes.”<sup>3</sup> The precise wording with which advice, or even a command, is given may not be significant; that of a statute always is. If Deuteronomy 24:1 speaks of a divorce occasioned by “a matter of indecency,” then what, for the Pharisees, constituted legitimate grounds for divorce hinged on the definition of “indecency.” If Exodus 16:29 forbids leaving one’s “place” on the Sabbath, then those concerned not to transgress this *statute* needed to know how “place” was rightly construed. The rabbinic term *halakhah* may be used to designate efforts directed toward clarifying the ambiguities of Mosaic law so understood, filling in gaps left by its legislation, perhaps even making its observance practicable in circumstances changed from the time when the laws were given. The goal was to be as concrete and exhaustive as required to ensure compliance with the statutes of God’s law; indeed, to prevent their transgression by constructing a “fence” around Torah’s commandments wide enough to avert unwitting infringement (cf. *m. Avot* 1:1).

First-century Jews that they were, neither Jesus nor Paul could articulate their vision of what God was doing in their day without dealing with issues raised by its relation to God’s prior revelation in Torah. They fully affirmed

---

<sup>1</sup> See chapter 3 below.

<sup>2</sup> See chapter 2 below.

<sup>3</sup> See also chapter 8 below.

that prior revelation. Still, the *primary* focus of both Jesus and Paul was on what God was doing in their day; to assess the legitimacy of their message merely by measuring it against the standard of some current understanding of Torah was to judge new wine by what it did to old wineskins. Decisive for one's relation to God – for Jesus, Paul, and, indeed, all the authors of the New Testament – was one's response to the good news of Jesus Christ.

Scholars of the New Testament must seek to do justice both to what was new and distinctive about the message of Jesus and his followers, and to the wide areas of continuity it shared with the convictions and practices of other pious Jews. If scholarship of earlier generations tended to emphasize the new while overlooking – if not denying – its continuity with the old, the pendulum, in our day, has perhaps swung to the other extreme. The chapters that follow represent my own attempts, over three decades and more, to rightly portray what was new and what was not, while fairly portraying the Judaism within which the new movement began.

Anyone who would consider *Jesus'* message of God's kingdom and its relation to Torah is immediately confronted by the question where Jesus' views can reliably be found. In my dissertation, I took up the challenge of demonstrating the plausible authenticity of particular sayings attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>4</sup> I now regard such attempts as largely (perhaps not completely) pointless: to this day, however sophisticated the argumentation, scholars, in the end, tend to find authentic whatever agrees with their overall understanding of Jesus, secondary whatever does not. Broadly speaking, I believe we must concede Dale Allison's point: either we trust the *general* picture that the Synoptic Gospels give us of Jesus – or we abandon the attempt to speak of him at all.

If the primary sources produce false general impressions, ... then the truth of things is almost certainly beyond our reach. If the chief witnesses are too bad, if they contain only intermittently authentic items, we cannot lay them aside and tell a better story. ... Because the Synoptics supply us with most of our first-century traditions, our reconstructed Jesus will inevitably be Synoptic-like, a sort of commentary on Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Nothing else, however, can carry conviction.<sup>5</sup>

I am, however, more optimistic than some about particular sayings.<sup>6</sup> Jesus was known as one who taught “in parables” (ἐν παραβολαῖς, Matt 13:34; cf.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Jesus and Scribal Authority*. I assumed the results of that study in the article reproduced in chapter 8 below.

<sup>5</sup> Allison, *Historical Christ*, 66.

<sup>6</sup> In what follows, I repeat points made by my doctoral supervisor, Birger Gerhardsson, most convincingly – to my mind – in Gerhardsson, *Reliability*. In the writings collected in that volume, Gerhardsson provides, in addition to a fine restatement of his position, responses to the objections most frequently raised to his approach – which neither posits that the gospel tradition was transmitted according to a specifically

Mark 4:33–34; the Hebrew term is מְשָׁלִים, *meshalim* – the content of our book of Proverbs). The term included carefully (i. e., *memorably*) formulated one-liners as well as the illustrative short stories traditionally labeled “parables” in English. That the Synoptic Gospels sum up the teaching of Jesus on any number of important issues in concise, pregnant sayings is thus no accident (e. g., Mark 2:17, 27; 7:15; 8:35; 10:9, 25; 12:17).<sup>7</sup> Sayings of this type were deliberately formulated to facilitate recollection: proverbs, proverbially, are not occasional, one-time utterances. And what are we to expect of disciples of one who taught in *meshalim* but that they retain and pass on their master’s pithy wisdom?<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the New Testament supplies ample evidence of the *intentional* preservation and transmission of Jesus tradition.<sup>9</sup> It stands to reason, then, that behind programmatic sayings in the Synoptic Gospels there typically lie pronouncements of the historical Jesus.

Be that as it may, I shall be content in what follows to depict the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels – though, for the reasons just stated, I believe that what I say is also true of the Jesus of history. Four points about these Gospels’ *general* picture of Jesus merit attention here.

1. Jesus saw in his own activity the dawning of the kingdom of God. Jews knew in their bones, and their prophets had assured them, that in a world where much had gone wrong, God would some day put things right.<sup>10</sup> Jesus saw, in his activity, the unprepossessing beginnings of that process, the tiny mustard seed that would one day grow into something mighty (Mark 4:30–32). Where the Synoptics summarize Jesus’ message, the dawning kingdom is the theme (Mark 1:14–15; Matt 4:17; 10:7; Luke 10:9, 11). Terms of admission to the kingdom are the subject of numerous pronouncements (Matt 5:3, 20; 7:21; 18:3; 19:23–24, etc.). Its mysteries are the subject of Jesus’ parables (Matt 13:1–52; 18:23–35; 20:1–16, etc.). Its powers are displayed in his mighty works (Matt 12:28). “The time [had] come,” and it was incumbent

---

rabbinic model nor is invalidated by the truism that particular sayings are reproduced somewhat differently in the different Gospels.

<sup>7</sup> Such sayings were transmitted and recalled even when the context in which they were originally spoken was forgotten; the process can lead to an obscuring of their original point, as noted in chapter 10. In general, however, sayings proverbial in nature require no context for their understanding – and this surely applies to the *meshalim* of Jesus listed above.

<sup>8</sup> The intentionality of the process renders moot questions of what, in general, hearers might recall of something spoken in their presence decades earlier. Chapter 10 below argues against the common assumption that perceived needs of the community inevitably shaped or determined what was transmitted.

<sup>9</sup> E. g., 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3. Indirect evidence for intentional preservation is given in chapter 10 below.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. chapter 14 below.

upon all who encountered Jesus to respond to the good news with faith (Mark 1:15).

2. Jesus saw in his mission the climax of the divine activity in Israel's past as recorded in its scriptures, and the start of the fulfillment of Israel's hopes: "Today this scripture is fulfilled as you hear it" (Luke 4:21).

3. Jesus acted in ways that invited the easy dismissal most concisely formulated in John 9:16: "This man is not from God, for he does not keep the Sabbath." Matthew 5:17 is clearly intended as a response to the same perception, and numerous accounts in the Gospels, while meant to counter the charge, at the same time provide evidence of the activity that provoked it. In the eyes of many of his contemporaries, Jesus at times acted in violation of God's law. Indeed, his association with the notoriously immoral suggested a general contempt for "morality" (to use *our* term; among first-century Jews, morality *meant* Torah).

4. For Jesus, earlier stages in the history of God's people, including the revelation given to Moses on Mount Sinai, must be interpreted in light of the new and decisive moment in salvation history, not the other way around. Something greater than wise figures of the past, the prophets, even the temple was here (Matt 12:6, 41–42). What prophets and righteous people had longed for could now be seen and heard (Matt 13:17). The period of anticipation represented by "the law and the prophets" had given way to the proclamation of God's kingdom (Matt 11:11–13; Luke 16:16). Whatever tensions arose between old revelations and the new must therefore be attributed to the partial nature of past revelation and its transcendence in the day of fulfillment. With full authority, Jesus, herald and inaugurator of God's kingdom, declared God's will.

Our concern here is with the ethical teaching of Jesus – and thus, necessarily, with the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7).<sup>11</sup> Any suggestion that Jesus meant to do away with Torah is emphatically denied; yet to speak of the law's "fulfillment" suggests something more than the mere reaffirmation of its commands (5:17).<sup>12</sup> Indeed, according to Matthew 5:20, it is not the inevitable transgressions of those committed to the law's observance that prevent their entry to God's kingdom; their very *righteousness* falls short. And, in the Sermon's antitheses, certain stipulations of Torah are declared inadequate statements of God's will.<sup>13</sup> Here, as elsewhere in the

<sup>11</sup> In what follows, I draw upon my article "Law in the Sermon on the Mount"; cf. also my *Understanding Matthew*.

<sup>12</sup> See chapter 15 below. That πληρῶσαι ("fulfill") includes an element of transcendence is rightly insisted upon by Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 1.486–487; cf. 1.507–509.

<sup>13</sup> The first, second, and sixth of the antitheses (5:21–22, 27–28, 43–45), though in-

Gospels, the relationship between Jesus' teaching and Torah is, I believe, a good deal more complex than is at times realized. Attempts to capture its essence need at least to take the following observations into account.

1. The Sermon on the Mount represents Jesus' expectations of how those who would have a part in God's kingdom are to live. Negatively, this means that the sermon is not intended as a blueprint for reforming the laws or institutions of current society.<sup>14</sup> It is assumed throughout that Jesus' followers are and will remain a minority group subject to persecution (5:10–12) and abuse (5:39–40), living alongside scribes and Pharisees, tax collectors and Gentiles – all of whom live differently than they, but among whom they are to serve as “salt” and “light” (5:13–16, 45–47; 6:1–18, 32). Positively, Jesus' disciples must be “doers,” not mere “hearers,” of Jesus' words if they are to enter the kingdom (7:21–27).

2. That Torah, unlike the teaching of Jesus, served as the law of an earthly society is no doubt the reason why Jesus can find a number of its stipulations inadequate statements of God's will without questioning their divine origin.<sup>15</sup> Deuteronomy's provisions for divorce represented a concession to human hardheartedness, not God's intention for the humans he created (so Matt 19:3–9; cf. 5:31–32). The same explanation presumably applies to stipulations in Torah related to oaths and the *lex talionis* (5:33–42): among hardhearted human beings, something was achieved by stressing, through oaths, the necessity of truth-telling at least in certain situations, and by restricting the natural desire for revenge. The laws of Torah served that limited purpose. But truth-telling is always to be the norm for God's children; and they are to respond to whatever abuse or demands they encounter, not with *lawful* self-assertion, but with expressions of God's goodness and generosity.

3. It is true that those who, following Jesus' teaching, are faithful in marriage, avoid oaths, and seek no revenge are not thereby *transgressing* Torah's commands. Crucially, however, those who punctiliously *comply with* Torah's provisions related to divorce, oaths, and the *lex talionis* fall short of doing God's will – as proclaimed by Jesus.<sup>16</sup> Jesus does not *abolish* Torah; indeed,

---

roduced as contrasts between what was said of old and what Jesus demands, *can* be understood as a “spiritualizing” or intensifying of Torah's own commands. The third, fourth, and fifth antitheses (5:31–32, 33–37, 38–42) do not permit the latter understanding. See the discussion below.

<sup>14</sup> See chapter 8 below.

<sup>15</sup> Daube, “Concessions,” points out that concessions to sinfulness were a recognized feature in Jewish law. The point of the Sermon is that, in the kingdom of God, there can be neither place nor need for such concessions.

<sup>16</sup> Jesus' position in these matters is *not* that of those who “made a fence around



if the essence of Torah is the demand for God-pleasing behavior, then the teaching of Jesus can be said to intend Torah's "fulfillment." Still, in the teaching of Jesus, the claim of various provisions of Torah to represent the righteous behavior God requires is clearly relativized.

4. Jesus finds fit for the kingdom, on grounds patently other than observance of the law, people whom society of the day regarded as particularly sinful (Matt 21:31–32; cf. Luke 7:36–50; 18:9–14; 19:1–10); and though, in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere in the Gospels, he demands of his followers boundless love, absolute purity, complete truthfulness, and utter self-denial, neither in the Sermon nor elsewhere are they told to observe the Sabbath or laws of tithing and ritual purity. Those who strictly observe the latter commandments are not faulted for doing so (cf. Matt 23:23; Luke 11:42); but their priorities are said to be skewed (Matt 9:13; 12:7; 23:23–24; Luke 11:42), and their zeal in condemning transgressors of norms in these areas is seen as misplaced (Mark 2:23–28; 3:1–6; 7:1–23, etc.).

5. Jesus' stance throughout is *not* that of a mere interpreter of an authoritative law code, bound to its wording in his definition of what is right. Rather, in spelling out what God requires of those who would enter his kingdom, Jesus speaks with the same authority as the law itself: an authority that demands recognition without obvious legitimation (Mark 8:11–13; 11:27–33). Of those who would enter the kingdom, he repeatedly makes demands that go far beyond Torah's statutes (as the "rich young ruler" found to his dismay [Mark 10:17–22]).<sup>17</sup> Among Torah's provisions, he sees in some, but not others, an adequate statement of God's will. Without pausing to construe what "work" Torah forbids on the Sabbath or what "matter of indecency" it sees as grounds for divorce, he finds it "lawful" to "do good" on the Sabbath (Mark 3:4), and declares, "What God has joined together, let no mere mortal put asunder" (Mark 10:9).

6. In form no less than content, Jesus' own statements of God's will are far removed from the halakhic endeavors of the Pharisees. As he conveys the *message* of the kingdom largely in parables, so the *requirements* of the kingdom are typically expressed in dramatic, poetic form, where the expectation is rather that disciples will show and act in accordance with the attitude illustrated in Jesus' command than that they will attempt to comply with its wording.<sup>18</sup> Literalists will miss the point of Matthew 6:6 if they refuse to

---

Torah." The latter, assuming that commandments in Torah represented the divine will, attempted to guard against their transgression. Jesus' point is that *conformity* with certain of those commandments falls short of God's will.

<sup>17</sup> See chapter 7 below.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Dodd, *Gospel and Law*, 46–63.

pray anywhere but in their rooms. They will be hard put to know how they can keep one hand from being aware of what the other is doing, or what logs are to be removed from their eyes (6:3; 7:5). Their self-congratulation that at least they have never thrown pearls to pigs will be premature (7:6). Yet, though Jesus' ethical teaching represents the opposite extreme from halakhic endeavors to define boundaries of proper behavior with maximum concreteness and comprehensiveness, it is not, for that reason, less serious, as any sensitive reader of the Sermon will attest.

Why the difference? East of Eden, after all, society does need laws – and laws need to be specific if they are to be enforced. Ideally, society's laws serve both to restrain evil and to inculcate virtuous behavior; society is the better where its laws are good and wise. Still, in the end, true *goodness*, the goodness at home in God's kingdom, though expressed in ways no law would condemn (cf. Gal 5:23), is not the same thing as careful compliance with rules.<sup>19</sup> Labored compliance, while a vast improvement over unprincipled living, falls far short of the spontaneous selflessness and concern for others, the uncalculating generosity and kindness, the unstinting love of God and all his creatures that ought to mark God's children. Such goodness is related to joy, thankfulness, appreciativeness – though none of these qualities necessarily accompanies the most fervent strivings for self-discipline and virtue. It corresponds, rather, to the innocence of Eden, the fruit of genuine, unselfconscious delight in the goodness of God and his creation. That innocence (Genesis tells us) was lost when God's creatures chose to pursue their own perceived good rather than play their part in a divinely ordered cosmos; and innocence, once lost, cannot be recovered. Divine purposes were served (“for the hardness of your hearts”) when God gave his law to the most privileged of his wayward creatures; but no law could make them good. A tree must be good before it can produce good fruit (Matt 12:33): something of the power and goodness of God's kingdom must be experienced before its righteousness can be expressed.

The Sermon on the Mount must not be detached from the message of God's kingdom, the announcement of whose coming it follows (Matt 4:17). Jesus, who announces the coming of the kingdom, speaks with authority of the righteousness required of those who would enter it: it is new age righteousness, though meant to be practiced even now, under old age conditions, by the children of the kingdom. Jesus portrays such righteousness, not by exhaustively listing concrete rules to be scrupulously adhered to, but by illustrating the kind of attitude and action that mark children learning to imitate their heavenly Father (5:45–48; 6:1–18, 32).

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Knox, *Ethic of Jesus*, 103–108; also his moving portrayal of the difference between a servant's and a son's obedience, 82–86.

There are parallels in Paul:<sup>20</sup> the conviction that the law, though divine, was too “weak” to produce God-pleasing behavior in sinful human beings (Rom 8:3); that the law served a limited purpose in the age of anticipation;<sup>21</sup> that God-pleasing behavior can only follow from experience of the power and goodness of the new age – in Paul’s terms, the gift of God’s Spirit (Rom 8:4; Gal 5:22–23); that those who belong to the new age know and approach God as their Father (Rom 8:14–16; Gal 4:4–7). Most importantly, it was the arrival of the new age (for Paul, with the death and resurrection of Christ) that was the focus of Paul’s message, as it had been that of Jesus; the law became a factor for the apostle only when he encountered those who would impose old age requirements on those who were a part of the new creation.<sup>22</sup> To this day, their number continues to grow.

The titles of a striking number of recent articles and books breathlessly announce to a world suspected of thinking otherwise that Paul was a Jew. The works in question regularly go on to add, as of particular moment, that he *remained* a Jew all his life. One can only agree, provided we understand the designation, as Paul understood his Jewishness, to refer to his Jewish ancestry: he was – and, to be sure, remained all his life – a Jew “*by birth*” (φύσει [Gal 2:15]); his kindred “according to the flesh” (κατὰ σάρκα) were similarly born (Rom 9:3; cf. 4:1). Since he was – and, to be sure, remained all his life – “of the seed of Abraham, the tribe of Benjamin,” he was, all his life, an “Israelite” (Rom 11:1; cf. 2 Cor 11:22; Phil 3:5). This was not subject to change – and it was important to the apostle. In addition to shaping his conscious and unconscious thinking in countless ways,<sup>23</sup> Paul saw his identity as a Jew as proof that God had not forsaken his people; that a remnant of those born Jews, even in his day, were God’s chosen “by grace”; and that God could therefore be trusted to bring salvation to “all Israel” – the born descendants of the patriarchs, to whom irrevocable promises had been made.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup> See chapter 7 below.

<sup>21</sup> Paul does not, however, follow the Sermon on the Mount in speaking of the inadequacies of particular provisions in the law, highlighting rather the inability of the law as a whole to compel rebellious “flesh” to submit to its demands (Rom 7:14; 8:3). Conversely, Paul (but not the Sermon on the Mount) explicitly limits the period of the law’s hegemony: though the essential players in human history are Adam and Christ (founding figures of the old and the new humanity, respectively), the law was “added” to the old age scene at the time of Moses in order to clearly define, and even exacerbate, the rebelliousness of old age humanity (Gal 3:19, 22; Rom 5:13, 20; 7:5, 7–11, 13); it remained in force until the coming of Christ, the promised “seed” of Abraham (Gal 3:19; cf. 3:23–25; 2 Cor 3:11).

<sup>22</sup> To judge, e.g., by the Thessalonian correspondence, the law of Moses played no part in Paul’s message in Thessalonica.

<sup>23</sup> See chapter 21 below.

<sup>24</sup> See the argument of Romans 11, and chapter 14 below.

Nonetheless, that Paul's Jewish ancestry was no longer what was most central to his identity is apparent from the terms "by birth" and "according to the flesh" by which he explicitly delimited his Jewishness.<sup>25</sup> Crucially, Paul could distinguish "being a Jew" from "living as a Jew," as he did when addressing Peter in Antioch: "if you, being a Jew, live 'Gentile-ly' and not 'Jewish-ly' (εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἔθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς)" (Gal 2:14). In the context, it is clear that Peter's (temporary) living as a Gentile and *not* as a Jew represented Paul's normal, and programmatically adopted, practice, that of eating with Gentile believers.<sup>26</sup> Since Paul went on to criticize Jewish believers who stopped eating with Gentiles for not acting in accordance with "the truth of the gospel," he evidently thought faithfulness to the gospel required them, too, to live "as Gentiles, and not as Jews" (2:13–14). That Paul himself no longer consistently lived in a recognizably Jewish way is presumably what he meant by speaking of his "former life in Judaism" (1:13–14).

Paul wrote Galatians to implore Gentiles not to take up the distinctively Jewish practices required by the law; one way he made the point was by telling them to become like him *as he had become like them* (i. e., like a Gentile [Gal 4:12]). He claimed, furthermore, that he would show himself a "transgressor [of the law]" if he were to reestablish ("build up again") what he had already "demolished" when he – as he put it, in the most *un*-Jewish statement he ever made – "died to the law *in order that he might live to God*" (Gal 2:18–19). In other words: he could not be guilty of transgressing laws to which he was no longer subject.<sup>27</sup>

Another way of saying that Paul "lived as a Gentile, and not as a Jew" (Gal 2:14), or that, when with Galatian Gentiles, he "became like" them (4:12), was to say that when he was with those "without the law," he lived

---

<sup>25</sup> *Everyone* born a Jew is, *ipso facto*, a Jew "according to the flesh"; that Paul so delimits his own Jewishness can only mean that something else is even more fundamental to his identity. Cf. the claim that God's Son was born of the seed of David "according to the flesh" in Rom 1:3 – to which Paul immediately adds that "according to the spirit of holiness," he was "ordained Son of God in power by [or "since"] his resurrection from the dead" (1:4). That Christ, "according to the flesh," belonged to the Jewish people is not what Paul deems most important in Rom 9:5 either; he immediately adds, on the most natural reading of the text, that Christ is "God over all, blessed forever." Paul is no longer content with knowing Christ (or anyone else) "according to the flesh" (2 Cor 5:16).

<sup>26</sup> Attempts to show that Paul did nothing that others, who were considered law-observant Jews, were prepared to do are not without interest; for understanding Paul, however, it is of greater significance to see that *he* saw himself, at least at times, as living "as a Gentile and not as a Jew."

<sup>27</sup> His position is thus scarcely captured by saying that, when with Gentiles, he occasionally "took liberties" with the law. Those obligated to observe a law are not, in any case, at liberty to decide when and where they will obey it. But Paul's point is precisely that he was under no obligation to observe a "demolished," "died to" law.

“as without the law”: “with Jews I *became* as a Jew, in order that I might win the Jews; with those under the law, as one under the law – though not being myself under law – in order that I might win those under the law; *with those without the law, as without the law* – not being without the law of God, but subject to the law of Christ – in order that I might win those without the law” (1 Cor 9:20–21). The law to which *he* was not subject, but with which he – pursuing a mission based on a different vision – chose to comply when with those who were, was clearly that of Moses; the “law of God” to which he *was* subject – in his mission, and according to his new vision – was that which bound him to the service of Christ.

Paul was, after all, a “strong” believer who felt free to eat any food and treat all days alike (Rom 14:1–15:6).<sup>28</sup> It does not follow that he looked for pork chops on the menu wherever he ate. Martin Luther denounced those

---

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Barclay, “Do We Undermine the Law?” In all likelihood, the assemblies in Rome in which Paul’s letter would be read were largely Gentile, though including a noticeable contingent of Jews as well. (Could a letter addressed to “all” those in Rome who are “beloved of God and called to be saints” [Rom 1:7] be intended to have *no* Jewish readers?) Paul’s concern that Jewish believers (patently, in Rome) not be disdained is evident in the specific warning given Gentiles in 11:13–24, as well as in 14:3, 10. His refusal to identify the “weak” in Romans 14 with Jewish believers was perhaps due in part to the sensitivity of the issue: direct identification might contribute to the very contempt for Jews that he wanted to avoid; but it is also likely true that *some* Gentile believers were numbered with the “weak.” But even if Paul envisaged his readership as entirely Gentile, and even if the issue lying behind Paul’s discussion was not Jewish food laws, the fact remains that Paul, Jew though *he* was, identified *himself* with those (“strong” in faith) who saw believers as free to eat any meat and who regarded no day as more sacred than another (cf. 14:2, 5; 15:1). And he cannot have imagined himself the only Jew entitled to do so, since he justified his freedom, not by speaking of what was peculiarly permitted an apostle to the Gentiles, but by citing a fundamental principle that he knew “in Christ Jesus” (14:14).

It is true that law-observant Jews could say, as Paul does in Romans 14, that no food, “of itself,” is unclean (Rom 14:14). So Rudolph, “Paul and the Food Laws,” 159–162, citing a well-known saying of Yochanan ben Zakkai. Yochanan’s *point*, however, was that the reason why we *must not eat certain foods* is not that such foods are inherently unclean, but that the Almighty *commanded* us not to eat them. Paul’s point, to the contrary, is that those aware that no food is inherently unclean are *free to eat “anything”* (cf. 14:2).

The rule of 1 Cor 7:17, 20, and 24 – that believers should remain in the state in which they were “called” – is sometimes interpreted as indicating that Jewish believers, but not Gentile, ought to keep all aspects of Mosaic law. But what Paul had in mind is shown by the illustrations he gives: since neither circumcision nor uncircumcision really matters, Jews should not attempt to reverse their circumcision, nor should Gentiles be circumcised; and slaves need not strive to procure their freedom. That, however, in the case of slavery, Paul’s “rule” is no more than a “rule of thumb” is evident from his implicit request for Onesimus’s freedom in his letter to Philemon; 1 Cor 7:21b may allow for other exceptions as well. Moreover, in the context in 1 Corinthians 7, the *point* of spelling out this policy is to say that both those married and those unmarried can best serve God by remaining in the marital status in which they found themselves when “called” – though here, too, Paul makes it clear that the unmarried are *not* obliged to follow this “rule” (v. 28). Whether or not Jewish believers retain an obligation to observe all parts of

who flaunted their freedom from traditional practices by ostentatiously doing the opposite.<sup>29</sup> Paul felt no need to do so; quite the contrary. There were times when Christ was best served, and love expressed, by living as a Jew (1 Cor 9:20). He was, moreover, quite prepared to recognize that there were Jewish Christians<sup>30</sup> *who served God best* by observing the practices in which they had been brought up and which they now found themselves unable, in good conscience, to abandon (Rom 14:1–9).<sup>31</sup> His own conscience was more robust; in their company, however, he would eat only what they ate rather than offend them (Rom 14:13–22; cf. 1 Cor 8:13). He was, he assures us, always prepared to limit his exercise of freedom “for the sake of the gospel” (cf. 1 Cor 8:9–13; 9:12, 19–23).

But the freedom itself was fundamental to the gospel as he understood it: “the freedom that we have in Christ Jesus” had to be maintained if “the truth of the gospel” was to be preserved (Gal 2:4–5). As noted above, Paul condemned *Jewish* believers who, rather than be seen as unfaithful Jews, withdrew from table fellowship with Gentiles: they were acting contrary

---

the Mosaic law is *not* the issue; and the suggestion that they are so obligated is contrary to much that Paul writes elsewhere.

<sup>29</sup> See my *Perspectives*, 37–38.

<sup>30</sup> I am, of course, aware that Paul does not use the term “Christian” for his converts and that, to the extent that the term suggests adherents of a “religion” in the modern sense of the word, it is misleading in an ancient context. I agree, furthermore, that Paul did *not* see his task in life as the trivial one of founding a new “religion”; ask him, and he will tell you that his few, tiny, scattered groups of converts marked the beginnings of the new *creation*. Still, a term is needed for what were already in Paul’s day distinct communities from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. And if use of the term “Christian” to designate them risks obscuring ways in which they differed from modern-day believers, the avoidance of the term risks obscuring the fundamental ways in which they are united, e.g., in their belief in Jesus as the Christ, who died and rose again for their salvation; and in their initiation into the community of believers through baptism in Jesus’ name and their regular observance of “the Lord’s supper.” In short, something is lost, and something gained, either way. To the diffident defense of my usage offered in chapter 20 n. 4, I am pleased to append the following words of E. P. Sanders (“Paul’s Jewishness,” 278–279): “Paul had terms for his own group – not the word *Christian* or *Christianity*, but nevertheless a distinct terminology. Scholars frequently ignore or undervalue this evidence. ... He often designates his group by a phrase that includes the word *Christ*, such as those who are ‘called of Jesus Christ’ (Rom 1:6), those who are ‘baptized in Christ Jesus’ (Rom 6:3), those in whom Christ is (Rom 8:10), ‘joint heirs with Christ’ (Rom 8:17), ‘one body in Christ’ (Rom 12:5), ‘the body of Christ’ (1 Cor 12:27), those who are ‘sanctified in Christ’ (1 Cor 1:2), ‘members of Christ’ (1 Cor 6:15), those who are ‘Christ’s’ (2 Cor 10:7; Gal 3:29), those who are ‘in Christ’ (Gal 3:27, 28), and ‘the saints in Christ Jesus’ (Phil 1:1). ... It is easy to call these people *Christians*, and I see no reason to avoid the use of the term when discussing Paul’s converts: they are *Christians*, people ‘in Christ,’ not *Jews* or *Israelites*.”

<sup>31</sup> In the light of 1 Cor 9:20–23, it is clear that Paul would also support believers who were Jews by birth *and* who continued to “live as Jews” “for the sake of the gospel”, i. e., to further their mission to other Jews.

to – the same phrase again – “the truth of the gospel” (2:11–14). Paul’s argument in Galatians shows why.

In all ages, God can declare *sinners* to be (not sinners, but) “righteous” only by reckoning their faith as righteousness (Gal 3:6–7; cf. 2:17; Rom 4:5); this *extraordinary* method of counting righteous the unrighteous had to be adopted because the *ordinary* standard of righteousness (i. e., the righteous are those who do what is right) was met by none:

If a law had been given that was able to give life [to the dead], then indeed righteousness would have been by the law. But Scripture confined all under the power of sin. ... The law was our guardian until Christ came, in order that we might be declared righteous by faith. (Gal 3:21–24)

In Paul’s understanding, the law spells out the “good” that human beings *ought* to do (cf. Rom 2:7–10, 13). But it is more than a code to guide people’s behavior: it “rules” – until death – those to whom it is given (Rom 7:1); under its administration, life in divine favor is granted those who obey it, while it calls down God’s “wrath” on transgressors (Rom 4:15; Gal 3:10). The fundamental principle of the law’s administration is this: “The one who does these things [i. e., the requirements of the law] will live by them” (Rom 10:5; cf. Gal 3:12). This is the “righteousness of the law” (Rom 10:5), and Paul nowhere questions its axiomatic truth – indeed, the gospel of justification by faith presupposes it.

Interpreters pre- and post-Sanders alike have, I believe, wrongly looked for what Paul saw as Judaism’s *misunderstanding* or *perversion* of the law. The fundamental problem, as Paul saw it, was not Judaism’s (purported) legalistic or its (purported) ethnocentric *distortion* of the law. Laws, *as laws*, require compliance with their demands; God’s law was no different. Jews were not wrong to think that righteousness lay in doing what God told them to do (cf. Deut 6:25); nor were they wrong in including God’s boundary-marking demands among those they were bound to obey. The problem with the law, as Paul sees it, is not that it has been distorted into something it is not, but that it spells out a path to righteousness that *sinners* are both unable and disinclined to take; and the law itself is too “weak” to enable them to do so (Rom 8:3). Under the law’s administration, and judged by the principle of the law, no human being is righteous.

We have previously charged [i. e., in the argument of 1:18–2:29, to which Paul here returns after the parenthesis of 3:1–8] both Jews and Gentiles as all under the power of sin. As it is written, “There is none righteous.” (Rom 3:9–10)<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Paul’s summary in 3:9 of his preceding argument shows that what *he* believes he has demonstrated is the sinfulness of Jews and Gentiles alike. This is further confirmed by the conclusion to 1:18–3:20 in 3:19–20: the *whole world* is culpable before God, including specifically Jews (to whom the law was given, and to whom the preceding quotations from the law must therefore particularly apply). The thrust of much of chapter 2 has been

What the law says it speaks to those who are under the law [i. e., the judgment that “there is none righteous” applies in the first place to Jews], in order that every mouth may be stopped [i. e., if those given the law are guilty as charged, then so much the more is the rest of humankind], and all the world might become culpable before God. Therefore, by the works of the law no flesh will be found righteous in God’s eyes; for by the law comes the recognition of sin. (3:19–20)

There is no difference [between Jew and Gentile]. All have sinned. (3:22–23)

The mindset of the flesh is one of enmity toward God; it does not submit to God’s law, and, indeed, it cannot. Those who are in the flesh cannot please God. (8:7–8)

It follows that if human beings, sinners all, are to be found righteous before God, it must be “apart from law” (3:21) – a law that serves its purpose in highlighting a dilemma it is itself powerless to resolve (3:20; 7:7; 8:3). Furthermore, if God is to be rightly served, it must be by those who have “died to the law” and who now, no longer “under the law” but “freed” from it, serve God “in a new way, by the Spirit” (Rom 6:14; 7:6).

In the earliest articles reproduced below, it seemed necessary to defend this understanding against those who would limit Paul’s declarations of freedom from the law to a *partial* freedom: freedom from certain demands of the law but not others; or freedom from the law’s condemnation but not from (at least certain of) its demands; or even freedom from a particular (legalistic) perversion of the law. Legitimate concerns lie behind such interpretations; to these I will turn below. But it seems clear to me, as I argued in those articles, that worthy intentions have led to misconstruals of Paul’s argument.<sup>33</sup> It was the law given to Moses on Mount Sinai – not *some* of its commands, or only its condemnation, still less a misunderstanding of it – that was to be valid only until Christ came (Gal 3:19); that served as “our”

---

to show that factors that might be thought to render innocuous Gentile or Jewish sin do not in fact do so. Gentiles can be held responsible for their sin though they were not given the law, since what the law requires is written on their heart (2:14–15). The privileges God has granted Jews (including the giving of the law) are only of benefit if they in fact keep the law; otherwise they are no better than Gentiles (2:17–29). The affirmation in Rom 3:1–2 – that the privileges of Jews to whom “the oracles of God” were given are real enough *in spite of what has just been said* – shows that what has just been said pertained to Jews and might appear to call in question any benefit in being Jewish. That Paul is concerned to show that, in the end, Jews and Gentiles are held to the same divine standard, found guilty alike, and justified alike by faith in Jesus Christ is clear in 2:9–11; 3:22–23, 28–30.

<sup>33</sup> If, e. g., Paul saw himself as still bound to observe the law’s commands but not subject to its sanctions, then he could still be a transgressor even though he would not be condemned for his transgressions; but Paul claims that he would show himself a transgressor *only if he reestablished what he had demolished* (Gal 2:18). Similarly, the wife who marries another after her husband has died is not free simply from the law’s *condemnation* of those who commit adultery; the law prohibiting adultery simply does not apply to her. And her position, says Paul, is also that of believers who have “died to the law” (Rom 7:2–4). See further chapters 15, 16, and 17 below.



guardian until faith came and “we” could be justified by faith; now “we” are no longer under the guardian (3:23–25). Those “led by the Spirit” are “not under the law” (5:18).

A more recent trend among Pauline scholars limits Paul’s declarations of freedom from the law to *Gentile* believers; in fact, we are told, Paul was simply affirming the common Jewish understanding that the law of Moses was meant for Jews, not Gentiles; that Gentiles need not (perhaps they *could* not) observe it; that they could be righteous *as Gentiles*, without becoming Jews and adopting Jewish practices. All of this would make sense, of course, for a first-century Jew to say. And it would be so *easy* to say that one can only wonder why Paul did not say it. Had he taken that straightforward tack in writing to the Galatians, who would have been offended? The argument of Galatians, however, is not that Gentiles need not get circumcised and adopt Jewish practices since the (still valid) Mosaic law and covenant were meant only for Jews; rather, Paul attempts to dissuade Gentiles from submitting to a law that curses its subjects (3:10, 13), or from entering a covenant (that of Mount Sinai) that “bears children for slavery” (a state in which, Paul declares, present-day Jerusalem finds itself [4:24–25]). The freedom from obligation to the law that Paul speaks of is not that of Gentiles for whom the law was not intended, but that of those “redeemed” from the law (4:4–5), who have “died” to the law (2:19), who – now that “faith” has come – are no longer under the law’s guardianship (3:23–25). In short, rather than affirming the standard position that Gentiles are not meant to keep the law, Paul develops a whole theology of the law that is anything but standard Jewish fare: a theology that is incompatible with the notion that believers, Jewish or Gentile, are bound to keep the law.

We may sum up much of what has been said by asking the question of the day: Did Paul “remain *within Judaism*”? If we leave to the side – as sometimes happens in these discussions – what Paul himself has to say on the question (Gal 1:13–14),<sup>34</sup> the answer will depend on what we mean by “remaining *within Judaism*.”<sup>35</sup> An ambiguous question<sup>36</sup> can only receive a qualified answer.

1. If, regardless of specifics of belief or practice, the faith of any pious, first-century Jew represents one of the *Judaisms* (plural) of the day, and the existence of many *Judaisms* is then seen as demonstrating the diversity of

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Dunn, “Review,” 784.

<sup>35</sup> See further chapter 20 below.

<sup>36</sup> Not only is the term “Judaism” ambiguous; when we ask whether Paul remained within Judaism, after whose view of Paul *and* Judaism are we inquiring: his own, that of his contemporary, non-Christ-believing Jews, or that of modern scholars?

*Judaism*, then Paul remained within Judaism. He was a Jew. He lived in the first century. He was pious.

2. All his life, Paul believed in the God of Israel. He accepted the Hebrew scriptures as sacred. He regarded the commandments given to Moses as holy, just, and good. He believed that Jesus was the Messiah of Jewish expectation; Jews who failed to see this were, in his view, blind to the truth of their own scriptures (cf. 2 Cor 3:14). He insisted that his Gentile converts worship *exclusively* Israel's God. The *moral* standards he required of his Gentile converts *correspond* to the second tablet of the Decalogue.<sup>37</sup> If these indisputable facts are sufficient to establish that Paul remained within Judaism, then Paul lived and died within Judaism. So do the Plymouth Brethren.

3. As one who shared with other Jews the same faith in the sacred history of his people, Paul continued to attend synagogues wherever he went. In that context, one cannot imagine the apostle of the epistles doing anything other than what he is portrayed as doing in the Acts of the Apostles: using every opportunity to convince his fellow Jews of what he had come to see as the true interpretation of Scripture, the true understanding of their common sacred history and, particularly, of its most recent developments. He clearly believed he had a better understanding than non-Christ-believing Jews of what it meant to be the "seed" of Abraham. Few Jews agreed.

4. More specifically: Paul believed that Israel's God was the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Cor 1:3). He saw references to Jesus Christ in scriptures that spoke of Israel's God (e. g., Rom 10:13; Phil 2:10). He spoke of the (Old Testament) "day of the Lord" as the "day of (Jesus) Christ" (Phil 1:6; cf. 1 Thess 4:15–5:2). He invoked divine blessing jointly "from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3, etc.). Now, while it is true that no individual, institution, or party could speak authoritatively for "Judaism" in the first century, it is clear that for many Jews – then, as later – Paul's faith in these regards was something other than the faith of their fathers. Those zealous for the latter might even deem it sufficiently pernicious to merit rooting out (cf. Gal 1:13–14, 20; Phil 3:6).

5. Paul believed that Jews no less than non-Jews needed faith in Jesus Christ if they were to be saved (cf. Rom 10:1; 11:14, 23; 1 Cor 9:20, 22). Implicit in this conviction is the judgment that the Mosaic covenant and law are inadequate for the purpose; but Paul did not leave that judgment implicit. Though the law was divinely given, it served a limited (divine) purpose

---

<sup>37</sup> The second tablet of the Decalogue is cited in Rom 13:8–10 to illustrate how the love that Paul enjoins in effect fulfills the law; but it is the love, not the keeping of the law, that he enjoins. See chapter 15 below.

(that of defining and highlighting human sinfulness) for a limited period of time (until Abraham promised “seed,” Christ, should come [Gal 3:16–19]). Righteousness cannot come from the law (Gal 2:21; 3:21–22); righteousness and salvation depend – for Jews and Gentiles alike – on confessing with one’s mouth the faith of one’s heart in the Christian gospel (Rom 10:9–13). E. P. Sanders, for one, thinks that Paul thus denied “the foundations of Judaism.”<sup>38</sup>

6. Paul’s practice matched his theology. As one free from the law, he at times lived “as a Gentile” (cf. Gal 2:13–14; 4:12; 1 Cor 9:21). So “strong” were his theological convictions that he could, with good conscience, eat any food and treat “holy” days as no different from any other (Rom 14:1–15:6). If “remaining within Judaism” means continuing to observe the distinctively Jewish requirements of the law, then Paul did not remain within Judaism.<sup>39</sup>

What, then, are the “legitimate concerns” referred to above that have been raised against such a reading of Paul?

1. *It is thought to pit God’s law against God’s gospel.*<sup>40</sup> Not every interpretation of Paul that appears to pit the law against the gospel can be right (Marcion’s, for one, was not); still, an interpretation that gives *no* such appearance *cannot* be correct. Paul does, after all, *contrast* “the righteousness of the law” with that “of faith”;<sup>41</sup> he *contrasts* the law and God’s promise, as realized in the gospel (Rom 4:13–15; Gal 3:15–18): already in his own day, Paul’s talk about the law provoked the question whether it was *opposed* to God’s promise (Gal 3:21). Paul responds, of course, with an emphatic denial. But in clarifying his position (3:21–25), he does *not* say that, in speaking of the law as he has just done (i. e., contrasting it with God’s promise and saying that its hegemony is now past [3:17–19]), he was referring only to a part of

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Sanders, “Did Paul Break with Judaism?” 235: Paul “argued that Jews and gentiles were equally outside the people of God unless they had faith in Christ, and that if they had faith in Christ the law was optional for them all – optional for Jews as well as for gentiles. Paul even thought that, in select circumstances, Jews should disregard aspects of the law.” Paul was thus “striking” at “the two pillars of Judaism: the election and the law,” thereby denying “the foundations of Judaism.” (For Sanders’s understanding of Judaism as based on election and the law, see chapter 11 below.)

<sup>39</sup> That Paul’s conduct was repeatedly seen as unacceptable by contemporary Jewish standards is apparent from the “thirty-nine stripes” that he repeatedly received in synagogues (2 Cor 11:24). Cf. the important article by Barclay, “Paul among Diaspora Jews,” and his pointed observation (“Deviance and Apostasy,” 136): “Inasmuch as he *was viewed* by his contemporary Jews as an apostate, he *was* (historically speaking) an apostate, and no amount of pleading about the Jewish elements in his theology or the diversity within first-century Judaism can mask or alter that reality.”

<sup>40</sup> Those who raise this charge generally interpret Paul more or less as Calvin did; see chapter 22 below.

<sup>41</sup> See chapter 13 below.

the law, or to the law when seen apart from its true essence, or to some other *misconstruction* of what the law was all about. His point, as he explains it, is rather that the limited purpose of the law could hardly infringe upon the very different purpose of the gospel: the one consigns all humanity to the power of sin, the other brings sinners justification. In short, as noted above, the law is neither to be identified with the gospel nor seen in opposition to it. Rather, the law is the gospel's essential presupposition: without the dilemma to which the law gives definition,<sup>42</sup> there would be no need for the solution on offer in the gospel.

2. *It is thought that those pronounced free from the law will think themselves free to do as they please.* Not every interpretation of Paul that appears to encourage immoral behavior can be right; still, an interpretation that gives *no* such appearance *cannot* be correct, for Paul's own teaching clearly led the Corinthians to draw that conclusion (1 Cor 6:12–20; perhaps even 5:1), he was aware that others so construed his teaching (Rom 3:8), and he repeatedly labored to banish such thoughts from his readers (Gal 5:13–26; Phil 3:17–21; Rom 6:1–23; 8:13). Still, none of Paul's labors took the form of saying (what many today want him to say) that his talk of freedom from the law referred only to its ceremonial aspects, or to its sanctions, or to its misinterpretation.<sup>43</sup> Rather, he argued consistently from what we may call *Christian* principles:<sup>44</sup> you are still to serve God, but now in a new way, by the Spirit (Rom 7:6); those who have died with Christ to sin cannot continue living in it (Rom 6:1–11); walk in the Spirit, and do not fulfill the desires of the flesh (Gal 5:16); clothe yourselves with the Lord Jesus Christ, and forget about gratifying fleshly desires (Rom 13:14); if you live by the flesh, you will die (Rom 8:13). In addition to such general admonitions, Paul gave instructions to his readers of what constituted appropriate behavior in a number of concrete situations – though his ethical teaching, like that of Jesus, bore little resemblance to the Pharisaic halakhah with which he must have been familiar. And it did not invoke Mosaic law as its basis.

A semi-qualification to the preceding is, however, in order: though Paul never suggested that believers remain subject to a *part* of the law, he clearly

---

<sup>42</sup> That the law is not itself the *source* of the problem is clear in Rom 5:12–14 and insisted upon in 7:7–25. But it gives definition to the problem (i. e., in the presence of the law, sin becomes obvious transgression [5:13]), even exacerbates it (5:20; 7:5), while being itself too “weak” to overcome it (8:3).

<sup>43</sup> In effect, such interpreters want Paul to say that the law (or the “moral law,” at least) continues to serve as a binding code for believers to live by. But for Paul, the law is never simply a code for behavior; it is a path to life that has proved not to be viable. It does not follow that those freed from the law may live as they please; but the demands under which they must live require a different basis.

<sup>44</sup> See chapters 5 and 17 below. On Gal 5:14; Rom 8:4; 13:8–10, see chapter 15 below.

expected their behavior to conform to its moral demands (cf. Rom 13:8–10) – not because Moses commanded them, but because those demands spell out what is “good” for all human beings, and hence a goodness that God requires even of those “without the law” (Rom 2:6–13).<sup>45</sup> Moral expectations cannot be stated more basically than that human beings are to do what is “good”; and Paul expects this of believers (Rom 12:2, 9; 16:19).

3. *It is thought to detach the law from the covenant.* Portrayed as above, Paul might seem to have understood the law simply as laying out commandments by which human beings are to live and a standard by which they will be judged. On that understanding, a Jew might well wonder why Paul ignores the covenant of which the law was a part: a covenant Israel entered *as God’s people*, and a covenant that provided means of atonement for their sins.<sup>46</sup> And a Christian, seeing believers as true heirs of Israel’s faith, and seeing the law’s rites of atonement and other ceremonial aspects as fulfilled in Christ, might well choose to highlight the continuity between the Old Testament law (and covenant) and New Testament realities. They might, indeed, prefer to speak of one covenant, not two, embracing both Old Testament and New.<sup>47</sup>

Neither Jews nor the heirs of Calvin see any reason to distinguish between promises God made to Abraham and the law God gave to Moses; together, they make one covenant. But Paul draws sharp distinctions – and he emphatically speaks of *two* covenants (Gal 4:21–5:6). He sees the Abrahamic promises (a covenant, according to Gal 3:17) as finding fulfillment in Christ, with their promised blessings enjoyed by Jews and Gentiles alike who believe in him. He sees the law (the essence of the “covenant” from Mount Sinai [Gal 4:24]) as something different entirely – so different that he must insist that the law cannot invalidate God’s earlier covenant of promise (Gal 3:17). The *essential* difference Paul sees between them is that a blessing *promised by God* will surely be fulfilled, whereas a blessing *contingent upon human observance of the law* is bound to go unrealized. For Paul, promise and law represent two potential, but mutually exclusive, paths to blessing (Gal 3:18; 5:2–4; Rom 4:13–16); only the promise, however, is efficacious.

It does not follow that Paul ignores the covenantal context of the law. He simply follows Scripture in believing that the Mosaic law (and covenant) attached blessing to observance of its commands (Deut 11:26–28; 28:1–14; 30:16–20). As for its rites of atonement, Scripture itself indicates that they were not meant to cover willful sin (Num 15:30–31) – and Paul sees all

---

<sup>45</sup> See chapter 19 below.

<sup>46</sup> So Schoeps, *Paul*. Cf. my *Perspectives*, 123–128.

<sup>47</sup> So, again, Calvin and his heirs; see chapter 22 below.

human beings as innately, and willfully, resistant to God's law.<sup>48</sup> It is likely enough that, for Paul, Sinai's rites of atonement merely foreshadowed Christ's efficacious self-sacrifice, though he is less explicit on the subject than the letter to the Hebrews (cf., however, Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 5:7; Col 2:17). But even if the law can be read as pointing to Christ, Paul still sees its essence as different from, though an essential presupposition of, the gospel of Christ Jesus (cf. Gal 3:11–13).

Chapters 2 through 22 below were written over a period of 35 years to meet a variety of demands.<sup>49</sup> All but one (chapter 10) have previously been published, though (like chapter 10), chapters 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 14, 18, and 19 perhaps still betray their origin in oral presentations; and chapters 2 and 6 *ought* to look like entries in a Bible dictionary. In addition to standardizing formatting and referencing, I have rewritten sentences here and there, largely for stylistic reasons, though occasionally (especially in earlier articles) to bring claims in line with my present thinking. These are few, however, and I have made no attempt to update bibliographies. Nor have I attempted to remove material in one chapter that overlaps with discussions in others: each chapter was first written to stand on its own, and is meant to do so still.

That the majority of articles pertain to Paul reflects the focus of most of my post-dissertation research; but chapter 22 (though still concerned with Pauline interpretation) is an offshoot of the project that led to the publication of *Reading Sacred Scripture*, a look at key figures in the history of Christian biblical interpretation (to which my son Martin also contributed). Knowing that I do not know what a day may bring forth, I tentatively plan to devote future research largely to the history of Pauline interpretation. But to readers of the following chapters, it will already be apparent that I have long found Luther, in particular, a superior interpreter of Paul.<sup>50</sup> Of

---

<sup>48</sup> See chapter 4 below. Mark Adam Elliott (*Survivors*) has shown that a number of Jews of Paul's day thought Israel's covenant had been broken, and that a large part of Israel was now effectively excluded from its blessings. Paul thought that, apart from Jesus Christ, that was true of all.

<sup>49</sup> I thank Markus Bockmuehl for proposing their republication here, and Dr. Henning Ziebritzki for direction and encouragement in preparing the present volume. Chapter 5 was originally prepared at the request of members of the Paraenesis Project (of which I was not a part) to apply their working definition of "paraenesis" to *4 Maccabees*. Since I had given a good deal of attention to Finnish contributions to the debate surrounding the "New Perspective on Paul," I was asked to introduce a volume of Finnish studies on Pauline theology (chapter 12). Chapter 19 was prepared in response to a request to address the issue of biblical foundations at a symposium devoted to the theme of natural law. Chapters 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 18 were also prepared in response to invitations to address particular topics.

<sup>50</sup> See chapter 22 in this volume, but also the concluding remarks to chapter 11 for some necessary qualifications to any endorsement of Luther as a reader of Paul. To be emphasized again is that I do not believe Paul faulted Judaism for its "legalism" – though