

Epworth Commentaries

Already published

The Book of Job
C.S. Rodd

Amos and Hosea
Harry Mowley

The Gospel of John
Kenneth Grayson

The First Epistle to the Corinthians
Nigel Watson

The Epistle to the Philippians
Howard Marshall

The Epistle to the Hebrews
Paul Ellingworth

The Johannine Epistles
William Loader

In preparation

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians
Nigel Watson

Revelation
Christopher Rowlands

The Epistle to the GALATIANS

JOHN ZIESLER

EPWORTH PRESS

and is now Turkey, modern Antakya, with a considerable Jewish community. It became one of the major centres of early Christianity.

2.12 *he was taking his meals with Gentile Christians*: the wording of REB tends to support the position adopted above, namely that he was eating with them, not they with him. Some infringements of Jewish food laws, such as eating pork, would be obvious, but others would not, and perhaps the essential point is that one could never be sure. The Greek is literally 'he was in the habit of eating ...' so that a regular practice is implied. It is not clear whether we are talking about ordinary meals, or the eucharist (perhaps in the context of an ordinary meal).

he was afraid of the Jews: Jews might have objected for political/nationalistic reasons, or for strictly religious reasons, or quite possibly both, though it is hard to believe religious reasons were absent.

2.13 *the same lack of principle*: the Greek word *hypokrisis* is often translated 'hypocrisy' but that does not suit the present context. The meaning could be as in REB, i.e. a mismatch between profession and action, or it could more simply be defiance of God, i.e. a standing against the truth. Either meaning is possible here.¹⁸

the truth of the gospel: Paul's objection to the conduct of Barnabas and the others is not just that it fractured the Christian fellowship of Antioch, but that it was inconsistent with the gospel as he saw it. Behind the community question lies a theological question: what is it that qualifies men and women, Jew and Gentile, for membership of God's people and acceptability with him? Almost immediately Paul will give in answer his basic principle that it is faith in Jesus Christ and that alone. Implicitly Peter and Barnabas and the rest were conceding that such faith is not enough, and that meeting certain requirements of the Torah is also needed. Although the issue here is not directly circumcision, the principle is the same: are Jesus Christ and faith in him enough, or are they not?

live like a Gentile and not like a Jew: the three great 'identity markers'¹⁹ for Judaism were circumcision, observance of the Sabbath, and the dietary laws. Particularly in social terms, it was these that marked the difference between living Jewishly and living like the Gentiles. Here it is the last of these that is the centre of the controversy.

The fundamental proposition

2.15-21

At long last we come to the heart of Paul's contention in this letter. It is not without its difficulties which are discussed in the detailed notes, but what is offered here is one possible account of the argument. Presumably the rebuke to Peter delivered at Antioch has ended, and Paul now draws his conclusions for his Galatian readers/hearers. *We ourselves* (v. 15) presumably refers to Paul himself and Jewish Christians like him who have been brought up within the covenant people, as Gentiles have not (*sinners* could reflect a common Jewish view that Gentiles tended to be incorrigibly sinful in a general moral sense, cf. Rom. 1.18-32, or it could be less condemnatory in moral terms and reflect the fact that Gentiles do not have the Torah and so do not follow the full will of God). Yet it is precisely people like Paul who have come to recognize that men and women are accepted by God into his people (*justified*) not by observance of the Torah but by *faith in Christ Jesus* and by that alone. So he and Jews like him have turned to faith in Christ in order to find justification (v. 16), knowing that such acceptance by God can never be found through Torah-observance. It can be argued that Paul is here talking only about entry into God's people, not about the consequent life as that people, yet it seems impossible to maintain such a distinction.²⁰ The language he uses seems more general than that, and in any case the issue arises out of the Antioch incident which is primarily about how people who already consider themselves God's people ought to live. Paul's answer is that it is faith in Jesus Christ that both enables them to enter and also enables them to remain as his people, acceptable to him.

If Jews who turn to Christ then fail to be fully Torah-observant and so become strictly speaking *sinners* like the *Gentiles* (v. 17) this does not mean that Christ promotes sin. Indeed not (v. 18): it rather shows that the definition of sin is wrong. The real sin would be to reassert those distinctions between Jews and Gentiles (the 'identity markers')

found in the law, or perhaps to re-assert that it is not faith in Jesus Christ that is the sole and sufficient ground of acceptance with God but that Torah-observance is necessary as well or instead. That would be the real infringement of God's will (make Paul *one who breaks the law*, v. 18: but it is important to note that in the Greek the word *law* does not occur, and we may take it that the infringement would be of God's will in general and not the law in particular).

Paul has elsewhere (Rom. 7.1-6) spoken of Christians as those who have *died to law*, v. 19. The point seems to be that the law is here seen as a regime which is no longer Paul's final authority, and in that sense he has *died* to it. The basic idea is not uncommon in Paul. Now that his life is centred in Christ and lived under the authority and in the power of Christ and his Spirit (e.g. Rom. 8.1-17) he is freed from all other powers and authorities, see Rom. 8.2, 4, 9, 37f. In effect, no one can serve two masters, and if Christ is the master now, then nothing else and nobody else can be. If the basic idea is not unusual, what is unusual here is that he says that it was *through the law* that he died to the law: what does this mean? One could argue that there is a reflection of the notion of dying with Christ, cf. v. 20 and Rom. 6.1-11; Col. 2.20; 3.3. Now Christ died to the law (escaped from its power) when he underwent the curse of the law (3.13) and came out unscathed. Those who die with Christ thus die through the law. This interpretation is not altogether satisfactory, if only because the law did not bring about the death of Christ: it was subsequent to his death that he underwent the curse of the law (see below on 3.13). Yet if we do not press the details of the text too hard, it could be possible to say that Christ died *through the law* and so Paul with him: that interpretation does at least depend on material in Galatians itself.

It may be easier, however, to detect a hint of Pauline autobiography here, reflecting what is implicit in 1.13-16: it was through his fanatical adherence to the law that Paul himself was brought to persecuting the nascent Christian community, but was then converted, literally turned round, so that he joined the very people whom he had persecuted. In a sense then, it was *through the law* (i.e. through his zealous devotion to the law) that he came to meet Christ and then *died to the law*. Paradoxically, since as a Jew he had believed that keeping the law was living for God, it was when he died to the law that he came to *live for God*. How the law can be both God-given and also something to which to die, he will take up later in the letter, see especially 3.19-25.

In any case, his old life came to an end and he was *crucified with*

Christ: not literally of course, but in so far as he was released from his old securities and goals and above all from the old authorities and powers under which he had lived. We are dealing with something close to a change of identity, and certainly a change of social identity.²¹ His present life is firmly centred in Christ (v. 20) and in faith in him *who loved him and gave himself for him*. Once again a reference to the death of Christ for others is left unexplained (cf. 1.4), but in the light of the beginning of the verse, *I have been crucified with Christ*, that death can be understood as enabling others to die with him, cf. II Cor. 5.14-15. It was not to replace their deaths, but to bring them about, their deaths to all the old powers and authorities. Because all this is central for Paul, any attempt to supplement it or to replace it is tantamount to trying to *nullify the grace of God*. No doubt Paul's opponents would have hotly denied that they were imperilling the grace of God, which was after all at the heart of Judaism. For Paul, however, that grace of God is to be found definitively in Jesus Christ and in his death, and to insist on Torah-observance as part of the life of God's people (*righteousness*, v. 21), as implicitly happened at Antioch, is to derogate from or even to nullify that grace. In the end, if Torah-observance is still essential then we do not need Christ, who thus *died for nothing*.

* * * *

2.16 *but only through faith in Jesus Christ*: as REB has the verse, and as we have assumed above, Paul is saying that even born Jews know (if they are also Christians) that it is not keeping the law that makes people acceptable to God and members of his people, but rather faith in Christ. The two ways are alternatives, but only one gets to the destination. It can be argued, however²² that here Paul first states the Jewish Christian position, which is that doing the law needs to be accompanied by faith in Christ. The verse then runs:

'We Christian Jews, who are not sinful Gentiles, know that doing the works of the law does not place people within the covenant community, unless there is also faith in Christ Jesus'

- or something like that at any rate. On this argument, the second part of the verse is where Paul moves beyond this Jewish Christian position and proposes faith in Christ not as a complement to Torah-

observance but as an alternative to it, so that we are *justified by this faith and not through actions dictated by law*. In this interpretation, the Greek *ean mē* is given its usual meaning 'unless' rather than *but only* as in REB. The difficulty with this whole proposal is that it has Paul making a significant argumentative move in the middle of the verse from the Jewish Christian normal position to his own, without making the shift even half clear. Therefore while this proposal cannot be brushed aside, it nevertheless appears less probable than the usual understanding of the argument at this point, that implied by REB, namely that both halves of the verse say much the same thing, that even Jews like Paul know that justification is through faith in Christ and not by keeping the law.

faith in Jesus Christ: there are two interlocking questions here, the meaning of *faith* (Greek *pistis*) and whether we should read 'faith in Jesus Christ' or 'the faith(fulness) of Jesus Christ'.

(i) *Pistis* has a range of meanings which includes something like 'the faith' in the sense of the Christian faith, which may perhaps be reflected in 1.23, faithfulness, belief, and the sort of response which combines reliance and commitment. It is the last that is usually regarded as characteristically Pauline, especially where justification is being spoken of, and it is certainly present in the next part of the present verse, *we too have put our faith in Jesus Christ*. It is essentially the human acceptance of the unconditional offer of God. This is the interpretation implied by REB.

(ii) If however we take the Greek literally it could run differently, because the *pistis* of Jesus Christ is surely not his faith in the sense of (i) just outlined, but his faithfulness (to his Father's will, presumably, cf. Rom. 5.19 for example). It is increasingly argued that here and in 3.22 and in some other places we ought to take the genitive at its face value to mean 'of' not 'in'.²² If this is right, then the line of thought in this verse is that we are justified first by the faithful action of Jesus Christ in undergoing the cross (presumably) and then by our response to, our faith in, that faithful action. This way of taking the phrase is gaining ground in scholarly circles and certainly makes good sense, but it cannot be said that the issue is settled.

justified: this is the first occurrence of the verb (Greek *dikaioō*) that is so important in Galatians. It is common in LXX, where it usually means something like 'vindicate, prove/find to be in the right', but where it also often denotes restoration to proper relationship with God and with other people within the covenant with God. There is often but not always a forensic colouring, where the implied setting

is a court of law at which someone receives justice. In Paul it normally denotes the giving of a right standing within God's people and with God, a standing that may very well be undeserved because it is the result of God's unconditional generosity (grace). It is thus virtually the same as acceptance and has both a Godward and a community reference, as it clearly does here: throughout this chapter the community issue (who can have fellowship with whom) runs into the issue of acceptability before God. It is probably also impossible to confine the term to entry into God's people or his favour; it is indeed primarily an entry term, but as the present passage is concerned with the conditions of being God's people as much as with the conditions of entry into that people, it is hard to confine it to the latter. Moreover in all probability it has a future dimension, and can be used of God's verdict at the Judgment: compare 3.6 with 5.5, and Rom. 3.24, 26, 28; 4.2–12; 5.1, 9, 6.7; 8.30 REB with Rom. 2.13; 3.30.²⁴

doing what the law requires... actions dictated by law... keeping the law: all these expressions in REB translate the same Greek words, literally 'works of law'. It has usually been assumed that Paul was writing quite generally about all or any of the commands of the Torah. It has now been argued, however, that this term refers specifically to the three great 'identity markers' of the Jewish community, namely circumcision, the Sabbath and the dietary laws, and that Paul is simply not talking about the law in general. His concern is strictly with those matters in the law that serve to demarcate Jews from Gentiles, and we consequently ought not to enlarge his focus to the law as a whole.²⁵

Now it is true that in this letter the matters from the law with which Paul is particularly concerned are circumcision (2.3; 5.2, 3, 6, 11; 6.12–13, 15) and dietary laws (2.11–14). There is no mention of the Sabbath. The only other specific point from the law that is quoted is the command to love, 5.14. It is true also, as both the account of the Jerusalem meeting and the story of the Antioch affair show, that what marks out a community from another or from its surrounding society was at the heart of Paul's dispute with his opponents. On the other hand, most of Paul's argument is about the law without qualification or restriction (e.g. 2.19, 21, 3.11, 12, 19, 21, 23, 24; 4.21; 5.4 etc.) and although he does attack in the first instance both circumcision and the food laws as requirements of the people of God, the way in which he mounts his attack is to relegate the importance of the law as such, not just three important items within it. We may

therefore agree that two of the identity markers are what spark off the debate behind this letter, but need not go on to accept that the focus is on them throughout the argument. They are the specific cases which lead to the general question and it is the general question which finally dominates Galatians. In any case, whether we take 'works of the law' to be any works of the law, or specifically circumcision, the Sabbath and the food laws, for Paul it is none of them that is necessary to constitute the people of God; rather what is needed is faith in Christ, acceptance by him and thereafter of him.

It is important to underline that in any case Paul is not here contrasting faith with morality or with good deeds. He is certainly being more particular than that, and is contrasting a community that is based only on faith in Christ with one that is based on living Jewishly (v. 14).

no human being can be justified by keeping the law: see Ps. 143.2. Paul does not say that it is impossible to keep the law, but rather that this is not the way to find justification. Did anyone think it was? It is obvious, for example, from the book of Deuteronomy that for Israel it was God's grace in election that made her his people, and that their observance of the Torah was people's grateful response, their way of living within the covenant which he had generously given them (see for example Deut. 10.12-11.32). Judaism did not and does not teach that law-observance is what constitutes Israel as God's people, though of course it did and does teach that such observance is the way of living as his people. Yet here Paul finds it necessary to deny what presumably no instructed Jew would ever have found it necessary to affirm, viz. that justification is by works of the law, however these are defined. Why? There are several possibilities.

(i) The people whom Paul was opposing did not represent mainstream Judaism but a somewhat distorted form of it, a merit-centred form which is indeed found after CE 70, for example in II(4) Esd. 9.7 and II *Apor. Bar.* 14.7, 12. While this possibility cannot be ruled out, there is no contemporary evidence for it.

(ii) Paul's opponents did not themselves have a very instructed understanding of Judaism and were quite unaware that law-observance was how to live as God's people but was not a condition of entry. This would be parallel to their supposed unawareness that circumcision was no isolated matter but carried with it the obligation to keep the whole Torah, 5.3. Perhaps innocently but ignorantly they were simply arguing that circumcision was the condition of being acceptable to God.

(iii) The most feasible suggestion is that Paul is not attacking a position that anyone consciously holds, but is rather exposing the logic of those who are insisting on circumcision and other matters. In effect he is saying, if you require circumcision and observance of the dietary laws (with or without the rest of the Torah) as well as faith in Jesus Christ for entry into God's people, then you are saying that the law is necessary for justification.

It is worth noting that *can be justified* is in Greek in the future tense. This may indicate that Paul is talking about God's acceptance at the Last Judgment, though as it comes in a quotation from LXX we cannot be sure.

2.17 *justified in Christ*: the expression is unusual. Perhaps the preposition *in* simply means 'by' which is possible in NT Greek. Perhaps however *in Christ* has something of its frequent force in Paul's writings and indicates that it is in the sphere of Christ's power that people are justified, cf. above on 1.22.

we no less than the Gentiles turn out to be sinners: the interpretation we have adopted above is that *sinners* is not to be understood in ordinary moral terms but as 'not fully Torah-observant'. Today, with our resources of punctuation, we should doubtless put *sinners* in inverted commas.

does that mean that Christ is a promoter of sin? Of course not! the last three words translate *mē genoito*, an extremely emphatic denial. We should perhaps say something like 'not on your life' because the conclusion is ridiculous. It is so ridiculous that something must be wrong with the premises that have led to it, and what is wrong is the definition of sin. Gentile Christians who are not law-observant are not thereby sinners, nor are Jewish Christians like Paul himself who are prepared to forgo certain observances in order to maintain one fellowship within the church.

2.18 *On the contrary...*: the real sin is not to sit loose to things like circumcision and dietary laws (as Paul's opponents presumably think). The real sin would rather be to start insisting all over again on law-observance as a condition of being in God's people, for that would amount to saying that Christ and faith in him were not enough. It would also be to re-assert the division between Jew and Gentile. The point is that for Paul the distinction between sinner and righteous is no longer determined simply by the Torah.

It is worth noting that at this verse Paul switches from 'we' to *I*. It

is likely that this is purely rhetorical, but it is conceivable that the change is significant and that he is saying something like 'if I in my ministry were to start insisting on certain law-observances . . . then I *prove to be one that breaks the law*: we noted above that the word for *law* (*nomos*) does not occur in the Greek, though it may be held that what one *breaks* (literally 'be a transgressor') must be that.

If that is correct, and if REB is thus correct, the meaning is: 'if we bring back the law, and especially things like the food laws, then judged by that standard I am indeed a law-breaker.' The view adopted in the main comment above, however, is that what Paul would break would be not the law but the more fundamental will of God if he were to reassert such things. We have adopted it because it seems to suit the drift of the passage better.

2.19 *through the law I died to the law*: we suggested above alternative ways of explaining *through the law*, but in fact there are several possibilities.

(i) There is a reference to Paul's own life, where his zeal for the law led him, by way of persecuting Christians, to his encounter with Christ and so to his dying to the law (the view we preferred).

(ii) There is an implied reference to dying with Christ who died to the curse of the law (3.13) (a view we found possible, even though it does not fit the text very comfortably).

(iii) Because the demands of the law made it scarcely feasible for Gentiles to become Christians other than through Paul's law-free gospel, Paul found it necessary to die to the law.

(iv) The law in its wider sense as the Pentateuch and not just the laws within it, leads to dying to the law: this is to anticipate the argument of 3.6ff. and its quotation of Gen. 15.6 in favour of faith as sufficient for entry into the people of God (and the progeny of Abraham). This would be a stronger candidate if we did not have to anticipate something uncomfortably far ahead in the letter. It must be conceded that this sort of anticipation is not impossible, however, in a letter which does not disclose the basic issue until quite late in its course.

(v) The law showed the need for redemption by giving awareness of sin: this is one way of taking 3.19–25. The law itself thus showed that I needed to die to sin perhaps, but did it show that I needed to die to the law?

None of these explanations is altogether impossible, and none appears inescapably correct. The verse remains problematic.

to live for God: REB slightly obscures the parallelism in the Greek, which more literally could be translated 'I died to law in order to live to God'. The datives seem to represent alternative powers or regimes.²⁶ What is remarkable here is that instead of seeing the law as representing the regime or power of God Paul sees it as an alternative, which incidentally supports the interpretation we have adopted for v. 18.

2.20 *I have been crucified with Christ*: for the same idea see 5.24; 6.14 and Rom. 6.1–11. At least for Paul, the old world is now over (see 1.4) and his present life is for God, v. 19. In the classic passage on dying with Christ (Rom. 6) there is an explicit link with baptism and also with resurrection. Neither note is sounded here and ought not to be imported into the passage, though see immediately below.

the life I now live is not my life, but the life which Christ lives in me: taken literally, this is of course an exaggeration. His life in the obvious sense is still his life. Yet in terms of its centre and its governance it is not his, for it is centred in Christ (and in his Spirit, see chapter 5) and is under Christ's lordship. We ought not to take this clearly rhetorical way of putting things as a philosophical denial of the existence of the self.

It is comparatively rare to find in Paul's writings the notion of Christ in us, whereas the notion of our being in Christ is very common. The suggestion is probably correct that while the more frequent reference to believers' being in Christ concerns the basis of their existence, Christ's being in the believers is more a matter of his acting in and through them.²⁷ If so, REB's rendering here is appropriate (the Greek is more literally 'I live and yet not I, but Christ lives in me'). The expression refers to the basic springs of action, and thus fits well in a context concerned with how one defines sin: it is not law, but Christ's activity within them which makes believers righteous and which therefore distinguishes them from sinners. What sort of life this turns out to be will be dealt with in chapters 4 and 5, but the connection of *life* with *Christ* certainly suggests an allusion to the resurrection.

I here is almost certainly not particularly autobiographical but rather rhetorical, as in v. 18. All believers are in view, though naturally Paul himself is included.

my present mortal life: more literally, 'the life I now live in the flesh'. It is unlikely that 'flesh' (*sarx*) here means life without God as it does in chapter 5. REB's rendering is therefore perfectly appropriate, cf. II

2.15-21 *The fundamental proposition*

Cor. 10.3. Nevertheless there may be overtones of human weakness as REB's *mortal* brings out. Betz on this expression plausibly suggests that Paul is emphasizing that Christian life is lived under normal human conditions and that having Christ in us does not mean that we are in some way translated out of ordinary humanity or ordinary circumstances.

the Son of God: cf. 1.16. There is a rich literature on the meaning of this designation of Christ.²⁸ The expression must not be confused with the later definition of him as 'God the Son', the Second Person of the Trinity. In the Bible a king can be called God's son, as can the people of Israel as a whole, and in Hellenistic Judaism the angels and the righteous (see for example, in order: II Sam. 7.14; Ex. 4.22; Deut. 32.43 LXX; Wisd. 5.5). In the NT Jesus is frequently called Son of God, e.g. Mark 1.1; Matt. 11.27; Acts 13.33; I Thess. 1.10; Rom. 8.3-4, 29; Gal. 4.5. The basic notion is of someone appointed, sent and commissioned by God, responsible and obedient to him. We too easily think of sonship in nearly sentimental terms, forgetting that one of the essential characteristics of true sons was – in biblical times and in many other societies – their obedience to their fathers. As God's Son, Jesus Christ is therefore not only the one who enjoys a special relationship with him but also the one who carries out his will. The same applies to the sonship of those who belong to the Son, see 4.1-7.

2.21 *if righteousness comes by law*: although *righteousness* (*dikaïosynē*) is more often than not here taken to mean 'justification' and thus to denote entry into God's people, it is perfectly feasible to let it have its usual meaning, 'living as God's people'. Both renderings make sense in the context but it is preferable to adopt the latter. Thus Paul is using the word here in its normal sense to denote how people live, and is perhaps reflecting the issue at Antioch which was primarily not about how one enters the people of God but about how one lives within it.²⁹ For Paul it is not only admission to that people but also remaining within it that is based on faith in Jesus Christ rather than on Torah-obedience.

First argument, from the Galatians' experience 3.1-5

First argument, from the Galatians' experience 3.1-5

Paul's vehemence is obvious, and leads him to be less than polite to the *Galatians*. He says that they are *stupid*, v. 1. They have listened to a graphic presentation of Christ crucified in preaching (presumably Paul's) and they have responded to it. As a result (v. 2) they received *the Spirit*, a sign that they were God's people of the New Age.³⁰ They therefore already have the clearest of indications that they are within that people, so why do they now propose to accept Jewish legal observances? Is the gift of the Spirit not enough for them? Having begun (v. 3) *with the spiritual*, that is with God's own power and therefore with his validation, do they now intend to revert to something lesser, *the material*, in the hope that this will make them complete (*perfect*)? *Material* is literally 'the flesh' and is surely a reference to circumcision, sometimes called 'the covenant in the flesh', see Gen. 17.13 and Eccles. 44.20. At the same time it cannot be accidental that Paul here, as in chapter 5, juxtaposes and contrasts 'flesh' (*sarx*) and 'Spirit' (*Pneuma*); this opposition in Paul regularly signifies the contrast not between physical and non-physical, but between what is essentially God-centred and God-empowered and what is merely human.³¹ It is true that usually *sarx* refers to things that are unambiguously bad (e.g. 5.13-21) as circumcision is not (6.15), so it is the more striking that he can use it here of something which traditionally stood for acceptance into the covenant and the covenant people. The point is that now that Christ and his Spirit have come and now that both Jews and Gentiles can be admitted into God's people by faith in Christ, to revert to the requirement of circumcision and what follows from it is to revert to the purely human after enjoying the God-given. This is strong language indeed and must have been found offensive by those who believed that circumcision itself was God-given. In Paul's defence it must be recognized that he is writing in the heat of controversy and it is important that in 6.16 he treats circumcision as irrelevant rather than as reprehensible. Nevertheless he says what he says: in moving from the gift of the Spirit on to an insistence on legal requirements they are not moving on towards completion or perfection. On the contrary they are moving backwards from the divine to the human. We have noted that this is not his last word on the subject, and we should bear in mind that later he will argue (3.23-25) that the law was God's

NOTES

1. K. Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*, SCM Press 1977.
2. E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, SCM Press 1977, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, Fortress 1983, SCM Press 1985.
3. See for example J. Smit, 'The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: a Deliberative Speech', *NTS* 35, 1989, 1-26, and the critical survey in G. W. Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians*, Sheffield Academic Press 1989, Part I; also Fung, pp. 28-32.
4. For recent discussion of this see K. Grayston, *Dying, We Live*, Darton, Longman and Todd 1990, pp. 69, 80, 306.
5. The Greek translation of the Old Testament and Apocrypha, usually cited as LXX.
6. There could be occasional exceptions if the reason was good. See the case of King Izates of Adiabene (Josephus, *Ant.* 20.38ff.) and discussion in Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert*, Yale University Press 1990, pp. 99-101.
7. See J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, SCM Press 1959, pp. 87ff., 13ff.
8. See W. Schmithals, *Paul and the Gnostics*, Abingdon 1972, pp. 13-64.
9. For the first, see H. Räisänen, *The Torah and Christ*, Finnish Exegetical Society 1986, ch. III; for the second, S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1984.
10. See Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*, pp. 7-22: 'Call rather than Conversion'. Contrast Segal, *Paul the Convert*, pp. 5-8 and often.
11. For further discussion see J. A. Ziesler, *Pauline Christianity*, OUP 1990, pp. 49-65.
12. So Segal, *Paul the Convert*, pp. 129, 194-210, and *passim*. It is noteworthy that although some discussions of the Noachic laws are later, that in *Jubilees* is pre-Christian.
13. So J. Paul Sampley, *Pauline Partnership in Christ*, Fortress 1980, ch. III.
14. See B. Byrne, 'Sons of God' - 'Seed of Abraham', Biblical Institute Press, Rome 1979, p. 143.
15. For an account of the possibilities see J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law*, SPCK 1990, ch. VI.
16. See E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, SCM Press/Trinity Press International 1990, ch. IV; *idem*, *Jesus and Judaism*, SCM Press 1985, ch. VI and especially pp. 180-211, about Jesus but with implications for our passage. There seem to have been two views on this question: see *Jub.* 22.16 and P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, Van Gorcum/Fortress 1990, pp. 230-236.
17. See for example J. Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, Darton, Longman and Todd 1964, pp. 55-64.
18. See N. Turner, *Christian Words*, T. & T. Clark 1980, p. 219.
19. So Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law*, pp. 191-4.
20. With Sanders, *Paul and the Palestinian Judaism*, p. 501, contrast Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law*, p. 190.
21. See Grayston, *Dying, We Live*, pp. 73, 86.
22. As by Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law*, pp. 195-8.
23. For a recent and spirited defence of this view see M. D. Hooker, *From Adam to Christ*, CUP 1990, ch. 14.
24. See J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul*, CUP 1972, chs. X and XI, and for this specific point, pp. 180, 208f.
25. So Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law*, pp. 191-5. For counter-argument see Räisänen, *Torah and Christ*, ch. VII.
26. See Grayston, *Dying, We Live*, p. 72.
27. So C. F. D. Moule, *The Phenomenon of the New Testament*, SCM Press 1967, pp. 22-26.
28. For example, M. Hengel, *The Son of God*, SCM Press 1976; J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, SCM Press 1980, pp. 12-64; TDNT, pp. 1206-15.
29. Cf. Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness*, p. 174.
30. See M. E. Isaacs, *The Concept of Spirit*, Heythrop 1976, pp. 82-96.
31. The meaning of *sarx* has a rich literature. For an excellent analysis see J. M. G. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth*, T. & T. Clark 1988, ch. VI.
32. There is a long and useful discussion in Fung, pp. 130-33.
33. So C. K. Barrett, *Essays on Paul*, SPCK 1982, pp. 158f.
34. For example *Ecclus.* 44.19-21; *Jub.* 23.10; 24.11; *II Apoc. Bar.* 57.2.
35. See N. A. Dahl, 'The Atonement - Adequate Reward for Akedah?' in *Neotestamentica et Semitica*, ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox, T. & T. Clark 1969, pp. 15-29.