

/ 9 /

The Law of Moses or the Law of Christ

Douglas J. Moo

INTRODUCTION

Few issues are of greater significance to biblical theology and, ultimately, to systematic theology as the relation between the Testaments. And a matter that is of crucial importance for the correct delineation of this relationship is the degree of continuity accorded to the Mosaic Law in the NT. For the law is central to the Sinaitic Covenant, which itself looms so large in the OT. Thus, if the NT reveals a largely discontinuous approach to the law, considerable support for a discontinuous view of the Testaments is provided; a more continuous attitude encourages us to find more continuity between the Testaments. Study of such an issue demands both exegetical and theological skill and sensitivity. An essay on this matter is therefore appropriately dedicated to S. Lewis Johnson, whose many writings stand out as models of theological exegesis—or exegetical theology! This writer remembers particularly well Dr. Johnson's scolding of exegetes who fail to recognize the necessary theological nuances in the study of Rom 5:12.¹ At the risk of exposing myself to similar strictures, I offer this study of the law to Dr. Johnson.

The title of this piece suggests that a generally discontinuous emphasis on the law in redemptive history will be offered. This is essentially true.

But we must be very careful about coming to simplistic solutions to what is a very complex question. The straightforward alternatives *continuity* and *discontinuity* are much too boldly drawn. In reality, it is a matter of emphasis, with positions ranging along a wide spectrum of alternatives. While my view, then, tends toward the discontinuous end of the spectrum, I hope to be sufficiently nuanced in my treatment that the clear elements of continuity will not be ignored.

Many readers of this volume will recognize the immensity of the issue before us. Several key verses have had entire monographs devoted to them.² The last decade has witnessed an almost overwhelming number of significant studies of Paul's view of the law alone.³ When confronted with so vast an issue, and given limited space to write about it, one has two alternatives: seize on one tiny piece of the puzzle and fit it precisely into the larger picture, or suggest some general ideas about the shape of the puzzle itself, with necessarily limited argumentation and scope. I have chosen the latter course. Many pieces of the puzzle are ignored in what follows, and even those that are mentioned are not treated in depth. Specifically, we intend to focus on three points that are central to the question of the degree of continuity in the law between the OT and the NT: what Jesus meant by claiming to "fulfill" (πληρώω) the law and the prophets in Matt 5:17; the significance of Paul's claim in Rom 10:4 that "Christ is the τέλος [end, goal?] of the law"; and the significance of Paul's claim that Christians are no longer "under the law" but under the "law of Christ." Taken together, these three pieces of the puzzle suggest that a clear note of discontinuity must be sounded as a basic theme in this discussion.

"I CAME TO FULFILL THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS" (MATT 5:17)

We begin with the teaching of Jesus and his programmatic announcement, "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them" (Matt 5:17). Decisive is the meaning to be given the word πληρώω ("fulfill"). Matthean usage of "Law and Prophets" as well as the context, which focuses on the relationship between the OT and Jesus' *teaching* (5:21-48), demonstrate that Jesus is speaking to the way in which his teaching relates to the demand of God in the OT law. Advocates of a strong measure of continuity between Jesus' teaching and the law argue that Jesus' fulfillment of the law consists of his "establishing" or "upholding" the law, giving it its real intended meaning in response to Jewish attempts to evade its full significance.⁴ But while πληρώω could mean this, and the contrast with καταλύω ("abolish") would be a natural one, this view suffers from two key difficulties.

First, the context does not support it. In the "antitheses" of Matt 5:21-48 Jesus does not simply reestablish the true meaning of the law, as if he

were simply exegeting the relevant OT texts. No exegesis of the *lex talionis* would lead to the conclusion that one is not to resist one who is evil (5:38-39); loving the neighbor in Lev 19:18 means to love the fellow-Israelite, not, as Jesus demands, to love the enemy (5:43-47); nor does the OT demand to keep one's oaths lead naturally to the conclusion that one is to refrain from oaths (whether applied universally or more narrowly) (5:33-37).

To be sure, some of the requirements of Jesus seem to be directed against a perversion of the teaching of the law current among some Jews of his day; hatred of the enemy (5:43) is certainly not OT teaching. But the fact remains that Jesus' own demands go considerably beyond any fair exegesis of at least most of the actual texts he quotes; nor do most of his demands find support anywhere in the OT. The "I say to you" emphasizes a new and startling focus on the authority of this Jesus of Nazareth, an authority that goes far beyond a restatement of the OT law.

These points have inclined a large number of scholars to suggest that πληρώ signifies something like "deepen" or "extend." Jesus takes the OT law further by extending its demands from the external to the internal (murder-hatred; adultery-lust) and by "radicalizing" the will of God.⁵ This view makes better sense of the context, but, along with the first view, does less than justice to the Matthean use of πληρώ. This word is central to Matthew's theological vocabulary; in addition to 5:17 he uses it fifteen times in comparison with Mark's two and Luke's nine uses. Ten occurrences come in the introductions to the distinctive Matthean "formula quotations" (1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 27:9), two in more general statements regarding Jesus' fulfilling of the Scriptures (26:54, 56), one in the reason given for Jesus' baptism (3:15), and two others have no theological significance (13:48; 23:32).

What emerges from this is that πληρώ is the key term chosen by Matthew to depict the impact of Jesus' coming on the OT. For it is clear that πληρώ is used by Matthew more broadly than as a way of designating the coming to pass of OT predictions. The history of Israel reaches its "fulfillment" in Christ (cf. 2:15); and, in a striking and most suggestive statement, Matthew has Jesus declare that "all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John" (11:13). In other words, Matthew presents a theology of salvation history which pictures the entire OT as anticipating and looking forward to Jesus.⁸

When this distinctive Matthean usage of πληρώ is taken into account, it is likely that the "fulfillment" of Matt 5:17 means that Jesus' new, eschatological demands do not constitute an abandonment of the law but express that which the law was all along intended to anticipate. The continuity of the law with Jesus' teaching is thereby clearly stressed, but it is a continuity on the plane of a salvation-historical scheme of "anticipation-realization." It is in this sense that Matt 5:18-19 is to be understood, where Jesus asserts the enduring validity of the law and recommends that it continue to be taught. Appeal to these verses as demonstrating the

enduring validity of the law as a code of conduct runs into the problem that the verses would then seem to demand the offering of sacrifices and observance of the ceremonial law in the Christian era. While some think that this is exactly what these verses mean (at least in their supposed original setting),⁷ such a conclusion is plainly incompatible with the teaching of Hebrews, not to mention Paul. It is usually argued that Jesus has in view here only the “moral” law. However, not only is this a category not well-established in Jesus’ day, but the “jot and tittle” of verse 18 render any such restriction very problematic.⁸ If, however, verse 17 is taken as programmatic, then it is quite legitimate to conclude that verses 18-19 be taken as asserting the enduring validity and usefulness of the law, *when seen in light of its fulfillment in Christ*.

The implication of this exegesis of Matt 5:17-19 is that the code of conduct applicable to life in the kingdom—and so, I would take it, to the church—is to be found essentially in Jesus’ own teaching. The OT law is not to be abandoned. Indeed, it must continue to be taught (Matt 5:19)—but interpreted and applied in light of its fulfillment by Christ. In other words, it stands no longer as the *ultimate* standard of conduct for God’s people, but must always be viewed through the lenses of Jesus’ ministry and teaching. That this conclusion is in keeping with Jesus’ general approach to the OT law is clear from the relatively few number of times he cites the OT as substantiation of his demands (and most of these occur in polemical contexts⁹), from the clear implications of statements such as “the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath” (Mark 2:28), and from the fact that it is *Jesus’* teaching that his disciples are to convey in their missionary enterprise (Matt 28:16-20).¹⁰

Far-reaching and dogmatic conclusions from this evidence are out of order. Indeed, the context of Jesus’ ministry and teaching—which occupies a kind of salvation-historical transitional phase as the Old Covenant was still in effect even as the New was in the process of inauguration—explains why more decisive pronouncements on this issue are not to be found in the Gospels. But when we turn to Paul, we are faced with the opposite problem. Paul says so much about the law and in different contexts and in response to so many different problems that many despair of systematizing his thought on the law.¹¹ And even if one can decide on Paul’s overall approach, it is commonly held that his view is different than Jesus’.¹² We cannot attempt here to answer these problems. But what I would like to do is to show that some, at least, of what Paul says about the law is quite similar to what we have found in the teaching of Jesus.

“CHRIST THE ΤΕΛΟΣ OF THE LAW” (ROM 10:4)

We might begin with perhaps Paul’s most famous statement about the law: “Christ is the τέλος of the law” (Rom 10:4). This verse is frequently

taken as a slogan, summing up Paul's conviction that Christ is the "end" of the law. But we have seen a strong attack of this view mounted in recent years, and some discussion is required. Three issues are crucial.

First, what meaning are we to give the word νόμος in this verse? It has become popular recently to argue that many occurrences of this word in Paul refer not to the law as such but to legalism, a misuse of the law that sees it as a means of salvation.¹³ This meaning is supplied in Rom 10:4 by a number of scholars.¹⁴ But it is doubtful that Paul ever uses νόμος to mean "legalism,"¹⁵ and the suggestion is particularly unlikely for Rom 10:4 because it would suggest that the law before Christ was a means of salvation. This is contradictory not only to the OT but to Paul's view. It is overwhelmingly probable, then, that νόμος in Rom 10:4 refers to the Mosaic Law. This is the meaning that νόμος has in all but a handful of its occurrences in Paul.¹⁶ A second question is how the phrase "righteousness for everyone who believes" relates to the first phrase. Some take it to qualify "law" with the result that it is only the law "in its connection with righteousness" that Christ ends.¹⁷ But it is pretty clear that the phrase specifies the result of the first clause: "Christ is the τέλος of the law, so that there is righteousness available to everybody who believes."¹⁸

What, then, does τέλος mean in this verse? The word is capable of several meanings, the two most often cited being "end"¹⁹ and "goal."²⁰ It seems clear, however, that the word is not likely to mean "end" in the sense of termination or cessation.²¹ But this does not mean that the translation "goal" should be accepted and a strongly continuous emphasis derived from the verse. This has happened when scholars have allowed English (or German, or French) words to act as a grid for the meaning of a Greek word where that grid does not adequately represent the possibilities. Elements of both "end" and "goal," along with nuances from other English words, are involved. This does not mean that we are accepting a "double meaning" for τέλος, as Badenas seems to think is the case if such a meaning is adopted. Rather, it is necessary to use several English words, or a phrase, to capture the meaning of this word in this kind of context.

Against the background of Paul's theology, then, we would argue that Christ being the τέλος of the law means that he is the point of culmination for the Mosaic Law. He is its "goal," in the sense that the law has always anticipated and looked forward to Christ. But he is also its "end" in that his fulfillment of the law brings to an end that period of time when it was a key element in the plan of God. Both ideas are clearly present in the context: Paul scolds the Jews for failing to see that the law had other purposes than a call to works (9:31-32) and for failing to recognize "God's righteousness" (10:2-3), a righteousness that has come "apart from law" (Rom 3:21).

We see in this key verse, then, elements of both continuity and discontinuity. Christ is that to which the law has been pointing; now that he has

come, a whole new situation with respect to the place of the law in the life of the people of God exists. Interestingly, this interpretation of Rom 10:4 results in a meaning quite similar to our conclusions on Matt 5:17.

"THE LAW OF CHRIST"

It is only in Paul that we find the actual phrase used in the title of this article, "the law of Christ"; and he only uses it once, in Gal 6:2 (though 1 Cor 9:21, ἔννομος Χριστοῦ, "in-lawed to Christ," is similar). The meaning of the phrase is debated. Three main positions can be found. First is the view that "the law of Christ" is no different in content from the Mosaic Law which Paul has been talking about throughout Galatians. What makes it the Law *of Christ* is the fact that Christ has interpreted it, or fulfilled it, or provided the basis for its obedience.²² Secondly, there are those who view the word *law* "formally" and think that this Law of Christ is basically contentless. All that is meant is Christ in himself is now the root and standard of all Christian conduct.²³ Finally, the phrase can be viewed as a way of stating the new code of conduct applicable to New Covenant believers. As the OT had its Law of Moses, so the NT has its Law of Christ.

Two important subdivisions of this last approach must be noted. Some think that this new code consists solely of the demand of love (cf. Gal. 5:14),²⁴ while others see the phrase as a way of denoting the entire tradition of Jesus' person and teaching (including, perhaps, the apostolic paranesis).²⁵ What becomes immediately obvious is that only the wider context can determine which of these alternatives is to be preferred. In this context, two matters call for particular attention: the precise sense in which the love command fulfills the law (5:14), and the meaning of the statement that Christians who are led by the Spirit are "not under law" (5:18). Since these two points are also important in their own right for the thesis of this paper, we will take the occasion to look at these concepts in other Pauline letters also.

LOVE AND THE LAW

After establishing his independence from (and equality to) the Jerusalem apostles in Gal 1:1—2:14, Paul develops his understanding of the place of the law in justification and in salvation history as his central theological response to the Judaizers in 2:15—5:12. Gal 5:12—6:10 is best viewed as Paul's response to the possible objection against his "law-free" emphasis in the second section, the objection being in effect that Christians would be left without ethical motivation or guidance. If Christians are not to be circumcised, it is clear that the Mosaic Law is no longer an absolute standard of conduct; Christians are called to live in "freedom" (5:1). But

how, then, can Christians know what is right and wrong; will not “freedom” bring irresponsibility, license and immorality? It is this objection that Paul confronts, beginning in 5:13: “You, my brothers, were called to be free. But do not use your freedom to indulge the sinful nature [σάρξ]; rather, serve one another in love.” Verse 14 then explains why love is so important: the love command (Lev 19:18) fulfills the whole law.

What are the implications of this statement for the continuing validity of the law in the lives of believers? Our answer hinges on determining the precise significance of the same word that occupied our attention in Matt 5:17, πληρώω. Some interpret Paul along the lines of some well-known rabbinic discussions, such as the one that he is singling out the love command which in principle contains all the others.²⁶ But this background, while more plausibly advanced for Jesus’ teaching in Matt 22:34-40 (where even so, in my opinion, it is out of place²⁷), is quite foreign to the context and argument of Galatians.

Another approach is to see Paul singling out love as the summary and essence of the law. Love is that demand which lies at the heart of the law and without which adherence to its prescriptions fails to be true obedience to its spirit.²⁸ This interpretation is said to be particularly attractive because in the roughly parallel Rom 13:8-10, Paul says explicitly that love “sums up” the law. However, this summing up of the law in Romans 13 involves also its “fulfillment” (vv 8, 10). And in Galatians, the context makes it difficult to think that Paul wants simply to add love as a motive and underlying principle to the doing of the prescriptions of the law. For Paul has plainly forbidden the Gentile converts to obey the law of circumcision, whether done in love or not. And Gal 5:3 implies that Paul views the law as essentially whole and as a code that he refuses to place over the Christians in Galatia.

Therefore, the interpretation which takes πληρώω to mean that the one who obeys the love command has automatically done what the law requires is to be preferred. This fits perfectly the situation in Galatia, where Paul must show how Christians who are not bound to the law can and must nevertheless live according to the divine standard. It may be that the unusual placement of the article in the phrase ὁ πᾶς νόμος (5:14) is intended to highlight this unitary demand of God.²⁹

In this regard, many speak of a “reduction” of the law to the one command of love.³⁰ But this is going too far. While clearly holding out love as an activity which, in itself, accomplishes what the law sets out to do, Paul does not clearly dismiss the other commandments as no longer relevant. It may also be that Paul’s language in both Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8-10 implies the kind of eschatological fulfillment that we have found in Matt 5:17. The love command, taught by Jesus himself, represents the ultimate aim and purpose of the law.³¹

In sum, then, Paul in 5:14 highlights love as that activity which brings to its intended goal what the law aimed at. It remains necessary for Paul

that Christians “fulfill” the law (cf. especially Rom 8:4), but nowhere does he require that Christians “do” it.³² The distinction is not just a semantic one. “Fulfilling” the law in Paul is attached not to the obedience of precepts, but to the attitude of love and the work of the Spirit. For even in Rom 8:4 the meaning is not that the Spirit enables us to do the law, but that because we are indwelt by the Spirit, the law *has been fulfilled in us*. Thus, the continuity in God’s demand (the law must be fulfilled) is met by a discontinuity in method (not in “doing,” but in love and by the Spirit). Whether, of course, we are obliged to abide by precepts other than those of the Mosaic Law remains to be seen. For it is vital to remember that we are discussing the *Mosaic Law*, not *all* law. But we are perhaps getting ahead of our argument. We must turn back to the “law of Christ” and ask what implications “not being under the law” has for this phrase.

“UNDER THE LAW”

In addition to Gal 5:18, Paul uses the phrase ὑπὸ νόμον nine times. Four of these come earlier in Galatians (3:23; 4:4, 5, 21), three in 1 Cor 9:20, and two in Rom 6:14-15. We will look briefly at each context to see what Paul means by the phrase. Rom 6:14a—“For sin shall not be your master”—is the triumphant restatement of the key theme of the paragraph: in union with Christ one experiences a definitive release from the power of sin. Paul gives the basis for this promise in 6:14b: “because [γάρ] you are not under law [ὑπὸ νόμον], but under grace [ὑπὸ χάριν].” This contrast then serves as the transition to the next section, where Paul responds to the potentially antinomian conclusions that could be drawn from such a statement. But what does the contrast mean? Traditional Reformed exegesis emphasizes particularly the concept of being under grace, which is taken as a reference to the release from the penalty of sin. Ὑπὸ νόμον, its opposite, is then taken as a reference to the condemnation pronounced by the law.³³ Rom 7:4, a verse closely related to 6:14-15 in the progression of Paul’s thought, is then taken as referring to this same deliverance from condemnation. Some who advocate this interpretation suggest an additional nuance. They suggest that not being under the law (6:14-15) and death to the law (7:4) might also mean release from the perversion of the law characteristic of Jewish legalistic interpretation of the law.³⁴

However, this last suggestion is particularly unlikely. While it has been popular to explain some of the more negative statements about the law in Paul by suggesting that “law” often means not the law as God gave it, but the law as perverted by men into a means of salvation,³⁵ few, if any, contexts support such a meaning for the word. Paul certainly does criticize “legalism” at times; but he uses phrases like seeking justification “on the basis of” (ἐκ) the law (cf. Rom 10:5; Phil 3:9) or through “works of the law” (Gal 2:16, etc.) to designate it. In other words, it is not the word

νόμος itself that denotes “legalism” in Paul, but various phrases in which the law (as God gave it) is falsely understood as the basis for salvation.⁵⁶ In the context of Romans 6—7, the “legalistic” meaning is particularly inappropriate. For the condition of being “under the law” and the release from that situation through incorporation into Christ’s death (7:4) clearly imply that being under the law is an objective condition that is quite independent of anyone’s attitude toward or understanding of the law. As Räisänen says, “. . . it is hard to understand why a method as drastic as the *death* both of Christ and of the Christians would have been necessary to get rid of a mere misunderstanding about the law. A new revelation about its true meaning would have sufficed.”⁵⁷

That Paul includes condemnation in his understanding of being “under the law” is certainly possible. But it is questionable whether this is all that is meant. In Romans 6, as is well-known, the main issue is not freedom from the *penalty* of sin but freedom from the *power* of sin. If sin is not to rule over the believer (6:14a), more than forgiveness would seem to be necessary. After all, justification in itself could simply free the believer to sin with impunity—which is precisely the objection raised in 6:1. In the context, then, there is every reason to think that “not being under the law” involves more than being free from condemnation. This conclusion finds support from two other contextual factors. The last reference to νόμος before 6:14 comes in 5:20a, where the law is pictured as an instigator of sin: “The law was added so that the trespass might increase.” If the law functioned historically to increase sinning, one would expect “not [being] under the law” to describe the condition of freedom from that instigation of sin.

The argument of Paul in 6:15ff. should also be noted. The very question about whether one could sin with impunity because one was no longer under the law strongly suggests that not being under the law involves for Paul not being under its precepts. And it is interesting to note that Paul does not argue in 6:16ff. that obedience to the law is still required, but that obedience to God or to righteousness is necessary for the Christian. The last is admittedly an argument from silence, but is suggestive nevertheless. What we are suggesting, then, is that being under the law means living under the regime or power of the law.

Such a concept fits Romans 6—8 well, where Paul consistently employs the metaphor of slavery, freedom, and the transfer from one power to another to denote the state of the believer. Thus, he speaks of the Christian dying to sin and becoming joined to Christ (6:1-11), being set free from sin and enslaved to God and righteousness (6:15-23), dying to the law (7:4), being set free from it (7:3, 5) so as to be joined to Christ (7:4), and of being released from the sphere of the flesh (7:5; 8:9) and placed in the sphere of the Spirit (7:6; 8:9). That Paul would be designating another such transfer from one regime to another by speaking of Christians as no longer under law but grace fits into this overall argument

very nicely. Paul's point, then, would be that the Christian lives in a new freedom from the power of sin, because he no longer lives under that regime in which the Mosaic Law strengthened the power of sin. This realm of the law, although Paul does not specifically say so here, is sure to include the specific ordinances of the law. Not to be under the law, then, includes not being directly subjected to the ordinances of the Law of Moses.³⁸

This analysis is generally coherent with what we find in Galatians. Paul first uses the phrase ὑπὸ νόμον in 3:23 in the midst of his explanation for the purpose of the law in salvation history (the reference to the giving of this law through angels [v. 19], 430 years after Abraham [v. 17], and the stress on the divine purpose throughout the text render the hypothesis that Paul is speaking here of the "misunderstood" law of Jewish legalists³⁹ little short of incredible). The law, Paul has explained, is not the basis for justification (3:10-14); it was given 430 years after God's promise to Abraham and could not invalidate the strictly promissory character of that original arrangement (vv. 15-18). Why, then, the law (v. 19a)? It was added, Paul says, τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν. While the meaning of the phrase is disputed, it probably should be taken as a rough parallel to Rom 5:20. The law had as one of its purposes the "increase" of the "trespass," in the sense that the law gave further impetus to the sinning that had begun with Adam, and rendered that sin more serious by plainly branding it as rebellion against God's will.⁴⁰

The use of the verb προστίθημι ("add") reiterates the point of verses 15-18 to the effect that the law came subsequent to the promise to Abraham. Now Paul shows that the law had a temporal limit at the other end as well: it was "until the Seed to whom the promise referred had come" (v. 19c). Verses 19d-20 are as difficult as any in Paul, but our present purpose does not require that we decide on their meaning.

Another question related to the one raised in 19a is now brought up: "Is the law against the promises of God?" (v. 21). Paul's rejection of this supposition is supported, first, by a negative point: since the law never had the purpose of securing eternal life, its purpose does not finally conflict with the purpose of the promise. Thus, while Paul clearly accords to the law a theoretically life-giving *potential* (Rom 7:10: εἰς ζωὴν), he denies that it is a practical possibility to keep the law so as to secure that life. For no one after the fall has the capacity to fulfill the law perfectly; and only such perfect fulfillment would lead to the securing of eternal life.⁴¹ Positive support for the compatibility of law and promise is found in Paul's outline of the purpose and function of the law in the history of salvation. This is the topic of Gal 3:21—4:11.

To understand what ὑπὸ νόμον means in 3:23, we must look at the parallels to this phrase which occur throughout this context. These phrases are all used to denote Jewish life before Christ and are contrasted with another series of phrases that describe the situation of Christians.

That Paul is speaking here mainly of Jews under the law and within the framework of salvation history rather than individual experience seems clear. The temporal limits of the situation “under the law” that Paul here depicts are, as we have seen, Abraham on the one hand and Christ on the other. This same temporal context is continued throughout 3:22—4:11: the law was in effect “before this faith [in Christ]⁴² came” (v. 23), “until” Christ (vv. 24-25—taking the εἰς as temporal, as the context suggests); and it was God’s sending of his Son in the fullness of time (4:4) that effected the transition from minority confinement to inheritance. That Paul has *Jews* in mind is not so clear. The first-person plural verbs and pronouns used throughout 3:23—4:5 could point in this direction, but Paul’s use of this first-person is notoriously difficult to pin down.

Nevertheless, while it is true that Paul can picture Gentiles as having some kind of relationship to the law (cf. Rom 2:14-15), it is equally clear from the way he can designate Gentiles simply as those who do not have the law (cf. Rom 2:12; 1 Cor 9:20-21) that he principally confines the law to Jews. While dogmatism is out of order, then, it may be the case that the “we” of Gal 3:23—4:5 is “we Jews.” The transition to the Gentiles would then be made in 4:5; the redemption of Jews under the law has the purpose of bringing “sonship” to all Christians.

This issue has significance for the question of the status of Gentiles in the OT. Were they, in any sense, “under the law”? Paul provides only hints for us, but he does argue that Gentiles have relationship to “law,” even if not the Mosaic Law (Rom 2:14-15). Perhaps it is best to view Israel’s experience with *the* law as paradigmatic of all nations. While, then, the Gentiles would not be “under the law” in the same sense as Israel, they would be responsible for those moral standards that God had laid upon them. The OT prophets can condemn the “nations” because of this standard. And in addition, the nations would be under the condemnation brought by their failure to live up to those standards for which God made them responsible. Paul’s warning in Gal 4:21 and 5:4 to the effect that *Gentile* Christians who place themselves “under the law” are “alienated” from Christ suggests the continuing relevance of this function of the law. Thus, the fulfillment of the law brought by Christ is applicable only to those who become joined to him by faith; for those outside of Christ, both Jew and Gentile, God’s “law” continues to condemn.

In addition to being ὑπὸ νόμον, Paul also says that Israel was ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν (“under a *pedagogue*,” 3:24-25), “children” or “minors” (νήπιοι) under the care of “guardians and trustees” (ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμος, 4:1-3) and “under the basic principles of the world” (ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, 4:3). That these descriptions are interrelated and mutually interpreting seems clear from the repetition of the key word ὑπὸ and from the flow of the context. Linda Belleville, in a well-argued essay, has demonstrated this and has shown that the element of close supervision and custodial care is the image produced by

this series of descriptions.⁴³ The παιδαγωγός emerges from ancient literature not as the “tutor” leading a child on to something (a function often attributed to the law in the life of an individual in accordance with this understanding of Gal 3:24-25), nor as an excessively harsh character, but as a servant who closely supervises, monitors and watches over a young child.⁴⁴ That this is the right direction in our interpretation of παιδαγωγός is confirmed from the contrast of “minor/child” with “full rights” that dominates 4:1-5. The phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (used in 4:3 and Col 2:8, 20; cf. πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα in 4:9 and τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς in Heb 5:12) is one of the most debated in Paul, but taking it in the sense of “elementary or basic principles or rules” has much to be said for it.⁴⁵

Paul’s purpose is, then, to show that the law had the purpose of regulating the life of God’s people for a set period of time. It imposed rules, guarded behavior, and served to reveal, confine under, and stimulate sin. All this was intended by God as preparation for the era of fulfillment which has now dawned in Christ, the era in which slaves have become sons through the redemption brought by Christ and the gift of the Spirit. The similarity to Rom 6:14-15 is obvious. In both contexts, an earlier stage of salvation history, ὑπὸ νόμον, is contrasted with the present era (denoted by ὑπὸ χάριν in Romans), with particular stress on the freedom enjoyed in the latter state. And as in Romans, not to be ὑπὸ νόμον seems clearly to include not being bound to the law as a code of conduct. For when one reaches maturity, one no longer needs the “pedagogue” to direct, guide and correct one.

Whether this means that the believer has nothing at all to do with the precepts of the law is not clear, and such a view is probably too extreme. Longenecker, for instance, suggests that we carefully distinguish “the law as the standard and judgment of God” and “the law as contractual obligation.” By the latter, Longenecker means the way in which the law under the old covenant was a necessary, though secondary (to faith) component of piety and righteousness. It is this sense in which Christians are no longer “under the law”; it no longer stands as the authoritative norm for living out one’s relationship to God. This does not mean, however, insists Longenecker, that the law in its capacity to judge and condemn is done away with.⁴⁶ There is much to be said for this particular distinction, and it cautions us not to take Paul’s language farther than it should be taken. But justice will not be done to Paul’s argument in Galatians 3—4 unless there is recognition of some definite release from the binding force and guardianship imposed by the precepts of the Mosaic Law.

The phrase ὑπὸ νόμον occurs in one other context in Paul. In 1 Cor 9:20-21 Paul cites, as an example of his willingness to forego apostolic “rights” in the interests of the spiritual growth of others, his flexibility with respect to his manner of life: “To the Jews I became like a Jew, to win the Jews. To those under the law I became like one under the law (though I myself am not under the law), so as to win those under the

law. To those not having the law I became like one not having the law (though I am not free from God's law but am under Christ's law [ἔννομος Χριστοῦ]), so as to win those not having the law." It is clear that ὑπὸ νόμον here cannot designate looking at the law as a means of salvation or even being under the law's condemnation. Paul would certainly not do the former for any purpose, and he could clearly not, as a Christian, do the latter. What Paul has in mind is his lifestyle, and he makes plain that he is not under obligation to pursue a lifestyle dictated by the precepts of the law. When evangelizing Jews he *can* do so; but when evangelizing Gentiles, he exercises the liberty not to do so. There is nothing in this context or in Paul's use of νόμος that would justify a restriction here to the cultic law or to any part of the law.⁴⁷

GALATIANS 5—6

We are now in a position to return to Galatians 5—6. In 5:13-15, Paul has directed the exercise of Christian liberty in accordance with the central demand of love; in verse 16ff. he highlights the Spirit as a second directive force. The constant warfare between the force of the old age, characterized by human frailty and weakness—σάρξ, the flesh—and the power of the new age—the Spirit—renders necessary the believer's care to live according to the Spirit (vv. 16-17). "But if," Paul says, "you are led by the Spirit, you are not under law [ὑπὸ νόμον]." The conditional clause should be taken as stating the reality of the situation; "the indicative of salvation," as Betz puts it.⁴⁸ All who belong to Christ are, in fact, being led by the Spirit (cf. also Rom 8:14)—though this does not, of course, mean that all are "walking" by the Spirit—and this means at the same time that those so led are not under the law. Once more we see that "under law" designates the status antithetical to the status of the believer. To be "under grace," free children of God, "led by the Spirit" means to be living in the new age of redemption and no longer in the old age that was characterized by and dominated by the law.

Once more, it is argued that not being under the law involves here no more than not being bound to legalism⁴⁹ or to the condemning, constraining force of the law.⁵⁰ But the subsequent discussion of the "fruit of the Spirit," with its obvious behavioral emphasis, suggests otherwise. The Christian, living by the Spirit, must "keep in step with" (στοιχέω) the Spirit (5:25) and will thereby produce those qualities that are approved by God. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion, then, that life in the Spirit is put forward by Paul as the ground of Christian ethics, *in contrast to* life "under law."

Having examined in some detail the immediate context of "the law of Christ" (Gal 6:2), we can now suggest a probable interpretation of the phrase. The Law of Christ is Paul's way of stating the demand of God that is binding on Christians since the coming of Christ.⁵¹ It certainly features

the demand of love as one of its most basic components (5:13-15) and includes that “keeping in step with the Spirit” which is a key principle. But that the reference is not primarily to the Mosaic Law, even as “interpreted” or “fulfilled,” is clear from what we have seen earlier. And other evidence points in the same direction. Whether Eph 2:15 refers only to the ceremonial aspects of the law that served to divide Jew and Gentile or to the law as a whole is debated and is better not used here. But 1 Tim 1:9—“the law is not ‘laid on’ (κεῖται) the righteous person (δικαίω)” (literal translation)—probably means that the law is not binding on Christians.⁵²

But two other matters are not so clear. Does the Law of Christ also include specific teachings and demands as laid down by Christ and the apostles? Many deny that this is so, but the reasons given often betray a bias against finding any specific demands as binding on Christians. The work of Schrage and others has shown that Paul and the other apostles were quite willing to impose specific commandments on their charges,⁵³ and Paul alludes to and uses the teaching of Jesus more than has sometimes been recognized.⁵⁴ This, of course, does not prove that Paul has these components in mind when he talks of the “law of Christ,” but the option must at least be left open. Secondly, does the Mosaic Law play any role at all in the “law of Christ”? From the standpoint of simple, neat distinctions, it is tempting to say, “None at all; the Law of Moses was for the Old Covenant; the Law of Christ for the New.” But there is evidence that this is overly simple.

Appeal is often made in this respect to those places where Paul appears to use the OT law as a continuing norm of conduct. Some allude to 1 Cor 7:19, where Paul emphasizes the need for “keeping God’s commands.” But in a context in which Paul explicitly denies the continuing validity of circumcision, it is clear at least that “God’s commands” cannot refer to the Mosaic Law *simpliciter*.⁵⁵ Some then take the reference to be to the moral law only.⁵⁶ This is certainly possible, but somewhat unlikely in light of the fact that Paul fails to apply OT laws to the Corinthians, even though he is deeply concerned to combat their libertine tendencies. Even 1 Cor 14:34, which does refer to “the Law,” is an allusion not to the Mosaic Law, but to the Pentateuchal creation (or perhaps fall) narrative. Nor can much be made of 1 Cor 9:8-10. While Paul certainly cites the Law of Moses here, his use of the Deuteronomy text is notoriously obscure, and he appears to cite it not as binding authority, but as summarizing a principle. In fact, the only place in Paul’s letters where he appears unambiguously to quote Mosaic Law as applicable to Christian believers is Eph 6:2, in which the Decalogue commandment to honor parents is cited to show what is “right” (δίκαιον) for Christian children. Some seek to minimize this reference, but it is questionable whether this can be done.

Moreover, the evidence of the epistle of James must also be considered in this regard. James is sometimes viewed as very conservative in his

attitude toward the relevance of the law,⁵⁷ but this is overstated. He labels the law the “law that gives freedom” (1:25; 2:12) and associates it closely with the gospel (see the sequence in 1:18-25). And his use of “royal” to describe the law in 2:8 is probably an allusion to Jesus’ own teaching.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, James can cite Decalogue commandments as part of that law which will be the criterion of judgment (2:10-12).

CONCLUSION

What we have seen, then, is that the Pauline stress on discontinuity between the Law of Moses and the Law of Christ cannot eliminate some degree of continuity as well. How is this to be understood? First of all, it is clearly not a matter of balance or a question of tension between two equally weighty points. Discontinuity is plainly the “main line,” both in clear theological pronouncements and in the actual practice of teaching ethics in the NT. We must, therefore, speak of a “continuity within discontinuity.” Herman Ridderbos offers a long and penetrating discussion of this matter, concluding that there is no doubt that “. . . the category of the law has not been abrogated with Christ’s advent, but rather has been maintained and interpreted in its radical sense (‘fulfilled’; Matt. 5:17); on the other hand, that the church no longer has to do with the law in any other way than in Christ and thus is *ennomos Christou*.”⁵⁹

While I might not place quite as much emphasis on continuity as does Ridderbos in parts of his discussion, this summary admirably captures the heart of the matter. The Christian is no longer bound to the Mosaic Law; Christ has brought its fulfillment. But the Christian *is* bound to “God’s law” (1 Cor 9:20-21; cf. “God’s commands” in 1 Cor 7:19 and 1 John, *passim*). “God’s law” is not, however, the Mosaic Law, but “Christ’s law” (1 Cor 9:20-21; Gal 6:2), because it is to Christ, the fulfiller, the *τέλος* of the law (Rom 10:4), that the Christian is bound. In that “fulfillment” of the law, however, some of the Mosaic commandments are taken up and reapplied to the New Covenant people of God. Thus, while the Mosaic Law does not stand as an undifferentiated authority for the Christian, some of its individual commandments remain authoritative as integrated into the law of Christ.

In practical terms, this means that the Christian must always view the *whole* law only under the condition of its fulfillment. No commandment, even those of the Decalogue, is binding simply because it is part of the Mosaic Law. In saying this, I am running smack up against a cherished and widely taught tradition. The singling out of the Decalogue as basic and eternal “moral law,” to be distinguished from the ceremonial and civil law and thereby to be seen as an eternally valid ethical authority, has a long and respected history. Even within this tradition, however, there has been considerable discussion about what to do with the sabbath command

which, at least for the great majority of those who have advocated this approach, has not been applied or obeyed in the form in which it was first given (e.g., as requiring rest on the *seventh* day). A further difficulty was the question of how to determine what was “moral” law and what was not. But the basic difficulty, of course, is that the NT does not approach the matter this way. The *whole* law, every “jot and tittle,” is fulfilled in Christ and can only be understood and applied in light of that fulfillment. In actual ethical practice, very little is lost. For the NT clearly takes up all the Decalogue, except the sabbath, as part of “Christ’s law” and thereby as authoritative for believers. But considerable difference in theological construct is involved, and the difference in approach is therefore not at all insignificant.

An approach that eliminates the Mosaic Law as binding authority for Christians is sometimes accused of being “antinomian” and opening the door to ethical relativity. But two replies to this accusation must be made. First, the position outlined here holds that Christians are not under the *Mosaic Law*, not that they are free from *all* law. The distinction between the Mosaic Law, which is clearly what the NT writers mean 95 percent of the time when they use the word “law,” and the theological concept of “law” needs to be carefully observed. We have seen that the distinction has its roots in the NT, where Paul can distinguish between the Law of Moses and the Law of God (1 Cor 9:20-21). Failure to observe this distinction has resulted in considerable confusion and misunderstanding. Second, in the fear about ethical nihilism, one senses a failure to appreciate the power of God’s Spirit operative in the believer. When the “antinomian” implications of Paul’s teaching were raised as an objection against that teaching, Paul responded not by introducing a “new law” but by pointing to the Spirit (Gal 5:16ff.) and to union with Christ (Romans 6). To be sure, there needs to be recognition of the fact that Christians often fail to walk in accordance with that Spirit and need “law” to correct and discipline them (Luther is eloquent on this point). But any approach that substitutes external commands for the Spirit as the basic norm for Christian living runs into serious difficulties with Paul.

Finally, the potential of this general approach to unify the diverse NT teaching on the law remains to be seen. This essay has only scratched the surface and left untouched many difficult texts. But we can already see points of agreement with respect to the centrality of Jesus’ “fulfillment” of the law, with its implications for “continuity within discontinuity,” and in the new authority that acts as the binding force in Christian conduct. The paradigm suggested here may, therefore, prove a helpful one in establishing the unity of the NT on this key theological issue.

141. For the "ladder" itself (with particular reference to Deut 25:4 and 1 Cor 9:8-12), see Kaiser, *Rediscovering the OT*, p. 166. For similar suggestions by other scholars, see *ibid.*, pp. 155-66.
142. These two assumptions were originally mentioned in the Prospectus.
143. A classic example of a regulation whose underlying principle is notoriously elusive is Exod 23:19b, "Do not cook a young goat in its mother's milk" (cf. also 34:26; Deut 14:21). See Goldingay, p. 52. The second point presupposes all of my discussion on the law since Christ's coming.
144. This point holds true for man in relation to God both as Creator and as Redeemer. See the comments on the law's civil dimension, with reference to Romans 13. Also pertinent is n. 64, on the "three uses" of the law.
145. On OT Israel as a "church under age," see n. 60.
146. Bavinck, *Our Reasonable Faith*, p. 17. See J. I. Packer, *Knowing God* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1973).
147. C. S. Lewis, *Reflections on the Psalms* (Chicago: Harcourt Brace, 1958), p. 97.

CHAPTER NINE

1. S. Lewis Johnson, "Romans 5:12—An Exercise in Exegesis and Theology," *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, R. N. Longenecker, et al., eds. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), pp. 298-316.
2. E.g., C. Thomas Rhyne's *Faith Establishes the Law*, SBLDS 55 (Chico, CA: Scholar's, 1981) on Rom 3:31 and Robert Badenas' *Christ the End of the Law* on Rom 10:4, JSNT Supp 10 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985).
3. See my survey "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years," *SJT* 40 (1987): 287-307.
4. Good examples of this approach can be found in Carl F. H. Henry, *Christian Personal Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957), p. 318; Greg L. Bahnsen, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* (Nutley, NJ: Craig, 1977), pp. 61-72.
5. This view is widely held. Cf. especially W. D. Davies, "Matthew 5.17, 18," in *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), pp. 33-45; Martin Dibelius, *The Sermon on the Mount* (New York: Scribner's, 1940), pp. 69-71; Jacques Dupont, *Les Béatitudes*, 1: *Le Problème Littéraire—Les Deux Versions du Sermon sur la Montagne et des Béatitudes* (3rd ed.; Bruges: Abbaye de Saint-André, 1958), pp. 138-58.
6. The two best presentations of this perspective are Robert Banks, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*, SNTSMS 28 (Cambridge: CUP, 1975) and John P. Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel*, AnBib 71 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976).
7. It is customary to find in these verses the teaching of a conservative wing of the Jewish-Christian church (cf., e.g., Hans-Theo Wrege, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt*, WUNT 9 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1968), p. 40; Roger Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*, SNTSMS 48 (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), pp. 8-9.
8. Cf. Bahnsen, p. 48.
9. Cf. Martin Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), p. 46.
10. For these points and greater substantiation for this exegesis of Matt 5:17, see my article "Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law," *JSNT* 20 (1984): 3-49, now

- reprinted in a slightly condensed form in *The Best in Theology*; J. I. Packer, ed. (Carol Stream: CTI, 1987). Cf. also Wolfgang Schrage, *Ethik des Neuen Testaments*, NTD (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), pp. 63-9; and, on Luke-Acts, Craig Blomberg, "The Law in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 22 (1986): 53-80.
11. This is essentially the conclusion reached in the two most recent monographs on Paul and the law: Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983) and E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).
 12. See, e.g., Mohrlang (p. 127): "Matthew would bind Christians more tightly to the law. Paul would free them from it."
 13. C. E. B. Cranfield's article "St. Paul and the Law," *SJT* 17 (1964): 43-68 popularized this approach.
 14. E.g., C. F. D. Moule, "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul," *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to John Knox*, W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr, eds. (Cambridge: CUP, 1967), p. 402.
 15. See my article "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul," *WTJ* 45 (1983): 73-100.
 16. These occurrences, in my opinion, include several places where νόμος means "principle" or "force" (Rom 3:27 [*bis*]; 7:21, 23, 25; 8:2), a few where it refers to the entire OT, or the Pentateuch as a literary unit (Rom 3:19a, 21b, 31 [?]; 1 Cor 9:8, 9; 14:21, 34; Gal 4:21b), a few where it refers to moral demand generally (Rom 2:14b, 14d; 8:7; Gal 3:21b; 5:23), and the verse to be considered below, where the phrase "law of Christ" occurs (Gal 6:2). For further detail, see my "'Law,' 'Works of the Law.'"
 17. See John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959, 1965), pp. 49-50; Richard N. Longenecker, *Paul, Apostle of Liberty* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), pp. 144-7.
 18. Mark A. Siefid, "Paul's Approach to the Old Testament in Rom 10:6-8," *TJ* 6 NS (1985): 8-9.
 19. Cf., e.g., Andrea van Dülmen, *Die Theologie des Gesetzes bei Paulus*, SBM 5 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968), p. 126; Ulrich Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*, BEvT 49 (Munich: Kaiser, 1968), pp. 139-157.
 20. Ragnar Bring, "Das Gesetz und die Gerechtigkeit Gottes: Eine Studie zur Frage nach der Bedeutung des Ausdruckes τέλος νόμου in Röm. 10:4." *ST* 20 (1966): 1-36; Rhyne, p. 104; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 2, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975, 1979), pp. 516-9; and, at most length, Badenas, *Christ the End of the Law*.
 21. Badenas' thorough study has probably established this.
 22. Cf. Herman Ridderbos, *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia*, NIC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), p. 213; Andrew J. Bandstra, *The Law and the Elements of the World: An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul's Teaching* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1964), p. 114; Ulrich Wilckens, "Zur Entwicklung des paulinischen Gesetzesverständnisses," *NTS* 28 (1982): 175.
 23. John W. Drane, *Paul: Libertine or Legalist? A Study in the Theology of the Major Pauline Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1975), pp. 53-8.
 24. Victor Paul Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1972), p. 100; Karl Kertelge, "Gesetz und Freiheit im Galaterbrief," *NTS* 30 (1984): 391.
 25. C. H. Dodd, "Ἐννομος Χριστοῦ," *More New Testament Studies* (Manchester: University Press, 1968), pp. 134-48; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper &

- Row, 1948), pp. 144-8; Longenecker, pp. 184-90; Heinz Schürmann, "Das Gesetz des Christus" (Gal 6, 2). Jesu Verhalten und Wort als letztgültige sittliche Norm nach Paulus," in *Neues Testament und Kirche*, Joachim Gnilka, ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), pp. 282-300. Davies and Longenecker base their case partly on the view that a belief in a new, messianic law was known in first-century Judaism (see Davies' *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come*, JBLMS 7 [Philadelphia: SBL, 1952]). Since their exegesis of Gal 6:2 is not dependent on this conclusion, we will not here go into that question.
26. For this background, see Str-B 1:907-8.
 27. See my "Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law," pp. 6-7.
 28. Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 282.
 29. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), p. 241.
 30. E.g., Furnish, p. 97; Räisänen, pp. 26-7.
 31. André Feuillet, "Loi de Dieu, loi du Christ et loi de l'esprit d'après les Epîtres pauliniennes: Les rapports de ces trois lois avec le Loi Mosaique," *NovT* 22 (1980): 53.
 32. It is this distinction, rather than an unlikely distinction between $\delta\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\delta\lambda\omicron\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$ (argued by Hans Hübner, *Das Gesetz bei Paulus: Ein Beitrag zum Werden der paulinischen Theologie* [FRLANT 119; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978], p. 38; refuted by Sanders, pp. 96-7, among others), that explains the difference between Gal 5:3 and 5:14.
 33. John Murray, *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), pp. 183-8; Patrick Fairbairn, *The Revelation of Law in Scripture* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869), pp. 429-30.
 34. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1, pp. 319-20; Moule, pp. 394-5; Hübner, pp. 115-6; Bruce N. Kaye, *The Thought Structure of Romans with Special Reference to Chapter 6* (Austin, TX: Scholia, 1979), p. 111.
 35. See particularly, Cranfield, "St. Paul and the Law," pp. 43-68; Daniel P. Fuller, *Gospel/Law: Contrast or Continuum?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).
 36. For a more extensive critique of this approach, see my "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism," pp. 73-100. Cf. also Räisänen, pp. 43-7.
 37. Räisänen, p. 46.
 38. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 47; Stephen Westerholm, "Letter and Spirit: The Foundation of Pauline Ethics," *NTS* 30 (1984): 242-3; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Romans*, rev. ed., TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), pp. 132-5.
 39. Fuller, pp. 97-9.
 40. See, *inter alia*, Ridderbos, *Paul*, pp. 150-1.
 41. That Gal 3:10 implies this conception of the law is doubted by many, but seems to be the most natural interpretation. See especially Thomas R. Schreiner, "Is Perfect Obedience to the Law Possible? A Re-examination of Galatians 3:10," *JETS* 27 (1984): 151-60.
 42. We take the article before $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ to be anaphoric; it is that particular faith in Jesus Christ, mentioned in verse 22, that Paul speaks of.
 43. Linda Belleville, "'Under Law': Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3:21-4:11," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 59-60.
 44. *Ibid.*, pp. 59-62; Richard N. Longenecker, "The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3:19-4:7," *JETS* 25 (1982): 53-61.
 45. See Bandstra, *Law and Elements*; Belleville, pp. 64-8; Ridderbos, *Paul*, pp. 147-8.

46. Longenecker, pp. 125-7, 145-6.
47. Westerholm, p. 243.
48. Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), p. 281.
49. Ernest De Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921), p. 303.
50. Wilckens, p. 174.
51. "Das Gesetz Christi ist nicht das Gesetz Moses auf höherer Ebene in ethischer oder spiritualisierter Form, sondern die eschatologische Entsprechung zum Gesetz des alten Bundes" (Friedrich Lang, "Gesetz und Bund bei Paulus"), *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70 Geburtstag*, Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pöhlmann and Peter Stuhlmacher, eds. (Tübingen: Mohr/Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), p. 318.
52. Stephen Westerholm, "The Law and the 'Just Man' (1 Tim 1, 3-11)," *ST* 36 (1982): 79-95.
53. Wolfgang Schrage, *Die konkreten Einzelgeote in der paulinischen Paränese* (Gutersloh: Mohn, 1961).
54. Feuillet, pp. 45-51.
55. C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 169; Douglas DeLacey, "Paul and the Law," *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, D. A. Carson, ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), pp. 176-7.
56. Wilckens, pp. 158-9.
57. Cf. O. J. F. Seitz, "James and the Law," *SE* 2 (1964): 472-86.
58. Cf. my *The Epistle of James*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985) *in loc.*
59. Ridderbos, *Paul*, p. 285.

CHAPTER TEN

1. This is how the Belgic Confession (1561) puts it in Art. XXVII.
2. See also the Second Helvetic Confession (1562), Chapter 17, and the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), Lord's Day 21.
3. The Hebrew קְהָל is rendered with συναγωγῆ in the LXX of Exodus and Deuteronomy, but in the other OT books with ἐκκλησία . The other word used in the Hebrew OT for congregation, הַקָּהָל , is mostly rendered συναγωγῆ in the LXX. Assuming Jesus spoke Aramaic when uttering the words of Matt 16:18, he may have used either ܩܗܠܐ or ܩܗܠܐ , a loan word from Hebrew. Either of these would have reflected the OT understanding of congregation (cf. K. L. Schmidt, "Ecclesia," in TDNT, 3 Gerhard Kittel, ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), p. 524ff.
4. The words of caution against such an approach, uttered by J. Walvoord in "Does the Church Fulfill Israel's Program?," *BSac* 137 (1980): 19, appear to be well taken. This is not to deny that genuine light can be gained from the NT—e.g., in our understanding of the OT types and prophecies (cf. Hans K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy* [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1983], p. 32), provided it be kept in mind that it is the OT types and prophecies themselves that point forward to the meaning they are perceived to have in the NT.
5. J. Calvin renders it with *princeps Dei* in his commentary on Genesis, *ad loc.* Luther takes it as "to have dominion, to be chief." Cf. *Luther's Lectures on Genesis*, chaps. 31–37 in Jaroslav Pelikan, ed., *Luther's Works*, 6 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1970), p. 141.