

SBL Annual Meeting 2010 Atlanta
Special Session
Intercultural Interaction and Identity Formation in Pauline Tradition
The Continuation of Gentile Identity in Christ
J. Brian Tucker

Dale Martin's recent essay entitled, "Teleology, Epistemology, and Universal Vision in Paul," makes the claim that in Christ, gentiles are no longer really¹ viewed as gentiles; rather they are viewed by Paul as part of Israel.² These assertions intrigued me since my work focuses on the way previous social identities continue in Christ, and if Martin's claim is accurate, a fundamental premise of my approach to Paul is called into question.³ So, with Martin's statements in view, this paper seeks to offer some initial "soundings," concerning a way to construct a response to his claims with regard to the following: First, does Paul view gentiles in Christ as still gentiles? Second, does Paul view gentiles in Christ as part of Israel?

There are two concepts that shape my argument concerning the continuation of gentile identity in Christ: (1) In his letters, Paul invents gentile⁴ identity, by this I mean he is a figure of bicultural mediation between emerging local and translocal identities (1 Cor 9:20-21); (2) This gentile identity is similar to what some classicists⁵ refer to as a microidentity within the Roman empire, as seen in Tacitus' *Germania* 38-39, "where Tacitus figured his Germani as just one variety of barbarian; they included the Suebi, themselves represented as some sort of super-tribe, which in turn included nested within it groups such as the Semnones, who were themselves divided into one hundred *pagi*."⁶

How do these apply to Paul and the continuation of gentile identity? These microidentities were nested within a series of macroidentities. As a taxonomic device, the shared macroidentity was the first site for the formation of microidentities. So, in this

configuration, Paul is seen as a mediator between at least two shared macroidentities: social identification with Judaism through its scriptures;⁷ and Roman imperial ideology.⁸ These two contexts interpenetrate, but do not fuse, with local knowledge within the Christ-movement to produce localized expressions of being in Christ. These local identities continue to be elaborated upon and negotiated, resulting in, what Woolf calls “layers of accretion”⁹ in which unique constructions result that are quite distinct from other communities, who might share similar ideological and ritual space.

I. Does Paul view the Gentiles in Christ as Still Gentiles?

Martin contends that: (1) Paul was not interested in forming a new people. (2) Paul was not interested in forming a new religion. (3) Paul does not use *ethnē* to refer to non-Jews once they are in Christ. Thus, he was not interested in forming a new (read as “third”) ethnicity.¹⁰ (4) Paul envisions these former gentiles as part of Israel, i.e., the faithful remnant during Paul’s time. Let me begin by saying that I am not disputing that Paul might be understood to use language in the way Martin claims (or at least allowing for the possibility of polysemy); however, if a universalistic discourse is present, it does not negate the possibility that a discourse of difference and distinction may also be evident. So, I am in general agreement with Martin that Paul was not interested in forming a new people, nor was he interested in forming a new religion. I have my reservations about Martin’s construal of gentiles and their relationship to Israel, though his understanding of God’s ultimate faithfulness to Israel appears on target.¹¹ My primary concern is his claim that Paul does not, in the main, envision the continuation of gentile identity in Christ; rather, gentiles become descendants of Abraham grafted into the nation of Israel.¹² My research focuses on 1 Corinthians, and since Martin builds his argument on 1

Corinthians, I will limit most of my comments to the significance of previous gentile identities and their transformation in that letter.¹³

5:1 – “...Not heard of among the gentiles.”

Martin claims that Paul rarely uses the term ἔθνη to refer to his readers, i.e., those non-Jews already within the Christ-movement. Moreover, this term refers, in the main, to those outside of the Christ-movement; so much so, that contemporary translations render τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in 5:1 as, “‘pagans’ in order to *preclude* reference to the Corinthian recipients of the letter.”¹⁴ Martin is correct that τοῖς ἔθνεσιν has an outgroup orientation to it in 5:1, but Paul’s point is that the “sexual immortality” tolerated within the Christ-movement results in the community, at least rhetorically, being described in similar terms here. Paul uses ἔθνος as outgroup language in order to categorize gentiles in Christ who are not identifying with their in Christ identity. Paul finds in the use of ἔθνος a key group identifier that reminds the Christ-followers of both their pre-turning life, and the transformation that should be evident within the community. Thus, translating τοῖς ἔθνεσιν as “pagans in order to *preclude* reference to the Corinthian recipients of the letter,” seems unwarranted because Paul continued to understand these gentiles who were following Christ as “ex-gentiles in one sense, but still gentiles in another,” in this way Paul may be described as “inventing the gentile.”¹⁵ What I mean by that is that being in Christ, rather than replacing existing identities, ‘intersects’ these in a transforming process to produce microidentities that are negotiated in the intercultural communication between Israel’s symbolic universe, Roman imperial ideology, and local knowledge.¹⁶ By thinking about gentile identity through the heuristic devices of multiple identities, identity hierarchies, and intersectionality, we can discern the way Paul mediated between differing social

identifications.¹⁷ What we see in his use of various group identifiers is evidence of intersecting identities that combine to form localized expressions of being in Christ, a transformation that is not a new identity, as much as one that emerges within existing categories.¹⁸ So, Martin's approach with its focus only on ἔθνη could be expanded to include Paul's other identity descriptors that intersect with his use of gentile, in order to discern how he viewed the continuation of non-Jewish identity in Christ. I will look at two: Ἕλληνα and ἀκροβυστία.

ἔθνος and Ἕλληνα

Martin claims that Paul only uses ἔθνη to describe those outside the Christ-movement. He rightly qualifies his statement with the term, "rarely."¹⁹ Given the fragmentary nature of the Pauline epistolary discourse and the semantic overlap²⁰ between ἔθνη and Ἕλληνα, it may be that this analysis must be nuanced.²¹ First Corinthians 1:22-24 is quite instructive for the way Paul views ethnicity.²² For example, Paul relies on a social comparison that has its basis in a particularistic understanding of ethnic identity, described in 1:22-24 as two different approaches to wisdom and power.²³ In a stereotypical fashion in 1:22 he writes, "Jews (Ἰουδαῖοι) ask for signs" and "Greeks (Ἕλληνας) search for wisdom." In 1:23 the message of "Christ-crucified" is described as a "stumbling block (σκάνδαλον) to Jews" and "foolishness to the gentiles (ἔθνεσιν)." Notice that Paul has shifted from Ἕλληνας in 1:22 to ἔθνεσιν in 1:23 but returns again to Ἕλλησιν in 1:24. For Paul, the terms to describe Greek identity and gentile identity are interchangeable;²⁴ however, the same does not apply to Ἰουδαῖοι; it is more rhetorically stable in 1:22-24. Paul's argument here relies on an already existing social comparison for its effectiveness. He is redeploying relevant ethnic categories for his broader rhetorical purpose which is to emphasize the importance of transformed cognitive processes²⁵

in understanding as plausible that which was previously rejected as foolish, “Christ crucified” (Χριστὸν ἑσταυρωμένον). In 1:24, Paul returns to what he had argued was the foundation for the Corinthians’ identity, their “calling” (1 Cor 1:1–2, 9), which is further defined in the context of an ethnic comparison and classification, “both Jew and Greek (Ἕλλησιν).” Paul then reorients the community to the centrality of Christ and argues that Christ is both “God’s power (δύναμις)” and “God’s wisdom (σοφία).”²⁶

Ernest Best asked the following questions concerning 1:24 but never developed an answer to his query: “Is there in v. 24 a separation between Christ as power and Christ as wisdom comparable to the division in v. 22 where the Jews ask for signs and the Greeks seek wisdom? Or do Jews and Greeks find in Christ both wisdom and power? Do Jews and Greeks find the same thing in Christ?”²⁷ I would suggest that Jews and non-Jews do not find the same thing in Christ.²⁸ Gentile social identity is not obsolete for those in Christ but constitutes a viable microidentity, though that does not mean that it is thereby inscribed as the one dominant, monolithic, sanctioned identity that erases difference.²⁹ Stated more fully: (a) Jews and gentiles relate to Christ in somewhat different ways, (b) non-Jewish identity remains a salient subordinate category, and (c) this is only one possible microidentity, alongside Jewish identity, which has continuing significance within the larger community.³⁰ It should be expected that differing ethnic groups will experience being in Christ in differing ways. Thus, there is no reason on *a priori* grounds to suggest that Paul is melding the experiences of Jews and non-Jews into one undifferentiated discourse in 1:24. Rather, Paul expects differing experiences in Christ and, furthermore, discourages any attempt to downplay the fundamental continuing significance of one’s social identity.

ἔθνος and ἀκροβυστία

Though references to gentiles in Christ are rare, Paul uses another term that is marked for ethnic identity.³¹ In Gal 2:7-8, Paul connects his gospel for the uncircumcised (τῆς ἀκροβυστίας), with his apostleship to the gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη).³² Notice in these verses ἀκροβυστία and ἔθνος describe the same target group. Thus, Paul could use either term as a non-Jewish social identity marker. More importantly, “uncircumcised” and “circumcised” serve to differentiate the two groups. If that differentiation is evident elsewhere in Paul, then it would support the contention that Paul expects gentile identity to continue in Christ. In 1 Cor 7:18, Paul writes, “Was anyone called who is uncircumcised (ἀκροβυστία)? He should not get circumcised?” Paul’s instruction for these uncircumcised Christ-followers is not to seek to change their ethnic identification now that they are in Christ.³³

In 7:18-20, Paul teaches that calling continues to serve as that which re-oriens social life. In this context, ethnic identity is not opposed with reference to circumcision and uncircumcision, but it is reprioritized. This occurs as Paul teaches the community to stay in the social situation they were in when they began to follow Christ. He does not call the community to discontinue all the practices associated with their ethnic identity; rather he reminds them that what is foremost is “keeping the commandments of God” (7:19).³⁴ Thus, for Jewish Christ-followers, they are to remain torah-observant, while non-Jewish Christ-followers follow purity regulations designed for “sojourners” who lived among Israel (Gen 9:1-17; Lev 17-26; *Jub* 7:20-21; *Sibylline Oracles* 4:24-35; Acts 15:19-20).³⁵ Since, Paul’s rule is that those who embody an “uncircumcised” (ἀκροβυστία) social identity are to remain that way, it seems unlikely that Paul could be described, as Davros labeled Doctor Who, as “the destroyer of worlds.”³⁶

However, even if I expand Martin’s lexical focus to include “Ἕλληνα and ἀκροβυστία — it does not negate the fact that Paul describes the Christ-followers in Corinth as “former gentiles” in 1 Cor 12:2.³⁷

1 Cor 12:2 – “...former gentiles”

The syntax and grammar of 12:2 is terse and complex, and interpreters offer various additions for omitted constituents to make sense of the verse.³⁸ It is clear, however, that Paul is pointing to past social identifications of some of his hearers, which he characterizes as “when you were gentiles” (ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε). While ἔθνη here refers to a least an aspect of the previous life of those within the Christ-movement, it does not follow that Paul no longer considers them to be gentiles in Christ based on this use of ἔθνη.³⁹ What we see in 12:2 is Paul inventing the gentile as a microidentity that describes the pre-turning life and the transformation that should be evident within the ἐκκλησία.

Paul starts by describing two intersecting identities by calling the Corinthian Christ-followers “brothers,” but then he appears to distance himself from his audience by calling them “former gentiles.”⁴⁰ The focus here is not ontology but rather one node within their identity hierarchy, namely its uninformedness, or lack of local knowledge. Thus, Paul is not seen as negating gentile identity; rather he is saying this is what previously uninformed people do, i.e., they engage in devotion to their native gods. Paul has just told them, in 12:1, that he does not want them to be uninformed concerning πνευματικός,⁴¹ and he draws on the uninformed epistemic situation of their pre-turning life,⁴² here with regard to being led to mute idols (12:2), as a way to illustrate that those who have the spirit’s agency will walk in a manner that indicates Jesus’ lordship within their community (12:3).⁴³

Though outside of Rom 11:13 and 15:27 there are few constructions that unambiguously describe those in Christ as gentiles, Martin's argument may be challenged on the broader hermeneutical level because oneness in Christ is linked to the concept of gentiles in Christ. In 1 Cor 12:12-13, Paul describes the oneness of the body of Christ, in the context of intersecting social identifications (Jew or Greek, slave or free). Kartzow brings up an often overlooked point, "Every person belongs to more than one category."⁴⁴ The central question remains: What is the relationship between these various identities mentioned in 12:13? Paul could just as likely be arguing that "although all are one 'in Christ Jesus,' they are separate, different, and unequal in all other areas of life."⁴⁵ In this configuration, Paul is not the destroyer of worlds but rather one who seeks to reprioritize the significance of existing social identities under the lordship of Christ. What does this oneness that Paul envisions look like in practice? Would oneness in Christ require changing one's ethnic identification when engaged in table fellowship? Or, would Paul expect difference to continue in those settings? In 11:19, Paul sees the continuation of difference to be vital for the establishment of the community. Earlier, in chapter 10, Paul provides a framework in which difference would continue; vv. 25-28 allow for significant freedom with regard to ethnic eating practices, while vv. 31-32 offer 'other-centered' guidance with regard to these practices.⁴⁶

A brief word should be given regarding 10:32, and the supposed three groups that are in view.⁴⁷ Paul encourages the community not to offend Jews or Greeks; normally this is understood as those not in Christ; then Paul tells them not to offend those within the ἐκκλησία. This verse is then used to substantiate the claim that there are three entities in Paul's identity framework: Jews, Greeks, and the ἐκκλησία. However, if one takes the final καί in the

construction assensively, the verse is then rendered, “Give no offence to Jews and Greeks, even to those belonging to the ἐκκλησία.” In that case, Paul is describing those within the ἐκκλησία in the context of their continuing ethnic identities.⁴⁸ This provides evidence of a place where Paul uses an ethnic identifier to describe those within the Christ-movement. I have been arguing that Paul finds in the use of ἔθνος a key group identifier that reminds the Christ-followers of both their pre-turning life, and the transformation that should be evident within the community, but are these former gentiles transformed into Israel as Martin claims?

II. Does Paul view the Gentiles in Christ as Part of Israel?

Martin offers four pieces of evidence for a positive answer to this question.⁴⁹

A. Jewish Group Identifiers such as Brothers and Holy ones are used by Paul

Martin contends that the use of brother language, a term that Jews used to describe one another, is an indication that Paul views these former gentiles as now part of Israel. The term ἀδελφοί is a key group identifier in 1 Corinthians.⁵⁰ Here it is part of a stereotypical Pauline structure designed to indicate his understanding of the relationship between Paul and the recipients of his letters, rather than an indicator that they are now regarded as Jews.⁵¹ While, I agree in part with Martin that Paul’s usage of this term has a basis in Israel’s scriptures, this is because they worship the one God of historic Israel.⁵² They worship him as gentiles rather than becoming part of Israel; otherwise God remains only the God of Israel and not the God of the nations (Rom 3:28-29; 1 Cor 8:5-6).⁵³

Martin points out that “holy ones” is a term used by Jews to describe one another.⁵⁴ While, Martin is accurate in that, the inference he draws from this is not warranted. Rather than using “holy ones” as an indication of the erasure of gentile identity within the ἐκκλησία,

Paul's discourse may point to an inclusive ritual transformation of gentile identity. In this reading, gentile identity is transformed in Christ, by God, through God's spirit who has made the community holy (1:2). This ritual transformation overcomes the separation between God, Israel, and the nations and is further described as a "calling" that does not erase difference (7:18). In 6:11, Paul describes those who will not inherit God's empire and reminds them that some within the Christ-movement used to engage in ritually impure activities,⁵⁵ but they have been "washed," "sanctified," and "justified." Thus, their identity as a member of the "nations" has been transformed but not obliterated. They are distinguished from other "gentiles" who still serve their native gods; rather now, they are God's temple and are dedicated to God's service, to whom they belong (3:16, 23).

B. Christ-following Gentiles are now Children of Abraham

Martin's assertion that Paul views gentiles in Christ as no longer gentiles is supported by the contention, based on Gal 3:7-8 and Rom 4:16-17, that these gentiles are now children of Abraham. Abraham, however, is absent from 1 Corinthians, but since he is central to Paul's argument in Romans and Galatians, he should be addressed.⁵⁶ First, Martin concludes that being a child of Abraham can only refer to those who are Jewish.⁵⁷ While it is obviously accurate to see Abraham (along with Isaac and Jacob) as the father(s) of the Jewish people, Paul also emphasizes Abraham's role as the founding father of the nations.⁵⁸ Second, Paul, when addressing gentiles, only refers to Abraham and does not include Isaac and Jacob. Gentiles in Christ "descend from Abraham *alone*," while Israel descends from the fathers: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Rom 9:5; 15:8).⁵⁹ Third, Paul's apocalyptic worldview provides the basis for his view that gentiles in Christ are part of Abraham's lineage (cf. Gal 3:8; Gen 12:3).⁶⁰ Part of Paul's

priestly end of the age mission is to present the gentiles, who have been made holy by the spirit, as “an offering acceptable to God” (Rom 15:16). In that mission gentiles are not to become Jews, rather they are to relate to God as gentiles.⁶¹

Gentiles continue to relate to God as gentiles because as gentiles they have a role to play in the redemption of Israel. Though there is a negative tradition with regard to the future of gentiles, there is also an eschatological vision that sees a positive future for gentiles in the redemption of Israel.⁶² These are the eschatological pilgrimage texts, e.g., Zech. 8:23, which describes the nations coming with the Jews to worship God.⁶³ They participate in this event on their own terms as gentiles, rather than as Israel. Paul may be described as one who sees those to whom he writes, not as Israel, but as former gentiles who are still gentiles.⁶⁴

C. In 10:1, Gentile Christ-followers are Included in Israel by use of “our fathers”

Martin thinks the presence of “our fathers”⁶⁵ in 10:1 indicates that Paul viewed gentiles in Christ as Israel.⁶⁶ Is this view warranted?⁶⁷ First, this passage needs to be set in the context of the letter.⁶⁸ In 1:22-24, Paul distinguishes between Jew and gentile identity, and so there is no reason to assume that he diverts from that here. In 7:17-24, Paul laid out his rule with regard to the continuation of both the circumcision and uncircumcision callings. Then later in 12:13, Paul states by the use of the “Jew” and “Greek” pairing the way in which both ethnicities continue to be relevant in Christ.⁶⁹ Thus, 10:1 must be seen in Paul’s overall ecclesiology in which Jews remain Jews and gentiles remain gentiles. Second, the presence of “our fathers” in 10:1 should be interpreted in a manner similar to the term ἄδελφοί. Paul understood these gentile Christ-followers to be worshipping the God of historic Israel. Furthermore, Paul viewed gentiles as grafted into God’s family while at the same time remaining distinct from the natural branches.⁷⁰

To conclude that by the use of “our fathers,” Paul seeks to indicate that these gentiles are now Israel seems to go beyond Paul’s claim in 10:1.

D. “Israel According to Flesh” in 10:18 implies a True Israel of which includes Gentiles

The primary issue is the claim that the limiter “according to the flesh” (κατὰ σάρκα) implies an Israel “according to the spirit,” the true Israel. Furthermore, for Martin, this true Israel is made up of both: historic Israel and former gentiles, now in Christ.⁷¹ By this move, he avoids the supersession evident in other views,⁷² but it is at the expense of gentile identity,⁷³ and a redefinition of Israel’s identity that appears foreign to Paul, especially in light of his rule in 7:17.⁷⁴ First, Paul focuses the attention of his readers on the ritual life of a group described as “Israel according to the flesh.”⁷⁵ This refers to historic Israel, and the phrase “according to the flesh” may be understood as ethically neutral, as in Rom 1:3.⁷⁶ In chapter 10, Paul recounts a series of “past punishments of Israel as a warning” to his gentile audience, he is not arguing for the existence of a spiritual Israel, or the erasure of gentile identity in this context.⁷⁷ Actually, the phrase “Israel according to the flesh” is a way to distance Paul’s gentile auditors from historic Israel, i.e., you are not this group.⁷⁸ Second, the inference concerning “Israel according to the spirit,” a phrase Paul never uses, occurs when Rom 9:8 and Gal 6:16 are read into the present context.⁷⁹ The phrase “Israel according to the flesh” does not require a hypothetical correlate “Israel according to the spirit.” For Paul, Israel signifies his kin according to the flesh, those for whom the covenant and blessings continue. This is the group with whom the gentiles will rejoice (Rom 9:3-4; 11:29; 15:10).⁸⁰

III. Conclusion

Dale Martin is correct in arguing that Paul did not set out to found a new religion, a new people, or a new ethnicity. However, in arguing for the last point, he ends up with a process in which there is really no continuing gentile identity in Christ. He rightly confirms Israel, but he does it in a way that all of life for gentiles is left as part of the old age. What is needed is an approach to Paul that allows for previous identities to continue while maintaining the fundamental significance of oneness in Christ. Paul finds in the use of ἔθνος a key group identifier that reminds the Christ-followers of both their pre-turning life, and the transformation that should be evident within the community.

¹ I place the qualifier “really” here because in personal communication he does see gentile identity continuing in some measure. Martin’s view may be somewhat close to that of John M.G. Barclay, “Paul among Diaspora Jews,” *JSNT* 60 (1995): 89-120, (107).

² Dale B. Martin, “The Promise of Teleology, the Constraints of Epistemology, and Universal Vision in Paul,” in John D. Caputo and Linda Alcoff, editors. *St. Paul Among the Philosophers* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2009), 91-108. This discussion is only a small portion of Martin’s essay, but it clearly summarizes an interpretive approach that differs from mine, and provides a useful test case for discerning interpretive nuances.

³ J. Brian Tucker, *You Belong to Christ: Paul and the Formation of Social Identity in 1 Corinthians 1-4*. (Eugene OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010), 14. In my recent book *You Belong to Christ*, I contend that Paul did not set out to obliterate Jewish identity, or gentile identity for that matter. He understood social and cultural identities to be vital to the fulfillment of his mission, as long as they did not contradict God’s commands (e.g., immorality, idolatry, cultural boasting, or unscriptural patterns of thinking). This view is in stark contrast to the understanding of Paul as one who sought to transcend the particularities of Judaism for an egalitarian vision of humanity, often at the expense of the ‘so-called’ parochial concerns of Judaism. See also J. B. Tucker, “Did Paul Create Christian Identity?” *CTR* 8.1 (Fall 2010): 35-51; “Baths, Baptism, and Patronage: The Continuing Role of Roman Social Identity in Corinth.” in K. Ehrensperger and J. B. Tucker, eds., *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 173–88; “Paul and the Formation of the Urban Christ-Movement,” *JBV* 31 (2010): 97–106; “Christian Identity—Created or Construed?” *JBV* 30 (2009):71–77; “The Role of Civic Identity on the Pauline Mission in Corinth.” *Didaskalia: The Journal of Providence College and Seminary*. 19 (2008):72–91.

⁴ Neil Elliott, *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008), 46; Christopher Stanley, “Neither Jew nor Greek,” *JSNT* 64 (1996): 101-24. Both Elliott and Stanley doubt Romans would have referred to themselves this way. *Ethnē* could refer to a non-Jew. James M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul’s Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuc : J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995), 58, 120. Arland J. Hultgren, “The Scriptural Foundations for Paul’s Mission to the Gentiles,” in Stanley E. Porter, editor, *Paul and His Theology* (Pauline studies, v.3. Leiden: Brill, 2006), 21-44, (24). Cf. Georg Betram, “ἔθνος,” *TDNT* 2.364-69; Karl L. Schmidt, “ἔθνος,” *TDNT* 2.369-72. Mark Nanos, “Paul and Judaism: Why Not Paul’s Judaism?” in M. D. Given, ed., *Paul Unbound: Other Perspectives on the Apostle* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010), 130 n. 38. Nanos notes that gentile contains a sense of “not-ness” for the “non-Jewish (and non-Israelite).” He suggests translating *ethnē* as “a member of the nations other than Israel.” An inference from Nanos’ argument, and in personal communication with him, is that gentiles in Christ could be described as “honored non-Jews.” This may be a way forward, but remains to be fully developed. See Brigitte Kahl, *Galatians Re-Imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2010), 39, for a consideration of the confusing category of “honorary Jews.” This term was originally in Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 5. Cited in Kahl, *Galatians*, 313 n. 20. See also Paula Fredriksen, “Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time Has Come to Go,” in David B. Capes, et. al, editors, *Israel’s God and Rebecca’s Children Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity : Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal* (Waco, Tex: Baylor University Press, 2007), 7. It could also refer to a non-Roman. Davina C. Lopez, *Apostle to the Conquered: Reimagining Paul’s Mission* (Paul in critical contexts. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), xii, 4. *BDAG* 276 cites Appian, *Bell. Civ.* 2.26.99; 2.28.107, as an example of the way a Roman could refer to a foreign people group. Thanks to Neil Elliott for drawing my attention to the Appian reference.

⁵ Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁶ Greg Woolf, “Afterword: the local and the global in the Graeco-Roman east,” in Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 189-200, 196. Tacitus, *Germ.* 39: “The Semnones give themselves out to be the most ancient and renowned branch of the Suevi. Their antiquity is strongly attested by their religion. At a stated period, all the tribes of the same race assemble by their representatives in a grove consecrated by the auguries of their forefathers, and by immemorial associations of terror. Here, having publicly slaughtered a human victim, they celebrate the horrible beginning of their barbarous rite. Reverence also in other ways is paid to the grove. No one enters it except bound with a chain,

as an inferior acknowledging the might of the local divinity. If he chance to fall, it is not lawful for him to be lifted up, or to rise to his feet; he must crawl out along the ground. All this superstition implies the belief that from this spot the nation took its origin, that here dwells the supreme and all-ruling deity, to whom all else is subject and obedient. The fortunate lot of the Semnones strengthens this belief; a hundred cantons [*pagi*] are in their occupation, and the vastness of their community makes them regard themselves as the head of the Suevic race”

⁷ Also the role of the movement’s leaders who were Jewish, and their Jewish messiah/Lord obviously played a significant role in the formation of the movement’s social identity.

⁸ Roman imperial ideology relied on the resources of the urban environment, imperial religion, status-oriented discourse, and allegiance to the emperor to form local expressions of Roman social identity. See Louise Revell, *Roman Imperialism and Local Identities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 1-39.

⁹ Woolf, “Afterword,” 196.

¹⁰ Love L. Sechrest, *A Former Jew: Paul and the Dialectics of Race* (London: T & T Clark, 2009).

¹¹ It is beyond the scope of this paper to resolve this issue, however, see Terence L. Donaldson, *Jews and Anti-Judaism in the New Testament: Decision Points and Divergent Interpretations* (London: SPCK, 2010), 131. For a different approach see Christopher Zoccali, *Whom God Has Called: The Relationship of Church and Israel in Pauline Interpretation, 1920 to the Present* (Eugene, Ore: Pickwick Publications, 2010). Here Israel maintains its ethnic sense, but “all Israel” includes all the Jews who believe in Christ prior to his return. See also Donaldson, *Jews*, 129-30. The view closest to the one put forth here, Donaldson describes as, “Lying between are approaches in which the ultimate salvation of ‘all Israel’ is seen to be centred in Christ, but Israel nevertheless continues to exist as a distinct and significant entity. The present ‘remnant’ imply the ‘first fruits’ of the whole (11.16). In the present, the Jewish remnant continues to have a distinct identity, so that the people of God consists of two groups – Jewish believers, who belong by nature to the ‘olive tree’ of Israel, and Gentiles, who have come to share the ‘spiritual blessings’ (15.27) that properly belong to the Jewish people. In this reading, the people of God has the same two-fold structure in the end-times, except that the remnant has now been expanded to include ‘all Israel’.” Donaldson, *Jews*, 131. For N. T. Wright and R. B. Hays see n. 65.

¹² Martin, “Teleology,” 101.

¹³ Though, obviously I will have to come out of the hinterland of the Corinthian correspondence and address some of Paul’s arguments in Romans and Galatians.

¹⁴ Martin, “Teleology,” 99. In 5:1, Paul writes, “It is actually reported that there is sexual immorality among you (ἐν ὑμῖν), and of a kind that does not occur even among the gentiles/pagans/nations (ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν).”

¹⁵ Inventing the gentile here is meant to indicate that Paul mediates between the understanding of gentiles as non-Jewish idolators, while at the same time viewing them as children of Abraham, but not Israel. This category is not evident in James Scott’s work, thus, the suggestion that Paul is meditating between macroidentities and localidentities. James M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul’s Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians*

: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995), 58, 120. As Woolf, “Afterword,” 199, notes, “The difficulty we face, then, is in deciding which of the potential shifting macroidentities mattered most.” For Paul, what mattered most would be a discussion over the relative status of “Greek” or “Gentile.” Paula Fredriksen, *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defense of Jews and Judaism* (New York: Doubleday, 2008), 34-35, refers to them as “ex-pagan pagans.”

¹⁶ See further Simon Goodhill, “What is local identity? The politics of cultural mapping,” in Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 46-68.

¹⁷ Jennifer A. Glancy, “Jesus, the Syrophoenician Woman, and Other First Century Bodies,” *BibInt* 18 (2010): 342-63, (343). Glancy notes that intersectionality can “capture the interplay of identity categories, especially marginalized or stigmatized identities.” Also, she cites Nash’s definition of intersectionality as “the notion that subjectivity is constituted by mutually reinforcing vectors of race, gender, class, and sexuality.” See Jennifer Nash, “Re-thinking Intersectionality,” *Feminist Review* 89 (2008): 1-15, (1). For a discussion of an ecology of multiple identities see S. Stryker and R. T. Serpe, “Commitment, Identity Salience, and Role Behavior: A Theory and Research Example.” in *Personality, Roles, and Social Behavior*, edited by W. Ickes, and E. S. Knowles, (New York: Springer, 1982), 188-218. For a discussion of identity hierarchies see, S. Stryker and R. T. Serpe, “Identity Salience

and Psychological Centrality: Equivalent, Overlapping, or Complementary Concepts?" *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57 (1994):16–35, (17 n. 1).

¹⁸ Pamela Eisenbaum, "Paul, Polemics, and the Problem of Essentialism," *BibInt* 13.3 (2005): 224-38, (237).

Eisenbaum's original focus is on Paul's configuration of "in Christ" and "the body of Christ."

¹⁹ Martin, "Teleology," 98.

²⁰ Stanley, "Neither Jew nor Greek," 105-6, is correct to recognize that there are limits to this semantic overlap, see esp. 123. Though he insightfully remarks that "Non-Jews (including 'Greeks') were typically classed together as 'Gentiles' (ἄλλοφύλοι or ἔθνη), a term that carried a host of negative connotations within the Jewish community" 112. Cf. Bruce W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001), 25.

²¹ Antoinette Clark Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction Through Paul's Rhetoric* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 64. Paul "prefers the more honorable term 'Greeks' to the word 'Gentiles,' except when speaking of their earlier idolatry or immorality (1:24; 12:2; cf. 5:1; 10:20)."

²² Philip Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 43, draws on the six features of ethnicity from Hutchinson and Smith, "(1) a common proper name to identify the group; (2) a myth of common ancestry; (3) a shared history or shared memories of a common past, including heroes, events, and their commemoration; (4) a common culture, embracing such things as customs, language and religion; (5) a link with a homeland, either through actual occupation or a symbolic attachment to the ancestral land, as with diaspora peoples; and (6) a sense of communal solidarity." John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, "Introduction," in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., *Ethnicity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 6-7. Cited in Esler. See also Dennis C. Duling, "Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism, and the Matthean *Ethnos*," *BTB* 35.4 (Winter 2005): 125-43, who offers an ethnicity model that includes nine distinct features.

²³ D. K. Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. Gender, Theory, and Religion. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 33. Buell refers to this as ethnic reasoning which is a discursive strategy within early texts which defines "ethnicity through religious practices, viewing ethnicity as mutable even if 'real,' universalizing ethnicity and religion, and using ethnic ideas as polemic."

²⁴ Winter, *After*, 23, considers the terms as synonymous. He also considers the idea that "Ἕλληνας can also refer to "educational status" as well as "ethnicity" (23-24). Furthermore, Winter suggests that "Ἕλληνας should be translated as gentiles in 1 Corinthians, in that this is Paul's reference group when using this term. *LSJ* 536 defines *ethnē* as "gentiles, whether heathens or Christians, opp. Jews," cf. *LXX* Is. 9:11 (Is. 9:12); John 7:35. Furthermore, Winter concludes that when Paul employs this term, he is signifying "neither the ethnic origin nor the citizenship of those...living in Corinth, but he was repeating an all-embracing term" (25).

²⁵ Martin's claim that there is no current transformation, and that the transformation is in the future in Paul overlooks the agency of the Spirit/spirit in moral progress (1 Cor 2:14-16).

²⁶ Tucker, *You Belong*, 171-72.

²⁷ Ernest Best, "The Power and Wisdom of God," in *Paolo a una Chiesa divisa (1 Co. 1-4)*, ed. L. de Lorenzi (Rome: Abbazia di S Paolo fuori le mura, 1980), 9-44, here 36. Wire, *Prophets*, 64. Wire points out that "Paul's arguments in 1 Corinthians show his audience is now largely Gentile. He deals with the wisdom that Greeks seek rather than the power Jews want."

²⁸ George Howard, *Paul-- Crisis in Galatia : a Study in Early Christian Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 40, thinks that it "reflects a theological implication inherent in Paul's gospel that the unity which was destined for the church was one which envisioned a continued ethnic and cultural distinction between the Jewish and Gentile wings of the church."

²⁹ William S. Campbell contends the same is true for Jewish identity, "for Paul Jewish identity is not obsolete for those in Christ, but constitutes a viable and recognized sub-group identity pattern." William S. Campbell, *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 96. See also W.D. Davies, "Presidential Address: Paul and the People of Israel," *NTS* 24.1 (October 1977): 4-39.

³⁰ Thanks to Chris Zoccali for his interaction in clarifying these ideas in my argument.

³¹ Caroline Johnson Hodge, "Apostle to the Gentiles: Constructions of Paul's Identity," *BibInt* 13.3 (2005): 270-88, (270). She notes that "Each of Paul's terms for non-Judeans, 'gentiles' (*ethne*) and 'uncircumcised/foreskinned,' represents Judean ways of speaking about non-Judeans; they are terms of 'othering' and serve to flatten any

ethnic particularity from the identities of these people.” Johnson Hodge extends this too far, while it is true that this is a Judean way of organizing the ethnic map, and particularity is not primarily in view, the inference that there is little good in that identity is not entirely obvious. While, it may be a term of ‘othering’, it is an ‘other’ who is drawn near. Nicola Denzey, “The Limits of Ethnic Categories,” in A. J., P. A. Turcotte, and J. Duhaime, eds., *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2002), 489-507, Denzey doubts whether or not one can draw significant conclusion concerning ethnicity based on *ethnē*, (495).

³² Fredriksen, “Retirement,” 27. She makes a similar connection, as does Johnson Hodge, 270.

³³ As Campbell argues concerning a putative ἀδιάφορα topos here, that the “abiding difference at the point of call” is the key principle when thinking about ἀδιάφορα, in this context, and thus one’s state when called may not be classified as indifferent; that still matters to Paul. William S. Campbell, “I Rate All Things as Loss: Paul’s Rhetoric of Comparison,” in P. Spitaler, ed., *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift for Jerome Murphy O’Connor and Joseph Fitzmyer* (CBQ Monograph Series; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2010), forthcoming. See Tucker, *You Belong*, 232. David J. Rudolph, “Paul’s ‘Rule in All the Churches’ (1 Cor 7:17-24) and Torah-Defined Ecclesiological Variegation,” *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* 5.1 (2010): 1-24. I follow Rudolph’s approach at key points in this argument.

³⁴ Winter remarks that “[e]thnicity and social identity were the results of the providential oversight of God (7:18, 21, 23).” Bruce Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 239. See Tucker, *You Belong*, 81. Cf. Gal 5:6, 6:15.

³⁵ Dennis Edwin Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis (Minn.): Fortress press, 2003), 165-66. Pace Fitzmyer, *1 Corinthians*, 51. However, in Gen 9:17 “all flesh” are in view with regard to the rainbow. In 9:6, murder is not to occur, nor, in 9:4, are they to eat blood, this latter restriction is repeated in the “sojourner” regulations in Lev 17:10-16. The Leviticus passage also restricts idolatry (17:7-9), and incest (18:6-26). Circumcision is not required for this group, who are seeking to live among Jews, without becoming Israel. Cf. Mark D. Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 50-56. M. Zetterholm, *Approaches to Paul: A Student’s Guide to Recent Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 139. P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 19, 23, 220, 269.

³⁶ *Doctor Who*. BBC One, 5 July 2008. See also, *Bhagavad Gita* 11:32. As Ehrensperger asks, “How can redemption from the slavery of sin include the obliteration of human particularity and difference, something of which the Scriptures say ‘and indeed, it was very good’ (Gen 1.31)?” Kathy Ehrensperger, “Review of: *Our Mother Saint Paul*. By Beverly Roberts Gaventa,” *BibInt* 16 (2008): 302-6, (303). She also notes the ethical and theological dangers associated with promoting an “image of God” who seeks to “obliterate worlds.”

³⁷ Donaldson makes a similar argument. See Terence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the gentiles: remapping the Apostle’s convictional world* (Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress Press, 1997), 237.

³⁸ Terence Paige, “1 Corinthians 12.2: A Pagan POMPE?,” *JSNT* 44 (1991); 57-65, (57). David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2003), 564.

³⁹ It is interesting to note that interpreters often point to 1 Cor 12:2 as an indication that the Corinthian ἐκκλησία is predominantly gentile. Cf. Ehrensperger, *Dynamics*, 134. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 4.

⁴⁰ J. G. Muthuraj, “The meaning of *ethnos* and *ethne* and its Significance to the Study of the New Testament,” *Bangalore Theological Forum* 29 (1997): 3-36. Muthuraj argues that the “Gentiles-pagans-heathens” idea is not in view in the biblical usage, but rather, the focus is primarily “nations” which then acknowledges “peoplehood...without deculturising them” (34).

⁴¹ See Clint Tibbs, *Religious Experience of the Pneuma: Communication with the Spirit World in 1 Corinthians 12 and 14* (WUNT 2, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 44-47.

⁴² He addressed this earlier in 1 Cor 2:6-16, where the epistemic deficiency was concerned with the reasons these rulers failed to recognize who Jesus was and what was the purpose of his mission of redemption. See Tucker, *Belong*, 188 n. 39.

⁴³ The lack of local knowledge, which is a contact zone for microidentity formation, that is in view includes an unawareness of the social implications of the gospel. See Tim Whitmarsh, “Thinking local,” in Whitmarsh, *Local Knowledge*, 1-16, 12. Is this new epistemic situation, being part of the covenant? I am not suggesting that Paul

does not see gentiles as related to Israel in some way, I am pointing out that difference remains within this transformed identity. David Rudolph, "The Relationship between the Church and Israel," *Verge* 2.2 (Feb 2010): 4, suggests that gentiles are inside the commonwealth of Israel, the *politeia* of Israel. Campbell, *Paul and the Creation*, 138, suggests that "Gentile Christ-followers form satellite communities related to Israel but they are not actually Israel."

⁴⁴ Marianne Bjelland Kartzow, "'Asking the Other Question': An Intersectional Approach to Galatians 3:28 and the Colossian Household Codes," *BibInt* 18 (2010): 364-89, (370).

⁴⁵ Kartzow, "Asking," 376.

⁴⁶ Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 81. Bockmuehl thinks that "Based perhaps on their interpretation of Jesus' own pattern of table fellowship (Rom 14.14; cf. Mark 7.19c), Paul and the Antiochene church had evidently come to adopt a relatively liberal purity halakhah that could accommodate the Gentiles." Cf. David Rudolph, "Jesus and the Food Laws: A Reassessment of Mark 7:19b," *EQ* 74.4 (Oct 2002): 291-311.

⁴⁷ Sechrest, *Former*, 156. She writes, "Here we see that Paul has three groups in view and that in this case, he sees himself as a member of this third collective." It is not evident that Paul considers himself in only the third group. Sechrest provides no argument for her claim. My contention is based on Paul's rule in all his churches, in 1 Cor 7:17-24, in which he claims that Jews are to remain as Jews once they are in Christ. Sechrest does not deal with this passage in her book. She makes a general reference to the context of chapter 7, but fails to engage the primary passage that would argue for the continuation of previous social identities in Christ. My broader contention is that Paul argues that ethnic differentiation is relevant, and that communal behavior choices should be made with previous social identities in view.

⁴⁸ Tucker, *You Belong*, 81.

⁴⁹ (1)The Christ-followers are referred to as "brothers" and "holy ones" described as "designations by Jews for other Jews." (2)The Christ-followers are seen as "children of Abraham," which would have identified them as Jews. (3)The Christ-followers are included in the "descendants of the Israelites" by the use of "our fathers" in 1 Cor 10:1. (4) The presence of a group identified as "Israel according to the flesh" implies the existence of a true Israel of which these gentile Christ-followers are a part. We will briefly address each of these. Martin, "Teleology," 99. With regard to Abraham, Martin follows the general approach of Buell and Johnson Hodge, who see no continuing gentile identity in Christ. Being in Christ is a Jewish identity in their construct. Buell and Johnson Hodge write, "Paul does not explicitly ask his gentiles to become Judeans or to cease being Greeks, yet it is a Judean umbrella under which he locates all those 'in Christ.'" Denise Kimber Buell and Caroline Johnson Hodge, "The Politics of Interpretation: The Rhetoric of Race and Ethnicity in Paul," *JBL* 123.2 (2004): 235-51, (249). Lee rightly points out that for Buell and Johnson Hodge, gentile identity is really Judean identity. Jae Won Lee, "Paul and Ethnic Difference in Romans," in Randall C. Bailey, Tat-siong Benny Liew, and Fernando F. Segovia, (editors), *They Were All Together in One Place?: Toward Minority Biblical Criticism*, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 141-57, (151). I am not suggesting that Johnson Hodge sees gentile identity as Jewish identity. I am pointing out that the implication of Johnson Hodge's work is that all of gentile identity, even though it continues, is really left in the old age, and what is actually left of gentile identity is unclear.

⁵⁰ It is used 36 times in First Corinthians: 1:1, 10, 11, 26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6; 5:11; 6:5, 6, 8; 7:12, 14, 15, 24, 29; 8:11, 12, 13; 9:5; 10:1; 11:33; 12:1; 14:6, 20, 26, 39; 15:1, 6, 31, 50, 58; 16:11, 12, 15, 20. Second Corinthians 1:1, 8; 2:13; 8:1, 18, 22, 23; 9:3, 5; 11:9; 12:18; 13:11. (12 times in 2 Cor).

⁵¹ Tucker, *You Belong*, 154. R. Aasgaard, "My Beloved Brothers and Sisters": *Christian Siblingship in Paul* (Early Christianity in Context 265. London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), 278. He contends that "The almost obligatory address in these formulas serves to create confidence, to impart a sense of closeness, and to convey a feeling of a common knowledge, which is hidden from outsiders: as siblings they share a secret landscape together (1 Thess. 4.13)."

⁵² Mark D. Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 113. See also 142n.75 for a discussion of brothers in Romans, Luke-Acts. Nanos notes that "to be a brother means to belong to the family of Abraham, to share in the promises. *Adelphos* means Israelite (Acts 1:16; 3:12, 17; 7:23, 25 f.; 13:26)."

⁵³ Nanos, *Mystery*, 184; Magnus Zetterholm, "Paul and the Missing Messiah," in Magnus Zetterholm, editor, *The Messiah in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 33-55, (50). See Anders Runesson,

“Particularistic Judaism and Universalistic Christianity? Some Critical Remarks on Terminology and Theology.” *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 1 (2000): 120–44. See Runesson for a discussion of Apostolic Judaism, and the degree to which the movements were interconnected during this time.

⁵⁴ Martin, “Teleology,” 99. Peter Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective* (Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 72, suggests the connection for Paul's use of “holy ones” is to be found in Dan. 7:22, 27; 12:1-3, “These passages speak about the revelation of the Son of Man and the people he represents, the ‘holy ones of the Most High,’ in end time glory.” In this reading, the “holy ones” would be construed as Israel. The same issues still arises, if the “holy ones” refer to the people of God, and gentiles are now related to the God of historic Israel, does that identification carry over. However, this begs the question, how do these gentiles relate to the macroidentity of Israel. Paul appears to maintain some connection with clear distinguishing between Jews and gentiles. This is necessary for the future salvation of Israel (Rom 11:26).

⁵⁵ 1 Cor 6:9-11; cf. Rom 1:18-32; Gal 5:19-21; 1 Thess 4:4-6; Lev 18:24. See Christine Elizabeth Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 4-5, 12-15, 47-54.

⁵⁶ Abraham does occur in 2 Cor 11:22 where Paul describes his continuing identification with his Jewish identity. Halvor Moxnes, *Theology in Conflict: Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, v. 53. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), 250-52.

⁵⁷ Martin, “Teleology,” 98-99.

⁵⁸ Cf. Rom 4:17; Gen 17:4.

⁵⁹ Fredriksen, “Judaizing,” 243. Though, Hodge, based on Rom 9:7, argues for descent through Isaac. Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 94. Cited also in Fredriksen, *Judaizing*, 243 n. 27.

⁶⁰ For example, in Gal 3:8, Paul, when referring to the promise concerning the inclusion of gentiles, quotes Gen 12:3, which, referring to Abraham reads, “in you all the nations will be blessed.” Campbell rightly contends that Abraham is “a uniting figure in the church composed of Jewish and Gentile Christians.” William S. Campbell, “Romans III as a Key to the Structure and Thought of Romans,” in Karl P. Donfried, editor, *The Romans Debate*. Rev. ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 261. See also Nanos, *Mystery*, 141. Pamela Michelle Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Real Message of a Misunderstood Apostle* (New York: HarperOne, 2009), 201. Fredriksen “Judaizing,” 250, thinks, “Like other apocalyptically minded Jews of his era, Paul too held that the Kingdom's demography would reflect then what the world holds now: Jews and Gentiles, Israel and the nations.”

⁶¹ Eisenbaum, *Paul*, 207. She describes the purpose of Paul's mission as, “to integrate all these various non-Jewish peoples into the Abrahamic family.” Paul's mission implies the continuation of gentile identity.

⁶² Negative view see 1 Enoch 91:9; 4 Ezra 13:32-38; Sirach 36:7-10; Baruch 4:25; referenced in Fredriksen, *Augustine*, 33.

⁶³ Zech 8:23, “In those days ten men from the nations of every tongue shall take hold of the robe of a Jew, saying, ‘Let us go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.’” See also Tobit 14:7; Isaiah 2:2-3. As Klein notes, “in the great eschatological day, the pagan nations will be able to observe and participate in Israel's righteousness at last.” George L. Klein, *Zechariah* (Nashville, Tenn: B & H Pub. Group, 2008), 250. “The testimony of the Gentiles concerning Abraham's descendants will demonstrate the transformation of Judah's spiritual state from unrighteousness to righteousness.” For a recent discussion of the eschatological pilgrimage texts, see Matthew V. Novenson, “The Jewish Messiahs, the Pauline Christ, and the Gentile Question,” *JBL* 128.2 (Summer 2009): 357-73, concludes “The Gentiles are to be neither converted nor destroyed; rather they share in the blessedness of the age to come by virtue of their obedience to the Davidic kind of Israel This is the view attested in Paul's reading of Isa. 11:10 in Rom 15:12.” (373)

⁶⁴ Sechrest, *Former*, 150-51. Cf. Zetterholm, “Missing Messiah,” 49. He argues that Paul's strategy was to keep non-Jews from observing Torah in the manner of the Jews. Thus, Paul's “overarching strategy [was] to prevent non-Jews from relying on Torah observance and to uphold ethnic boundaries between Jews and non-Jews within the Jesus movement.” Harnack, Adolf von Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, v. 1 (Translated by James Moffatt; Theological translation library, v. 19. New York: Putnam, 1904), 346. For Paul – Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are the fathers of the Jews, while Abraham is at the same time, the father of the

gentiles. Eisenbaum, *Paul*, 203. She notes that this is “not just metaphorically or spiritually, as is sometimes thought. No. Abraham is just as much the father of faithful Gentiles as he is of faithful Jews.” See also *Sir.* 44:19-21.

⁶⁵ G. Walter Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement series, 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 175-99. The context of chapter 10 might indicate Moses is the father in view (but note the plural). *Judith* 8:25-26 uses the phrase “our fathers,” and then specifies Abraham (cf. *1 Macc.* 2:50-52; *Sirach* 44:1, 13, 16-21). *The Testament of Levi* 15:4 describes “Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” as “our fathers.” Likewise, Josephus in *Antiquities* 11.169, includes Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” in the group referred to as “our fathers.”

⁶⁶ Martin, “Teleology,” 99, remarking on 1 Cor 10:1, thinks that Paul “even seems to include [the Christ-followers] among the descendants of the Israelites who wandered with Moses in the wilderness. It is admittedly a matter of interpretation, but I think he is including his readers in 1 Corinthians 10:1 when he says, ‘Our Fathers were all under the cloud and all passed through the sea.’”

⁶⁷ Cranfield warns against making significant exegetical decisions based on Paul’s use of pronouns; however, he does see him using similar constructions in Rom 3:9; 4:1; 9:4, with reference to his fellow Jews. C. E. B. Cranfield, “Changes of Person and Number in Paul’s Epistles.” in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*, edited by M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. (London: SPCK, 1982), 280, 285. Also, Paul could be passing on a tradition that contains the wording evident in the text, in such a reading scenario, the pronoun would be explained from an original Jewish context. Barrett, *Corinthians*, 220. Collins also considers the “midrashic” elements of this section. See Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1999), 368. He notes that this is the only place in this letter where these descendants are connected in such a way, and that Paul may have simply had a universal human experience in view. Finally, he also thinks that “the use of the rhetorical device of paronomasia sets the stage for the paraenesis to come.” C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Harper’s New Testament commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 220, considers the following possibility, “By *our* he may have referred to himself (and his fellow-Jews) as distinguished from his readers.” Barrett, however, goes on to consider as more likely, the accepted interpretation that his gentile readers are now Israel. Charles Hodge, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1980), 171. Hodge thinks that the presence of “our fathers,” is an indication that Paul is speaking to Jews, and not primarily to the gentiles. See Nanos, *Mystery*, 75-84 for a discussion of implied and explicit readers.

⁶⁸ A special thanks to David Rudolph for pointing out to me the contextual nature of Paul’s argument.

⁶⁹ Not neither nor but both and. Williams remarks that “in Gal 3:28 Paul uses ‘neither...nor’ to formulate the pairs of opposites, while in 1 Cor 12:13 he uses the positive ‘whether...or.’ Paul’s intention here is not to emphasize the abolition of social difference but the unity of these different groups into one body.” Demetrius K. Williams, “‘Upon All Flesh’: Acts 2, African Americans, and Intersectional Realities,” in Randall C. Bailey, Tat-siong Benny Liew, and Fernando F. Segovia, (editors), *They Were All Together in One Place?: Toward Minority Biblical Criticism*, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 289-310,(294).

⁷⁰ See Rom 11:24, 25-27.

⁷¹ Martin, “Teleology,” 99. Schmidt, *TDNT* 2.371, contends that “It is true that in 1 C. 5:1; 12:2; 1 Th. 4:5; 1 Pt. 2:12; 3 Jn. 7 (K al) and various passages in Rev. the ἔθνη are Gentiles in distinction from Christians, but this usage rests on the fact that Christians are considered true Israelites and the Church as Israel κατὰ πνεῦμα.” Martin contends that 1 Cor 10:18 is the only place where Israel [Ἰσραήλ] is used to describe those who do not believe in Christ. While this is correct on the lexical level, Paul employs an overlapping term that limits the force of Martin’s contention. However, Rom 9:3-4, though it uses Ἰσραηλίτης rather than Ἰσραήλ, points to Jews who are not believers in Christ, and Paul uses Ἰσραηλίτης to describe himself in 2 Cor 11:22, though he obviously follows Christ. Also in Phil 3:5, he uses Ἰσραήλ to describe himself, though he believes in Christ. Thus, Paul can use these overlapping terms in different contexts, which calls into question the significance of Martin’s claim.

⁷² I have in mind here N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Thought* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 235. See also R. B. Hays, “The Conversion of the Imagination: Scripture and Eschatology in 1 Corinthians,” *NTS* 45 (1999): 391-412, (395-96). Hays and Martin are quite close with regard to the idea that gentile Christ-followers are now identified with Israel. See Hays, “Conversion,” 411; Martin, “Teleology,” 98-99. S. Hafemann, “Eschatology and Ethics: The Future of Israel and the Nations in Romans 15:1-13,” *TynBul* 51.2 (2000): 161-192, (162, 190). Donaldson, *Jews*, 138, contends that “Paul’s argument that simply by being ‘in Christ’ Gentiles

were members of Abraham's 'seed' could readily be understood in a supersessionist way, especially in a Gentile context where there were few Jewish 'branches' with whom they were called on to share – and even more especially as time went on and the Christian movement became increasingly Gentile."

⁷³ I.e., It doesn't continue in any meaningful sense.

⁷⁴ Martin, "Teleology," 99.

⁷⁵ S. G. Eastman, "Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-reading of Galatians 6:16 and Romans 9-11", *NTS* 56.3 (July 2010), 367-95.

⁷⁶ Cf. Rom 4:1; 9:3, 5.

⁷⁷ Jouette M. Bassler, *Navigating Paul: An Introduction to Key Theological Concepts* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 74. Schrage argues that the phrase ὁ Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα, refers to Israelites who served idols. W. Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther* (EKK 7; Zurich: Benziger; Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991-99), 442-43. Eastman thinks this fits the context of 1 Cor 10 and does not require a "correlative notion of the church as Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα." Eastman, "Israel," 367. One could also draw from 1 Cor 10:6-10 and the idolatry alluded to from Exod. 24:3, 7; 32:6.

⁷⁸ Joshua Garroway, "Neither Jew nor Gentile, but Both: Paul's 'Christians' as 'Gentile-Jews'," PhD diss. Yale University, 2008. 50. Thanks to Dale Martin for pointing out Garroway's work, which was previously unknown to me, and for Joshua's gracious willingness to share his soon to be published work with me. Garroway also notes that in 2 Cor 3:14, Paul distinguishes gentiles in Christ from Israel. (50) It is just as likely that Paul adds the phrase "according to the flesh" because the presence of "our Fathers" could have been misconstrued as suggesting these gentiles were now Israel. Thus, the limiter exists to clarify the rhetorical distance, rather than to suggest these gentile Christ-followers are spiritual Israel.

⁷⁹ A.C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 771. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 392. "Consider the people of Israel. Lit. 'look at Israel according to the flesh,' the ethnic or historical-empirical Israel of old, which Paul will distinguish in Rom 9:6 from those who are truly 'Israel,' the people of God in the OT (see *Romans*, 559-60). Now Paul contrasts old Israel with Christians, whom he has called 'the Israel of God' (Gal 6:16). For the same use of *kata sarka*, see Rom 4:1 (said of Abraham as forefather) and Gal 4:23." Campbell, *Paul and the Creation*, 124, has persuasively argued that Rom 9:8, should be translated, "For it is not those of fleshly descent alone, but those of fleshly descent and of promise who are Abraham's seed." He continues, "In Paul's terms, the children of promise is here a subgroup within those of fleshly descent from Abraham, and at this point in Chapter 9, he does not yet (prior to 9.24) include any beyond this group. It is not warranted to simply generalize this sub-group to refer to gentiles who at this stage in Paul's argument are not directly in focus." Furthermore, an inference is often made that "Israel according to the flesh" is in contrast to the ὁ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ "Israel of God" in Gal 6:16, which, the majority of interpreters conclude, describes those in Christ. However, Eastman has recently made a persuasive case that the Israel of God refers to historic Israel and that Paul is offering a second benediction over them because of the implications of his arguments in Galatians. See Eastman, "Israel," 367. Cf. F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 274. "W.D. Davies thinks that the Israel of God 'may refer to the Jewish people as a whole'. It may, provided we bear in mind Paul's observation that 'not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel' (Rom 9:6). If ὁ Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα (1 Cor 10:18) denotes the empirical Israel, ὁ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ may denote the Israel seen by God as the true Israel." Also cited in Susan G Eastman, "Israel," 367, notes that "such an opposition between κατὰ σάρκα and τοῦ θεοῦ, however, never occurs in Paul's letters. In Galatians itself, where one might expect to find it, *flesh* occurs in antithetical relationship to the promise and the Spirit (4.23; 5.17-24); Paul never coins the expression Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα." Eastman concludes that the Israel of God refers to empirical Israel and that Paul is offering a second benediction over them because of the implications of his arguments in Galatians.

⁸⁰ Fredriksen, "Judaizing," 250, is correct in asserting that "for Paul, 'Israel' always means his 'kinsmen according to the flesh – they are Israel' (Rom 9:4). The distinction of the covenant, and of the promises to the forefathers, remain. Romans ends with the Gentiles rejoicing 'with God's people' (Rom 15.10)." See Campbell, *Paul and the Creation*, 122.