CHAPTER 21

Equality in the Church

Justin K. Hardin

What does it mean for Jewish and gentile believers to be “one in Christ” (Gal 3:28) or for God to make “one new person out of two” (Eph 2:15)? Do these biblical affirmations imply ethnic equality while maintaining ethnic distinction, or should we understand them as collapsing ethnicity altogether? Admittedly, these passages are often assumed to support the latter — that Jew and gentile have been eclipsed, both groups becoming a tertius genum (third race). In this chapter, we will therefore evaluate these two biblical passages afresh, with our sights set on answering this significant question.

Unfortunately, the limits of this study prevent us from undertaking a detailed exegesis of each biblical text. Neither will we be able to discuss other significant issues related to this question, such as the Pauline referent of “the Israel of God” (Gal 6:16), the eschatological question of “Israel” (Rom 11:26), or what Paul precisely meant when he called the Corinthian believers former gentiles (see 1 Cor 12:2). Instead, our aims are much more modest: in this chapter, we will evaluate the meaning of (1) Galatians 3:28 and (2) Ephesians 2:14 – 18, in order to demonstrate that these texts, while clearly affirming full equality between Jew and gentile in the Messiah Jesus, assume an ongoing ethnic distinction between them.

Galatians: Equality through Faith in the Messiah

Paul’s letter to the Galatian churches is famous both for its theological density and its firmness of conviction that salvation comes through faith in the Messiah Jesus. Indeed, believers throughout the centuries have heralded this highly charged letter as a Magna Carta, as it were, of God’s free gift of salvation. But if most interpreters have correctly recognised the weight of Paul’s soteriology in this letter, they often tread down the wrong path by assuming Paul thereby diminished Jewish (and, indeed, ethnic) identity. Perhaps at one level this marriage is understandable. After all, in one of the climactic statements in Galatians, Paul pronounced decisively that “There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28). To be sure, this declaration does not support

---

1. Unless otherwise noted, Scripture translations are my own.
2. This designation was used as early as Tertullian (who opposed this understanding; see Nat. 1.3).
3. See also Col 3:11: “Here there is no Gentile or Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free, but Christ is all, and is in all”; and 1 Cor 12:3: “For we were all baptized by one Spirit so as to form one body — whether Jews or Gentiles, slave or free — and we were all given the one Spirit to drink.” What is said of Gal 3:28 largely applies to these passages as well, although there are some obvious points of departure in the overall
a collapse of ethnicity any more than it supports the collapse of the male and female genders. (Paul certainly did not think believers were androgynous!) So how precisely are we to understand Paul's statement in Galatians 3:28 that there is neither Jew nor gentile? In order to answer this question, we must place this verse securely within the context of the letter by making two preliminary points.

First, we must bear in mind that Galatians was addressed to gentiles (Gal 4:8 – 9; 5:2) in response to a “crisis” in the churches. In this letter we learn that “agitators” (see 1:7; 5:10) within these communities were demanding that the gentile believers needed to be circumcised to be members of Abraham’s family (5:2 – 12; 6:12 – 13). Despite the widespread assumption that the agitators were legalistic Jewish believers (a.k.a. “Judaizers”), Paul attributed their Judaizing tactics to practical, not theological, concerns (6:12 – 13). According to Paul, the agitators were preaching circumcision to gentiles simply to avoid persecution. Like Peter at Antioch, who also agreed with Paul’s gospel but denied gentiles table fellowship out of fear (2:11 – 21), the agitators in Galatia were distorting the gospel (1:7) out of fear (6:12 – 13; cf. 5:11) and were denying fellowship with the gentiles, until of course they followed through with circumcision (4:17 – 20). As we seek to understand Paul’s argument in Galatians, we must therefore remember both the letter’s occasion and its gentile recipients.

Second, we must understand correctly Paul’s theological aim. In short, Paul sought to demonstrate to his gentile readers that salvation and inclusion as God’s people came through faith in Jesus the Messiah, not through circumcision (Gal 3:1 – 9). In doing so, Paul argued that gentiles had been included as Abraham’s children though faith (cf. Rom 4). Of course, he did not argue his point by claiming that Abraham’s role as father of the Jewish people ceased to exist in the messianic age. Instead, Paul’s primary aim was to show that neither gentiles nor Jews are treated differently in God’s economy of salvation. In the face of the agitators who were arguing that gentiles needed to be circumcised, Paul averred confidently that gentiles were included as Abraham’s children through faith in the Messiah.

Given our understanding both of the occasion and of Paul’s aims in the letter, we are now in a better position to understand Paul’s broader argument and how Galatians 3:28 functions within it. In 3:1 – 9, Paul began his argument by rebuking these gentiles for the second time, reminding them that faith, not Law keeping (literally: “works of the Law”), makes one a child of Abraham. Thus, Paul prioritized faith over the Law,
using Abraham as a key figure in his argument. In the following verses, he then supported this assertion in two primary ways, which we can outline below:

1. The Messiah came under the curse of the Law so that, through faith, the gentiles might receive the blessing of Abraham and so that “we” Jews might receive the promised Holy Spirit (Gal 3:10 – 14).  
2. The promise to Abraham and to his “seed” (who is the Messiah Jesus), and thus Abraham’s faith, preceded the giving of the Law (Gal 3:15 – 18).

After sketching the priority of the Abrahamic promise/faith, Paul then answered two potential objections with regard to the Law. The first question: Why was the Law added (Gal 3:19a)? Paul replied briefly (and cryptically!) that it was added because of transgressions, even though admittedly it dealt with only one people (Israel) and not the world (Gal 3:19b – 20). The second question was a corollary to the first: Is the Law then contrary to the (Abrahamic) promises (Gal 3:21)? Paul flatly denied this suggestion and argued two basic points in reply:

1. The Law is not able to give life. On the contrary, the Scriptures shut up everything under sin, so that the promise would be given through faith in/of the Messiah Jesus to those who have faith (Gal 3:21b – 22).
2. The Law was a tutor (pedagogue) until the Messiah came, so that one would be made righteous from faith (Gal 3:23 – 24).

With these theological rejoinders, Paul had returned to the main thrust of the argument — that Abrahamic faith takes priority over the Law. Indeed, in the concluding verses of this chapter, Paul stressed that because “faith” has come, “we” Jews are no longer under the tutor (i.e., we do not need protection from the deathly consequences of sin) because “you” gentiles are children of God through faith in the Messiah Jesus (Gal 3:25 – 26). In 3:27 – 29, Paul then brought the entire argument to a fitting climax, proclaiming the reason these gentiles were children of God through faith:

for all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. If you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.

Given our understanding of Galatians 3, we can observe how Paul’s argument requires Jewish particularity, as it is inherently linked with the Abrahamic promise to gentiles (cf. Gen 12:3). Thus, Galatians 3:28 does not assume a deterioration of ethnic distinction; on the contrary, this verse is predicated on ethnic distinctiveness in God’s plan of salvation. In the Messiah, God has shown himself to be faithful to redeem both Jews and gentiles, and this reality points to God’s “new creation” (Gal 6:15) in which

---

9. With Paul’s statement “all of you” (Gal 3:27), perhaps he was including the Jewish agitators along with the gentle readers of this letter. If this is the case, Paul was showing that both groups had equal footing as God’s children through faith and must therefore come together in unity.
both groups are members of God’s family in the age of the Messiah. For the Galatian gentiles, Paul’s discussion would have served as an effective theological antidote to the bewitching tactics of the agitators.

If our interpretation of Galatians 3:28 is correct, we must now clarify two passages elsewhere in Galatians that seem to undercut this understanding. First, what should we make of Paul’s assertion that “neither circumcision nor uncircumcision has any value” (Gal 5:6; cf. 6:15)? Does this statement imply that Paul denied any ongoing importance to circumcision for Jewish believers in Jesus? In answering this question, of course, we must remember that Paul’s statements in Galatians were directed at gentiles in an effort to affirm that circumcision would not place them any closer to God. In the Messiah, the only thing that matters is the “new creation” (Gal 6:15). Seen in this light, Paul was not devaluing the practice of circumcision. Neither can these statements support the view that Paul was opposed to Jewish observance of the Law more generally or that he thought Jews should stop circumcising their children (1 Cor 7:17–24; cf. Acts 16:3; Acts 21:20–26). Rather, Paul was simply explaining that circumcision was not the means by which the Galatians would be included as Abraham’s children. Indeed, to value circumcision above faith was to ignore the age of the Messiah whereby gentiles were grafted into God’s people through faith (Gal 5:2–6).

We must now turn to a second passage that may overturn our reading of Galatians 3:28. Does not Galatians 4:1–11 render Jewish practice (and thus identity) in the Messiah an untenable option, since in these verses Paul seems to link observing the Jewish calendar with paganism (Gal 4:3, 9–10)? In response to this question, we should begin by stating that there are good reasons for understanding the calendar in 4:10 as a reference to the pagan calendar, not the Jewish one. The assumption that 4:10 refers to the Jewish calendar runs aground for the following reasons: (1) the faulty strategy of reading the circumcision issue (and Col 2:16) back into the context of Galatians 4:8–11; (2) the distinctly non-Jewish terms “days and months and seasons and years” employed in Galatians 4:10; (3) the evidence elsewhere in the Pauline corpus (and in Acts) that suggests Paul was not at all critical of the Jewish calendar, but even continued to keep it himself (e.g., 1 Cor 16:8; Acts 20:16); and (4) the unlikelihood that observing the Jewish calendar would have appeased the situation in the churches, since the real issue was circumcision (one wonders how uncircumcised gentiles would even be permitted to participate fully in Jewish festivals).

Furthermore, the present tense of the Greek underlying “you are observing” (Gal 4:10) seems to indicate something the Galatians were doing at the time of the letter, whereas the issue of circumcision was a potential action (hence, the warning not to
be circumcised in Gal 5:2 – 12). Given the social pressure these gentiles must have experienced for abandoning worship of pagan gods (including the imperial rulers), it is difficult to resist the probability that as they considered the circumcision option, these gentile believers had begun to observe the ubiquitous pagan cults in an attempt to allay their social dislocation. Thus, in Galatians 4:8 – 11 Paul reprimanded these gentile believers for slipping back to their pagan past. Both circumcision and returning to paganism were equal pitfalls for the Galatian gentiles to avoid; they must “stand firm” (Gal 5:1).

But even if we are correct that Galatians 4:10 refers to the pagan calendar, did Paul not consider Judaism to be tantamount to paganism when he claimed that both Jews and gentiles were under the *stoicheia* — that is, the demonic false deities of the world (Gal 4:3, 9)? To answer this question, it is necessary to observe the flow of Paul’s argument in Galatians 4:1 – 11. In 4:1 – 3, by means of an analogy of a son who had not yet received his inheritance, Paul argued that before redemption, “we” Jews were enslaved to the *stoicheia* of the world. This statement, of course, was not an attack on either the Law or on Judaism. Rather, Paul was likely pointing to the climax of the Law’s curses for disobedience, that is, exile and subjugation to foreign powers and their gods (see esp. Deut 28:36, 64; cf. Gal 3:10 – 14). In Galatians 4:4 – 5, Paul then affirmed that “we” Jews had been redeemed from these curses through Jesus the Messiah. Even more, this deliverance and adoption as children included “you” gentiles (Gal 4:6 – 7). Thus in 4:8 – 11, Paul linked gentile slavery to false gods with the Jewish experience under the Law’s curses for disobedience; he was not linking Judaism with paganism. With this fresh understanding of Galatians 4:1 – 11, we can observe how Paul maintained that both Jews and gentiles were under the *stoicheia* before the Messiah (see figure).

If our discussion thus far has been close to the mark, then we can conclude that Paul was neither devaluing circumcision as a practice for Jews nor disparaging the Jewish calendar. We can therefore affirm that Paul’s famous declaration “there is neither Jew nor Gentile” (Gal 3:28) was not a clarion call for ethnic collapse. On the contrary, in this verse Paul announced the glorious universal reality that through faith in

---

the Messiah, there is equality as children of Abraham across ethnic (as well as gender and social) boundaries.

**Ephesians 2:14 – 18: One United People in the Messiah**

If ethnic distinction is not erased in Galatians 3:28, we must now evaluate Ephesians 2:14 – 18 in order to answer the same question: Does gentile inclusion in the people of God require a dissolution of ethnic identity? Harold Hoehner represents the default position when he states on this passage that “Paul refers to a whole new race that is formed. A new race that is raceless!” and that “they are not Jews or Gentiles but a body of Christians who make up the church.” But do these conclusions actually follow from the argument of these verses? To answer this question, we will need first to grasp the context and aims of the broader argument within which 2:14 – 18 is situated.

After explaining in Ephesians 2:1 – 10 how both Jew and gentile have a secure relationship with God through Jesus the Messiah, Paul turned directly to the issue of unity between Jew and gentile (Eph 2:11 – 22). Although it is difficult to determine whether he was addressing a particular pastoral issue in Asia (Ephesus?), one can nevertheless discern that the aim of this section was to illustrate that gentiles had been included along with Israel in the great redeeming work of the one true God. The argument of Ephesians 2:11 – 22 unfolds in three stages, which we can set out below:

1. A command for the (gentile) readers to remember their former life as gentiles in the flesh (Eph 2:11 – 12).
2. A declaration that these gentiles had been brought near to God by the blood of the Messiah, thus creating peace (Eph 2:13 – 18).
3. A conclusion that these gentiles were fellow citizens of the (Jewish) saints, belonged to the household of God, and were being built up together as God's temple (Eph 2:19 – 22).

With this aim and broad outline of the passage in place, we should also note that Paul employed various metaphors of citizenship (Eph 2:11 – 12, 19), of warring parties (Eph 2:14 – 18), and of temple imagery (Eph 2:20 – 22) when explaining how both Jews

---

15. For a thorough (and convincing) defence of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians, see Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 2 – 61. We will refer to the author as “Paul” (although of course our conclusion on authorship has no bearing on the interpretation of the passage at hand).
16. See the excellent study on this passage by William S. Campbell, “Unity and Diversity in the Church: Transformed Identities and the Peace of Christ in Ephesians,” *Transformation* 25, no. 1 (2008): 21 – 22, who is probably correct to note that the theme of unity is a crucial pastoral issue in this letter. Frank Thielman, *Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 12 – 28, argues that the textual variant “in Ephesus” (1:1) is the original reading and that therefore the letter was written (by Paul) to address a specific pastoral problem in Ephesus.
17. Timothy G. Gombis, “Ephesians 2 as a Narrative of Divine Warfare,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26, no. 4 (2004): 403 – 18, argues convincingly that Eph 2 is linked crucially with the conclusion of Eph 1 in that it explains further how God has set all things under the Messiah’s feet (Eph 1:20 – 23): God “announces his victory by proclaiming peace. His people gather to him in unified worship as his temple, which he has founded and is building as a lasting monument to his universal sovereign lordship” (418). What Gombis does not discuss, however, is Paul’s view of ethnicity in relation to the Messiah’s universal rule.
and gentiles were unified in the Messiah. Thus, as we come to interpret the text, we must bear in mind how these metaphors were meant to function within Paul's argument.

While the broad scope of Ephesians 2:11 – 22 as set out above is fairly straightforward, the difficulty comes when interpreting the second section of Paul's argument (Eph 2:13 – 18). Before we discuss these verses in detail, however, perhaps it would be best to set out each clause in a sentence flow to highlight the inner logic of this complex argument (see figure).

13 But now in the Messiah Jesus you who were far away have been brought near by the blood of the Messiah. For  

he himself is our peace,  
the one who made both [groups] one and  
the one who destroyed the dividing wall of hostility — the enmity — in his flesh  
by setting aside the Law of commandments in decrees  
so that in him he might create the two into one new humanity,  
thus making peace  
and  
[so that] he might reconcile both [groups] in one body to God, through the cross, in him/it, putting to death the enmity;  
and  
coming  
he preached good news of peace to you who were far off  
and  
peace to those who were near  
since, through him, we both have access by one Spirit to the Father.

As one can observe in the sentence flow in the figure, in Ephesians 2:13 Paul declared that in the Messiah, God had brought gentiles near to God and to his people (translated “the saints” in some versions of Eph 2:19).19 In 2:14 – 18, Paul then explained how God had achieved this unity in the Messiah. The section contains two main clauses (see the bold italics in the sentence flow above): (1) the Messiah “is our peace” (Eph 2:14a) and (2) he has “preached good news of peace” to both gentiles and Jews (Eph 2:17).20 Both clauses highlight the peace gentiles and Jews enjoy in Jesus

19. Thiedman, Ephesians, 163, correctly points out that 2:14 – 18 was an excursion meant to show how gentiles have been brought near to Jews and to God.
20. Of course, this language of “peace” would have rung bells and whistles for the believers in Asia, who would have been inundated with similar imperial slogans in relation to the peace of the empire.
and serve to frame the entire argument of Ephesians 2:14–18. In the two remaining clauses of 2:14, Paul then explained how this peace was achieved: Jesus made “both (i.e., Jew and gentile) one” and “destroyed the dividing wall of hostility.” The means by which Jesus had pulled down the dividing wall is then explained in 2:15a with a third participial clause: “by setting aside the Law of commandments in decrees.” In Ephesians 2:15b–16, Paul then provided the twofold purpose for Jesus’ demolition work: (a) so that he might create the two into one new humanity (thus making peace) and (b) so that he might reconcile both groups in one body to God.

Now upon first blush, this passage seems to argue decisively that ethnicity has been eradicated in the Messiah. After all, Paul stated quite clearly that “one new humanity” had been created. And yet we must refrain from this understanding of this “oneness” language for at least two reasons. First, we must bear in mind that this language occurs within Paul’s metaphor of warring parties, which had come to an armistice through the work of Jesus. As a metaphor, this language of unity thus pointed to a peace in the Messiah where enmity previously existed, where gentiles were formerly “far away” (Eph 2:13, 17). When seen in this way, these statements must be interpreted metaphorically and cannot be interpreted literally to mean that ethnic distinctions have deteriorated.

What is more, we should note that Paul still assumed an ongoing Jewish identity both in the way the broader argument of Ephesians 2:11–22 is conducted and how it concludes. In 2:11–12, Paul commanded these gentiles to remember that they were formerly excluded from the privileges of being part of God’s chosen people of Israel. This same language is then picked up again in the conclusion — namely, that these gentiles were no longer “strangers and aliens” but were included as full members of the household of God and were being built into a holy temple (Eph 2:19–22). So as we read 2:14–18, we should note that Paul preserved an Israel-centric view of the world, with gentiles being brought into this grand deliverance through the Jewish Messiah. Thus, in 2:18 we should not be surprised to see that Paul still assumed an ongoing distinction between Jew and gentile when he declared that “we both [amphoteroi] have access to the Father by one Spirit,” even though he had employed the same term in Ephesians 2:14 to declare that both [amphotera] were made into one. Although it may seem to be a very fine distinction, it is essential to note that “oneness” and “ethnic collapse” are two very different things. Paul clearly declares the former, but not the

21. Campbell, “Unity and Diversity in the Church,” 18, along with others, is probably correct to note that the “dividing wall” was metaphorical for the balustrade in the temple that separated the gentiles from the Jews.

22. Note that this peace includes both a horizontal (i.e., between Jew/gentile) and a vertical (i.e., between each group and God) dimension.

23. Tet-Lim N. Yee, Jew, Gentiles and Ethnic Reconciliation: Paul’s Jewish Identity and Ephesians (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 162, similarly argues that “the notion of ‘one new man’ can be best understood against the backdrop of ethnic enmity.”

24. Campbell, “Unity and Diversity in the Church,” 18–19, who also points out that this “already” reality contains a “not yet” dimension, hence the command in Eph 4:17–24 for the gentiles to put off their old way of walking as gentiles. In this regard, there is clear evidence for gentiles abandoning their former practices in joining the people of God, but no evidence in Ephesians for Jews becoming non-Jews.

25. Of course, this is the language of the prophets as well (e.g., Isa 49:6: “It is too small a thing for you to be my servant to restore the tribes of Jacob and bring back those of Israel I have kept. I will also make you a light for the Gentiles, that my salvation may reach to the ends of the earth”).
latter. Indeed, as Campbell notes: “Israelite identity cannot at one and the same time be presented as foundational, and simultaneously undermined, since it is in this direction gentiles are to proceed.”

But even if our argument above is convincing, what then are we to make of Paul’s affirmation that the dividing wall of hostility was broken down “by setting aside the Law of commandments in decrees” (Eph 2:15a)? Here we will put forth three possible options. First, Paul may have been referring to those laws that were given to the children of Israel in order that they might remain separate from the polytheistic nations around them. Alternatively, perhaps Paul was simply referring to the fact that gentiles were not required to observe the Law (as we saw in Galatians). Third, it may also be possible that Paul was referring specifically to the barrier that separated the court of the Gentiles from the Jews in the Jerusalem temple. In any case, Paul was asserting that in the Messiah, these laws that divided Jews from their gentile neighbors had been set aside. Paul was not maintaining that Torah observance for Jewish Jesus-believers was obsolete; rather, he was declaring how the wall of division between Jew and gentile was eradicated. Thus, Paul was not disparaging the Law in Ephesians 2:15. Rather, his aim was to explain theologically how gentiles had been brought near to God.

In sum, our reading of Ephesians 2:14 – 18 does not support the view that a raceless people has been formed in the Messiah. To be sure, the Jewish Messiah had made everything different: peace had been secured between Jews and gentiles and between each group and God. In particular, gentiles had been brought near as the people of God. But this unity in the Messiah does not simultaneously declare an ethnic collapse. Instead, what is clearly affirmed is a very tangible peace (i.e., equality) between Jew and gentile that has been achieved in Jesus the Messiah. On this aim of reconciliation, Campbell has made the point well:

The preferred identity which the author seeks to construct is one based on resolution of ethnic enmity by depicting Christ as the peace-maker between those who are alienated from one another due to ethnically significant issues. His solution is not to downplay ethnic awareness or to ignore the hostility usually associated with it, but to seek resolution in that reconciliation and peace with difference, which he presents as the outcome of the Christ-event.

---

27. Here we must pause to note that some English translations of Eph 2:15 seem to indicate that in the Messiah, the Law was “abolished;” thus supporting the view that Paul was pouring scorn on the Mosaic Law (e.g., NIV 1984). But we must resist translating it “by abolishing the Law;” and instead use the more neutral term “by setting aside” (NIV 2011). Of course, Paul famously affirmed in Rom 7:12 that the Law was holy, righteous, and good.
28. This view was suggested to me by David Rudolph, who noted (1) that Paul’s arrest in Acts 21:27 – 36 was because the gentile Trophimus, who was from Ephesus, was thought (wrongly) to have gone beyond this barrier, (2) that Paul employed temple imagery to refer to unity between Jews and Gentiles, and (3) that Paul began Ephesians 3 with “For this reason, as a prisoner of the Messiah Jesus for the sake of you Gentiles,” perhaps alluding to his arrest in the temple according to Acts 21.
Conclusion

In this chapter, we have examined Galatians 3:28 and Ephesians 2:14 – 18 in order to assess what it means precisely for Jewish and gentile believers to be unified in the Messiah. We have argued that these passages demonstrate full equality between both groups, yet without destroying the ethnic distinctions between them. If this understanding is correct, we can now conclude with two implications of our study.

First, our reading is in agreement with a growing number of scholars who argue that after the Damascus road experience, Paul still lived as a Torah-observant Jew. Of course, there is much more work to be done on this issue, and unfortunately it was beyond the bounds of this essay to discuss other Pauline texts (e.g., 1 Cor 7:17 – 24; Rom 3:21 – 31). But at least our conclusions would agree with this understanding of Paul’s ongoing Jewish practice according to Acts (Acts 15:1 – 16:4; 18:18; 21:20 – 26).

Second, we can suggest that Paul regarded “transformation” to be a necessary obligation for all believers, both for Jews and gentiles, even if this transformation was not to result in stripping away ethnicity.30 Thus, Paul viewed himself along with other believing Jews as one of the faithful “remnant” (Rom 11:5). On the other hand, gentile believers, who had abandoned their false gods, had been grafted into God’s people. As “former gentiles” (see 1 Cor 12:2), they were thus to put off their polytheistic way of living and to put on the new person they had become in the Messiah (Eph 4:17 – 24). For both groups, the basis of this transformation was found precisely in the equality that had been achieved through the life, death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah.

For Further Reading


30. See esp. Campbell, “Unity and Diversity in the Church,” 15: “Pauline transformation in Christ does not mean the creation of a new group without ethnic identity but rather the transformation of those who are Greeks into transformed Greeks, and of Judeans into transformed Judeans in Christ.”


