

JUSTIFICATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE WAKE OF
THE NEW PERSPECTIVE ON PAUL

A Prospectus
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Andrew Michael Hassler

April 22, 2009

JUSTIFICATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE WAKE OF THE NEW PERSPECTIVE ON PAUL

Introduction

Since the rise of the New Perspective on Paul,¹ and with roots before, a shift has occurred toward viewing justification more in corporate terms. The New Perspective has tended to focus more on the inclusion of Gentiles into God's covenant with Israel and less on the sinful individual before God in need of grace and forgiveness. This shift acquired an element of decisiveness with Krister Stendahl in 1963² and has since influenced as well as gained steam from the New Perspective on Paul. This has led to readings of Paul that have differed greatly from those of earlier generations, generating a number of new conclusions regarding Paul's view of justification. While to some degree this new focus is to be appreciated for highlighting aspects of Paul that often have been overlooked, it has also raised new problems, a central one being an ambiguous understanding of Paul's doctrine of justification.

Thesis

In light of this ambiguity, there is a need, in my view, for more work to be done with

¹For a survey of the New Perspective, see, e.g., Guy Prentiss Waters, *Justification and the New Perspective on Paul: A Review and Response* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004); Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 3-248; Michael Bird, "The New Perspective on Paul: A Bibliographical Essay" (*The Paul Page*), [on-line]; accessed 15 April 2009; available from <http://www.thepaulpage.com/Bibliography.html>; Internet; James A. Meek, "The New Perspective on Paul: An Introduction for the Uninitiated," *Concordia Journal* 27 (2001): 208-33; Jay E. Smith, "The New Perspective on Paul: A Select and Annotated Bibliography," *Criswell Theological Review* 2 (2005): 91-111.

²Typical is a statement like that of Lloyd Ratzlaff: "Krister Stendahl (1963) has shown that Paul's view of the Law was not formed, like Luther's, as a result of personal anguish over guilt; rather it was the result of his struggling to identify the place of the Gentiles in the messianic community" ("Salvation: Individualistic or Communal?" *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 4 [1976]: 109).

regard to how Paul's view of justification incorporates the individual and, subsequently, how this individual relates to the corporate people of God. The tentative thesis of the present dissertation is that, in spite of the tendency of the New Perspective and its forerunners to downplay—however rightly at times—the place of the individual in justification in favor of a more corporate approach to Paul's soteriology, many Pauline texts do point to a strong individual, anthropological element in justification, an element that seems rarely to be given its due in current scholarship outside of more Reformed circles.³

An example of one of these texts would be Paul's allusion to Psalm 143:2 (142:2 LXX) in both Galatians 2:16 and Romans 3:20, where he grounds his entire case for justification by faith in the (very Jewish) idea of an individual, in this case David, standing before God, acknowledging that his own works cannot commend him to God, and that only God can save him through his own righteousness.⁴ Another example is Romans 4:1-8, where Paul specifically makes the argument that the individual is not saved by his own works, but is "reckoned righteous" through faith⁵ (other texts that I plan to explore include Rom 9:30-10:4; 2 Cor 5:21; Phil 3:2-9; Eph 2:8-

³Cf. Michael Bird, *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification, and the New Perspective*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007), 19, who writes that "those who want to reduce 'righteousness' to covenantal and sociological categories have done a great disservice to Paul" and that it is "wrong to think that the verdict rendered in justification can be reduced to sociological descriptions of group-identity and self-definition" (33).

⁴Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 372, n. 60, states that "the point of the text (in Ps. 143 as well as in its Pauline paraphrase) is that human conduct per se — Paul notes that this includes the doing of works demanded by the law — cannot measure up to divine standards of righteousness." I realize that the definition of "righteousness" in Paul is debated. My point here is simply that this text points to the Reformational idea of an individual calling out to God because he recognizes his own lack of merit and need of grace.

⁵About this passage, Simon Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 247, writes that the New Perspective view of works of the law as merely ethnic boundary markers "falls to the ground on this point: that David although circumcised, sabbatarian, and kosher, is described as without works because of his disobedience." Note the same argument could be made regarding Paul's allusion to David in Ps 143:2 in Rom 3:20 and Gal 2:16.

10; 2 Tim 1:9; Titus 3:5—see my tentative outline below).

To be sure, the more individual and anthropological approach to justification suffered a severe blow, in essence having its ground cut from beneath it, when E. P. Sanders and the subsequent New Perspective on Paul rescued first-century Judaism from any charge of legalism, a charge that traditional New Testament scholarship was notorious for leveling. However, while granting the value that such a contribution has made regarding the true nature of first-century Judaism, I would argue that the New Perspective has given some elements within first-century Judaism too much credit on this point. Therefore, I intend to argue at the outset of this work that such passages as mentioned above are best interpreted only if we accept the premise that there was, either implicitly or explicitly, some attempt being made at acceptance before God through general works—as opposed to merely Jewish “boundary-marking” works (contra much of the New Perspective).⁶ Such passages are not sufficiently explainable by the view that Jews were *merely* restricting Gentile inclusion in God’s covenant. My contention is that some attempt at “works-righteousness” was being made, even if it was done only implicitly. At the same time, my hope in the present work is also to be mindful of the valid New Perspective concern that Paul’s concept of justification was closely related to his Gentile mission.

⁶I am aware that such an argument in itself could be the subject of a full-length work, and of course that the word “legalism” will have to be defined very carefully and specifically (e.g., on the word’s slippery nature, see Kent Yinger, “Defining Legalism,” *AUSS* 46 [2008]: 91-108). I also admit that I will have neither the time nor space to look at *all* the relevant primary literature on this topic. At the same time, I am of the opinion that enough work has already been done to demonstrate that Paul *could* be addressing legalism at some level in his discussion of justification. Since we are always doing some form of mirror reading when trying to discern the Judaism with which Paul was interacting, there will always be a level of speculation in attempting to describe the nature of his opponents’ way of thinking. My intention is to show that a valid case for some form of legalism can be made, and that such a case will greatly benefit our study of Paul.

Background – Personal Interest

My personal interest in Paul's relation to the law stems from a longstanding interest in how faith and works cohere throughout the Scriptures, as well as in the Christian life. While working on an M.Div. at Covenant Theological Seminary, where I learned for the first time of the New Perspective on Paul, I became even more interested in this issue. At this point I decided to enter doctoral studies specifically with a view to pursuing a related area of research. Since then, studying under Pauline scholars such as Dr. Seifrid and Dr. Schreiner has served to increase my interest. Exegetical papers on Galatians and Romans, as well as book reviews on Richard Hays and N. T. Wright, have all contributed to my thinking. Through such work I have come to believe that broader New Testament scholarship is, at least in part, moving in an unhelpful direction with regard to justification. My hope is to counter this trend in some small manner.

Background – History of Research⁷

The Traditional Reformational View

Before moving to modern scholarship, it will be beneficial here to briefly delineate the view of justification that emerged from the Reformation (designated henceforth as the “Reformational” view). It is this view that has been brought into question over the last century and serves as a starting point for all discussion. One of the more helpful outlines of this view is

⁷The following history of research is not meant to be exhaustive, but to highlight key figures who have been critical in the move toward a more corporate understanding of justification, as well as those who have responded to this move. For example, while William Wrede is the first scholar listed below, the shift toward a corporate view of justification could be argued to have even earlier roots. For example, Mark Seifrid, “In What Sense is ‘Justification’ a Declaration?” *Churchman* 114 (2000): 123, states that the “recasting of justification in corporate terms” goes back “at the very least to Albrecht Ritschl,” in whose thought justification was simply “the vehicle by which the community of the reconciled is formed,” while Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*, rev. and exp. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 40-44, traces opposition to the Reformational reading back to F. C. Baur.

found in Stephen Westerholm's monograph, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*. Here Westerholm provides a portrait of the "Lutheran" Paul that has been handed down from the Reformation.⁸ Westerholm sets forth seven theses that articulate this understanding, four of which are the most critical to our present study and provide a succinct overview of the Reformational view of Paul. They are:

1. "Thesis 1: Human nature, created good, has been so corrupted by sin that human beings are incapable of God-pleasing action. They are rightly subject to God's condemnation."
2. "Thesis 2: Human beings must be justified by divine grace, responded to in faith, and *not* by any works of their own."
3. "Thesis 3: Justification by grace through faith leaves human beings with nothing of which they may boast in God's presence. The (false) notion that human beings *can* contribute to their justification opens the door to a presumption that ill suits creatures in the presence of their Creator."
4. "Thesis 5: The Mosaic law was given, in part, to awaken in human beings an awareness of their need of divine grace. Believers are delivered from its condemnation and need not observe its ceremonial prescriptions. The gift of God's Spirit enables them (in some measure) to fulfill its moral demands."⁹

This understanding provides the foundation from which newer views of justification take their point of departure, and with which we may compare and contrast such views. We begin with William Wrede.

⁸Westerholm is careful to designate the word "Lutheran" with quotation marks so that the reader understands that the term does not refer only to the views of Martin Luther himself (as influenced by him as they were), nor any Lutheran church, but with reference to the view outlined here that emerged from the *many* streams of the Reformation. However, since the word is prone to misunderstanding, I will use the term "Reformational," so as not to imply that this view is limited *only* to Lutheranism, thereby excluding other lines of tradition stemming from the Reformation.

⁹Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 88-95. The remaining theses (four, six, and seven) are, respectively: believers must still do good works; a legitimate issue up for discussion is the nature of the reality of remaining sin; another legitimate issue up for discussion is the irresistible nature of grace.

Early Movement Toward a Corporate View of Justification

William Wrede. Wrede's influential *Paul* was first published in German in 1904 and departs from the Reformational understanding in several ways. First, Wrede sees *redemption*, not justification, as the center of Paul's thought. This is contrasted with "modern belief," which transfers "the scene of salvation to man himself, or his consciousness," thereby elevating "peace of heart, a pure conscience, a confident assurance of grace, a consciousness of forgiveness."¹⁰ According to Wrede, Paul does not see salvation as pertaining to such "subjective states of consciousness." Rather, salvation is an *objective* change of humanity.¹¹ Paul is not "thinking of the individual at all, or of the psychological processes of the individual, but always of the race, of humanity as a whole."¹² Hence, for Wrede, redeemed corporate humanity is the central focus.¹³

Naturally, these views have ramifications for Wrede's understanding of justification. Because he downplays the place of the individual, he sees the doctrine of justification as a minor point in Pauline theology.¹⁴ He notably dubbed it Paul's "polemical doctrine"—a doctrine that is "only made intelligible by the struggle of his life, his controversy with Judaism and Jewish

¹⁰William Wrede, *Paul*, trans. Edward Lummis (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1908; reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001), 111-12. The work originally appeared in German in 1904 as *Paulus*.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 112.

¹²*Ibid.*, 114.

¹³Not surprisingly, then, Wrede preferred to understand Paul in salvation-historical rather than anthropological terms, calling Paul's mode of thinking "purely historical." He writes, "Paul has always before his eyes great periods of human development, and thinks in terms of the temporal distinctions, past, present, and to come. . . . [Paul's] very piety receives its character from the salvation history; the history of salvation is the content of his faith" (*ibid.*, 115). In this way, Wrede anticipates later scholars such as N. T. Wright.

¹⁴"The Reformation has accustomed us to look upon this as the central point of Pauline doctrine; but it is not so. In fact the whole Pauline religion can be expounded without a word being said about this doctrine, unless it be in the part devoted to the Law" (*ibid.*, 123).

Christianity, and is only intended for this.”¹⁵ Justification was essentially a “weapon” with which Paul ensured that the Gentile mission was “free from the burden of Jewish national custom” and that the “superiority of the Christian faith in redemption over Judaism” was maintained.¹⁶ To be sure, he grants to Luther that justification is “of grace,”¹⁷ but, beyond this, Luther is wrong in asserting that the individual man overcomes “tormenting uncertainty” about his salvation by recognizing that “it depends absolutely on grace.”¹⁸ At bottom, “justification is nothing else than Christ’s historic act of redemption, namely his death.”¹⁹

Albert Schweitzer. Like Wrede, Albert Schweitzer objected to Reformation readings of Paul. Schweitzer, well-known for understanding Paul largely in terms of “mysticism,”²⁰ argued that what these older readings looked for in Paul were “proof-texts for Lutheran or Reformed theology; and that was what they found.”²¹ Schweitzer was critical of reading Paul under dogmatic *loci* in general, preferring to trace the development of the “essence of Paulinism” from “one fundamental conception,” which for him was eschatological mysticism.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., 127.

¹⁷Ibid., 131.

¹⁸Ibid., 132.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰“The fundamental thought of Pauline mysticism runs thus: I am in Christ; in Him I know myself as a being who is raised above this sensuous, sinful, and transient world and already belongs to the transcendent; in Him I am assured of resurrection; in Him I am a Child of God.” This is the “prime enigma of the Pauline teaching: once grasped it gives the clue to the whole” (Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*, trans. William Montgomery [London: A. & C., 1931; reprint, Boston: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998], 3).

²¹Albert Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History*, trans. William Montgomery (London: A. & C. Black, 1912; reprint, New York: Schocken Books, 1964), 2. Likewise, “Reformation exegesis reads its own ideas into Paul, in order to receive them back again clothed with Apostolic authority” (ibid.).

What is important for the present study is how Schweitzer's conception of Pauline theology moved justification by faith out of the center of Paul's thinking and more to the fringes. In his view, scholars have simply assumed the doctrine's critical nature because it stands so much in the foreground of Romans and Galatians. But righteousness by faith is only one part of a bigger picture, a "fragment from the more comprehensive mystical redemption-doctrine."²² Schweitzer's classic statement here is that justification is a "subsidiary crater" that "has formed within the rim of the main crater—the mystical doctrine of redemption through the being-in-Christ."²³ Furthermore, the concept of justification by faith, or the "intellectual appropriation of what Christ is for us," is inferior to the more difficult "quasi-physical" doctrine of eschatological redemption, for which Schweitzer argues. The latter is a "collective, cosmically-conditioned event," while the former, in contrast, is "individualistic and uncosmic."²⁴ Thus, for Schweitzer, justification by faith, while not indispensable, has been afforded much more attention than warranted. His view here has been an important component in the shift toward a more corporate understanding of the doctrine.

Ernst Käsemann. Ernst Käsemann is somewhat unique with regard to the present issue, arguing, against Rudolf Bultmann specifically, that "the righteousness of God," rather than merely being a gift, is a "salvation-creating power." It is "God's sovereignty over the world revealing itself eschatologically in Jesus," where the "world's salvation lies in its being recaptured

²²Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 220.

²³Ibid., 225.

²⁴Ibid., 219.

for the sovereignty of God.”²⁵ Käsemann was anxious to move past the arid individualism that he saw in Bultmann, contending that the phrase does not “refer primarily to the individual and is not to be understood exclusively in the context of the doctrine of man.”²⁶ Rather, it was an apocalyptic term wherein God reclaims his rightful sovereignty over the world.²⁷

On the other hand, Käsemann *also* argued against the salvation-historical approach of Krister Stendahl.²⁸ While Stendahl was right to protest against the “individualist curtailment of the Christian message,”²⁹ salvation history must nevertheless not be allowed to supersede justification: “It is its sphere. But justification remains the centre, the beginning and the end of salvation history.”³⁰ Therefore, while in one sense Käsemann did move the discussion in a more corporate direction, it was not entirely for the same reasons as the other scholars mentioned here.

Krister Stendahl. Krister Stendahl, perhaps more than anyone besides N. T. Wright, epitomizes the shift toward corporate justification. In his influential article, “The Apostle Paul

²⁵Ernst Käsemann, “‘The Righteousness of God’ in Paul,” in *New Testament Questions of Today*, tr. W. J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 180, 182 (first delivered in 1961 as a lecture, entitled, “Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus,” then published in *ZTK* 58 [1961]: 367-78; it is considered one of the most important works in the “righteousness of God” discussion). For more on Käsemann and “the righteousness of God,” see Karl Paul Donfried, “Justification and Last Judgment in Paul,” *Int* 30 (1976): 140-42; Richard Hays, “Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3,” *JBL* 99 (1980): 107-15; Sam K. Williams, “‘The ‘Righteousness of God’ in Romans,” *JBL* 99 (1980): 241-45.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 180. Bultmann responded in his article, “ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ,” *JBL* 83 (1964): 12-16.

²⁷Bultmann takes issue with Käsemann on this point, arguing that, rather than an apocalyptic term borrowed from Judaism, the phrase was “eine Neuschöpfung des Paulus” (Bultmann, “ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ,” 16).

²⁸He saw himself as standing “between two fronts” by “refusing either to subordinate the apostle’s doctrine of justification to a pattern of salvation or to allow it to turn into a mere vehicle for the self-understanding of the believer” (Ernst Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul*, tr. Margaret Kohl [London: SCM, 1971], 76, n. 27).

²⁹*Ibid.*, 74.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 76.

and the Introspective Conscience of the West,”³¹ Stendahl argues that Paul did not arrive at conclusions about the law because of his individual conscience, but because of the place of Gentiles in the church. It was not until Augustine that the “Pauline thought about the Law and Justification was applied in a consistent and grand style to a more general and timeless human problem.”³² Unfortunately, where Paul is concerned with Gentile mission, “his statements are now read as answers to the quest for assurance about man’s salvation out of a common human predicament.”³³ Thus, the West has projected its own conscience onto the biblical writers, creating problems that “never entered their consciousness.”³⁴

Furthermore, Stendahl argues that while Paul did emphasize justification and righteousness, he did not emphasize *forgiveness*. Yet, contemporary Western Christianity does precisely the opposite. For us, “it all amounts to forgiveness,” and we quickly turn to anthropology because we are “more interested in ourselves than in God or in the fate of his creation.”³⁵ However, Paul was not firstly concerned with anthropology but *ecclesiology*. The

³¹Originally appearing in *HTR* 56 (1963): 199-215, it was later reprinted in Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 78-96. Stephen Westerholm writes, “No article published in the twentieth century on a New Testament topic garnered more attention, provoked more debate, or exercised greater influence than Krister Stendahl’s ‘The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West’ (‘Justification by Faith is the Answer: What is the Question?’ *CTQ* 70 [2006]: 197).”

³²Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*, 85.

³³*Ibid.*, 86.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 95. Lucien Cerfaux, *The Christian in the Theology of St. Paul*, trans. Lilian Soiron (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1967), 375-76, n . 1 (originally published in French in 1962), made this same observation even before Stendahl, writing that if we correctly understand Paul’s call to ministry, we find that “the Christian idea made an inrush upon his conscience through Christ’s appearance, which was destined not to resolve a crisis of the soul, but to call him to great mission, the greatest that a soul such as his could dream of. Introspection was not much practiced in this era.”

³⁵Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles*, 24; he criticizes Bultmann here for taking for granted that anthropology is the “the center of gravity” from which “all interpretation springs” (*ibid.*, 25). Along similar lines, Markus Barth, “Jews and Gentiles: The Social Character of Justification in Paul,” *JES* 5 (1968): 241, argues that the traditional understanding of salvation through grace “left little room for interest in the role of fellow-men in

doctrine of justification originates in Paul's mind not from contemplating an innate need in man, but rather the Gentile mission. In other words, it was "triggered by the issues of divisions and identities in a pluralistic and torn world, not primarily by the inner tensions of individual souls and consciences."³⁶ This thought would be influential for E. P. Sanders, whose work would lead to a complete change in the landscape of Pauline scholarship in this area.

The Tipping Point: E. P. Sanders

The publication of E. P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* is widely considered to be the watershed moment that led to the subsequent formation of the New Perspective on Paul, creating a paradigm shift in Pauline studies.³⁷ It is here that Sanders first put forth his notion of "covenantal nomism," which would be a major shaping influence on all later Pauline studies.³⁸ But while considered monumental in its illumination of Paul's Jewish context, for many Sanders' work was less helpful in illuminating Paul himself.³⁹ This left the door open for others to refine

salvation." Moreover, danger of "crass individualism and egotism is apparent in this type of interpretation," because everyone is interested largely in their own justification before God" (ibid.). Yet, Paul held that "justification of our fellow-men is closely related to the individual's justification by grace, because justification occurs only in a human community of those who are also justified by God" (ibid.). Therefore, faith in Christ is weighed not by "the struggle and the victory in which I am engaged in order to find my own salvation," but in the "thankfulness and obligation for the justice, freedom and peace which God has secured for my fellow-man" (ibid., 267).

³⁶Ibid., 40.

³⁷Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," 103, writes, "If Stendahl cracked the mould of 20th century reconstructions of Paul's theological context, by showing how much it had been determined by Luther's quest for a gracious God, Sanders has broken it altogether by showing how different these reconstructions are from what we know of first-century Judaism from other sources." For more on this paradigm shift, see Terence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 3-27.

³⁸Covenantal nomism is the idea that first-century Judaism was not legalistic, that Jews were saved by grace-centered election in the covenant, and that keeping the law—far from an attempt at meriting righteousness—was merely the means to *keep* the Jewish people within the bounds of this gracious covenant.

³⁹For example, N. T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 189, states that the book is "in some ways curiously unsystematic

and build upon Sanders' work, leading to the multifaceted New Perspective on Paul.

Nevertheless, Sanders himself has contributed to the present issue in a number of ways. First, following Schweitzer, Sanders argues that "righteousness by faith alone" is not the center of Paul's thought. As long as we do consider it the center, we miss "the significance of the realism with which Paul thought of incorporation in the body of Christ, and consequently the heart of his theology."⁴⁰ Instead of "righteousness by faith," two other convictions govern Paul's theology: (1) Jesus Christ is Lord, and (2) Paul was called as apostle to the Gentiles. "It is on the basis of these two *convictions* that we can explain Paul's *theology*."⁴¹

This second conviction is especially relevant for Paul's view of justification. Sanders writes that it is "the Gentile question and the exclusivism of Paul's soteriology which dethrone the law" and not "a view predetermined by his background."⁴² Thus, the polemic in Galatians has virtually nothing to do with "whether or not humans, abstractly conceived, can by good deeds earn enough merit to be declared righteous at the judgment; it is the condition on which Gentiles

and incomplete" and that one of the "ironies in Sanders' position is that he has never really carried through his reform into a thorough rethinking of Paul's own thought" (19). Likewise, James Dunn writes, "The most surprising feature of Sanders' writing, however, is that he himself has failed to take the opportunity his own mouldbreaking work offered," remarking that Sanders' "presentation of Paul is only a little better than the one rejected" ("The New Perspective on Paul," in *The New Perspective on Paul*, rev. ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 103; this article originally appeared in *BJRL* 65 [1983]: 95-122). Sanders did put forth a more detailed view of Paul in his work *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983; also see his brief *Paul* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991]). In the preface he writes, "The first and third chapters expand and clarify, and sometimes correct, the account of Paul's view of the law which was sketched in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. The essay also takes up aspects of Paul's treatment of the law which were not previously touched on, and I attempt to consider the problem of Paul and the law as a whole" (ix).

⁴⁰E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 434.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 442.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 497.

enter the people of God.”⁴³ Hence, Paul’s argument is not for faith and against works per se, but rather against “requiring the Gentiles to keep the law of Moses in order to be true ‘sons of Abraham.’”⁴⁴ The question is one of who may enter the people of God.

To be sure, Sanders is not as explicit or developed in his downplaying of the role of the individual in justification as others, but his understanding of Paul’s relation to Judaism would lay the groundwork for other scholars who would pick up his themes and run with them. Especially important for our purposes are his denial of any legalism or works-righteousness in first-century Judaism, and his argument that Paul’s preaching of justification by faith did not stem from an internal need for salvation but from his mission to the Gentiles.

Post-Sanders: Balancing the Individual and Corporate⁴⁵

James D. G. Dunn. James Dunn’s major contribution to the history of the New Perspective on Paul is the way he tailored Sanders’ paradigm-shift to make it more palatable to a greater number of Pauline scholars. In doing so, he buttressed some of the weak areas in Sanders’ approach to Paul and gave the blossoming New Perspective on Paul not only its moniker but also the coherence it needed to take deeper root in Pauline scholarship.

⁴³Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 18.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 19.

⁴⁵This title is a bit misleading, because in many ways all the interpreters listed in this history of research are attempting to balance the individual and the corporate. However, some lean more heavily in one direction than the other. Those I list below appear as not wishing to cast their lot too heavily in either direction, wanting instead to equally affirm central elements of the New Perspective while also maintaining traditional, anthropological elements of justification. Some examples of a few others that, in my opinion, could be included here are: Don Garlington, “The New Perspective on Paul: An Appraisal Two Decades Later,” *Criswell Theological Review* 2 (2005): 17-38; idem, *The Obedience of Faith’: A Pauline Phrase in Historical Context*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994; Colin Kruse, *Paul, the Law and Justification*, (Leicester, England: Apollos, 1996); Richard Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC, vol. 41 (Dallas: Word, 1990).

Interestingly, Dunn at times can appear close to the “old perspective” on justification. For example, he flatly affirms as a “central point of Christian faith that God’s acceptance of any and every person is by his grace alone and through faith alone,”⁴⁶ taking it as a “fundamental fact that no person can stand before God except by God’s forgiving, justifying grace.”⁴⁷ While Dunn is dissatisfied with older approaches to Paul, he does not seem comfortable with completely casting out the traditional view of justification. However, in spite of this, his work has been instrumental in opening new doors toward embracing an approach to Paul that emphasizes social aspects of justification, often at the expense of the individual.

The starting point is Dunn’s well-known article, “The New Perspective on Paul,” where he argues that the “works of the law,” with which Paul took issue, were not to be understood “as works which *earn* God’s favour, as merit-amassing observances” but rather *boundary markers* that are “simply what membership of the covenant people involves, what mark out the Jews as God’s people” (mainly these would include circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath).⁴⁸ Justification, then, becomes less about how a sinful person is declared righteous before God apart from works and more about “acceptance into a relationship with God

⁴⁶James Dunn, “The New Perspective: whence, what and whither?” in *The New Perspective on Paul*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 23.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 96. He goes on here, “Justification by faith alone needs to be reasserted as strongly as ever it was by Paul or by Augustine or by Luther. To acknowledge dependence wholly on God the Creator and Redeemer, to glorify and worship him alone, to trust in him and give him thanks is the proper and only proper response of the creature before the Creator.” Cf. also James Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 379: “Human dependence on divine grace had to be unqualified or else it was not Abraham’s faith. . . . God would not justify, could not sustain in relationship with him, those who did not rely wholly on him. Justification was by faith, by faith alone.” He even goes so far as to state that it is *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* (the “doctrine by which the church stands or falls”) and registers astonishment at the “charge that ‘the new perspective on Paul’ constitutes an attack on and denial of that Lutheran fundamental” (Dunn, “Whence, what and whither,” 23). To be sure, Dunn would firmly argue that there is more to the “full scope” of justification and that it was not *merely* about individuals as such. Nevertheless, it is striking how “Lutheran” he sounds at times.

⁴⁸Dunn, “The New Perspective on Paul,” 111.

characterized by the grace of Israel’s covenant.”⁴⁹ Paul was not opposing some form of Jewish legalism, but rather Jewish *restrictiveness*—that is, “the tendency in Judaism to restrict the covenant grace of God, covenant righteousness to Israel” through these boundary markers.⁵⁰

Therefore, the Reformational view, while not entirely jettisoned by Dunn, is not the whole picture. It needs to be complemented “with a firm reassertion of the corporate and social implications of the full doctrine—in terms both of what it says about nationalist and racialist presumption, and of what it says about civic and political responsibility for the disadvantaged in a society which cherishes its biblical heritage.”⁵¹ It is this shift from understanding Paul’s polemic as being aimed not at *general* good works done in self-righteousness, but *specific* covenantal works done for self-identification that has given a boost to Sanders’ thesis and continued the trajectory away from the Reformational view of the individual in justification.

Michael Bird. Michael Bird is a more recent scholar who has as one of his objectives the balancing of the traditional understanding of justification with that of the New Perspective. After noting the divided nature of the discussion over “whether being ‘righteous’ signifies a legal status before God or represents a legitimisation of covenant membership,” he argues that “both elements are necessary for a comprehensive understanding of Paul.”⁵² While New Perspective scholars try to “squeeze all ‘righteousness’ language under the umbrella of ‘covenant,’” Reformed

⁴⁹Dunn, *Theology*, 388.

⁵⁰James Dunn, “Paul and Justification by Faith,” in *The New Perspective on Paul*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 372.

⁵¹James Dunn, “The Justice of God,” in *The New Perspective on Paul*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 211.

⁵²Michael Bird, “Justification as Forensic Declaration and Covenant Membership: A *Via Media*

interpreters tend to “divorce Paul’s talk of righteousness from the social context of Jew-gentile relationships in the Pauline churches.”⁵³ Bird walks the line between the two, arguing that for Paul “justification creates a new people, with a new status, in a new covenant, as a foretaste of the new age.”⁵⁴

While he argues that the verb *δικαίω* is “strictly forensic,”⁵⁵ for Bird justification is more than a forensic verdict.⁵⁶ There is a covenantal dimension to justification. In this way, the unity of Jews and Gentiles is not merely *illustrative* of the effects of justification, as some would argue, but *constitutive* in creating a new people with a new status.⁵⁷ Thus, Bird attempts to wed critical elements of both the Reformational and New Perspective views.

Post-Sanders: Justification in Corporate Terms

Richard Hays. Richard Hays understands justification in highly corporate terms, considering its focus mainly to be the covenant community of the people of God. His view rests heavily on his understanding of the “righteousness of God.” He writes, “Once it is recognized that ‘the righteousness of God’ in Romans is deliberately explicated in terms of this OT covenant conceptuality, it becomes apparent that the term refers neither to an abstract ideal of divine

Between Reformed and Revisionist Readings of Paul,” *TynBul* 57 (2006): 109.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Ibid. He writes, “My concern here is to show that the unity of Jews and Gentiles in the church is intimately related to ‘righteousness’, but I wish to affirm this on two conditions: (1) That one does not thereby reduce justification to ecclesiology, covenant, membership, or identity legitimation; and (2) that one keeps the vertical, forensic, and soteriological aspects of righteousness/justification foremost and primary” (152, n. 130).

⁵⁵Bird, *Saving Righteousness*, 17.

⁵⁶Ibid., 33.

⁵⁷Ibid.

distributive justice nor to a legal status or moral character imputed or conveyed by God to human beings. It refers rather to God's own unshakable faithfulness."⁵⁸ Furthermore, the "righteousness" of believers who receive God's grace "should be interpreted primarily in terms of the covenant relationship to God and membership within the covenant community."⁵⁹

This understanding of "righteousness," then, provides the foundation for Hays's understanding of justification. If the righteousness of God and the believer centers mainly on God's covenant faithfulness and the inclusion of people into the covenant community, then the traditional emphasis upon the sinful individual's need for forgiveness and righteousness before a holy God more or less falls by the wayside.⁶⁰ This emphasis is not necessarily unimportant, but it is not the main thrust of Paul's letters. The idea of God "claiming and vindicating a covenant community" is central, thus precluding the "individualistic error of treating justification as the believer's personal experience of forgiveness and deliverance from a subjective sense of guilt."⁶¹

N. T. Wright. A similar line of thought is found in N. T. Wright. Wright is one of the strongest proponents of a more corporate approach to justification, exercising great influence and

⁵⁸"Justification," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1131.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*

⁶⁰"The fundamental problem with which Paul is wrestling in Romans is *not* how a person may find acceptance with God; the problem is to work out an understanding of the relationship in Christ between Jews and Gentiles" (Richard Hays, "Have We Found Abraham to be Our Forefather According to the Flesh?" A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1," *NovT* 27 [1985]: 83-84). Likewise, the "driving question in Romans is not 'How can I find a gracious God?' but 'How can we trust in this allegedly gracious God if he abandons his promises to Israel?'" (idem, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989], 53).

⁶¹*Ibid.*, 1132 (Hays here cites Stendahl [who apparently has been highly influential for him], who "has stressed the absence of these categories in Paul"). Cf. also Hays, "Psalm 143," 115, where he argues that Paul's allusion to Psalm 143 in Romans 3:20 demonstrates that Paul does not have in view "the subjective quest for salvation" so much as, "as in Rom 3:5, the issue of God's integrity, God's justice which persistently overcomes

also receiving a great amount of criticism. Perhaps the clearest statement of Wright on justification is the following: “It is not ‘how you become a Christian’, so much as ‘how you can tell who is a member of the covenant family’.”⁶² Here Sanders’ covenantal nomism scheme plays a central role, though Wright has gone a separate route in understanding Paul. Convinced that Sanders was correct about the “Lutheran” interpreters of Paul who “smuggle Pelagius into Galatia,” Wright contends that justification is “not about how someone might establish a relationship with God.”⁶³ Rather, it is a matter of “how you tell who belongs to that community”—it is about “God’s eschatological definition, both future and present, of who was, in fact, a member of his people.”⁶⁴

Therefore, picking up the salvation-historical emphasis of his predecessors—as opposed to the anthropological emphasis of the Reformational interpretation—Wright asserts that justification is “not so much about salvation as about the church.”⁶⁵ It is “the original *ecumenical* doctrine,” because once we “relocate justification, moving it from the discussion of how people become Christians to the discussion of how we know that someone is a Christian, we have a

human unfaithfulness.”

⁶²N. T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said*, 122. See also N. T. Wright, “Justification,” in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright (Downers Grove, IL: 1988), 359-61.

⁶³Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said*, 119. “The point is that the *word* ‘justification’ does not itself *denote* the process whereby, or the event in which, a person is brought by grace from unbelief, idolatry and sin into faith, true worship and renewal of life. . . . In other words, those who hear the gospel and respond to it in faith are *then* declared by God to be his people . . . They are given the status *dikaios*, ‘righteous’, ‘within the covenant’” (N. T. Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005], 121-22).

⁶⁴Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said*, 119.

⁶⁵*Ibid.* Richard Gaffin, “Review Essay: Paul the Theologian,” *WTJ* 62 (2000): 127, objects to Wright on this point: “At issue here are not the ecclesiological implications, undeniable and crucially important, of Paul’s teaching on justification . . . Where Wright’s overall construction is problematic, however, is in *making these implications the heart or main point of Paul’s doctrine*, denying or at least diminishing, at the same time, its soteriological significance” (emphasis added).

powerful incentive to work together across denominational barriers.”⁶⁶ To be sure, it is not that Wright wishes to extinguish *all* discussion regarding personal salvation. Paul may or may not agree with Augustine or Luther on how one comes to know God in Christ personally. But, “he does not use the language of ‘justification’ to denote this event or process.”⁶⁷ For Wright, the idea of individual salvation has received too much attention throughout the history of the church, causing many interpreters to miss Paul’s central point.⁶⁸

Post-Sanders: Justification in Individual Terms

Despite this move toward a more corporate understanding of justification, there are those who still prefer the older perspective. While not denying that the New Perspective has made valuable contributions to Pauline scholarship, they remain unconvinced that the Reformation was wrong in its strong emphasis upon the individual, anthropological element in justification.⁶⁹ The following are representative examples.⁷⁰

⁶⁶N. T. Wright, “New Perspectives on Paul,” in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Bruce L. McCormack (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2006), 261.

⁶⁷Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said*, 119 (his emphasis).

⁶⁸Although not identical to Wright or Hays, Douglas Campbell, *The Quest for Paul’s Gospel: A Suggested Strategy*, JSNTSup 274 (London; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005) and idem, *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26*, JSNTSup 65 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) arguably could be included in this category as well.

⁶⁹E.g., Simon Gathercole writes, *Where is Boasting*, 251, “The New Perspective is helpful in that it corrects some of the lack of historical particularism of traditional approaches, but it is wrong to downgrade anthropological concerns when for Paul the Torah brings them to the fore.”

⁷⁰Many others could be included here. E.g., see G. K. Beale, “Review Essay: The Overstated ‘New’ Perspective?” *BBR* 19 (2009): 85-94; A. Andrew Das, “Beyond Covenantal Nomism: Paul, Judaism, and Perfect Obedience,” *Concordia Journal* 27 (2001): 234-52; idem, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001); Gaffin, “Paul the Theologian”; I. Howard Marshall, “Salvation, Grace and Works in the Later Writings in the Pauline Corpus” *NTS* 42 (1996): 339-358; Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996); idem, “‘Law,’ ‘Works of the Law,’ and Legalism in Paul,” *WTJ* 45 (1983): 73-

Simon Gathercole. Gathercole, studying both the Jewish and Pauline evidence, has argued in several places against New Perspective conceptions of Paul.⁷¹ In his book, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5*, Gathercole examines significant texts in Jewish literature that raise questions about the sufficiency of Sanders' "covenantal nomism." He argues that too little attention has been paid to Jewish "boasting" as found in the primary sources and that the "lack of emphasis [in Pauline scholarship] on Jewish confidence on the basis of obedience is unjustified."⁷² Furthermore, he argues that the antithesis set up by those such as Dunn, Hays, and Wright between Torah "as a means to righteousness" and Torah "marking out the righteous" is false. This neglects the fact that "effort is involved in obedience, effort that is impossible 'in the flesh,'" and sidesteps the important anthropological dimension in Paul's doctrine of justification.⁷³ Paul's view of justification, then, is not "integrally related to the inclusion of the gentiles in the people of God but is part of who Paul believes God

100; John Piper, *Counted Righteous in Christ: Should We Abandon the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness?* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2002); idem, *The Future of Justification: A Response to N. T. Wright* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007); Moisés Silva, "The Law and Christianity: Dunn's New Synthesis," *WTJ* 53 (1991): 339-53; idem, *Interpreting Galatians: Explorations in Exegetical Method*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001); idem, *Philippians*, 2nd ed. BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005); Brian Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Imputation* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006); Waters, *Justification and the New Perspective*.

⁷¹Besides his monograph, *Where is Boasting*, see, e.g., "The Doctrine of Justification in Paul and Beyond: Some Proposals," in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Bruce L. McCormack (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2006), 219-41; "Early Judaism and Covenantal Nomism: A Review Article," *Evangelical Quarterly* 76 (2004): 153-62; "Justified by Faith, Justified by his Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3:21-4:25," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism, Volume II: The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 147-84.

⁷²Gathercole, *Where is Boasting*, 197.

⁷³*Ibid.*, 249.

to be in relation to humanity in general and the believer in particular.”⁷⁴

Thomas Schreiner. Despite Sanders’ influential claim that first-century Judaism was not legalistic, Thomas Schreiner has continued to insist that legalism played at least some role in Paul’s Jewish context, thereby contributing to his doctrine of justification.⁷⁵ When Paul says that Israel pursued the law “as from works” in Romans 9:32, he means that Israel was attempting to establish her own personal righteousness by trying to keep the law—a “delusive enterprise,” since no one obeys perfectly.⁷⁶ Furthermore, righteousness is often forensic in Paul, “denoting God’s gift to his people,” and forms an “indispensable bond” with forgiveness of sin.⁷⁷ Schreiner’s view is essentially Reformational—forensic righteousness is an “alien righteousness, given to sinners by God” that is “not merited by works” and is “the basis and ground of any transformation that occurs in our lives.”⁷⁸

This informs how Schreiner understands the New Perspective emphasis on Jewish nationalism and covenantal inclusion as the root of Paul’s doctrine of justification. Taking issue here, he states that “Jewish nationalism and exclusivism cannot be neatly separated from Jewish

⁷⁴Ibid., 251.

⁷⁵Related to this, Piper, *Future of Justification*, 157-58, argues that even if ethnocentrism is granted as the central Jewish problem (as opposed to legalism), the same issue is at stake: self-righteousness.

⁷⁶Thomas Schreiner, “Israel’s Failure to Attain Righteousness in Romans 9:30-10:3,” *Trinity Journal* 12 (1991): 220. For more on the place of Jewish legalism in Paul’s doctrine of justification, see Schreiner, “‘Works of Law’ in Paul,” *NovT* 33 (1991): 217-44.

⁷⁷Schreiner, “Israel’s Failure,” 204. So also J. A. Zeisler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 164, who argues that the “three main places where the righteousness-in-Christ idea is found (1 Cor. 1.30; 2 Cor. 5.21; Phil. 3.9) have it in common that ‘righteousness’ is best taken ethically, that it is God’s, and that in Christ it becomes ours.”

⁷⁸Thomas Schreiner, *Paul, Apostle of God’s Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001), 208.

obedience to the law”⁷⁹ and that while “God’s righteousness expresses his faithfulness to his covenant,” this does not mean that “God’s righteousness *is his faithfulness to the covenant.*”⁸⁰ In these ways, Schreiner’s work tends to operate against the more corporate view of justification.

Stephen Westerholm. Stephen Westerholm, after spelling out the traditional “Lutheran” view at the beginning of his *Perspectives Old and New on Paul* (mentioned above), goes on to expound and defend this view in the rest of his monograph. To be sure, he concedes that New Perspective scholarship has rightly shown that it was in the context of the dispute over Gentiles, and not in “a debate whether one is saved by human effort or divine grace, that Paul formulated the doctrine of justification.”⁸¹ Nevertheless, this was “in effect Paul’s ‘gospel’ all along: a gospel of salvation for sinners facing God’s wrath, but graciously offered through Jesus Christ to all who believed in him.”⁸² Further, Westerholm attempts to demonstrate this through a survey of the relevant Pauline literature (including that outside Romans and Galatians), arguing that even when justification by faith is not explicitly mentioned, it is still assumed as a critical foundation for Paul’s theology.⁸³

Consequently, for Westerholm, the works that were excluded for righteousness were not simply Jewish boundary markers. They also “included the righteous works on the basis of

⁷⁹Schreiner, “Works of Law,” 236.

⁸⁰Schreiner, *Paul*, 199.

⁸¹Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 441.

⁸²*Ibid.*, 442.

⁸³E.g., he writes, “No study that took Ephesians and the Pastorals into account could conclude . . . that the Pelagian crisis or sixteenth-century controversies are the source of the ‘misreading’ of Paul that sees him excluding human works from salvation rather than particular works from the terms for Gentile admission to the people of God” (*ibid.*, 406). See also Westerholm, “What is the Question.”

which people were (ordinarily) thought to be righteous.”⁸⁴ The law was not able to deal adequately with human sin,⁸⁵ and, therefore, the fundamental problem Paul had with first-century Judaism was not ethnocentrism but sin: “The message of ‘justification by faith’ pertains in the first place not to how Gentiles may be included in the Jewish covenant but to how sinners—Jews and Gentiles alike—who are threatened by God's wrath may enjoy God's approval.”⁸⁶

Mark Seifrid. Mark Seifrid has been a relatively vocal opponent of the New Perspective and N. T. Wright in particular on several points.⁸⁷ According to Seifrid, Paul was “a fallen human being under the power of sin and death” and neither his “good standing as a member of the nation of Israel, nor his energetic pursuit of the law” could change this fact.⁸⁸ It follows, then, that circumcision was a “mark of faith and piety, not mere national identity.”⁸⁹ Because of this, justification by faith necessarily has a strong individual element to it. Paul seeks to “individuate”—that is, to “set the individual before the presence of God as a sinner . . . and as one who is justified and forgiven in Jesus Christ (Rom 3:26).”⁹⁰

⁸⁴Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 442.

⁸⁵*Ibid.*

⁸⁶Stephen Westerholm, “The Righteousness of the Law and the Righteousness of Faith in Romans,” *Interpretation* 58 (2004): 264.

⁸⁷E.g., see Mark Seifrid, “The ‘New Perspective on Paul’ and Its Problems,” *Themelios* 25 (2000): 4-18; “The Narrative of Scripture and Justification by Faith: A Fresh Response to N. T. Wright,” *CTQ* 72 (2008): 19-44.

⁸⁸Mark Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 9 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP; Leicester, England: Apollos, 2000), 33.

⁸⁹Mark Seifrid, “Blind Alleys in the Controversy Over the Paul of History,” *TynBul* 45 (1994): 79.

⁹⁰Seifrid, “Fresh Response,” 37.

Moreover, the idea that in Paul God's righteousness is strictly his covenant faithfulness is misguided. According to biblical usage, "righteousness-language does not derive from the context of 'covenant', but that of creation."⁹¹ It "has to do with creational thought, not merely God's covenant with Israel."⁹² God's acts of justification do not merely provide "salvation" for Israel, or anyone else for that matter, but instead "constitute the establishment of justice in the world which Yahweh made and governs."⁹³ Therefore, Seifrid rejects the idea that the inclusion of the Gentiles provides the major impetus behind Paul's doctrine of justification. Instead, the reason the Gentile mission is so critical in Paul's teaching on justification is because it points to the deeper, more fundamental idea of the forgiven sinner—it was "a *visible and bodily* expression of the justification of the ungodly."⁹⁴

The present work. The present work finds its place within this latter group of scholars to the extent that it shares the understanding that Paul, in his doctrine of justification, greatly emphasizes the individual's lack of merit and absolute need of forgiveness and righteousness before God in Christ. In this dissertation I intend to argue that there is a highly significant and weighty individual element in Paul's doctrine of justification, one that is increasingly neglected due to the trajectory of the New Perspective toward a more corporate, covenantal understanding of justification, a trajectory that cannot fully handle critical Pauline

⁹¹Mark Seifrid, "In What Sense is 'Justification' a Declaration?" *Churchman* 114 (2000): 125.

⁹²Mark Seifrid, "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism, Volume I: The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 440.

⁹³Ibid., 441.

⁹⁴Seifrid, "Fresh Response," 44.

texts. My hope here is not to neglect the very real corporate themes found in Paul, but to re-emphasize the place of the individual in justification, while demonstrating how this fits with these corporate elements. At present, I am aware of no such full-length work.⁹⁵

Method

In my view, the study of broader topics in Paul like justification must carefully labor to blend exegesis together with continual examination and reformulation of larger assumptions brought to the text, informed as these things are by one's own thought and that of the scholarly community.⁹⁶ The present work will follow this method, being largely exegetical in nature and therefore making use of the best available exegetical resources, while at the same time keeping in view and making adjustments to larger assumptions.

Tentative Table of Contents

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION (10 pages)

Statement of the Problem

Thesis

Method

2. HISTORY OF RESEARCH (25 pages)

3. THE PROBLEM OF JEWISH "WORKS-RIGHTEOUSNESS" (25 pages)

⁹⁵For an interesting study with a similar but not identical theme, and different approach, see Gary W. Burnett, *Paul & the Salvation of the Individual* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2001).

⁹⁶In other words, there will be no text that I can point to that "seals the deal" when it comes to my thesis, especially in light of the deep presuppositions held by New Perspective scholars and others on this issue. The present thesis can only be established by building a case based on several passages, in addition to challenging specific hermeneutical assumptions (e.g., in the chapter on Jewish works-righteousness).

4. JUSTIFICATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL: ROMANS & GALATIANS (50 pages)

No Flesh Shall be Justified (Psalm 143:2 in Galatians 2:16 and Romans 3:20)

Reckoned Righteous and the Problem of David (Romans 4:1-8)

Not by Faith but as if by Works (Romans 9:30-10:4)

5. JUSTIFICATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL: OTHER PAULINE EPISTLES (50 pages)

Righteousness from God (Philippians 3:2-9)

That We Might Become the Righteousness of God (2 Corinthians 5:21)

The Contribution of the “Disputed” Epistles⁹⁷

Not by Works so that No One May Boast (Ephesians 2:8-10)

Not According to our Works (2 Timothy 1:9)

Not Because of Works Done in Righteousness (Titus 3:5)

6. JUSTIFICATION AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO THE CORPORATE PEOPLE OF GOD (30 pages)

No Distinction (Romans 3:21-31)

One New Man (Ephesians 2:11-22)

Conclusion: The People of God as a Community of Justified Individuals

7. CONCLUSION (10 pages)

In *chapter one*, I will introduce the problem of modern scholarship’s trajectory toward a more corporate view of justification. Then I will present my thesis that the textual evidence

⁹⁷About these epistles, Westerholm, “Justification by Faith,” 202, writes, “What can be said with certainty, however, is that already in the first century the Pauline justification texts were invoked to address the predicament of sinners facing God’s wrath; and already in the first century they were used to insist that God offers such sinners salvation in Jesus Christ by grace through faith apart from a demand for righteous deeds that they are in no position to meet. The claim that such a reading modernizes Paul can only be maintained if we date the onset of modernity prior to the composition of Ephesians.”

does not wholly support such a trajectory, briefly addressing my intended method. *Chapter two* will survey the history of research, showing how the corporate view has gained ground over the years, as well as highlighting some of the responses to it. In *chapter three*, I will consider the notion that the Judaism of Paul's day was not legalistic and argue that there is credible evidence to presuppose that some level of legalism or "works-righteousness"—the attempt to be justified before God by keeping the law—was present in certain elements of first-century Judaism, and specifically in the thinking and behavior of Paul's Jewish opponents, as well as those they were influencing. *Chapter four* will be comprised of the exegesis of a few key texts in Romans and Galatians that support the idea of a more individual view of justification. I will attempt to show that Jewish restrictiveness cannot fully explain these passages. In *chapter five*, I will argue the same idea from texts outside Romans and Galatians, including some passages where Pauline authorship is disputed in broader scholarship. *Chapter six* will demonstrate how the findings of the previous chapters correspond to Paul's view of the corporate people of God. *Chapter seven* will summarize the conclusions of these lines of research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Commentaries – Romans

- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. 1. 6th ed. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 38. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
- Godet, F. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by A. Cusin. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Edited and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromily. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Assisted by Roy D. Kotansky. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leicester, England: Apollos, 1988.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. 1. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th Ed. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Romans: The Righteousness of God*. Translated by Siegfried S. Schatzmann. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.

Witherington, Ben, III. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. With Darlene Hyatt. Grand Rapids; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2004.

Wright, N. T. *The Letter to the Romans*. In vol. 10 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*, 393-770. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.

Commentaries – Galatians

Betz, Hans Dieter Betz. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Exeter, UK: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Burton, Ernest De Witt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921.,

Dunn, James D. G. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1993; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.

Fung, Ronald Y. K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Hays, Richard. *The Letter to the Galatians*. In vol. 11 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*, 181-348. Nashville: Abingdon, 2000.

Lightfoot, J. B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. London: Macmillan, 1865.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.

Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians*. Anchor Bible, vol. 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.

Commentaries – Philippians

Silva, Moisés. *Philippians*. 2nd ed. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Hawthorne, Gerald F. *Philippians*. Rev. and exp. by Ralph P. Martin. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 43 (Revised Edition). Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2004.

Hooker, Morna. "Philippians." In *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*, ed. James D. G. Dunn. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

O'Brien, Peter T. *The Epistles to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Reumann, John. *Philippians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible, vol. 33B. New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2008.

Books

Bandstra, Andrew John. *The Law and the Elements of the World: An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul's Teaching*. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1964.

Barclay, John. *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Edited by John Riches. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.

Barth, Markus. *Justification: Pauline Texts Interpreted in the Light of the Old and New Testaments*. Translated by A. M. Woodruff III. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

Bassler, Jouette M. *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 59. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.

Beker, J. Christian. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress: 1980.

Bird, Michael F. *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification, and the New Perspective*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007.

Boyarin, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951-55.

Burnett, Gary W. *Paul & the Salvation of the Individual*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2001.

Campbell, Douglas A. *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 65. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

- _____. *The Quest for Paul's Gospel: A Suggested Strategy*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 274. London; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Carson, D. A. and Douglas J. Moo. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Cerfaux, Lucien. *The Christian in the Theology of St. Paul*. Translated by Lilian Soiron. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1967.
- Chae, Daniel J-S. *Paul as Apostle to the Gentiles: His Apostolic Self-Awareness and its Influence on the Soteriological Argument in Romans*. Paternoster Biblical and Theological Monographs. Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Paternoster, 1997.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
- Das, A. Andrew. *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Donaldson, Terence L. *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of the Apostle Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Dunn, James D. G. and Alan M. Suggate. *The Justice of God: A Fresh Look at the Doctrine of Justification by Faith*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Fuller, Daniel P. *Gospel and Law: The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology*. Pasadena, CA: Fuller Seminary Press, 1982.
- _____. *The Unity of the Bible: Unfolding God's Plan for Humanity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992.
- Garlington, Don B. *Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance: Aspects of Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994.
- _____. *'The Obedience of Faith': A Pauline Phrase in Historical Context*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994.
- Gathercole, Simon J. *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *The God of Promise and the Life of Faith*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2001.
- _____. *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

- Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreters of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- _____. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. 2nd ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002
- _____. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.
- Howard, George. *Paul: Crisis in Galatia*. 2nd ed. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Jüngel, Eberhard. *Justification: The Heart of the Christian Faith*. Translated by Jeffrey F. Cayzer. Edinburgh; New York: T&T Clark, 2001.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Perspectives on Paul*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. London: SCM, 1971.
- Kertelge, Karl. *Rechtfertigung bei Paulus. Studien zur Struktur und zum Bedeutungsgehalt des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsbegriffs*. Verlag Aschendorff: Münster, 1967.
- Kim, Seyoon. *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Grand Rapids; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Kruse, Colin G. *Paul, the Law and Justification*. Leicester, England: Apollos, 1996.
- Küng, Hans. *Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection*. 40th Anniversary Edition. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- Longenecker, Richard N., ed. *The Road from Damascus: The Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought, and Ministry*. Grand Rapids; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1997.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2002.
- Müller, Christian. *Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk: Eine Untersuchung zu Römer 9-11*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1964.
- Piper, John. *Counted Righteous in Christ: Should We Abandon the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness?*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2002.

- _____. *The Future of Justification: A Response to N. T. Wright*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007.
- Rainbow, Paul A. *The Way of Salvation: The Role of Christian Obedience in Justification*. Bletchley, UK; Waynesboro, GA, 2005.
- Räisänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983; reprint, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Reumann, John. "Righteousness" in the New Testament: "Justification" in the United States Lutheran—Roman Catholic Dialogue. With responses by Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Jermoe D. Quinn. Philadelphia: Fortress; New York: Paulist, 1982.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- _____. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- _____. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Paul, Apostle of God's Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*. Translated by William Montgomery. London: A. & C. Black: 1931; reprint, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- _____. *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History*. Translated by William Montgomery. London: A. & C. Black, 1912; reprint, New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
- Seifrid, Mark A. *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 68. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- _____. *Christ, Our Righteousness*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 9. Downers Grove, IL: IVP; Leicester, England: Apollos, 2000.
- Silva, Moisés. *Interpreting Galatians: Explorations in Exegetical Method*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Stendahl, Krister. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- _____. *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001.
- Thielman, Frank. *Paul & the Law: A Contextual Approach*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1994.
- VanLandingham, Chris. *Judgment & Justification in Early Judaism and the Apostle Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Vickers, Brian. *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Imputation*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006.
- Waters, Guy Prentiss. *Justification and the New Perspective on Paul: A Review and Response*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Rev. and exp. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- _____. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. London; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Wrede, William. *Paul*. Translated by Edward Lummis. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1908; reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991; reprint, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- _____. *Paul: In Fresh Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- _____. *What St. Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Zeisler, J. A. *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Articles

- Aune, David E. "Recent Readings of Paul Relating to Justification by Faith." In *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*, ed. David E. Aune, 188-245. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

- Bachmann, Michael. "Christus, 'das Ende des Gesetzes, des Dekalogs und des Liebesgebots'?" *Theologische Zeitschrift* 63 (2007): 171-74.
- _____. "J. D. G. Dunn und die Neue Paulusperspektive." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 63 (2007): 25-43.
- Barth, Markus. "Jews and Gentiles: The Social Character of Justification in Paul." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 5 (1968): 241-67.
- Bassler, Jouette M. "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 43-58.
- Baugh, S. M. "The New Perspective, Mediation, and Justification." In *Covenant, Justification, and Pastoral Ministry*, ed. R. Scott Clark, 137-63. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2007.
- Bayer, Oswald. "L'héritage paulinien chez Luther." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 94 (2006): 381-94.
- Beale, G. K. "Review Essay: The Overstated 'New' Perspective?" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19 (2009): 85-94.
- Bird, Michael F. "Incorporated Righteousness: A Response to Recent Evangelical Discussion Concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in Justification." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 47 (2004): 253-75.
- _____. "Justification as Forensic Declaration and Covenant Membership: A *Via Media* Between Reformed and Revisionist Readings of Paul." *Tyndale Bulletin* 57 (2006): 109-130.
- _____. "The New Perspective on Paul: A Bibliographical Essay." *The Paul Page* [on-line]. Accessed 15 April 2009. Available from <http://www.thepaulpage.com/Bibliography.html>; Internet.
- _____. "When the Dust Finally Settles: Coming to a Post-New Perspective Perspective." *Criswell Theological Review* 2 (2005): 57-69.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (1964): 12-16.
- Carson, D. A. "Summaries and Conclusions." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism, Volume I: The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, 505-48. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Conzelmann, Hans. "Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Paulus: Theologie oder Anthropologie?" *Evangelische Theologische* 28 (1968): 389-404.

Cranfield, C.E.B. "St. Paul and the Law." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 17 (1964): 43-68.

_____. "'The Works of the Law' in the Epistle to the Romans." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 43 (1991): 89-101.

Das, A. Andrew. "Beyond Covenantal Nomism: Paul, Judaism, and Perfect Obedience." *Concordia Journal* 27 (2001): 234-52.

Donfried, Karl Paul. "Justification and Last Judgment in Paul." *Interpretation* 30 (1976): 140-52.

Dugid, Iain M. "Covenant Nomism and the Exile." In *Covenant, Justification, and Pastoral Ministry*, ed. R. Scott Clark, 61-87. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2007

Dunn, James D. G. "The Justice of God: A Renewed Perspective on Justification by Faith." In *The New Perspective on Paul*, 193-211. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

_____. "The New Perspective on Paul." *The New Perspective on Paul*, 99-120. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

_____. "The New Perspective: whence, what and whither?" In *The New Perspective on Paul*, 1-97. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

_____. "Paul and Justification by Faith." In *The New Perspective on Paul*, 367-80. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Espy, John M. "Paul's 'Robust Conscience' Re-Examined." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 161-88.

Estelle, Bryan D. "The Covenant of Works in Moses and Paul." In *Covenant, Justification, and Pastoral Ministry*, ed. R. Scott Clark, 89-135. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2007

Evans, Craig A. "Jesus & the Continuing Exile of Israel." In *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*, ed. Carey C. Newman, 77-100. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster; Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1999.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., S.J. "Justification by Faith in Pauline Thought: A Catholic View." In *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*, ed. David E. Aune, 77-94. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Fuller, Daniel P. "Paul and the Works of the Law." *Westminster Theological Journal* 38 (1975): 28-42.

Gaffin, Richard B., Jr. "Review Essay: Paul the Theologian." *Westminster Theological Journal* 62 (2000): 121-41.

Garlington, Donald B. "The New Perspective on Paul: An Appraisal Two Decades Later." *Criswell Theological Review* 2 (2005): 17-38.

_____. "Paul's 'Partisan ἐκ' and the Question of Justification in Galatians." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 567-89.

Gathercole, Simon J. "After the New Perspective: Works, Justification, and Boasting in Early Judaism and Romans 1-5." *Tyndale Bulletin* 52 (2001): 303-06.

_____. "The Doctrine of Justification in Paul and Beyond: Some Proposals." In *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Bruce L. McCormack, 219-41. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2006.

_____. "Early Judaism and Covenantal Nomism: A Review Article." *Evangelical Quarterly* 76 (2004): 153-62.

_____. "Justified by Faith, Justified by his Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3:21-4:25." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism, Volume II: The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, 147-84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.

_____. "What Did Paul Really Mean?" *Christianity Today* 51, no. 2 (2007): 22-28.

Gundry, Robert H. "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul." *Biblica* 66 (1985): 1-38.

Hays, Richard B. "Christology and Ethics in Galatians: The Law of Christ." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 268-90.

_____. "'Have We Found Abraham to be Our Forefather According to the Flesh?' A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1." *Novum Testamentum* 27 (1985): 76-98.

_____. "Justification." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

_____. "Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 107-115.

Hooker, Morna D. "Paul and 'Covenantal Nomism.'" In *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*, ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson, 47-56. London: SPCK, 1982.

Hübner, Hans. "Existenziale Interpretation der Paulinischen 'Gerechtigkeit Gottes': Zur Kontroverse Rudolf Bultmann–Ernst Käsemann." *New Testament Studies* 21 (75): 462-88.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. "Rom 3:21-26 and the Faith of Jesus." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 77-90.

- Käsemann, Ernst. "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul." In *New Testament Questions of Today*, tr. W. J. Montague, 168-82. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Lohse, Eduard. "Christus, des Gesetzes Ende? Die Theologie des Apostels Paulus in kritischer Perspektive." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (2008): 18-32.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Salvation, Grace and Works in the Later Writings in the Pauline Corpus." *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 339-358.
- Matlock, R. Barry. "The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2.16, 3.22, Romans 3.22, and Philippians 3.9." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (2007): 173-203.
- Meek, James A. "The New Perspective on Paul: An Introduction for the Uninitiated." *Concordia Journal* 27 (2001): 208-33.
- McGrath, Alister E. "Justification." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: IVP.
- Moo, Douglas J. "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul." *Westminster Theological Journal* 45 (1983): 73-100.
- _____. "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 40 (1987): 287-307.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul." In *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr, 389-406. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Owen, Paul L. "The 'Works of the Law' in Romans and Galatians: A New Defense of the Subjective Genitive." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (2007): 553-77.
- Ratzlaff, Lloyd W. "Salvation: Individualistic or Communal?" *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 4 (1976): 108-17.
- Reumann, John. "Justification in Pauline Thought: A Lutheran View." In *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*, ed. David E. Aune, 108-30. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. "The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 35 (1989): 47-74.
- _____. "Did Paul Believe in Justification by Works? Another Look at Romans 2." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 3 (1993): 131-58.
- _____. "Is Perfect Obedience to the Law Possible? A Re-examination of Galatians 3:10." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 27 (1984): 151-60.

- _____. "Israel's Failure to Attain Righteousness in Romans 9:30-10:3." *Trinity Journal* 12 (1991): 209-20.
- _____. "Paul and Perfect Obedience to the Law: An Evaluation of the View of E. P. Sanders." *Westminster Theological Journal* 47 (1985): 245-78.
- _____. "Paul's View of the Law in Romans 10:4-5." *Westminster Theological Journal* 55 (1993): 113-35.
- _____. "Reading Romans Theologically: A Review Article." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41 (1998): 641-50.
- _____. "'Works of Law' in Paul." *Novum Testamentum* 33 (1991): 217-44.
- Seifrid, Mark A. "Blind Alleys in the Controversy Over the Paul of History." *Tyndale Bulletin* 45 (1994): 73-95.
- _____. "'The Gift of Salvation': Its Failure to Address the Crux of Justification." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42 (1999): 679-88.
- _____. "In What Sense is 'Justification' a Declaration?" *Churchman* 114 (2000): 123-36.
- _____. "The Narrative of Scripture and Justification by Faith: A Fresh Response to N. T. Wright." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 72 (2008): 19-44.
- _____. "The 'New Perspective on Paul' and Its Problems." *Themelios* 25 (2000): 4-18.
- _____. "Paul, Luther, and Justification in Gal 2:15-21." *Westminster Theological Journal* 65 (2003): 215-30.
- _____. "Paul's Use of Righteousness Language Against Its Hellenistic Background." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism, Volume II: The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, 39-74. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- _____. "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism, Volume I: The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, 415-42. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Silva, Moisés. "Faith Versus Works of Law in Galatians." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism, Volume II: The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, 217-48. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.

- _____. "The Law and Christianity: Dunn's New Synthesis." *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991): 339-53.
- Smith, Jay E. "The New Perspective on Paul: A Select and Annotated Bibliography." *Criswell Theological Review* 2 (2005): 91-111;
- Surburg, Raymond F. "Justification as a Doctrine of the Old Testament: A Comparative Study in Confessional and Biblical Theology." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 46 (1982): 129-46.
- Westerholm, Stephen. "Justification by Faith is the Answer: What is the Question?" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 70 (2006): 197-217.
- _____. "The Righteousness of the Law and the Righteousness of Faith in Romans." *Interpretation* 58 (2004): 254-64.
- Williams, Sam K. "Justification and the Spirit in Galatians." *Journal for the Study of New Testament* 29 (1987): 91-100.
- _____. "The 'Righteousness of God' in Romans." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 241-90.
- Wright, N. T. "Justification." In *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair Ferguson and David F. Wright. Downers Grove, IL: 1988.
- _____. "New Perspectives on Paul." In *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Bruce L. McCormack, 243-64. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2006.
- _____. "Paul as Preacher: The Gospel Then and Now." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 72 (2007): 131-46.
- _____. "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith." *Tyndale Bulletin* 29 (1978): 61-88.
- _____. "Romans and the Theology of Paul." In *Pauline Theology, Volume III: Romans*, ed. David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson, 30-67. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Yinger, Kent. "Defining Legalism." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 46 (2008): 91-108.

Dissertations and Theses

- Eriksson, Bart A. "Luther, Paul and the New Perspective." Th.M. thesis, Wycliffe College, 2004.
- Rayburn, Robert S. "The Contrast Between the Old and New Covenants in the New Testament." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1978.

Waldron, Samuel Eldon. "Faith, Obedience, and Justification: Current Evangelical Departures from Sola Fide." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005.

Yun, Yong-Pil. "Justification as the Work of the Holy Spirit and Its Relation to Other Spiritual Realities in Galatians and Romans." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005.

VITA

Andrew Michael Hassler

PERSONAL

Born: July 20, 1977, Crawfordsville, Indiana
Parents: George and Brenda Hassler
Married: Sarah Jane Zahn, June 3, 2000
Children: Jakob Andrew (5/17/05), August George (11/15/07), Emma Jane (8/9/09)

EDUCATIONAL

Diploma, Southmont High School, Crawfordsville, Indiana, 1995
B.S., Butler University (Indianapolis, Indiana), 1999
M.Div., Covenant Theological Seminary, 2004
Th.M., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2006

MINISTERIAL

Student Leader, Campus Crusade for Christ, 1997-1999
Pastoral Assistant, Hanley Road Baptist Church, 2002-2005
Community Group Leader, Sojourn Community Church, 2008-present

ACADEMIC

Assistant to Dr. Jay Sklar, Covenant Theological Seminary, 2002-2004
Assistant to Dr. David Chapman, Covenant Theological Seminary, 2003
Assistant to Dr. Jonathan Pennington, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,
2006-present
Assistant to Dr. Thomas Schreiner, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008
Assistant to Dr. Robert Plummer, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,
2008-present
Researcher for Docent Research Group, 2008-present
Greek Instructor, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009

ORGANIZATIONAL

Evangelical Theological Society, 2005-present
Society of Biblical Literature, 2009-present