

PERSPECTIVES ON PAUL



FIVE VIEWS

Contributors:

John M. G. Barclay

A. Andrew Das

James D. G. Dunn

Brant Pitre

Magnus Zetterholm

EDITED BY

SCOT MCKNIGHT

AND

B. J. OROPEZA

AFTERWORD BY Dennis Edwards

PERSPECTIVES ON PAUL

FIVE VIEWS

EDITED BY
SCOT MCKNIGHT
AND
B. J. OROPEZA


Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Scot McKnight and B. J. Oropeza, Perspectives on Paul
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group © 2020
Used by permission.

Contents

Preface ix

Abbreviations xi

Paul in Perspective: An Overview of the Landscape More Than Forty Years after Paul and Palestinian Judaism

B. J. OROPEZA AND SCOT MCKNIGHT 1

1. The Roman Catholic Perspective on Paul BRANT PITRE 25

▸ *Traditional Protestant Perspective Response to Pitre* A. ANDREW DAS 56

▸ *New Perspective Response to Pitre* JAMES D. G. DUNN 62

▸ *Paul within Judaism Perspective Response to Pitre*
MAGNUS ZETTERHOLM 65

▸ *Gift Perspective Response to Pitre* JOHN M. G. BARCLAY 69

▸ *Roman Catholic Perspective Reply to the Respondents* BRANT PITRE 75

2. The Traditional Protestant Perspective on Paul A. ANDREW DAS 83

▸ *Roman Catholic Perspective Response to Das* BRANT PITRE 107

▸ *New Perspective Response to Das* JAMES D. G. DUNN 114

▸ *Paul within Judaism Perspective Response to Das*
MAGNUS ZETTERHOLM 117

▸ *Gift Perspective Response to Das* JOHN M. G. BARCLAY 122

▸ *Traditional Protestant Perspective Reply to the Respondents*
A. ANDREW DAS 127

3. The New Perspective on Paul	JAMES D. G. DUNN	133
▶ <i>Roman Catholic Perspective Response to Dunn</i>	BRANT PITRE	146
▶ <i>Traditional Protestant Perspective Response to Dunn</i>	A. ANDREW DAS	153
▶ <i>Paul within Judaism Perspective Response to Dunn</i>	MAGNUS ZETTERHOLM	159
▶ <i>Gift Perspective Response to Dunn</i>	JOHN M. G. BARCLAY	164
▶ <i>New Perspective Reply to the Respondents</i>	JAMES D. G. DUNN	168
4. The Paul within Judaism Perspective	MAGNUS ZETTERHOLM	171
▶ <i>Roman Catholic Perspective Response to Zetterholm</i>	BRANT PITRE	194
▶ <i>Traditional Protestant Perspective Response to Zetterholm</i>	A. ANDREW DAS	201
▶ <i>New Perspective Response to Zetterholm</i>	JAMES D. G. DUNN	207
▶ <i>Gift Perspective Response to Zetterholm</i>	JOHN M. G. BARCLAY	210
▶ <i>Paul within Judaism Perspective Reply to the Respondents</i>	MAGNUS ZETTERHOLM	216
5. The Gift Perspective on Paul	JOHN M. G. BARCLAY	219
▶ <i>Roman Catholic Perspective Response to Barclay</i>	BRANT PITRE	237
▶ <i>Traditional Protestant Perspective Response to Barclay</i>	A. ANDREW DAS	244
▶ <i>New Perspective Response to Barclay</i>	JAMES D. G. DUNN	246
▶ <i>Paul within Judaism Perspective Response to Barclay</i>	MAGNUS ZETTERHOLM	248
▶ <i>Gift Perspective Reply to the Respondents</i>	JOHN M. G. BARCLAY	253
Afterword: Pastoral Reflections on Perspectives on Paul: Five Views		
	DENNIS EDWARDS	259
Author Index		267
Scripture Index		273
Subject Index		279

Paul in Perspective

An Overview of the Landscape More Than Forty Years after Paul and Palestinian Judaism

B. J. OROPEZA AND SCOT MCKNIGHT

More than forty years have passed since the publication of E. P. Sanders's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, a study that would revolutionize the way biblical scholars and theologians interpret Paul and the Judaism of his day.¹ Sanders worked through the “patterns of religion” in the Palestinian literature on Second Temple Judaism and in Paul’s undisputed letters.² One of his primary aims was “to destroy the view of Rabbinic Judaism which is still prevalent in much, perhaps most, New Testament scholarship.”³ Sanders’s perspective in this monograph, along with

1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977; London: SCM, 1977. For Sanders’s own description of this study, see E. P. Sanders, *Comparing Judaism and Christianity: Common Judaism, Paul, and the Inner and the Outer in Ancient Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 1–27.

2. Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, Philemon.

3. *PPJ*, xii. Prior to Sanders, some prominent forerunners included George Foot Moore, “Christian Writers on Judaism,” *HTR* 14 (1921): 197–254; Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927); C. G. Montefiore, *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays* (New York: Dutton, 1915); H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, trans. Harold Knight (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961); W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 4th ed. (1948; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980). See further examples in *PPJ*, 1–12; Preston M. Sprinkle, “The Old Perspective on the New Perspective: A Review of Some ‘Pre-Sanders’ Thinkers,” *Them* 30 (2005): 21–31; Jay E. Smith, “The New Perspective on Paul: A Select and Annotated Bibliography,” *CTR* 2 (2005): 91–111.

his follow-up book, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*,⁴ presented a different perspective than the Lutheran-Protestant interpretation of Paul and the Judaism of his time. An entire generation of scholars has been influenced by, or made its point of departure from, Sanders and the New Perspective on Paul that followed from his studies.⁵ In this introductory chapter, then, a brief “history of interpretation” is in order that covers Sanders, the New Perspective on Paul, critics of the New Perspective, and some of the major perspectives that followed.⁶

4. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

5. Of course, we are not suggesting that these are the only perspectives on Paul on the market. Our focus centers on traditions and criticisms engaging with Sanders and the New Perspective on Paul.

6. For further surveys and bibliographies, consult Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The “Lutheran” Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 101–248; Westerholm, “The ‘New Perspective’ at Twenty-Five,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 2, *The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, WUNT 2/181 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 1–38; Westerholm, “The New Perspective in Review,” *Direction* (2015): 4–15; Michael F. Bird, “Bibliography on the New Perspective on Paul,” in *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification and the New Perspective*, PBM (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2007), 196–211; Don Garlington, “The New Perspective on Paul: Two Decades On,” in *Studies in the New Perspective on Paul: Essays and Reviews* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008), 1–28 (= “The New Perspective on Paul: An Appraisal Two Decades Later,” *CTR* [2005]: 17–38); Jay E. Smith, “The New Perspective on Paul: A Select and Annotated Bibliography,” *CTR* 2 (2005): 91–111; James D. G. Dunn, “The New Perspective: Whence, What and Whither?,” in *The New Perspective on Paul*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–97; Kent L. Yinger, *The New Perspective on Paul: An Introduction* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011); Magnus Zetterholm, *Approaches to Paul: A Student’s Guide to Recent Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009); N. T. Wright, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters: Some Contemporary Debates* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015); Steven E. Enderlein, “Justification in Contemporary Debate,” in *Justification: Five Views*, ed. James K. Beilby and Paul Rhodes Eddy (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011), 53–82; Murray J. Smith, “Paul in the Twenty-First Century,” in *All Things to All Cultures: Paul among Jews, Greeks, and Romans*, ed. Mark Harding and Alanna Nobbs (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 1–33; Mark A. Chancey, foreword to *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, by E. P. Sanders, 40th anniversary ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017), xi–xxvi; Mark M. Mattison, “A Summary of the New Perspective on Paul,” *The Paul Page*, October 16, 2009, <http://www.thepaulpage.com/a-summary-of-the-new-perspective-on-paul/>; see also the bibliography on *The Paul Page*, <http://www.thepaulpage.com/new-perspective/bibliography/>. *The Paul Page* website continues to provide updates on relevant sources and links.

For earlier surveys, see Donald A. Hagner, “Paul and Judaism: Testing the New Perspective,” in Peter Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting Paul’s Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 75–105, esp. nn. 64, 79; Christian Strecker, “Paulus aus einer ‘neuen Perspektive’: der Paradigmenwechsel in der jüngeren Paulusforschung,” *KI* (1996): 3–18; A. J. Bandstra, “Paul and the Law: Some Recent Developments and an Extraordinary Book,” *CTJ* 25 (1990): 249–61; Stephen Westerholm, *Israel’s Law and the Church’s Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988); F. F. Bruce, “Paul and the Law in Recent Research,” in *Law and Religion: Essays on*

E. P. Sanders's Perspective

Sanders's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* and *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* featured a number of tenets that would become pivotal in biblical scholarship, not least his calling into question the historical integrity of much New Testament scholarship.

First, his examination of Palestinian Second Temple Judaism, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Tannaitic literature led him to conclude that the Judaism of Paul's day was not typified by work-righteousness or legalism; it did not seek to secure divine approval by human merit.⁷ Contrary to what Lutheran-Protestant scholars had assumed, ancient Judaism was a religion of grace.⁸ The Jews held to what Sanders called *covenantal nomism*: "Briefly put, covenantal nomism is the view that one's place in God's plan is established on the basis of the covenant and that the covenant requires as the proper response of man his obedience to its commandments, while providing means of atonement for transgression."⁹ A covenant relationship with God and adherence to Mosaic law were central to understanding rewards and punishments from God. For

the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity, ed. Barnabas Lindars (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988), 115–25; Douglas J. Moo, "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years," *SJT* 40 (1987): 287–307; John M. G. Barclay, "Paul and the Law: Observations on Some Recent Debates," *Them* 12 (1986): 5–15. Some basic overviews (some amiable, some not) can be found in James E. Allman, "Gaining Perspective on the New Perspective on Paul," *BSac* 170 (2013): 51–68; Solomon H. F. Wong, "Paul Revisited: New Perspective on Paul," *TL* 32 (2009): 145–80; Douglas C. Bozung, "The New Perspective: A Survey and Critique—Part I," *JMT* 9 (2005): 95–114; Michael B. Thompson, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Cambridge: Grove Books, 2002); James A. Meek, "The New Perspective on Paul: An Introduction for the Uninitiated," *ConcJ* 27 (2001): 208–33. For a systematic theological assessment, see Michael Scott Horton, *Justification*, 2 vols., NSD (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), esp. 2:17–55.

7. E.g., *PPJ*, 233–34; cf. 33.

8. E.g., *PPJ*, 543. Sanders also addresses Jewish-Hellenistic Second Temple sources in "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism," in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity; Studies in Honor of William David Davies*, ed. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs, *SJLA* 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 11–44; Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992), 262–78. Prior to *PPJ*, see Sanders, "Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison," *HTR* 66 (1973): 455–78.

9. *PPJ*, 75; cf. 180. Sanders writes, "The 'pattern' or 'structure' of covenantal nomism is this: (1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies (3) God's promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement, and God's mercy belong to the group which will be saved. An important interpretation of the first and last points is that election and ultimately salvation are considered to be by God's mercy rather than human achievement" (422).

God's elect people, the aspect of "getting in" a covenant relationship with God happened as a sheer act of grace. The people, moreover, were to keep the Torah in obedience to God, which constituted their "staying in" that covenant relationship.¹⁰ Works are thus the condition of staying in, "*but they do not earn salvation.*"¹¹ For Sanders, then, Israel's salvation is by grace, and judgment is according to works.

Second, when Paul became a Christ-follower, his experience led him from solution to plight. He started with God's redemption in Christ (solution) and then attempted to explain why humans were in need of salvation (plight).¹² This makes it unlikely that what is at stake with the Torah for Paul is that it is impossible to obey or that it leads to self-righteousness.¹³ The issue that Paul faces is how gentiles could be on equal footing with Jews rather than being second-class citizens.¹⁴ Prior to Sanders, Krister Stendahl came to a similar conclusion after arguing that a troubled conscience, exemplified by Luther and Western sentiments, was not Paul's struggle. As a Pharisee, Paul could claim to have confidence in his status and considered himself "blameless" regarding righteousness in the Torah (Phil. 3:4–6).¹⁵

Third, for Sanders, when transgressions and other shortcomings took place among Torah adherents, the Torah provided its own means of expiating such violations through cultic sacrifices (e.g., Lev. 4–6; 16). This assisted in maintaining and restoring Israel's covenant relationship with God.¹⁶ Israel's atonement already provided a remedy for guilt and sin prior to Christ.

Fourth, Paul's negativity toward the Torah in his letters resulted from his conclusion that faith in Christ was the only way to salvation.¹⁷ Thus, he ob-

10. *PPJ*, 420, 543.

11. *PPJ*, 543 (emphasis original).

12. *PPJ*, 442–47, 474–76.

13. *PLJP*, 150–51.

14. *PLJP*, 153–54.

15. Krister Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," *HTR* 56 (1963): 199–215, esp. 200–206; reprinted in *Paul among Jews and Gentiles* (London: SCM, 1976), 76–96. Stendahl presented an earlier version as an address at the American Psychological Association (September 1961), a summary of which is published in *JSSR* 1 (1962): 261–63. The introduction states that "Professor Stendahl reports that a fuller statement has appeared in Swedish: 'Paulus och Samvetet,' *Svensk Exegetisk [Årsbok]*, 25 (1960)" (261). Sanders (*PPJ*, 436–37) claims that a forerunner to Stendahl is Lucien Cerfaux, *Le chrétien dans la théologie paulinienne* (Paris: Cerf, 1962); ET, *The Christian in the Theology of St. Paul*, trans. Lilian Soiron (New York: Herder & Herder, 1967), 375–76. See also Dunn, *New Perspective*, 469–90; N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, COQG 4 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 2:988–89.

16. *PPJ*, 442.

17. *PLJP*, 47; *PPJ*, 519.

jected to the law because it attempts another way of righteousness. It is not that Judaism is legalistic; rather, “*This is what Paul finds wrong in Judaism: it is not Christianity.*”¹⁸ God chose another way to save without the law; it is through faith in Jesus Christ,¹⁹ and gentiles simply “cannot live by the law.”²⁰ This either-or approach of Sanders can be seen along the axes of either apocalyptic disruption or salvation-historical fulfillment.

Fifth, whereas justification for Jews meant to live according to the Torah and so retain covenant membership, justification for Paul involves salvation through Christ. Sanders prefers to interpret the verb *δικαιῶ* (*dikaioō*) as “to righteous” rather than “to justify.” Stress is then placed not on the forensic aspect of God’s declaration of acquittal but on a person being “righteoused” by participation in Christ. The righteoused person is transferred over into the community of God’s people in Christ.²¹

Sixth, for Paul, to remain a member of God’s covenant people, God’s will is to be fulfilled not by particularisms of observing things such as Sabbath and food laws but by loving one’s neighbor.²² Here we see that Sanders maintains a “getting in” and “staying in” covenantal pattern not only for Second Temple Judaism but also for Paul.

Sanders’s perspective, though criticized on certain points, received praise as a milestone in scholarship from early reviewers such as Nils A. Dahl, Philip King, G. B. Caird, and Samuel Sandmel.²³ In more recent years, Sanders’s *Comparing Judaism and Christianity: Common Judaism, Paul, and the Inner and the Outer in Ancient Religion*²⁴ collects a number of his previous essays and unpublished papers, and his massive *Paul: The Apostle’s Life,*

18. *PPJ*, 552 (emphasis original).

19. *PPJ*, 550.

20. *PPJ*, 496.

21. Regarding a deeper explanation of what participation in Christ means, Sanders (*Paul: The Apostle’s Life, Letters, and Thought* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015], 724–25) defers to Richard B. Hays, “What Is ‘Real Participation in Christ’? A Dialogue with E. P. Sanders on Pauline Soteriology,” and Stanley K. Stowers, “What Is ‘Pauline Participation in Christ’?,” both in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh et al. (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), 336–51 and 352–71, respectively. And now see Michael J. Gorman, *Participating in Christ: Explorations in Paul’s Theology and Spirituality* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019); Gorman, *Becoming the Gospel: Paul, Participation, and Mission* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015); Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul’s Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); Gorman, *Cruciformity: Paul’s Narrative Spirituality of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

22. *PLJP*, 93–135.

23. See Chancey, foreword to *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, xiv–xv.

24. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.

Letters, and Thought covers the apostle's undisputed letters. In these works, inter alia, Sanders reaffirms and expands on his interpretation of Paul and covenantal nomism. Sanders says of *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought*, "I have summed up my views after a career as an interpreter of the apostle."²⁵ The Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) also recently dedicated a session in honor of Sanders and the fortieth anniversary of *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. The articles presented at the session were revised and reprinted in the *Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting*.²⁶ In the journal's introduction the editor-in-chief writes, "In 1977, E. P. Sanders published a book that would change the way that New Testament scholarship approached both Judaism and, in consequence, the NT texts themselves. . . . As the reader will discover on the pages that follow, this quest shows no signs of slowing down. On the contrary, it has entered a new level of intensity and strength."²⁷

The New Perspective of James D. G. Dunn and N. T. Wright

Scholars influenced by Sanders, particularly James D. G. Dunn and N. T. Wright, made their own points of departure from Sanders when it came to interpreting Paul. "The New Perspective on Paul" was minted from the title of Dunn's Manson Memorial Lecture in Manchester (November 4, 1982), which was published the year after in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*.²⁸ Dunn, however, mentions that Wright used the term earlier in his 1978 article "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith," and in the pre-Sanders era, Stendahl used the term in his famous "Introspective Conscience" article.²⁹ In any case, Dunn claims that the New Perspective

25. E. P. Sanders, "Preface to the 40th Anniversary Edition," in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (2017), xxvii–xxviii, n. 1. But as one reviewer states of this work, "Readers may wish to know what Sanders makes of the apocalyptic Paul, intertextuality, rhetorical criticism, 'empire' criticism, or even the various permutations of the 'new perspective on Paul' that Sanders himself is credited with launching. Yet none of this factors significantly in the book's discourse." Garwood Anderson, review of *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought*, by E. P. Sanders, *Int* 71 (2017): 434–36, here 435.

26. Issue 5 (2018).

27. Anders Runesson, "Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Milestone in New Testament and Early Jewish Studies," *JJMJS* 5 (2018): 1–3.

28. "The New Perspective on Paul," *BJRL* 65 (1983): 95–122; reprinted in Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990), chap. 7; and in Dunn, *New Perspective*, chap. 2.

29. N. T. Wright, "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith," *TynBul* 29 (1978): 61–88, here 64; Stendahl, "Introspective Conscience," 214; cf. Dunn, *New Perspective*, 7n24.

on Paul (NPP) is not really new at all, since it is Paul's own perspective³⁰ that highlights teachings he considered central to justification and that largely had been ignored among contemporary perceptions of Paul.³¹ Not only do Wright and Dunn disagree with Sanders's Paul, but also they do not agree with each other on various points.³² Discussions and criticisms on the NPP, then, must take into account both the similarities and differences among its authors.

Dunn in his NPP article, and again in his other publications that followed,³³ proposed that Sanders's conclusion regarding Second Temple Judaism (STJ) was correct though overstated. Contrary to Sanders, however, Dunn asserts that Paul maintained a sense of continuity with his Jewishness. Paul's language of law and justification is to be understood within the social context of his gentile mission. The central point of his letters regarding these issues was that the gospel is about salvation in Christ for all, Jews and gentiles, and the latter are not to be excluded from belonging to God's people, despite their nonobservance of Jewish customs. For Dunn, Paul's mentioning of the "works of the law" centers on boundary markers related to Jewish pride and exclusivism, such as circumcision and food laws. These markers became important in the Maccabean era during Hellenist attacks on the Jews, and as such they focused on "Israel's distinctiveness and made visible Israel's claims to be a people set apart, [and they] were the clearest points which differentiated the Jews from the nations. The law was coterminous with Judaism."³⁴ For Paul's opponents, to be elect as a Jew meant to take

30. Affirmed in the recent study by Matthew J. Thomas, *Paul's "Works of the Law" in the Perspective of Second Century Reception*, WUNT 2/468 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

31. James D. G. Dunn, "A New Perspective on the New Perspective," *EC* 4 (2013): 157–82, here 157.

32. See, e.g., James D. G. Dunn, "An Insider's Perspective on Wright's Version of the New Perspective on Paul," in *God and the Faithfulness of Paul: A Critical Examination of the Pauline Theology of N. T. Wright*, ed. Christoph Heilig, J. Thomas Hewitt, and Michael F. Bird, WUNT 2/413 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017), 347–58; N. T. Wright, foreword to *Jesus and Paul: Global Perspectives in Honor of James D. G. Dunn for His 70th Birthday*, ed. B. J. Oropeza, C. K. Robertson, and Douglas C. Mohrmann, LNTS 414 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), xv–xx. Dunn and Wright engage each other in "An Evening Conversation on Paul with James D. G. Dunn and N. T. Wright," ed. Mark M. Mattison, *The Paul Page*, October 16, 2009 (updated March 25, 2016), <http://www.thepaulpage.com/an-evening-conversation-on-paul-with-james-d-g-dunn-and-n-t-wright/>. On Wright's ambivalence about the New Perspective, see, e.g., N. T. Wright, "Communion and *Koinonia*: Pauline Reflection on Tolerance and Boundaries," in *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978–2013* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 257; Chancey, foreword to *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, xxii–xxiii.

33. A number are reprinted in Dunn, *New Perspective*.

34. Dunn, "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10–14)," *NTS* 31 (1985): 526; this essay is reprinted in Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law*, 215–41. Garlington, who

one's righteousness for granted, and the apostle comes against this attitude by proclaiming salvation by faith in Christ alone and that his gentile converts do not need to become Jewish proselytes in order to be saved. Even so, Dunn has repeatedly clarified that "works of the law" has a broader meaning than the boundary markers; this term refers to "what the law requires, the conduct prescribed by the Torah; whatever the law requires to be done can be described as 'doing' the law, as work of the law."³⁵ The clarification is important since repeated characterizations of his position wrongly limit his meaning to "boundary markers." In the context of gentile mission, when gentiles are being compelled to become Jews, however, the works of the law more specifically center on that which divides Jews from gentiles, and hence boundary markers come to the foreground.³⁶

In his monumental *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*,³⁷ Dunn, along with doing other things, reaffirms and elaborates on the New Perspective, suggesting that interpreting Paul in this light helps combat that type of racism and nationalism that has "distorted and diminished Christianity past and present."³⁸ More recently he writes that the NPP does not seek to replace the "Old Perspective" but endeavors to have all factors be included and carefully considered in Paul's theology of justification. This includes four prominent points. First, the "new perspective" on Judaism views it in terms of covenantal nomism—though with an accent on the "nomism." Second, although it emphasizes the inclusion of gentiles with Jews, Paul's gospel mission was for all who believe. Third, in the history of Christian faith, Paul initially set justification in opposition to works of the law as a result of Jewish believers requiring gentile believers to live like Jews. And fourth, the *whole* gospel should be featured in relation to Pauline soteriology, "warts and all," not just parts that do not create tensions or inconsistencies for the interpreter. Such aspects include (1) justification by faith *in* Christ (rather than Christ's faith); (2) readiness with Paul to cut through the "letter" (surface reference) of the law to the principles underlying it that determine faith's conduct; (3) attention to justification according to works, which encourages good works while warning against moral failure and holding final salvation in some sense contingent upon faithfulness; and (4) a holding

draws attention to this point, adds that such markers "became *the acid tests of one's loyalty to Judaism*." Garlington, "The New Perspective on Paul," 4 (emphasis original).

35. Dunn, *New Perspective*, 23–24; cf. 25–28.

36. See Dunn, "New Perspective on the New Perspective," 174–75.

37. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

38. Summary from Dunn, *New Perspective*, 16–17.

together of both the imagery of forensic justification and participation in Christ.³⁹

N. T. Wright generally concurs with Sanders's assessment of STJ, and he argues that Paul's problem with the Judaism that he encounters involves a social dimension. It was caught up in "national righteousness," an expression also used by Dunn; it held that "fleshly Jewish descent guarantees membership of God's true covenant people."⁴⁰ Wright describes his "Romans" moment in 1976: He was reading particularly Romans 10:3, where Paul says that his fellow Jews, not knowing God's righteousness, seek to establish their own righteousness. Wright considered that "their own righteousness" was not "in the sense of a *moral* status based on the *performance* of Torah and the consequent accumulation of a treasury of merit, but an *ethnic* status based on the *possession* of Torah as the sign of automatic covenant membership."⁴¹ He agrees with Dunn that "works of the law" identifies Jew over gentile with badges such as Sabbath, circumcision, and food laws.⁴² He also finds that justification in Paul normally appears in the context of Jew and gentile coming together and/or his criticism of Judaism.⁴³

Valuing the role that Scripture plays in Paul's thinking, Wright posits that God had established a covenant with Abraham as the proper venue to deal with evil, but Abraham's family tragically shared in the evil. Israel was to be the light of the world and deal with what is wicked, but instead of fulfilling this role to the nations, the people treated their vocation as their exclusive privilege.⁴⁴ This became for the people a sin, and Torah enticed Israel to national righteousness.⁴⁵ Hence, the Israel of Paul's day is suffering exile based on prophetic declarations, and due to their being in sin,

39. Dunn, "New Perspective on the New Perspective," 157–82. On this final aspect along with stress on the Holy Spirit, see Dunn, "The Gospel according to St. Paul," in *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*, ed. Stephen Westerholm (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014), 139–53.

40. Wright, "The Paul of History," 65. A collection of Wright's essays conveniently appears in Wright, *Pauline Perspectives*. See also *NTWrightPage*, <http://www.ntwrightpage.com>.

41. N. T. Wright, "New Perspectives on Paul," paper presented at the 10th Edinburgh Dogmatics Conference, Rutherford House, August 25–28, 2003, 1–17, here 2 (emphasis original, though the quotation was posed as a question).

42. Wright, "New Perspectives"; cf. N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 242–43; Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 132; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2:1034–35.

43. Wright, "New Perspectives," 3.

44. N. T. Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 36–37.

45. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 242–43.

they are under covenant curse (Deut. 27–30). Jewish occupation by Rome is a constant reminder of this.⁴⁶ But Jesus the Messiah is to be the people’s restorer in whom the blessing of covenant renewal takes place and extends to the nations. His death on the cross deals the final blow to sin and the curse of the people; he is their representative.⁴⁷ Christ is also to be ruler of the world, causing political implications with the Roman Empire and its imperial ideology.

For Wright, righteousness (δικαιοσύνη, *dikaioynē*) can be interpreted along the lines of covenant membership,⁴⁸ and to be justified identifies the believing person as a covenant member of God’s family, a single people of all nations inclusive of Israel. This is God’s verdict on whoever is genuinely God’s people.⁴⁹ Wright adds further that final judgment is on the basis of works, which are to be taken seriously; these works are things showing that one is “in Christ” and obedient to the Spirit’s leading.⁵⁰ Justification by faith, then, is courtroom language of the “*anticipation in the present* of the justification which will occur in the future,”⁵¹ on the ground of “the entirety of the life led.”⁵² Wright clarifies:

Justification is not “how someone becomes a Christian.” It is God’s declaration about the person who has just become a Christian. And, just as the final declaration will consist, not of words so much as of an event, namely the resurrection of the person concerned into a glorious body like that of the risen Jesus, so the present declaration consists, not so much of words, though words there may be, but of an event, the event in which one dies with the Messiah and rises to new life with him, anticipating that final resurrection. In other words, baptism.⁵³

46. See, e.g., Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 1:150; 2:1036, 1165; cf. 1:139–63; Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 141.

47. See, e.g., Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 141, 154; cf. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said*, 51; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2:943–44, 999–1000.

48. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 203. “Righteousness of God” is understood by Wright as “God’s covenant faithfulness” (“New Perspectives,” 5). See also Wright, *Justification: God’s Plan and Paul’s Vision* (London: SPCK, 2009), 116, 133–34.

49. Wright, *Justification*, 116, 121; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2:960–61. On Rom. 4:3–5 interpreted along this line, see N. T. Wright, “Paul and the Patriarch: The Role of Abraham in Romans 4,” *JSNT* 35 (2013): 207–41.

50. Indeed, justification is grounded in Christ; see N. T. Wright, “Justification: Yesterday, Today, Forever,” *JETS* 54 (2011): 49–63, here 62.

51. Wright, “New Perspectives,” 9–10 (emphasis original); further, Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2:1030–32.

52. Dunn and Wright, “An Evening Conversation,” 4; similarly, Wright, *Justification*, 251; Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective*, 57.

53. Wright, “New Perspectives,” 14.

In response to assumptions that Wright considers works as the basis (rather than evidence) of salvation and thus makes “faith alone” questionable,⁵⁴ Wright insists that his view is in accord with traditional Protestant Reformed theology.⁵⁵ He also clarifies that how a person is saved or justified should not be polarized against how Jews and gentiles may come together without necessity of the latter being circumcised. Likewise, there is both juridical and participatory (“in Christ”) language in Paul.⁵⁶

Some common tenets generally shared by New Perspective scholars are as follows.⁵⁷ First, there is sensitivity toward Judaism and how it is to be perceived by Christians. Second, STJ is generally perceived not in terms of legalism but in terms of grace, election, and covenantal nomism. Third, the pre-Damascus Paul had problems with pride and privilege rather than inner struggles with guilt and sin. Fourth, the social dimension of Paul’s mission to the gentiles is featured. Fifth, whereas distinctive practices such as circumcision demarcated STJ, Paul rejected such particularisms for his gentile churches in favor of righteousness, faith, love, and obedience. Sixth, there is interest in highlighting righteousness related to participation in Christ. Seventh, New Perspective scholars insist that interpretations based on biblical and ancient historical examination carry more weight than traditional and theological dogmas when it comes to interpreting Paul. In addition, six benefits related to studying the NPP are worth repeating:⁵⁸ (1) a better understanding of Paul’s Letters; (2) avoidance of individualistic Western perception; (3) reduction of anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism; (4) more continuity between Old Testament and New Testament; (5) more continuity between Jesus and Paul; (6) more continuity between Roman Catholics and Protestants over justification.

54. E.g., John Piper, *The Future of Justification: A Response to N. T. Wright* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2007); see further Alan P. Stanley, introduction to *Four Views on the Role of Works at the Final Judgment*, by Robert N. Wilkin et al., ed. Alan P. Stanley (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013), 9–24, here 20; also discussion in Michael F. Bird, “What Is There between Minneapolis and St. Andrews? A Third Way in the Piper-Wright Debate,” *JETS* 54 (2011): 299–309.

55. Wright, *Justification*; Wright, “Justification”; see further Stanley, introduction to *Four Views on the Role of Works*, 20–23.

56. Dunn and Wright, “An Evening Conversation,” 7; cf. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2:1038–39.

57. Different and overlapping lists are also given in Brendan Byrne, “Interpreting Romans Theologically in a Post-‘New Perspective’ Perspective,” *HTR* 94 (2001): 227–41, here 228–29; Byrne, “Interpreting Romans: The New Perspective and Beyond,” *Int* 58 (2004): 241–51, here 245–47.

58. On these benefits, see Yinger, *New Perspective*, 87–93.

Responses to the New Perspective: Positive and Negative

A complete survey of supporters and works sympathetic toward the New Perspective is beyond the scope of this study.⁵⁹ Even so, three influential scholars are worth mentioning in this category. Terence L. Donaldson, who agrees with Sanders's covenantal nomism, advances studies on the gentiles and Paul's core convictions that provide the framework for his thinking.⁶⁰ Don Garlington stresses the obedience of faith and the importance of perseverance for followers of Christ needed during the "now and not yet" interim of justification and final judgment.⁶¹ Kent Yinger focuses on the importance of final judgment in relation to justification, and he addresses the issues of Jewish legalism and synergism as factors in the debate between Old and New Perspectives.⁶² Such studies represent a continued interest in scholarship over issues related to Paul and the gentile problem,⁶³ and covenant nomism and the pattern of "getting in" and "staying in" in light of

59. For supporters, see, e.g., scholars mentioned in Westerholm, "The 'New Perspective' at Twenty-Five," 13–17; on *The Paul Page*, see "Bibliography," <http://www.thepaulpage.com/new-perspective/bibliography/>; "From the New Perspective," <http://www.thepaulpage.com/new-perspective/around-the-web/articles-from-the-new-perspective/>. On recent ethical, ethnic, and gender studies related to the NPP, see, e.g., Scot McKnight and Joseph B. Modica, eds. *The Apostle Paul and the Christian Life: Ethical and Missional Implications of the New Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016); Jens-Christian Maschmeier, "Justification and Ethics: Theological Consequences of a New Perspective on Paul," *TR* 38 (2017): 35–53; Maschmeier, *Rechtfertigung bei Paulus: Eine Kritik alter und neuer Paulusperspektiven*, BWANT 189 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010); Kobus Kok, "The New Perspective on Paul and Its Implication for Ethics and Mission," *APB* 21 (2010): 3–17; Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, "Die Darstellung und Begründung der Ethik des Apostels Paulus in der *new perspective*," in *Jenseits von Indikativ und Imperativ*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Horn and Ruben Zimmermann, *KNNE* 1, *WUNT* 238 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 213–31; Tet-Lim N. Yee, *Jews, Gentiles, and Ethnic Reconciliation: Paul's Jewish Identity and Ephesians*, SNTSMS 130 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Kathy Ehrensperger, *That We May Be Mutually Encouraged: Feminism and the New Perspective in Pauline Studies* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

60. Terence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997). More recently, see Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007); Donaldson, "'Gentile Christianity' as a Category in the Study of Christian Origins," *HTR* 106 (2013): 433–58.

61. Don Garlington, "*The Obedience of Faith*": A Pauline Phrase in Historical Context, *WUNT* 2/38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991); Garlington, *Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance: Aspects of Paul's Letter to the Romans*, *WUNT* 79 (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1994); Garlington, *Studies in the New Perspective*.

62. Kent L. Yinger, *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds*, SNTSMS 105 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Yinger, "The Continuing Quest for Jewish Legalism," *BBR* 19 (2009): 375–91; Yinger, "Reformation Redivivus: Synergism and the New Perspective," *JTI* 3 (2009): 89–106; Yinger, *New Perspective*.

63. See, e.g., our discussion of Paul within Judaism below.

tensions between divine and human agencies,⁶⁴ perseverance and apostasy,⁶⁵ justification and final judgment.⁶⁶

Nevertheless, the NPP has gained many critics over the years.⁶⁷ Critics frequently come from traditional Protestant backgrounds that place emphasis on

64. E.g., John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, eds., *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, LNTS 335 (London: T&T Clark, 2007); Preston M. Sprinkle, *Paul and Judaism Revisited: A Study of Divine and Human Agency in Salvation* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013); Kyle B. Wells, *Grace and Agency in Paul and Second Temple Judaism: Interpreting the Transformation of the Heart*, NovTSup 157 (Leiden: Brill, 2015); Jason Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul: A Comparative Study*, WUNT 2/297 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Yinger, “Reformation Redivivus”; Paul A. Rainbow, *The Way of Salvation: The Role of Christian Obedience in Justification*, PBM (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005).

65. E.g., B. J. Oropeza, *Jews, Gentiles, and the Opponents of Paul: The Pauline Letters*, vol. 2 of *Apostasy in the New Testament Communities* (Eugene, OR: Cascade; Wipf & Stock, 2012); Oropeza, *Paul and Apostasy: Eschatology, Perseverance, and Falling Away in the Corinthian Congregation*, WUNT 2/115 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007); Judith M. Gundry Volf, *Paul and Perseverance: Staying In and Falling Away*, WUNT 2/37 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991); Andrew Wilson, *The Warning-Assurance Relationship in 1 Corinthians*, WUNT 2/452 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

66. Chris VanLandingham, *Judgment and Justification in Early Judaism and the Apostle Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006); Wilkin et al., *Four Views on the Role of Works*; Oropeza, *Jews, Gentiles, and the Opponents of Paul*; Christian Stettler, *Das Endgericht bei Paulus: Frame-semantische und exegetische Studien zur paulinischen Eschatologie und Soterologie*, WUNT 371 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017); Stettler, “Paul, the Law and Judgment by Works,” *EvQ* 76 (2004): 195–215; James B. Prothro, *Both Judge and Justifier: Biblical Legal Language and the Act of Justifying in Paul*, WUNT 2/461 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018); Kyoung-Shik Kim, *God Will Judge Each One according to Works: Judgment according to Works and Psalm 62 in Early Judaism and the New Testament*, BZNTW 178 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010); John M. G. Barclay, “Believers and the ‘Last Judgment’ in Paul: Rethinking Grace and Recompense,” in *Eschatologie—Eschatology: The Sixth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium; Eschatology in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism, and Early Christianity (Tübingen, September 2009)*, ed. Hans-Joachim Eckstein, Christof Landmesser, and Hermann Lichtenberger, WUNT 272 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 195–208; Dane C. Ortlund “Justified by Faith, Judged according to Works: Another Look at a Pauline Paradox,” *JETS* 52 (2009): 323–39.

67. For a sampling (some more polemical than others), see Gitte Buch-Hansen, “Beyond the New Perspective: Reclaiming Paul’s Anthropology,” *ST* 71 (2017): 4–28; Yongbom Lee, “Getting In and Staying In: Another Look at 4QMMT and Galatians,” *EvQ* 88 (2016/17): 126–42; Charles Lee Irons, *The Righteousness of God: A Lexical Examination of the Covenant-Faithfulness Interpretation*, WUNT 2/386 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015); Jordan Cooper, *The Righteousness of One: An Evaluation of Early Patristic Soteriology in Light of the New Perspective on Paul* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2013); Michael Morson, “Reformed, Lutheran, and ‘New Perspective’: A Dialogue between Traditions Regarding the Interpretation of ‘Works of the Law’ in Galatians,” *CanTR* 1 (2012): 61–67; Andrew Hassler, “Ethnocentric Legalism and the Justification of the Individual: Rethinking Some New Perspective Assumptions,” *JETS* 54 (2011): 311–27; Mark Seifrid, “The Near Word of Christ and the Distant Vision of N. T. Wright,” *JETS* 54 (2011): 279–97; Thomas R. Schreiner, “An Old Perspective on the New Perspective,” *Concj* 35 (2009): 140–55; Gerhard H. Visscher, *Romans 4 and the New Perspective on Paul: Faith Embraces the Promise*, SBL 122 (New

justification by grace through faith and the inability to secure divine approval by human merit or submission to divine law.⁶⁸ There are three prominent categories of these responses.

York: Peter Lang, 2009); Cornelis P. Venema, *The Gospel of Free Acceptance in Christ: An Assessment of the Reformation and New Perspectives on Paul* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2006); Peter T. O'Brien, "Was Paul a Covenant Nomist?," in Carson, O'Brien, and Seifrid, *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, 2:249–96; Donald Macleod, "The New Perspective: Paul, Luther and Judaism," *SBET* 22 (2004): 4–31; Paul F. M. Zahl, "Mistakes of the New Perspective on Paul," *Them* 27 (2001): 5–11; Friedrich Avemarie, "Die Werke des Gesetzes im Spiegel des Jakobusbriefs: A Very Old Perspective on Paul," *ZTK* 98 (2001): 282–309; David Abernathy, "A Critique of James D. G. Dunn's View of Justification by Faith as Opposed to the 'Works of the Law,'" *LTI* 35 (2001): 139–44; R. Barry Matlock, "Almost Cultural Studies? Reflections on the 'New Perspective' on Paul," in *Biblical Studies / Cultural Studies: The Third Sheffield Colloquium*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum and Stephen D. Moore, JSOTSup 266 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 433–59; Timo Eskola, "Paul, Predestination and 'Covenantal Nomism': Re-Assessing Paul and Palestinian Judaism," *JSJ* 28 (1997): 390–412; Michael Bachmann, "Rechtfertigung und Gesetzeswerke bei Paulus," *TZ* 49 (1993): 1–33; C. E. B. Cranfield, "'The Works of the Law' in the Epistle to the Romans," *JSNT* 43 (1991): 89–101; Moisés Silva, "The Law and Christianity: Dunn's New Synthesis," *WTJ* 53 (1991): 339–53; Robert H. Gundry, "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul," *Bib* 66 (1985): 1–38; John M. Espy, "Paul's 'Robust Conscience' Re-Examined," *NTS* 31 (1985): 161–88. In addition, we counted 139 critiques from *Monergism* (www.monergism.com). In 2011, Yinger (*New Perspective*, 39) counted 108.

68. See, e.g., Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 408–45; cf. 88–97; more specifically on justification, Westerholm, *Justification Reconsidered: Rethinking a Pauline Theme* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013). For recent responses from Lutheran sources, see, e.g., Stephen J. Hultgren, "The 'New Perspective on Paul': Exegetical Problems and Historical-Theological Questions," *LTI* 50 (2016): 70–86; Michael Bachmann, "Lutherische oder Neue Paulusperspektive? Merkwürdigkeiten bei der Wahrnehmung der betreffende exegetischen Diskussionen," *BZ* 60 (2016): 73–101; Bachmann, ed., *Lutherische und neue Paulusperspektive: Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion*, WUNT 182 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Timothy J. Wengert, "The 'New' Perspective on Paul at the 2012 Luther Congress in Helsinki," *LQ* 27 (2013): 89–91; Jens Schröter, "'The New Perspective on Paul'—eine Anfrage an die lutherische Paulusdeutung?," *Lutherjahrbuch* 80 (2013): 142–58; Notger Slenczka, "Die neue Paulusperspektive und die Lutherische Theologie," *Lutherjahrbuch* 80 (2013): 184–96; David C. Ratke, ed., *The New Perspective on Paul* (Minneapolis: Lutheran University Press, 2012); Erik M. Heen, "A Lutheran Response to the New Perspective on Paul," *LQ* 24 (2010): 263–91.

For responses from other churches/denominations (whether constructive, critical, or polemical), see, e.g., Lekkantshi C. Tleane, "N. T. Wright's New Perspective on Paul: What Implications for Anglican Doctrine?," *HTSTS* 74 (2018): 1–9; Athanasios Despotis, ed., *Participation, Justification, and Conversion: Eastern Orthodox Interpretation of Paul and the Debate between "Old and New Perspectives on Paul"*, WUNT 2/442 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017); Despotis, *Die "New Perspective on Paul" und die griechisch-orthodoxe Paulusinterpretation*, VIOT 11 (St. Ottilien: EOS-Verlag, 2014); Tara Beth Leach, "A Symphonic Melody: Wesleyan-Holiness Theology Meets New-Perspective Paul," in *The Apostle Paul and the Christian Life: Ethical and Missional Implications of the New Perspective*, ed. Scot McKnight and Joseph B. Modica (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 153–78; Sungkook Jung, "The New Perspective on Paul and Korean Evangelical Responses: Assessment and Suggestions," *JAET* 19 (2015): 21–41; Thomas D. Stegman, "Paul's Use of *dikaio*- Terminology: Moving beyond N. T. Wright's Forensic Interpretation," *TS* 72 (2011): 496–524; S. M. Baugh, "The New Perspective, Mediation,

First, there are criticisms related to Sanders's interpretation of Second Temple Judaism.⁶⁹ Contrary to Sanders's tendency for the nationalistic election and salvation of Israel, Mark Adam Elliott argues from STJ, minus rabbinic literature, that the sources often provide evidence only for a remnant of Israel being saved.⁷⁰ Simon J. Gathercole takes issue with Sanders's lack of focusing on *final* vindication when STJ sources bear out the importance of obedience as the condition and ground for Jewish confidence at final judgment. Romans 1–5 is then said to criticize a soteriology related to keeping the law to be saved at the eschaton.⁷¹ Chris VanLandingham contests Sanders's connection between grace and election for STJ. What is evident in these sources is “reward for obedience to God's will, not the unmerited gift of God's grace.”⁷² The two-volume compilation edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, *Justification and Variegated Nomism*,⁷³ is perhaps the most ambitious response of this sort. The contributors in volume 1 set out to examine STJ to assess whether various texts teach covenant nomism as Sanders proposes. Volume 1 assesses various theological aspects relevant to the NPP. The conclusion of this work asserts that STJ is more variegated than Sanders had proposed. Although several of the contributors found covenant nomism to be a useful category for the sources they examined, the conclusion of the monograph has it that Sanders is “wrong when he tries to establish that his category is right everywhere.”⁷⁴ More recently, John Barclay concedes to grace being pervasively found in STJ, though quite more diverse than Sanders proposed. For Barclay, grace is everywhere present in the literature but not everywhere the same.⁷⁵

and Justification,” in *Covenant, Justification, and Pastoral Ministry: Essays by the Faculty of Westminster Seminary California*, ed. R. Scott Clark (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2007), 137–63; Guy Prentiss Waters, *Justification and the New Perspectives on Paul: A Review and Response* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004); Theodor Stoychev, “Is There a New Perspective on St. Paul's Theology?,” *JEBS* 11 (2001): 31–50.

69. See also, e.g., Friedrich Avemarie, *Tora und Leben: Untersuchungen zur Heilsbedeutung der Tora in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur*, TSAJ 55 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996); A. Andrew Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 1–69; Das, “Paul and Works of Obedience in Second Temple Judaism: Romans 4:4–5 as a ‘New Perspective’ Case Study,” *CBQ* 71 (2009): 795–812; Sigurd Grindheim, *The Crux of Election: Paul's Critique of the Jewish Confidence in the Election of Israel*, WUNT 2/202 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Charles L. Quarles, “The New Perspective and Means of Atonement in Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period,” *CTR* 2 (2005): 39–56.

70. Mark Adam Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

71. Simon J. Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 33, 90, 159, 194, 214–15.

72. VanLandingham, *Judgment and Justification*, 333.

73. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001, 2004.

74. D. A. Carson, “Conclusion,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, 2:543.

75. John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), e.g., 319.

Second, a number of critiques focus on the New Perspective's interpretation of Paul's Letters. Stephen Westerholm categorizes scholarly criticisms into five groups.⁷⁶ One group of interpreters argues that Paul's own view is contradictory or distorts Jewish evidence.⁷⁷ Another set believes that Paul's view may be compatible with certain Jewish traditions, and both Paul and these traditions determine that other Jews did not live up to covenant requirement for righteousness.⁷⁸ Others argue that Christ's atonement either added reality behind Judaic atonement or invalidated it.⁷⁹ Others emphasize anthropological pessimism; humans who are not transformed are simply too corrupt to be obedient and contribute to salvation.⁸⁰ A final group believes that "Paul found it important *in principle* that human beings rely exclusively on divine goodness for all their needs—and he deemed Judaism, in its reliance on 'works,' to have departed from this principle."⁸¹ Westerholm himself argues that righteousness in Paul is not primarily about covenant language; righteousness by faith is about what sinners lack and what is unmerited. Romans 4:4–6 and 5:7–9, for example, cannot be about what humans have done; what they have done is sinned, and transgression brings about curse, since none can obey all that is written in the law. Paul insists that humans "are sinners who do not, and cannot, do the good that the law demands of its subjects."⁸² As such, Paul "based his case not on the impracticability of imposing Jewish practices on Gentiles, nor indeed on a charge of ethnocentricity brought against the Jews who thought Gentiles ought to live as they did, but on the inability of

76. Westerholm, "The 'New Perspective' at Twenty-Five," 17–18.

77. Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 2nd ed., WUNT 29 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986); Kari Kuula, *The Law, the Covenant, and God's Plan*, vol. 2, *Paul's Polemical Treatment of the Law in Galatians*, PFES 85 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).

78. Frank Thielman, *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans*, NTS 41 (Leiden: Brill, 1989); Timo Eskola, *Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology*, WUNT 2/100 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

79. Thomas R. Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law* (Grand Rapids Baker, 1993); Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*. But technically, Das opts for a "newer" perspective (see below, his essay "The Traditional Protestant Perspective on Paul"), which arguably can place him among proponents of the more recent trend below.

80. E.g., Mark A. Seifrid, *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme*, NovTSup 68 (Leiden: Brill, 1992); Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Justification* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000); Peter Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001); Timo Laato, *Paul and Judaism: An Anthropological Approach*, trans. T. McElwain, SFSHJ 15 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

81. Westerholm, "The 'New Perspective' at Twenty-Five," 18 (emphasis original). See, e.g., Seyoon Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

82. Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 444; similarly 333.

the law to cope with human sin.”⁸³ Gentiles and Jews “are declared righteous by faith in Jesus Christ *apart from* the law (cf. Gal. 2:21; 5:4; Rom. 3:1) and its works (Gal. 2:16; Rom. 3:20, 28).”⁸⁴ Even so, Westerholm concedes with the NPP that ancient Judaism on its own terms did not seem to “promote a self-righteous pursuit of salvation by works,”⁸⁵ and he affirms that the NPP has made an important contribution to Pauline studies.⁸⁶

A third manner of critique involves monographs or journals in which other scholars evaluate NPP topics or a work by a NPP proponent, who then responds.⁸⁷ The monograph *God and the Faithfulness of Paul: A Critical Examination of the Pauline Theology of N. T. Wright*⁸⁸ assesses Wright’s tome *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. In the final chapter of the critique Wright responds to the contributors. Similarly, various scholars assess Wright’s view of Israel remaining in exile in *Exile: A Conversation with N. T. Wright*.⁸⁹ Wright contributes two chapters to the volume, the second one a response. Similarly, various essays in German or English assess the NPP in *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive* (Lutheran and new Pauline perspective).⁹⁰ James Dunn responds in the final chapter. In the *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* Barry Matlock and Douglas Campbell write critiques of Dunn’s *Theology of the Apostle Paul*, and Dunn responds.⁹¹ A common misconception about the NPP is that it is attempting to overthrow Lutheran, Reformed, or Reformation theology. Both Wright and Dunn deny this.⁹² Rather, as biblical scholars, they endeavor to refine Paul’s theology through the rigors of their discipline rather than simply adhere to dogmas that may not be properly sustainable in Paul’s Letters.

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

84. Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 442 (emphasis original).

85. Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 444.

86. Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 445.

87. Apart from the main text, other important NPP responses to critics include Dunn, *New Perspective*, esp. 1–97; Garlington, *Studies in the New Perspective*; Yinger, *New Perspective*, 47–80. For various contributor viewpoints (both for and against the NPP), see James D. G. Dunn, ed., *Paul and the Mosaic Law*, WUNT 89 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996); Wilkin et al., *Four Views on the Role of Works*; Beilby and Eddy, *Justification: Five Views*.

88. Christopher Heilig, J. Thomas Hewitt, and Michael F. Bird, eds., WUNT 2/413 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017).

89. James M. Scott, ed. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017). See also Wright’s interaction with various contributors in Nicholas Perrin and Richard B. Hays, eds. *Jesus, Paul and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N. T. Wright* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011).

90. Michael Bachmann, ed., subtitled *Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion*, WUNT 182 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

91. *JSNT* 21 (1998): 67–90 (Matlock); 91–111 (Campbell); 113–20 (Dunn).

92. See, e.g., Wright, *Justification*; Dunn, *New Perspective*, 18–23; Dunn and Wright, “An Evening Conversation,” 2. Further questions about the NPP are recently answered by various scholars in “The New Perspective on Paul,” *Overthinking Christian*, www.overthinkingchristian.com/?s=new+perspective.

In an overlooked rapprochement, Dunn and Westerholm wrote back-to-back essays commending each other's viewpoints, entitled, respectively, "What's Right about the Old Perspective on Paul" and "What's Right about the New Perspective on Paul."⁹³ For Dunn, Luther's rediscovering of the saving righteousness of God, his reasserting of faith's essential role in human-divine relationships, and his emphasis that humans cannot achieve that relationship with God on their own efforts are among positive "Old Perspective" features. For Westerholm, the importance of grace in Judaism, emphasis on the social setting of Jew/gentile relationships, and sensitivity regarding the practical implications of justification, such as with class, gender, and ethnicity, are among the positive NPP features.

Post-New Perspectives

While NPP advocates and critics remain, its influence presses other scholars to reconceptualize relevant Pauline texts and make their own points of departure or rapprochement. This more recent development has been identified as "post-new perspective" or "beyond new perspective."⁹⁴ We now turn to some significant examples.

The "Paul within Judaism Perspective," also called the "radical" new perspective on Paul,⁹⁵ is promoted by scholars such as Mark Nanos,⁹⁶ Paula

93. In *Studies in the Pauline Epistles: Essays in Honor of Douglas J. Moo*, ed. Matthew S. Harmon and Jay E. Smith (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 214–29 (Dunn); 230–42 (Westerholm).

94. The term is used by, e.g., Garlington, *Studies in the New Perspective*, 1; Byrne, "Interpreting Romans Theologically in a Post-'New Perspective' Perspective"; Michael F. Bird, "When the Dust Finally Settles: Reaching a Post-New Perspective," *CTR* 2 (2005): 57–69, though the latter two change their terminology in later publications to "beyond new perspective": Byrne, "Interpreting Romans: The New Perspective and Beyond"; Bird, *Saving Righteousness*, chap. 5, "When the Dust Finally Settles: Beyond the New Perspective."

95. Mark D. Nanos, introduction to *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, ed. Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 1–29, here 1; Pamela Eisenbaum, "Paul, Polemics, and the Problem with Essentialism," *BibInt* 13 (2005): 224–38, here 232–33. For surveys, see Daniel R. Langton, *The Apostle Paul in the Jewish Imagination: A Study in Modern Jewish-Christian Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Langton, "The Myth of the 'Traditional View of Paul' and the Role of the Apostle in Modern Jewish-Christian Polemics," *JSNT* 28 (2005): 69–104; Kathy Ehrensperger, "The New Perspective and Beyond," in *Modern Interpretations of Romans: Tracking Their Hermeneutical/Theological Trajectory*, ed. Daniel Patte and Christina Grenholm, RHCS 10 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 191–219; Philip La Grange Du Toit, "The Radical New Perspective on Paul, Messianic," *HTSTS* 73 (2013): 1–8; Zetterholm, *Approaches to Paul*, 127–64; Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle, "Jewish Interpretation of Paul in the Last Thirty Years," *CBR* 6 (2008): 355–76.

96. Mark Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996); Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*

Fredriksen,⁹⁷ Pamela Eisenbaum,⁹⁸ Matthew Thiessen,⁹⁹ Magnus Zetterholm,¹⁰⁰ and others.¹⁰¹ Although not uniform in all of their beliefs, supporters generally maintain that Paul always considered himself a Jew and never left Judaism or its practices after encountering Jesus as the Messiah. Paul started a reformed movement or Jewish sect within Judaism, and he was not a law-free apostle. His teachings are directed at non-Jewish followers of Christ, whom he instructs to live in consistency with Judaism, and yet he respects their identity as non-Jews. Although this perspective affirms its indebtedness to Sanders, Dunn, and Stendahl—and it rejects caricatures of Judaism as a religion of works righteousness—it does not consider itself to be “*within* the New Perspective paradigm or in reaction *against* it,” but it endeavors to place Paul “within his most probable first-century context, Judaism,” before having him converse with other contexts or interpretations.¹⁰² “Paul within Judaism” disagrees with the NPP, for instance, when the latter claims that Paul found “something wrong with and in Judaism itself, something essentially different from Paul’s ‘Christianity’ (however labeled);” it also rejects the NPP notion

(Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002); and now the multivolume set subtitled *Collected Essays of Mark Nanos* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017–18).

97. Paula Fredriksen, *Paul: The Pagans’ Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017); Fredriksen, “How Jewish Is God? Divine Ethnicity in Paul’s Theology,” *JBL* 137 (2018): 193–212.

98. Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009); Eisenbaum, “Jewish Perspectives: A Jewish Apostle to the Gentiles,” in *Studying Paul’s Letters: Contemporary Perspectives and Methods*, ed. Joseph A. Marchal (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 135–53.

99. Matthew Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); Thiessen, “Conjuring Paul and Judaism Forty Years after *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*,” *JJMJS* 5 (2018): 6–20. See also Rafael Rodríguez and Matthew Thiessen, eds., *The So-Called Jew in Paul’s Letter to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016).

100. Magnus Zetterholm, “Paul within Judaism: The State of the Questions,” in Nanos and Zetterholm, *Paul within Judaism*, 31–51; Magnus Zetterholm, “‘Will the Real Gentile-Christian Please Stand Up!’ Torah and the Crisis of Identity Formation,” in *The Making of Christianity: Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions; Essays in Honor of Bengt Holmberg*, ed. Magnus Zetterholm and Samuel Byrskog, ConBNT 47 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 391–411; Zetterholm, “Jews, Christians, and Gentiles: Rethinking the Categorization within the Early Jesus Movement,” in *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation; Essays in Honour of William S. Campbell*, ed. Kathy Ehrensperger and J. Brian Tucker, LNTS 428 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2010), 242–54.

101. Fredriksen (*Paul: The Pagans’ Apostle*, 177) adds recently Gabriele Boccaccini and Carlos Segovia, eds., *Paul the Jew: Reading the Apostle as a Figure of Second Temple Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016); John G. Gager, *Who Made Early Christianity? The Jewish Lives of the Apostle Paul* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015); Joshua Garroway, *Paul’s Gentile-Jews: Neither Jew nor Gentile, but Both* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); J. Albert Harrill, *Paul the Apostle: His Life and Legacy in Their Roman Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

102. Nanos, introduction to *Paul within Judaism*, 2, 6 (emphasis original).

of Paul finding Judaism wrong with regard to ethnocentrism, nationalism, and related terms.¹⁰³ An apocalyptic motivation may be viewed behind Paul's urgency for gentiles against the law.¹⁰⁴

If Paul within Judaism moves further away from traditional Protestantism than the NPP, another trend moves in the opposite direction by holding to a *via media* between the Old and New Perspectives on Paul. Bruce Longenecker reflects this position when writing that Lutheran and NPP advocates "make claims which suggest that if one approach has merit, the other does not. . . . However, there is good reason to think that the situation may not be so clear cut, and that the 'either-or' that marks out current polemic in Pauline scholarship might best be laid to rest."¹⁰⁵ He agrees with the NPP that the Galatian concern is centered not on meriting salvation through works but on community identity: "To be excluded was a form of ethnocentrism rather than self-righteousness."¹⁰⁶ He also agrees with the Traditional Protestant Perspective, for example, when Paul says that the law is not a proper way to life, "since human inability rendered it impossible to do the law perfectly, and since the law is powerless to correct that situation."¹⁰⁷ Michael Bird, in *The Saving Righteousness of God*, argues that Reformed and NPP readings of Paul provide a complementary and fuller picture of the apostle's soteriology. Bird endorses both forensic and covenantal aspects of justification, and for him "incorporated" righteousness captures justification in relation to a believer's union in Christ. More recently, Garwood Anderson's *Paul's New Perspective: Charting a Soteriological Journey* studies the disputed and undisputed Pauline letters together—and his theory depends on dating the letters of Paul—to conclude that both Old and New Perspectives are right, "but not all the time."¹⁰⁸ Paul's view developed from one that was compatible with the NPP regarding "works of the law" in his earlier letters (e.g., Galatians) to "works" as human effort in his later letters (e.g., Pastoral Letters). Stephen Chester's *Reading Paul with the Reformers: Reconciling Old and New Perspectives*¹⁰⁹ argues, inter alia, that early Reformers generally came to the same exegetical interpretation as Stendahl: the pre-Damascus Paul was *not* plagued by a guilty conscience. Such a view developed later on in the tradition. Likewise,

103. Nanos, introduction to *Paul within Judaism*, 6–7.

104. A central tenet, e.g., in Eisenbaum, "Jewish Perspectives."

105. Bruce W. Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 179; cf. Longenecker, "Lifelines: Perspectives on Paul and the Law," *Anvil* 16 (1999): 125–30.

106. Longenecker, *Abraham's God*, 180.

107. Longenecker, *Abraham's God*, 180–81.

108. Downer's Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016 (quotation, p. 5).

109. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

for Reformers, union with Christ and interest in transformation were held together with Luther's alien righteousness.¹¹⁰

Differently than both perspectives, Francis Watson's *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach*¹¹¹ originally was complimentary of the NPP and against the Lutheran view, but in a revision of this work—newly subtitled *Beyond the New Perspective*—he is also critical of the former.¹¹² Watson argues, for example, that divine agency “plays a more direct and immediate role in the Pauline ‘pattern of religion’ than in the Judaism” opposed by Paul, and works of the law are not boundary markers but a distinctive “way of life” for Jewish communities.¹¹³ Paul's antithetical statements in Romans—faith / works of law—may reflect the antithesis of the church's separation from the synagogue, and this separation helps give account for why faith in Christ is “incompatible with works of the law.”¹¹⁴ Watson still claims, against the Lutheran view, that Judaism as legalism or works righteousness is misleading, but then again, so is the NPP notion of “Judaism as a religion of grace.”¹¹⁵

Douglas Campbell's point of departure stresses an apocalyptic and participatory reading of Paul, presented most extensively in *The Deliverance of God*.¹¹⁶ Among other things, he argues that Paul typically has been misread.

110. Chester, *Reading Paul with the Reformers*, 136–37, 360–61, 368–77, 421–22. Union with Christ is another recently recognizable theological trend: e.g., Constantine R. Campbell, *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012); Grant Macaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); J. Todd Billings, *Union with Christ: Reframing Theology and Ministry for the Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011); Robert Letham, *Union with Christ: In Scripture, History, and Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2011); Michael S. Horton, *Covenant and Salvation: Union with Christ* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007). See also Michael Gorman's works, e.g., *Participating in Christ*, and notice that the NPP, especially Sanders, reflects this perception.

111. SNTSMS 56; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

112. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

113. Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles* (2007), 25.

114. Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles* (2007), 98; cf. 60.

115. Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles* (2007), 346.

116. Subtitled *An Apocalyptic Reading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); see also Campbell, “Beyond Justification in Paul: The Thesis of the Deliverance of God,” *SJT* 65 (2012): 90–104; Campbell, “An Apocalyptic Rereading of ‘Justification’ in Paul,” *ExpTim* 123 (2012): 182–93; Campbell, “Christ and the Church: A ‘Post-New Perspective’ Account,” in *Four Views on the Apostle Paul*, ed. Michael F. Bird (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012); and Campbell's responses in Chris Tilling, ed., *Beyond Old and New Perspectives on Paul: Reflections on the Work of Douglas Campbell* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2014). Prior to *The Deliverance of God*, see Campbell, *The Quest for Paul's Gospel: A Suggested Strategy*, JSNTSup 274 (London: T&T Clark, 2005). Reading Paul apocalyptically, as advanced in the last century by scholars such as Ernst Käsemann, J. Christiaan Beker, J. Louis Martyn, and Martinus de Boer, remains

This misreading, which Campbell associates with “Justification theory,” focuses on retributive justification, a contractual mode of salvation, and conditional human faith rather than a liberating justification, unconditionality, and the faithfulness of Christ. For Campbell, Romans 1:17, citing Habakkuk 2:4, is not to be understood as “The righteous shall live by faith,” but rather, “The Righteous One [Messiah = Jesus] by faithfulness shall live,” intimating the resurrection of Christ, Christ’s eschatological centrality in salvation, and his faithfulness as the means to the deliverance of God. The following passages in Romans 1–4 are said to characterize “Justification theory,” and as such, they reflect mostly the beliefs of Paul’s opponents, representative of a Jewish Christian “Teacher.” In Campbell’s view, Paul uses speech-in-character (*prosopopoeia*) here so that, for example, Romans 1:18–32 reflects the Teacher’s words, which Paul contests beginning in 2:1, and the Teacher then responds to Paul, and an exchange continues from there. Paul’s own view stands out prominently in Romans 5–8, which, inter alia, highlights a Triune God known through the act of redemption.

Finally, newly called “the Gift Perspective” for the present volume (see chapter 5), John Barclay presents his own view distilled from his recent work *Paul and the Gift*.¹¹⁷ In that study, which has already sparked much discussion,¹¹⁸ Barclay agrees with the NPP when it comes to the context of Paul’s theology of justification grounded in gentile mission and “the constructions of communities that crossed ethnic (as well as social) boundaries.”¹¹⁹ At the same time, Barclay parts company with the NPP by locating the root of Paul’s theology in the incongruous grace of the “Christ-gift that shapes his appeals to the Abrahamic promises, to the experience of the Spirit, and to the oneness of God”; in relation to the gentile mission it “demolishes old criteria of worth and clears space for innovative communities that inaugurate new patterns of social existence.”¹²⁰ Barclay concludes that his reading harmonizes with neither Augustinian-Lutheran tradition nor NPP, but reshapes both.¹²¹

an important point of view in the new millennium: e.g., Joshua B. Davis and Douglas Harink, eds., *Apocalyptic and the Future of Theology: With and beyond J. Louis Martyn* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2012); Beverly Roberts Gaventa, ed., *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5–8* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013); Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston, eds., *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016).

117. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

118. See, e.g., article reviews by Joel Marcus and Margaret Mitchell, and Barclay’s response, in *JNT* 39, no. 3 (2017). The entire issue of *EvQ* 89, no. 4 (2018), is also dedicated to Barclay’s view.

119. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 572.

120. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 572.

121. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 573.

Perspectives on Paul

We now present *Perspectives on Paul: Five Views*, which incorporates some of the most influential perspectives above. Five well-recognized scholars present their respective positions. Since the New Perspective responded to the “Old Perspective”—the traditional Protestant perspective influenced by Luther and other Reformers—and Luther, in turn, made his point of departure from Roman Catholicism, it is important for us to include these perspectives in the current discussion. Our first contributor, Brant Pitre, presents the Roman Catholic Perspective on Paul. Our second contributor, A. Andrew Das, presents the Protestant Perspective. Then James D. G. Dunn presents the New Perspective. Magnus Zetterholm then presents the Paul within Judaism Perspective, and finally, John Barclay finishes our viewpoints with the Gift Perspective. They each present their position, and then the other contributors provide a critique of each position. After this, each presenter concludes by replying back to these critiques. After this, Dennis Edwards concludes our study by evaluating the various perspectives from a pastoral point of view.

We hope that these stimulating perspectives and exchanges will challenge every reader to think more deeply, and perhaps even differently, about Paul and salvation.