

## Paul and Judaism: Ten New Perspectives

Daniel J. Harrington, S.J.

In the history of relations between Jews and Christians, the figure of Paul of Tarsus has been controversial and often divisive. Many Jews have regarded Paul as an apostate and as the real founder of the religion known as Christianity. Many Christians have celebrated Paul as the convert who showed that right relationship with God (justification) is through faith alone and as the one who has freed us from the burden of observing all the precepts of the Mosaic Law.

In recent years, however, biblical scholars, both Jews and Christians, have developed new and better ways of looking at Paul and his letters. They have tried to take much more seriously 1st century Judaism as the proper context for understanding Paul's life and work, and to place Paul's preaching about the saving significance of Jesus' death and resurrection in its wider biblical framework.

The most prominent proponents of this "new perspective on Paul" include a Lutheran bishop (the late Krister Stendahl), a self-described "low-church Protestant" (E. P. Sanders), a charismatic Scotch Methodist (James D. G. Dunn), and an Anglican bishop (N. T. Wright).<sup>i</sup> American Catholic scholars such as Frank Matera and Luke Timothy Johnson have made important contributions to the movement. Likewise, Jewish scholars such as Daniel Boyarin, Mark Nanos, and Alan Segal have eagerly participated in the conversation.

The new perspective on Paul that I wish to describe in this lecture reflects the renewed scholarly interest in 1st-century Judaism inspired by the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls in the late 1940s, theological reflection on the tragic role of Christian theology and practice in the European Shoah, and the firm resolve expressed in Vatican II's *Nostra aetate* (1965) to rethink the Catholic church's relationship to the Jewish people in Pauline terms.

In this lecture I want to consider ten new perspectives on Paul. Not all the major proponents agree with every item on my list. And some Christian scholars have criticized not only individual items but even the whole approach. Nevertheless, these new perspectives have gained enough support that one can say that they represent at least a groundswell, if not a consensus. I regard these new perspectives as good for both Jews and Christians. They remind us of the value of looking at Paul as a major figure in Second Temple Judaism. They also can help us locate key concepts of Paul's theology in the wider context of the biblical narrative of God's covenantal relationship with the Jewish people.

1. Paul's work and writings must be interpreted in the context of 1st-century Judaism.

According to the New Testament, Paul was a person of several worlds: a Diaspora Jew raised in Tarsus, an orator and a writer trained in the conventions of Greek rhetoric, and a citizen of the Roman empire. <sup>ii</sup> Without denying Paul's cosmopolitan credentials, the new perspective on Paul emphasizes his identity as a Jew shortly before the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem.

In Philippians 3:5-6, Paul lists his Jewish credentials: “circumcised on the eighth day, a member of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews; as to the law a Pharisee; as to zeal, a persecutor of the church; as to righteousness under the law, blameless.” Likewise in Galatians 1:14 he claims that “I advanced in Judaism beyond many among my people of the same age, for I was far more zealous for the traditions of ancestors.”

Paul’s Bible was the Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures (the Septuagint), what Christians call the Old Testament.<sup>iii</sup> His own letters, of course, are the earliest complete compositions in the New Testament, from the 50s of the first century C.E. Like many other late Second Temple Jews, Paul adopted the language and style of the Jewish Bible, and applied the various interpretive techniques commonly used in reading its texts. Besides the hundreds of allusions and echoes, his letters contain almost one hundred explicit quotations of the Jewish Bible, roughly one-third of all the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament. The bulk of them are taken from the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and the Psalms. They appear mainly in what are regarded as Paul’s most important letters: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians. Paul’s abundant use of the Jewish Scriptures in his most substantial letters indicates that for him and his first readers (mainly Gentile Christians) these texts continued to possess great authority.

However, Paul’s experience of the risen Jesus on the road to Damascus became the ultimate authority for him, to the point that he would dismiss his impeccable credentials as a Jew as “loss” and even “rubbish” (Phil 3:7-8). That experience led Paul to regard

Christ as the key to the correct interpretation of all the Jewish Scriptures. Such an approach has many parallels in Second Temple Judaism. As the Pesharim and other Dead Sea scrolls show, the Qumran people regarded their community's history and life together as providing the solution to the many puzzles and mysteries in the biblical prophecies and psalms.<sup>iv</sup> The Jewish apocalyptists behind the books of Daniel, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch looked forward to the fulfillment of God's promises to his people in the near future. Likewise, the rabbis considered Israel's continuing existence as God's holy people to be the key to the Jewish Scriptures. In this context Paul and other early Christians took Jesus of Nazareth as the key that unlocked the Scriptures of Israel.

At the heart of Paul's thoroughly biblical theology was God's promise to Abraham in Genesis 17 that he would become "the ancestor of a multitude of nations" (17:5). In the biblical narrative God's covenant with Abraham was the divine response to the sin of Adam and Eve, Cain's murder of Abel, the sinfulness of the flood generation, and the arrogance of those who built the Tower of Babel (see Genesis 1–11). Paul regarded the death and resurrection of Jesus as the pivotal event in the history of salvation whereby God's covenant relationship with Israel might be extended to all nations and God's promise to Abraham might be fulfilled as we all await the full coming of God's kingdom.

2. Jews in the time of Jesus and Paul were not legalists per se. Most observed the Mosaic Law in the context of their covenant relationship with God (covenantal nomism). The oppositions

between Judaism (works righteousness, legalism) and Christianity (righteousness by faith alone, love) are not well founded.

In the Christian tradition teachers and preachers have often labeled Jews as legalists and contrasted them with Christians who supposedly are guided only by faith and love. These stereotypes are not only untrue but have also been dangerous throughout history.

One of the important new perspectives on Paul has been the effort at recovering the biblical framework of covenant and recognizing that the laws set down in the Torah are placed in the context of God's love expressed in creation, in his promises to the patriarchs, and in his liberation of Israel from slavery in Egypt. In this framework the 613 precepts in the Torah represent the proper response of God's people to the covenant fidelity that God has so abundantly shown in its early history. This covenant framework is at least ideally what Jews through the centuries have embraced and acted upon. Their approach is what E. P. Sanders has described as "covenantal nomism," that is, observing the Jewish Law (Torah in Hebrew, *nomos* in Greek) in the context of Israel's covenant relationship with God.<sup>v</sup>

Paul's attitude toward the Jewish Law is ambiguous, to say the least. On the one hand, he claims that the Law is "holy and just and good" (Rom 7:12), and that "we uphold the law" (Rom 3:31). On the other hand, Paul describes the Law in Gal 3:24-25 as a kind of disciplinarian or *paidagogos*, a slave who escorted children to school and provided guidance along the way. More controversial and problematic is Paul's depiction of the Law as a malevolent power that specifies sins and so entices persons to commit them (Rom 7:7-25). In this way Paul portrays the Law as an ally of the

powers of Sin and Death. He goes so far as to suggest in Gal 3:19-20 that the Law was given to Moses through the mediation of angels, a tradition found in other Jewish and early Christian texts.

Some representatives of the new perspective, notably the Finnish scholar Heikki Räisänen, have argued that Paul was simply confused on this matter.<sup>vi</sup> Perhaps “ambiguous” is a better term. Writing some twenty-five years after Jesus’ death, Paul was necessarily creating some aspects of Christian theology as he went along. While we can sympathize with Paul’s ambiguity, it is the merit of the new perspective on Paul to have recovered the authentic Jewish framework of covenantal nomism, and to have pointed out some apparent contradictions in Paul’s statements about the Mosaic Law. While it may be possible to find some statements in ancient Jewish texts that sound like legalism, to dismiss Judaism as mere legalism is unfair and even slanderous.

3. Paul did not have a tender conscience with regard to his past in Judaism. Rather, his experience of the risen Christ trumped his past in Judaism.

Like most New Testament writers and indeed most writers in the Greco-Roman world, Paul seldom provides much autobiographical information or insight into his personal feelings. However, in Gal 1:13-17 and Phil 3:2-16, Paul describes his own conversion/call in some detail. In both cases he looks back on his life before his experience of the risen Christ with pride in his accomplishments in Judaism.

When reflecting on his attempt to persecute and destroy the early Christian movement, Paul observes that he had “advanced in

Judaism beyond many among my people of the same age” (Gal 1:14). The implication is that he persecuted the Greek-speaking Jewish Christians out of the conviction that they had gone beyond the boundaries of traditional Judaism and that their movement had to be stopped. Likewise in Philippians 3, when listing his credentials as a Jew, Paul places in a climactic position the claim that he was “as to righteousness under the Law, blameless” (3:6). Although Paul may have violated certain precepts along the way, in his own mind he regarded himself as “blameless.” The idea that Paul had a tender conscience stems largely from his anguished reflection in Romans 7 where Paul describes the human condition before and apart from Christ and employs first-person singular language. But today that passage is generally seen as a meditation on the sorry state of humankind without Christ. The impression that Paul the Jew had a tender conscience was reinforced by the prominence of his two great interpreters, Augustine and Martin Luther, who struggled with their own tender consciences.<sup>vii</sup>

If we accept Paul’s own words at face value, he had “advanced in Judaism” and was “blameless” with regard to the Law, it seems that what changed Paul’s mind and his life was his experience of the risen Jesus on the road to Damascus. In light of that experience, what had been the source of Paul’s greatest pride—his blameless life in Judaism—paled by comparison to the point that it now appeared to be “loss” and even “rubbish” (Phil 3:8). What became much more important to him was “knowing Christ and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings by becoming like him in his death, if somehow I may attain the resurrection from the dead” (Phil 3:10-11).

4. Paul's "conversion" involved a "call." Paul's "conversion" was from one form of Judaism (Pharisaic) to another (Christian). His "call" was to bring the gospel (the good news of Jesus Christ) to non-Jews (Gentiles).

When students of religion treat the topic of conversion, their prototype is often the case of Paul the apostle. Luke, the author of the Acts of the Apostles, describes Paul's conversion three times and in great detail (see Acts 9, 22, and 26). Paul himself describes it in less detail in Galatians 1 and Philippians 3. How and why Paul converted has been analyzed from many different perspectives—psychological, sociological, and so on. But none of these reductive explanations has been very successful. And so we are left with Paul's own testimony that his experience of the risen Christ was so overpowering that it brought about remarkable changes in Paul's worldview and activity.

Yet a careful reading of Paul's own testimony indicates that Paul continued to regard himself as a Jew who had once belonged to the Pharisaic Jewish movement and now belonged to the Christian Jewish movement. In other words, he moved from one form of Judaism to another.<sup>viii</sup>

Despite the impression given in the Gospels and in much New Testament scholarship, the Pharisees were a progressive party within Judaism.<sup>ix</sup> They were eager to adapt the prescriptions of the Torah to the changing conditions of their time. They shared their wisdom in fellowship meals, extended the spirituality of Israel as a priestly people to lay folk, promoted beliefs in the resurrection of the dead and post mortem rewards and punishments, and gathered

the teachings of earlier sages. Among the several Jewish groups active in Jesus' time, Jesus seems to have stood closest to the Pharisees, at least to the extent of sharing an agenda with them

It has been observed that although you can take Paul out of the Pharisees, you can't take the Pharisee out of Paul. Indeed it is possible to detect lingering elements of Pharisaism in Paul's letters. Nevertheless, it seems that in Paul's mind he had shifted his allegiance from one form of Judaism to another as the result of his experience of the risen Christ.

Moreover, according to his own testimony, Paul's "conversion" involved a call or vocation to "proclaim him [Christ] among the Gentiles" (Gal 1:16). In describing his call Paul alludes to the call of Jeremiah the prophet: "But when God, who had set me apart before I was born and called me through his grace..." (Gal 1:15; see Jer 1:5). As a result Paul interpreted his conversion as also a call to bring the good news about Jesus to non-Jews so that they too might become part of the people of God.

5. Paul did not set out to found a new religion separate from Judaism. Rather, he regarded himself as a Jew and viewed Jesus as the fulfillment of God's promises to Israel.

In responding to the risen Christ's call to bring the gospel to non-Jews, Paul did not think that he was starting a new religion. Indeed, Paul did not invent the Christian mission to non-Jews. Rather, from the accounts in Acts 10–11, it appears that the Gentile mission began when certain non-Jews expressed their interest in becoming part of the Christian movement.<sup>x</sup>

What quickly became a problem and a matter of great controversy were the conditions under which Gentiles might be accepted into the Christian community. From several of Paul's letters (Galatians, 2 Corinthians, and Philippians) it appears that some prominent Jewish Christians insisted that Gentiles had to become fully Jewish by undergoing circumcision and observing the precepts of the Torah. These Jewish Christians presumably suspected that Paul was in danger of starting a new religion and wanted to stop him.

Paul, however, was convinced that the success of the Gentile mission had revealed something more basic to Judaism—the fidelity of Abraham to God's covenantal promise that he would become the father of many nations—than even the Torah given to Moses on Mount Sinai. What mattered most to Paul was his conviction that Gentile Christians had received the Holy Spirit (see Gal 3:1-5) without undergoing circumcision and observing the Torah. Moreover, Paul viewed Jesus as the true offspring of Abraham (Gal 3:16) and as the pivotal figure in salvation history whose saving death and resurrection had opened up a place for non-Jews in the people of God. Paul thought that what God was doing through Jesus was expanding the parameters of God's people rather than founding a new religion separate from Judaism.

According to Acts 15, the leaders of the early Christian movement (including Paul) met in Jerusalem and agreed on a compromise. According to their decree, non-Jews were to be accepted into the Christian community if they abstained “from what had been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from fornication” (Acts 15:29). However, there is not much evidence that this decree was strictly enforced in early

Christian circles or even that Paul insisted on it in guiding his Gentile Christian communities.

6. The major and most pressing concern in Paul's letters to the Galatians and the Romans was not the theological principle of justification by faith but the ecclesiological-pastoral question about how non-Jews could be part of the people of God.

Paul's letters to the Galatians and the Romans are generally regarded as his most significant theological statements. They provide the strongest support for the doctrine of justification by faith, which in many Christian circles is regarded as the core of Pauline theology and indeed of all Christian theology.

While admitting that justification is an important theme in these letters, proponents of the new perspective contend that these two letters are ultimately concerned with membership in the church.<sup>xi</sup> The major question they deal with is, How can non-Jews be part of the people of God? In Galatians Paul seeks to rebut the claims of rival Jewish Christian missionaries that Gentiles had to become fully Jewish. In Romans Paul was trying to get Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians to look upon one another as equals before God.

Paul is best described as a pastoral theologian. He was not a professor writing books on general topics in the quiet of his office. Rather, Paul was a founder of Christian communities, and his letters were extensions of his pastoral ministry. In them he sought to respond to pastoral crises and to answer questions that arose in his physical absence.

In the course of responding to the ecclesial problems facing the Galatian and Roman Christians, Paul developed the idea of justification by faith. It is a legal image and presupposes the setting of a trial. It imagines God as a judge who delivers a verdict in favor of one of the litigants and allows that litigant to start over with a clean slate. There are some echoes of the Jewish theology of the Day of Atonement. However, the Pauline version places its emphasis on the favor or grace displayed by God and on faith or fidelity as the proper response to the divine favor and fidelity.

Without dismissing the importance of justification, N. T. Wright insists that the concept must be placed in the wider context of God's covenant relationship with Abraham, the pivotal role played by Jesus in the history of salvation, the law court image as the setting for both the divine decree of justification in the present and for the Last Judgment, and the opening up of God's people to all the nations through the Holy Spirit. In other words, justification must be viewed in its comprehensive biblical and covenantal theological framework.

7. For Paul, the "faith of Christ" (Jesus' fidelity to God) came before and provided the basis for "faith in Christ" (Jesus as the object of faith).

One of Paul's favorite Greek theological terms is *pistis*, which is usually translated as "faith." And one of his favorite uses of that word is with "Christ" or "Christ Jesus" in the genitive case.<sup>xii</sup> A beginner in the study of New Testament Greek might naturally translate the phrase *pistis Iesou Christou* in Rom 3:22 as "the faith of Jesus Christ." In that context it might refer to the trust and

fidelity to God’s covenant and plan that Jesus displayed during his earthly life, especially in accepting the cup of suffering in the passion narrative. Such trust and fidelity are graphically depicted in the Gethsemane episode in Mark 14:32-42. This interpretation takes the genitive case as subjective, that is, the fidelity possessed and demonstrated by Jesus.

However, in the English Bible tradition it has become customary to interpret the noun in the genitive case as an objective genitive, that is, “faith in Christ.” In this rendering what is important is the faith displayed by those who believe in the saving significance of Jesus’ death and resurrection. The idea of faith in Christ and the justification before God that it brings about has been (and still is) a pivotal doctrine in many forms of mainline and evangelical Protestantism. It has always seemed to me, however, that this kind of faith is in danger of becoming a “work”—just the kind of “works righteousness” that the Protestant Reformers sought to combat.

It is interesting to note that the *New Revised Standard Version of the Bible* (1989)—the most widely used English Bible and sponsored by the Protestant National Council of Churches in the USA—usually retains the traditional rendering (“faith in Christ”) in the main text but in each case adds in a footnote the alternative (“the faith of Christ”). This practice is an invitation to readers to reflect on which translation—“the faith of Christ” (subjective genitive) or “faith in Christ” (objective genitive)—better fits the passage under consideration. At the very least, the new perspective on Paul makes us rethink what Paul believed about Jesus and how believers relate to God through him.

8. Paul was reasoning from solution (Christ) to plight (all humankind before and apart from Christ was under the powers of Sin, Death, and the Law).

This thesis picks up the problem described in Point 2, about the Mosaic Law as a tool and ally of Sin and Death in Paul's letter to the Romans. There he shows that all humankind, Gentiles and Jews alike, found themselves enslaved to Sin and Death. Paul rarely uses "Satan" language. Instead he prefers to personify Sin, Death, and the Law as powers subjugating all humans. They function as a kind of unholy trinity or gang of three, serving as the equivalent of the Prince of Darkness in the Jewish schema of modified apocalyptic dualism glimpsed in the Dead Sea scrolls (*Rule of the Community*, cols. 3–4).

According to Paul in Romans 1, the Gentiles failed to recognize the true God from creation itself, and their fundamental mistake about God led them into a downward spiral of sin. Likewise, Jews, according to Rom 2:1–3:8, even though they had the Law, failed to observe it properly. This bleak picture of humankind before and apart from Christ is reaffirmed in Paul's anthology of biblical quotations in Rom 3:10-18, placed under the heading "all, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin" (3:9).

According to Paul, Jesus, especially in his death and resurrection, was the divinely appointed solution to the plight of humankind.<sup>xiii</sup> The thesis of Paul's letter to the Romans is that the gospel is "the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith" (1:16). So convinced was Paul that Jesus was the solution that he

seems to have portrayed the plight in the darkest way possible. This is why some proponents of the new perspective describe Paul's reasoning as proceeding from solution to plight.

Which raises the question, Was Paul an optimist or a pessimist? In his analysis of all humankind as enslaved under Sin, Death, and the Law, Paul was clearly a pessimist about what humans do on their own, without God's help through Christ and the Holy Spirit. In his analysis of the coming of Christ and what it meant for the human condition, Paul may have overestimated at least the tangible results. Of course, Paul embraced the twofold character of Jewish eschatology ("this age" and "the age to come"). But he also believed that Christ has inaugurated the age to come and looked forward in hope to the fullness of God's kingdom.

9. For Paul, the "works of the Law" were first and foremost the distinctive identity markers attached to Judaism: circumcision, Sabbath observance, and food laws.

In much Christian teaching and preaching on Paul there has been a tendency to caricature Judaism as a legalism, that is, the belief that one can earn one's salvation on the basis of good works and in particular by keeping the 613 commandments in the Torah. In the Reformation tradition, alleged Jewish legalism has often served as a not very subtle code for criticizing Catholicism and its teachings about merit accruing from good works.

In Gal 3:2 an exasperated Paul asks the Gentile Christians whom he had brought to Christian faith, "Did you receive the Spirit by doing the works of the Law or by believing what you heard?" Paul's real problem with the Law was that it could not do what he

believed Christ had done, that is, make possible right relationship with God (justification).

But what did Paul mean by the “works of the Law?” Was it the 613 precepts in the Torah as they were counted by the rabbis? Or did Paul have something more specific in mind? According to some representatives of the new perspective on Paul, the “works of the Law” were those practices that made Jews stand out in the Greco-Roman world and so had come to serve as identity markers for Jews: circumcision, Sabbath observance, and food and purity laws.<sup>xiv</sup> These practices made Jews look foreign and mysterious to outsiders, and functioned as boundary markers within which Jews could celebrate what made them into a distinct people spread all over the Mediterranean world.

In writing to the Galatians Paul does not refer much to Sabbath observance (though see 4:10). He does reprove Peter for his failure of nerve in refusing to eat with Gentile Christians and to regard them as his spiritual equals. Rather, he focuses more on the practice of circumcision as being unnecessary for Gentile Christians. He contends that what makes one a true child of Abraham is faith understood as trust in God’s covenant and his unfolding plan for humankind (3:6-29), suggests that circumcision for Gentile Christians is at best a matter of indifference (5:6), and accuses his rival Jewish Christian missionaries of trying to gain control over Gentile Christians and to limit their freedom (6:13). He even goes so far as to wish (crudely) that those proponents of circumcision might castrate themselves (5:12).

10. Paul looked forward to the salvation of “all Israel” (Rom 11:25-26).

In Romans 9–11 Paul tries to put together the three great entities in his vision of salvation history: Jewish Christians like himself, Gentiles who had embraced the good news about Jesus, and those fellow Jews who had not accepted the gospel.<sup>xv</sup> That this was a matter of great personal significance to Paul is clear from the passionate introduction (9:1-5) to his long meditation on the topic. There he rehearses Israel’s prerogatives in salvation history (“the adoption, the glory, the covenants, ...”) and claims that he was willing to be cut off from Christ (the most important thing in his life) if only his fellow Jews would accept the gospel.

The simplest way to explain Paul’s long and complicated train of thought in Romans 9–11 is to use his own analogy of the olive tree in 11:17-24. The olive tree is occasionally used as a biblical symbol for Israel as the people of God. Jewish Christians like himself constitute the root of the olive tree. Paul could not envision the church without its roots in historical Israel. Gentile Christians are compared to the branches of a wild olive tree that had been grafted on to the cultivated olive tree. Non-Christian Jews are described as branches that had been broken off from the olive tree. Here Paul reminds Gentile Christians that if God could graft branches from the wild olive tree (Gentile Christians) on to the cultivated olive tree, how much easier will it be for God to graft back the natural branches (other Jews) on to their own olive tree!

In what can be called his *eureka* moment, Paul states what he regarded as the solution to the mystery of God’s plan for Israel’s salvation. He writes in Romans 11:25-26, “I want you to

understand this mystery: a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of Gentiles has come in. And so all Israel will be saved.” Here Paul takes over the biblical motif of the divine hardening of Israel from Isaiah 6:9-10 and the Jewish apocalyptic motif of a divine quota of those to be saved. Thus Paul views the rejection of the gospel by many Jews and its acceptance by a surprising number of Gentiles as in accord with the divine plan for all Israel’s salvation (as he had made clear already in Romans 11:1-16).

Paul’s grand conclusion in Rom 11:26 is, “And so all Israel will be saved.” Unfortunately Paul fails to tell us exactly who “all Israel” is (each and every Jew, Israel taken as a collective, or the church?), when it will be saved (in history, or at the end of time?), and how it will be saved (through some experience of Christ as Paul had, through missionary activity, or through a separate way designed by God?). While we must be grateful for what Paul tells us, we must also wish that he had answered those three important questions.

## Conclusion

One does not have to agree to every one of these ten new perspectives on Paul to recognize their importance for relations between Jews and Christians today. They help us to appreciate better our common spiritual heritage and to see that from the beginning Christian theology was rooted in Judaism.

We today cannot live in the 1st century. Our ways have parted long ago, and Christianity and Judaism are now separate religions. But we can work together toward greater mutual

understanding and appreciation as we await “the day known to God alone, when all people will call on God with one voice and ‘serve him shoulder to shoulder’” (*Nostra aetate* 4). That was the dream of the Second Vatican Council. That was the dream of Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, whose memory we honor with this lecture. I am convinced that these ten new perspectives on Paul can help make that dream more of a reality than it has been for many centuries.

---

<sup>i</sup> James D. G. Dunn seems to have coined the term in “The New Perspective on Paul,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 65 (1983) 95-122. For a survey of modern Pauline scholarship in which the new perspective is prominent, see Magnes Zetterholm, *Approaches to Paul: A Student’s Guide to Recent Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009). For an excellent bibliography, see D. Bolton and E. Nathan, “New Understandings of Paul and His Jewish Heritage: A Select Bibliography,” *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* [<http://escholarship.bc.edu/scjr/vol3/iss1/22>] 3/1 (2008) article 22. For critiques of the approach, see Donald A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (eds.), *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Vol.1. *The Complexity of Second Temple Judaism*; Vol. 2: *The Paradoxes of Paul* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 2004); Seyoon Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul’s Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); and Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The ‘Lutheran’ Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

<sup>ii</sup> For a concise guide to Paul and his writings, see Daniel J. Harrington, *Meeting St. Paul Today* (Chicago: Loyola Press, 2008).

<sup>iii</sup> For a presentation of various approaches, see S. E. Porter and C. D. Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture* (SBL Symposium 50; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).

<sup>iv</sup> Timothy H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

<sup>v</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

<sup>vi</sup> Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (WUNT 29; Tübingen: Mohr, 1983).

- 
- <sup>vii</sup> Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976).
- <sup>viii</sup> Alan Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).
- <sup>ix</sup> Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).
- <sup>x</sup> Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997).
- <sup>xi</sup> N. T. Wright, *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Academic, 2009).
- <sup>xii</sup> Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substratum of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- <sup>xiii</sup> Sanders, *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).
- <sup>xiv</sup> Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (rev. ed.; WUNT 185; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).
- <sup>xv</sup> Harrington, *Paul and the Mystery of Israel* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992).