ESSAYS IN HONOR OF D. A. CARSON

On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday

Understanding *the* Times

NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES *IN THE* 21ST CENTURY



Edited by

ANDREAS J. KÖSTENBERGER AND

ROBERT W. YARBROUGH

Understanding the Times: New Testament Studies in the 21st Century: Essays in Honor of D. A. Carson on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday
Copyright © 2011 by Andreas J. Köstenberger and Robert W. Yarbrough
Published by Crossway
1300 Crescent Street
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher, except as provided for by USA copyright law.

Cover design: Studio Gearbox
Interior design and typesetting: Lakeside Design Plus

First printing 2011
Printed in the United States of America

Hardcover ISBN: 978-1-4335-0719-9
PDF ISBN: 978-1-4335-0720-5
Mobipocket ISBN: 978-1-4335-0721-2
ePub ISBN: 978-1-4335-2237-6

Crossway is a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers.

LB 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11
14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Editors' Preface 9

Abbreviations 13

Part 1: New Testament Studies and Ancillary Disciplines

1. Greek Linguistics and Lexicography 19
   Stanley E. Porter
2. Hermeneutics and Theological Interpretation 62
   Grant Osborne
3. The Church: A Summary and Reflection 87
   Mark Dever
4. Evangelical Self-Identity and the Doctrine of Biblical Inerrancy 104
   John D. Woodbridge

Part 2: Special Topics in New Testament Studies

5. Lifting Up the Son of Man and God's Love for the World: John 3:16 in Its Historical, Literary, and Theological Contexts 141
   Andreas J. Köstenberger
6. Justification in Galatians 160
   Douglas J. Moo

7. God as the Speaking God: "Theology" in the Letter to the Hebrews 196
Peter T. O'Brien

8. The Language of Baptism: The Meaning of βαπτίζω in the New Testament 217
Eckhard J. Schnabel

Part 3: New Testament Studies around the World

9. New Testament Studies in Africa 249
Robert W. Yarbrough

10. New Testament Studies in North America 277
Craig L. Blomberg

11. New Testament Studies in Asia 300
David W. Pao

12. New Testament Studies in Europe 324
Robert W. Yarbrough

Appendix: D. A. Carson: His Life and Work to Date 349
Andreas J. Köstenberger

Selected Writings of D. A. Carson 370

Contributors 379

Bible Permissions 381

General Index 383

Scripture Index 393

Editors' Preface

At a recent lecture, a cameraman planted himself close to Don Carson's podium, palpably distracting the audience from Carson's message. With only a moment's hesitation, Carson paused and asked the man to move, explaining, "We are talking about the *gospel*. The gospel is a lot more important than media." During the same lecture, Carson also referred to an e-mail exchange he had with his daughter Tiffany, who gently chided her dad that he was the only one who sent his daughter e-mails that required the use of a dictionary. These vignettes reveal two vital aspects of Don Carson's life and passion: the gospel and his family.

Over the years, Carson has been a close student of evangelicalism. He has taken a keen interest in the doctrine of Scripture, which is one of the most significant benchmarks of the evangelical movement. He has engaged in a worldwide teaching, preaching, and writing ministry that has had a large impact on God's kingdom, both on a church-wide level and on many servants of God and students of Scripture individually. Don Carson truly has proved to be one who exemplifies "understanding the times," like the men of Issachar in Old Testament days, "who understood the times and knew what Israel should do" (1 Chron. 12:32, NIV).

Those who desire to know what the church should do today would do well to listen to Don Carson. Transcending narrow areas of specialization, Carson has not only authored numerous scholarly contributions—including commentaries on Matthew and John, with several others in various stages of production—he has also contributed significantly to a wide variety of current issues in the contemporary church. Whether the issue is gender-inclusive Bible translation, the

emergent church, or postmodernism, to name but a few, Don Carson has provided a judicious assessment of the relevant issues and has prescribed a sensible, constructive way forward.

This volume is but a small token of appreciation for D. A. Carson at the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday by some of his colleagues, former students, and friends. Our focus here—spanning only part of the vast area of Don's interests—is the state of New Testament studies at the beginning of the twenty-first century. The volume is divided into three parts. The first deals with New Testament studies and ancillary disciplines—Greek linguistics and lexicography, hermeneutics and theological interpretation, the church, and evangelical identity—and features essays by Stanley Porter, Grant Osborne, Mark Dever, and John Woodbridge. The second part is devoted to special topics in New Testament studies. Andreas Köstenberger conducts an in-depth study of the well-known verse John 3:16; Douglas Moo deals with justification in Galatians (against the backdrop of the "New Perspective" on Paul); Peter O'Brien contributes an essay on "the speaking God" in the book of Hebrews; and Eckhard Schnabel provides a thorough study of the language of baptism in Greek, Jewish, and Christian literature. The third part takes the reader on a tour of New Testament studies around the world: Africa, North America, Asia, and Europe, with contributions by Robert Yarbrough, Craig Blomberg, and David Pao.

An appendix discusses D. A. Carson's life and work to date, followed by a selected bibliography of his contribution to New Testament studies. We are well aware that this is but a small installment, with many significant contributions still to come.

A word on the genesis of this project is appropriate. While the idea of a Festschrift honoring Don Carson was an obvious one and had been contemplated for several years by both of the editors (along with others), Andy Naselli deserves credit for approaching us and making preliminary contact with Crossway and thus serving as a key catalyst for the project. Andy also compiled a comprehensive bibliography that formed the basis of the "Selected Writings" included at the end of this volume. In addition, Andy made early contributions in the form of possible authors and topics. The editors are very grateful to Andy for the important impetus he provided.

The editors wish to express appreciation to the Henry Center for Theological Understanding, its director, Dr. Douglas A. Sweeney, and

its board members. Without their support, this project would not have been possible.

The editors and contributors to this volume join in expressing our profound gratitude to you, Don, for your tireless work in God's kingdom and for your immeasurable impact on the church and on all of us. May God give you and your dear wife, Joy, many more years of fruitful labor, and may the gospel continue to spread, to God's greater glory and for the good of his people. *Soli Deo gloria*.

Andreas J. Köstenberger, Wake Forest, North Carolina
Robert W. Yarbrough, Deerfield, Illinois
May 1, 2010

6

Justification in Galatians

DOUGLAS J. MOO

Three contemporary developments have put justification toward the top of the list of current theological controversies. The reevaluation of the apostle Paul's appropriation of his Jewish heritage that has followed the "Sanders revolution" and is at the heart of the so-called New Perspective has inevitably turned scholarly attention to the Pauline teaching on justification, since it is so thoroughly interwoven with his response to Judaism. The strong current toward ecumenical rapprochement has stimulated both Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians to look afresh at their respective teachings on justification and to wonder quite seriously whether this historically divisive doctrine need any longer be a cause of separation between the two movements. And the perennial concern that "justification by faith alone" might be partly responsible for the widespread failure of Christians to take seriously the demands of discipleship has fostered a fresh batch of articles and books proposing various revisions to the traditional teaching.

These three powerful currents—the academic, the ecclesiological, and the practical—have flowed together to produce a flood of articles

and books on justification. Surprising by its absence, however, has been any sustained attention to justification in Galatians—surprising because not only was Galatians historically the fountainhead of the distinctly Protestant teaching on justification (in the commentaries of Luther) but also because this letter has a much higher number, proportionally, of occurrences of the key verb δικαιόω than any other New Testament book. In this essay, accordingly, I will all too superficially survey and comment on justification in Galatians.

But what do we mean by "justification"? A failure to deal with the matter of definition (and sometimes even to raise it) has introduced unnecessary confusion into some of the recent discussions. At the extremes of the spectrum, justification can refer, on the one hand, to the entire Christian doctrine of salvation and, on the other, to the teaching of New Testament passages that use some form of the δικ- root. One can imagine how these conflicting definitions can bedevil discussions of the relative importance of justification in the Bible. The Lutheran systematic theologian who operates with the former definition, for instance, will have little difficulty showing that "justification" is immensely important in Scripture. The New Testament exegete who works with the latter definition, observing that δικ- language is common in only a few New Testament books, will, on the other hand, pretty easily show that justification is quite a minor and peripheral doctrine. Neither of these extreme definitions is satisfactory. The former, expansive, definition is questionable not only because it singles out one particular biblical portrayal of salvation and turns it into the whole but also because, in the process, it runs the risk of robbing justification of its own particular meaning. The latter, minimizing, definition errs in confusing lexicography with theology. Justification, whatever it is, is a theological concept. It is therefore both narrower and wider than the scope of δικ- language in the New Testament. Narrower because some occurrences of δικ- words in the New Testament have nothing to do with justification. While the matter is debated, for instance, we should probably exclude from our construct of the New Testament teaching about justification the many texts in which δικαιοσύνη occurs in its typical Old Testament sense of "what is right." But "justification" is also wider than the occurrences of δικ- language per se: other words may express the same *concept* that the relevant

δικ- words are getting at.[1] Of course, this is to invite the question, which are the "relevant" δικ- words? It is because this question finds no easy answer that a simplistic lexical approach has its temptations, offering as it does an apparently objective basis for our definition. The matter deserves serious consideration, but I would have to stretch my own competencies and the scope of this essay to the breaking point even to start down this road. At the risk of determining my outcome by the way I set up the issue, then, I propose that the way forward is to start with those δικ- words, especially in Paul, that appropriate the imagery of the lawcourt to express the concept of the believer's vindication/deliverance. From this basis, one could then look for other words and phrases that express a similar idea.

In this essay, to keep it at a manageable size, I will focus on the first step: the significance of the δικ- words in Galatians.

Justification Language in Galatians

It is well known that Paul's use of δικ- language is hardly spread evenly throughout his letters, with the bulk of occurrences coming in Romans and Galatians. As I noted above, Paul uses the verb δικαιόω more often, proportionately, in Galatians than in any other of his letters, including Romans: it is found 8 times in Galatians (2230 words), 15 times in Romans (7111 words), and 4 times in other letters. In contrast, the noun δικαιοσύνη occurs much less frequently: only 4 occurrences in Galatians, in comparison with 33 in Romans (and 20 elsewhere in Paul). The only other δικ- word in Galatians is δίκαιος, which occurs once (7 in Romans; 10 elsewhere). How many of these words should we consider in our study of justification in Galatians? In what remains the most substantial lexical/theological study of the language of righteousness in Paul, John Ziesler argues that the verb δικαιόω has a narrow forensic sense but that the noun δικαιοσύνη refers to a combination of forensic and moral righteousness.[2] This

[1]Allen and Treier point out this methodological issue in their review of Peter Leithart's proposal about a broader meaning of *justification* (for which see below, note 5) (R. Michael Allen and Daniel J. Treier, "Dogmatic Theology and Biblical Perspectives on Justification: A Reply to Leithart," *WTJ* 70 [2008]: 105–10).

[2]J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry*, SNTSMS 20 (Cambridge: University Press, 1972). This distinction has been followed by Richard N. Longenecker in his important commentary in the Word series, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Waco, TX: Word, 1990), e.g., 95 (with ref. to 2:21).

neat distinction has, however, drawn few followers, and rightly so.[3] In Galatians, certainly, the verb and the noun overlap significantly. Every occurrence of the noun comes in close proximity to the verb (2:21 with 2:16; 3:6 with 3:8; 3:21 with 3:24; 5:5 with 5:4), and in each case the context strongly suggests that the verb and the noun occupy the same basic semantic space (for elaboration see the commentary on the relevant texts).

Of course, as is well known, Paul can use the noun, reflecting the common Old Testament use of צדקה/צדק (usually δικαιοσύνη in the LXX), to mean "the behavior that God deems to be right." But more often δικαιοσύνη in Paul echoes the basic semantic force of the verb, referring to the status of righteousness that the action, or verdict, of "justify" confers.[4] Thirty years ago, it could be taken almost as an assumption in Protestant—and particularly evangelical Protestant—circles that this verdict of justification is a purely forensic act. No longer, however, does this consensus hold, as a growing number of scholars from a variety of theological traditions argue for a transformative element within justification itself.[5] We will touch briefly on this issue below, although a thorough analysis of this matter would take us far beyond the scope of this chapter. In my view, however, every occurrence of δικ- language in Galatians relates to the doctrine of justification; and, in Galatians, justification is forensic. The issue in the letter is all about status before God.

---

[3]For brief critiques of Ziesler on this point, see Mark A. Seifrid, "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 1, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 442; John Reumann, *"Righteousness" in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 56–59.

[4]Westerholm perceptively notes that Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη is derived from his use of the verb δικαιόω and that it is the verb that stands in continuity with the Old Testament (Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 276–77).

[5]A certain element of transformation in justification is implied in the significant ecumenical agreement between the Roman Catholic Church and the Lutheran World Federation: *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (2000). Among those arguing for a transformative view are, e.g., the so-called "Finnish School" (e.g., Tuomo Mannermaa, *Christ Present in Faith: Luther's View of Justification* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005]); and cf. also Michael Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); Don Garlington, "'Even We Have Believed': Galatians 2:15–16 Revisited," *Criswell Theological Review* 7 (2009): 9–15; Peter Leithart, "Justification as Verdict and Deliverance: A Biblical Perspective," *Pro Ecclesia* 16 (2007): 56–72; and especially Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Reading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); for a critical review, see Douglas J. Moo, "Review Article: *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*," *JETS* 53 (2010): 143–50.

The language of justification first occurs in 2:15–21, a transitional paragraph that uses Paul's theological rationale for his rebuke of Peter at Antioch (cf. 2:11–14) to put on the table the central matter in dispute between Paul and his opponents at Galatia: the means by which people, and especially Gentiles, can be justified before God. In this paragraph Paul introduces many of the key words that will dominate the central section of the letter:

Word	in 2:15–21	in 3:1–5:12	(in 1:1–2:14)	(in 5:13–6:18)
νόμος (*nomos*) "law"	6	22	0	5
ἔργα νόμου (*erga nomou*) "works of the law"	3	3	0	0
δικαιόω (*dikaioō*) "justify"	4	4	0	0
δικαιοσύνη (*dikaiosynē*) "righteousness"	1	3	0	0
δίκαιος (*dikaios*) "righteous"		(3:11 only)		
πίστις (*pistis*) "faith"	3	15	1	2
πιστεύω (*pisteuō*) "believe"	1	2	1	0
ζάω (*zaō*) "live"[6]	5	3	1	0

The heart of this paragraph is 2:15–16, where three occurrences of the verb δικαιόω are found. The rest of the paragraph elaborates the negative side of Paul's argument in verse 16: that a person is *not*

[6]See Frank J. Matera, *Galatians*, SP 9 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 98. Most scholars think that the central argument of Galatians opens with Paul's address in 3:1. From a rhetorical point of view, they are probably right. But the close connections between 2:15–21 and the following argument (noted above) could also imply that the main line of division should be placed between 2:14 and 2:15 (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982], 135). The upshot is that most scholars, appropriately, recognize that 2:15–21 is a transitional paragraph. Paul continues, to some degree, his "speech" at Antioch (2:11–14); but he clearly has in view the Galatians, and more so as the speech progresses. As Betz puts it, "Paul addresses Cephas formally, and the Galatians materially" (Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979], 114; see also, especially, Vincent M. Smiles, *The Gospel and the Law in Galatia: Paul's Response to Jewish-Christian Separatism and the Threat of Galatian Apostasy* [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998], 103–4; Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater*, 6th ed., KEK [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989], 87–88).

justified by "works of the law."[7] Verses 17–18, though some of the most difficult in the letter, appear to be responding to an objection to the sharp antithesis that Paul draws in verse 16. If to be justified "in Christ" means that Jews must no longer seek that status through the law, are they not "sinners" just like the Gentiles (see v. 15)? Only, Paul responds, if Jewish Christians do what Peter's actions at Antioch implied and reestablish the law as their authority. Verses 19–20 look at this same point positively. Citing his own paradigmatic experience, Paul argues that he has "died to the law" so that he might identify fully with Christ and experience the life that he alone conveys. Verse 21, whether it responds to an objection or, more likely, is Paul's own climactic affirmation,[8] is important for two reasons. First, the continuity of Paul's argument in this paragraph requires that δικαιοσύνη in this verse must have the same basic sense as the verb δικαιόω in verses 16 and 17. "Righteousness" is the "right standing" with God that God's justifying verdict in Christ produces. Second, the mention of "grace" in this verse may hint at an underlying concern in the letter. "Grace" language does not appear often in Galatians, but it does crop up somewhat unexpectedly in some key texts, which feature grace as characteristic of Paul's gospel, in contrast to the "other gospel": "I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting the one who called you by the grace [ἐν χάριτι] of Christ and are turning to a different gospel" (1:6); "You who are trying to be justified by the law have been alienated from Christ; you have fallen away from grace" (5:4; cf. also 1:15; 2:8; 3:18). I will come back to this point.

As we have seen, justification language occurs exclusively in the central section of Galatians: (2:15) 3:1–5:12. But the language is not spread evenly through this section. A cluster of δικ- words occurs in 3:6–11, then two more in 3:21 and 3:24, and then again two in 5:4–5. The main argument within the central section is found in 3:1–4:20.[9]

[7]Unless otherwise indicated, Scripture quotations in this chapter are from the TNIV or are my own translations.

[8]For the former, see, e.g., Ernest de Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921), 140; for the latter, Scott Schauf, "Galatians 2.20 in Context," *NTS* 52 (2006): 96.

[9]Some interpreters, on the basis of the *inclusio* of personal rebukes in 3:1 and 4:11, and an alleged shift in rhetorical strategy (from "forensic" to "deliberative"), limit this argument to 3:1–4:12 (e.g., Longenecker, *Galatians*, 97; cf. also Walter G. Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts*, JSNTSup 29 [Sheffield: JSOT, 1989], 78–79). But it makes better sense to attach the personal appeal of 4:12–20 to the rebuke of 4:9–11 than to see 4:12–20 as the beginning of a new stage of the argument (J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with*

Paul frames this argument with appeals to the Galatians (3:1–5; 4:8–20) that focus on their own experience and Paul's relationship to them. The opening appeal, coming as it does at a pivotal point in the letter, is especially significant in setting the rhetorical direction for the whole argument. The strong contrast between faith and torah that was introduced in 2:16 as a fundamental principle surfaces here with respect to the Galatians' experience: they have entered into their Christian experience by "hearing characterized by faith" (ἀκοὴς πίστεως) and not by "works of the law" (ἔργα νόμου)(3:2, 5).[10] But Paul's real concern is not how they began but how they are to continue: "hearing characterized by faith" is the means by which they will sustain their Christian experience (see 3:3). Paul's appeal to Abraham's experience via Genesis 15:6 in Galatians 3:6 should probably be attached to this opening paragraph, as corroboration of the importance of faith in the Galatians' experience.[11] At the same time, however, the reference

Introduction and Commentary, AB 33A [New York: Doubleday, 1997], 409; François Vouga, *An die Galater* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1998], 113).

[10]The phrase ἐξ ἀκοὴς πίστεως is difficult to interpret, since the meaning of both nouns is disputed and their genitive relationship is ambiguous. Probably the majority opinion is that the phrase refers to the "message" (ἀκοή) that the Galatians believed; the NIV is here representative: "believing what you heard." A few have downplayed any focus on human response in the phrase, arguing that it can be reduced basically to "the proclamation of the gospel," "the faith message" (Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*, rev. ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002], 130–31; see also Martyn, *Galatians*, 284, 286–89). This interpretation is, of course, interwoven with the larger interpretive issue of the "faith of Christ" debate. Without entering that debate here, I simply note that the connection with Abraham's faith in 3:6 argues strongly for a focus on human believing (Debbie Hunn, "Πίστις Χριστοῦ in Galatians 2:16: Clarification from 3:1–6," *TynBul* 57 [2006]: 23–33). The meaning of ἀκοή is much more difficult to determine. The roughly parallel occurrences in Rom. 10:16 provide grounds for the sense "what is heard," e.g., "report" or "message" (see, e.g., Longenecker, *Galatians*, 103). But Paul usually uses the noun in an active sense (1 Cor. 12:17; 1 Thess. 2:13 [probably]; 2 Tim. 4:3, 4), and that makes better sense of the precedence given to ἀκοή here in Galatians 3. See James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 154; Moisés Silva, "Faith versus Works of the Law in Galatians," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 2, *The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 236. The "hearing" in the phrase perhaps conveys something of the connotation of the equivalent Hebrew word: faithful receptivity, an "attentiveness" to the Word of God that includes both trust in its content and giver and the disposition to obey. See, e.g., Ex. 15:26; 19:5; 23:22; Deut. 11:13, 22; 15:5; 28:1, 2; 2 Sam. 22:45; Jer. 17:24; 1 Sam. 15:22 ("To hear [ἀκοή] is better than sacrifice"). For this view of the phrase, see Oliver O'Donovan, *Resurrection and Moral Order: An Outline for Evangelical Ethics*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 110; Don Garlington, *An Exposition of Galatians: A New Perspective/Reformational Reading* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 134.

[11]So, e.g., ESV, NIV, and see Bruce, *Galatians*, 152–53; Moisés Silva, "Galatians" (unpublished essay, 2001), 253; Andrew H. Wakefield, *Where to Live: The Hermeneutical Significance of Paul's Citations from Scripture in Galatians 3:1–14*, SBL Academia Biblica 14 (Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 136; contra, e.g., NRSV, NLT; and see Burton, *Galatians*, 153; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 112.

to Abraham brings onto the stage of Paul's argument a figure whose place in salvation history is central to the argument through the end of the chapter (vv. 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 29; cf. 4:22).[12] The intricate, Old Testament–soaked, and controversial argument that follows is concerned especially to make two points: that Abraham's "family" was all along intended to include Gentiles; and that belonging to Abraham's family—for both Jews and Gentiles—comes only through faith (and not the law or the works it calls for). The brief but programmatic paragraph of Galatians 3:7–9 establishes both these points.[13] At the same time, it is important for our purposes to note that justification language surfaces here again, first with the substantive δικαιοσύνη in the quotation of Genesis 15:6 and then with the verb δικαιόω in Galatians 3:8. The basic semantic equivalence of the words is seen here again: the "righteousness" God granted Abraham is clearly the same as the "justifying verdict" promised to the Gentiles.

Having expounded the positive side of the principle of 2:16 in 3:7–9 (justified by faith), Paul turns in 3:10–14 to the negative side (*not* justified by works of the law). People who rely on works of the law suffer the curse (v. 10), the contrast, of course, to the blessing connected with Abraham. While of course contested, "as many as are 'out of' the works of the law" (ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου) should be taken as referring to the Galatians. The verse therefore refers not to the historical curse that came on the people of Israel but to the curse that comes on anyone who tries to find blessing/righteousness via the works of the law (see below). Moreover, the connection between "doing" in this verse and "doing" in verse 12 suggests that *this* is the underlying issue in the failure of the law (again, more on this later). The torah, then, cannot be the means of justification because, by definition (for Paul), it involves "doing" rather than "believing." Justification language surfaces here in verse 11, where Paul quotes Habakkuk 2:4—"the person who is just will find life through faith"—as substantiation of the claim that "no one is justified before God through the law."[14] As

[12]Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 137.

[13]James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 82–83.

[14]I assume here the usual reading of the sequence ὅτι . . . δῆλον ὅτι as "for it is clear that, because," rather than "because . . . it is clear that." See, e.g., Franz Mußner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 5th ed., HTKNT (Freiburg: Herder, 1988), 228; contra, e.g., Wakefield, *Where to Live*, 162–67, 201–14.

my paraphrase implies, I am tentatively associating the verb δικαιοῦται in Galatians 3:11a with ζήσεται in the quotation (largely on the basis of vv. 12 and 21).[15] If we follow this reading, then the substantival adjective δίκαιος in the quotation would have its standard Old Testament sense of "the person who is right before God" (often in a context showing that "doing right" is part of this "rightness"; see the contrast in the two other occurrences of צדיק/δίκαιος in Habakkuk with the "wicked": Hab. 1:4, 13). On this reading, this would be the only δικ-word in Galatians that does not refer to justification. Woven together in this paragraph, as in the preceding one, is the general principle that "faith" is the means of finding righteousness/blessing (Gal. 3:7, 9, 11, 14) *and* that faith also enables the inclusion of Gentiles within the people of God (vv. 8, 14).

The argument in this part of the letter unfolds via a series of linking words. "Faith" in 3:1–6 triggers Paul's focus on the faith of Abraham in 3:7–9. The "blessing" God promises to those who rely on faith (v. 9) becomes the climax of the next paragraph (v. 14) at the same time as that blessing brings up its opposite, the curse (vv. 10, 13). Mention of the "promise of the Spirit" at the end of verse 14 stimulates Paul's discussion of the contrast between promise and law in verses 15–18. And it is worth noting that Paul again appeals to the principle of grace at the end of this paragraph: "God gave it in grace to Abraham in the form of a promise" (τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ θεός). Paul's depreciation of the law vis-à-vis the promise in salvation history leads him then to raise the obvious question: "What . . . was the purpose of the law?" (v. 19). Paul's answer is complicated and debated, but for our purposes it is sufficient to note that he insists on the compatibility of law and promise, and sustains this consonance by sharply distinguishing the purposes of each: the law acts as the guardian of the people of Israel during their "minority" and, because it issues demands that cannot be met (implied in v. 10, despite the many who doubt it),[16] locks everyone up under sin (v. 22). Or, to put

[15]While some interpreters attach ἐκ πίστεως to δίκαιος—"the one who is just by faith will live" (e.g., Bruce, *Galatians*, 161; Smiles, *The Gospel and the Law*, 204; Hans-Joachim Eckstein, *Verheissung und Gesetz: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15–4,7*, WUNT 2/86 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996], 143–44), most, following the connection in the Habakkuk text, attach it to ζήσεται (see, e.g., the arguments in Maureen W. Yeung, *Faith in Jesus and Paul: A Comparison with Special Reference to "Faith That Can Remove Mountains" and "Your Faith Has Healed/Saved You,"* WUNT 2/147 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002], 208–10).

[16]I elaborate this point later in the essay.

it negatively, the law cannot impart life/righteousness (v. 22). The logic of this verse suggests that Paul is basically identifying the "imparting of life" (ζῳοποιῆσαι) with "righteousness" (δικαιοσύνη).[17] And, if this is the case, then δικαιοσύνη is forensic rather than moral. This imparting of life/righteousness, Paul implies, is the purpose of the promise first given to Abraham, which has Christ as its ultimate beneficiary. And promise operates in the sphere of faith (even as torah operates in the sphere of doing or works). After being absent for several verses, then, "faith" emerges again as a key point in verse 22 and is then identified in verses 23–25 as that which the era of torah has looked ahead to. And it is also specifically said once more to be the means of justification (ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν, v. 24).[18]

Verses 26–29 circle back to the beginning of Paul's argument in verses 7–9, even as they gather up some of the key themes of verses 15–25. Whether "you all" (vv. 26, 28; see also ὅσοι in v. 27) refers to Gentiles or, as may be more likely, all believers,[19] there can be no doubt that the language (in contrast to the first-person plurals of vv. 23–25) alludes to the inclusion of Gentiles that was touched on in verse 8 (see also v. 14). Identifying these believers as "sons"/"children" (υἱοί) harks back to verse 7 ("sons/children of Abraham"). Key language from verses 15–25 is also integrated into this paragraph: "faith" (v. 26; see vv. 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25), "seed" (v. 29; see vv. 16, 19), "heir"/"inheritance" (v. 29; see v. 18), "promise" (v. 29; see vv. 8, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22). But the weight of these verses falls on the "in Christ" conception—a point to which we shall return.

We see again the linking-word mechanism at work, as the mention of "heirs" at the end of verse 29 leads Paul in 4:1–7 to use the metaphor of inheritance to illuminate the present juncture in salvation history. Justification language is absent in this paragraph, as it is in the appeal of 4:8–20 and the contrast between the two sons and their descendants in 4:21–30. This latter text has a somewhat secondary role in Paul's theological argument, perhaps being introduced as a response to the

[17]Burton, *Galatians*, 195; Bruce, *Galatians*, 180; contra Fung, *Galatians*, 163, who thinks that righteousness is the means to life.

[18]I deal with the salvation-historical focus on faith here in light of the "faith of Christ" controversy later in the essay.

[19]Bruce, *Galatians*, 183; contra, e.g., Dunn, *Galatians*, 201, and Brendan Byrne, *"Sons of God"—"Seed of Abraham,"* Analecta biblica 83 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979), 172–73, who think Gentiles are in view.

agitators' use of the argument from Abraham and Isaac.[20] In any case, it is best seen as an illustration designed to bolster the appeals that dominate the paragraph (4:21, 30; cf. 5:1).

The paragraph 5:2–6, with further support in verses 7–12, brings the theological argument of the letter to its paraenetic climax.[21] It begins with warning (vv. 2–4) and then turns to exhortation (vv. 5–6). Submitting to the agitators' insistence on torah obedience for justification will consign the Galatians again to their slavery under "the elements of the world" (see 4:3, 8–9) and mean nothing less than being cut off from Christ and from access to the grace found only in him. The first-person plural verb in 5:5—"we eagerly await" (ἀπεκδεχόμεθα)—includes the Galatians along with Paul[22] and signals a rhetorical shift. Paul is not just stating a truth; he is inviting the Galatians to join with him in taking ownership of that truth.[23] Returning to two of the key ideas in Galatians 2:16–4:31, Paul calls on the Galatians to wait through the

[20]See especially C. K. Barrett, "The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians," in *Rechtfertigung*, ed. J. Friedrich, W. Pöhlmann, and P. Stuhlmacher (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1976), 9–10.

[21]The place of 5:1 in the argument is debated: is it the concluding exhortation of the "allegory" (J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians* [repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957], 185) or of the argument of the letter to this point (James L. Boyce, "The Poetry of the Spirit: Willing and Doing in Galatians 5 and 6," *WW* 20 [2000]: 293; Susan G. Eastman, *Recovering Paul's Mother Tongue: Language and Theology in Galatians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 133–34)? The literary marker ἴδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος in v. 2 suggests, in any case, that a new paragraph begins here (Richard B. Hays, "The Letter to the Galatians," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck, vol. 11 [Nashville: Abingdon, 2000], 302); 5:1 may be transitional.

[22]Galatians scholars debate the referent Paul intends in his first-person plural pronouns and verbs in the letter. On the basis of 2:15—ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, "we who are by nature Jews"—and the nature of the argument in chap. 3, many interpreters think that Paul rather consistently uses "we" to denote himself and fellow Jews in the letter—including 5:5 (e.g., Longenecker, *Galatians*, 229; Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 369; Garlington, *Galatians*, 221). But it is difficult to enforce this consistency throughout the letter; Paul's shift of pronouns appears at times to have more to do with rhetorical considerations. In 5:5, I think it likely that Paul uses the first-person plural to draw the Galatians into the conversation (see also Susanne Schewe, *Die Galater zurückgewinnen: Paulinische Strategien in Galater 5 und 6*, FRLANT 208 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004], 69–72; Dunn, *Galatians*, 269; Joachim Rohde, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, THKNT [Berlin: Evangelische Verlangsanstalt, 1989], 217; Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994], 418).

[23]David G. Horrell notes that Paul's "indicative" often functions this way, providing a critical bridge to his imperatives: "The apparently paradoxical nature of the Pauline indicative-imperative formulations can, then, be resolved when the indicatives in question are seen not as statements which can be held to be either 'true' or not but as identity-descriptors and group norms which need to be constantly affirmed" (*Solidarity and Difference: A Contemporary Reading of Paul's Ethics* [London: T&T Clark, 2005], 94).

Spirit and through faith. Justification language appears in this paragraph for the last time in the letter, it again being clear that the verb in 5:4 must refer to the same thing as the noun in 5:5.[24]

The trend in recent Galatians scholarship has been away from the traditional (and therefore, in some quarters, automatically suspect) focus on justification and toward various other emphases, such as the Spirit or, particularly, inclusion in the people of God (expressed in the language of being Abraham's sons/children/seed (3:7 [9], 29; 4:28–31) or God's sons/children (3:26; 4:5–7). The Spirit is no doubt an important motif in the letter, one that has undoubtedly been neglected.[25] Yet the relative paucity of references in the central section of the letter (3:2, 3, 5, 14; 4:6, 29; 5:5) makes it difficult to put the Spirit at the center of the argument. Both justification and inclusion within the people of God are important and, we would argue, overlapping if not referentially equivalent concepts. But justification language, in comparison with "people of God" language, is more frequent and occurs at critical rhetorical points in the letter: it introduces the main argument (2:16) and climaxes Paul's appeal to the Galatians (5:5–6). Membership in God's people is basic to Paul's argument in 3:6–4:7, where being "sons of Abraham/God" brackets the argument (3:7 and 4:7).[26] We might conclude that the "seed of Abraham" argument is defensive, Paul responding to the agitators' own theological agenda, whereby his use of justification language is offensive, his own preferred way of putting the matter at issue. Of course, some interpreters would argue that justification language is in fact just another way of expressing the notion of membership within God's people or inclusion in the covenant; and so we now turn to the question of the breadth of the justification concept in Galatians.

Justification, Participation in Christ, and Inclusion in the People of God

Our survey of the central argument of Galatians suggests that δικαιόω and δικαιοσύνη have the same semantic force in this letter, denoting

[24]It is therefore unlikely that there is any reference to "moral" righteousness in Gal. 5:5 (contra, e.g., Burton, *Galatians*, 278; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness*, 179).

[25]The centrality of the Spirit in Paul's argument is the basic thesis of Charles Cosgrove, *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians* (Mercer, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988).

[26]See, e.g., Fee, who sees 3:7—"those who have faith are the sons of Abraham"—as the thesis statement, with 3:29—"you are the seed of Abraham"—and 4:7—"you are sons of God"—as the double conclusion (*God's Empowering Presence*, 379).

the conveying of (in the case of the verb), or possession of (the noun), right standing with God. As is widely recognized, this application of the language picks up a particular strand in the usage of these words in the LXX: where δικαιόω, translating the hiphil of צדק, denotes a (forensic) declaration of "righteousness" (Gen. 38:26; 44:16; Ex. 23:7; Deut. 25:1; 1 Kings 8:32; 2 Chron. 6:23; Ps. 82:3; Isa. 5:23; 50:8; Jer. 3:11; Ezek. 16:51–52), and where δικαιοσύνη (צדקה/צדק) refers to the establishment of Israel's "righteousness" or "vindication," often with a distinctly eschatological focus.[27] Isaiah 40–55, a passage that has exercised considerable influence on Paul's theology, provides key instances of this language. In contrast to the idols, the living and powerful God will display his love and commitment to Israel by delivering them from their captivity and shame. This deliverance is expressed with the verb δικαιόω/צדק—"He who *vindicates* me is near" (50:8, alluded to in Rom. 8:33)—and with the noun δικαιοσύνη (צדקה/צדק), for example, "I am bringing my righteousness near" (also Isa. 51:6, 8; 54:14; this language is undoubtedly foundational to Paul's "righteousness of God" language in Rom. 1:17; 3:21–22; 10:3; 2 Cor. 5:21). Yahweh, by means of his Servant (Isa. 49:1–7; 52:13–53:12), will establish and display the "right standing" of Israel; he will "vindicate" his people. Along with the classic texts of Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4, this seems to be the well from which Paul draws his distinctive language of "justification." To be sure, unlike Romans, where allusions to these texts are obvious, Galatians does not clearly ground the language in these Isaiah texts (though it may be no accident that Paul quotes from Isa. 54:1 in Gal. 4:27). We may, however, surmise that this use of "righteousness" language was common ground among Paul, the agitators, and the Galatians. Certainly Paul's claim in his first use of the language, that he and his fellow Jews "know" about the manner of justification (Gal. 2:15–16), suggests that the language was common currency in the early church (or at least the Pauline-influenced early church) before Paul wrote Galatians.

If one might describe the material in the last paragraph as a matter of general scholarly consensus, the same cannot be said of another matter: the degree to which, in Galatians, Paul "redefines" justification

[27]Ziesler provides a good survey of the linguistic data in the Old Testament (*Meaning of Righteousness*, 17–69); see also Seifrid, "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism," 415–42.

language to mean "to be declared to be members of God's people." N. T. Wright, while acknowledging that justification language functions in the metaphorical sphere of the lawcourt, insists that Paul, reflecting the strongly covenantal context of the language in the Old Testament, and in light of the immediate context (where the issue is, who can eat at the same table together? [2:11–14]), uses δικαιόω in its first programmatic occurrences in Galatians to mean "to be reckoned by God to be a true member of his family, and hence with the right to share table fellowship"—with particular emphasis on the inclusion of Gentiles (2:15–16).[28] This initial usage sets the tone for the letter as a whole, δικαιοσύνη, then, meaning, in turn, "membership in God's true family."[29] However, these apparently either/or propositions—forensic verdict of acquittal *or* membership in God's family—are later (within the same book) relativized with both/and language—forensic acquittal *and* membership in God's family (see esp. 133–34). So the real question is not whether, as Wright himself (too strongly) puts it, "The lawcourt metaphor behind the language of justification, and of the status 'righteous' which someone has when the court has found in their favor, has *given way to* the clear sense of 'membership in God's people'" (121, my emphasis); it is, rather, whether the notion of membership in the people of God should be *added to* the notion of forensic acquittal, and, indeed, to the extent that the latter becomes the dominant idea in the letter.

Wright (and others who follow a similar pattern of interpretation) is correct, of course, that Paul's first announcement of "justification by faith" comes in a dual context, both contexts being dominated by the issue of Gentile inclusion (the dispute at Antioch [2:11–14] and the crisis in Galatia). However, more precisely, the issue in both situations was not the inclusion of Gentiles in the new messianic community per se (which, as far as we can tell, no one was disputing) but the terms on which they should be recognized to be such. More importantly, Wright's claim that δικαιόω in 2:16 loses or sheds some of its forensic connotation because "Paul is not in a lawcourt, he is at a dinner table" (116) illegitimately privileges context over semantics. Only a few pages later, Wright claims that lawcourt imagery is "always there by implica-

[28]N. T. Wright, *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009), 116.
[29]Ibid., 121.

tion in the language of 'justification'" (128); and he should observe this sound semantic observation in his interpretation of 2:16. In this text, and the paragraph of which it is a part, Paul is using the Antioch incident as a jumping-off place to address the central theological issue that lies behind that incident and the situation in Galatia as well. And in both situations, this issue is the terms on which people can expect to find right standing with God. Paul applies his teaching on justification to the issue of the means by which Gentiles can be included. But in this opening paragraph of his theological argument, he is establishing the broad framework of justification, with reference to Jews as much as (or more than) Gentiles. Paul stresses that Jews also "know" that this right standing comes by christologically oriented faith and not by "works of the law" (v. 16); if right standing with God could come by means of the torah, Christ need not have died at all (v. 21). This fundamental theological fact, "the truth of the gospel" for which Paul fought in Jerusalem (v. 5) and that Peter has called into question by his conduct at Antioch (v. 14), makes clear that it is wrong for Peter, by his withdrawal of table fellowship in Antioch, to force Gentiles to "Judaize" (v. 14) and equally wrong for the agitators to insist that the Gentile Galatians succumb to circumcision and a torah lifestyle (3:1–5; 5:2–6). There is no good contextual reason to insist that "justify" in 2:16 must be redefined to mean, or to include, the notion of membership in God's people. There is no need to collapse the two concepts into one. As Simon Gathercole insists, "The *content* of the doctrine of justification by faith should be distinguished from its *scope*."[30] The flow of the text makes perfect sense if Paul in 2:16 is using the δικαιόω language in its well-attested sense "declare righteous."

Moreover, while the issue cannot be explored adequately in this essay, it is also questionable whether "justification" language in the Old Testament ever takes on the sense of "membership in God's people." As we noted above, in Isaiah 40–55, "righteousness" denotes God's vindication of people already in covenant relationship with him. In other texts, justification language denotes God's initial acceptance of a person, an acceptance that at the same time normally implies that one "enters" the people of God. But that the language does not *denote* entrance into the people of God is clear, for instance, in the key text

[30]Simon J. Gathercole, "Justified by Faith, Justified by His Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3:21–4:25," in *The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. Carson, O'Brien, and Seifrid, 156.

Genesis 15:6 (cf. Gal. 3:6): there is no "people of God" for Abraham to join at this point; his "justification" is foundational to the process by which that people is being created.[31]

Membership in God's people and justification are closely related; but they are not identical. Paul argues both points in Galatians: people by their faith in Christ are established as "righteous" in God's sight; and by that faith they are brought into the people of God. But in Galatians, as in Paul's letters in general, justification does not in itself include belonging to God's people; still less, how one *knows* a person belongs to God's people.[32]

One other definitional issue pertaining to justification in Galatians requires brief mention. Recent interpreters (echoing, to be sure, a minor strand in the Reformation theological heritage), sometimes out of an express concern to counteract the ethical indifference that they think tends to follow from a strictly forensic view of justification, want to expand the scope of justification to include a transformative element.[33]

---

[31]Wright tries to rescue his interpretation by suggesting that the text speaks of "membership in . . . the covenant family which God was creating" (*Justification*, 134). But this seems to be an attempt to force a text to fit a preordained mold. See, on this point, John Piper, *The Future of Justification: A Response to N. T. Wright* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007), 42–44.

[32]In Wright's earlier writing on justification, he separated justification from conversion, arguing that justification is a declaration of a relationship that has been previously established via conversion ("The Epistle to the Romans," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Leander Keck, et al., vol. 10 [Nashville: Abingdon, 2002], 468; cf. also 466, 481; see also *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 113–33; *Paul in Fresh Perspective* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005], 111–13). Of course this way of describing justification has considerable resonance with the Reformation tradition, which often conceptualizes the matter in just this general manner; justification is God's recognition of a person's "rightness" based on her identification with Christ and his righteousness. But in contrast to Wright, the tradition rightly notes that justification is closely tied to conversion itself; if not the actual point of "transfer"—Sanders's "getting in"—it is clearly bound up with it (see, e.g., Rom. 5:1, 9; 1 Cor. 6:11) (see on this point, e.g., Piper, *The Future of Justification*, 39–44; Simon Gathercole, "The Doctrine of Justification in Paul and Beyond: Some Proposals," in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Bruce McCormack [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006], 228–31). This insistence on separating justification from conversion is not as evident in Wright's latest book on the subject (*Justification*). For a broader criticism of Wright's view on justification, see especially Gathercole, "The Doctrine of Justification," 219–41, 228–40; Michael F. Bird, "Justification as Forensic Declaration and Covenant Membership: A Via Media between Reformed and Revisionist Readings of Paul," *TynBul* 57 (2006): 109–30, 115–16; Bird, *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification, and the New Perspective*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2007), 113–54; Robert S. Smith, *Justification and Eschatology: A Dialogue with "The New Perspective on Paul"* (Doncaster, Australia: Reformed Theological Review, 2001), 89–92; Peter T. O'Brien, "Was Paul a Covenantal Nomist?," in *The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. Carson, O'Brien, and Seifrid, 249–96, 286–95; Piper, *The Future of Justification*.

[33]The transformative power of justification is an important part of Ernst Käsemann's famous definition of "God's righteousness" in terms of both gift and power (see, e.g., "The Righteousness

Paul can certainly use the word δικαιοσύνη, in continuation with the Old Testament and other New Testament authors, to refer to appropriate ethical behavior (e.g., Rom. 6:13, 16, 18, 19, 20; Eph. 5:9; 1 Tim. 6:11; cf. Matt. 5:20; Luke 1:75; Acts 10:35; James 1:20). But I am not convinced that these occurrences should be incorporated into the concept of Pauline "justification." We return here, of course, to the methodological issue we raised at the beginning of the essay: which occurrences of δικ- *language* in Paul should be the building blocks in our construction of the *concept* of justification in Paul? I would argue, simply, that at least two distinguishable semantic categories of δικ- *language*—for the sake of brevity, the "moral" and the "forensic"—are identifiable, on the basis of sound syntagmatic considerations, in both the LXX and the New Testament, and that it is a mistake to merge these categories. Certainly there is little reason to do so in Galatians. The fact that Paul *associates* justification with transformation through participation in Christ in texts such as Galatians 2:15–21 does not mean that he *identifies* them.[34] Paul is concerned about the transformation of character in Galatians, as the section 5:13–6:10 reveals most clearly. But to argue that this concern must be *part of* justification tends to assume that transformation can become part of what it necessarily means to be a Christian only if it is folded into justification.

Following the lead of Calvin and many others in the Reformed tradition, it does much better justice to Paul if we connect forensic justification with transformation by viewing both as inevitable and necessary products of our being "in Christ."[35] While not explicitly

of God in Paul," in *New Testament Questions of Today* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969], 168–82). The transformative nature of justification was hinted at in the work of Adolf Schlatter (e.g., *The Theology of the Apostles: The Development of New Testament Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998 (1922)], 248–50) and has also been a hallmark of Peter Stuhlmacher's approach to righteousness (see *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus*, FRLANT 87 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966]; *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001], 62–67; *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 3rd ed. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005], 332–34). See also Eberhard Jüngel, *Justification: The Heart of the Christian Faith: A Theological Study with Ecumenical Purpose* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 208–11; Don B. Garlington, *Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance: Aspects of Paul's Letter to the Romans*, WUNT 2/79 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 155–61; and, most recently, Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) and Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*.

[34]Contra, e.g., Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, 63–69.

[35]William B. Evans has recently surveyed some of the ways that union with Christ and justification are related in historical and contemporary Reformed theology ("Déjà Vu All Over Again? The Contemporary Reformed Soteriological Controversy in Historical Perspective," *WTJ* 72 [2010]: 135–51).

taught in Galatians, the idea that our union with Christ produces these two inseparable but distinguishable benefits is clearly hinted. Being "in Christ" is foundational, as the important summarizing paragraph 3:26–29 makes clear. We should probably translate verse 26, as in the NIV, "So in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith."[36] And the union-with-Christ theme appears again in verse 27 ("clothed yourselves with Christ"), verse 28 ("all one in Christ Jesus"), and verse 29 ("belong to Christ"). Paul explicitly relates justification to participation in Christ in 2:17—"seeking to be justified *in Christ*"—and union with Christ appears at key points elsewhere in the letter (1:22; 2:4; 2:19–20; 5:6, 24; 6:14). Since Christ is *the* "seed of Abraham" (3:16), it can be only in and through Christ that a person can receive the promised "blessing of Abraham" and "the promise of the Spirit" (3:14). This verse reveals as clearly as any the underlying "theologic" of the letter. The "blessing of Abraham" is, in context, justification.[37] "The promise of the Spirit" looks back to 3:2 and 3:5; but, just as importantly yet often not recognized, this language also anticipates Paul's argument in 5:13–6:10. Paul's association of the blessing of Abraham and the promise of the Spirit depends on the prophetic anticipation of the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham being accompanied by the transforming work of God's Spirit.[38] It is this transforming work of the Spirit, creating the conformity to God's will that the law was unable to accomplish, that is the theme of 5:13–6:10. In 3:13–14, then, Paul traces back to our association with Christ, who in his death took our curse on himself, the twin blessings of justification and transformation. As I would argue is the case throughout his letters, union with Christ, not justification, lies at the heart of Paul's theology.[39] But forensic justification is one of

[36]Taking διὰ τῆς πίστεως and ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ as parallel rather than sequential. So, e.g., Longenecker, *Galatians*, 153–54; Karl Friedrich Ulrichs, *Christusglaube: Studien zum Syntagma Πίστις Χριστοῦ und zum paulinischen Verständnis on Glaube und Rechtfertigung*, WUNT 2/227 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 102; Mußner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 261.

[37]Chee-Chiew Lee, "The Blessing of Abraham and the Promise of the Spirit: The Influence of the Prophets on Paul in Galatians 3:1–14" (PhD diss., Wheaton College, 2009), 48–57.

[38]See ibid., esp. 312–13.

[39]This does not mean, however, that "justification" is a mere "subsidiary crater" or a "battle doctrine," as was famously alleged by Albert Schweitzer and Wilhelm Wrede (see Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* [London: Black, 1931]; Wrede, *Paul* [Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1908]). Many contemporary scholars agree with Schweitzer and Wrede: E. P. Sanders also privileged the participationist category over the judicial (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977], 501–8); see also Philip Esler, *Galatians* (London: Routledge, 1998), 153–59; Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, and, in more polemical form, Douglas A. Campbell, *The Quest for Paul's Gospel* (London:

the primary and critical benefits that people who belong to Christ by faith receive. And in Galatians this forensic issue comes to the surface because the letter focuses resolutely on the question, Who, and how, will people experience God's vindicating judgment in their favor?

The Means of Justification

As we noted earlier, the "Gentile problem" in Galatians is not whether Gentiles should be included in the people of God. The issue is, rather, on what grounds they are included in the people of God. For the agitators, belonging to God's people and thereby enjoying God's eschatological vindication could come only by identifying with Abraham's descendants by the Old Testament–mandated and time-honored means of circumcision and torah piety. Central to Paul's disagreement with the agitators at this point is a more discontinuous reading of salvation history. For the agitators, the recognition of Jesus as Messiah was important but did not constitute any reason to shift the terms on which people could relate to God. For Paul, on the other hand, who experienced in his own life a fundamental paradigm shift (1:11–16), the coming of Christ meant a cataclysmic shift in the contours of salvation history. The "apocalyptic" significance of Christ's coming in Galatians, highlighted especially in the work of J. Louis Martyn, does not mean

T&T Clark, 2005); and *The Deliverance of God*. These critics have a point. Many of Paul's letters hardly refer to justification per se, and the texts in which the language is used (Galatians, Romans, Philippians 3) involve dialogue with Jewish viewpoints and disputes over torah. But Paul's teaching on justification is more than an occasional strategy to deal with Jewish opponents. The concept of "righteousness," and the juridical category to which it belongs, are important in the Old Testament, and Paul's explanation of the Christ event in these terms is therefore rooted in a central biblical concern. Udo Schnelle accuses Schweitzer and Wrede of confusing the origin of Paul's view with its importance (*Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005], 471). Justification is not central in Paul's thought, but it is a critical and important means of explicating his gospel. Nor is there any need to set Paul's "juridical" and "participationist" categories in opposition to one another. The latter may be more fundamental for Paul, but it is also a very general category, comprising various other ways of thinking about the Christ event, including the juridical (see especially Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *By Faith, Not by Sight: Paul and the Order of Salvation* [Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2006], 35–41). The problem of positing a union with Christ that precedes the erasure of our legal condemnation before God (e.g., making justification the product of union with Christ; see, e.g., Michael S. Horton, *Covenant and Salvation: Union with Christ* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007], 147) can be answered if we posit, within the single work of God, two stages of "justification" (using the term here very broadly), one involving Christ's payment of our legal debt—the basis for our regeneration—and the second our actual justification—stemming from our union with Christ (see Henri Blocher, "Justification of the Ungodly (*Sola Fide*): Theological Reflections," in *The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. Carson, O'Brien, and Seifrid, 497–98).

that Paul renounces salvation history (as Martyn has suggested);[40] it means, rather, that salvation history has within it a critical juncture, a decisive turning point.[41] And this turning point reveals that the issue confronted by the Galatians is an either/or one: if one tries to be justified "in the sphere of/through the law," one falls from grace and is separated from Christ (5:4). Justification "in Christ" (2:17) is set in stark contrast to the attempt to be justified "in the law." Why does Paul attach the kind of epochal significance to Christ's coming that the agitators did not? Galatians suggests that it was the implications of Christ's death on the cross that led Paul to such a radical interpretation. The argument of Galatians is remarkable for its focus on the cross and, of special significance for our point, believers' being caught up in that cross event (see esp. 2:19–20; 3:13–14; 5:24; 6:14).[42] The cross of Christ brings a "crisis" in human history and in the believer's own history and becomes the focal point around which everything must be reconfigured.

The christological κρίσις in salvation history is probably the explanation for Paul's distinctive claim in Galatians that belonging to God's people and justification come through faith and not through works of torah/torah. Paul uses the phrase "by faith" (ἐκ πίστεως) eight times in the letter, usually in direct or indirect connection with righteousness language (direct in 2:16; 3:8, 11, 24; indirect in 3:7, 9; see also 3:12, 22; two other texts use the verb to make the same point, 2:16; 3:6).[43] Paul and the agitators did not disagree, apparently, about the importance of faith. What they disagreed about was whether faith was to be followed by torah obedience; or, more precisely (and very importantly), whether torah obedience had to be added to faith for the purpose of securing one's relationship to God and his people.

[40]Martyn's seminal essay is "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 31 (1985): 410–24.

[41]See, e.g., John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 99–105.

[42]Frank J. Matera, "The Death of Christ and the Cross in Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *Louvain Studies* 18 (1993): 283–96.

[43]The use of ἐκ after πιστεύω is comparatively rare and probably expresses instrument (Charles H. Cosgrove, "Justification in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Reflection," *JBL* 106 [1987]: 656–60); on the use of ἐκ to indicate instrument with this verb and the corresponding noun, see Murray J. Harris, "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament," in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, ed. Colin Brown, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 1189.

The nature and significance of the contrast between faith and "works of the law" or "law" are deeply contested in Pauline scholarship—with quite significant consequences for one's overall soteriology. The Reformers understood the contrast that Paul draws in these texts to signal a fundamental distinction between human believing, on the one hand, and human "working" or "doing," on the other. Some contemporary interpreters want to revise both sides of the Pauline works-versus-faith polarity. On the one hand, the "works" that Paul excludes from justification are given a restricted sense—works "done in the flesh," as opposed to works done in the Spirit;[44] or, more often, "works of torah" intended to maintain a distinctly Jewish covenant identity as opposed to good works in general.[45] And on the other, faith is sometimes expanded to include works, at least of a certain kind. The literature on these matters is massive and the issues complex. I can here only state my own views with a very few arguments.

I turn first to the "works" side of the polarity. In Galatians, Paul contrasts faith with ἔργα νόμου ("works of the law") six times (2:16 three times; 3:2, 5, 10). Significantly, he abbreviates this phrase never with "works" but with "law" (as in 5:4). This suggests that Paul's chief concern in Galatians, as we might expect granted the situation being addressed, is with torah, not with works as such. The agitators were arguing not that people get right with God by doing good works but that people can have their right standing with God vindicated only by faithful observance of God's covenant stipulations. And it is just this argument that Paul contests with his strongly salvation-historical perspective: the era of torah has ended with the coming of Christ and any attempt now to require torah obedience for righteousness is to turn the clock back and, in effect, deny that Christ has come. This much is a matter of agreement among most contemporary Galatians scholars. The disagreement is over whether Paul's polemic against "works of the law" has any broader anthropological implications. New Perspective advocates tend to claim that it does not and that Galatians therefore provides no grounds for a principial contrast between faith and works.[46]

[44]See, e.g., Daniel P. Fuller, *The Unity of the Bible: Unfolding God's Plan for Humanity* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 310–16, 323; Paul A. Rainbow, *The Way of Salvation: The Role of Christian Obedience in Justification* (Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2005), 79–96.

[45]James D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul: Whence, What, Whither?," in *The New Perspective on Paul: Collected Essays*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 77.

[46]While distancing himself in several crucial ways from the New Perspective, Francis Watson has recently made this point quite vigorously: "The critique of Luther's essentially allegorical

James Dunn, for instance, argues that Paul can be rescued from inconsistency only if we distinguish between the "works of the law" that he argues against in 2:16 and those works that spring from faith that he commends later in the letter.[47] I have elsewhere defended the basic Reformation approach on this point, arguing that Paul's "works of the law," while obviously denoting works done in obedience to torah, can validly be seen ultimately as a subcategory of the broad human category "works."[48] This case is certainly more difficult to make in Galatians than in Romans, but I nevertheless think that it can be made.

The interpretation of 3:10 is pivotal to this issue and is one of the reasons the verse has received so much attention in recent years. A broadly "New Perspective" approach to the verse interprets the curse in purely salvation-historical terms: Israel, as the exile reveals, fell under God's curse, and anyone who now wants to identify with Israel by torah observance will fall under that same curse. This reading then becomes part of a broader approach to the letter according to which the only problem with the law is that it is outmoded (a new era in salvation history has dawned) and that it acts as a barrier to Gentile inclusion

interpretation of Paul's critique of works is presented here with all the emphasis I can muster" (*Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*, rev. ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 25; argument on 121–31). See also, for this general point of view, Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 235–41; Matera, *Galatians*, 242–43; James D. G. Dunn, *A Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 354–66. New Perspective advocates are not always clear about whether Paul's polemic against "works of the law" has broader theological implications. For instance, in his commentary on Romans, Wright insists quite strongly in the "Commentary" section that "works of the law" are signs that one belongs to Israel and that any notions of legalism or "proto-Pelagianism" are simply not present (459–61). But in the "Reflections" section he acknowledges other "overtones" in Paul's teaching, including some that are compatible with traditional Reformation teaching (464). Wright is even clearer about these "old perspective" elements in Paul's teaching in his latest book. Note also Dunn's remarks in his latest essay on the matter ("The New Perspective," 27–28).

[47]James D. G. Dunn, "Noch Einmal 'Works of the Law': The Dialogue Continues," in *The New Perspective on Paul*, 427. An extreme form of this view is that of Michael Bachmann, who thinks the phrase (in keeping with his understanding of the phrase at Qumran) focuses on God's demand and not human doing in any form (see, e.g., "Keil oder Mikroskop? Zur jüngeren Diskussion um den Ausdruck 'Werke des Gesetzes,'" in *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive: Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der Gegenwärtigen Exegetischen Diskussion,* ed. Michael Bachmann, WUNT 2.182 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005], 69–134). In response to Bachmann, see, e.g., Otfried Hofius, "Werke des Gesetzes": Untersuchungen zu der Paulinischen und Johanneischen Theologie und Literatur," in *Paulus and Johannes: Exegetische Studien zur Paulinischen und Johanneischen Theologie und Literatur*, ed. Dieter Sänger and Ulrich Mell, WUNT 2/198 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 273–85.

[48]Douglas J. Moo, "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul," *WTJ* 45 (1983): 73–100; see also Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 211–17.

in the people of God.[49] The "traditional" reading, on the other hand, insists that the logic of the verse reveals that Paul is warning the Galatian Christians directly ("as many as") that reliance on "works of the law" will bring them under the curse because (implicitly) they will not be able to produce sufficient works to avoid the curse. This latter reading, while widely criticized, seems to be, in fact, the only way to make sense of the text.[50] And it finds confirmation in verse 12, where Paul identifies the law with the principle of *doing* (3:12; cf. also 5:3).[51] The point is, then, that Paul here views reliance on doing the law ("works of the law") as bringing people under the curse, not simply because the law belongs to a past stage of salvation history, but because the law is bound up with "doing," and "doing" or "works" in general are never able to justify a person before God. Paul's polemic against "works of the law" in Galatians, then, rests ultimately on a pessimistic anthropology. Stephen Westerholm puts the point well: "The fundamental question addressed by Galatians thus is not 'What is wrong with Judaism (or the Sinaitic law)?' but 'What is wrong with humanity that Judaism (and the Sinaitic law) cannot remedy?'"[52]

I turn now to the other side of the polarity, "faith." I have suggested above that the focus of Paul's argument in the central section of Galatians rests precisely on this word. "Believing" (πιστεύω) (2:16; 3:6, 22 [2:7 is different]) and "faith" (πίστις) (2:16 twice, 20; 3:2, 5, 7,

[49]For the "Israel in exile" view, see especially N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 137–56; James M. Scott, "'For as Many as Are of Works of the Law Are under a Curse' (Galatians 3:10)," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 187–221. Dunn (*Galatians*, 170–74) takes a slightly different approach, viewing the curse in terms of exclusion of Gentiles.

[50]See especially Thomas R. Schreiner, "Is Perfect Obedience to the Law Possible: A Re-Examination of Galatians 3:10," *JETS* 27 (1984): 151–60; A. Andrew Das, *Paul and the Jews* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 36–42; Seyoon Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 139–43; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 375; Timo Laato, "Paul's Anthropological Considerations: Two Problems," in *The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. Carson, O'Brien, and Seifrid, 354–59; Eckstein, *Verheissung und Gesetz*, 123.

[51]Preston M. Sprinkle, on the basis of a careful study of Lev. 18:5 in the Old Testament and Judaism and its place in Paul's argument, concludes that the text has clear soteriological implications: it refers to a way of salvation (*Law and Life: The Interpretation of Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and in Paul*, WUNT 2/241 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], cf. 136–42).

[52]Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 381; see his whole argument on 371–84; and see also, especially, Silva, "Faith versus Works of the Law in Galatians," 217–48; Robert H. Gundry, "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul," *Biblica* 66 (1985): 15–32; Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective*, 61–75; Bird, *Saving Righteousness*, 123; Bruce W. Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 76–77; Hofius, "Werke des Gesetzes," 299–301.

8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 22, 23 twice, 24, 25, 26; 5:5, 6; 6:10 [the occurrences in 1:23 and 5:22 may have a different sense]) dominate this part of the letter. This language has usually been interpreted anthropologically, as referring to human believing "in" Christ. But recent interpreters have drawn attention to the undeniably salvation-historical focus on this language in some texts in the letter; most notably 3:23, where Paul refers to "the coming of faith" in parallel to the coming of Christ (see v. 24). Since Paul attributes faith to Abraham earlier in the letter, it is argued that he must here, and in several other passages in the letter, be referring not to human believing but to Christ's faith or faithfulness.[53] On this point I remain stubbornly recalcitrant. I doubt that any reference to "faith" in Galatians refers to Christ's faith or faithfulness.[54] The significance of the verbal forms in both Galatians and elsewhere in Paul (with Christ as object and never as subject), along with the clear connections Paul draws between Abraham's faith and ours (3:1–9), among other arguments, convinces me that this is the correct reading of the letter.[55] Some of the more extreme proponents of the "faith of Christ" interpretation, claiming to want to avoid "anthropocentrism," are, in fact, in danger of eliminating any human element in Paul's soteriology at all.[56] Of course, much more could (and needs to) be said; but space limitations prevent me from pursuing the matter here.[57] In

[53]The view is, of course, widely held, but Hays's presentation of the case is classic. See Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 119–62; and see also the exchange between Dunn and Hays on this question (249–97). And see now, especially, Campbell, *The Quest for Paul's Gospel* and *The Deliverance of God*.

[54]See, e.g., Silva, "Faith versus Works of the Law in Galatians," 217–48.

[55]It is possible that the εἰς construction in 2:16 does not mean simply that Christ is the "object" of faith (see the careful linguistic work of Ulrichs, *Christusglaube*, 119–29). But nor does it mean, vaguely, as Campbell argues, that we believe "concerning" or "with respect to" Christ (*The Deliverance of God*, 840). Rather, as the linguistic evidence in the rest of the New Testament suggests (where almost all the relevant contemporary examples of the πιστεύω + εἰς combination appear), the idea seems be something like "we believe so as to join"; "we believe in order to enter into union with." Likewise, I am unconvinced that Abraham figures in Galatians 3 as a paradigm of Christ; this again flies in the face of the connections Paul makes back to the Galatians' own experience (3:1–5) and forward to "the people of faith" (v. 9). See also Gathercole, "Justified by Faith," 163–64, for this point in Romans 4.

[56]"Insofar as the argument [he is referring to Martyn's "faith of Christ" focus] turns on the perception that Paul wishes above all to emphasize God's initiative in justification, and therefore to have Paul assert that even human believing is God's (not human) work, such a view seems to be in danger of voiding the human reception of such salvific action of any substance at all" (John Riches, *Galatians through the Centuries*, Blackwell Bible Commentaries [Oxford: Blackwell, 2008], 133).

[57]The most extensive critique of the "faith/faithfulness of Jesus Christ" interpretation is Ulrichs, *Christusglaube*.

any case, most scholars who find "the faith of Christ" to be significant in the letter do not eliminate reference to human believing (although Douglas A. Campbell's massive and polemical reworking of justification in Paul virtually eliminates this element from the letter[58]).

The faith side of the Reformation works-versus-faith antithesis is eroded in another way also: by expanding the scope of faith to include, in some fashion, what we would call "good works."[59] The equivalent Hebrew word (אמונה), of course, includes the ideas of trust and faithfulness; and πίστις in Paul clearly has this sense at times. But any attempt to collapse works into faith in Paul founders on the same evidence that we have noted above: the polarity between faith, on the one hand, and "works of the law" or "works," on the other, includes a basic opposition between "believing" and "doing." Even in those texts where Paul appears to identify faith and obedience, he does not expand faith to include obedience, but he narrows down obedience to the one central requirement of faith. Believing in Paul is certainly more than an intellectual exercise; it involves the will and includes the disposition to trust and follow God. Paul and James on this point are in total agreement. True faith and works cannot be separated (Gal. 5:6); but they must be distinguished from one another also.[60] Faith is the disposition of the will necessary for works to be done in a way pleasing to God; but faith does not include in itself those works.[61]

With the two poles of the contrast now in place, we can consider a little more carefully the nature of this contrast. That Paul's argument in Galatians is characterized by a strongly salvation-historical framework that focuses on the extension of God's blessing to Gentiles in the new covenant era is, of course, quite clear. But some of the points we have made above suggest quite strongly that Paul also argues—at

[58]Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*, see esp. 833–95.

[59]Garlington is ultimately very unclear about the precise way he understands the relationship between faith, works, and obedience. He claims, on the one hand, that "*faith and works are two ways of saying the same thing*" (*Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance*, 146, emphasis his); and again, in the last sentence of the book: "In short, *faith, obedience, and perseverance are one and the same*" (163, emphasis his). But perhaps these are intended as generalizations (if so, they are very misleading ones!), since he also claims that faith, obedience, and perseverance are "three aspects of the same entity," and, "thus tested, 'faith' becomes the 'obedience' which is 'perseverance'" (163).

[60]James, then, who is probably responding to Pauline theology (though in garbled form), shows, by maintaining the distinction between faith and works, that this was probably Paul's view also (see Friedrich Avemarie, "Die Werke des Gesetzes im Spiegel des Jakobusbriefs: A Very Old Perspective on Paul," *ZTK* 98 [2001]: 282–309).

[61]See also, e.g., Gaffin, *By Faith, Not by Sight*, 102–3.

least implicitly—on another level also in Galatians. And this is to be expected. For the salvation-historical argument, in itself, does not explain *why* doing the torah cannot secure the promised Abrahamic blessing. Why couldn't the blessing of Abraham simply have been extended to Gentiles, as they were brought under the supervision of torah—as the agitators apparently argued? One clear indication that Paul's argument moves beyond (or behind) salvation history as such is his focus on Jews in his discussion of justification (the "we" who know about being justified by faith and not works of the law in 2:16 are clearly Jews [v. 15]; and the "we" who are "justified by faith" in 3:24 are also almost certainly Jews).[62] Justification by faith in Galatians does not focus only on providing a means to bring Gentiles into the people of God; it more fundamentally responds to a problem shared by Jews and Gentiles alike: sin.

Another indication along these same lines comes in the verse that best captures the essence of the issue in Galatia, 3:3. When Paul accuses the Galatians here of trying to "finish" their spiritual journey "by means of the flesh" (σαρκί, 3:3), the issue is not just salvation-historical (the "era of the flesh" versus "the era of the Spirit") but anthropological (cf. NIV, "After beginning with the Spirit, are you now trying to finish by *human effort*?").[63] Works are a problem in Galatians, therefore, not simply because they involve an outmoded torah; they are a problem also, and more fundamentally, because human inability renders them incapable of delivering people from sin. And, on the other side of the polarity, faith, Paul suggests, is the appropriate means of justification because it is the natural extension in the human sphere of God's grace. We noted earlier how Paul introduces the language of "grace"—somewhat unexpectedly—into his argument at several key points. Granted the significance of grace in Paul as a characteristic new covenant reality (see, e.g., Rom. 5:1), it is unlikely that Paul uses this language simply for defensive purposes.[64] It is more likely that he wants to tie the agitators' demand for torah obedience to the broader issue of human "achievement" as a contrast to the utterly gracious

[62]The first-person plurals in 3:23–25 probably refer to Paul and his fellow Jews (Dunn, *Galatians*, 198; Garlington, *Galatians*, 165; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 145; contra, e.g., Martyn, *Galatians*, 362; Bruce, *Galatians*, 182; Mußner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 256).

[63]See also Sprinkle, who thinks that the basic dichotomy reflected in Paul's use of Lev. 18:5 in Gal. 3:12 is divine versus human action (*Law and Life*, 150–63).

[64]As some commentators think he does in, e.g., Gal. 2:21 (Bruce, *Galatians*, 146; Burton, *Galatians*, 140; Schlier, *Brief an die Galater*, 103–4; Martyn, *Galatians*, 259).

character of God's justifying work in Christ. Again, the point is that this logic appears to move beyond (or behind!) salvation history to more fundamental theological issues, with anthropological and soteriological implications. Galatians is not a polemic against semi-Pelagianism (as N. T. Wright has often insisted); but Paul's argument suggests that he finds behind the agitators' views a reliance on human achievement that, indeed, has fundamental resemblances to semi-Pelagianism.

The Time of Justification

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of justification in Galatians is its time. Many traditional interpretations of the letter assume, or argue, that when Paul insists that people are "justified by faith," he is referring to entrance into Christian experience; to put it bluntly, "how you get saved." But a survey of Paul's justification language in the context of the letter's occasion and argument suggests that the matter is more complicated.

I begin with the last occurrence of justification language in the letter, 5:5: ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα: "for we by the Spirit by faith await the hope of righteousness." The NIV translates the phrase ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης as "the righteousness for which we hope." This rendering reflects the majority scholarly opinion—that "righteousness" is the object of Christian hope (taking τῆς δικαιοσύνης as either an epexegetic or objective genitive). But a significant minority of interpreters argue that "righteousness" here is, in fact, the basis or source of our hope (a subjective genitive).[65] Ronald Fung thus translates "the hope to which the justification of believers points them forward."[66] Paul can certainly use a subjective genitive after "hope" as, for instance, he does in Colossians 1:23, where the translation of the NRSV, "the hope promised by the gospel," certainly captures Paul's intent.[67] But interpreters are usually driven to this view not by linguistics but by theology. They note that Paul associates justification with the believer's entrance into salvation in several

[65]No major English translation explicitly reflects the subjective genitive interpretation. But it receives support in the literature. See, in addition to Fung and George (see the notes below), Matera, *Galatians*, 182; Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness*, 179; Eckstein, *Verheissung und Gesetz*, 142; Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 419.

[66]Fung, *Galatians*, 226.

[67]In addition to Gal. 5:5 and Col. 1:23, Paul uses a genitive after ἐλπίς eight other times. Two appear to be subjective (Eph. 1:18 and Eph. 4:4), while six appear to be objective/epexegetical (Rom. 5:2; Col. 1:27; 1 Thess. 1:3; 5:8; Titus 1:2; 3:7).

key texts, such as Romans 5:1 and 1 Corinthians 6:11, and that he accordingly argues *from* the past act of justification *to* future salvation from God's wrath (see esp. Rom. 5:9; and also 8:29–30). A reference to forensic righteousness as an object of hope for the believer would stand in tension with these texts.[68] (Of course, this argument assumes that "righteousness" in Gal. 5:5 and the justification language in these other texts refer to the same thing: the traditional notion of forensic righteousness, right standing before God. But, as we have seen, I think this assumption is justified.)

If, then, "righteousness" in Galatians 5:5 is forensic righteousness, those who think the reference must be to a present right standing as the basis for our hope would seem to have a pretty good case. Attaching justification firmly to the "already" side of Christian experience seems to be suggested by these texts in Paul's other letters and yields an attractively elegant consistency in Paul's soteriological terminology.[69] I have argued this view myself in the past. But I no longer think it is persuasive.

First, it does not seem likely that "righteousness" in Galatians 5:5 refers to the present status of righteousness as the basis for hope. If this is what was meant, Paul would in effect be saying that "we eagerly await hope," in the sense of "what we hope for." But after the verb ἀπεκδεχόμεθα ("eagerly await") we expect a more specific object than this.[70] "We are eagerly awaiting what we hope for" would make sense if Paul had defined this hope in the context. But he has not. This is the first reference to Christian hope in any form in Galatians.

[68]Timothy George summarizes the point: "Paul was not saying, of course, that we must wait until the second coming of Christ either to receive justification or to be assured of it. The whole burden of Paul's doctrine of justification is that divine righteousness is imparted here and now through faith in Jesus Christ" (*Galatians*, NAC [Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994], 361). S. M. Baugh explicitly grounds his opposition to a future element of justification in Paul on this consideration ("The New Perspective, Mediation, 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], 150–56).

[69]See especially the way Karl Donfried puts the matter: "In short, the Christian life is a process which begins in justification, is actualized in sanctification and is consummated with salvation" ("Justification and Last Judgment in Paul," *ZNW* 67 [1976]: 90–110, here 100).

[70]Smith, *Justification and Eschatology*, 94–95. Paul uses the verb ἀπεχδέχομαι five other times, in each case referring to eschatological anticipation. In four cases the object of the verb has definite content: creation "waits in eager expectation for the children of God to be revealed" (Rom. 8:19); believers await "our adoption, the redemption of our bodies" (Rom. 8:23), "our Lord Jesus Christ to be revealed" (1 Cor. 1:7), and "a Savior" (Phil. 3:20). Only in Rom. 8:25 does Paul use a rather vague object (implicitly) after this verb; but "what we do not yet have" here has been elaborated in what precedes.

Second, the timing of justification in other texts in Galatians is surprisingly difficult to pin down. The verb occurs in the present indicative (2:16a; 3:8, 11; 5:4) and the future indicative (2:16c); with ἵνα in the aorist subjunctive (2:16b; 3:24); and in the aorist infinitive (completing the verb ζητοῦντες in 2:17). In none of these texts do we find a clear allusion to "initial" justification of the sort we find, for instance, in Romans 5. Two of these, in fact, might share with Galatians 5:5 a reference to future justification.[71] Paul's claim in 2:17 that he and other Jewish Christians are "seeking to be justified in Christ" might refer to their hope of ultimate vindication in the judgment.[72] And Paul's warning in 5:4 that the Galatians are "trying to be justified by the law" (I am taking the verb δικαιοῦσθε as a conative present, along with most scholars) is even more likely to have a future reference. The Galatians have already experienced new life in Christ. The problem is that they are in danger of being convinced that they can maintain their status of righteousness only by adding torah obedience to their faith in Christ. To be sure, some of these texts could well refer to, or at least include, reference to initial justification. But they seem rather simply not to be interested in the matter of time. Several of these verses have a gnomic force, Paul expressing the principle that "justification" is rendered (whenever that might be) in a certain way, on certain grounds. When we turn to the noun, the situation is a bit more complicated. If δικαιοσύνη in 5:5 refers to a future bestowal of righteousness, 3:6 pretty clearly has an "already" focus: Abraham, like the Galatians themselves (3:1–5), attained to a righteous status the moment he believed.[73] Galatians 2:21 and 3:21, on the other hand, fall pretty clearly in the gnomic or

[71]Moisés Silva argues that 2:16a is also a reference to future justification ("Galatians," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 791).

[72]The issue is complicated by the contested nature of Paul's argument at this point. Much depends on how much temporal weight we give to the verb εὑρέθημεν. Most versions translate it with an English present tense (as in my paraphrase above), and in this case a reference to future justification is likely (see, e.g., Mark A. Seifrid, "Paul, Luther, and Justification in Gal 2:15–21," *WTJ* 65 [2003]: 218; Martyn, *Galatians*, 254; Garlington, *Galatians*, 117). But a past reference, to the time when Paul and his fellow Jewish Christians were seeking initial justification in Christ, is possible (see NRSV; and Fung, *Galatians*, 119; Michael Bachmann, *Sünder oder Übertreter: Studien zur Argumentation in Gal 2,15ff.*, WUNT 2.59 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992], 38–39).

[73]Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," 71–72.

principial category. Overall, justification language in Galatians has a timeless and, if anything, future-oriented focus.[74]

This focus makes good sense in light of the rhetorical situation of the letter. This situation is clearly revealed in 3:1–5, where Paul argues *from* the good start that the Galatians have made *to* the need to continue as they began. It is therefore not surprising that righteousness language in Galatians has a general, gnomic quality. A definitive act of justification at the beginning of the Christian life is presumed, as the parallel Paul draws between Abraham's experience and the Galatians' makes clear. And Romans, written in a different (and arguably less polemical) situation, affirms such a definitive initial justification unmistakably (Rom. 5:1, 9; cf. 8:30). But the situation in Galatia requires that Paul emphasize how the Galatians are to *maintain* their status of righteousness and, especially, how they can expect to be found to be in the "right" in the judgment. This last point deserves particular attention. Without denying that first-century Judaism viewed God's election as the ultimate basis for their place in the covenant, I think it is also the case that, in practice, many Jews operated with "a semi-tacit consciousness of having been born there, of always having been there," as Henri Blocher puts it.[75] In this scenario, the question becomes not simply how one "gets in" initially or how one "stays in" but how one can hope to "get in" the eternal kingdom on the day of judgment.[76] This seems to be exactly the issue that Galatians is addressing.[77]

[74]See also Gaffin, *By Faith, Not by Sight*, 98; A. Andrew Das, "Oneness in Christ: The *Nexus Indivulsus* between Justification and Sanctification in Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *Concordia Journal* 21 (1995): 173–86; C. K. Barrett, *Freedom and Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985), 63–65; Bernard H. Brinsmead, *Galatians: Dialogical Response to Opponents* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 201. Kwon, indeed, argues that justification in Galatians is exclusively future (Yon-Gyong Kwon, *Eschatology in Galatians: Rethinking Paul's Response to the Crisis in Galatia*, WUNT 183 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 51–76).

[75]Blocher, "Justification of the Ungodly," 488–89; see also Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 8–11.

[76]Simon Gathercole has drawn attention to the importance of this future "getting in" in Jewish literature and its comparative neglect in the debate (Simon J. Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002], 113–19). On Galatians, see also Graham N. Stanton, "The Law of Moses and the Law of Christ: Galatians 3:1–6:2," in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 99–116, 103–4.

[77] A reference to future justification in Galatians is at least consonant with two other phenomena. First, a good case can be made that Paul uses justification language to refer to a future time elsewhere. In contrast to the trend of recent interpretation (see especially Thomas R. Schreiner, "Did Paul Believe in Justification by Works? Another Look at Romans 2," *BBR* 3 [1993]: 131–58; Simon J. Gathercole, "A Law Unto Themselves: The Gentiles in Romans 2.14–15 Revisited,"

N. T. Wright is surely correct to stress that eschatology is one of the key lenses through which justification must be viewed. Indeed, it is traditional to assert that justification in Paul is a basically eschatological verdict, with his focus on the initial verdict then being seen in light of his typical "realized" perspective. I have no quarrel with this way of viewing the matter; and it does explain the bulk of occurrences in Romans quite well. However, our study of Galatians suggests that justification functions in Paul at both the "already" and "not yet" poles of his eschatology. A future element in justification does not fit entirely comfortably within my own Reformed tradition.[78] It is messy. But it appears to be biblical.

Conclusion

We will explore some implications of this conclusion in a moment. But I want first to summarize. Occurrences of δικ- language in Galatians (with the possible exception of δίκαιος in 3:11) all refer to one thing: the declaration of the forensic status of "right" before God (the verb) or that status itself (the noun). Paul probably draws this language especially from Old Testament passages such as Isaiah 46–55, where δικ-/צדק language occurs prominently to denote the vindicating deliverance that God will bring to his people. This background may be

JSNT 85 [2002]: 27–49; Bird, *The Saving Righteousness of God*, 155–78; Garlington, *Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance*, 56–71; Wright, "Romans," 440–42), I don't think Rom. 2:13 is one of these (see Moo, *Romans*, 139–42, 147–48). But Rom. 5:19 and 8:33 are at least possible references to a future aspect of justification. Dunn thinks that other texts may also refer to a future element in justification: Rom. 3:20, 30; Gal. 3:8, 11, 24 ("Jesus the Judge: Further Thoughts on Paul's Christology and Soteriology," in *The New Perspective on Paul*, 401–2). I doubt that Rom. 3:20, 30 or Gal. 3:8 have a future focus; Gal. 3:11 and 24 might. Some others who advocate a future focus in justification are Peter Stuhlmacher, "The Apostle Paul's View of Righteousness," in *Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 72 ("justification designates in Paul both the sharing in God's grace that has already been given by faith and acquittal before God in the last judgment"); Cosgrove, "Justification in Paul," 652–54; Peter T. O'Brien, "Justification in Paul and Some Crucial Issues of the Last Two Decades," in *Right with God: Justification in the Bible and the World*, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 90; Rainbow, *Way of Salvation*, 155–74. See also Gathercole, who argues that "salvation should be viewed as a unity, with justification referring to the whole while highlighting a certain aspect" ("Doctrine of Justification," 230). Contesting any future element to justification in Paul are, e.g., Fung, *Galatians*, 232–35; Chris VanLandingham, *Judgment and Justification in Early Judaism and the Apostle Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), 317–18. The second phenomenon is the fact that justification language often has an eschatological significance in Judaism and elsewhere in the New Testament (e.g., Matt. 12:37; James 2:21–25). Of course, we must recognize that linguistic parallels do not necessarily translate into conceptual parallels. But I think that many of these texts are, indeed, conceptually parallel to Paul's justification teaching.

[78]Although, as Richard B. Gaffin Jr., notes, the view has been held by Reformed theologians in the past ("Justification and Eschatology," in *Justified in Christ: God's Plan for Us in Justification*, ed. K. Scott Oliphint [Fearn, Ross-shire: Mentor, 2007], 4–5).

one reason why Paul uses δικ- language in Galatians with a distinctly future orientation. Another reason, however, is the situation that Paul addresses. The agitators were not teaching the classic idea of "works righteousness," in the sense that one had to do works to "get in." Rather, they were insisting that the Galatians—already "in," in some sense—had to add to their faith in Christ torah obedience in order to maintain their "righteous" status and, especially, in order to be finally vindicated: declared to belong to God's righteous people in the day of judgment. Galatians is, therefore, in my view, not (mainly) about "sanctification," or "how to live,"[79] or even about "justification" in its usual sense of initial acceptance, but about justification broadly considered. In response to false teachers who claim that this vindication, since it is promised only to Israel, can be experienced only by those who identify with Israel by doing torah, Paul, reading salvation history in light of the epochal significance of the cross, insists that faith, and faith alone (accompanied, to be sure, by the transforming power of the Spirit), maintains one's relationship to Christ, in whose person the people of God are now constituted. Strikingly, in light of Romans, Paul puts no emphasis on an initial definitive act of justification.[80] This is not because he has no such notion as he writes Galatians (the logic of 3:6–9 suggests that he does) but because he addresses a situation that requires a focus on maintaining the status of righteousness in view of an ultimate declaration of vindication yet to come. By seeking to "supplement" their faith in Christ with torah observance, the Galatian Christians are in danger of forfeiting their (apparent) standing in Christ and therefore failing to achieve that final vindication. In Galatians, then, righteousness tends to have the idea of vindication, in continuity with the usage of this language that we noted earlier in Isaiah 46–55. In contrast to that latter passage, of course—and this is the nub of the issue in Galatia—the people of God who can expect to be vindicated are now defined not by their biological connection with Abraham and/or by torah observance but by their connection with Messiah Jesus, a connection maintained by faith alone.

[79]As, e.g., is argued by Wakefield, *Where to Live*; Das, "Oneness in Christ," 173; Esler, *Galatians*, 143.

[80]The contrast between Galatians and Romans on this point relates to their situations. In contrast to Galatians, where the agitators make it necessary for Paul to focus on warning about continuance in righteousness and ultimate vindication—the "not yet"—Romans focuses on the assurance promised to those who have been justified—the "already."

Paul's teaching on justification in Galatians strongly endorses the traditional Reformation emphasis on justification by faith alone. In contrast to some recent reconfigurations of this doctrine, the Reformers did not mean by this teaching that a person gains only initial entrance into the state of salvation by faith alone—the ultimate verdict being based on faith plus works.[81] They intended to assert that the eschatological gift of justification, at whatever "time" or in however many stages it might be manifested, came by faith alone. Paul seems to be saying just this in Galatians. Faith is the means not only of entering into relationship with God but also of maintaining that relationship and of confirming that relationship on the day of judgment.[82] Of course, it is not faith in itself that has this power; it is because faith connects the believer to Christ, in whose vindication (see 1 Tim. 3:16) the believer shares. My brief overview confirms those who find a monergism in Paul's teaching about salvation that stands in contrast to the synergism of covenant nomism.[83] Justification, not only in its initial phase, but in its totality, is *sola fide*—and, though it has not been a focus of this study, in light of Galatians 2:21 and 5:4, *sola gratia* also.

I conclude by suggesting two topics that require further reflection in light of this survey.[84]

[81]A well-known recent claim along these lines comes (again!) from N. T. Wright, who argues that God judges us on the basis of "the whole life lived" (e.g., *Paul in Fresh Perspective*, 111–13). His latest book, however, appears to back off from this way of putting matters. He suggests that works "demonstrate" membership in God's people (*Justification*, 146) and that from initial justification, "Paul sets out on a journey which, though its end is in fact secure, always *seems* like something that has to be struggled for" (153). On one reading of Wright's latest book, I believe he is arguing a view very close to what I am suggesting above. For others who suggest that works play some kind of instrumental role in ultimate justification, see Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," 80–89; Dunn, "Jesus the Judge," 407; Kent L. Yinger, *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*, SNTSMS 105 (Cambridge: University Press, 1999), 288; Gathercole, "A Law Unto Themselves," 27–49; Daniel J. R. Kirk, *Unlocking Romans: Resurrection and the Justification of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 223–27.

[82]Rainbow's claim, therefore, that Paul never suggests that the final judgment will be based on faith, while perhaps linguistically valid, is conceptually erroneous (see *Way of Salvation*, 194). Indeed, he seems to contradict his own claim two pages later, where he refers to "the sort of faith which is active will withstand the judgment" (196).

[83]See for this point especially Gundry, "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved," 1–38 ("For Paul, then, getting in and staying in are covered by the seamless robe of faith as opposed to works" [p. 12]); O'Brien, "Justification," 87; O'Brien, "Was Paul a Covenantal Nomist?," 265–66, 269–70; Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*, 15–19; and Gathercole, who comments on Yinger's monograph, "If Yinger is correct to deny that 'the grace-works axis in Judaism generally is any more synergistic . . . than in Paul' then the Holy Spirit came at Pentecost for nothing (cf. Gal. 2:21!)" (*Where is Boasting?*, 134).

[84]Two consequences that do not follow might be mentioned. First, any future element in justification must not detract from the decisive nature of the declaration of righteousness that we receive

First, the focus on the future aspect of justification in Galatians raises difficult questions about the nature of this event, especially in its relationship to "initial" justification. Piper, reflecting the main line of Reformation teaching, argues that future justification is a declaration and not a "saving act."[85] Future justification declares publicly what initial justification has definitively settled in the divine lawcourt. This way of putting the matter would seem to be the inevitable logical deduction from a conviction that initial justification is a definitive act; and it may well be the best way of handling all the biblical data involved. Yet one has to wonder whether Paul would give the future aspect of justification the kind of prominence it has in Galatians if it was a matter simply of public declaration. The importance he attaches to the Galatians' continued reliance on faith and the Spirit—see especially Galatians 5:2–4—suggests that more may be involved. What is this "more"? I am not at all sure; but the evidence of Galatians (not to mention, e.g., James 2) should impel us to continue to think about how we might best formulate the relationship between an initial definitive declaration of justification and the final declaration.

---

when we first believe. To do so would be to rob initial justification of the decisive soteriological significance that it has in Romans 5, Romans 8, and 1 Corinthians 6. As long as the emphasis is on "unqualified" and "yet-to-be-determined," I therefore agree with Cornelis P. Venema: "An unqualified affirmation of a future, yet-to-be-determined justification based upon works would surely compromise in the most radical way Paul's teaching that there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" ("What Did Saint Paul Really Say? N. T. Wright and the New Perspective(s) on Paul," in *By Faith Alone: Answering the Challenges to the Doctrine of Justification*, ed. Gary L. W. Johnson and Guy P. Waters [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006], 33–59, 58; see, e.g., O'Brien, "Justification," 94). These texts, and others, provide solid textual support for the traditional Reformed emphasis on the definitive nature of initial justification. Therefore, while I am happy to ascribe to justification an "already"/"not yet" quality, I am not comfortable with the language of "two justifications." Justification is a single, eschatological, act that we experience in two phases. Second, and for a similar reason, I would also prefer to avoid the language of "process" that some have applied to Paul's teaching on justification. See, e.g., Stuhlmacher: "*The justification of which he speaks is a process of becoming new that spans the earthly life of a believer, a path from faith's beginning to its end*" ("The Apostle Paul's View of Righteousness," 72 [emphasis his]; see also Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification*, 62–63). Dunn does not use the language of "process," but suggests something like it: "Justification is not a once-for-all act of God. It is rather the initial acceptance by God into restored relationship. But thereafter the relationship could not be sustained without God continuing to exercise his justifying righteousness with a view to the final act of judgment and acquittal" (*The Theology of Paul*, 386). To be sure, the initial experience of justification brings us into a continuing state of justification, or "righteousness," a state that will be secured in the final phase of justification. But "process" suggests a continuing action, opening up the possibility of a "growing" in or into justification that inappropriately minimizes the eschatological character of justification as definitive verdict.

[85] *The Future of Justification*, 101–16.

Second, granted that "by faith alone" is, indeed, taught in Galatians, what of "works"? What role do they place in the believer's ultimate justification? In keeping with the balance that typifies all of Paul's letters, Galatians highlights, along with faith, the necessity of works for entrance into eternal life:

> Do not be deceived: God cannot be mocked. People reap what they sow. Those who sow to please their sinful nature, from that nature will reap destruction; those who sow to please the Spirit, from the Spirit will reap eternal life. Let us not become weary in doing good, for at the proper time we will reap a harvest if we do not give up. (6:7–9)

The issue we raise here is, of course, simply another way of putting the age-old question of the relationship between "justification by faith" and "judgment according to works"[86]—what Wright labels the "hardest point in the whole theology of justification."[87] The question becomes even more difficult if the "justification" in question, as we have argued, includes not just initial justification, but ultimate justification in all its forms. Any kind of temporal answer to the question—e.g., justified initially by faith, judged finally by faith plus works—is ruled out. Evangelicals in the broadly Reformed tradition have usually responded to this problem by arguing (1) that our works will have a bearing on the "reward" that we receive but not on salvation per se and/or (2) that works are the product or "evidence" of faith. I don't think the former is exegetically responsible. The latter has much more to be said for it and certainly captures an important aspect of biblical teaching. It is therefore usual to speak of works as the evidence of faith. And this way of approaching the matter has some grounding in Galatians. The "doing good" that will clear us in the judgment comes only by the influence of the Spirit. Christian "works," Paul suggests in texts such as Galatians 5:22–23, are the "fruit" of God's Spirit, dwelling within by faith. However, while surely not incorrect, labeling our Spirit-induced works *simply* as "evidence" may not finally do justice to the fact that

[86]For a recent survey of views on the relationship between justification by faith and judgment according to works, see Dane C. Ortlund, "Justified by Faith, Judged According to Works: Another Look at a Pauline Paradox," *JETS* 52 (2009): 323–39.
[87]Wright, *Justification*, 101–2.

this evidence is something we are commanded to produce.[88] Good works may be the fruit of the Spirit, yet they are also, Paul makes clear, fruit that can be produced only through the active and continuing commitment of the believer to "walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5:16; cf. 25).

Paul, in keeping with the New Testament generally, stresses both the utter sufficiency of the righteousness that we have been given in Christ for our salvation and the significance of our righteous behavior for that same salvation. At its deepest level, the tension raised by these claims is an aspect of a much broader and more fundamental biblical tension: that between divine action and human action; or, as the man we honor in this volume might prefer to put it, divine sovereignty and human responsibility. D. A. Carson's first book-length work (his published dissertation) dealt with this matter,[89] and both the book and many conversations (and debates!) over the years have fundamentally shaped my own approach to this central biblical issue. I strongly suspect that the compatibilist view that Don has strongly endorsed is the framework within which we must think further about the tensions I have mentioned in the last several paragraphs. I am deeply grateful for Don's work on this matter and for the "fellowship in the gospel" that we have enjoyed over many years. As he would himself insist, *soli Deo gloria*.

[88]See also Mark Seifrid, who suggests that contenting ourselves with the language of "evidence" may sever the close tie between faith and obedience in Paul (*Christ, Our Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Justification*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 9 [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000], 148). Note also his comments on James 2: "Works therefore are not only evidence of faith; they are integral to it"; "James freely draws the conclusion that the justification of Abraham and Rahab was based upon works, as it is likewise for all others (2:21, 24, 25)"; "Justification must ultimately be by works, because works are faith's perfection" (180). And what Seifrid says of James he would apply also to Paul, since he concludes that they are in ultimate agreement: "Both understand that our justification at the last judgment will be based upon works. Both understand that these works belong to faith, and that they are God's works, not our own" (182).

[89]D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension* (1981; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002).

"Don Carson is one of the most productive and capable evangelical scholars in the English-speaking world, and this volume by former students and teaching colleagues reflects the breadth of his interests and especially his concern for the development of biblical studies in a global context. This solid volume thus offers not only a worthy tribute to its honoree but also valuable assessments of the state of New Testament scholarship worldwide."

I. HOWARD MARSHALL, *Professor Emeritus of New Testament, University of Aberdeen, Scotland*

"D. A. Carson is a biblical scholar of the highest caliber, a preacher and evangelist of renown, and a theologian of unswerving commitment to the gospel. This book is a snapshot of issues in the international New Testament scene as it stands today. This erudite collection of essays is rightly dedicated to one who has committed his life to serving the global church."

MICHAEL F. BIRD, *Lecturer in Theological Studies, Crossway College, Brisbane, Australia*

"This lively book of essays represents a fitting tribute to the life of Don Carson, one of the liveliest and most learned biblical scholars of our time. It will only suit its honoree, however, if it leads its varied readers to the Scriptures he has studied for so long, increasing devotion and fidelity to the gospel they proclaim."

DOUGLAS A. SWEENEY, *Professor of Church History and the History of Christian Thought, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School; Director, Carl F. H. Henry Center for Theological Understanding*

"A remarkable series of studies in honor of a remarkable man. Carson's influence has been extraordinary, and this book explores a number of his particular interests with great skill."

SIMON J. GATHERCOLE, *Senior Lecturer in New Testament, The University of Cambridge; editor,* Journal for the Study of the New Testament

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

CROSSWAY
www.crossway.org