

Title: The Heart of the Matter

Text: Galatians 2:15a

Central Idea: There's no beating around the bush when it comes to the Gospel

Number: 1024Ga2.15a(14)

Date: October 20, 2024

[i] Scripture Reading and Prayer

15 We [are] Jews by nature and not sinners from among the Gentiles. 16 Yet we know that a man is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have believed in Christ Jesus so that we may be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the law, since by the works of the law no flesh will be justified. 17 But if while seeking to be justified in Christ, we ourselves were found to be sinners, is Christ then a minister of sin? May it never be! 18 For if I rebuild what I once destroyed, I prove myself to be a transgressor. 19 For through the law I died to the law, so that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ – 20 and it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself up for me. 21 I do not nullify the grace of God: for if righteousness [comes] through the law, then Christ died for no purpose.

[ii] Idioms

Word “idiom” hails from Gk: ἰδίωμα – “special phrasing, a peculiarity.”

When we talk about idioms, we speak of words whose fig. meaning is diff. from t/lit. meaning.

Can't take idioms strictly lit. to understand their meaning.

Here are some you may have heard before.

As you listen to these imagine being a non-English speaker. Or listen to these phrases & interpret them literally.

**I'm going to bury the hatchet*

**A penny for your thoughts?*

**That cost me an arm and a leg*

**Listen buddy, you're barking up the wrong tree*

**I heard it on the grapevine*

**I just killed two birds with one stone*

**He let the cat out of the bag*

**Stop sitting on the fence*

**I'm going to give him a taste of his own medicine*

**It's the best thing since sliced bread* (bread slicer machine hails from 1920s)

Here's one you may not be familiar with==>

**Jumping the shark*

Origin = 1977 episode of sit. com. "Happy Days" where Fonzie (Mr. Cool) puts on a pair of water skis & does a stunt where he jumps over a live shark (while donning his sig. black leather jacket). Episode is often looked at as t/end of this once highly-rated TV show.

So t/phrase is used to refer to something/someone who has ridiculously attempted to reacquire former glory or status.

One definition: "Jumping the shark is an idiom used to describe the moment of a misguided attempt at generating new publicity for something once, but no longer, widely popular." [stackexchange]

Idioms are quite humorous.

Again, what would you think if you heard these w/o any knowledge of their idiomatic sense ==>

* *Hold your horses*

* *I heard this song and now I have an earworm*

* *I've just been up to some monkey business*

* *My husband is a bull in a china shop*

* *I have a bone to pick with you*

* From t/Bible (BOJ 19:20): *I survived by t/skin of my teeth*

* One more: *Beating around the bush*

Origin of that phrase goes back to the 16th c. when hunters would employ others to lit. beat around bushes in order to spook game animals into the open.

Indirect way to hunt, hence indirect way to broach a subject: "Stop beating around the bush & get to t/point!"

To BAB is to skirt t/issue. To be less than forthright.

[iii] Reason I end with "Beating around the bush" ...

... is because no one could accuse TAP of doing such a thing.

Paul gets to the point. Something we see in chap. 1 where he had (as we put it then) "No time for kudos"
(no time to say pos. things about t/Gal. CHs.

Instead, he opens with some direct words 6 vv. into chapt. 1: I am amazed that you are so quickly deserting Him who called you by the grace of Christ, for a different gospel;

8 But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to what we have preached to you, he is to be accursed! (he repeats t/warning in v. 9)

Paul gets right to t/point. Concern: maintaining t/truth of t/G.

[iv] We saw that recently in chapter two

2:11 But when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned.

(How's that for not "beating around the bush?")

[v] Don't misunderstand: Paul could be gentle . . .

He could be subtle when approp.

Example: he writes to his friend Philemon on behalf of t/runaway slave Onesimus whom Paul brought to t/faith.

Paul sends Onesimus back to his owner (which was a violation of t/Law acc. to Deut. 23:15) & appeals to him w/a spirit of patient love that Philemon would do what is right & even go beyond that.

Receive Onesimus back as a beloved brother in X.

Think there's a hint there that he should release Onesimus.

Paul's tone depended on t/context. He wasn't afraid to use strong words when he deemed it approp—as he does here. Paul needed to get right to t/point of his argument as it relates to Law & t/Gospel.

There's no beating around the bush when it comes to the Gospel.

[vi] This section of chapter two (vv. 15-21) is significant

At this point that we move from t/shallows into t/deep waters

[vii] Here's what I want to accomplish this morning

I want you to see t/context as to how vv. 15-21 relate to Paul's flow of thot & set t/stage for what follows in chps 3-4.

AND I want you to learn some key words & terms that we'll be revisiting. We're going to end w/a quick look at a recent threat to t/Gospel that began in academia & has been infiltrating t/CH: The New Perspective on Paul.

At t/Heart of the Matter = Justification by Faith Alone

I. Establishing the Context

II. Examining Key Words

Going to be academic today. You're going to have to "put on your thinking caps."

If you are listening for t/first time, I apologize. We are setting t/stage for what follows.

I. Establishing the Context

A. The Context Within the Chapter

1. Brings us back to verse 11: Scene shifts from Jerusalem to Antioch

a. The chapter began with Paul describing his 2d trip to Jerusalem after his conversion to Christ (cf. 1:18)

Barn. & Titus accomp. Paul on this 2d trip which ended up being a test case for t/Gospel.

"Litmus test" that invol. Titus & circumcision.

Accord. to v. 2 – it was bec. of a rev. that they went to Jerus.

Ties into Acts 11:

[prophet] named Agabus indicated that a famine was coming
So t/CH responded by taking a collection for the relief of the brethren living in Judea. This contribution was brought to Jerus. by Barnabas & Paul.

While they were there some false brethren πσευδω αδελφοι (sham Xns) showed up (Judaizers) & began to debate w/them contending that Titus (a Gentile) needed to be circumcised & keep t/Law.

These pseudo-Xns were opposed & their false Gospel rejected. Peter, James & John were in agreement w/Paul Barnabas & Titus.

Paul's second trip to Jerusalem proves that there's harmony between Jerusalem and Antioch.

The Pillars (Peter/James/John) and Paul sing in unison.

2. The scene shifts from Jerusalem back to Antioch in Verse 11

11 But when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face because he stood condemned.

a. Things have changed

Whereas there was agreement as to t/Gospel, now there's hypocrisy. Now we have TAP rebuking Peter as it relates to t/Gentiles & t/Gospel.

This throws t/entire Titus test case in reverse!

Titus, a Gentile, didn't need to be circumcised under t/M.L. Liberty. Now Peter shys away from eating w/his Gentile bros/sisters.

What we see in v. 12 ==>

12 For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision.

b. Peter “used to eat with the Gentiles”

Not just eating w/them, but likely eating t/same foods they ate, which under t/Old Law were forbidden.

Peter dined w/Gentiles — until some men arrived from Jerus. Out of fear he separated from t/Gentiles—hypocrisy. Peter's actions were inconsistent w/what he believed (context of 2:1-10 – Titus; Peter/James/John & right hand of fell.).

Now Peter changes his practice from liberty to license.

c. Other Jewish Christians followed Peter's bad example — even Barnabas was carried away in hypocrisy We saw that last time in v. 13.

d. Serious! It was all about the Gospel of grace

14a **But when I saw that they were not acting straight-forward concerning the truth of the gospel . . .**

(1) “straight-forward” (ESV “not in step”)

Greek verb: ὀρθοποδεω (ορθος = straight & πους = foot).
Straight walk / line (opposed to “crooked” / “bent”).

Peter was “out of step” when it came to t/Gospel / Xn liberty under t/N.C.

(a) Paul rebukes him

14b . . . I said to Cephas in the presence of all: “If you, being a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how [is it that] you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?”

IOW ==>

“You lived like your Gentile brethren, eating w/them & treating them as co-equals in God's KD. But now, out of fear, you've gone back to your Old Covt. ways. When t/Gentiles see your behavior they are compelled to act like you because you're giving t/impression that to truly be a Xn, one must keep t/Law.”

(b) Paul tells Peter in v. 14:

14 . . . you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?”

i. We saw that same word “compel” used in 2:3 ==>

3 But not even Titus who was with me, though he was a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.

Verb ἀναγκάζω defined by L&N: “to compel someone to act in a particular manner—‘to compel, to force.’”

“T/pressure of t/false brethren then couldn't compel Titus to be circumcised. Why now, Peter, do you compel Gentiles to live like Jews?”

As t/Apostolic father, Ignatius of Antioch wrote in his early letter to t/Magnesians in Asia Minor:

“It is absurd to be a Xn & live like a Jew”

There's no beating around the bush when it comes to the Gospel.

2. That brings us to verse 15 . . .

B. Here's where Paul begins address a larger audience

While still recounting what he said to Peter, he begins to widen his scope to incl. t/Galatians (by ext., all of us).

1. Like a Pie Diagram (I prefer “pizza”)

Take a slice out of t/pie & you have a piece w/3 corners, triangular in shape.

At t/narrow point, t/tip, Paul is addressing Peter ==>
Verse 14 – “I said to Peter in t/presence of all.”

As t/lines widen toward t/crust, Paul, while still addressing Peter, is incl. t/Galatians in t/convers.

What begins w/Peter's hypoc. ends w/the great truths of Just. by F. alone (v. 16) & t/believer's union w/X (v.20).

a. Question:

How far do the quotes extend? How much of this passage records Paul’s direct words to Peter.

Quotation marks are not part of the orig.

In our translations we supply them to ind. discourse.

Matter of interpt.

Some transl. like t/ESV, NET = thru v. 14.

Others like NIV, NASB = all the way to end of the chapter.

We know that Paul begins recounting his rebuke of Peter =>
14b . . . **I said to Cephas in the presence of all: “If you, being a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how [is it that] you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?”**

Is verse 15 part of Paul’s reprimand of Peter?

15 **“We are Jews by nature and not sinners from among the Gentiles;”**

Probably.

Is verse 16 part of what Paul said to Peter in Antioch?
Verse 17? All t/way to t/end of t/chapt. in v. 21?

Maybe? Maybe not. Interpretational issue.
But there is an imperceptible broadening of Paul's words.

That's what Timothy George says in his commentary ==>
"The theological thrust of [Paul's] presentation is seen in the fact that the historical narrative [Paul & Peter in Antioch] flows almost imperceptibly into his theological exposition [of justification by faith]. [George, 105]

b. Verses 15 – 21 Are Transitional

It's a transition that looks forward to chapters 3-4.

2. In fact we can note how the letter unfolds ==>

1:6 – 2:14 establishes t/historical context
(much of it autobiographical to Paul).

2:15–21 marks a transition to t/rich theol. content of chs 3–4.

Chpts 5–6 top off t/letter with t/practical outcome of what it means to walk in liberty united w/X.

Put it this way: We move from history to theology to application.

**C. This Concluding Section of Chapter 2 (vv. 15-21):
Where the Central Issue of the Gospel Comes into Focus**
Thru 2:14 Paul has used t/word "Gospel" 9x.
He uses t/phrase "truth of the Gospel" 2x (2:5,14).

Doesn't state what t/gospel is – what are t/central elements?

1. From this point in chapter two Paul get specific ==>

* No one can be justified by the “works of the law”

(an issue he will tackle in greater depth later in chapt. 3.

* Justification is possible only “by faith in Christ”

(a topic that comes up repeatedly in t/3d chapt.

Implicit in these 2 points is t/fact that Jews & Gentiles are equally under sin // cannot be saved by works of any kind // can only be justified by faith in X

2. We’ll look at 2:20: The believer has been crucified with Christ

This is t/believer's union w/X. A corollary to that union is found in chapt. 5: What it means to walk by t/Spirit along w/the necessary outcome of spiritual fruitfulness.

D. Lastly – We’ll See Several Important Contrasts in Verses 15-21

1) “Jews by birth” contrasted to “Gentile sinners” (v. 15)

2) Justification “by the works of t/law” contrasted to justif. “by faith in Jesus Christ” (v. 16).

3) Rebuilding t/old structures of t/Mosaic Law contrasted to its annulment by t/New Covt. Gospel (vv. 17-21).

4) “Dying to the law” contrasted to “living for God” (v. 19).

5) T/Xn’s being crucified w/X is contrasted w/X living in t/believer (v. 20).

I. Establishing the Context

II. Examining Key Concepts

Here’s where we will be going deep. Hang on!

A. Key Words

B. Key Terms

A. Key Words

1. νόμος (Greek word for “law”)

a. Up to this point we haven’t seen this word

In 2:15-21 it’s used 6x. 27x in chaps 3-6.

b. NT word νόμος finds its OT counterpart in the Hebrew noun 'torah' (found 189 OT verses)

'Torah' = ‘instruction’ (instr. in t/Law, partic. Mosaic Law).

c. There’s nuance of meaning (think of at least 4)

1. Word “law” can refer to Script. in general (Psalm 119).

2. Sometimes t/word “Law” refers to t/Pentateuch (1st 5 books of t/OT).

3. Sometimes t/word refers specif. to t/Mosaic Law, that which was given t/Israel as a nation.

4. Then you have “law” used simply as t/revealed will of God as that which people are under obligation to abide by (cf. “law written on t/hearts of Gentiles – Ro. 2:15).

That’s not spec. referring to t/M.L. but G’s universal law.

These “universal laws” reflect t/abiding nature & attributes of God. Murder, adultery, fornication, idolatry were wrong before t/giving of t/law to Moses // are still wrong even tho we are no longer under t/Law given to Israel under Moses.

d. Again it’s a matter of interpretation . . .

. . . whether the word “law” refers to the “Law of Moses” or “law in general” depends on context.

Eng. versions will capitalize t/word “Law” when it refers to t/Sinai Covt. That’s a judgment call. The original MSS didn’t make that distinc. Oldest Grk. MSS were written in all capital letters which we refer as “Uncials.”

Whether to capitalize t/word with that much nuance is tricky.

1. νόμος (Greek word for “law”)

2. Phrase: έργα νόμου (“works of the law”)

a. Where is this phrase used in Galatians?

Since we’ve not seen t/word νόμος yet, we know that we have not seen this phrase, έργα νόμου yet. We will come across it 3x in 2:15-21 & 3 more times in t/rest of t/letter.

b. This is a distinctly Pauline phrase used at least 8x by him

It’s not found in t/OT, But is used in extra-biblical lit. written about same time as t/NT.

c “Works of the Law” = Requirements of the entire Mosaic code

Those things that t/faithful Jew must obey under t/O.C.

Galatians 3:10 For as many as are of the works of the Law are under a curse; for it is written, “CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO DOES NOT ABIDE BY ALL THINGS WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF THE LAW, TO PERFORM THEM.” quote of Deut. 27:26 –

Context of Deut. 27 is a ratification ceremony where Israel ratifies t/Covt. Replete w/blessings for obed. & curses for disobedience.

3. πιστις (“faith”)

1x in 1:1-2:14 (2:7); 3x 2:15-21; 18x in rest of the letter.

a. When we speak of faith we speak of belief

(1) More than belief in sense of raw knowledge

Word “Trust” is t/Best English equiv.

As it relates to t/plan of God for t/salv. of men – trust in JC.

(2) Faith in the Bible always has an object

No one just possesses faith as some sort of special entity all its own, which is t/way t/world looks at it: “people of faith” / “I’m a person of faith.” Our cultural use doesn’t necess. have an object. IOW it’s not grounded in immutable truth.

To t/world it doesn’t matter what you believe, it’s all subjectively “your faith.”

Bibl. faith points to an object / person: Person & Work of X.

b. Saving faith = knowledge (notitia); assent (assensus); trust (fiducia)

Saving faith requires knowledge (God / man / sin / Savior / Gospel) // Assent . . . That faith alone qualifies you to be a demon, according to James 2:19. Must also be Trust.

Numbers 4 & 5 we’ll treat tog.

4. δικαιοω

5. δικαιοσυνη

a. These are words for righteousness

Not come across either word so far, but will see both in these next 7 vv. of chapt. 2.

δικαιοω (verb) / δικαιοσυνη (noun).

“to justify, to vindicate, justified, righteous, to be righteous.

Often transl. “righteousness” as in God's R. in who He is, or God's r. req. of man which is in keeping w/who He is.

b. As it relates to our salvation (our judicial standing before God) the word means "To declare righteous"
“to be justified” / “to be saved”

(1) Why we call it a "forensic" term

Speaks of law courts & judges who render decisions.

When a sinner comes to humble faith in God's provision of X for his sin, God (as Judge) declares that person just / righteous.

Not that God makes us righteous in his declaration, but he declares us righteous because we are now united with JC & I.D. w/Him in his death/burial/resurr.

Rom. 5:1 THEREFORE having been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

(2) As it relates to our salvation: “justified” in the N.T. = ‘declared righteous’

It's a legal term // t/opposite of condemnation.

(a) Think about this parallel

When a judge in a court pronounces judgment on someone convicted of a crime, that judge doesn't make t/offender guilty. He simply recognizes that he is guilty and pronounces judgment.

ISW when a judge pronounces someone “not guilty,” he doesn’t make him just, he declares him to be so before t/std of t/law.

As it relates to God's Law – we are not ‘righteous’ before t/bar of God’s justice.’

We have no recourse to t/court of heaven.

No possibility of being acquitted of such a great debt of sin.

(b) Good News

Another has paid the debt // has stood in our place // has taken our punishment & provided us w/perfect righteousness

Salv. or Justif. isn't just about being forgiven. Much more than that, it’s about being counted as righteous.

That righteousness is not our own. It’s what’s been termed an “iustitia aliena” . . .

Not just t/neg. of being forgiven. It doesn’t just wipe t/slate clean. That wouldn’t be enough. It’s also a positive state of righteousness – T/perfect righteousness of JC.

Last word is ==>

6. ζαω (“to live” / cf. noun ζωη)

5 forms of this word are used in 2:19–20 (count them w/me):
19 “For through the Law I died to the Law, that I might LIVE to God. 20 “I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who LIVE, but Christ LIVES in me; and the life which I now LIVE in the flesh I LIVE by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and delivered Himself up for me.

Cf. βιος used 4x in N.T. (3 neg.) and ζωη in John 3:16.

A. Key Words

B. Key Terms

1. Union with Christ (already touched on this)

UWX describes t/abiding position of t/believer. When I come to faith in X, I am spiritually joined w/Him. I am part of His body, t/CH. He indwells me thru t/agency of t/HS.

“I am in X”/“X is in me.” Read Rom. chapt 6.

2. Justification by Faith

JBF is another key phrase & we've already covered that ground earlier when we looked at t/key words δικαιοω / δικαιοσυνη.

Spec., JBF (alone) – sometimes called t/material principle of t/Reform. – is t/means by which sinners have right standing B4 God. Not by faith & works of any kind. By faith ALONE

a. Two other concepts I'd put under JBFA

(1) PSA - Penal (punishment) + Substitutionary (substitution) + Atonement (satisfaction)

What does that mean? We're talking about t/death of JC — it's purpose & what it accomplished.

Penal: Relates to punishment; JC was punished on t/Cross.

Substitutionary: Jesus as a sinless substitute took our place.

Atonement: G's satis. in t/death of X that renders us forgiven
G's wrath fell on Him rather than on we who deserved it.

Liberal theologians hate PSA. They call it “cosmic child abuse.” They may hate it, but there's no Gospel w/o it.

(2) Imputation

(a) To charge or credit to the account of another

Xn's sin is credited to X / X's righteousness credited to t/Xn.

(b) Beautifully portrayed in little book of Philemon

Mentioned him earlier as it relates to the runaway slave, Onesimus, Paul tells Philemon: "If he has done you any wrong or owes you anything, charge it to my account."

"The point of the Gospel is that imputation is real—God really laid our sins on Christ and really transferred the righteousness of Christ to us. We really possess the righteousness of Jesus Christ by imputation. He is our Savior, not merely because He died, but because He lived a sinless life before He died, as only the Son of God could do." [RC Sproul]

(c) Imputation doesn't MAKE Christ sinful any more than it MAKES the believer righteous

Again, it's imputation:

your sin credited to X; His righteousness credited to you.

Simul Iustus et Peccator

i. Does that mean I don't have to be righteous?

Well, I don't have to be righteous (perfectly holy) to be saved. JC was, is, did, does what I couldn't & can never do.

That doesn't mean I can live like t/devil. If I am justified, I will also be sanctified. I am a new creature in X // born again I am united w/X.

Rom. 6:1-2 1 WHAT shall we say then? Are we to continue in sin that grace might increase? 2 May it never be! How shall we who died to sin still live in it? (imparted right.)

There's no beating around the bush when it comes to the Gospel.

3. New Perspective on Paul (NP) spend rest of R time here
NP is an historically recent view that's relevant to Galatians.

a. What is this NPP?

(1) New + Perspective + About TAP

Really "New Perspectives" (not a monolithic movt.).

(2) There is basic agreement on this among advocates

Protestants (Evangelicals) have misunderstood Paul's teaching on justification.

Misunderstood context of 1st c. Jewish thot (2d Tmpl Jdisim)

T/reformers & those who proceeded them read too much into Paul & t/Law. They read it in t/context of t/works-righteousness of medieval Rome.

(a) Keep in mind however ==>

Justification by grace alone, thru faith alone, in X alone was not novel to t/16th c. It weaves a golden thread thruout CH history, even tho that thread was later tarnished by t/dominance of an apostate CH.

(3) Reinterprets Paul & the Reformed understanding of justification

Contends that Paul was opposing Jewish boundary markers in the NT people of God, rather than works-righteousness.

Justification in about who is a member of t/CH, not individual salvation.

Paul wasn't referring to works-righteousness by his phrase "works of t/law" (εργα νομου, rem?). "WOTL" refer to Jewish boundary markers that separated Jews from Gentiles. (Spec. t/Sabbath, circumcision, & food laws). This division is what's in view.

(4) For the NP - salvation has two components: Initial Justification & final justification

Initial justification is about who is in t/CH (t/Covt comm). It's not about salvation (soteriology; it's about unity in t/CH (ecclesiology). There is no imputation of X's right. to t/bel. Final justification is based on one's works.

One is made part of t/ppl. of G. by grace, but stays in by obedience to t/Covt.

b. Summary (x5)

1. Reformers were wrong about salvation.
2. 1st c. Judaism wasn't legalistic, or works-based. Was based on grace ("covenantal nomism" - E. P. Sanders).
3. Issue Paul addresses isn't salvation, per se, but Jewish boundary markers & membership in t/CH or Covt. Comm.
4. As far as salvation, initial justification is by faith, but final justification is by works (at least partially).
5. One enter t/Covt community by grace & stays in by obedience. About who's in t/CH, who stays in t/CH, & who is finally & forever in (at t/final judgment).

c. Why is this relevant? Why go there?

Because it's ultimately an attack against t/Gospel. Taken to its logical conclusion it erases t/doctrine of salv. as it's taught in t/entire Bible & replaces it w/a counterfeit that is devoid of hope & leads to hell.

R.C. Sproul named t/NPP as 1 of t/greatest threats to t/CH today.

There's no beating around the bush when it comes to the Gospel.

d. History

Have been others who laid t/groundwork (20th c Swedish NT scholar Krister Stendahl & his 1963 book, “The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West”).

Opened t/door. But these 3 men are of more recent significance

(1) E.P. Sanders (1937-2022)

A NT scholar who was Arts & Sciences Professor of Religion at Duke University, NC (retired in 2005).

In 1977 Sanders published, “Paul and Palestinian Judaism” in which he argues that 2d Temple Judaism was not based on legalistic works-righteousness. Instead, he contended, it was based on God’s choice of Israel & His grace toward them.

Sanders coined t/term “covenantal nomism”—t/Jews relationship w/God was grounded in His grace & mercy (“covenantal”), but also driven by t/expectation that they would obey t/Law (“nomism”).

T/sacrificial system presumed that t/covenantal ppl. would fall short of t/high expectations of the Torah, & provided a means for restoration & atonement for sin.

(2) James D.G. Dunn (1939-2020)

Dunn coined t/phrase “NPP.” Dunn emphasized that t/Law had a social function as an ethnic boundary marker or badge of Jewish ID.

Paul's concern was that t/Jew's obsession w/the Law had become a barrier between Jews & Gentiles—1 that X had abolished. Was about eccl. rather than soter.

(3) N.T. Wright (born 1948)

Wright has popularized t/NPP (this is what often happens – certain views – I'm thinking of bad ones – start in t/schools & make their way to t/CH thru “popularizers” – Open Theism / Greg Boyd – Same w/NPP).

Wright is a popular speaker & author. He's written lots of good things & he's much to defend t/historicity of t/resurrection & of Jesus' life.

He's British and often appears on t/BBC defending t/integrity of Scripture against liberal voices (of which there is no shortage in Engl).

Dunn and Wright did soften their views somewhat. Both have been more recently quoted as perhaps affirming justification by faith alone.

A lot of double-talk as well, so t/jury's out.

c. Assessment?

(1) There is some truth in NPP

It's good to try to understand t/historical setting (Jewish) of t/NT writings.

However, we believe t/NP has overstated their case.

There's some truth that relates to t/believer's future justification. While I believe that justification is point in time Evang. today miss t/point that even believers will stand b4 t/judgment seat of X. Our “works” will vindicate our lives in that they will testify to t/fact that we belong to X.

From a Reformed perspective, we are justified BY faith (once for all) & will be judged ACCORDING to works which will serve to prove t/reality of our salvation.

(2) The bad (greatly outweighs the good)

I fear that t/NP leads to works-grace salvation & ultimately denies t/gospel of grace.

It falls into the category of Paul's warning in 1:8-9.

Guy Prentice Waters ==>

"The soteriological sympathies of the New Perspective on Paul (NPP), to the degree that these sympathies exists, are not with Protestantism, but with Roman Catholicism." [Waters, xi]

NPP = ecumenical dialogue w/RC's - "We basically believe the same thing about salvation after all."

Some of this goes back to something I've said many times: Danger of new doctrines on foundational issues.

Many scholarly works have been written refuting t/NP. I like what someone said, that t/best resource on 1st c. Jewish that is TAP. Let him speak for himself. Let t/NT speak for itself.

Galatians is relevant. Gospel of grace. "Sanct. stubbornness"

There's no beating around the bush on that.