

North Park Theological Seminary
3225 W. Foster Ave., Chicago, IL 60625

BIBL 6261 (Section 1) **Paul and His Theology**

March 2012 Syllabus (version 10/22/11; subject to revision)

Professor	Dr. Max J. Lee Associate Professor of New Testament
Class Hours/Location:	MTWThF 8:30am-4:30pm (Spring break in Mar from 3/12/2012 to 3/16/2012) Room TBA
Office	Nyvall-39
Office Hours	During the intensive week, the best available time for office hours is eating lunch together MTWThF For other times, let's make a separate appointment
Email	mlee1@northpark.edu

Catalog Description

This course examines the dominant themes and perspectives of Paul's gospel including, but not limited to, his understanding of sin, the person and work of Christ, salvation, the church, and the ethical demands of the Christian life. Special attention will be given to how Paul's theology informs the work of the church today as it addresses contemporary issues and challenges.

Course Objectives

- ♦ To be more aware of your own biases and presuppositions to biblical interpretation. In the context of this course, to study various texts from the Pauline letter corpus with an emphasis on its theological themes. Methodological questions will be explored but as a whole the class will engage issues in Pauline theology under the working model of contingency-coherence.
- ♦ Primarily, *to build a common vocabulary* with the first century world of the Apostle Paul and his letter recipients (i.e., the task of **exegesis** and the historical critical method) and *apply* his original message into our present Christian context (the task of **hermeneutics** and **theological reflection**).
- ♦ In order to achieve the above objective, it is necessary to study also the history, cultural milieu, social networks, religious value systems, and politics of Palestine and of the wider Roman world during the late Republic to early imperial period (ca. 1st century B.C.E. to the 2nd century C.E.).
- ♦ To appreciate the history of New Testament scholarship on the Pauline interpretation. We will engage with scholarship from both the dominant European and American segments of the academy as well as from segments who represent a non-European, non-American, and 'majority world' perspectives, or perspectives 'from the margins.'
- ♦ Key topics of theological discussion include: Paul's call and conversion, Pauline Christology, the New Perspective(s) on Paul, Pauline soteriology (but especially 'justification through faith'), Paul's doctrine of church and his pastoral practice, Pauline ethics (addressing especially issues of women in ministry, homosexuality, and just war/violence), and Pauline eschatology.

Required Textbooks

Wright, N.T. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 2009. [ISBN: 0-8308-3863-9] This book must be read entirely prior to the first day of class and a critical book review of it should be submitted on the first day of instruction on Tues. Jan 19th

Bassler, Jouette M. *Navigating Paul: An Introduction to Key Theological Concepts*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2007. [ISBN: 0-664-22741-4]. For years, Bassler has been a key figure in the Pauline Theology section at the Society of Biblical Literature and editor of two of four key volumes which the section produced. Here is a nice distillation of current trends in Pauline studies and her exegetical assertions on the nature of salvation, the gospel's relation to the law, participation in Christ, and eschatology. We will be reading all chapters except one.

The Pauline Reader (hence **PR**)

On blackboard in the assignment folder for this course, journal articles, essays, and select chapters from books/monographs will be available online as part of your required reading. The assigned readings from the reader are *required* and provide additional materials to your textbooks. The reader includes the writings of both past and present contributors to New Testament scholarship who have fundamentally shaped (for better or for worse) the way modern readers understand Paul. You will be reading either directly from these authors themselves or secondary descriptions of their work, including (but not limited to) the following heralds of Pauline theology: Luther, Käsemann, Stendahl, Beker, Sanders, Dunn, Hays, Wright, Segal, and others.

[For all MDiv students; no exceptions unless otherwise permitted by the instructor of the course]: *The Greek New Testament* (UBS⁴ or NA²⁷). MDiv students are required to work from the Greek New Testament at select points from the course. You are allowed, however, to bring your English Bible as well (see comments below) as a *second* reference but all MDiv students will be required to do assignments using their Greek New Testament.

[For non-MDiv students]: *The English Bible* in any contemporary translation, but preferably the **NRSV** or **TNIV/NIV**.

Please do not use a paraphrased translation (e.g., New Living Bible) or an idiomatic/colloquial one (e.g., Eugene Peterson's translation). A more literal translation of the Hebrew/Greek texts are needed for the course. If you have any questions concerning if a particular version or translation is acceptable or not, please do not hesitate to ask the instructor.

Overview of Assignments

Time Frame	Assignment Description/Summary	Maximum Point Value
Before Class begins	Critical Book Review on Wright's <i>Justification</i> * due the first day of class Tues 1/19/10	100
During instruction	Student Presentation * due during your assigned day	100
During instruction	Attendance and Participation	100
After instruction	Final Paper * due by 11:59pm Fri 3/15/10 via email: mlee1@northpark.edu	200
	<i>Total Possible Points/Percentage</i>	500

Assignments and Papers

Critical Book Review on Wright (100 pts)

Prior to the start of class, please read all of N.T Wright's *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision* (2009) and write a 2-3 page critical review (single-spaced) of the book. The criteria for the critical review is included below in Appendix 1.

Student Presentation (100 pts)

Each student must sign up for a student presentation for a select day during the week of instruction. The sign up sheet is on blackboard. One student per topic only. Please do not double up on a presentation.

For your presentation, please provide a short 1-page outline for the whole class, but *for the instructor of the course*, you are to provide a 2-3 page (single-spaced) critical essay of the reading specified for our discussion on a given theme in Pauline theology. A sample of the expected quality of work is given below in Appendix 2. In general, you must include the following information:

1. A brief biography on the author and his/her importance in New Testament scholarship.
2. Summarize the central thesis of the essay/article, its main arguments, and the supporting evidence/data which the author uses to assert these arguments.
3. What biblical texts from Paul's letters does the author interpret? Does the author interpret the text from a particular modern methodological approach or from a specific 1st-century AD historical, cultural, or social background? or OT and Jewish background? Is the author's interpretation of the texts convincing? Why or why not?
4. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the article in contributing to our understanding of Paul's theology?

Important note: The presenter is expected to do more than just read the assigned essay/article. The presenter should add a research component to his or her presentation and consult other secondary sources. The grade for this assignment is dependent on the written paper, not so much one's oral presentation.

Final Paper (200 pts)

You will be asked to write an 5-6pp. research paper (single-spaced; or 10-12 double-spaced) providing a Pauline theology for a modern ethical issue and arguing for the implications of Paul's theology on this topic for the life and ministry of the church. The paper will be divided in two halves: 1. *contingency* (or exegesis): an examination of key Pauline texts from his letters, paying attention to the historical, cultural, religious, or political context for the passage; and 2. *coherence* (or synthesis): what overall message or understanding of Paul's thought on a certain theme can be *extracted* and *extended* from the texts. Again, your synthesis should include an engagement with other New Testament scholars who have written on your topic.

Topics are limited to the ones suggested on the criteria sheet for the paper; see Appendix 3. A student may suggest an alternative topic of choice but must have the approval of the instructor beforehand. The student should provide a written proposal for the topic and a preliminary bibliography on the secondary sources used for the paper in seeking the instructor's approval.

Participation and Attendance

You are expected to be present during class throughout the entire day Mon–Fri. Absences from part of the class during any of the sessions may result in the lowering of the participation grade. You are expected to be prepared to discuss the Pauline texts and the secondary reading for each session. Much of your preparation (especially the reading) should be done prior to the start of the intensive week of instruction.

Make-up work

Work should be turned in on time. Late papers/assignments will be deducted 10pts for each day it is late (excluding weekends/holidays). No assignments will be accepted 1 week after the due date.

Grading System

The final percentage will be calculated from the total points earned over the total points possible. The following scale is used for your final grade:

93-100%	A	77-79	C+	60-62	D –
90-92	A–	73-76	C	0-59	F
87-89	B+	70-72	C –		
83-86	B	67-69	D +		
80-82	B –	63-66	D		

This scale is absolute. On a rare occasion, the above scale *may* be curved at a later point, but only if the overall class grades are too low, but it is up to the instructor of the course to decide if the final grades should be curved up or not. *Just assume **no** curve will be applied* so you will not expect a boost in your scores and be disappointed when it is not given.

Ethical Standards: Warnings against Plagiarism and Cheating

Cheating of *any kind*, whether plagiarism in written assignments or the giving/receiving of information during quizzes/exams, will result in an F for the assignment, and most likely an immediate F in the course. There also may be additional penalties (e.g., suspension, expulsion) lodged against the student. If you have any questions on what constitutes plagiarism or what constitutes acceptable exam-taking practice, please ask the instructor.

Class Schedule

Day	Time	Texts and Topics	Readings and Assignments
1	8:30 – 10:00am	Introduction to the Course and Syllabus What is Pauline Theology?: Methodological Challenges and Working Models	* You should have read all of Wright's <i>Justification</i> and your critical book review is due at the beginning of class * PR: Beker, "Recasting Pauline Theology," pp. 15-24
	10:20am – 12:00pm	Saul the Pharisee	* Bassler: 1–9 (ch. 1 "Grace"); pp. 11–21 (ch. 2 "Paul and the Jewish Law")
	1:30 – 3:00pm	Presentation by the Instructor: Paul's Call and Conversion	* PR: Segal, <i>Paul the Convert</i> , pp. 34-71 (ch. 2 "Paul's Ecstasy")
	3:20 – 4:30pm	Theological Reflection and Synthesis: The Implications of Paul's Call and Conversion for the Church Today	
2	8:30 – 10:00am	Introduction to the New Perspective(s) on Paul	* Bassler: 49–69 (ch. 5 "The Righteousness of God")
	10:20am – 12:00pm	The Righteousness of God: Options and the Contemporary Debate	
	1:30 – 3:00pm	Student Presentation: Käsemann vs. Piper: God's cosmic righteousness or the righteousness that comes from God	* PR: Käsemann, "The Righteousness of God," pp. 100-10; John Piper, "The Demonstration of the Righteousness of God," pp. 175-202
	3:20 – 4:30pm	Discussion: How the 'righteousness of God' language fits within the wider doctrine of justification	* Wright's book <i>Justification</i>
3	8:30 – 10:00am	Paul's Doctrine of (Original) Sin and Sin as an Apocalyptic Power	There is no assigned reading for the first half of the day. These will mostly be lectures from the instructor. But the 2nd half of the day is dependent on your reading and requires you to be prepared for discussion.
	10:20am – 12:00pm	Lordship and Slavery as Soteriological Metaphors in Paul's Theology	
	1:30 – 3:00pm	Student Presentation: Interchange in Christ: How Is Salvation Appropriated by Human Beings	
	3:20 – 4:30pm	Theological Reflection and Synthesis: Exploring Non-Reformed Doctrines on Justification [= the Non-Imputational Views]	
			* PR: Morna Hooker, "Interchange in Christ," 13–25; idem, "Interchange and Atonement," 26–41
			* Bassler: pp. 23–33 (ch. 3 "Faith"); 35–47 (ch. 4 "In Christ")

Day	Time	Texts and Topics	Readings and Assignments
4	8:30 – 10:00am	Justification and Sanctification in Romans 6-8	* PR: Thiessen, “Traditional Analysis: Romans 7,” pp. 202–21.
	10:20am – 12:00pm		
	1:30 – 3:00pm	Student Presentation: Imitating Paul and Ideologies of Power	* PR: Castelli, <i>Imitating Paul</i> , 89-117 (ch. 4); Barton, “Paul as missionary and pastor,” pp. 34–48
	3:20 – 4:30pm	Theological Reflection and Synthesis: Paul’s Understanding of Church, Discipleship, and Pastoral Ministry	
	6:00 – 8:00pm	<i>Dinner at the Lee’s</i> Special Session: Toward a Pauline Ecclesiology for the Church Today	* Discussion on how Pauline theology informs the way we live out our convictions as a community of faith
5	8:30 – 10:00am	Student Presentation: Contemporary Issues: Homosexuality as a Test Case for Pauline Ethics	* PR: Hays, “Homosexuality,” pp. 379–406. * Bassler: pp. 87–96 (ch. 7: “Then Comes the End...”)
	10:20am – 12:00pm	A Pauline Theology of Hope for the Future Summary Remarks on Pauline Theology	

**Appendix 1: Criteria for the Critical Book Review of:
Tom Wright's *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision* (100pts; due Tues 1/19/10)**

I. Goal of the Review

- ◆ You are asked to write a *professional, academic* review of the book (overall: 2 pages single spaced)
- ◆ The book review is due the 1st day of class and we will discuss the book in the middle of the intensive week of instruction

II. Content of the Review

1. In the first three chapters of Wright's book, he answers lays out his methodological approach to understanding Paul's teachings on justification, including 1. how to relate Paul's first century context with the traditions of the Protestant church, 2. in what Jewish context or background justification language is situated and should be understood, and 3. some deficiencies in the type of Reformed interpretations of which John Piper champions and defends. **Please summarize Wright's method of interpreting Paul, explaining each of the three above points.**

2. In the second half of the book, Wright looks at key passages in the Pauline letters (particularly Galatians and Romans) and argues for a particular reading of these texts. **Pick 2-3 examples and explain both the content and theological implications of Wright's interpretation of these passages.**

3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Wright's "new perspective" on Paul? In your discussion of strengths, be sure to articulate how Wright's reading of particular texts in Paul informs and edifies the ministry of the church. In your discussion of weaknesses, be sure to provide an alternative translation/interpretation of key Pauline texts and defend your interpretation where you disagree with Wright.

III. The Mechanics of the Paper and Grammar

- ◆ Your review must be *typed*; no hand-written reviews will be accepted.
- ◆ **Avoid** slang, colloquialisms, dangling antecedents, contractions, and any other ungrammatical or informal use of language!!!
- ◆ Do **not** use excerpts or quotations. Summarize everything *in your own words*. Quotations or excerpts will result in a deduction in your grade. Excessive quotes will result in your paper being returned ungraded and your being asked to rewrite it.
- ◆ Your work should be *well-documented* with parenthetical notes with the page references from Wright.
- ◆ You may have to consult outside secondary sources to help you evaluate the book's strengths and weaknesses.

Sources should meet the following criteria:

- a. They must be an *academic* source written by a professional scholar within the guild of New Testament scholarship ; *no* devotional-type of materials are allowed.
- b. **No** internet sources period. Often internet sources receive their information from published works, so it is far better to consult directly the resources on which the internet site depends rather than relying on their distillation of the published sources.
- c. No sources originally published *before 1950*. That means: you may not use a book that was originally published in 1910 but was simply reprinted in 1990. Why? Because in 1947, for example, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls practically made any systematic study of 2nd Temple Judaism out-of-date and exposed past scholarship's portrayal of Judaism as slightly skewed.
- d. No NIV study notes (or Bible footnotes), and no articles within Bible dictionaries are allowed.

- ◆ For samples of how to do an critical review, see the online SBL database: <http://www.bookreviews.org/>

Appendix 2: Sample Paper Presentation of Assigned Reading (100pts) (Note: Your paper can be shorter: minimum 2 pages;)

Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), pp. 34-71 [ch. 2 "Paul's Ecstasy"]

Brief Biography

Alan F. Segal is one of the few Jewish scholars to write on Paul with the understanding that Paul stands as a legitimate source for understanding the Pharisees of the 2nd Temple period prior to the birth of rabbinic Judaism. Dr. Segal is currently teaching at Barnard College in Columbia University (New York), a graduate of the Hebrew Union College (masters) and Yale University (doctorate), and has written extensively on a variety of topics including the origins of Judaism and Christianity. His works are prolific, but notably include: *Two Powers in Heaven* (Brill), *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Harvard University Press), *The Other Judaisms of Late Antiquity* (Scholars Press), and *Paul the Convert: The Apostasy and Apostolate of Saul of Tarsus*.

Summary of ch. 2: *Paul's Ecstasy*

Segal's overall thesis stands in contrast to the recent studies on Paul by the New Perspective (see esp. the works of Stendahl, Sanders, Dunn, Donaldson, and other adherents; mentioned on pp. 5-6 in Segal), the former of whom argue that what Paul experienced on the Damascus Road was not a conversion from Judaism to Christianity but rather a prophetic call to preach the gospel to the Gentiles. According to Segal, Paul's Damascus Road experience is *both* a call *and* a conversion. Recognizing that the Nazarene sect was still considered a part of Second Temple Judaism at the time of Paul's encounter with the risen Christ, Segal acknowledges that Paul's conversion is not (in the traditional sense of the term) from one religion (Judaism) to another (Christianity), but rather from one Jewish sect (the Pharisees) to another (that is, an apocalyptic mystic sect known as the Nazarenes). Later, in retrospect, when Judaism and Christianity official split, the early church can re-describe Paul's conversion as one from Judaism to Christianity. But Segal's point is that whether historically one wants to call Paul's experience a conversion from the Pharisee sect to the apocalyptic Nazarene sect, or retrospectively, a conversion from Judaism to Christianity, it is a conversion nonetheless. As a point of comparison, Segal observes that Josephus describes his own entrance into Pharisaism and possibly to Essenism as a type of conversion (*Life* 7-12; see pp. 81-83) and also cites the example of how new members of Qumran community underwent a type of conversion experience as they participated in the community's baptismal rites and adopted a "radically different lifestyle" (p. 83).

How, then, are we to understand Paul's conversion from the Pharisees to the Nazarenes? Segal answers this question by appealing to Jewish apocalyptic and mystic traditions to reconstruct what Paul must have seen on the Damascus Road. Segal begins his reconstruction by pointing to 2 Cor. 12:1-9 as an example that Paul has had mystical experiences¹ of which Paul's conversion experience may have been but one (although certainly the first and most influential). Segal then turns to tracing the *merkabah* (or throne-chariot) mysticism from Old Testament prophetic texts, through the apocalyptic tradition in the intertestamental period, and through to Paul.²

¹ Segal never gives an explicit definition of mysticism or the *merkabah* tradition, although he does want to make a distinction between ancient mystic experiences from modern connotations of the term. On pp. 38-39, Segal describes an ancient mystical experience as an ecstatic journey of two possible types: 1. an out-of-body vision through which the person can have direct contact with God outside the boundaries of the ordinary life; and 2. an in-body ascension to heaven which is well attested in the apocalyptic tradition (a similar but altogether separate tradition than mysticism).

² The *merkabah* tradition describes a Jewish mysticism that was prevalent from the 4th-6th centuries C.E. Segal is attempting to trace a line of continuity for the tradition as far back as the OT by using Paul as a 1st century C.E. link to the *merkabah* traditions arising much later.

The *merkabah*, or throne-chariot, mystic experience is a special kind of theophany or divine encounter with God in Judaism where the mystic (whether in-body or out-of-body) sees a vision of Adonai in his full glory in the likeness of a human being who is enthroned in the midst of his heavenly court. The first explicit throne theophany occurs in Ezekiel 1:25-28, where Ezekiel sees "what looked like a throne of sapphire, and high above on the throne was a figure like that of a man... This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD." The anthropomorphic description of Adonai in the Ezekiel vision is not without its precedents in the history of Israel. On pp. 41, Segal argues that the angel of the Lord in Exodus 23:20-21 who carries the very name of God may not have been literally an angel but rather the name of YHWH himself as a personified, embodied, and acting divine agent (see also Exodus 24:9 where Moses, Aaron, and the 70 elders see the feet of God; and Exodus 33:18, where Moses sees the back of God as the *Kavod*/Glory of God walked passed him).

The Ezekiel tradition will be further developed by the prophecy of Daniel. Segal notes several significant developments in Daniel: 1. there are now (at least two) thrones in the theophany instead of one; 2. the Ancient of Days assigns to a human figure (one like the son of man) the power and authority of God himself to execute justice upon the earth (7:13); 3. the son of man receives this authority upon entering into the presence of the Ancient of Days; and 4. the *hamaskilim* or the wise ones who remain faithful to the covenant of Israel will be transformed into the stars in heaven (i.e., a reference to the resurrection; 12:3). Thus, in the Daniel passage, there is God (the Ancient of Days) and another separate divine figure (the son of man) who is given power equal to God, or in the words of Segal, acts as God's "vice-regent, his Wazir, his gerent" (p. 42). The whole scene alludes to the idea that the Son of Man, when he enters into the presence of the Ancient of Days, did so by sitting on one of the thrones in the theophany, and because he is given the authority of God, it is most likely that the throne upon which he sits is on the right hand of God.

On pp. 42-52, Segal catalogues an enormous amount of intertestamental, Hellenistic Jewish, and rabbinic texts to demonstrate how there is a "true fleshing out of the visions of Daniel [and Ezekiel]" (p. 50) during the next 400 years up until the conversion of Paul (pp. 42-56). Among the key texts, Segal discusses the Septuagint translations of Ezekiel 1:26 (who uses the Greek word *eidōs* or the Platonic term for "form" to describe "like the form/image of man;" cf. Plato's *Poimandres*); 1 Enoch 51.3; 55.4; 61.8; 62.2-6; 70.7; et al.; 11QMelch, Philo (Sac. 1-10; *Moses* 1.115-58; *Flight and Finding* 164; *Dreams* 1.157; et al); 3 Enoch 10.1; and others. In the above texts, Segal traces how the concept of God's Wazir whose titles include "Son of Man" and "The Glory (*Kavod*)," and alternatively Melchizedek, Michael, Enoch, and even some of the patriarchs like Moses, Adam, Abel, Jacob, the Chosen One, the Elect One, and the Anointed One are clearly depicted as either carrying God's name and so acting an extension of God rather than a subordinate angel, or are enthroned at the right hand of God explicitly interpreting what the Daniel 7 text implies.

Segal then moves his discussion to early Christianity and specifically Paul's autobiographical statements concerning his own mystic, apocalyptic encounter with the risen Christ (see pp. 56-71). In a very brief discussion of the gospel traditions and Heb. 1:8 (pp. 57-58), he explains how Christians combine the heavenly enthronement of David's messianic descendent in Psalm 110:1 with the Daniel 7:9-13 "son of man" traditions to develop a high Christology for Jesus. The treatment is all too brief (see my critique of Segal on this point below) but unapologetically Segal moves onto focusing his analysis on the Pauline texts (see pp. 58-69) ending with the deutero-Pauline corpus (pp. 69-71). Key to Segal's discussion is 2 Cor. 3:18-4:6, where Paul speaks of "the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God" and how God "made his light shine in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ." The problem of Paul's personal statements about his conversion is that they are *not explicitly autobiographical* but *ethical*; in other words, Paul only talks about his Damascus Road conversion in the context of using his conversion experience as an ethical example for admonishing his churches. Like Paul was transformed into the image of Christ, so too all Christian believers are to experience such a transformation. For Paul, Jesus is the form (*morfē*,) of God (see 2 Cor. 4:4; Phil. 2:6; also Col. 1:15) and the image (*eivkw, n*) of God (see Rom 8:29; 1 Cor. 15:49; 2 Cor. 3:18), and therefore Jesus' resurrection/exaltation to glory as an image of God means our being *transformed* (*metamorfou/sqai*) or *conformed* (*summorfou/sqai*) into the image of Christ (Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 15:49; 2 Cor. 3:18; Phil 3:21) as a fulfillment of the apocalyptic vision of the "wise ones" who in Daniel 12:3 are transformed into the stars of heaven. Thus, Paul states: "Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we will also bear the image of the man of heaven" (1 Cor. 15:49).

Segal ends his chapter with the following summary of the main currents of his thesis: 1. the divinity of God's vizier (a divine being above the angels who carries the name of God and has alternatively been called the Son of Man, the Elect One, Melchizedek, and even a divine type of Moses, the patriarchs, and other title) is a unique development with Jewish mystic and apocalyptic traditions stemming all the way back to the OT texts; 2. the divinity of God's vizier is uniquely claimed by Christians as being fulfilled in the messianic identity of Jesus; 3. the enthronement of Christ as the image of God is the "first fruits" of a larger harvest or resurrection of Christian believers who are made into the image of Christ; 4. Paul is a legitimate source demonstrating that the merkabah tradition was vibrant in the 1st century C.E. and provides a crucial link with the later rabbinic merkabah traditions developed in the 4th-6th centuries C.E.

II. Critique of Segal: Strengths and Weaknesses

There are numerous strengths to Segal's thesis. For one, Segal's work provides a needed corrective to the New Perspective's faulty description of Paul's Damascus Road conversion as a purely prophetic call narrative. In the history of NT scholarship, Segal's book stood as a rare critique of the New Perspective's views of Paul and early Judaism from a decisively Jewish scholar. Segal's comparison of Paul's conversion to the Nazarene sect from Pharisaism with the accounts by Josephus and the Qumran community offers a needed historical backdrop against a previously neglected corpus of comparative material. Secondly, Segal's thesis confirms the early work of Seyoon Kim, the latter of whom argued more than a decade before Segal's work that what Paul experiences on the Damascus Road was a double-throne theophany in the light of Jewish apocalyptic traditions on Daniel 7 and Ezekiel 1.³ Yet, Segal provides an alternative tradition to apocalyptic than Kim by providing a detailed description concerning literary and theological development of these texts within Jewish mysticism. His tracing of a second, complementary tradition in Jewish literary history is a welcome addition to Kim's work.

There are, however, some key weaknesses to Segal's work. For one thing, Segal, despite his aversion to seeing merkabah traditions as modern mystical phenomena, nevertheless uses terms or phrases that give the ancient throne-chariot visions a modern feel: e.g., ecstasy (p. 34 and throughout), trance (p. 54), and paranormal (p. 53), to name just a few. We can forgive Segal's poor word choice and suggest the alternative use of "vision," "heavenly ascension," and "spiritual" for the above terms.

More importantly, on pp. 56-58, Segal mentions how the Son of Man tradition may have been attributed to Jesus after the birth of the early church. He, of course, is taking into consideration current research on Christology and historical Jesus studies. But given the narrative framework in which Jesus addresses the Son of Man, it does not seem Jesus addresses the Son of Man as if he was a separate person. The gospels clearly portray Jesus as voicing all the Son of Man sayings as self-referential, otherwise the charge of blasphemy by the Sanhedrin would not endure (Mark 14). One can argue that the Son of Man was voiced by Jesus himself as a self-referential way to describe his divine origin, and that the Daniel 7 merkabah tradition unfolded with Jesus as the Son of Man for Paul in the Christophany on the Damascus Road. Along this line, I also do not think Paul's experience in 2 Cor. 12 is the same as his Damascus road Christophany, for in the former, Paul is not clear whether he is in body or out of body when he ascends into the different levels of heaven, but certainly he is in-body with his encounter of the risen Christ on the way to Damascus.

Segal, surprisingly, does not discuss in detail Jesus' own reference to the throne-chariot theophany as well as the early Christian movement's use of the image in the Book of Acts. Had Segal done so, he would have traced a possible connection from Jesus' self-identification during his trial before the Sanhedrin as the Danielic Son of Man sitting as the right hand of God (Mark 14:61-64) to the theophanies experienced by both Stephen (Acts 7:55-56) and Paul (Acts 9:1-7).

³ See Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (WUNT 2.4. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2nd ed., 1984); idem, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), and idem, "God Reconciled His Enemy to Himself: The Origin of Paul's Concept of Reconciliation," in *The Road from Damascus: The Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought, and Ministry* (ed. by R. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 102-24.

Segal also makes an interesting note how the rabbis of the 2nd-4th century C.E. will eventually in its engagement with Gnosticism seek to ensure *not* to identify such a vice-regent as an equal partner with God in order to avoid "two powers in heaven" (see pp. 45-46). Is he hinting that possibly the rabbis offer a corrective to the Christian interpretation of God's vizier as a divine person? But the rabbinic revulsion against having two powers in heaven is clearly *late* or after the 1st century C.E., and therefore one can expect that in Paul's day that the Son of Man figure must have been seen as enigmatically divine, in fact, a second power, even though later rabbinical tradition (in response to 2nd century C.E. Gnosticism) will completely disavow the idea.

But the above criticisms of Segal's work are, in the end, *minor*, and should in no way keep us from appreciating the enormous contribution he makes to our deeper appreciation of Paul as a convert from Pharisaism and as an apostle to the Greco-Roman world.

Questions for Further Discussion

Segal says that Paul's experience on the Damascus road is normative for all Christians. *In what sense is he correct? In other words, what is historically particular to Paul's conversion experience but also eternally relevant for all Christians today?*

Suggested answer: I would like to suggest that Paul's visionary aspects of his conversion were historically particular to his situation. Not every Christian is called to have a merkabah theophany as part of his/her conversion experience. But certainly there are elements in Paul's account of his Christophany that are normative for all believers: 1. the conviction of sin with a personal encounter with God, 2. the simultaneous call and conversion with one's encounter, and 3. the invitation to surrender one's life under the Lordship of Christ.

Recommended Reading

Longenecker, Richard N., ed. *The Road from Damascus: The Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought, and Ministry*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Appendix 3: Final Interpretive Paper Guidelines (200pts)

Paper Objectives:

1. To study and interpret carefully specific passages/texts in the Pauline letter corpus
2. To put into practice the principles exercised throughout the course: that is, *contingency* (interpreting the text in its original historical, cultural, and literary context) and *coherence* (extracting and extending an overall structure/conceptualization by Paul on a given theological theme)
3. To familiarize oneself with the primary non-canonical Jewish and Roman sources available for the study of Paul's contingent setting
4. To familiarize oneself with the secondary academic sources that are available for the study of Paul's coherent theology.

Topics

* Pick one of the following contemporary issues facing the Christian church and articulate a Pauline theology that addresses this issue by interpreting carefully selected texts from the Pauline corpus in their *contingent* setting and seeing how they together paint a *coherent* message from the Apostle Paul on how the Christian is to engage the chosen issue as doctrine and in conduct.

- * Issues include:
1. homosexuality
 2. the relationship between the Church and the State
 3. wealth, poverty, and possessions
 4. racial reconciliation or the divided church along racial and cultural lines
 5. other: propose your own but must get approval from instructor first and present a formal written proposal including preliminary bibliography

Assignment Details

1. Preliminary Paper Proposal (due one week after the intensive week; **by 11:59pm Fri Mar23** via email)

1.1 Clearly state your choice of topic. What is the scope and limits of your study? Who are some of the major interpreters whom you are including in your paper? What are the major interpretative options that they defend?

1.2. In the correct citation format, list at least 7 *secondary* sources for your paper in your bibliography.

A *primary* source is an ancient piece of literature written near the time of the period that is under study; e.g., the OT, NT, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Josephus, Philo, any Roman historian are all primary sources. [I do not expect you to engage with *non-biblical* primary sources directly (although this is welcome!) but at a minimum, you need to engage with the biblical primary sources and any non-biblical texts that you encounter *through the readings of your secondary sources*].

A *secondary* source is a publication which is contemporary to our time written by professionals who are experts in the given subject; e.g., commentaries on the NT, essays, journal articles, books and monographs, review articles, etc.

Overall guidelines to the types of secondary sources:

- a. They must be an *academic* source written by a professional scholar within the guild of New Testament scholarship ; *no* devotional-type of materials are allowed.
- b. *No* internet sources period. Often internet sources receive their information from published works, so it is far better to consult directly the resources on which the internet site depends rather than relying on their distillation of the published sources.
- c. No sources originally published *before 1950*. That means: you may not use a book that was originally published in 1910 but was simply reprinted in 1990. Why? Because in 1947, for example, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls practically made any systematic study of 2nd Temple Judaism out-of-date and exposed past scholarship's portrayal of Judaism as slightly skewed.
- d. No NIV study notes (or Bible footnotes), and no articles within Bible dictionaries are allowed.
- e. Your choice of 2ndary sources must reflect diversity: at least 1 commentary, 1 monograph or book, 1 essay, 1 review on the book/monograph you selected (this way, you can see what another scholar thinks of the source you have chosen), and 1 journal article from an academic periodical on the NT (e.g., *Novum Testamentum*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Journal for the Evangelical Theological Society*, *Tyndale Bulletin*, *Interpretation*, and many more!).

f. For your choice of commentaries, the following are recommended: AB = Anchor Bible; BECNT = Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; BNTC = Black's New Testament Commentary; ICC = International Critical Commentary; NIBC = New International Biblical Commentary; NICNT = New International Commentary on the New Testament; NIGTC = New International Greek Testament Commentary; NTL New Testament Library; PNTC = Pillar New Testament Commentary; SP = Sacra Pagina; THNTC = Two Horizons New Testament Commentary; and WBC = Word Biblical Commentary. You do not need to understand Greek or Hebrew to appreciate the discussion of the interpretative options for a text. Other commentaries are welcome, but again, please make sure they are non-devotional, academic works. When in doubt, ask the instructor of the course.

1.3. Your list of sources should follow the standard citation format of either *Turabian* or *the Chicago Manual of Style* (including the practice of listing the citations alphabetically according to *last name*; make sure your punctuation for citations is correct). You will be *marked down* for improper formatting of notes and your paper as a whole.

1.4. *Helpful hints on the assignment*

a. Where to start: Bible dictionaries are great places to start, but never a place to end. In other words, look up the topic in a Bible dictionary (e.g., *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, or the *Dictionary for the Theological Interpretation of the Bible*) and read the article listed for your topic to give yourself a basic understanding of the different scholarly opinions on the subject, the issues at stake, and some proposed resolutions from the scholarly guild. Then look at the bibliography at the end of the article. Here, the bibliography can point you to specific books/essays/articles that you can access directly. Thus, the Bible dictionary gives you a quick snapshot of your paper topic and starts you off with a suggested list of works, but you should not cite the Bible dictionary itself as a source in your paper.

b. Give yourself time to order journal articles or books through interlibrary loan for those sources you need but are not accessible at the Brandel Library

c. When in doubt about the source, come to the professor's office hours and ask him.

d. Besides *DPI* and *DTIB*, other suggested Bible dictionaries to start (but not to end) your research: *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (Double Day, 1992), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (IVP, 1992), *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and its Developments* (IVP, 1997), *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (IVP, 2000); *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible* (Mercer, 1990; repr. 1998), *Eerdmans Bible Dictionary* (2000), *New Bible Dictionary* (IVP, 3rd ed., 1996); *Holman Bible Dictionary* (Holdman, 1998), and others.

2. **Your final paper due on last day of instruction (not the finals week) on Tues 5/8 11:59pm**

2.1. The **goal of the paper** is the *integration* of your *contingent* reading of the texts with the *coherent* conceptualization of the wider Pauline theological theme. Your paper should integrate well the two halves of your paper, and not read as two completely separate papers altogether.

2.2. As much as possible, *extraneous* information that is unrelated to the interpretation of your text or Pauline theme should be *avoided*. Note that your page requirement is limited to 5-6 single-spaced pages; therefore, you have to think carefully about what information is really important, and what is not and can be excluded. Too long of a paper generally reflects the person's lack of preparation more than anything else. If you rush at the last minute to write your paper, you will find yourself spending too long a time on tangential issues and not enough on the central points of interpretation.

2.3. **Mechanics of the paper** (5-6pp. single-spaced; or 10-12pp. double-spaced):

Title page (Name, Campus Box#, BIBL 6261: Pauline and His Theology, *paper title*)

Introduction (1 paragraph)

Contingent Analysis of Individual Texts (2-3 pages)

Coherent Synthesis of Paul's Theology of [Topic Name] (2-3 pages)

Application of the Text for the Church/Christians Today (1/2 page or 1 paragraph which functions as the *conclusion* to your paper)

Bibliography (yes, you need a bibliography which is *not* a part of your 5-6 pp. space limit; remember that footnotes and bibliographies have different formats and you need both for your paper)

2.4. Your paper will be graded on the following criteria:

a. *use of sources*: What 2ndary sources are used in the person's interpretation of the texts or major Pauline theme? Were there neglected resources that the paper should have accessed but did not? Does the paper carefully document the sources? Does the paper discuss what primary sources a particular scholar uses to make his/her argument? Again, you are *not* responsible for engaging with non-biblical primary sources in the interpretation of your text. But you *are responsible* for noting what primary sources that a scholar uses to form the basis or foundation of his or her arguments. Of course, if your passage interacts with other passages in the biblical canon, namely the Old Testament, you should address how the New Testament taps into that particular tradition and transforms it.

b. *content*: does the paper present a fair and accurate description of different scholarly viewpoints? Was the content *too general* when he or she should have focused more upon a certain issue that was central to the interpretation of a given Pauline theme? Is all the material in the paper needed or is there too much "fluff" material; that is, is there too much information that is unrelated or so commonplace that it unnecessarily takes up too much space in the paper and leaves no room for further elaboration on more central issues in the interpretation of a Pauline theme?

c. *critical engagement and creativity*: Having consulted a number of works/commentaries on the passage, what are the problems and issues in interpreting the text? what are the *main* options or readings for a particular passage? Note: the operative word is *main*; although there may be a dozen or so different options in interpreting the text, scholars usually narrow down the legitimate readings to 4, 3, and sometimes even just 2 main competing interpretations... what are these main options? and which scholar(s) argue for and against a particular reading? Of the many options, which reading do you think is the most convincing and why? does the paper simply give a summary of many different options but never makes a decisive choice one way or the other? Was the reasons for choosing a particular reading convincing? was the application of the text to today's Christian context appropriate, insightful, and relevant?

d. *organization*: does the paper present a logical, coherent flow of thought? is too much space devoted on a particular section of the paper when more emphasis should have been placed on other parts? does the paper make sense? are options presented in a logical manner and a particular reading among the options argued for in a convincing and thorough fashion?

e. *grammar and style*: The paper should demonstrate excellent grammar, punctuation, footnotes, bibliography, and formal use of the English language. That means:

- * Avoid slang and colloquial expressions. But if it must be used, place such remarks in quotes. Too much informal use of language will result in a downgrade.
- * No contractions.
- * Gender-inclusive language.
- * If you quote directly from a source, use proper quotation format (see Turabian or the Chicago Manual of Style).
- * **ABSOLUTELY NO QUOTATIONS OR EXCERPTS.** Summarize everything *in your own words*. Quotations or excerpts will result in a deduction in your grade. Excessive quotes will result in your paper being returned ungraded and your being asked to rewrite it.
- * Use footnotes and use them well. Ideas that come from a source should be accurately noted in your paper.
- * Yes, you need to include a bibliography in addition to the footnotes.

The final grade for the paper will reflect the professor's overall evaluation for how well the above 5 criteria are addressed. Some categories may be more important than others, depending on the passage chosen.

3. Some Last Words of Warning and Encouragement

* Warning: plagiarism of any kind will result in an F for the assignment and possibly an F for the course. If you have any questions on what constitutes plagiarism, please talk to the professor in his office hours. Intentional or not, if plagiarism is found in a paper, it will be noted and graded accordingly

* Try to have fun writing the paper. My hope is that the skills you will procure in completing the assignment will lead to life-time habits of interpreting the word of God and placing yourself under its authority in trust and obedience.