

The Multicultural Christ

Jesus the Jew and the New Perspective on Paul in an Age of Neoliberalism

James Crossley
University of Sheffield

In a recent book I argued that the contemporary scholarly rhetoric of a 'Jewish Jesus' who consistently transcends the Judaism(s) constructed by scholarship is, in part, the product of dominant Anglo-American attitudes towards the Middle East over the past forty years and a dramatic change in perceptions of Israel and the Holocaust since 1967 (Crossley 2008). Underlying this 'Jewish ... but not that Jewish' Jesus is, clearly, an updated form of Orientalism and related understandings of Otherness and cultural difference. What I want to do in this article is to show how other dominant and complementary discourses and historical trends have contributed to this kind of understanding of both Jesus and Paul in contemporary scholarship, particularly multiculturalism in relation to neoliberalism and postmodernity. In addition to shedding further light on the strange 'Jesus the Jew' rhetoric, it becomes clear that the scholarly success of the much vaunted New Perspective on Paul owes much to its cultural and ideological contexts.

INTRODUCTION

In a recent book I argued that the contemporary scholarly rhetoric of a 'Jewish Jesus' who consistently transcends the Judaism(s) constructed by scholarship is, in part, the product of dominant Anglo-American attitudes towards the Middle East over the past forty years and a dramatic change in perceptions of Israel and the Holocaust since 1967 (Crossley 2008). Underlying this 'Jewish ... but not that Jewish' Jesus is, clearly, an updated form of Orientalism and related understandings of Otherness and cultural difference. What I want to do in this article is to show how other dominant and complementary discourses and historical trends have contributed to this kind of understanding of both Jesus and Paul in contemporary scholarship, particularly multiculturalism in relation to neoliberalism and postmodernity. In addition to shedding further light on the strange 'Jesus the Jew' rhetoric, it becomes clear that the scholarly success of the much vaunted New Perspective on Paul owes much to its cultural and ideological contexts.

JESUS IN AN AGE OF NEOLIBERALISM

Neoliberalism, postmodernity and multiculturalism are all distinctive, overlapping and interlinked historical and cultural trends over the past forty years. The links between neoliberalism (or, if preferred, late capitalism) and postmodernity have been well documented (e.g. Harvey 1989; Jameson 1991; Anderson 1998). The one thing that marks the past forty years of historical Jesus scholarship, not least with the intellectual centre shifting from Germany to North America, is a marketplace of Jesuses and a historical Jesus who *sells*.¹ While there are precursors for most, if not

all, Jesuses trumpeted in contemporary scholarship (Allison 2005; Bermejo Rubio 2009), there has been a relentless obsession with putting the options 'out there': Cynic-like philosopher, social critic, apocalyptic prophet, wisdom teacher, rabbi, and so on. We might think of this these relentless listings of scholarly Jesuses and multiple identities as part of seemingly perpetual capitalist drive for something new and the demands to be another voice to be heard and taken seriously. As Badiou put it somewhat distinctively:

What inexhaustible potential for mercantile investments in this upsurge – taking the form of communities demanding recognition and so-called cultural singularities – of women, homosexuals, the disabled, Arabs! And those infinite combinations of predicative traits, what a godsend! Black homosexuals, disabled Serbs, Catholic paedophiles, moderate Muslims, married priests, ecologist yuppies, the submissive unemployed, prematurely aged youth! Each time, a social image authorizes new products, specialized magazines, improved shopping malls, 'free' radio stations, targeted advertising networks ... (Badiou 2003, 10)

We might convert this into historical Jesus currency with particular reference to the famous listings of Jesus options. Not only do we have a Cynic-like figure, an eschatological prophet, a rabbi, a wisdom teacher, charismatic holy man and so on, but all sorts of combinations which are now being touted by major historical Jesus scholars: Jewish peasant cynic, wisdom teacher *and* eschatological prophet, charismatic holy rabbi, challenger of traditional gender categories and social critic, and so on, as often seen in responses to criticisms of fitting Jesus into one distinct category (cf. Wright 1996; Crossan 1998; Kloppenborg Verbin 2000). The possibilities are seemingly endless.

The Jesus battles have also been recounted endlessly but Paul Anderson has recently given them a twist. In his advocating of John's Gospel as a source for understanding the historical Jesus, Anderson takes the market place of Jesuses to a different logical conclusion. For Anderson, John's Jesus also comes across as 'an apocalyptic messenger ... and the entire ministry of Jesus is presented eschatologically'. But then the Johannine Jesus was also a 'noneschatological prophet ... the prophet-like-Moses' who also fits 'within the portraiture of a wisdom-imparting sage' and an 'institution-challenging Cynic, in that Jesus cleanses the Temple at the beginning of his ministry, heals on the Sabbath, confronts religious authorities in Jerusalem prolifically, and is willing to challenge the Roman governor in the name of God's transcendent truth and reign'. Furthermore, Anderson believes that the Johannine Jesus 'comes across with spiritual power, as a holy man in John. While he does not perform exorcisms, the Johannine Jesus is encountered by people epiphanically ... Jesus as a holy man cannot be said to be incompatible with the Johannine presentation of Jesus' (Anderson 2007, 63-65). All these interpretations, no matter how conflicting, no matter contradictory, are now valid historically, it would seem. There also seems to be an assumption in Anderson's argument that most or all of the scholarly portraits of the historical Jesus can be found in John's Gospel and so are an argument for John's Gospel being useful for understanding the historical Jesus. Instead of the aggressively competitive marketplace, are not these kinds of truth claims in line with certain strands of postmodernism with their rhetoric of polite pluralism, interdependence, difference and otherness without judgment, a kind of tolerant, multicultural society for scholarly constructions of the historical Jesus? If the conventional market place of Jesuses thinks lunch is for wimps, then Anderson's inclusive approach presumably curls up in an evening with a tub of Ben and Jerry's and an Innocent smoothie.

Perhaps predictably in the postmodern era of historical Jesus scholarship, scholar-images have also become prominent. Compare, for instance, Mark Allen Powell's reporting of scholars, each instantly recognisable to those with any interest in historical Jesus studies:

John Meier wins the prize for length ... When *U.S. News and World Report* sought a catchy caption to distinguish Meier from other Jesus scholars they settled on the phrase 'dogged digger ... Marcus Borg ... Although a confessing Christian, he admits that his own faith has

been enhanced by studying Buddhism, the writings of Carlos Castenada, and the latter's Indian seer, Don Juan ... he had a number of mystical and ecstatic experiences ... It [a degree of celebrity] agrees with him [Crossan]. As comfortable chatting on Larry King Live as he is engaging in academic debates at meetings of the Society for [sic] Biblical Literature ... Unlike many scholars, he doesn't mind 'being a personality'... Even those who have never read any of Wright's volumes may know him as the scholar who spells *god* with a lowercase *g* ... (Powell, 1998: 95, 112, 142, 160)

We might further note that Bart Ehrman, like Crossan before him, is now a media star, probably *the* media star, of historical Jesus studies, appearing on no less than *The Daily Show* and *The Colbert Report* to discuss his scholarly work as a *New York Times* bestselling author.

Perhaps there is no better example of Jesus scholars for our times than the Jesus Seminar. In its heyday, the Jesus Seminar and its members would actively get involved in the American media (television and press) to promote scholarly work, though it attracted controversial headlines, inevitably perhaps with such subject matter and despite the honourable aims of the Jesus Seminar. Here we can also show how the Jesus scholarship of our postmodern age was shaped in part by the entrepreneurial spirit so central to neoliberalism. One of the main players in the Jesus Seminar was, of course, Robert Funk. Yet Funk is also remembered for what Lane C. McGaughey calls his 'entrepreneurial talents', 'an entrepreneur' and 'entrepreneurial leadership'. Evidence of such talents are said to include Funk's transforming of the AAR and SBL partly through 'cutting costs' of flagship journals by 50%, tackling 'the escalating cost of books by publishing works written and edited by AAR and SBL members using the offset method at a fraction of the cost of commercial publishers' and so 'challenge commercial publishers to lower the price of books by pioneering newer and less expensive forms of production' and so on. In terms of the Jesus Seminar (and beyond), Funk was central to the founding of Scholars Press (1974), Polebridge Press (1981) and the Westar Institute (1986). It comes as little surprise that McGaughey recalls that Funk was 'never quite comfortable with the bureaucratic constraints of either the church or the university' (McGaughey 2006, 4-6).

Arguments relating to the economic underpinnings of postmodernity provide a more solid context for understanding Žižek's criticism of multiculturalism and liberal inclusiveness of the Other in relation to postmodernity (e.g., among many, Žižek 1989; 2002; 2009). For Žižek, multicultural inclusiveness may superficially appear to embrace the Other(s) but it is a limited inclusiveness most suited to liberal western multiculturalism and our postmodern age, an acceptance of the Other without the otherness. Put another way, part of the narrative of western liberalism is to include the Other without the unpalatable bits and extract those bits which are palatable (recall the common debates about what 'true Islam' or 'spiritual Islam' is). If cast in terms of historical Jesus scholarship, we might recall the 'Jesus the Jew' rhetoric so central to scholarship since Geza Vermes' 1973 book, *Jesus the Jew*. As I have discussed in detail elsewhere and alluded to above, a dominant feature of scholarship since Vermes has been to stress just how Jewish Jesus was, telling us what Judaism was like, and then telling us that Jesus believed some aspects of Jewish identity were still invalid, redundant, unnecessary or now transcended. As N.T. Wright put it, we get 'a very Jewish Jesus who was nevertheless opposed to some high-profile features of first-century Judaism' (Wright, 1996: 93). Wright may be one of the most explicit examples, seeing this trend right across the synoptic tradition, but the less explicit work of scholars such as Meier, Sanders and Allison still provide moments where Jesus overrides some aspect of Jewish identity as constructed by scholars. This limited multicultural tolerance for the Other is also neatly expressed in the very rhetoric of 'Jesus the Jew' because, as Arnal (2005) emphasises, no mainstream scholar since the Nazi era denies Jesus was Jewish!

THE NEW PERSPECTIVE ON PAUL; OR, PAUL AGAINST RACISM

Paul raises some slightly different problems from Jesus. Whereas Jesus in the Synoptic tradition is not so obviously rejecting his Jewish tradition, Paul does at least imply that some aspects of Jewish Law and identity are problematic or possibly irrelevant to some degree (e.g. Gal. 2.17-21; 3.10-13; 4.21-26; Gal. 6.15; Rom. 14.1-8; 1 Cor. 7.19). From a perspective concerning popular Jewish debates, the problem was casually summarised by Jacob Taubes:

Now it happens that the Jewish study of Paul is in a very sad state. There is a literary corpus about Jesus, a nice guy, about the rabbi in Galilee, and about the Sermon on the Mount; it's all in the Talmud and so on ... This apologetic literature proliferated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and there is a consensus in Liberal Judaism (not in Orthodox Judaism, which hasn't moved an inch), that is, a sort of pride in this son of Israel. But when it comes to Paul, that's a borderline that's hard to cross ... (Taubes 2004, 5)

In one sense, however, this contrast seems to have made it easier for certain strands of contemporary scholarship to present a 'Jewish Paul' distanced from any unpalatable Jewish beliefs. Gaining momentum at more-or-less the same time as the scholarly rhetoric of Jesus the Jew, was the New Perspective on Paul, famously heralded by James Dunn (1983), though with Wright already in 1978 showing influences of Sanders' groundbreaking work of 1977. While not the first to make the challenge, E.P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Sanders 1977) meant that scholarship, and Pauline scholarship in particular, was no longer going to be able to repeat uncritically, at least not without serious criticism in response, Lutheran-influenced analysis of Paul and early Judaism and the continual negative stereotypes about Judaism as a cold, harsh legalist religion of works-righteousness in contrast to the loving religion of grace advocated by Paul and, in the long run, (orthodox) Christianity. Sanders' famous 'covenantal nomism', namely the idea that 'common Judaism' typically combined ideas of graceful election and the maintenance of the covenantal relationship through observance of the commandments ('getting in' and 'staying in'), became the central feature of the diverse approaches brought under the heading of the New Perspective on Paul.²

Another general feature of the New Perspective on Paul involved, and still involves, dealing with difference from Judaism without bringing in the triumphalism and negativity associated with the Old Perspective on Paul. And so the New Perspective era instead brought us the language of Jewish boundary markers and Jewish nationalism and how Paul rejects these categories when they impact upon the early church. Yet, as with Jesus the Jew, the superiority myth is perpetuated implicitly and with a liberalising credible overlay in the positive language. To generalise, Judaism is only acceptable for constructing Paul's identity once the difficult and strange aspects are put to one side. There can be few better examples of using liberal rhetoric while maintaining cultural and religious superiority than Dunn's suggestion that one of the five points of the New Perspective on Paul is that justification, in stark contrast to the pre-New Perspective period, can now help combat 'nationalism and racialism' (Dunn 2005, 15)? The unmentioned implications of this for the scholarly construction of Judaism seem somewhat negative to say the least. In this respect, it is perhaps worth noting what might happen to those scholarly positions which attempt to construct too high a degree of 'Jewishness' or Otherness, namely those views which seem to allow Jewish identity (at least as constructed by scholarship) to flourish relatively untouched (most famously, Gaston 1987; Stowers 1994). The fuller embrace of Otherness may be why Simon Gathercole (2002, 18) has to explain why he decided not to discuss them in his own work on Paul: 'L. Gaston and S.K. Stowers have not been particularly influential with their theological conclusions because they have been so radical' (Gathercole 2002, 18).³

Another key aspect of this liberal turn, so to speak, is the 'secularisation' of the language. Where terms such as imputed righteousness, justification by faith, righteousness of God, salvation, and so

on, were standard in the Old Perspective era, we now have a new academic vocabulary with terms such as 'nationalism', 'boundary markers', 'common Judaism', 'story, symbol and praxis', 'a web of social and religious commitments', 'ethnicity' and so on.⁴ If not with his tongue slightly in cheek, Francis Watson (Watson 2001) goes too far when he claims that the New Perspective emphasises 'presuppositionless exegesis' in the sense that proponents are freed from prior theological commitments, but there has obviously been a tendency to downplay, to some degree, an overtly Protestant (and specifically Lutheran) background in the language of New Perspective, even if some have tried to rectify this. However, as Watson recognises, one of the functions of this academic language is, it might be argued, to give credibility or legitimacy to the New Perspective and partly discredit the 'too theological' Old Perspective.

Moreover, another function is, ironically, to perpetuate a theological agenda masked or deflected by 'secular' academic language and Sanders, of course, has openly portrayed himself as not interested in theology but in history and religious studies (Sanders 2008). Despite the secularised scholarly language, theological agendas continue. While covenantal nomism is not perpetuating a specifically Lutheran model, it certainly is a model influenced by Christian systematic theology which imposes on Jewish ideas of grace and works, neither of which seem to have been systematised at all in early Judaism. Furthermore, as already implied, does not the New Perspective simply perpetuate a myth of religious/theological superiority, at least in those readings of Paul which ditch the problematic Jewish practices? And is not the New Perspective a serious confessional issue when a popular book has the magnificent subtitle, *A Study Text Introducing the New Perspective on Paul and Paul's Attitudes about Women and Homosexuality* (Brown 2010)?

CENTRES AND EXTREMES

The use of 'credible' academic language can also be seen in the function of those constructed as extremists (or non-credible) in the New Perspective debates, as we saw in a different way with the reception of Gaston and Stowers. This is where the construction of extremes gains further significance and here it is worth looking at an ideological function of extremism. A decade ago, Jörg Haider was leader of Austria's far right Freedom Party and his rise led to widespread international condemnation. In response to this situation, Žižek (2000) wrote 'Why We All Love to Hate Haider'. For Žižek, one function of the popularist right is to supply the 'negative common denominator of the entire established political spectrum' and 'furnish the proof of the benevolence of the official system'. This legitimizes the international liberal consensus and hegemony while effectively strangling any radical alternative, particularly from the left, anti-capitalist movements, and class-struggles, which become de-legitimized through association with similar concerns among the popularist right. We might add that, in more concrete terms, figures such as Clinton and Blair, epitomizing the international liberal consensus, could use a figure such as Haider to make themselves, and their ideological position, look thoroughly credible in contrast to someone tainted with Hitler and fascism, while at the same time perpetuating policies which attacked anything associated with class-conflict and critical of involvement in (say) the Balkans. This angle of Žižek's argument can be developed with reference to any number of figures on the popularist right.⁵

We should also bear in mind that definitions of 'liberal', 'moderate' and 'centre', and by implication the extremes, are easily transferable into scholarly issues of consensus and widely held assumptions (Crossley 2010b). As Shawn Kelley points out, 'There are times when racial thought shuns the vile rhetoric of the demagogue in favour of the dignified discourse of the poet and the intellectual ... This form of racial thinking appears in discourse that is decidedly gentle and in rhetoric that can tend towards the inspirational ... The aesthetic ideology is more than capable of prospering in the rarefied air of postmodern criticism' (Kelley 2009, 192, 208). Kelley effectively shows this, as he has done elsewhere (Kelley 2002), by tracing the ideological underpinnings of mainstream,

'centrist' and liberal scholarship of the twentieth century. We can do analogous things with the New Perspective and look at how extremes work in the scholarly arena. N.T. Wright, more than any figure in the New Perspective, has faced a remarkably fierce backlash, and a degree of infamy most biblical scholars can only dream of, among a vocal wing of the Reformed church, particularly in America, where affirming or denying Wright can be the key factor in identifying as a genuine Reformed pastor or not, or a heretic or not. Less dramatically, we might point to Wright's ongoing disputes with John Piper over Wright's exegesis in relation to the Reformed tradition (Piper 2008; Wright 2009). But perhaps the most spectacular allegation thrown at Wright is by the Reformed pastor Dr C. Matthew McMahon:

A heresiarch. He will forever burn under God's righteous wrath and under the solemn and scornful gaze of the Lamb of God for all eternity if he does not change his theological views before he dies, or rather, his lack of good theology! He is a false teacher, and one of the most influential heretics of the century because he affected people at the seminary level - where pastors are trained and scholars born - and has infected a good number of churches, right down to the layman and youth of the day ... Wright, as I said, a HERETIC ... This is Romanism repackaged ... you are being plagued by this man who is taking down many young in the faith to hell with him by his heretical views which basically gut the Gospel of any power, spit on Christ's work, and destroy the orthodox doctrine of justification as it has been taught throughout the history of the church ...⁶

The more moderate reactions online (with some support) were, not unreasonably, able to dismiss this tirade in terms such as 'delightfully unbalanced and infuriating'⁷ and 'inflammatory language ... used in order to force people to close their minds on a particular issue ... in the worst tradition of Reformed rationalism'.⁸

To round off our discussion of extremes with reference back to Jesus, we might note that equally high profile debates can function by constructing extremes and where we can see the structural similarities between the more overtly 'politicised' centring and 'academic' centring. It is probably fair to suggest that scholars such as E.P. Sanders, John Meier and Dale Allison represent the credible 'centre' of historical Jesus studies, with scholars, including those religiously conservative, using such work as a way of generating their own plausibility through agreements and (relatively) polite disagreements or more vigorous disagreements when the aforementioned really get things wrong. There can be no better example of the construction of the liberal or credible centre, or indeed of the links between academic centring and political centring, than the work of Bart Ehrman. Ehrman is open in his desire to provide the public with work on Jesus and Christian origins which reflects broad consensus views in scholarship:

The perspectives that I present in the following chapters are not my own idiosyncratic views of the Bible. They are the views that have held sway for many, many years among the majority of serious critical scholars teaching in the universities and seminaries of North America and Europe, let alone among people of faith who revere the Bible ... For all those who aspire to being well educated, knowledgeable, and informed about our civilization's most important book, that has to change. (Ehrman 2009, 2)

In addition to constructing the centre, we can also transfer the ideological function of the far right in contemporary political terms into the ideological function of the construction of the extremes in Jesus scholarship. Here we can turn again to Ehrman who does 'say a word about idiosyncrasy' by pointing out that 'some rather unusual views of Jesus sell well: "Jesus Was a Marxist!" "Jesus Was a Feminist!" "Jesus Was a Gay Magician!".' Ehrman then contrasts this with the view 'shared probably by the majority of scholars over the course of this century, at least in Germany and America' and that these views need to be shown more popularly in the 'right *kind* of book' (Ehrman 1999, ix).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

None of the above is meant to imply that all scholarship can be reduced to one ideological position. But even from this brief survey it ought to be clear that, from the complexity of scholarly positions, major trends emerge which are entirely compatible with dominant ideological positions, at least in Anglo-American contexts. This should be no surprise given the history of New Testament scholarship (and, no doubt, all scholarship). From the ties between scholarly Jesuses and Pauls and the Enlightenment, emerging nationalism, the 'Jewish Question', Nationalism Socialism, the Cold War, liberal America and so on, it is only to be expected that contemporary scholarly Jesuses and Pauls will be, in part, products of dominant discourses surrounding neoliberalism, postmodernism and multiculturalism.

I should also stress what ought to be obvious though I fear is not in certain scholarly contexts: the above approach to the history of scholarship neither means this author is immune from ideology and history nor that the above approaches analysed are necessarily historically accurate or inaccurate portrayals of Jesus and Paul. The assumption is that an ideological or political reading of scholarship somehow means that the critic is immune or that scholarly history has now been sufficiently deconstructed so that we can start afresh and finally *now* find the historical truth about the historical Jesus or the historical Paul. While ideological approaches to scholarship such as that pursued here can use historical criticism to make a point (I implied such a thing in the above discussion of the imposition of systematic Christian theology on early Jewish texts), the real emphasis of this approach is to develop recent attempts at providing alternative (though not necessarily mutually exclusive) approaches to the social history of biblical studies, and looking at different ways of understanding how scholarly trends remain buoyant, other than simply as theological history so dominant in histories of biblical scholarship.

REFERENCES

- Allison, D.C. 2005. *Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and its Interpreters*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Anderson, P. 1998. *The Origins of Postmodernity*. London and New York: Verso.
- Anderson, P.N. 2007. 'Why This Study Is Needed, and Why It Is Needed Now'. Pp. 13-73 in P.N. Anderson, F. Just, and T. Thatcher (eds.), *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*. Atlanta: SBL.
- Arnal, W. 2005. *The Symbolic Jesus: Historical Scholarship, Judaism and the Construction of Contemporary Identity*. London: Equinox.
- Badiou, A. 2003. *Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bermejo Rubio, F. 2009. 'The Fiction of the "Three Quests": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Historiographical Paradigm'. *JSHJ* 7: 211-53.
- Bird, M.F. 2006. *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification and the New Perspective*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
- Brown, R.A. 2010. *What Was Paul Thinking? A Study Text Introducing the New Perspective on Paul and Paul's Attitudes about Women and Homosexuality*. Blue Springs: Isaac's Press.
- Crossan, J.D. 1998. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering what happened in the years immediately after the execution of Jesus*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Crossley, J.G. 2008. *Jesus in an Age of Terror: Scholarly Projects for a New American Century*. London: Equinox.
- Crossley, J.G. 2010a. 'Biblioblogging, "Religion", and the Manufacturing of Catastrophe'. *Bulletin for the Study of Religion* 39: 23-29.

- Crossley, J.G. 2010b. Does the Centre Need an Extreme. *Bible and Interpretation*. <http://www.bibleinterp.com/opeds/centre357929.shtml>.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 1983. The New Perspective on Paul. *BJRL* 65: 95-122.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 2005. *The New Perspective on Paul: Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Ehrman, B.D. 1999. *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrman, B.D. 2009. *Jesus, Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (and Why We Don't Know about Them)*. New York: HarperOne.
- Gaston, L. 1987. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Gathercole, S.J. 2002. *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Harvey, D. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jameson, F. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kelley, S. 2002. *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship*. London: Routledge.
- Kelley, S. 2009. 'Race, Aesthetics, and Gospel Scholarship: Embracing and Subverting the Aesthetic Ideology'. Pp. 191-209 in L. Nasrallah and E.S. Fiorenza (eds.). *Prejudice and Christian Beginnings: Investigating Race, Gender, and Ethnicity in Early Christian Studies*. Fortress: Minneapolis.
- Kloppenborg Verbin, J.S. 2000. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- McGaughy, L.C. 2006. 'Robert W. Funk—a Profile', *Fourth R* 19–2: 4-6.
- Piper, J. 2008. *The Future of Justification: A Response to N.T. Wright*. Nottingham: IVP.
- Powell, M.A. 1998. *The Jesus Debate: Modern Historians Investigate the Life of Christ*. Oxford: Lion.
- Sanders, E.P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM.
- Sanders, E.P. 2008. 'Comparing Judaism and Christianity: An Academic Autobiography'. Chapter 2 in F.E. Udoh (ed.), *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Stowers, S.K. 1994. *A Rereading of Romans*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Taubes, J. 2004. *The Political Theology of Paul*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Thompson, M.B. 2002. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Cambridge: Grove Books.
- van Spanje, T.E. 1999. *Inconsistency in Paul? A Critique of the Work of Heikki Räisänen*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Watson, F. 2001. 'Not the New Perspective'. An unpublished paper delivered at the British New Testament Conference, Manchester, September 2001. <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/divinity/staff/watsonart.shtml> .
- Westerholm, S. 2004. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The 'Lutheran' Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Wright, N.T. 1978. 'The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith.' *Tyndale Bulletin* 29: 61-88.
- Wright, N.T. 1996. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. London: SPCK.
- Wright, T. 2009. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. London: SPCK.
- Zetterholm, M. 2009. *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Žižek, S. 1989. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso.
- Žižek, S. 2000. 'Why We All Love to Hate Heider'. *New Left Review* 2: 37-45.

Žižek, S. 2002. *Welcome to the Desert of the Real! Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates*. London: Verso.

Žižek, S. 2009. *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce*. London and New York: Verso.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/)

¹ For a different but complementary approach to historical Jesus scholarship in relation to postmodernity and global economic contexts, see Arnal 2005, 39-72.

² For overviews, summaries and assessments of the New Perspective on Paul see e.g. (among many): Thompson 2002; Westerholm 2004; Dunn 2005; Bird 2006; Zetterholm 2009.

³ Gathercole makes similar comments on Räisänen who is neglected in large part because he 'represents an extreme position in the debate ... not many in Germany, Britain, and the United States have been convinced' (Gathercole, 2002: 18). Räisänen is problematic in a different way because he argues that Paul is inconsistent. There is even a book dedicated to dealing with Räisänen and referenced by Gathercole: van Spanje 1999.

⁴ For a list of such language see Bird 2006, 105.

⁵ I have discussed this further with reference to biblical scholars blogging ('bibliobloggers') on the Haiti disaster and their handling of Pat Robertson (Crossley 2010a).

⁶ This is from McMahon's website, <http://www.puritanboard.com> and the above quotation is from, <http://www.puritanboard.com/forum/viewthread.php?tid=15612&page=1>.

⁷ <http://www.christilling.de/brainpoo/2005/12/nobody-expects-spanish-inquisition.html>

⁸ <http://alastair.adversaria.co.uk/?p=111>