

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

### Why study “judgment according to deeds?”

Particularly since the Protestant Reformation, interpreters of Paul have pondered over the meaning of judgment according to deeds in the light of justification by faith alone. According to Romans 2:7 God will repay with eternal life those who do good, but in Romans 3:28 “a person is justified by faith apart from works.”<sup>1</sup> Yet in spite of the immense effort expended by scholars to resolve this puzzle, no consensus or even large-scale agreement on how to relate these two elements in Paul’s thought has been reached. Nevertheless, students of the apostle’s writings return to this theme again and again, demonstrating its importance for an understanding of his theology.<sup>2</sup>

This book seeks to shed light on one important but somewhat neglected component in that debate: *divine judgment according to deeds*. Although some important preliminary work has been done in the past few decades,<sup>3</sup> most treatments have given relatively little attention to a first-hand study of the use and meaning of this motif in Jewish sources prior to Paul. The studies referred to even today

<sup>1</sup> Apart from an historic Protestant aversion to any overemphasis on “works,” the two terms (“deeds” and “works”) can hardly be distinguished in meaning and will be used interchangeably.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, Matthias Kinghardt, “Sünde und Gericht von Christen bei Paulus,” *ZNW* 88 (1997), 56–80.

<sup>3</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977; hereafter *PPJ*, see subject index “Reward and Punishment”); R. Heiligenthal, *Werke als Zeichen, Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung der menschlichen Taten im Frühjudentum, neuen Testament und Frühchristentum* (WUNT 2/9; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983), 143–164, 172–184, 234–264; S. Travis, *Christ and the Judgment of God: Divine Retribution in the New Testament* (Foundations for Faith; Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1986), 5–29; D. W. Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul’s Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5–4:5* (NovTSup 66; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 38–95.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)2 *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*

by most when commenting on this issue are either in German, have a different focus, or are only suggestive in scope. No monograph has been devoted to a thorough examination of the motif of divine judgment (or recompense) according to deeds in pre-Pauline Jewish sources, and that in spite of the fact that it is precisely the language of judgment according to deeds which is most often felt to be in direct conflict with Paul's teaching on justification by faith.

Thus, one of the major goals of this study is to examine carefully the terminology and rhetorical functions of recompense according to deeds in relevant Jewish texts. Paul's use will then be examined against the same background in order to ascertain the degree of terminological and functional continuity or discontinuity. Does he evince proximity to use in the Scriptures, to that in apocalyptic writings, in sectarian circles? Does he significantly modify the traditional wording or rhetorical function(s), and, if so, does this give any hint as to his own particular theological understanding of the motif?

Studies of judgment and justification written prior to the 1970s were generally reliant upon an understanding of Judaism represented by names such as Weber, Strack-Billerbeck, and Bousset.<sup>4</sup> These suggested a radical *discontinuity* between Paul and his Jewish upbringing in regard to a doctrine of divine recompense. Whereas Judaism was thought to be a religion of works in which salvation had to be earned by accumulating more good works than bad in one's lifetime, in Paul justification (and thus judgment) was by grace apart from works.

This debate over Paul's relationship to Judaism has received new impetus from the work of E. P. Sanders, who raises the possibility of greater *continuity* between Paul and Judaism on the point of judgment according to works.

Paul's view is typically Jewish . . . the distinction between being *judged on the basis of deeds* and punished or rewarded at the judgment (or in this life), on the one hand, and being *saved by God's gracious election*, on the other,

<sup>4</sup> F. W. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften* (2nd edn.; Leipzig: Dörrfling & Franke, 1897); H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (4 vols.; Munich: 1922 [hereafter *Str-B*]), esp. Exkursus 20: "Das Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im Weinberg Mt 20,1–16 u. die altsynagogale Lohnlehre" (IV.484–500); W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (3rd edn.; HNT 21; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

3

was the general view in Rabbinic literature . . . Salvation by grace is not incompatible with punishment and reward for deeds.<sup>5</sup>

Though Sanders himself argues that Paul and Palestinian Judaism represent two differing “patterns of religion,” he also admits they evince no essential difference in regard to the relationship between grace and works. A reevaluation of judgment according to works in both Paul and second temple Judaism is necessary to determine whether Paul’s understanding of judgment as well as of the relationship among the concepts faith – obedience – salvation – judgment might not be much closer to Jewish views than previously allowed. Perhaps Mark Seifrid is correct in suggesting that the resolution of the “inherent but invisible connection” in Paul between justification and sanctification may only be achieved by a reexamination of the background of such a connection in Judaism.<sup>6</sup>

Thus, another goal of this study will be to examine the place, theologically, of judgment according to deeds within the larger soteriological pattern(s) represented in the various sources. Of course, a full-scale study of their soteriological views is beyond the scope of this book. Therefore, I will be somewhat more reliant at this point on the findings of others. Sanders’ basic insight into the pattern of Palestinian Jewish religion (“covenantal nomism”) has been adopted as a working hypothesis, but has been tested constantly against the texts studied. For clarification, “covenantal nomism” means that salvation is not earned by human initiative or merits, but is granted freely by means of God’s election and the giving of the covenant. One “gets in” by grace. Within this covenantal relationship, however, obedience to God’s will (the Law) is required. Works are the condition of maintaining one’s status within the saved. One “stays in” by obedience.<sup>7</sup>

In adopting this hypothesis, I am not unaware of the challenges that have been raised against Sanders as to the relation of grace and works in Judaism and in Paul. Laato, for instance, contrasts Jewish synergism with Pauline monergism. Paul’s pessimistic anthropology demands both a radical doctrine of *sola gratia* and the rejection of Judaism’s optimistic anthropology in which the

<sup>5</sup> *PPJ*, 517; see also 515–518, 543.

<sup>6</sup> *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme* (NovTSup 68; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992) 46.

<sup>7</sup> See *PPJ*, esp. 75, 236, 422.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)4 *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*

freedom and ability of the human will remain intact.<sup>8</sup> This rejection of Pauline continuity based upon Jewish synergism has been voiced by others as well.<sup>9</sup> While there may well be more variety in second temple Judaism than Sanders' "pattern" indicates, these critics have not succeeded in demonstrating that the grace-works axis in Judaism generally is any more synergistic or meritorious than in Paul. Both entry into and continued (and final) enjoyment of salvation find their *cause* in God's grace and mercy; the condition for the maintenance and final enjoyment of the same is human obedience.<sup>10</sup>

Finally, ongoing debate regarding δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ [the righteousness of God] raises anew the question of the relationship between Pauline justification by faith and Christian obedience, and thus, of justification and judgment. For example, the movement away from a strictly forensic-judicial perspective in favor of "Heilsetzende Macht" [saving power] which includes transformational categories virtually collapses justification and sanctification.<sup>11</sup> Without claiming to provide a fresh analysis of this issue, these developments will nevertheless have to be kept in mind as possibly providing new avenues for defining the relationship between justification and judgment.

<sup>8</sup> T. Laato, *Paul and Judaism: An Anthropological Approach* (trans. T. McElwain; South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 115; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 167.

<sup>9</sup> Examples include D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension* (New Foundations Theological Library; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981), 45–109; R. H. Gundry, "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul," *Bib* 66 (1985), 1–38; and C. F. D. Moule, "Jesus, Judaism, and Paul," *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis* (ed. G. Hawthorne; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 43–52.

<sup>10</sup> Though maintaining points of criticism, examples of the general acceptance of this fundamental thesis of Sanders include J. Neusner, "The Use of the Later Rabbinic Evidence for the Study of Paul," *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, vol. II (ed. William Scott Green; Brown Judaic Studies 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980), 48, 50; J. D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," *BJRL* 65/2 (1983), 95–97; and W. D. Davies, *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 17–23 and 308, n. 27; *idem.*, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (4th edn.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), xxix.

<sup>11</sup> E. Käsemann, "Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus," *ZTK* 58 (1961), 367–378 (ET = *New Testament Questions of Today* [1969], 168–182). M. T. Brauch provides an overview, "Appendix: Perspectives on 'God's righteousness' in recent German discussion," in E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 523–542. For a critical response, see M. Seifrid, *Justification by Faith*, 37–77.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

5

**Method and procedure**

The study of the motif in Judaism prior to Paul has value in its own right, apart from its significance for understanding Paul's letters. Thus, part one will be devoted to an examination of the pertinent Jewish literature. The attempt will be made to avoid imposing Pauline categories on this literature, or only combing it for parallels to Paul's use. In comparing one literary motif across several bodies of literature I will investigate its linguistic characteristics and rhetorical functions as well as its theological significance. Attention will be given especially to identifying the vocabulary and rhetorical functions which are typical in order to provide a basis for determining to what extent Paul's use is or is not continuous with that of second temple Judaism. Further, the theological significance of the motif within the soteriological pattern of each individual writing will be explored, and related motifs noted (e.g., divine impartiality, two-ways contrast, weighing of deeds). Thus by the end of part one we should have formed a clear picture of the form, function and content of divine judgment according to deeds in second temple Judaism.

Part two will then turn to the Pauline texts and will follow a similar procedure, but with greater detail in the exegetical analysis. The same issues of form, function, and content will guide the study, but in addition special attention will be given to the relationship between Paul's use and that discovered in second temple Judaism. In particular, at what points do the form and function of the motif in Paul show continuity or discontinuity with common Jewish use? Is there evidence of his having modified the tradition in ways which hint at his (differing) understanding of its meaning within his own soteriological pattern? Or, lacking indications of significant change in form and function, does judgment according to deeds function for him theologically in the same way that it does in the Jewish sources? What is the meaning of this judgment motif for the believer's justification or salvation?<sup>12</sup> The concluding chapter will summarize these results and will suggest an understanding of

<sup>12</sup> Sanders' objections to certain types of motif-comparison (*PPJ*, 1–24, esp. 12–18) can be avoided, it seems to me, by attempting to understand the motif in each instance within its own soteriological pattern before attempting any comparison. Examples of the approach I am using to understand a particular motif are J. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBLDS 59; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), see esp. 1–4; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), xxiii; and Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds  
Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)6 *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*

judgment and justification in Paul which has been made plausible by the foregoing analysis.

In order to keep the amount of pertinent material within reasonable limits, I will confine myself to *divine recompense to those within the religious community*. Thus the focus is not upon intra-community (human) judgment or judgment upon outsiders. Primary texts to be considered will be those using the terminology of “judgment (or recompense) according to deeds,” or texts alluding to a divine judgment-recompense in connection with deeds.<sup>13</sup>

As witnesses to the pre-Pauline Jewish use of the motif I will examine the Jewish Scriptures (both the MT and the LXX), the OT Pseudepigrapha, and the DSS.<sup>14</sup> Rabbinic texts will be cited occasionally for comparison, but the current state of research into this literature suggests that a defensible reconstruction of first-century CE rabbinic perspectives is still a task for the future.<sup>15</sup> Greco-Roman views of judgment will be noted only briefly since Paul’s use of the particular motif under consideration stems by common consent from Jewish sources. Evidence for Paul’s use of the motif will be taken from the undisputed Paulines, and from Colossians.<sup>16</sup>

### The longstanding debate: judgment and justification in Paul<sup>17</sup>

As noted above, attempts to understand judgment in Paul have traditionally approached the subject in terms of defining and

<sup>13</sup> See the next chapter for further definition of the semantic field.

<sup>14</sup> On the omission of Philo, cf. C. Roetzel, *Judgement in the Community: A Study of the Relationship between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 14, n. 1; and Heiligenthal, *Werke als Zeichen*, 273–278.

<sup>15</sup> K. Müller, “Zur Datierung rabbinischer Aussagen,” in *Neues Testament und Ethik: FS R. Schnackenburg* (ed. H. Merklein; Freiburg: Herder, 1989), 551–587.

<sup>16</sup> On the authenticity of Colossians, see chapter 7. The motif is found in 2 Thessalonians only at 1:6 (“it is indeed just of God to repay with affliction those who afflict you”), but applied to enemies of the gospel, thus not meeting this study’s criteria for primary motif-texts. The occurrence in Eph. 6:8 (“whatever good we do, we will receive the same again from the Lord”) may be safely overlooked, since it is so similar to Col. 3:24 and would make little difference to my conclusions. 2 Tim. 4:14 may also be mentioned here, being one of the few instances in the Pauline corpus where the motif is used to pronounce a sentence of divine punishment upon a named individual: “Alexander the coppersmith did me great harm; the Lord will pay him back for his deeds.” Elsewhere such statements are generally left conditional (“if you”) or more oblique in their reference (“whoever”).

<sup>17</sup> A good survey can be found in Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict*, 1–7. Older reviews include H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke und Rechtfertigungslehre bei Paulus* (UNT 19; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich’sche, 1930), 14–31; C. Haufe, *Die sittliche Rechtfertigungslehre des Paulus* (Halle: VEB Max Niemeyer, 1957), 37–68; and R. C.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

7

resolving the theological paradox or tension perceived to exist between the twin Pauline affirmations of judgment and justification. Writers on this topic may be organized broadly into two basic groups, those for whom the tension between judgment and justification is ultimately unresolvable, and those who propose a resolution. To the first group belong those who see Paul's thought on this subject as incoherent or ultimately illogical.

Gillis Wetter, for example, is particularly concerned to focus on Paul's relation to his prior Jewish world of thought.<sup>18</sup> Specifically, to what degree did the apostle retain Judaism's emphasis on retribution? For Wetter, the discontinuity on this point is stark indeed. Paul "does not proclaim retribution with punishment and reward as did the Jews, but he calls out to everyone: God has rescued us from retribution."<sup>19</sup> Although divine recompense still works in the world, it has no more effect upon the Christian. Grace in Paul replaces Jewish retributive thinking. While explainable psychologically, "Every attempt to express Paul's eschatology as a coherent system is utterly impossible; the elements he places side by side *cannot be united*."<sup>20</sup>

Herbert Braun adds that it is particularly in paraenetic contexts that Paul's use of judgment must be deemed inconsistent.<sup>21</sup> On the one hand, the judgment (of Christians) is integral to Paul's doctrinal system, and is no "unüberwundener jüdischer Rest" [unexpunged remnant of Judaism]. This judgment according to works is the same judgment as is in view in justification by faith (i.e., no "second" justification). Paul maintains a dominant note of hope, certain of a positive outcome, though with occasional notes of uncertainty or even warning of loss. Its outcome for believers is salvation (not simply gradations of blessedness), and is according to works.

On the other hand, judgment is subservient to justification by faith. This is in sharpest contrast to Judaism. For the apostle, justification assures the eschatological verdict with a certainty which cannot be overturned by disobedience, even in the light of grave sinning. But this means, particularly in paraenetic contexts,

Devor, *The Concept of Judgment in the Epistles of Paul* (Ph.D. Diss., Drew University, 1959), 95–150.

<sup>18</sup> Gillis P. Wetter, *Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus: Eine Studie zur Religion des Apostels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912).

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 173.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 154 (my emphasis).

<sup>21</sup> Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke und Rechtfertigungslehre*.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)8 *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*

that Paul's use of judgment must be deemed inconsistent. Texts which allow a double possibility of behavior as well as of outcome for Christians (salvation or damnation) reflect this inconsistency; they are *an unreflected paraenetic use of Paul's Jewish traditions*. Braun ties this to Paul's mode of "unsystematic Jewish thinking."

Somewhat similar is Nigel Watson who argues that judgment and justification conflict in Paul because they are "directed to different addresses."<sup>22</sup> Justification texts speak to overscrupulous legalists, while judgment warnings aim at the presumptuous. Yet both these poles are fully Pauline (not simply a Jewish remnant), and can be understood properly only from within a sort of dialectical preaching. Paul did not draw these various elements from a single, and to him coherent, system. The result is that "nothing else remains for us but to remain under the contradiction and to see it through."

Finally, to this group may be added two authors who dispute that there is any tension to be resolved; at least Paul does not appear to have felt any. Not that Paul's thought exhibits any logical harmony; instead, the very possibility of paradox is removed by sealing off statements on justification and on judgment from one another. Calvin Roetzel (*Judgement in the Community*) believes the perceived impasse is caused largely by trying to interpret Paul's statements on judgment against the backdrop of a theology of justification by faith. His alternative is to give greater attention to the occasional nature of the texts, and to highlight eschatology and ecclesiology as the primary conceptual backgrounds upon which to understand Paul's statements about judgment.

Roetzel challenges a prevailing assumption that Paul is best understood in juxtaposition or contrast to his Jewish background. A brief analysis of judgment in the post-exilic prophets, Jewish apocalyptic literature, Qumran and rabbinic materials, leads to the conclusion that Paul's thought is in essential continuity with the eschatological framework found in all but the rabbinic materials. The major discontinuity is located in the apostle's christology. The cross of Christ means that the Eschaton (including judgment and salvation) is already present, while the still outstanding parousia

<sup>22</sup> Nigel M. Watson, "Justified by Faith; Judged by Works – An Antinomy?" *NTS* 29 (1983), 209–221. The "problem texts" are: Rom. 2:1–16; 14:7–12; 1 Cor. 3:1–17; 4:1–5; 5:1–5; 6:9–11; 9:24–27; 11:27–34; 2 Cor. 5:9–10; Gal. 5:19–21; and 6:7–10.



Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

9

simultaneously necessitates an “eschatological reservation” for believers in all these matters. This tension is rooted in the nature of the church which lives between the cross and parousia. Thus, Paul can say believers already enjoy salvation and freedom from wrath, yet, without contradiction, warn them that they must still face judgment and attain salvation. Roetzel’s rationale for de-coupling justification and judgment statements is two-fold: (1) the latter have a corporate focus (i.e., are not addressing the issue of individual justification by faith), and (2) the apostle can speak of judgment without reference to faith or justification.

Ernst Synofzik is not satisfied with Braun’s arbitrary dismissal of certain paraenetic texts.<sup>23</sup> Paul could indeed place judgment and justification in theological relation to one another, which indicates that the apostle did not perceive them to be incompatible. Rather, Paul’s judgment statements stem from preexisting Jewish or early Christian traditions, and he uses these pieces of tradition strictly as *Argumentationsmittel* [rhetorical devices]. This can be an encouragement to endure, an admonition to Christian responsibility before God, or a warning of consequences. By thus *restricting* Pauline intention to a rhetorical employment of such traditional *Argumentationsmittel*, their conceptual significance can be minimized, relieving Paul (and his interpreters) of the need to seek harmonization. Although Paul utilizes such judgment sayings, he rejects (or at least rhetorically sidesteps) the Jewish theology (= legalism) supposedly implicit in them.<sup>24</sup> While Braun and others dismiss such difficult sayings as an inconsistency, Synofzik answers – this is just rhetoric.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Ernst Synofzik, *Die Gerichts- und Vergeltungsaussagen bei Paulus. Eine Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (GTA 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

<sup>24</sup> The term “legalism” can denote different things: (i) emphasis on the letter rather than the spirit of the law; (ii) belief in salvation by obedience to the law rather than by the grace of God or by faith; or (iii) undue stress on legal details without balancing considerations of justice or mercy (D. T. Kauffman, *The Dictionary of Religious Terms* [Westwood, NJ: Revell, 1967], 287). For clarity these could be termed “literalism” (i) and “casuistry” (iii), with “legalism” reserved for definition (ii) above.

<sup>25</sup> In spite of the rich insights and methodological advance represented by this book, its conclusion is based on an unproven assumption; namely, once the paraenetic purpose of a particular judgment statement has been identified, one can safely ignore the associated conceptual matter. One wonders if it could not be equally argued that Paul takes up such eschatological judgment sayings as motivation for his paraenesis precisely *because* they were part of the conceptual worldview of both the apostle and his readers.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03669-6 - Paul, Judaism, and Judgment according to Deeds

Kent L. Yinger

Excerpt

[More information](#)10 *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*

Turning now to those who seek some logical resolution of the tension between Paul's judgment and justification statements, it is possible to divide this group further into three basic approaches. First, some seek to *redefine Paul's judgment statements* so as to reduce the tension. D. E. Köhl argues, more theologically than exegetically, for a position that has played a major role in studies on judgment and justification in Paul.<sup>26</sup> The key lies in understanding saving grace to be exclusive of any sort of dependence on human activity. *Grace* is "the highest religious principle of the apostle."<sup>27</sup> For this reason, whatever might be the result of a future judgment according to deeds, it cannot be described with such terms as *σώζεσθαι* or *σωτηρία*. Judgment according to works does not conflict with justification by grace, because the former deals solely with reward, but it cannot affect salvation (see Braun's opposite position above). Justification, salvation, and eternal life are seen as guaranteed by grace, regardless of the outworking of grace in the moral life.

I may be permitted to point out a certain ambiguity in Köhl's position regarding the place and importance of works in the lives of the justified. On the one hand, faith is to evidence itself in the moral life, and walking in the Spirit is everywhere the expectation. The author can even affirm in this vein, when speaking of vice-catalogs (1 Cor. 6:9–10), "Whoever acts in this way is no Christian at all, but a pagan."<sup>28</sup> Yet, commenting on 1 Corinthians 3:15, he concludes that salvation and participation in life are "certain, even when the sum total of one's behavior must be judged in the final assize to have been worthless."<sup>29</sup> However important works might be in the process of salvation, they are not a necessity or condition for its ultimate attainment. If one asks how Paul logically related grace and works, Köhl contends that Paul simply didn't sense a need to draw the connection between these two circles of thought, since it was the strength of the apostle's position to tolerate absolutely no hint of deviation from his chief principle, the sole supremacy of grace in matters of salvation.

In a similar fashion, Richard Devor asserts that justification by faith leads to salvation, while judgment according to works deter-

<sup>26</sup> D. E. Köhl, *Rechtfertigung auf Grund Glaubens und Gericht nach den Werken bei Paulus* (Königsberg i.Pr.: Wilh. Koch, 1904).

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.