

# Paul's Universalizing Hermeneutic in Romans<sup>1</sup>

Douglas Moo

**Douglas Moo** is Blanchard Professor of New Testament at Wheaton Graduate School in Wheaton, Illinois. Prior to this, he taught for over twenty years at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, in Deerfield, Illinois. Dr. Moo has authored numerous articles and books, including *Introduction to the New Testament* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., with D. A. Carson; Zondervan, 2005), *2 Peter, Jude* (NIV Application Commentary; Zondervan, 1996), *The Epistle of James* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Eerdmans, 2000), and *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Eerdmans, 1996).

## Introduction

In this article, I focus on Paul's Old Testament "justification" for the inclusion of Gentiles in the new covenant people of God within the Epistle to the Romans. While not, in my view, the central purpose of Romans, the inclusion of Gentiles and the related question about the unity of salvation history is a critical issue in Paul's explanation and defense of the gospel. Analyzing Paul's OT-based argument for this critical move in salvation history provides us with a large though not always clear window through which we can observe Paul's hermeneutics of OT appropriation.

How large is the window? Precise identification of quotations is a difficult matter, but, counting each place where Paul breaks the flow of his own words with several or more words verbatim from the OT, we arrive at about 100 quotations in all the letters of Paul.<sup>2</sup> More than half of these—fifty-five—are found in Romans. And thirty-five of these fifty-five quotations—over sixty percent—are related in some fashion to the issue of the inclusion of the Gentiles.

How clear is the window? Not very, apparently, as the volume and diversity of proposals explaining this facet of Romans demonstrate. We may take the monograph of Terrence Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles*, as an example.<sup>3</sup> Arguing that the epochal shifts in Pauline scholarship over the last thirty years have rendered untenable traditional answers to the question,

Donaldson sets out to discover just why it was that Paul came to believe that Gentiles should be included in the new people of God. Donaldson concludes that Paul's universalism was simply the extension of the view of Gentiles that he had held as a Jew. Paul the Jewish covenantal nomist believed that Gentiles could become members of God's people by identifying with Israel via circumcision and law-keeping. Paul the Christian continued to believe that Gentiles could be saved by identifying with Israel, God's people, although this identification now came via faith in Christ and not by circumcision and torah.

Donaldson's argument is careful, wide-ranging, and often illuminating. But what is especially relevant for our purposes is Donaldson's contention that Paul could not have derived his belief about Gentile inclusion from the OT. For Paul's appeal to the OT on this topic is often contrived and, viewed on its own merits, unconvincing. Passages are wrested from their contexts, misapplied, and elements within the texts that are uncongenial to Paul's interpretation are suppressed. Clearly, Donaldson concludes, Paul turns to the OT to justify, by whatever means necessary, a view of the Gentiles that he has already derived from elsewhere.

In this article, then, I bring together three issues that have stimulated my interest for a long time: the use of the OT in the New, the relationship of the church to Israel, and Romans. Mixing three top-

ics of such complexity is audacious and probably foolhardy. Perhaps I will end up saying little that is significant about any one of them. But I hope that I will at least stimulate some general thinking about these matters.

### **Paul's Use of OT Quotations**

In a vast, overarching inclusio, Paul intertwines concern for the Gentiles, his gospel, and the OT at both the beginning and the end of Romans. The first thing Paul says about the gospel in Romans is that it was “promised beforehand through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures” (1:2), and he links to this gospel to his own apostolic calling to inculcate “the obedience of faith among all the Gentiles” (v. 5; my trans.).<sup>4</sup> Then, in the concluding doxology—which I take to be original to the letter<sup>5</sup>—Paul again speaks of his “gospel,” relating it to the “mystery” that is “now revealed and made known through the prophetic writings by the command of the eternal God, so that all the Gentiles might come to faith and obedience” (16:25-26).<sup>6</sup> This triad of gospel, Gentile inclusion, and the OT then surfaces in various ways throughout the letter.<sup>7</sup> Paul makes other general assertions about the OT and his gospel (e.g., 3:21). He appeals directly to Scriptural stories, most notably that of Abraham. He alludes to the Scriptures, weaving its language into his own words in order to suggest more subtle relationships between his teaching and the OT revelation. But I will confine myself to the quotations.

As we said, we find thirty-five quotations in Romans that seem to be part of Paul's universalizing hermeneutic. These thirty-five quotations may be subdivided by topic into three categories.

### **Members of the New Covenant**

First are quotations that directly or indirectly support the inclusion of Gentiles within the new covenant people of God. A good example here would be Rom 4:18: “[Abraham] in hope believed and so became the father of many nations, just as it had been said to him, ‘So shall your offspring be’ [Gen 15:5].” Fifteen quotations belong in this category.

- 4:17 = Gen 17:5
- 4:18 = Gen 15:5
- 8:36 = Ps 44:22
- 9:25-26 = Hos 2:23 (MT and LXX 2:25);  
1:10 (MT and LXX 2:1)
- 10:11 = Isa 28:16
- 10:13 = Joel 2:32 (LXX 3:5)
- 10:18 = Ps 19:4
- 10:19 = Deut 32:21
- 10:20 = Isa 65:1
- 14:11 = Isa 45:23
- 15:9 = Ps 18:49
- 15:10 = Deut 32:43
- 15:11 = Ps 117:1
- 15:12 = Isa 11:10
- 15:21 = Isa 52:15

### **Condemnation of Israel**

A second category of quotations are those that “level the playing field” between Jew and Gentile by denouncing Israel's sin and announcing Israel's condemnation. The series of quotations in Rom 3:10-18, all directed to “those who are under the law” (v. 19) provides a good example. We find twelve such quotations in Romans.

- 2:6 = Prov 24:12 (Ps. 62:12?)
- 2:24 = Isa 52:5
- 3:10-12 = Ps 14:1-3
- 3:13a = Ps 5:9
- 3:13b = Ps 140:3b
- 3:14 = Ps 10:7
- 3:15-17 = Isa 59:7
- 3:18 = Ps 36:1
- 10:16 = Isa 53:1
- 10:21 = Isa 65:2
- 11:8 = Deut 29:4/Isa 29:10
- 11:9-10 = Ps 69:22-23

### *True Israel*

Third, we find quotations that Paul uses to support his interpretation of the extent and nature of true, “spiritual,” Israel. These quotations come, as we might expect, in Romans 9, where we find eight such quotations.

9:7 = Gen 21:12  
9:9 = Gen 18:10, 14  
9:12 = Gen 25:23  
9:13 = Mal 1:2-3  
9:15 = Exod 33:19  
9:17 = Exod 9:16  
9:27-28 = Isa 10:22-23  
9:29 = Isa 1:9

These thirty-five OT quotations are drawn from a relatively small number of OT books. Paul depends especially on the Psalms (ten quotations) and Isaiah (eleven and one-half quotations). The Genesis story of Abraham, while not reflected in many OT quotations, is, of course, very important. And also playing a significant role (though with only two quotations) is the “Song of Moses” in Deuteronomy 32.<sup>8</sup> Also represented are: Genesis (3), Exodus (2), Deuteronomy (1/2 outside the Song of Moses), Proverbs (1), Joel (1), Hosea (1) and Malachi (1).

How does Paul use these texts in the service of his theology of Gentile inclusion? In order to answer this question, I will follow a method that I have found helpful elsewhere in analyzing the appropriation of biblical texts.<sup>9</sup> Basic to this method is a distinction between “appropriation techniques” and “hermeneutical axioms.” The former refers to the various methods used by authors to appropriate the meaning of biblical texts for their own purposes and applications. These techniques are found widely in the first-century Jewish world, utilized by various Jewish groups as well as by the early Christians. Hermeneutical axioms, on the other hand, are those

theological convictions that direct and guide the way in which the appropriation techniques are applied. And it is at this level that the real differences among first-century interpreters of the biblical text emerge. The different applications given to Isaiah’s call to “prepare in the desert the way for the Lord” (40:3) by the Qumran community and by the evangelists has nothing to do with their exegetical techniques and everything to do with their convictions about where and how God was revealing himself.

### **Appropriating OT Texts**

Simplifying matters considerably, we can detect three basic appropriation techniques in the thirty-five quotations we are examining. The most common technique, displayed in seventeen of the thirty-five quotations, involves a direct application of the text. In these instances, Paul makes no evident changes in the text that he cites; nor does he apply the passage in a way that is inconsistent with its original meaning. In these cases, the legitimacy of Paul’s application of the OT text will depend on the legitimacy of the basic theological convictions that drive his reading of the OT—what we have called hermeneutical axioms. A good example of the kind of direct appropriation is Paul’s use of Isa 52:15 in Rom 15:21. Isaiah is prophesying about how the mission of the “servant of the Lord” will have an impact on nations and kings, who “will see” “what they were not told” and “understand” “what they have not heard.” Paul uses this language to justify his missionary practice of bringing the gospel to places where Christ had not yet been proclaimed. What legitimizes this use of the Isaiah text for Paul is a certain interpretation of the enigmatic figure of the “servant of the Lord.” Probably Paul

sees the “servant” as Christ, although some have suggested that he may also see himself in the role of the “servant.” But, in either case, Paul’s appropriation of the passage is quite “direct” once this broad hermeneutical assumption about the text is recognized.

A second appropriation technique evident in these quotations is “modification of the text.” Under this heading I include places where Paul has evidently consciously created or chosen a form of the text that conforms the quotation to its intended application. Paul does not use this technique very much in the quotations we are studying; we find only three possible examples. Much more significant for our study is the third appropriation technique evident in these quotations: shift of meaning. In these cases, Paul has evidently applied the OT text to a situation or in a way that does not seem to be in keeping with its original meaning. This appropriation technique is evident to varying degrees in fourteen of the texts that Paul cites.

I now want to look more closely at the texts where we find Paul using these appropriation techniques with a view toward illuminating the universalizing hermeneutic that informs this interpretation of the OT. Since twenty-six of the thirty-five passages we are considering occur in four blocks of text, it will be most convenient to begin with the quotations found in these four passages.

### ***Romans 3:10-18***

The first of the blocks we consider is 3:10-18, which is a catena of quotations from the OT used to support Paul’s contention that “all people, whether Jews or Gentiles” are “under sin” (v. 9). Nowhere else does Paul use a quotation

so long or one drawn from so many different (at least six) OT passages. There are resemblances between this collection of thematically-linked verses and what the rabbis called “pearl-stringing,” and some have suggested that Paul is quoting an early Christian psalm or “florilegium.”<sup>10</sup> This is not clear, however; and, in any case, Paul’s purpose in citing these verses is clearly to substantiate the accusation of v. 9, and, in particular, his claim that sin is universal. Thus, the “all” of v. 9 is taken up in the repeated “there is no” of the quotations; and the way is prepared, in turn, for the universal application Paul gives the sequence of quotations in vv. 19-20.

The quotations begin with a series of phrases taken from Ps 14:1-3 (LXX 13:1-3) (Ps 53:1-3 is almost identical). As is the case with most of the quotations in this series, Paul’s wording agrees closely with the LXX. But there is one important difference: where the Psalm text has “there is no one who does good,” Paul has “there is no one who is righteous.”<sup>11</sup> Granted the importance of the language of “righteousness” in this part of Romans (cf. 3:4, 5, 8, 19, 20), the word is almost certainly Paul’s own editorial change.<sup>12</sup> We have here, then, a “modification of the text,” although the modification is so slight as to create almost no change from the meaning of the original.

The rest of the quotations also contain some minor modifications of the text, but the difficulty of determining the textual source in each case combined with the fact that the changes do not materially affect the sense renders them innocuous for our purposes. What is more serious is the apparent shift of application that we find in several of the quotations. Psalm 5:9 (MT, LXX 5:10), quoted in v. 13b, Ps 140:3b (MT 140:4b; LXX 139:4b), quoted in v. 13c,

and Ps 10:7 (LXX 9:28), quoted in v. 14, all refer to wicked enemies of the psalmist. Here we have an example of shift of application. Many commentators put the quotation of Isa 59:7-8a in vv. 15-17 in the same category, arguing that the Isaiah text is directed against the unrighteous within Israel. This is not so clear, however, as the prophet here seems to include all the people of Israel in a general confession of sin. But the final quotation, in v. 18, drawn from Ps 36:1b (MT 36:2b; LXX 35:2b), again manifests a shift of application, since it is applied, in its original context, to “the sinfulness of the wicked.”<sup>13</sup>

By citing several texts that denounce the unrighteous, and applying them to all people, including all Jews, he underscores the argument of 2:1-3:8 that, in fact, not even faithful Jews can claim to be “righteous.”<sup>14</sup>

#### ***Romans 9:30-10:21***

A second passage containing many quotations relevant to our investigation comes in Romans 10. In 9:6-29, Paul has sketched what to many seemed like a very surprising turn in salvation history: Israel, blessed and given so many privileges, is failing to act on her privileges and experience the messianic salvation. In 9:30-10:21, Paul pauses to consider more deeply the reasons for this surprising turn of affairs. He criticizes Israel for not responding to God’s eschatological righteousness in Christ. But a contrasting, though subordinate, theme in this section, sounded already in 9:24-26, is the positive response of Gentiles to God’s righteousness. Two quotations of interest to us in 10:5-13 support this particular aspect of Paul’s argument. Each provides scriptural support for the inclusion of the Gentiles, and each does so with a word that becomes loaded

with theological importance in Romans:  $\pi\alpha\varsigma$ , “everyone, all.” The word occurs in the theme statement of the letter, where Paul emphasizes that the power of God unleashed in the gospel leads to salvation for “everyone who believes.” But Paul immediately qualifies this “everyone” as “the Jew first and then the Greek” (1:16). This theme of “no distinction” recurs frequently in the letter, Paul often uses  $\pi\alpha\varsigma$  to signal the inclusion of Gentiles beside Israel as equal recipients of God’s grace and judgment (see also 2:9-10; 3:9, 19, 22-23; 4:11, 16; 10:4; 11:32).

In the context we are considering, the theme appears in the programmatic and debated 10:4, which I translate, “For Christ is the culmination of the law, so that there might be righteousness for everyone who believes.” Verses 5-13 expand on the final words in this assertion, with the “everyone” taken up particularly in vv. 11-13. And here is where we find our two OT quotations. The first is from Isa 28:16, a text that Paul has already quoted (mixed with Isaiah 8:14) in 9:33. He now, however, adds the word  $\pi\alpha\varsigma$  to the quotation: “no one who believes in him will be put to shame.” This addition has no textual basis and is clearly a modification of the text designed to bring out the point of universality that Paul is focusing on at this point in Romans. Verse 12 unpacks this universality inherent in the “no one” of the quotation, as Paul appeals to the universal lordship of Christ to show that there can be “no distinction” between Jews and Gentiles in God’s bestowment of his riches of salvation. An implicit quotation of Joel 2:32 (LXX 3:5) in v. 13 furnishes further scriptural proof: “Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.” Here we have no modification of the text, since the word  $\pi\alpha\varsigma$  is in the Septuagint, which

Paul quotes verbatim. But we are probably dealing with a shift in application, since the “everyone” in Joel appears to refer to the people of Israel. Paul, on the other hand, clearly extends the scope of the “everyone” to include both Jews and Gentiles in the new covenant people of God. Just as interesting, but outside the scope of our present inquiry, is the extension of the title *Yahweh* (Gk. κύριος) to include Christ.<sup>15</sup>

The paragraph that follows, 10:14-21, is of particular significance for our study, with five quotations that bear on the inclusion of the Gentiles. Identifying the people that Paul is speaking about in this paragraph is especially vital for our study. Since Paul explicitly identifies “Israel” as the object of his criticism in v. 19, the whole paragraph may be directed to Israel. But the reference to Israel may also suggest a shift in address, with the earlier verses being directed to people generally.<sup>16</sup> Perhaps it is best to conclude that Paul addresses all people, but with particular relevance to Israel.<sup>17</sup> His point, then, is that Israel cannot plead ignorance: God has made his purposes clear in both the OT (note the six OT quotations in vv. 14-21) and the worldwide proclamation of the gospel. So the fault rests with Israel: she has been “disobedient and obstinate” (v. 21; cf. v. 16).

The first quotation for us to consider comes in v. 16b, where Paul quotes Isa 53:1, “Lord, who has believed our report?”<sup>18</sup> The question is clearly rhetorical, Paul using it to show that the good news preached by the messengers whom God has sent (vv. 14-15) has been met with widespread disobedience (v. 16a). Paul’s application of the text is quite straightforward, once his hermeneutical axiom about the relevance of these “servant of

the Lord” texts to the Christian era is recognized.

Verse 17 focuses attention on the critical step of “hearing” in the sequence of steps leading to salvation that Paul outlined in vv. 14-15. Paul now goes back to this step and asks “have they not heard?” Paul’s answer employs words that are taken from Ps 19:4: “their voice has gone out into all the earth, their words to the ends of the world.”<sup>19</sup> No modification of the text is present here,<sup>20</sup> but we are faced with a striking shift in application.<sup>21</sup> For the Psalm verse, of course, extols God’s revelation in nature. Yet the implied object of the verb “heard” in Paul’s question must be “the word of Christ”; “their voice” and “their words” in the Psalm verse must then refer to the voices and words of Christian preachers (see vv. 14-16). The simplest explanation for this application is that Paul is not really “quoting” Ps 19:4. After all, we have here no introductory formula or quotation. Paul may simply use the language of the psalm, with the “echoes” of God’s revelation that it awakes, to assert the universal preaching of the gospel.<sup>22</sup>

Paul now takes his demonstration of Jewish disobedience one step further. In v. 19, he raises and rejects the possibility that Israel’s hearing was a merely superficial hearing, not accompanied by genuine understanding. No, Paul affirms, Israel has “known.” Paul quotes Deut 32:21b as the first step in his demonstration from Scripture of what Israel knew.<sup>23</sup> The words Paul quotes state God’s “equivalent” response to Israel’s idolatry: because Israel has made God jealous with “what is no god” (v. 21a), God will make Israel “jealous”<sup>24</sup> with what is “no people.” The phrase “no people” was probably the catch phrase that drew Paul’s attention to

this text, since he quotes the Hosea prophecy about those who are “not my people” becoming the people of God in 9:25-26.<sup>25</sup> But the chapter, which rehearses the history of God’s gracious acts on Israel’s behalf and Israel’s stubborn and sinful response to those acts, is one that Paul also seems to have valued in its own right as an important confirmation of his own view of salvation history. Paul accordingly sees in the words a prophecy of the mission to the Gentiles: the inclusion of Gentiles in the new people of God stimulates the Jews to jealousy and causes Israel to respond in wrath against this movement in salvation history. OT scholars debate about whether the “no people” in Deut 32:21 refers to an “uncivilized” nation unworthy of the name “people”<sup>26</sup> or whether it has the more theological sense of a people whom God has not chosen.<sup>27</sup> If it is the latter, Paul’s use of the text is not far from its original meaning, and we would have here a rather direct appropriation of scripture.

But it is not only the “law” that anticipates the gospel and Israel’s negative reaction to it; the “prophets” bear witness to the same truth. In fact, Paul suggests, the prophetic text testifies even more clearly to these points: “Isaiah boldly says, ‘I was found by those who did not seek me; I revealed myself to those who did not ask for me.’”<sup>28</sup> The quotation is from Isa 65:1. A few scholars think that this verse refers to Gentiles,<sup>29</sup> but the majority are surely correct in thinking that the context of Isaiah 64-65 requires that it be speaking about Israel.<sup>30</sup> We have here again, then, a shift of application, as Paul applies to the Gentiles a text that originally referred to Israel. Paul may, of course, have simply misunderstood the verse, assuming that the description of the people in the second

part of the verse as “a nation that did not call on my name” made a reference to Gentiles obvious. But since the shift of application we find here is evident elsewhere in Romans, as we will see, we will want to ask eventually whether Paul’s interpretation is guided by an underlying hermeneutical axiom.

Having applied Isa 65:1 in v. 20 to the Gentiles, Paul now applies Isa 65:2 to Israel, an application that matches the original meaning of the text.<sup>31</sup> The passage stresses both God’s constant offer of grace to his people and their stubborn resistance to that grace. But which is uppermost? God’s continuing gracious concern for Israel?<sup>32</sup> Or Israel’s disobedience?<sup>33</sup> The question that this verse sparks in 11:1 might suggest that the latter is closer to the truth. But we should probably not choose between the two. Both the grace of God in revealing himself and in reaching out to Israel and Israel’s refusal to respond to that grace are important for Paul’s argument.

### ***Romans 15:7-13***

The third block of text significant for our study features another catena of OT quotations. The important summary paragraph 15:7-13 is the conclusion to Paul’s exhortation to the “weak” and the “strong.” But many think that the paragraph has an even wider significance, arguing that the breadth of themes in 15:7-13 suggests that it should be seen as the conclusion to the entire letter.<sup>34</sup> And it is true that this paragraph alludes to many of the themes that have dominated Romans. Nevertheless, I think it is preferable to see Paul’s allusion to some of the larger themes of the letter as a means of buttressing his final appeal to the “strong” and the “weak.” He sets the local conflict

in Rome against the panorama of salvation history in order to stimulate them to obedience.<sup>35</sup>

Paul's emphasis on the inclusion within the people of God of both Jews and Gentiles is an appropriate last appeal to the "weak" and "strong." For I understand the difference between these two groups to be basically the issue of the continuing applicability of the Jewish law. The fissure between the two parties ran, then, largely along ethnic lines. Paul's "broadening" of perspective, as he reminds his readers of the new covenant inclusion of Jews and Gentiles, provides the basic theological undergirding for his plea that the "strong" and the "weak" at Rome "receive one another."

Verses 8-9a summarizes one of the central motifs of the letter: that God has fulfilled the promise of the Abrahamic covenant by bringing Gentiles into the people of God through the gospel. For the barrier between "strong" and "weak" is at root the barrier between Jew and Gentile, a barrier that Christ's ministry dismantled. Paul makes this clear by showing that Christ provided both for the fulfillment of God's promises to the Jews (v. 8) and for the inclusion of Gentiles in glorifying God (v. 9a). The precise syntactical relationship between these two assertions is not clear. But I think it is easiest to posit two parallel purpose expressions dependent on v. 8a:

I say that Christ has become a servant of the circumcision for the sake of the truth of God,  
(a) in order to confirm the promises made to the fathers;  
(b) and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for the sake of his mercy.<sup>36</sup>

Paul maintains a critical theological balance basic to his argument in Romans: the equality of Jew and Gentile and the sal-

vation-historical priority of the Jew (e.g., 1:16b: the gospel is "for all who believe," but "for the Jew first"). Paul accomplishes this here by using parallel statements to describe the benefit that both Jews and Gentiles derive from Christ's mission—promises made to the Jewish patriarchs are confirmed and Gentiles are enabled to glorify God for his mercy to them—while at the same time subordinating the blessing of the Gentiles to Christ's mission to the Jews in confirmation of God's faithfulness. Thus Paul implicitly reminds the "weak," mainly Jewish Christians, that the "strong," mainly Gentile Christians, are full members of the people of God: to use the illustration of chap. 11, the Gentiles, "wild olive shoots," have been "grafted in" (11:17). At the same time, however, he reminds the "strong" that the status they enjoy rests on a Jewish foundation: "the root supports you" (11:18).<sup>37</sup>

Paul's customary *καθὼς γέγραπται* ("as it is written") introduces the catena of four OT quotations. Common to all the quotations is the link-word "Gentiles," and the first three also feature the praise of God. These elements suggest that Paul may intend the quotations to provide OT support for his assertion in v. 9a about the Gentiles glorifying God. But the second quotation, from Deut 32:43 LXX (v. 10), links Gentiles and Jews together in the praise of God, while the fourth, from Isa 11:10, bases the Gentiles' hope in God on the Jewish Messiah. Probably, then, the quotations support vv. 8-9a as a whole. Paul cites every part of the OT—the "writings" (vv. 9b and 11), the "law" (v. 10), and the "prophets" (v. 12)—to show that the inclusion of Gentiles with Jews in the praise of God has always been part of God's purposes.

The first quotation is from Ps 18:49.<sup>38</sup>



Paul may cite this text simply because it speaks of God being “praised” among the Gentiles. But the speaker is David, and it is possible that Paul read the psalm typologically (as in his use of Psalm 69 in v. 3). Thus Paul may cite the verse as a claim of the risen Christ. And this possibility gains credence when we note the context of the verse that Paul quotes. For David’s praise of God “among the Gentiles” is stimulated by the fact that God has given him victory over Gentile nations. God has made him “the head of the nations,” so that a “people I did not know now serve me” (v. 43). It would fit Paul’s purposes perfectly if he were attributing to Christ this praise of God for the subduing of the Gentiles under his messianic rule. Through his death and resurrection, Gentiles who had not known the righteous rule of the Lord can now be brought into submission to him, glorifying him for his mercy to them. This opening quotation would then match the last in the series, both focusing on the way in which the Jewish king/Messiah has brought Gentiles into submission.

The next quotation, in v. 10, comes from an important source for Paul’s theology of salvation history, the Song of Moses. In the majority of MT manuscripts, Deut 32:43 reads *עֲמֹ גוֹיִם הַרְנִינֵי גֹיִם*, “Praise his people, Gentiles.” But the LXX, with support in at least one medieval Hebrew MS and possibly in a Qumran MS, reads *εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*, “Praise, Gentiles, with his people.”<sup>39</sup> This version, which invites the Gentiles to praise God along with Israel, obviously suits Paul’s purposes better, and we may have here, then, a modification of the text. But we need to be cautious about this conclusion, since the Hebrew text tradition is, as we have seen, by no means clear. Significantly, most English versions adopt the Septuagint textual

tradition at this point, and this may have been the standard text in Paul’s day.

Paul next quotes another OT verse—Ps 117:1—that calls on Gentiles to praise “the Lord.” As Richard Hays points out, Paul’s use of this verse may again suggest that he chooses OT texts to quote partly because of contextual factors: the second (and only other) verse of this psalm cites God’s “mercy” (*ἐλεός*) and “truth” (*ἀληθεία*) as reasons for this praise, the exact blessings that Paul has cited in vv. 8-9a as reason to praise God.<sup>40</sup>

Paul’s final quotation comes from Isa 11:10. The wording is again very close to the LXX, although in this case the LXX differs from the MT. For the Hebrew speaks of the root of Jesse standing “as a signal to the peoples” and of the Gentiles “inquiring” of him. With its reference to the shoot of Jesse “arising”—a possible allusion to Jesus’ resurrection<sup>41</sup>—to “rule” the Gentiles and to the Gentiles’ “hoping”—a key word in this section (cf. vv. 4, 12)—the LXX rendering obviously suits Paul’s purposes better than the MT. So we might have here a modification of the text. Nevertheless, the basic meaning of the text is the same in both versions; either would allow Paul to make the point he wants to make: that the Gentiles’ participation in the praise of God (vv. 9b-11) comes as a result of the work of “the shoot of Jesse,” a messianic designation.<sup>42</sup> Once more, Paul may cite this text partly because of its context: Isaiah 11 goes on to refer to God’s gathering of the “remnant” of Israel from among the nations.<sup>43</sup>

### **Romans 9:6-29**

The final block of texts comes in Paul’s discussion of Israel in Rom 9:6-29. Nine quotations are found here, and they can be divided into two categories. Eight of

the quotations support Paul's argument about the true extent of what we might call "spiritual" Israel. The basic point of the section is made in v. 6b: "Not all of Israel are Israel." Israel in both these instances is national Israel, and so Paul is arguing for the existence of a spiritual Israel *within* physical Israel. His quotations support this argument by pointing to the decisive role played by God and his calling in making up the spiritual Israel. Verses 7-13 illustrate this point from the history of the patriarchs. The first three citations, from Gen 21:12, 18:10 (14), and 25:23 all quote the OT text accurately and apply it rather straightforwardly. But the fourth, from Mal 1:2-3 in v. 13, calls for brief scrutiny. Malachi uses the names Jacob and Esau to denote peoples: Israel and Edom, respectively. Most contemporary interpreters think that Paul also intends such a reference, the issue in this chapter being the roles of different nations in salvation history. Others, however, think that Paul is speaking about the salvation of individuals, and that Paul uses Mal 1:2-3 to refer to God's determination of the eternal destiny of individuals.<sup>44</sup> The issue is large and would take us too far afield. Following the careful arguments of John Piper, I think that Romans 9 does, indeed, refer to the salvation of individuals, but indirectly. Paul is not quoting Mal 1:2-3 to refer to individuals; but he uses this text, and others, to establish a pattern of God's sovereign election that he then applies to individuals.<sup>45</sup> Paul then uses these OT texts as part of a larger argument for which they were not originally designed, but the principles Paul draws from them seem to be legitimate.

Verses 14-23 is an excursus in Paul's argument, stimulated by the very emphasis on God's sovereignty in election. Paul

here quotes from God's words to Moses in Exod 33:19 and to Pharaoh in Exod 9:16. Both are straightforward.

In v. 24, Paul returns, after the excursus in vv. 14-23, to the theme of vv. 6-13: God's call is the sole basis for inclusion in the true people of God. Thus we encounter here again the characteristic vocabulary of that earlier paragraph: "sons of God" (v. 26; cf. v. 8); "seed" (v. 29; cf. vv. 7 and 8); and, especially "call" (vv. 24 and 26; cf. vv. 7 and 12). But these verses also move beyond what Paul has said in vv. 6b-13. For Paul now explicitly includes Gentiles among those whom God is sovereignly calling to be part of his people. The main point comes in v. 24: God is calling his people from among both Jews and Gentiles. The OT quotations in vv. 25-29 pick up this thesis chiastically, proof of God's calling of the Gentiles coming in vv. 25-26 and reference to Israel coming in vv. 27-29. Paul quotes from Isa 10:22-23, a famous "remnant" text, in vv. 27-28. There are textual difficulties in both the OT and in Paul, but no startling modification of the text seems to occur. His application is straightforward: Isaiah himself, by insisting that it would be the "remnant," out of the vast host of Jews, who would be saved, justifies Paul's insistence that God would save only some Jews. Verse 29, quoting literally from Isaiah 1:9, on the other hand, contains a note of hope: the Lord Almighty has left Israel with a "seed," foreboding hope for the future. Paul thus prepares the way for the promises of Romans 11.

We now return to the only quotation in the passage that relates to the inclusion of the Gentiles: the use of Hos 2:23 and 1:10 in 9:25-26. We find here perhaps the most striking of the shifts of application that we encounter in the OT quotations that Paul uses to validate the inclusion of the Gen-

tiles in the messianic people of God. Ross Wagner calls it “a radical rereading.”<sup>46</sup>

He quotes freely from Hos 2:23 (MT and LXX 2:25) in v. 25 and then verbatim from the LXX version of Hos 1:10a (MT and LXX 2:1b) in v. 26. Paul changes the sequence of the verses, reverses the order of the two clauses he cites from 2:23, and uses wording different from both the LXX and MT. Thus Paul: “I will call them “my people” who are not my people [2:23c]; and I will call here “my loved one” who is not my loved one’ [2:23b], and ‘In the very place where it was said to them “You are not my people,” they will be called “children of the living God [1:10].”” These differences have given rise to the suggestion that Paul has taken these quotations, with perhaps the others in vv. 25-29, from a catena already in existence.<sup>47</sup> This is certainly possible, since 1 Pet 2:10 attests the popularity of this language from Hosea in the early church.<sup>48</sup> Paul does modify the text in several ways, the most notable being his use of the verb *καλέω*, “I will call,” in place of the more generic verb, “I will say,” of both the Hebrew and Greek. This is almost certainly Paul’s own change, since it matches exactly the point for which he adduces the quotations (cf. “call” in v. 24).<sup>49</sup> By reversing the order of the clauses in his quotation of Hos 2:23, Paul is able to put this verb at the beginning of his composite quotation from Hosea. This same verb also comes at the end of the quotation—“they shall be called sons of the living God”—indicating clearly where Paul’s stress lies.

But a potentially more serious instance of what seems to be arbitrary hermeneutics on Paul’s part is his application of these Hosea texts to the calling of Gentiles. For the prophet Hosea is predicting a renewal of God’s mercy toward

the rebellious northern tribes of Israel, or perhaps, toward Israel as a whole:<sup>50</sup> those whom God rejected and named *lo-ruhamah*, “not pitied,” and *lo-ami*, “not my people” (the symbolic names given to Hosea’s children [1:6-9]) are again shown mercy and adopted again as God’s people. Interpreters have sought to get around this difficulty by arguing that Hosea’s prophecy includes the Gentiles.<sup>51</sup> But, however much one might want to justify this conclusion theologically, there is no exegetical evidence for it. Others avoid the difficulty by arguing that Paul applies these passages to the calling of the Jews rather than the Gentiles.<sup>52</sup> But the chiasmic structure of the passage that we noted above is against it, and the explicit mention of Israel in the introduction to the Isaiah quotations in v. 27 implies a change of subject. Other apologists for the apostle’s hermeneutics think that Paul may imply an analogy: God’s calling of Gentiles operates on the same principle as God’s promised renewal of the ten northern tribes.<sup>53</sup> But Paul requires more than an analogy to establish from Scripture justification for God’s calling of Gentiles to be his people. I will consider below the hermeneutics involved in the appropriation of the text in a wider context.

### *Remaining Quotations in Romans*

We are now left with seven other quotations to consider. Four of these need only brief mention, since they exhibit a direct appropriation of the OT: Rom 2:6, which cites the principle that “God ‘will repay everyone according to what they have done’” from Prov 24:12 (or Ps 62:12); Rom 11:8 and Rom 11:9-10, which apply imprecations from Deut 29:4, Isa 29:10, and Ps 69:22-23 to the “hardened” majority of Israel; and 14:11, which quotes the

well-known language from Isa 45:23 about “every knee bowing” and “every tongue confessing” to demonstrate the equality of Jew and Gentile in the judgment of the Lord.

Three other quotations are not so straightforward and require more investigation. At the end of Paul’s criticism of Jews for failing to live up to the privileges they boast about in 2:17-24, Paul cites the OT for confirmation: “‘God’s name is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you,’ just as it is written” (v. 24). Two different prophetic passages contain language like this, Isa 52:5 and Ezek 36:20. The latter verse comes from the famous “new heart” and “new spirit” prophecy, which Paul uses elsewhere, including a possible allusion later in Romans.<sup>54</sup> But the text of Paul’s quotation is closer to the Isaiah passage. Since the sense of the two OT passages is the same, the issue is not of major importance, but I think the allusion to Isaiah is a bit more likely. Not only is Isaiah Paul’s favorite OT book, but he also quotes from this very section (v. 7) in 10:15 to sketch the course of evangelistic preaching.<sup>55</sup>

But the interesting aspect of this quotation is that Isaiah (and Ezekiel also, if we choose that text) ascribes the blasphemy of God’s name not to Israel’s sin but to her condition of exile, which has led the nations to question God’s existence and faithfulness. We have here, then, another shift of application in the use of the OT that has as its ultimate purpose “leveling the playing field” between Israel and the Gentiles.

The quotation of Ps 44:22 is one of the only two quotations in Romans 5-8. Its purpose is, as Calvin puts it to show that “it is no new thing for the Lord to permit his saints to be undeservedly exposed to

the cruelty of the ungodly.”<sup>56</sup> But in comparing Christians who suffer tribulation to sheep being led to the slaughter of Psalm 44, Paul is also implicitly making another point.<sup>57</sup> For the “sheep to be slaughtered” of Psalm 44 are, of course, the people of Israel, suffering in exile. Paul’s shift of application—from Israel to the church—can easily go overlooked, just because it is so common. But at some time, it cries out for hermeneutical and theological justification.

The two final quotations are part of Paul’s exposition of the Abraham story in chapter 4. Romans 4 elaborates with respect to Abraham two important points that Paul has made in 3:27-30: that justification is by faith, not works; and that justification is equally available to both the circumcised and the uncircumcised. The two quotations are similar, each coming from a promise made by God to Abraham that he would be blessed with many descendants. Paul first quotes from Gen 17:5 in v. 17, “I have made you a father of many nations,” to confirm his assertion in v. 16 that Abraham is the “father of us all”—including both Jewish believers and Gentile believers.<sup>58</sup> He then repeats the OT description of Abraham as the “father of many nations” in v. 18, citing an earlier promise of God to Abraham in confirmation: “So shall your offspring be,” from 15:5. Clearly, in Paul’s view, the “many nations” of which Abraham is the father are equivalent to the “offspring,” or “seed” of Abraham. We find here no modification of the text: Paul quotes the LXX exactly, and the LXX accurately renders the MT. Whether we have a shift of application depends on the scope of the word “offspring” in 15:5 and “nations” in 17:4. But other OT texts followed, of course, by Jewish interpreters, tend to

restrict Abraham's "seed" to Israel and the "nations" to physical descendants of Abraham.<sup>59</sup> To be sure, the covenant with Abraham always included ultimate blessing, in some form, for the nations (e.g., 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4). But a distinction between Abraham's "offspring" or "descendants," who become participants in the covenant, and the "nations," which receive benefits through Abraham in some unspecified way, seems strictly to be maintained.<sup>60</sup> Paul's claim that the "offspring" of Abraham includes Gentiles as well as Jews (v. 16) is a considerable advance on this idea, and his use of Gen 15:5 and 17:4 to buttress the case does require a shift in application to work.

We have reached the end of our brief and all-too-superficial survey of the OT quotations that Paul uses in Romans to redefine the people of God. We have found abundant evidence of a "universalizing" hermeneutic, leading Paul to find in the OT abundant testimony to the turn of salvation history that the gospel has initiated. I want next to take a quick glance at what these quotations may reveal about Paul's hermeneutical axioms.

### **Salvation History, Gentile Inclusion, and Paul's Hermeneutical Axioms**

What theological assumptions about salvation history might explain Paul's use of the OT to justify the inclusion of the Gentiles in the people of God? Let's look at the following points. (1) Paul's consciousness of being "a light to the Gentiles," a conviction that probably stemmed from his conversion experience, made it clear that he was an important instrument in the eschatological plan revealed in the latter chapters of Isaiah. The key elements in Paul's understanding of salvation history

are all present here, and often juxtaposed together: the mission of a servant who dies an atoning death for the people, the restoration of Israel to new and unprecedented blessing after the experience of sin and exile, the participation of the Gentiles in that restoration. Paul's "Copernican revolution," his replacement of torah with Christ at the center of his theological convictions, led him to read the OT, and especially the prophecies of Isaiah, with a new perspective.

(2) One theological pattern that many scholars think informed Paul's use of the OT to argue for the inclusion of the Gentiles is the eschatological pilgrimage tradition. According to this tradition, Israel's restoration to glory in the end-times would stimulate Gentiles to offer themselves and their gifts in the service of Yahweh. See, perhaps most clearly, *Pss. Sol.* 17:26-46:

He will gather a holy people [v. 26].  
. . . He will have Gentile nations  
serving him under his yoke, and  
he will glorify the Lord in (a place)  
prominent (above) the whole earth.  
And he will purge Jerusalem (and  
make it) holy as it was even from  
the beginning, (for) nations to come  
from the ends of the earth to see his  
glory, to bring as gifts her children  
who had been driven out, and to  
see the glory of the Lord with which  
God has glorified her [vv. 30-31].  
(See also Isa 2:2-3a; 56:6-7; 60:1-7;  
Tob. 13:11-13; 14:6-7; T. Zeb. 9:8; Benj.  
9:2; SibOr. 3.767-95.)

Paul, in light of his new understanding of events from the gospel, reverses the order of events and "spiritualizes" the process: instead of Gentiles coming to worship Yahweh in Jerusalem as a result of Israel's restoration, Israel is saved in response to the extension of salvation to the Gentiles. Donaldson questions the significance of the tradition for Paul, not-

ing that Paul does not quote any of the standard OT pilgrimage texts.<sup>61</sup> In my commentary, I dismissed Donaldson's skepticism,<sup>62</sup> but I now think it is more warranted than I did then. Three considerations are especially telling. (i) Paul does not quote from the OT texts that most clearly predict this eschatological pattern. (ii) Many of the texts that prophesy a pilgrimage of Gentiles in the last days picture the Gentiles in a decidedly subordinate role to Israel (see, e.g., Isa 49:23; 61:4-6). Paul, on the other hand, clearly affirms the Gentiles' co-equality with Jews in the people of God. (iii) Paul's reversal of the sequence of Israel and the Gentiles strikes at the very essence of the tradition. I do not want to dismiss the possibility that the pilgrimage motif has influenced Paul at some points. But I doubt that it was a major hermeneutical axiom in his interpretation of the OT.

(3) We are on much more solid ground when we turn to the Abrahamic story. Abraham provides Paul with the most important OT antecedents for his insistence on justification by faith and the centrality of grace. But Abraham's story, and especially the divine promises that are basic to that story, also provide Paul with the key to salvation history and therefore to his hermeneutics of OT interpretation. Indeed, at the risk of exaggeration, we might almost say that continuity with Abraham is the key to Paul's argument about the Gentiles in Romans. The argument of Romans 4 is well-known, and we need not repeat its details here. But Abraham is also central to the argument about the nature and extent of the people of God in Romans 9-11. The chapters begin with a reminder that Israel possesses the promises and the patriarchs (9:4-5), and all the rest of the discussion is, in a sense,

an elaboration of what these promises, connected with the patriarchs really mean. The way in which Abraham's seed is "reckoned" is central in Romans 9, and in Romans 11 the "root" from which the olive tree, the people of God, spring, is Abraham and the other patriarchs (v. 16). The climax of Paul's argument, the salvation of all Israel, is grounded in the fact that the people are "loved on account of the patriarchs" (v. 28). And the climactic text we looked at earlier, 15:7-13, makes God's confirmation of his promises to the patriarchs basic to the inclusion of the Gentiles (vv. 8-9). The Abrahamic and patriarchal promises would be brought into even greater prominence if the thesis of Sam Williams and others—that "the righteousness of God" refers to God's faithfulness to the Abrahamic promise—could be confirmed. But I doubt whether that is what the "righteousness of God" means.

One of the remarkable aspects of Paul's appeal to Abraham is his apparent assumption that he does not have to explain why Abraham is so important. In Galatians, Paul seems to accept his opponents' contention that belonging to Abraham's seed is essential if the Gentiles are to be included in the people of God. No such clear polemical context exists in Romans, but here, also, Paul never seeks to justify this assumption. We are justified in thinking, then, that the equation between God's people and the seed of Abraham is Pauline theological bedrock. And, of course, this equation is one that the OT itself attests.

Paul's task, then, was to explain how the gospel he proclaimed, which brought Gentiles into the people of God on equal footing with believing Jews, could be squared with these Abrahamic promises.

Thus he affirms in Romans 4 that the promises about Abraham's "offspring" and the "nations" that he would produce include uncircumcised Gentiles. While these texts in themselves do not clearly bear this meaning, Paul is undoubtedly influenced by the broader context of the promise in Genesis, which includes blessing of the nations through Abraham. And Paul, of course, quotes from this aspect of the promise in Galatians.

Once we recognize the foundational nature of the Abrahamic promise for Paul, we can look more closely to see if it helps explain some of the other shifts of application in the quotations we have considered. And it is just at this point that we find some warrant for Paul's application of Hos 1:10 to the Gentiles, for Hosea's prophecy echoes the Abrahamic promise of Genesis.<sup>63</sup> The opening words of Hos 1:10 (which Paul does not quote) predict, "Yet the Israelites will be like the sand on the seashore, which cannot be measured or counted." This theme of innumerable descendants is a constant refrain in the Abrahamic promise texts of Genesis, and the analogy with the "dust of the earth" or "the sand on the sea shore" is used four times.<sup>64</sup> Other OT texts use the language in the same way, and one of those texts, Isa 10:22, is quoted by Paul in the very next verse (27).<sup>65</sup> As D. Stuart reconstructs the logic, "Those who are in Christ constitute Abraham's seed, of whom this prediction of great growth was made."<sup>66</sup>

At the risk of stretching the connecting thread beyond the breaking point, let me also suggest that two other quotations Paul uses might have been drawn into his universalizing hermeneutic through this Hosea text. For the Hosea text characterizes those who are the recipients of God's grace as "not my people." Similar

language occurs in Deut 32:21, which Paul quotes in 10:19, and in Isa 65:1, which he quotes in 10:20. I think it is at least possible that the wording of the Abrahamic promise, which Paul applies to Gentiles, led him to Hos 1:10, which, in turn brought Deut 32:21 and Isa 65:1 into the orbit of inclusivist proof-texts. Whether these further connections can be demonstrated or not, it is certainly safe to conclude that Paul uses a universalistic interpretation of the Abrahamic promises as a key lens through which he reads the OT.

(4) A theological axiom deeply rooted in many streams of Christian tradition is that the church is the new covenant counterpart of Israel. OT predictions of a renewed Israel therefore find their fulfillment in the church.<sup>67</sup> If Paul held such a theological assumption, it would explain several of the most striking shifts of application we have discovered, each involving the application to Gentile Christians of texts that speak of Israel. Nevertheless, the long and honored pedigree of this theological assumption does not make it immune to criticism. Dispensationalists have always been unhappy with the equation, and they have been joined by many post-Holocaust interpreters, who fear that the "replacement" model so long popular in Christian theology has contributed to anti-Semitism. I cannot enter this argument in any depth here, and so I will simply state and develop two of my own conclusions on this issue.

First, the Christian community has taken over many of the spiritual privileges and blessings granted to OT Israel. In calling the church "the elect," "the beloved of God," and attributing to her "adoption" and "glory" in Romans 1-8, Paul makes this point quite clear. And while, of course, it is debated, I think that

Gal 6:16 expresses this conviction in so many words, Paul calling the church the “Israel of God.”<sup>68</sup> By speaking of an “Israel according to the flesh” (1 Cor 10:18), Paul implies the existence of a different Israel, an “Israel according to the Spirit.” But one can, of course, also reverse this logic: the existence of an “Israel according to the Spirit,” defined now not by ethnic status but by faith, implies the existence of an “Israel according to the flesh.” Here, perhaps, in what E. E. Ellis calls an “eschatological reversal,” we might have the hermeneutical basis for Paul’s application of OT texts about the wicked to Israel as a whole. God’s revelation in the gospel, by redefining the boundaries of the people of God, makes clear that Israel can make no claim, on the basis of ethnic identity, to be the people of God. From this standpoint, therefore, it is perfectly logical to apply to Israel OT language directed to those outside the covenant.

Third, however, Paul stubbornly resists a straightforward “replacement” model of Israel and the church. On my view, the contested Rom 11:25-27 predicts salvation for Israel as a nation, and Paul quotes to support that prediction an OT prophecy about the restoration of Israel (Isa 59:20-21). Clearly, then, Paul does not countenance the idea that we can just substitute the church for the word Israel in OT prophecies. Is Paul’s appeal to OT prophecies about Israel then simply arbitrary? Why does Paul think that Hos 1:10, for instance, applies to Gentiles while Isa 59:20-21 includes national Israel?

Perhaps an answer to these questions lies in a re-evaluation of the Israel = church typology. As I will suggest, typology in general is a helpful hermeneutical construct, rooted in Scripture itself. But typology can easily slide into a kind

of a-historical allegorical approach, in which, for instance, OT Israel becomes a kind of symbol for the NT church. The relationship between Israel and the church in Paul’s perspective is much more historically oriented and continuous than this model might suggest. As his olive tree analogy in Romans 11 makes clear, Paul views Gentiles who are experiencing the messianic salvation as belonging not to a new body discontinuous with Israel but to Israel itself. True, this is not simply national Israel—for unbelieving Jews can be, and are, cut off from it. But it is the spiritual Israel within Israel that, according to Romans 9, has always been in existence and, according to 11:16, grows from the seed of God’s promises to the patriarchs. If we follow the logic of this analogy, then, the church is not so much a replacement for Israel or even a “new” Israel; it is the continuation of “Israel” in the era of fulfillment. As has always been the case, believing Jews, the remnant, are a part of this spiritual Israel. And Paul’s “to the Jew first” makes clear that the Jewish presence in the new Israel is both fitting and necessary. Now, however, in fulfillment of the promise to Abraham and in line with the prophetic expectation of the universal extent of God’s kingdom, Gentiles are becoming a part of Israel. And in the eschatological consummation, as I understand Romans 11, many more Jews will be added to spiritual Israel.

Recognizing this continuity in Israel from testament to testament provides a rationale for Paul’s application of OT texts about Israel to the Gentiles. Paul can see in Hos 1:10 and Isa 65:1 and Ps 44:22 and Joel 2:32 reference to the Gentiles because Israel, the seed of Abraham, now includes Gentiles. In some sense, what I am proposing is not a lot different than the



usual church = Israel construct. But this construct too easily leads to a complete displacement model that would have Paul uprooting one olive tree and planting another in its place. Paradoxically, while such a view is usually seen to highlight the continuity of the testaments, at this point, at least, it introduces an unwarranted break in salvation history.

What I am suggesting is, of course, not new, and similar schemes have emerged in recent decades as both covenant and dispensational theologians have been compelled by hard biblical data to revise some of the older, perhaps overly simplistic hermeneutical formulas. But let me add my voice to those who are seeking a *via media*.

We could clearly say much more here, but I want to conclude with some general remarks on the universalizing hermeneutic that we have uncovered in Romans. Paul's daring and original reading of the OT raises insistently the question of the validity of what he is doing. What are we to make of Paul's interpretations in light of our belief in the unity and truthfulness of Scripture? Many exegetes and theologians have grappled with this problem, and they have come to many different conclusions. It will be useful to glance quickly at seven of the major solutions to the "problem" that we have sketched.

### **Various Attempts to Understand Paul's Universalizing Hermeneutic**

We first briefly note three approaches that downplay the problem or deny it entirely.

#### ***The Textual Approach***

Theologians in earlier centuries often explained discrepancies between OT text and NT quotations by recourse to alterna-

tive texts. When Paul's wording did not match that of the existing Hebrew text of the passage that he cites, scholars would posit a harmonizing alternative reading in either Paul or the OT. This approach was generally discredited with the advent of historical criticism, since the alternative texts often hypothesized sometimes seemed to be no more than phantoms created to get around a theological problem. But the approach had new life pumped into it as a result of the manuscript finds at Qumran. The Dead Sea documents provide evidence that some readings of the LXX that were once regarded as translational mistakes may, in fact, be accurate renderings of an existing Hebrew text. And this raises the possibility that textual forms of the OT existed in the first century for which we have little evidence.

These discoveries remind us that quick and dogmatic assertions of a NT author's "misquotation" of an OT passage are inappropriate. And a few vexing textual issues in the NT quotations may find resolution here. Paul's quotation of Deut 32:43 in Rom 15:10 is a good example. His version differs from the Masoretic text, but, finding support in both the LXX and in other Hebrew manuscripts, it has good claim to have been the original version of the Hebrew text here. Nevertheless, this textual approach is not a final solution to the larger problem of validity. For one thing, it often simply creates a new level of problems. Let us say, for instance, that a NT author quotes a Greek text represented in a non-Masoretic text that has little claim to be the "original" text. The NT author may be following faithfully the text before him, but it still differs from the "original." It would be as if a preacher proclaimed a false doctrine based on an erroneous translation of the Bible into

English. And, finally, the textual approach is quite inadequate as a final solution because it offers no help for the “shift in application” issue that we have detailed so clearly in Romans—a problem, judging from our survey, that is much bigger than the textual issue.

### *The Literary Approach*

Interpreters rightly note that people use language found in other sources for more than one reason. Sometimes they will use the language because it is proverbial, or because it puts a certain point very well. They may have no intention of claiming the original text’s authority for what they say. When my third son Lukas, a six-foot six, 245 pound, superbly conditioned college basketball player, said to me on the driveway as I threatened to take the basketball to the hoop against him, “Go ahead, Dad, make my day,” he has no intention of capturing the “original” meaning these words had on the lips of Clint Eastwood. And so we must allow the NT authors occasionally to use the OT in a similar manner. We have suggested that Paul’s use of Ps 19:4 in Rom 10:18 might be explained in this way. Paul simply uses the wording of that psalm to express his point, and we misunderstand him if we think he is claiming that the psalmist was predicting the preaching of Christian evangelists. As Richard Hays argues, “The citation of Ps 19:4 does not prove that Jews have had the opportunity to hear the gospel; rather, it gives Paul a ‘vocabulary of a second and higher power’ with which to *assert* that they have heard it.”<sup>69</sup> What Hays suggests is that Paul intends his allusion to Psalm 19 to pick up some of the flavor of that text, with its emphasis on God’s marvelous, universal display of his nature. Similarly, my son’s Lukas’s taunt

to me, while not claiming the authority of the original, picks up some of the menace and threat of violence that adheres to the quotation because of shared remembrance of its original setting. He is suggesting that my foolish plan to drive to the basket against him may bring on a disaster akin to that suffered by those miscreants who dared challenge Dirty Harry.

I think that Hays is right to suggest that we have often accorded NT quotations more evidential purpose than they actually had. And Ps 19:4 may well be a good example of the concept of “intertextual echo” that he talks about in his book and that we will look at in more detail later. But this “literary” approach offers no final solution to the problem posed by the NT quotations (nor does Hays argue that it does). For many quotations, and some of the most problematic ones, clearly do have the purpose of providing OT support for the point the NT author is making.

A related, though slightly distinct situation is the use of the OT to draw an analogy. As we noted, for instance, many interpreters think that Paul quotes Hosea in 9:25-26 because that OT text states a certain principle in the operation of God’s grace that Paul applies to a different situation: as God graciously brought back erring Israel, so he graciously accepts Gentiles. But the situation Paul addresses requires more than an analogy. The inclusion of Gentiles is, from the standpoint of Jewish theology, an unexpected and radical situation. Paul must show that the inclusion of Gentiles is warranted by Scripture. So, while argument by analogy may explain some NT quotations, it provides no comprehensive solution to the problem.

### *The Theological Exegesis Approach*

I first became acquainted with the issue of the OT in the New through the classes of Walter Kaiser over thirty years ago. His ideas have been a great stimulus to my own thinking, and I gladly acknowledge my considerable debt to him. Nevertheless, as this laudatory introduction will prepare you to expect, I do not finally agree with Kaiser's views on the OT in the NT. Kaiser's answer to the problem we are addressing is simple: there is no problem. Rightly exegeted, with due attention given to the informing theology, the OT texts that NT authors quote are in complete harmony with the meanings the NT authors give them. Kaiser will allow for elaborations of OT texts by application, but this affects the significance of the quote and not its meaning.<sup>70</sup>

Kaiser is especially to be commended for his valiant attempts to descend from theory and to validate his view "in the trenches" of exegesis. Over the years, he has tackled many of the problem quotations in the NT, suggesting ingenious and sometimes convincing interpretations that justify his larger theory. However, it is just here—at the level of exegesis—that I find Kaiser's approach to be wanting. I agree entirely with Kaiser that too many exegetes go about their business with a kind of tunnel vision, ignoring the larger theological themes that the texts are a part of and which they advance. But even when all possible allowance is made for the influence of theology on texts, a gap between the original meaning of the OT text and the meaning that text is given in the NT very often remains. We may cite Paul's quotation of Isa 65:1 in Rom 10:20 as an example from our own survey. Isaiah, so the best exegetes of that text inform us, predicts that the Israel, will find the

Lord, though they are not seeking him. Paul applies the language to the inclusion of Gentiles. The "meaning"—and not just the "significance"—that Paul gives this passage is different than its meaning in the context and historical situation of Isaiah. A quick review of the texts we have looked at together will reveal many other such examples.

### *The Dual-Authorship Approach*

One time-honored solution to the problem presented by such texts is to claim that the NT author perceives, via inspiration, a meaning in the text intended by the divine author but not perceived by, nor expressed by, the human author.<sup>71</sup> This approach correctly emphasizes that the NT authors claim to find the meaning that they give their texts in the texts themselves, and, of course, we can agree that God was active in production of Scripture. But the theory of inspiration that it rests upon, positing as it does different meanings intended by the two authors of Scripture, runs into severe difficulties with the traditional "concurative" view of the relationship of the divine and the human authors of Scripture. Moreover, the view has difficulty explaining why Paul, for instance, explicitly cites Isaiah (the human author) in introducing his quotation of Isa 65:1 that we were just talking about.

### *The Jewish Exegesis Approach*

Scholars trying to understand the way in which NT writers use the OT have naturally spent a great deal of time searching ancient Jewish literature for illumination. And the search has certainly paid off. NT authors are clearly indebted to Jewish techniques of interpretation for procedures and, less often, for conclusions. In the texts we have studied, for instance, we

have found evidence of what the Jews call “pearl-stringing,” the rapid-fire citation of texts on a similar topic (3:10-18), the technique the rabbis termed *gezerah shawah*, which uses verbal links to associate texts (the “sand of the sea” phrase common to Hos 1:10 and Isa 10:22, the texts Paul quotes in 9:25-27; ἑθνη in each of the quotations in 15:9-12), and the appeal to all three parts of the OT canon, “law,” “prophets,” and “writings” (also in 15:9-12).

Nevertheless, parallels between Jewish and NT use of the OT occur almost entirely at the level of what I have called “appropriation techniques.” At the level of hermeneutical axioms, where the real driving force in interpretation is to be found, there are profound differences between the NT and the various ancient Jewish communities. Moreover, parallels with Jewish procedures, to the extent that those procedures go against the grain of what is today considered valid exegetical procedure, simply exacerbate the problem.<sup>72</sup> Hays’s observation here is right on target:

The more closely Paul’s methods can be identified with recognized interpretive conventions of first-century Judaism, the less arbitrary and more historically understandable they appear; however, at the same time, such historical explanations of Paul’s exegesis render it increasingly difficult to see how interpretations that employ such methods can bear any persuasive power or normative value for that mythical creature of whom Bultmann spoke with such conviction: modern man.<sup>73</sup>

### *The Typological Approach*

Typology promises help at just this level. To be sure, typology is easier to talk about than to describe. And those who have attempted definitions do not always agree. To put matters as simply

and with as little controversy as possible, typology is the hermeneutical implication of a salvation-historical understanding of the relationship of the testaments. Christ’s ministry and the new messianic community are the fulfillment of the OT. These new covenant realities “fill up” (cf. πληρώω) the meaning of the OT. With such a conviction in place, the NT authors naturally seek to discover specific ways in which OT events, people, or institutions might prefigure the new revelation that they are both seeking to understand and to relate to the revelation God had already given his people. Further, as Paul implies in 1 Cor 10:11, the NT authors think that these prefigurements are divinely ordained.<sup>74</sup>

Typology is probably the most common approach among conservative interpreters seeking to explain the phenomena of the quotations that we have examined. Both Old and New Testament scholars, commenting on the OT text or its Pauline application, will suggest that the relationship between the two is to be explained as an outworking of the basic NT conviction that the people of Israel find their NT counterpart in the church. As Goppelt puts it, “[T]here is a typological relationship between the people of God in the Old and New Testaments that reveals to the NT people of God the nature of their salvation.”<sup>75</sup> Goppelt refers specifically in this context to Rom 9:25-26 and notes the way in which “the calling of Gentiles fulfills the prophecy that originally promised the readoption of Israel.”<sup>76</sup> Now it is just at this point that some of you will begin to entertain doubts about the usefulness of typology to explain the issues we are examining. Certainly those readers who remain unreconstructed dispensationalists and probably also their progressive

brethren will blanch at a hermeneutical approach that validates the equation of Israel with the church. And the fact is, as you have probably recognized, typology does not “validate” this equation. Understood in the manner we have described, typology is not an exegetical technique, nor even a hermeneutical axiom, but a broad theological construct with hermeneutical implications.<sup>77</sup> (A survey of just how much Goppelt can subsume under the category of “typology” in his famous book on the subject would quickly confirm this hypothesis.) Therefore, while typology is an important part of the solution to the problem we are addressing, it does not, in itself, provide the kind of specifics about Paul’s interpretation of the OT that we require.

### *The Intertextual Approach*

Those of you who have been paying close attention will recognize how much I am indebted to Richard Hays’s important monograph on Paul’s use of the OT, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. And in case you have missed it, let me acknowledge clearly how much this book has influenced and, in some cases, redirected, my thinking on the use of the OT in the NT. Hays argues for an intertextual approach to Paul’s use of the OT, and his carefully worked out view is a good representative of this latest fad in interpretation.

Intertextuality, in keeping with so many recent developments in biblical exegesis, is indebted to insights from literary analysis. It focuses on the way in which texts written at different times and places can resonate with one another, shedding new insight on both the old text and the new one. Intertextuality emphasizes that texts relate to one another at more fundamental levels than the explicit quotations we

have focused on. Authors influenced by another text will express their dependence in a variety of ways, some of them subtle and discerned only by very careful reading. This process can be clearly observed within the OT itself, and Hays sees Paul as continuing that pattern of intertextual interpretation that the Scripture itself appears to validate.

One element of intertextual relationship that Hays focuses particular attention on is the literary convention of metalepsis, according to which allusions between texts must be seen in light of a broad interplay between those texts. Explicit quotations are the tip of an intertextual iceberg, representing only the surface level of a far-ranging intertextual nexus of relationships. Hays’s interpretation of Paul’s quotation of Isa 52:5 in 2:24 is a good example. At the surface level, Paul seems here to misquote the OT text. But when we view the quotation in the light of the larger context of Isaiah 52 and of the direction of the argument in Romans, a different picture emerges. Isaiah 52 goes on to speak of God’s eventual mercy to Israel; and Paul, of course, does the same thing as Romans progresses. Thus, Hays argues, once we have read to the end of Romans, we recognize that Paul’s negative reading of Isa 52:4 is only provisional, ultimately to be taken up and redirected by the larger argument of the letter. In insisting that Paul quotes OT texts with attention to the context from which they are taken, Hays’s intertextual proposal is similar to the famous C. H. Dodd argument that NT writers quote from blocks of OT texts. But Hays goes much further than Dodd in finding what he calls “echoes” that are awakened by the NT quotations and allusions, as the perceptive reader reflects on the rich and sometimes confus-

ing interplay between NT fulfillment and OT context and narrative.

Hays's particular version of intertextuality has many attractive features. Against those who persist in thinking that Paul quotes atomistically, in proof-text fashion, Hays rightly insists that Paul often shows regard for the context from which the quotation is taken. And Hays is also right, I think, to suggest that our approaches to the problem of the OT in the New have often been constricted by a rather linear and simplistic model of literary relationship. Texts with which we are very familiar shape our thinking and writing in many different ways—some obvious, some very subtle. Hays is right to argue that we must approach Paul's interaction with the OT with the expectation that the OT will influence his writing in a variety of ways, some of them subtle and perhaps even unconscious to Paul himself.

But I am not yet ready to jump on the intertextual bandwagon. My reaction to many interpretations indebted to a broadly intertextual approach is that they are too clever by half. Subtle relationships—sometimes too subtle for me to discern—become the central interpretive focus, often subordinating or even driving out what seem to be the explicit concerns of the text. I am not so sure, for instance, that a reader of Romans, however perceptive, would note the word of promise that Hays finds in Paul's quotation of Isa 52:5.

But a more serious problem, particularly relevant to our own agenda, is the problem of validity. Hays's intertextual proposal offers little help at this point. He argues that Paul was not an exegete of the OT text, concerned about its "original sense." Rather, under the influence of the Spirit, Paul read the OT in light

of its culmination in Christ and uncovered latent meaning in the text that the original authors themselves would often have been unaware of.<sup>78</sup> Paul was himself convinced that his interpretations brought out the true, eschatological sense of the Scriptures. But the gap that we perceive between the original sense and the NT application remains. Hays, I think, would argue that this gap, or at least the problem of the gap, is partly of our own making. It is only because we insist that the "historical-grammatical" method is the only way to uncover the "true" sense of the text that we have a problem at all. The gap we are talking about is created by our rather immodest insistence that the only true meaning is the meaning that *we* discover by *our* methods. I have myself some sympathy with this response to the problem, and Moisés Silva has expressed some similar reservations. But we need to look at this issue from a slightly broader perspective. I need to proceed very warily here, because I am moving onto ground that Hays himself does not cover. But I would at least tentatively suggest that Hays's proposal, along with other similar intertextual methods, is influenced not a little by postmodern views of meaning and interpretation. Hays suggests, as I read him, that the validity of Paul's OT interpretation can be assessed only within the parameters of his hermeneutical assumptions about the fulfillment of the OT story in Christ. Further, he suggests that the OT may "echo" in Romans in ways that Paul is himself not conscience of. As Charles Cosgrove comments on Hays's proposal, "Paul becomes Paul-with-his canon, an intertextual field."<sup>79</sup> Lurking in the background here seems to be the assumption that we have no "objective" perspective from which we can assess ulti-

mate or absolute validity of interpretation. We have no “meta-narrative” that would enable us to evaluate and pronounce right or wrong the narrative of God’s activity that Paul finds in the OT.

Postmodernism, to the degree that I understand it, poses both opportunities and challenges to evangelical Christianity. But surely its greatest challenge is the denial that absolute truth can be discovered. And it is at this point that I am finally unsatisfied with Hays’s proposal about Paul’s interpretation of the OT. For all its strengths, it does not go quite far enough in dealing with the problem of validity.

### Summary Reflections

The time has come for me to put up or shut up. I have canvassed and critiqued seven approaches to the validity question that Paul’s quotations relating to Gentile inclusion in Romans create. Most of them offer some help toward a solution, with both typology and the related intertextual approach of Richard Hays providing some very helpful undergirding perspectives. But none suffices finally to “explain” the problem. Nor, I confess, do I have an all-encompassing theory that answers all our questions. But I would like to resurrect at this point the theory that I developed in a 1986 essay on the subject. There I argued that “The meaning intended by the human author of a particular text can take on a ‘fuller’ meaning, legitimately developed from his meaning, in the light of the text’s ultimate canonical context.”<sup>80</sup> And on the issue of validity, I said,

[W]e must forthrightly admit that we cannot *prove* that the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament is correct at every point. We can show that that many are straightforward, legitimate interpretations and that many others can

be considered valid if we admit the principle of the canon as the ultimate context of meaning.<sup>81</sup>

I did not recognize it at the time, but the kind of validity that I argue for here has some resemblance to certain insights derived from postmodern thinking. Here, perhaps, is where postmodernism may offer positive opportunities to us as evangelicals. The traditional approach to the validity of the OT in the New rested on what philosophers, I think, would call “foundationalism”: the idea that we have a solid, unassailable foundation on which to construct and by which to assess our truth claims. Scholars would assume that modern historical-critical techniques would reveal *the* meaning of a particular OT text, and any deviation from that meaning in a NT quotation spelled trouble for its validity. Postmodernism, of course, rejects any such foundation, and has therefore the potential to throw us into a sea of relativism and chaos. Hays would not want to go this direction, but I think that his proposal can at least tend in this direction. And certainly many other interpreters are far more forthright, denying that we can even assess the issue of validity in the OT use of the New. But there is a middle position that both acknowledges the problems with foundationalism and yet rejects the relativity of postmodernism. Kevin Vanhoozer calls this “fallibilism,” and he insists that the key issue is testability.<sup>82</sup> We may not be able to construct a truth claim from the ground up, each proposition following inevitably and rationally from the previous one, and all resting on unshakable foundation of agreed-upon propositions. But any claim to truth must be able to survive the test of rationality and adequacy. Does it make sense? Does it explain the phenomena? If we apply

this fallibilism to the problem we are addressing, then the question we should be asking is, does the NT interpretation of the OT make sense? Does it make better sense than the interpretation of the OT found at Qumran, or in the rabbis? We still may not be able to “prove” that the NT is the fulfillment of the Old. But what we can do is ask whether the overall framework of biblical truth established by the NT interpretation of the OT validates the assumption of their unity. Such a task goes far beyond the bounds our present more modest study. But what we can do is to assess the validity of the OT quotations we have surveyed earlier against the backdrop of the canonical assumption.

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>A form of this paper was read at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Region of the Evangelical Theological Society, Columbia, SC, 20 March 1998.

<sup>2</sup>Using different criteria, D.-A. Koch (*Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* [BZHT 69; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986], 21-22) comes up with eighty-nine and C. D. Stanley (*Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* [SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: University Press, 1992] with seventy-four (but he does not include Ephesians or the Pastorals).

<sup>3</sup>Terrence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997).

<sup>4</sup>All biblical quotations are taken from the *Today's New International Version* (TNIV) unless otherwise noted.

<sup>5</sup>See my commentary (Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* [New International Commentary on the New Testa-

ment; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996], 936-37).

<sup>6</sup>While some scholars think that the “prophetic writings” are the writings of the apostles (e.g., F. L. Godet, *Commentary on Romans* [repr.; Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977], 504-05); and many scholars who think the doxology was added by a later redactor (e.g., E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980], 426), the reference is almost certainly to the OT (See Moo, *Romans*, 940).

<sup>7</sup>These connections call into question the thesis advanced by Richard Longenecker that Romans 5-8 is especially where Paul sets forth “his gospel” (Richard N. Longenecker, “Prolegomena to Paul's Use of Scripture in Romans,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 7 [1997]: 162-65). For these chapters are notorious for their lack of reference to the OT.

<sup>8</sup>Richard Hays has drawn attention to the importance of this passage (*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* [New Haven: Yale University, 1989], 163).

<sup>9</sup>See esp. my published dissertation, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983), 25-78.

<sup>10</sup>L. A. Keck, “The Function of Rom 3,10-18. Observations and Suggestions,” in *God's Christ and His People. Studies in Honor of Nils Alstrup Dahl* (ed. J. Jervell and W. A. Meeks; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977), 141-57; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 254. See also Longenecker (“Paul's Use of Scripture,” 161) who thinks the testimonia was drawn up by Jewish Christians.

<sup>11</sup>In addition to Paul's modification of v. 1c, he eliminates the reference to the Lord's looking from Heaven (v. 2a) and gives the coordinate substantival participles



συνίων and ἐκζητῶν separate lines. But the substance of the OT verse is unchanged. In v. 12, on the other hand, Paul reproduces the LXX of Ps 14:3 exactly (with the probable exception of the article before ποιῶν [the article is omitted in a few MSS, but the reading is probably an accommodation to the LXX]). The inclusion of Rom 3:13-18 in several MSS of the LXX of Psalm 14 is a influence of Christian scribes on the transmission of the LXX (see W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902], 77-78 for a thorough discussion).

<sup>12</sup>It is less likely that “there is no one righteous, not even one” are Paul’s own words (this would be unusual, coming after the introductory formula καθὼς γέγραπται) or that Paul refers to Eccl 7:20 LXX—ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ἐν τῇ γῆ (e.g., J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* [Word Biblical Commentary; Waco, TX: Word, 1988], 150).

<sup>13</sup>Glenn Davies avoids the conclusion that Paul shifts of the application of several of these texts by arguing that Paul intends to use the quotations only to condemn pre-Christian Jewish covenant-breakers (G. N. Davies, *Faith and Obedience in Romans: A Study in Romans 1-4* [JSNTSup 39; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990], 82-96). Davies has a certain point, of course: surely Paul does not believe that there were absolutely no “righteous” people before Christ (cf. his references to Abraham and David in chap. 4). But Paul appears to be

looking at all human beings as they appear before the Lord apart from his saving grace. Even Abraham and David, then, are, in themselves, “unrighteous.”

<sup>14</sup>See, e.g., Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 149.

<sup>15</sup>A few scholars (e.g., G. Howard, “The Tetragram and the New Testament,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 [1977]: 63-83) think that κύριος refers to God the father here, but the flow of the context makes this view virtually impossible.

<sup>16</sup>See, e.g., Käsemann, *Romans*, 294; J. Munck, *Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), 91-92; R. H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11* (WUNT 63; Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 83-87. Some commentators think, in light of the universalism of v. 13, that Paul might have Gentiles specifically in mind (e.g., J. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* [reprint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947], 396; F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* [SNTSMS 56; Cambridge: University Press, 1986], 166-67; L. Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* [Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1987], 131-32).

<sup>17</sup>See, e.g., Godet, *Romans*, 385; Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, 295; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975, 1979), 2.533.

<sup>18</sup>Paul reproduces the LXX exactly, which accurately translates the MT; the only difference is that κύριε has

no counterpart in the Hebrew. The quotation of this same text in John 12:38 suggests that it may have been a common early Christian “testimony” used to explain and justify in Scripture the Jews’ unbelief (C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* [London: Collins, 1952], 39). Perhaps Paul also sees the text as particularly appropriate since it closely follows Isa 52:7, which he has just quoted in v. 15b.

<sup>19</sup>How could Paul assert, in A.D. 57, that the gospel has been proclaimed “to the whole earth”? Two implicit qualifications of Paul’s language are frequently noted. First, as the word οἰκουμένη in the second line of the quotation might suggest, Paul may be thinking in terms of the Roman Empire of his day rather than of the entire globe. Second, Paul’s focus might be corporate rather than individualistic: he asserts not that the gospel has been preached to every person but to every nation, and especially to both Jews and Gentiles (see esp. Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 95-99). Both these considerations may well be relevant. But perhaps it would be simpler to think that Paul engages in hyperbole, using the language of the Psalm to assert that very many people by the time Paul writes Romans have had opportunity to hear. Comparison should be made with Col 1:23, where Paul claims that the gospel has been preached “to every creature under heaven.”

<sup>20</sup>Paul’s wording exactly follows the majority MSS tradition of the LXX; and the LXX accurately renders

the MT.

<sup>21</sup>Such a shift is denied, but unconvincingly, by e.g., H. L. Ellison (*The Mystery of Israel: An Exposition of Romans 9-11* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966], 69-71).

<sup>22</sup>See particularly Hays, *Echoes*, 175. The view that Paul is here simply using the language of the Psalm verse without intending to “quote” it has some truth. Note, e.g., the lack of an introductory formula, in contrast to the clear introductions when the OT is quoted in vv. 16, 19, 20, and 21; see, for this view, many of the Greek Fathers; Godet, *Romans*, 388; Dunn, *Romans 9-16* (Word Biblical Commentary; Waco, TX: Word, 1988), 624; J. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible; Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1993), 599.

<sup>23</sup>Paul’s wording differs from the majority LXX MSS tradition (cf. also the MT) in using second person plural objects of the verbs—ὑμᾶς—in place of third person plural objects—αὐτοῖς. Paul probably introduces this change himself, in order to highlight the “personal” way in which God (cf. ἐγὼ) addresses his people (H. Hübner, *Gottes Ich und Israel: Zum Schriftgebrauch des Paulus in Römer 9-11* [FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984], 97; Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 143-44).

<sup>24</sup>The verb is παραζηλώω, which can have a range of meanings. Crucial for Paul’s use of the term in Romans 10-11 are (1) “provoke to jealous anger” (in this verse); and (2) “provoke to jealous emulation” (cf. 11:11, 14). See Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*,

24-42. Bell further suggests that Deuteronomy 32 was an important source for Paul’s theological argument in Romans 9-11.

<sup>25</sup>F. F. Bruce, *The Letter of Paul to the Romans* (Tyndale New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 198.

<sup>26</sup>See, e.g., S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), 365-66.

<sup>27</sup>See, e.g., C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, vol. 1: *The Pentateuch* (repr.; 3 vols. in one; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.), 3:477-78.

<sup>28</sup>Paul, in relationship to the LXX, transposes the verbs, but otherwise, except for orthographic variants, quotes the LXX accurately. The LXX is an accurate enough rendering of the MT, but it may miss the force of the niphal verbs, thus assisting Paul in his use of the text.

<sup>29</sup>See, most recently, J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), 523. He argues that the second part of v. 1 should be translated “a nation not called by my name” (the MT reading) and that the verse therefore refers to Gentiles (cf. KJV).

<sup>30</sup>This is the majority view among OT commentators. See, e.g., John Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 40-66* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 636. This majority thinks that the last phrase in the verse should be translated “a nation that did not call on my name,” as the BHS suggests and

LXX seems to follow (cf., e.g., NIV, NRSV).

<sup>31</sup>Paul again probably quotes the LXX: the only difference between his wording and the LXX is that he moves the phrase ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν to the beginning of the sentence.

<sup>32</sup>E.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:541-42.

<sup>33</sup>E.g., Godet, *Romans*, 390.

<sup>34</sup>See, e.g., Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 844-45; Hays, *Echoes*, 70.

<sup>35</sup>Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (3 vols.; EKKNT; Zurich: Benzinger/Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1978-82), 3:107.

<sup>36</sup>On this view, the infinitives βεβαιῶσαι in v. 8b and δοξάσαι in v. 9a are dependent on εἰς τό in v. 8. See, e.g., NRSV; REB; TEV, and most commentators. The main alternative is to take most of v. 8 and v. 9a as two parallel assertions dependent on “I say”: “I say: (a) that Christ has become a servant of the circumcision for the sake of the truth of God, in order to confirm the promises to the fathers (b) and that the Gentiles are glorifying God for the sake of his mercy.” On this view, the infinitive δοξάσαι in v. 9a is parallel to γεννηθῆσαι in v. 8, both being used in noun clauses dependent on λέγω. See esp. Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:742-43.

<sup>37</sup>I assume here, with most commentators, that Romans is directed to an audience composed of both Gentile and Jewish believers, despite the strong case for an exclusively Gentile audience made recently by A. Andrew Das (*Solving the Romans Debate* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007]).

<sup>38</sup>The LXX of 2 Sam 22:50 is identi-

cal, except for the placement of the word κύριε, which Paul omits. Paul's fondness for the psalms make it more likely that Ps 18:49 is the source for this quotation. With the exception of κύριε, Paul quotes the LXX verbatim; and the LXX is an accurate translation of the MT.

<sup>39</sup>The Qumran MS is 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>; cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 707.

<sup>40</sup>Hays, *Echoes*, 71.

<sup>41</sup>The same Greek verb that occurs here, ἀνίστημι, refers to Christ's resurrection in 1 Thess. 4:16 (and perhaps Eph. 5:14); see Käsemann, *Romans*, 386; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 849.

<sup>42</sup>See Jer 23:5; 33:15; Sir. 47:22; 4 QFlor 1:11; 4QPat 3-4; Rev 5:5; 22:16.

<sup>43</sup>Hays, *Echoes*, 73.

<sup>44</sup>Käsemann, e.g., thinks that Paul disregards the original sense of the OT texts and sees them as containing "types" of God's salvific methods (*Romans*, 264).

<sup>45</sup>J. Piper, *The Justification of God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 9:1-23* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983), 45-54.

<sup>46</sup>J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans* (NovTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2002; repr., Brill, 2003), 89.

<sup>47</sup>E.g., O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (MeyerK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 316.

<sup>48</sup>Others, however, doubt the existence of a pre-Pauline testimonium: Koch, *Schrift*, 104-5; 166-67; Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 109-13. For the use of Hosea in early Christianity, see Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 75.

<sup>49</sup>Another difference between Paul's quotation and the majority LXX tradition is his use of the verb ἀγαπάω ("love") in v. 25b rather than ἐλέεω ("have mercy"). It is possible that Paul found ἀγαπάω in his text (MS B reads this verb). B. Lindars, on the other hand, thinks Paul has made his own independent translation from the Hebrew (*New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the New Testament Quotations* [London: SCM, 1961], 243). But it is more likely that Paul has himself made the change in order to facilitate comparison with 9:13: "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated" (Mal. 1:3; my emphasis) (see Wagner, *Heralds*, 81-82).

<sup>50</sup>Most commentators on Hosea think that Hos. 1:10 refers to the northern tribes only; but D. Stuart (*Hosea-Jonah* [Word Biblical Commentary; Waco, TX: Word, 1987], 38) thinks the reference is to the reunited Israel as a whole.

<sup>51</sup>See T. Laetsch: "Very clearly God here prophesies the admission of the heathen into covenant relations with God" (*Bible Commentary on the Minor Prophets* [St. Louis: Concordia, 1956], 75).

<sup>52</sup>J. A. Battle, Jr., "Paul's use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:25-26," *Grace Theological Journal* 2 (1981): 115-29.

<sup>53</sup>See, e.g., S. L. Johnson, "Evidence from Romans 9-11," in *A Case for Premillennialism: A New Consensus* (ed. D. K. Campbell and J. L. Townsend; Chicago: Moody, 1992), 207-10; J. N. Aletti, *Comment Dieu est-il juste? Clefs pour interpréter l'épître aux Romains* (Rome: Editions

du Seuil, 1991), 219-22; J. Ridderbos, *Isaiah* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 565-66. S. Hafemann suggests that Paul's use of ὡς ("as") in the introductory formula may signal the presence of such an analogy ("The Salvation of Israel in Romans 11:25-32: A Response to Krister Stendahl," *Ex Auditu* 4 [1988]: 47).

<sup>54</sup>See J. A. Alexander, *Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah* (repr.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971), 277.

<sup>55</sup>See Hays, *Echoes*, 45.

<sup>56</sup>Calvin, *Romans*, 328.

<sup>57</sup>See, again, Hays, *Echoes*, 57-58.

<sup>58</sup>The extent of "all the offspring" in v. 16 is debated because of uncertainty about the syntax of the two contrasting phrases: "not only to those who are of the law, but also to those who have the faith of Abraham." "Those who are of the law" could, especially in light of the contrast with "those who have the faith of Abraham," refer to unbelieving Jews (F. Mussner, "Wer ist 'Der ganze Samen' in Röm 4,16?" in *Begegnung mit dem Wort. Festschrift für Heinrich Zimmermann* [ed. J. Zmijewski and E. Nellesen; BBB 53; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1980], 213-17; L. Gaston, "Abraham and the Righteousness of God," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 2 [1980]: 58). In this case, Paul would be asserting that Jews continue to be part of the "offspring of Abraham," in a different way, however, from the way in which Christians are the offspring of Abraham. Such a point would not, if properly nuanced, be incompatible with Paul's thought (see Rom 11:11-30). But it is perhaps unlikely that this is what he intends here. Paul has forcefully

stated that the true descendants of Abraham are those who believe (vv. 11-12); and when he uses the word “offspring” here, it must be with this spiritual meaning that he has given the word. Moreover, the phrase “out of faith” rules the entire verse and must be carried over to this latter part of it. The meaning, then, is that the promise is for the Jew who is part of the seed through faith (so most commentators, ancient and modern). “Out of the law” must mean something a bit different from what it does in v. 11, and designate Jews as such, “those who had the advantage of being under the Mosaic economy” (J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* [2 vols. in one; New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959, 1965], 1:145). In light of the contrast indicated by “not only . . . but also,” “those who have the faith of Abraham” are Gentile believers (Godet, *Romans*, 178).

<sup>59</sup>Some commentators, however, do include spiritual as well as physical descendants of Abraham in the “nations” of chap. 17 (see, e.g., G.C. Aalders, *Genesis* [2 vols; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981], 1:305).

<sup>60</sup>See, e.g., Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles*, 98.

<sup>61</sup>See *Paul and the Gentiles*, 187-97.

<sup>62</sup>*Romans*, 684 n. 2. In the commentary, I was responding to his article, “‘Riches for the Gentiles’ (Rom 11:12): Israel’s Rejection and Paul’s Gentile Mission,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993), 92.

<sup>63</sup>Perhaps this is why some rabbis applied these Hosea texts to the

conversion of proselytes (cf. *Pesiq.* R. 87b; H.-J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961], 240).

<sup>64</sup>Gen 13:16 and 28:14 use the Heb word עָפָר, “dust,” while Gen 22:17 and 32:13 use the word לֵחַם, “sand.” The LXX translates both with ἄμμος, the word that also occurs in Hos 2:1.

<sup>65</sup>Wagner (*Heralds*, 89-92) emphasizes this point.

<sup>66</sup>Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, 41.

<sup>67</sup>See, e.g., H. K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1983), 98-108; Hübner, *Gottes Ich und Israel*, 56-57.

<sup>68</sup>Many scholars think that Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ in this verse refers to a group distinct from those denoted earlier in the verse, those “who adhere to this rule.” Since this phrase seems to denote Christians generally, “Israel of God” may then refer to Jews, or perhaps Jewish Christians (see G. Schrenk, “Der Segenwunsch nach der Kampfepistel,” *Judaica* 6 [1950]: 170-90; P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* [SNTSMS 10; Cambridge: University Press, 1969], 74-84). But the syntax of the verse makes it more likely that “Israel of God” is exegetical of αὐτούς, which in turn finds its antecedent in the phrase “as many as adhere to this rule” (see esp. N. A. Dahl, “Der Name Israel: Zur Auslegung von Gal 6,16,” *Judaica* 6 [1950]: 161-70; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* [Word Biblical Commentary; Waco, TX: Word, 1990], 297-99; H. Ridderbos,

*Paul: An Outline of his Theology* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974], 336).

<sup>69</sup>Hays, *Echoes*, 175. Italics are original, and he quotes from Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University, 1982), 39.

<sup>70</sup>The most useful source for Kaiser’s view is in his collection of essays, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985).

<sup>71</sup>See, e.g., S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New: An Argument for Biblical Inspiration* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980).

<sup>72</sup>See my discussion in “The Problem of Sensus Plenior,” in *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon* (ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 192-95.

<sup>73</sup>Hay, *Echoes*, 8-9. This point would seem to apply also to the treatment of this issue in Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005).

<sup>74</sup>Paul in this passage claims that OT events happened τυπικῶς (1 Cor 10:11), the past-referring tense implying that the events were intended from the outset to have typical significance. For this view, see, *inter alia*, P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture* (2 vols.; New York: Funk & Wagnells, 1876), 1:46; L. Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 18-19; R. M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Τύπος Structures* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University,

1981), 193-207; E. E. Ellis, *Paul and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), 127. On the other side of this issue are Francis Foulkes (*The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament* [London: Tyndale, 1958], 20-34) and R. T. France (*Jesus and the Old Testament* [London: Tyndale, 1971], 39-40), who do not think that typology must always be prospective.

<sup>75</sup>Goppelt, *Typos*, 142.

<sup>76</sup>*Ibid.*, 141.

<sup>77</sup>See, e.g., Goppelt, *Typology*, 152, who argues that typology is not a system of exposition but a spiritual approach. Hays's evaluation is similar. Typology, he says, is not a method of interpretation, but "a framework of literary-historical sensibility that creates the hermeneutical conditions necessary for the metaphorical linkage of scriptural text and contemporary situation." *Echoes*, 161.

<sup>78</sup>See esp. *Echoes*, 154-56, on this point.

<sup>79</sup>Cosgrove, *Elusive Israel*, 56.

<sup>80</sup>Moo, "The Problem of Sensus Plenior," 210.

<sup>81</sup>*Ibid.*, 211.

<sup>82</sup>Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "Christ and Concept: Doing Theology and the 'Ministry' of Philosophy," in *Doing Theology in Today's World: Essays in Honor of Kenneth S. Kantzer* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 99-145, esp. 103.