

Prolegomena to Paul's Use of Scripture in Romans

RICHARD N. LONGENECKER
McMASTER DIVINITY COLLEGE
McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Paul's use of Scripture in his epistle to the Roman Christians raises many questions: Why does he appeal to Scripture so frequently in this letter? How is the distribution of quotations to be understood? Why did Paul appeal to Scripture at all, since most of his readers were Gentiles? How are we to understand Paul's diverse exegetical methods? There are other questions that suggest themselves. This paper attempts to answer all of these questions by carefully considering the recipients' background and experience, the nature of Paul's argument in Romans and in his other extant writings, and Paul's understanding of the gospel, especially as it impinges on Israel.

Key words: Romans, use of Scripture, Jews, Gentiles

Paul's letter to the Romans has always been highly regarded by Christians. It has been, in large measure, the heartland of Christian theology and piety. And throughout the two millennia of its existence, its status in the church has been more highly acclaimed than that of any other NT writing.

Yet despite its importance and status, Romans is probably the most difficult NT letter to analyze and interpret. It can hardly be called a simple writing. Augustine, for example, began in 394-95 to write a commentary on Romans. But after producing material on 1:1-7¹ he felt unable to proceed, saying that the project was just too large for him and that he would return to easier tasks.² Erasmus in 1517 said of Romans: "The difficulty of this letter equals and almost surpasses its utility!"—citing Origen and Jerome who also found the

1. See Migie, *Patrologia Latina* 35.2087-2106.

2. *Retractationes* 1.25.

letter difficult.³ As Erasmus saw it, its difficulty stems from three causes: (1) its literary style, for "nowhere else is the order of speech more confused; nowhere is the speech more split by the transposition of words; nowhere is the speech more incomplete through absence of an apodosis," (2) its content or the "obscurity of things which are hard to put into words," for "no other letter is handicapped by more frequent rough spots or is broken by deeper chasms," and (3) its "frequent and sudden changes of masks" or shifting stances on the part of the author, for "he considers now the Jews, now the Gentiles, now both; sometimes he addresses believers, sometimes doubters; at one point he assumes the role of a weak man, at another of a strong; sometimes that of a godly man, sometimes of an ungodly man."⁴

In addition to style, content and shifting stances, Erasmus could have referred to the difficulty of understanding Paul's use of Scripture. And it is this feature of the letter that we intend to examine in this paper.

A. QUESTIONS ARISING FROM PAUL'S USE OF SCRIPTURE

Paul's use of Scripture in Romans presents the interpreter with a number of perplexing questions. Eight, in particular, are important here. One set of questions focuses on issues that may be classed as being more introductory in nature—that is, questions that concern the concentration, distribution and purpose of the biblical quotations in the letter. First of all, one must ask: (1) Why did Paul use so many OT quotations in Romans, when elsewhere in his letters he is more reserved in the use of Scripture? For of the approximately 83 places in the Pauline corpus where quotations are to be found--totaling some 100 biblical passages, if one disengages the conflated texts and separates the possible dual sources—well over half appear in this letter: 45 of 83 in Romans (or 55-60 biblical passages of about 100 total, if the conflated texts and dual sources are unpacked and counted separately). Elsewhere in the Pauline letters there are 15 places in 1 Corinthians, 7 in 2 Corinthians, 10 in Galatians, 4 in Ephesians, 1 in 1 Timothy, 1 in 2 Timothy, but none in 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, or Titus. Also to be asked is: (2) Why is the distribution of OT quotations in Romans so uneven? For about 18 quotations appear in eight or nine places in 1:16– 4:25 and about 30 quotations in 25-26 places in 9:1-11:36--with an additional ten to be found in the exhortations of 12:1-15:13 and one more in the so-called *Apostolic Parousia* of 15:14-32—whereas biblical quo-

3. "The Argument of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans," *LB* 7.777.

4. *Ibid.* 7.777-78.

tations occur only twice, and then somewhat tangentially, in what has seemed to most interpreters to be the apex of Paul's argument in 5:1-8:39 (once in 7:7, citing in illustrative fashion the tenth commandment "Do not covet" of Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21; once in 8:36, in what appears to be a traditional confessional portion that makes use of Ps 44:22).

As well, one might ask (3) Why did Paul use the OT at all in writing to Christians at Rome, particularly when his addressees are identified as being within the orbit of his Gentile ministry (1:5-6; 13-15; 15:15-16), explicitly addressed as Gentiles (11:13), and distinguished in their ancestry from his own Jewish ancestry (9:3; 11:14)? One could understand why Paul used Scripture so extensively in writing to Gentile believers at Galatia and Corinth, particularly if the problem at Galatia stemmed from "Judaizers" who themselves were using the OT for their own purposes and if the "Peter party" at Corinth represented some form of Jewish Christian propaganda. The use of Scripture in Ephesians and the letters to Timothy, though more infrequent, might even be justified on the basis of Ephesians being a circular letter to mixed congregations and Timothy having been trained in the Scriptures by his mother. But Romans cannot easily be "mirror read" so as to identify any Jewish or Jewish-Christian protagonists or opponents. And Paul's more common practice when writing to Gentile believers, particularly those not affected by a problem of Jewish origin, was not to quote Scripture at all in support of his arguments (though, of course, his language was always informed by biblical idioms and expressions)—as witness his letters to the Thessalonians, Philippians and Colossians, as well as to Philemon and Titus.

A second set of questions regarding the use of Scripture in Romans focuses on comparative issues. Here one must ask: (4) How do Paul's exegetical procedures in Romans compare to those of Second-Judaism and early Rabbinic Judaism, and what effect do such cognate exegetical practices have on our understanding of Paul's treatment of the OT?, and (5) How does Paul's use of the OT compare to his use of Scripture in his other writings, particularly in Galatians where there is an overlap of topics and similar treatments?

A third set of questions brings us to the very heart of matters in dealing with interpretive issues: (6) Why do the textforms of Paul's biblical quotations differ from those attributed to Jesus in the four Gospels and those credited to the earliest preachers in the Book of Acts? For in Paul's quotations, both in Romans and throughout his other letters, there appears a rather peculiar mix of textual readings. Over half of the Pauline textforms are either absolute or virtual reproductions of the LXX, with about half of these at variance with

the MT. But almost another half vary from both the LXX and the MT to a greater or lesser extent—and once in Romans (11:35, citing Job 41:11 in a traditional theocentric doxology) and three times elsewhere in the Pauline corpus (1 Cor 3:19, citing Job 5:13; 2 Cor 9:9, citing Ps 112:9; and 2 Tim 2:19, citing Num 16:5) the texts are in agreement with the MT against the LXX. By contrast, the texts used by Jesus and the earliest Christian preachers are reported as having been dominantly septuagintal in form.

As well, it must be asked: (7) How can the wide scope of Paul's treatment of OT texts be understood, ranging, as it does, from his quite literal "pearl-stringing" approach in Rom 3:10-18 to his seeming disregard of the original text and context in Rom 10:6-8 (where Deut 30:12-14 is cited in an inexact and possibly proverbial manner to his own advantage; cf. Eph 4:8, where Ps 68:18 is cited in a similar fashion). And, finally, it needs to be asked: (8) What does it mean to speak of Paul's "christocentric exegetical orientation," and how did such a perspective affect his interpretation of holy Scripture?

B. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING ADDRESSEES AND PURPOSE

The above questions cannot be treated in isolation or in any atomistic fashion. Rather, much depends on how one views (1) the addressees and their circumstances, and (2) Paul's purpose in writing the letter. These are matters that are being extensively debated today, with many finding it necessary to go back to "square one." But such a reevaluation is absolutely necessary, particularly if Romans is to be read as a letter and not as a theological tractate or a compendium of the Christian religion. For as a letter, it cannot be properly interpreted—and its use of Scripture rightly appreciated—unless the nature and circumstances of its addressees are correctly identified and its purpose correctly understood.

1. *The Addressees and Their Circumstances*

The usual way of determining the identity and circumstances of Paul's Roman addressees has been by "mirror reading" the letter itself. It is impossible here to identify all of the positions taken using this approach or to list all of the data that have been cited in attempting to justify the various views proposed. Suffice it only to say that, using a mirror-reading method, some have found the Jewish features of the letter and what they take to be the letter's contra-Jewish polemics (esp. vis-à-vis Galatians) to be the controlling fac-

tors in their determination of the identity and circumstances of the addressees; others have found the fact of Gentiles being directly addressed and the presence of Gentile features to be decisive for their determination. Still others, however, have proposed a mixed audience of Jewish and Gentile believers, though with the Gentiles in the majority and the Roman church experiencing some difficulties—either of a doctrinal or an ethical nature, or both—arising from the interaction between these two groups.

But mirror reading only works well where one is dealing with either polemic (i.e., an aggressive explication that seeks to counter specific errors, whether doctrinal or ethical) or apology (i.e., a defensive response to accusations)—that is, where one can be reasonably sure that the agenda of a particular writing is driven by some error, need or situation that was present among the addressees, and not just by a desire for contact or communication on the part of the author himself. The problem, however, is that it is not always easy in a letter to distinguish between (1) polemic, (2) apology, and (3) exposition. In particular, the problem in applying this method to Romans is that, while the letter is forthright in its exposition, it is notoriously vague when it comes to matters of polemic and apology.

We need not deny that circumstances at Rome played a part in motivating Paul to write, or that some knowledge of the situation of the Roman Christians can be derived from a mirror reading of his letter to them. But something of a dead end seems to have come about in the identification of Paul's addressees and their circumstances through a mirror-reading approach—with data derived from external sources only being utilized later in order to supplement conclusions reached by such an internal process. It is, therefore, probably better to start the other way around: first, by giving attention to external considerations; then to note how a mirror reading of the letter might support the hypotheses proposed from such an external approach.

As Wolfgang Wiefel has pointed out, questions regarding the origin of Roman Christianity, its character, and the identity and circumstances of Paul's addressees in Romans "cannot be clarified without considering) the entire phenomenon of Judaism in Rome."⁵ It is impossible here to enter into a full discussion of Jews and Judaism at Rome. But three matters drawn from Wiefel's article seem especially important as background for any consideration of the identity and circumstances of Paul's addressees: (1) that of Roman Jewry's

5. "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity," in *The Romans Debate. Revised and Expanded Edition* (ed. K. P. Donfried; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991) 86.

decentralized situation administratively and socially; (2) that of Roman Jewry's religious dependence on Palestinian Jewry; and (3) that of the continued existence of Jews in Rome even after Claudius' edict of expulsion in AD 49. With regard to the first two of these matters, undoubtedly the decentralized situation of the Jews at Rome and their close ties with Palestinian Jewry had an impact on the character of Christianity at Rome as it arose within the city's various synagogues. So it may be postulated, what with Roman Christianity coming to birth within the context of Roman Jewry, that the first Christians of the city of Rome, though in fellowship with one another, probably did not develop any central governing structure or agency, but looked primarily to the Jerusalem church for their spiritual direction.

And with regard to the third of the above matters, the continued existence of Jews in Rome after the edict of Claudius, it may also be postulated that the emperor's order of expulsion was directed primarily against those Jews who were in Rome's eyes stirring up trouble and causing dissension among the Jewish populace of the city, whether in defense of traditional Judaism or in proclaiming Jesus of Nazareth as the Jewish Messiah.⁶ It seems likely, for a number of reasons, that many Jews continued to live in Rome or returned to Rome during the latter years of Claudius' reign. Their existence in the city after Claudius' edict, of course, would have been severely restricted, for with the emperor's edict they also lost the right of free assembly in their various synagogical groupings. But it need not be held that a Jewish component was no longer part of a Christian presence at Rome, for many Jewish believers in Jesus may have remained in the city and have had some influence within the developing Christian congregations, whatever might be postulated regarding their numbers compared to Gentile believers within that community.

The question to be asked regarding the identity and character of Christians at Rome when Paul wrote them, however, is not, "Were they Jews or Gentiles, or, if ethnically mixed, dominantly one or the other?"—with the implications being that if Jewish believers, then they should be viewed as non-Pauline in outlook, but if Gentile believers, then adherents to Paul's teaching. Undoubtedly the addressees constituted both Jewish and Gentile believers in Jesus. And probably the Gentiles were in the majority, for Paul considered the Roman church to be within the orbit of his Gentile ministry.

But rather than trying to determine the addressees' character on the basis of their ethnicity, "the crucial issue," as Raymond Brown points out, "is the theological outlook of this mixed Jewish/Gentile

6. Cf. Suetonius *Vita Claudius* 25.4, interpreting "Chresto" to be a reference to Christ, whether intended or inadvertent.

Christianity."⁷ The testimony of the 4th century commentator 'Ambrosiaster' (as dubbed by Erasmus) is that believers at Rome, both Jews and Gentiles, "came to embrace faith in Christ . . . according to the Jewish rite [*ritu licet judaico*]."⁸ Closely aligned with this view is the suggestion of the early 2nd century Roman historian Tacitus that Judean Christianity and Roman Christianity are to be seen as being directly related: "This pernicious superstition [i.e., Christianity, which arose in Judea during the reign of Tiberius] had broken out again [i.e., during Nero's reign], not only in Judea (where the mischief had originated) but even in the capital city [i.e., Rome] where all degraded and shameful practices collect and become the vogue."⁹ Therefore, we should probably highlight as being of major importance the axis that ran from Roman Christianity back to the Jerusalem church in Judea. And if that be true, then we should understand Paul's Roman addressees—even though dominantly Gentile believers, and so within the orbit of his Gentile ministry—to be principally influenced in their thought, traditions and religious practices by Jewish Christianity as centered in Jerusalem.

In addition, as Brown further points out, the witness of the Acts of the Apostles needs here to be taken into account:

According to Acts, for the first two Christian decades, Jerusalem and Antioch served as the dissemination points of the Gospel. Because of his interest in Paul, the author keeps us well informed of missions to the West moving out from Antioch, but there is never a suggestion that a mission went from Antioch to Rome. (Indeed, in the first 15 chapters of Acts the only mention of Rome/Romans is 2:10, which notes the presence of Roman Jews at Jerusalem on the first Pentecost.) There are no arguments from Acts for a site other than Jerusalem as the source for Roman Christianity, and Acts 28:21 relates that Jews in Rome had channels of theological information coming from Jerusalem.¹⁰

So Brown concludes (1) that for both Jews and Christians "the Jerusalem-Rome axis was strong," (2) "that Roman Christianity came from Jerusalem, and indeed represented the Jewish/Gentile Christianity associated with such Jerusalem figures as Peter and James," and (3) that both wrote the earliest days of the Roman church and at the time when Paul wrote them, believers at Rome could be characterized as "Christians who kept up some Jewish observances and remained faithful to part of the heritage of the Jewish Law and cult,

7. "The Beginnings of Christianity at Rome," in R. E. Brown and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York/Toronto: Paulist, 1983) 109 n. 227.

8. *Com. ad Romanos*, prol. 2 [CSEL 81.1.6], per codex K.

9. *Annals* 15.44.

10. *Antioch and Rome* 103-4.

without insisting on circumcision."¹¹ With such an understanding of the addressees and their circumstances Joseph Fitzmyer has recently expressed agreement, though without spelling out the hermeneutical implications of such a view.¹² And it is this understanding that will be postulated in what follows, believing it to be the position that is best supported by all of the available data—and believing that it casts Paul's use of Scripture in Romans in an entirely new light.

2. Paul's Purpose in Writing

One other preliminary consideration, however, needs also to be raised: the question as to Paul's purpose in writing Romans. For unless one reads the letter in a purely devotional, theological, homiletical, canonical, liberation, or some other "reader response" manner, how one understands an author's purpose has a profound effect on how one understands the character and content of what is written.

This is a matter, of course, that has taken center stage in many recent scholarly treatments of Romans.¹³ At the heart of the issue are the questions: "Was Romans written principally to counteract some problem or problems within the church at Rome—whether doctrinal or ethical, and whether arising from outside the body of believers or from within?," or, "Did the decisive motivation for Paul's writing spring from within his own ministry—whether to introduce himself to an unknown audience, to defend himself against possible misunderstanding, to assert his apostolic authority over a group of believers whom he considered part of his Gentile mission, to set out his understanding of the Christian message as something of a 'last will and testament', or to seek support for his forthcoming mission to the western regions of the Roman empire?" Or to frame the questions in a somewhat different manner: "Was Paul's purpose in writing Romans principally pastoral in nature, being motivated by a desire to correct problems, whether doctrinal or ethical, within the Roman church?" Or, "Was Paul's purpose primarily missionary in nature, being motivated by his own sense of mission, by his own consciousness of being appointed by God as an apostle to the Gentiles, and/or by issues that had arisen previously in his ministry?"

These two questions, as posed, may not represent mutually exclusive options. Various interpretive possibilities exist within each of

11. *Ibid.* 104.

12. *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 33-34.

13. Cf., e.g., K. P. Donfried's collection of essays in *The Romans Debate*, first published in 1977 and then revised and expanded in 1991. See also L. A. Jervis, *The Purpose of Romans. A Comparative Letter Structure Investigation* (JSNTSup 55; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

them. In fact, scholars have often tried to bring together a number of such possibilities in positing "reasons for Romans," selecting some from the first set and some from the second.¹⁴ Yet in asking whether Paul's purpose in writing Romans was motivated principally (1) by conditions within the church at Rome, or (2) by factors arising from within his own consciousness and ministry, we seem to have come to something of a watershed in the matter. And it is probably not too extreme to claim that from this watershed flows almost everything else that one might say about the character, form and content of Romans.

Our thesis regarding Paul's purpose in writing Romans is that it stems principally from his own consciousness and ministry--thought also that it may have been occasioned, in part, by the particular circumstances of his addressees. The opening Salutation (1:1-7) and Thanksgiving (1:8-15, though possibly ending at 1:12 or 1:17) and the closing Apostolic Parousia (15:14-32) and Conclusion (15:33-16:23 probably also 16:25-27)—with the first two sections setting out the agenda of the letter and the latter two sections retrospectively referring to that agenda¹⁵—all highlight Paul's own concerns and his desires for believers at Rome, but provide little data regarding his addressees' situation. And the Body of the letter (1:16-15:13, though possibly starting at 1:13 or 1:18), as well, furnishes little data regarding their situation—unless, of course, one transposes Paul's exposition into polemics, thereby constructing a scenario of doctrinal problems at Rome by analogy to the problems at Galatia and/or ethical problems by analogy to those at Corinth.

A better approach, we suggest, is (1) to identify Paul's purpose(s) for writing Romans by means of a close reading of the agenda that he sets out in the opening sections of the letter and that he retrospectively refers to in the closing sections, especially in the Thanksgiving and Apostolic Parousia sections, but (2) to infer his addressees circumstances (which must have had some part in occasioning the letter, even though Paul does not refer to them) by reference to the history and experiences of Jews at Rome (which were undoubtedly foundational in many ways for the Roman Christians, and probably analogous) and by reference to the suggestive statements that appear in Ambrosiaster (4th century), Tacitus (2nd century), and Acts (1st century), as referred to above.

14. So, e.g., A. J. M. Wedderburn, *The Reasons for Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988).

15 Cf. P. Schubert, *The Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939); Jervis, *The Purpose of Romans*; J. A. D. Weima, *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings* (JSNTSup 101; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

With regard to Paul's purpose, it seems clear from the Thanksgiving and Apostolic Parousia that it was at least twofold: (1) to give his readers what he calls a *χάρισμα πνευματικόν*, or "spiritual gift," so as to strengthen them—a gift that he thought of as being uniquely his, but which he felt obligated to share with all those within the orbit of his Gentile mission (cf. 1:11-15; 15:15-18); and (2) to seek the assistance of the Roman Christians for the extension of his ministry to the western regions of the empire (cf. 1:10b, 13; 15:23-32). It may be, as well, that he wanted to prepare them theologically for his coming, so that they would understand more accurately and appreciate more fully what he was proclaiming in his ministry to Gentiles. And it may be that he wanted to head off doctrinal or ethical divisions among believers at Rome, so that they would be united in their support of his western mission. But these latter purposes, if real, seem to be more related to Paul's own agenda than to his addressees' concerns. And while it may be supposed that Paul had some uncertainties about how his theological views and personal presence would be received at Rome—particularly with believers there having been strongly influenced by Jewish Christianity—such concerns are not easily derived from a mirror-reading of the letter itself.

In characterizing Paul's addressees and their circumstances, therefore, it may be postulated (1) that ethnically they constituted both Jews and Gentiles, though with the latter more dominant, (2) that theologically they looked to the Jerusalem church for inspiration and guidance, revered the Mosaic law, and followed some of the Jewish rites, but were not Judaizers like those who troubled the Galatian congregations, and (3) that socially they were not meeting in Jewish synagogues (Claudius' edict having ended such synagogical gatherings) and where without an overarching administrative structure (in common with the situation of the Jews in the city), but were meeting for worship and fellowship in various believers' homes or "house churches" in a somewhat loose association of separate congregations. And if all this be true, one needs to read Paul's letter to the Romans in a different light than is usually done—particularly with respect to his use of Scripture.

C. THE USE OF TRADITIONAL MATERIALS

For an understanding of his arguments, methods and procedures in Romans, it is important to have some appreciation of how Paul uses various traditional portions in the letter—particularly, how he uses materials that may be identified as stemming from a Jewish or Jewish Christian milieu. For how Paul uses such materials in Romans parallels to a large extent how he uses Scripture in that letter.

Most significant is Paul's use of early Christian confessional materials.¹⁶ A great deal of attention has been directed during the past century to early Christian confessional materials incorporated within the New Testament—whether those materials are in the form of hymns (poetic affirmations), *homologia* (non-poetic statements), 'Sayings', or Christological titles. Paul's letters, in particular, have been the subject of many such investigations, with confessional materials having been found most readily in Philippians, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, Colossians and 1 Timothy (largely in that order). Romans, too, has been seen to contain some of these confessional portions—though much of Romans, particularly its large letter body, awaits a proper form-critical mining of what might very well be the 'mother lode' of early Christian confessional materials. What have been identified to date as confessional materials within Romans are (1) the Christological formulations of 1:3-4, 3:24-26 (or, 3:25-26), 4:25, and 10:9—probably also those of 9:5b and 14:9; (2) the theocentric hymn of 11:33-36; and (3) various confessional fragments brought together in the lyrical and almost defiant statements of 8:33-39. Each of these portions has its own form-critical features, its own history of identification, and its own postulated provenance. It is impossible here to enter into an extended discussion of such matters. Suffice it only to note those portions that have been, to date, identified as early Christian confessional materials used by Paul in Romans, and then to comment briefly on their usage.

Of interest for a structural analysis of Romans is the fact that three of these confessional portions appear as the final items of their respective sections, and so serve to summarize or conclude what was said earlier in those sections. Rom 4:25 ("Who was delivered over to death for our sins, and was raised to life for our justification") seems to function in this manner, summarizing the central statements of 3:21-31 and bringing to a climax the whole presentation of 1:16-4:24. Likewise, the forceful affirmations of 8:33-39, which probably include a number of early confessional statements, summarize and bring to a dramatic conclusion all that is said in chaps. 5-8. And while it may be debated whether chaps. 9-11 begin with a portion that includes a confessional doxology at 9:5b, certainly the majestic hymn of praise to God in 11:33-36 provides a fitting climax to those three chapters.

16. Admittedly, much of what follows in this section anticipates portions of my forthcoming monograph on "Contextualizing the Early Christian Confessions." The subject is just too large for a detailed treatment here. Yet because of the parallels that exist between Paul's use of such traditional materials and his use of Scripture, some reference must be made to these materials.

What seems to be occurring here is that Paul is using Christian confessional materials to close off each of the three main theological sections of his letter (i.e., chaps. 1-4, 5-8 and 9-11). And with addressees for whom he was not their spiritual father, but who looked to the Jerusalem church for their traditions and support (as suggested above), this was undoubtedly a strategic move on his part. For in concluding his three main theological sections with confessional materials that were known and accepted by his addressees—or, at least, with recognizable echoes from such materials—Paul would have "nailed down," as it were, their acceptance of his presentations.

There are also, however, three or four confessional portions used by Paul in the development of his theological arguments and exhortations: (1) 1:3-4, which sets out a two-stage understanding of Christ ("seed of David according to the flesh . . . Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead"); (2) 3:24-26, which depicts God's salvific activity through the work of Christ in terms of "justification," "redemption," and "expiation-propitiation" in a manner and with terminology not quite Pauline; (3) 10:9, which incorporates the confession "Jesus is Lord"; and (4) 14:9, which in context has appeared to many to be an early Christian confessional portion: "Christ died and returned to life so that he might be the Lord of both the dead and the living." Perhaps all that need be done by way of highlighting the importance of these confessional portions in the development of Paul's argument is to point out how strategically each of them is located in Romans. For 1:3-4 appears in the salutation of the letter, which Paul uses to highlight a number of themes that he intends subsequently to develop; and 3:24-26 is included in what most commentators take to be a major thesis paragraph of the letter, i.e., 3:21-26—though it may be debated whether this paragraph sets out the thesis of the whole letter, the thesis of the first eight chapters, or, more narrowly, the thesis of only the first four chapters. As well, 10:9 appears at the heart of Paul's discussion of the gospel and Israel in chaps. 9-11, while 14:9 appears at the heart of his exhortations regarding the weak and the strong.

In addressing Gentile Christians whom he considered within the orbit of his Gentile mission, but whom he also knew did not trace their spiritual heritage back to his preaching—rather, who looked to the Jerusalem church for their traditions and support—Paul uses early Christian confessional materials in at least two ways: (1) to summarize and bring to a climax his presentations in the three main theological sections of his letter (i.e., in 4:25; 8:33-39 and 11:33-36), and (2) to support and focus his arguments (i.e., in 1:3-4; 3:24-26; 10:9 and 14:9). Presumably, these confessional materials were known

to his addressees. So Paul builds bridges of commonality with those addressees in his use of these materials.

It could be pointed out, as well, that Paul's letter to a mixed group of believers at Rome—but one in which Gentile Christians were dominant—incorporates a number of features that must have been quite traditional within Jewish Christian circles. For example, there are striking parallels between 1:18-32 and Wis 13:1-14:31 in describing the idolatry and immorality of the Gentile world, but a sharp contrast between 2:1-29 and Wis 15:1-6 with regard to the situation of the Jews. The argument of 1:18-2:29 sounds very much like some of the preaching that must have gone on within Jewish Christian circles, where there was need to counter the propaganda and special pleading of Wisdom of Solomon 13-15 (cf. also *Ep. Arist.* 151-53).

Likewise, in the dialogical context of 2:1-11, the material contained in 2:7-10 may very well stem from a certain facet of Jewish or Jewish Christian ethical teaching (cf. Jas 2:14-26), which Paul quotes and redacts for his own purpose in opposition to some postulated Jewish interlocutor's use of that material. On such a view: (1) the principle that God "will reward each person according to what that person has done" (so v. 6, quoting Ps 62:12; Prov 24:12), (2) was evidently being used in a soteriological manner in some Jewish tradition, with an emphasis on "doing" and "works" (ἔργα) as being redemptive (so vv. 7-10); but (3) Paul universalizes that tradition by twice adding the statement "first for the Jew, then for the Gentile" (cf. 1:16): "There will be trouble and distress for every human being who does evil—*first for the Jew, then for the Gentile*; but glory, honor and peace for everyone who does good—*first for the Jew, then for the Gentile*" (vv. 9-10). The 'salvation by works' theology of vv. 7-10 is radically opposed to Paul's own theological perspective, particularly as expressed in 3:21-4:25. It is not just un-Pauline, but contra-Pauline. Yet Paul seems to have used just such a tradition (1) as a foil in his diatribe type of argument, allowing him in 2:12-29 to correct the false views of his interlocutor, and (2) as an opportunity to highlight the universality and impartiality of God's treatment of human beings. For taken together, 1:16 and 2:9-10 lay stress on the fact that both salvation and judgment are effected by God in an impartial way—as 2:11 states expressly ("God does not show favoritism") and as Paul goes on to elaborate throughout 2:12-3:20.

Mention could also be made of (1) Paul's use of Abraham as an example of faith *par excellence* in 4:1-24, (2) his reference to the "one man" through whom sin and death entered into the world, thereby conditioning all of human life, in 5:12-21, and (3) his development of a remnant theology argument in 9:6-11:32—all of which, it may

be postulated, were traditional features within Jewish Christian circles. But these are matters that require close commentary treatment, even full-blown monographs, to be dealt with adequately, and so can only be referred to here.

It may be, of course, that Paul went through "frequent and sudden changes of masks" in Romans in speaking at one time to Jewish believers, at another time to Gentile believers, and at other times to both (as Erasmus claimed, and as many continue to hold). Or that Paul's addressees were principally Jewish Christians, for only such an audience would have been able to appreciate his Jewish-style arguments, content and procedures (as sometimes asserted). Or, conversely, that they were primarily Gentile Christians, to whom, nonetheless, Paul spoke using the categories and traditions of his own Jewish and Jewish Christian backgrounds—even though his addressees might not have been able to understand all that he said (as many, in essence, have argued). A more cogent explanation of the "dual character" of the letter, however, I believe, is along the lines suggested above: that Paul used materials drawn from the traditions of Jewish Christianity in his letter to a dominantly Gentile group of believers at Rome simply because his addressees, though primarily Gentiles ethnically, were related religiously to the traditions and theology of Jewish Christians at Jerusalem. Thus in Romans Paul (1) speaks of Abraham as "our father" (4:1), even while distinguishing his ancestry from that of his addressees (9:3; 11:14), (2) addresses his readers as "those who know the law" (7:1; cf. 3:19a), while also identifying them as Gentiles (11:13; cf. 1:5-6 and 15:15-16), (3) uses a conciliatory tone and tempered expressions when referring to the Jews, (4) highlights such essentially Jewish and Jewish Christian themes as "the righteousness of God," the validity of the Mosaic law, the nature of redemption, and the election of Israel, and (5) develops his argument in certain sections of the letter in a distinctly Jewish manner.

D. THE USE OF BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS

Much of what has been said about Paul's use of traditional materials in Romans can also be said about his use of Scripture in the letter—that is, that he uses biblical quotations (1) to build bridges of commonality with his addressees, and (2) to support and focus his arguments in ways that his addressees would appreciate and understand. Paul has no doubt that his addressees are believers in Jesus. In fact, he begins the Thanksgiving section by saying: "I thank my God through Jesus Christ for all of you, because your faith is being reported all over the world" (1:8). But though he and his addressees share a common faith and have much in common theologically, Paul wants to add to their understanding of the Christian gospel—in particular,

he wants his Roman readers to understand the gospel as he has proclaimed it in his Gentile mission (cf. "my gospel" in 16:25). And he wants to impart this "spiritual gift" so as to strengthen them as believers (cf. 1:11-15; 15:15-18) and so that they will then be prepared to receive and assist him in the extension of that gospel to the west (cf. 1:10b, 13; 15:23-32).

His procedure, therefore, is (1) to begin where his addressees are in their Christian lives and thought, arguing for fundamental issues in ways that they will appreciate and understand, but then (2) to move out beyond such commonalities to a proclamation of the Christian faith that he considered to be uniquely his, but which he felt obligated to share with all of those within the orbit of his Gentile mission. Perhaps this can best be seen, in overview, by taking each of the major units of the body of the Romans letter separately.

1:16-4:25—Righteousness and Justification by Faith

Exactly where the first unit of the Body of Romans begins and ends has always been difficult to determine. Some have seen the Thanksgiving to close at 1:12, with the Body commencing with a disclosure formula ("I do not want you to be ignorant") at 1:13; others take the Thanksgiving to close at 1:15, with the Body beginning with a thesis statement at 1:16-17; while others close the Thanksgiving at 1:17 and begin the Body at 1:18. Likewise, some close Paul's discussion of 'the righteousness of God and justification by faith' at 4:25, others at 5:11, and still others at 5:21. The issues are largely epistolary, rhetorical and stylistic in nature, and much too complex to be set out here. Our view, to come quickly to the bottom line, is that while 1:16-17 could be seen as a transitional portion that functions both to conclude the Thanksgiving and to introduce the Body, and while Paul's discussion of justification by faith could be taken to extend either to 5:11 or to 5:21, (1) the repetition of the axiom "first for the Jew, then for the Gentile" in 1:16 (once) and 2:9-10 (twice) suggests that 1:16-2:11 is a unit and expresses some type of "ring composition," (2) the word chain πιστεύω/πίστις, as well as the dominance of the term δικαιοσύνη, serve to signal the unity of 1:16–4:25, and (3) the illustration of Abraham in 4:1-24 and the confessional portion of 4:25 aptly conclude this section. In addition, 5:1-8:39 holds together as a recognizable unit (as will be argued later).

What needs to be noted here, however, is that this first unit of Paul's letter body, 1:16-4:25, is extensively Jewish and/or Jewish Christian in both its content and its argumentation. It begins with a thesis statement in 1:16-17 that speaks of the universality of the gospel ("first for the Jew, then for the Gentile"), highlights the theme of the gospel as being both "the righteousness of God" and "by faith,"

and supports that conjunction of righteousness and faith by the quotation of Hab 2:4. It follows this in 1:18-3:20 with a basically negative presentation that argues that all people—Jews as well as Gentiles—stand without excuse as sinful beings before a God who "shows no favoritism": first in 1:18-2:29 by paralleling the presentation of Wisdom of Solomon 13-15, though dramatically turning the self-aggrandizing propaganda of Wis 15:1-6 on its head in Romans 2; then in 3:1-20 by setting out a series of rhetorical questions (vv. 1-9) and a catena of biblical quotations (vv. 10-20), all to the effect that "Jews and Gentiles alike are all under sin" (v. 9) and that Jewish prerogatives serve to make Jews more accountable before God and not superior to others (vv. 19-20).

Positively, however, Paul goes on in the latter half of this opening unit (1) to set out a thesis paragraph on the righteousness of God in 3:21-23—which picks up from his opening thesis statement of 1:16-17—arguing that the righteousness of God, while witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets, is now made known in the gospel apart from the Mosaic law (χωρὶς νόμου), (2) to support that thesis by the use of an early Christian confessional portion in 3:24-26, (3) to elaborate on the "divine impartiality" feature of that thesis in 3:27-31, and (4) to illustrate the factor of faith contained in that thesis by the example of Abraham in 4:1-24. He then concludes in 4:25 with another confessional portion that speaks of the work of Christ in humanity's redemption and justification ("He was delivered over to death for our sins and was raised to life for our justification").

As for biblical quotations, Paul's arguments in 1:16–4:25 are chock-full of Scripture. The first, of course, is the quotation of Hab 2:4 in 1:17b: "The righteous will live by faith." The second appears in 2:24—toward the close of Paul's paralleling of Wisdom of Solomon 13-15, where he acknowledges the idolatry and immorality of the Gentile world but reverses the favorable characterization of Jews—with a prophetic denunciation against Israel drawn from a conflation of Isa 52:5b and Ezek 36:22b: "God's name is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you." A third biblical passage appears in 3:4b, quoting Ps 51:4: "So that you may be proved right in your words and prevail in your judging." Each of these three quotations is introduced by the formulaic phrase "as it is written" (καθὼς γέγραπται).

The eight to ten passages strung together in 3:10-18, which are also introduced by "as it is written," deserve special comment. For this catena of passages has often been seen to be an early set piece or *testimonia* list that Paul used to emphasize the fact that no one is righteous before God. Its selection of passages is not quite Pauline. Unpacking all of the possible conflated texts, it quotes Qoheleth once (Eccl 7:20), Proverbs once (Prov 1:16), Isaiah twice (Isa 59:7, 8), and the Psalms six times (Pss 14:1-3; 53:1-3; 5:9; 140:3; 10:7; 36:1). As

well, the textforms of the passages evidence a variety of LXX and MT readings, with the quotations at times being not exactly either. And its structure, while probably not strophic, evidences great care in composition, what with its sixfold repetition of the phrase "there is none" (οὐκ ἔστιν) and its cataloguing of various parts of the body ("throats," "tongues," "lips," "mouths," "feet," and "eyes") to make the point that all human beings in their totality are sinful.

Paul's argument is that all of these passages refer not just to the plight of the Gentiles, but more particularly to the condition of the Jews—for, as he argues, "whatever the law says, it says to those who are under the law, so that every mouth might be silenced and the whole world held accountable to God" (3:19). It need not be supposed, however, that such an application was uniquely his or new to his addressees. Indeed, he introduces his statement of 3:19 with the words "Now we know" (οἶδαμεν δέ), which suggests agreement. Perhaps, in fact, this list of passages in 3:10-18 represents a *testimonia* collection already drawn up by Jewish Christians before him, as the selection of passages, their textforms, and the structure of the catena seem to indicate. At any rate, he expects his addressees at Rome—whom we have posited were plugged into the theology and traditions of Jerusalem Christianity—to agree with him. And so having begun the negative development of his thesis statement in 1:16-17 with allusions to Wisdom of Solomon 13-15, he now closes that portrayal of the universality of sin with what seems to have been a catena of passages drawn up by his Jewish Christian predecessors.

The final group of quotations in Paul's discussion of 'righteousness and justification by faith' is to be found in 4:1-24, where Abraham is presented as the example of faith par excellence. Four passages are quoted: (1) Gen 15:6 ("Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness") in vv. 2 and 22, the first being introduced by the rhetorical question, "For what does the Scripture say?" (τί γὰρ ἡ γραπὴ λέγει) and the second by the inferential conjunction "for this reason" (διό); (2) Ps 32:1-2 ("Blessed are those whose offenses have been forgiven and whose sins have been covered; blessed are those whose sin the Lord will never count against them") in vv. 7-8, which is introduced by "David says" (Δαυὶδ λέγει); (3) Gen 17:5 ("I have made you a father of many nations") in v. 17, with an echo in v. 18, which is introduced by "as it is written" (καθὼς γέγραπται); and (4) Gen 15:5 ("So shall your seed be") in v. 18b, which is introduced by "according to what was said" (κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον). Gen 15:5-6 and 17:5 are the main passages that speak of God's blessing and promise to Abraham. To these standard passages is added Ps 32:1-2, which is cited in midrashic fashion to support Gen 15:6 and to highlight God's action in both "crediting righteousness" (ἐλογίσθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην) and "not counting sin" (οὐ μὴ λογίσηται ἁμαρτίαν).

In effect, therefore, Paul begins the first four chapters of his letter to believers at Rome in quite a traditional manner—not only praising his addressees and agreeing with them, but also using materials and methods that they and he held in common. He believes, as he said in the first part of the *Propositio* of Gal 2:15-21, that all true believers in Jesus, whether Jew or Gentile, know that a person is not justified by "the works of the law," but by what Christ has effected and one's faith in him (vv. 15-16). So he writes with confidence to his Roman addressees, expressing as he starts his letter what they and he hold in common—before then going on to speak of matters that pertain to the distinctive nature of his proclamation ("my gospel") within the Gentile mission.

5:1-8:39—Relationships "in Adam" and "in Christ"

Though many have taken Paul's discussion of 1:16–4:25 to continue on through 5:11,¹⁷ or on through 5:21,¹⁸ most commentators today view 5:1-8:39 as a distinguishable unit of material.¹⁹ That is not only because the example of Abraham as a "proof from Scripture" is a fitting conclusion to what precedes, but also because 5:1-11 seems to serve as something of a thesis paragraph for what follows—with most of the themes and many of the terms that appear in 5:1-11 re-appearing in 8:18-39, thereby setting up an *inclusio* or type of "ring composition." As well, (1) 5:1 seems to function as a literary hinge in first summarizing the argument of 1:16-4:25 ("Since, therefore, we have been justified through faith") and then preparing for what follows in 5:2-8:39 ("we have peace [or, 'let us have peace'] with God through our Lord Jesus Christ"); (2) the word chain shifts from πιστεύω / πίστις and the dominance of the term δικαιοσύνη in 1:16-4:25 to ζῶω / ζωή and the dominance of ἁμαρτία and θάνατος in 5:1-8:39; (3) the style shifts from an argumentative tone in 1:16-4:25 to a more "confessional style" that is cast into the first person plural "we" in 5:1-8:39; and (4) there appears throughout the repeated refrain διὰ / ἐν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, not only as an *inclusio* at 5:1 and 8:39 but also at the end of each of the separate units within this larger section at 5:11, 5:21, 6:23, and 7:25.

Much more could be said, of course, about 5:1-8:39 by way of commentary. What needs to be noted for our purpose here, however, is the difference in the use of Scripture in this portion as compared with 1:16-4:25. For whereas chaps. 1-4 contain some 15-18 biblical

17. E.g., Luther (with 5:12-21 being considered an excursus), Melancthon, T. Zahn, F. Leenhardt, M. Black, J. A. T. Robinson.

18. E.g., Calvin, U. Wilckens, O. Kuss, F. F. Bruce, J. D. G. Dunn.

19. E.g., H. Schlier, A. Nygren, O. Michel, C. H. Dodd, N. Dahl, C. E. B. Cranfield, E. Käsemann, J. A. Fitzmyer, D. Moo.

quotations located at eight or nine places (see above), biblical quotations in chaps. 5-8 are notoriously lacking. One quotation appears at 7:7 with the citing of the tenth commandment "Do not covet," whether taken from Exod 20:17 or Deut 5:21, or both—or simply repeated from common Jewish tradition. But the citing of the tenth commandment is only used as an illustration of how a divine prescription, because of human depravity, can be turned into sin and result in death. The only other biblical quotation in chaps. 5-8 appears at the end of the section in 8:36, quoting Ps 44:22: "For your sake we face death all the day long; we are consumed as sheep to be slaughtered." It is introduced by the formulaic phrase "as it is written" (καθὼς γέγραπται). But it appears in conjunction with a number of other portions in 8:33-39 that have been seen to be confessional statements drawn from the early church, and so may not be distinctly Paul's own quotation. The only two explicit biblical citations in chaps. 5-8, therefore, look very much like traditional materials that Paul used either (1) simply to illustrate in specific fashion a general statement, or (2) because the passage was included in a confessional portion that he quoted. Certainly they do not function as did his biblical quotations in chaps. 1-4—nor do they function, to anticipate a later discussion, as they do in chaps. 9-11.

How does one explain this difference between 1:16- 4:25 and 5:1- 8:39 in Paul's use of Scripture—the former with an abundant use, evidently to build bridges of commonality with his addressees and to support and focus his arguments; the latter with almost no use at all? Perhaps this difference supports the thesis that chaps. 1-11 contain two Pauline sermons: one to a Jewish audience that was originally made up of materials now in chaps. 1-4 and 9-11, but whose parts have somehow become separated; the other to a Gentile audience as represented in chaps. 5-8.²⁰ More likely, however, it can be argued that in chaps. 5-8 Paul is presenting what he spoke of in the Thanksgiving section of his letter as his "spiritual gift" to his Roman addressees for their strengthening (1:11)—that is, the form of the gospel that he customarily proclaimed within his Gentile mission, which in the concluding doxology he calls "my gospel" (16:25).

Approaching the relationship of chaps. 1-4 and 5-8 from the perspective of this latter thesis, 1:16- 4:25 can be seen as the type of proclamation that Paul knew was held in common by all Jewish believers in Jesus—as his opening statement in the *Propositio* of Gal 2:15-21 plainly declares: "We who are Jews by birth, and not 'sinners of the Gentiles,' know that a person is not justified by the works

20. So R. Scroggs, "Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies in Romans 1-11," in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians (Festschrift for W. D. Davies)*; ed. R. Hammerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs; Leiden: Brill, 1976) 271-98.

of the law (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου) but by the faith/faithfulness of Jesus Christ (διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; or, of course, 'by faith in Jesus Christ'), and so we have put our faith in Christ Jesus" (vv. 15-16a). That form of Christian proclamation, it may be posited from Rom 1:16-17 and 3:21-26, laid stress on such Jewish concepts as "the righteousness of God," "the witness of the Law and the Prophets," "justification," "redemption," and "expiation/propitiation," seeking only to focus attention on Jesus as Israel's Messiah and faith as one's proper response—features that Jewish Christians believed were certainly inherent in Israel's religion. It proclaimed the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham in Jesus' ministry and the church's message, honored the Mosaic law as the God-ordained "pedagogue" for the nation Israel, cherished the traditions of the Jerusalem church, and supported its proclamation by a christocentric reading of holy Scripture. And with this form of Christian proclamation Paul was thoroughly in agreement, probably often presenting the gospel in this manner himself when occasion demanded.

In 5:1-8:39, however, it may be claimed, Paul sets out the features of the gospel as he proclaimed them in his Gentile mission, to those who had no Jewish heritage and no biblical instruction. Prominent among these features, as highlighted in these chapters, are such matters as "peace with God," the experience of divine grace, glory and love, the gift of the Holy Spirit, "reconciliation" with God and others, deliverance from sin and death, being "in Christ," and being unable to be separated from "Christ's love"—and so from God's love and protection. These are matters that can be based, by analogy, on God's past dealing with Israel as recorded in Scripture. But they were also matters, evidently, that were not directly demonstrable to Gentiles by specific biblical texts. Nor, it seems, would such an approach have been meaningful or appreciated by Gentiles. Rather, Paul's emphases on "peace with God," "reconciliation," being "in Christ," being "in the Spirit," etc. (as in chaps. 5-8) appear to have stemmed primarily from his own conversion experience.

Christ's confrontation of Paul on the Damascus Road, with all that went into the apostle's subsequent understanding of it, confirmed for him what the early Jewish believers in Jesus were proclaiming—which, of course, he also proclaimed (so Rom 1:16-4:25). In addition, however, it gave him a new understanding of (1) relationship with God, (2) relationships with others, and (3) the logistics for a Gentile mission (so Galatians 1-2). Therefore in writing to Christians at Rome, who were largely dependent on the theology and traditions of the Jerusalem church, he speaks in the Thanksgiving section of his letter of wanting to give them a "spiritual gift" (1:11) and refers in the Doxology to "my gospel" (16:25).

The essence of what Paul believed to be uniquely his, I am suggesting, is what he presents in 5:1-8:39. From at least Augustine²¹ to the present day,²² these four chapters have frequently been viewed as the apex of Paul's argument in Romans. They deal with the central factors of human existence—viz., sin, death, life, and relationship with God and others. And these are matters, it is further suggested, that Paul found resolved and illuminated primarily by his conversion experience, with his practice being to present them to his Gentile audiences in his Gentile mission without any necessary reference to the Jewish Scriptures. So he sets them out in 5:1-8:39 as a supplement to what his dominantly Gentile addressees at Rome already believe, as he previously depicted in 1:16- 4:25.

9:1-11:36—The Gospel and the Hope of Israel

That 9:1-11:36 comprises a carefully composed unit of material is beyond doubt. It has a clear beginning at 9:1-5—probably including an early Jewish Christian confessional portion in v. 5b, with its use of Χριστός in the titular sense of "Messiah" (the most obvious use of Χριστός as a title in Paul's letters). It also has a clear ending in its hymn of praise to God at 11:33-36. And throughout the material contained within this *inclusio* the argument is sustained.

But while the unity of these three chapters is clear, debate continues to rage regarding (1) the relation of chaps. 9-11 to chaps. 1-4 and 5-8, and (2) the function of chaps. 9-11 vis-à-vis the overall argument of the letter. It is impossible here to reproduce anything approaching the depth and breadth of discussion that has gone on regarding these two issues. Suffice it only to point out with regard to the first, the relation of chaps. 9-11 to the materials of chaps. 1-8, that there is a very close connection between 9:1-11:36 and 1:16-4:25, both linguistically and thematically. The word chain πιστεύω / πίστις and the term δικαιοσύνη, which were dominant in 1:16- 4:25, reappear in force in 9:1-11:36. More importantly, the axiom "first for the Jew, then for the Gentile" of 1:16, 2:10 and the extensive denunciation of Jewish self-congratulation in 2:1-3:20 call for a fuller exposition on the state of the Jews; while the claim that the gospel is supported by "the Law and the Prophets" in 3:21 (also the biblical passages cited throughout 1:16- 4:25) and the assertion that Chris-

21. Cf. Augustine's emphasis on God's sovereign grace in Romans 5-9, as set out in his *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistula ad Romanos*, which was written shortly after his return to North Africa in 391.

22. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson's simile of Romans as a canal that crosses an isthmus with a series of locks, the highest being that of chaps. 5-8 and the watershed being chap. 8, in *Wrestling with Romans* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979).

tian faith is illustrated by the faith of Abraham in 4:1-24 call for an answer to the question, "If this be so, why have the Jews rejected it?"

On the other hand, connections between 9:1-11:36 and 5:1-8:39 are more obscure. As Joseph Fitzmyer points out,

Nowhere in chaps. 9-11 does the "Spirit" appear (save in 9:1 and 11:8, and then in an entirely different sense!), and the whole argument moves in a direction quite different from the thrust of chaps. 5-8. Similarly, the theme of "life" disappears (save in 11:15, which is a problem apart), and *doxa* occurs only in 9:23, a verse that does refer to the predestination of 8:28-30. Moreover, the function of "illustration" [as sometimes proposed by commentators] does not explain well the bulk of chaps. 9-11.²³

Still, as noted by Fitzmyer (above), the so-called "golden chain" of 8:28-30—"called . . . foreknown . . . predestined . . . called . . . justified . . . glorified"—nicely sets up a further exposition of these matters in chaps. 9-11. As well, the expression "the elect of God" (ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ) in 8:33, which is used by Paul with reference to Gentiles who have faith, seems to be the verbal springboard for the ensuing discussion of faith, election, the remnant, and relations between believing Gentiles and Jews in chaps. 9-11. So chaps. 9-11 must be seen to function as an appropriate conclusion to the materials of chaps. 1-8.

But just how chaps. 9-11 function as a conclusion to the presentations of chaps. 1-8 is beyond the scope of this paper. Various explanations have been offered. Many have seen these chapters to be teaching predestination (e.g., Augustine, Aquinas and Calvin); others, free will (e.g., Origen, Chrysostom and Arminius); and still others, universalism. Some have taken chaps. 9-11 to be a theodicy; others, a History of Religions presentation; and still others, a *Heilsgeschichte* ("Salvation History") explanation. For myself, I take a remnant approach, believing that what Paul is doing in these chapters is setting out—in quite a traditional manner—his thesis regarding a remnant of believing Jews, to which he then connects the remnant of believing Gentiles. But all of that must be left for commentary.

What is clear, however, and needs to be highlighted here, is that Paul's discussion in 9:1-11:36 is peppered throughout with biblical citations. Some 30 quotations from the OT, in fact, are set out in 25-26 places in these three chapters, with such standard Pauline introductory formulas appearing as "as it is written" (9:13, 33; 10:15; 11:8, 26), "he [God] says" (9:15, 25; 11:4), "the Scripture says" (9:16; 10:11; 11:2), "Isaiah cries out/says" (9:27, 29; 10:16, 20, 21), "Moses wrote/says" (10:5, 19), and "David says" (11:9). Only in 10:6-8, where Deut 30:12-14 is paraphrastically quoted or alluded to in a proverbial fashion, is there to be found an exception to Paul's usual citation of Scripture. But that passage is introduced by a more general introductory

23. *Romans*, 540.

statement, "the righteousness that is by faith says" (v. 6). So it probably, as many have argued, represents a traditional proverb based on Scripture that was used among early Jewish believers, and which here Paul used to keep contact with his Roman addressees and to support his argument in a manner that they would appreciate.

Each of the 30 or so quotations in these chapters, of course, needs to be studied separately for any full discussion of Paul's use of Scripture. Generally, however, it can be said that Paul's use of Scripture in 9:1-11:36 is very similar to his use in 1:16– 4:25, and for the same reasons. For while it might be claimed, on analogy with Galatians, that both of these sections should be read as polemical thrusts against a Judaizing threat (whether lurking or actual; whether arising from within or outside of the various Roman congregations), all that need be seen is that Paul in Romans is (1) addressing a group of Christians (both Gentiles and Jews, though dominantly the former) whose theology and traditions have been extensively formed by Jerusalem Christianity, and (2) speaking to them in ways that they would appreciate and understand, using both their traditions and Scripture in so doing.

12:1-15:13 and 15:14-32—Exhortations and Apostolic Parousia

Likewise, what has been said about 1:16– 4:25 and 9:1-11:36 should probably also be said, in the main, about the Exhortations of 12:1-15:13 and the Apostolic Parousia of 15:14-32.

The exhortation section may be seen as composed of two units: the first on "Love and Peace" in 12:1-13:14; the second on "Tolerance and Acceptance" in 14:1-15:13—with each unit having its own provenance in Paul's preaching, but now brought together to buttress his purpose in addressing believers at Rome. As well, it might be that such topics as "Love and Peace" and "Tolerance and Acceptance" express some type of polemical thrust, and so the exhortations should be read as Paul's attempts to quiet antagonisms or heal estrangements among certain "strong" and "weak" believers at Rome. But it "mirror-reading" of the supposed polemics does not produce a very clear picture of the postulated situation. More likely, all that need be argued is that Paul is addressing believers whose theology has stemmed largely from the Jerusalem church and is speaking to them in ways that they would appreciate and understand. And so he cites some ten biblical passages in his Exhortations and one in his Apostolic Parousia.

E. CONCLUSION: AN ANSWER TO OUR QUESTIONS

What, then, can be said in answer to our opening eight questions? To question #1, 'Why did Paul use so many OT quotations in Romans?',

and question #3, 'Why did he use the OT at all in writing to Christians at Rome?', our answer is: Because he was addressing believers (Gentiles and Jews, but dominantly the former) whose theology and traditions stemmed largely from the Jerusalem church, and so he used Scripture to support and focus his presentation in a manner that would be appreciated and understood by them. To question #2, 'Why is the distribution of OT quotations in Romans so uneven?', our answer is: Because in 5:1-8:39, which is the section that is largely devoid of such quotations, Paul's purpose was to present to a dominantly Gentile group of believers the essence of what he customarily proclaimed to Gentiles—which message he thought of as his unique "spiritual gift" to believers at Rome (1:11), and so he called it "my gospel" (16:25). This message, evidently, arose primarily out of his own conversion experience, and so he felt that it did not need to be buttressed by explicit references to Scripture. Answers to questions #1-#3, therefore, depend largely on how we have understood "The Addressees and their Circumstances" (mainly as inferred from external data) and "Paul's Purpose in Writing" (mainly from "mirror-reading" the opening and closing sections of the letter).

Our answers to questions #4 and #5 follow along the same lines, being derivative in nature. As for Paul's exegetical procedures (Question #4), we propose that they are those shared by Paul and the traditions from Jerusalem, which were accepted by Gentile believers at Rome. Therefore, there was a commonality of exegetical practice and procedure between Paul and his addressees at Rome, which commonality can be traced back to the practices and procedures of Second Temple Judaism. And as for Paul's use of Scripture in Romans vis-à-vis his use in his other letters, particularly Galatians (Question #5), we believe that the similarities are due not to similar problems being confronted (i.e., the Judaizers and their message) but to the same theological structures and traditions of Jewish Christianity being addressed (i.e., the Jerusalem church)—though with those structures and traditions being differently explicated to Gentile believers in Galatia (wrongly) and to dominantly Gentile believers at Rome (correctly).

Questions #6-#8 (on textforms, scope of treatment, and christocentric interpretation) can be adequately dealt with only by means of a close study of each of the biblical quotations separately, whether by means of a commentary or one or more monographs. Our purpose in this paper has only been to set out a prolegomena to such intensive treatments. So we must conclude with the hope that our attempted prolegomena will provide some guidance for future study.