

“Children of Promise”: Spiritual Paternity and Patriarch Typology in Galatians and Romans

GÜNTHER H. JUNCKER

TOCCOA FALLS COLLEGE

This article begins by asking whether Paul’s second reference to “Israel” in Rom 9:6b refers to the faithful Jewish remnant alone or to the eschatological people of God comprising believing Jews and Gentiles together and suggests that a satisfactory answer can be obtained if this verse is viewed in the larger context of Paul’s discourse in which the patriarchs repeatedly play a determinative and predominantly typological role in marking out the boundaries of God’s eschatological people. The remainder of the article closely examines Gal 3 and 4:21–31 as well as Rom 4 and 9:7–13 in order to demonstrate that there is an underlying hermeneutical consistency to Paul’s typological use of the patriarchs and that this consistency is supportive of the view that “Israel” in Rom 9:6b refers to spiritual Israel—that is, the church.

Key Words: children of promise, typology, eschatology, church, people of God, Israel, spiritual Israel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Ishmael, Esau, Gal 4:21–31, Rom 9:6–13

According to Paul, the crowning proof that Israel’s rejection of gospel and Messiah has not rendered the promises of God null and void is the fact that “not all Israel is *Israel*” (Rom 9:6b). But immediately a problem arises: Who and what is *Israel*? Is Paul’s second reference to Israel to be understood *restrictively* as denoting the faithful Jewish remnant, or is it to be understood *expansively* as denoting the church made up of believing Jews and Gentiles together? Surely Paul’s crowning proof cannot hold good both ways: that would be a remarkable proof indeed! Paul undoubtedly believed in the existence of a Jewish remnant *and* in the existence of a church that is in salvation-historical continuity with God’s covenant people Israel.¹ But does the balance of probability favor one understanding of the term *Israel* over the other in Rom 9:6b? It should be added that

1. J. D. G. Dunn (*The Theology of Paul the Apostle* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 508) is thus quite correct to say that “a Christianity which does not understand itself in some proper sense as ‘Israel’ forfeits its claim to the scriptures of Israel”—and, one might add, to the blessings promised God’s people in those Scriptures.

the question is not *whether* Paul could change the meaning or referent of the term *Israel* within so short a span, for it is quite evident that he has done so; the question is only how *radically* he has changed it. At stake here are two dramatically different readings not only of Rom 9:6b but also of Rom 9 and, what is more, the place of Rom 9 in the argument of Romans as a whole. Though commentators remain divided, it will be suggested that a satisfactory resolution can be obtained if Paul's reference to Israel in Rom 9:6b is viewed not only in the context of the typological elaboration of Israel's patriarchs that immediately follows in Rom 9:7–13 but also in the larger context of Paul's previous discourse, in which patriarchs repeatedly play a determinative role in marking out the boundaries of God's eschatological people.

The initial impetus behind this investigation was the clarification of a single equivocal term in Rom 9:6b in the hopes of more precisely elucidating the thrust of Paul's revolutionary argument that God's word has not fallen because "what God has done is what he always said he would do. God has not been unfaithful to the promises that were actually made."² But what were the promises that were made? And to whom were they made? The resulting investigation has ranged a bit more widely than was initially anticipated. But this was necessitated by Paul's remarkable use of the term in question: specifically, by the way in which the term "Israel" in Rom 9:6b is effectively defined and delimited in Rom 9:7–13 with reference to patriarchs whose significance has, in turn, been defined and delimited by Paul's earlier arguments in Gal 3–4 and in Rom 4.³ These texts are all part of a larger pattern of predominantly typological exegesis; they have all been cut, so to speak, from the same hermeneutical cloth and cannot be understood in isolation from one another.⁴ This means that the interpretation of "Israel" in Rom 9:6b that fits best within this broader polemical-typological matrix will have a strong *prima facie* claim to validity.

2. N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 238.

3. Galatians precedes Romans *historically* and thus sets the hermeneutical trajectory for Paul's later use of patriarchs in Romans, while Rom 4 precedes Rom 9 *contextually* in a "linear" reading of this epistle and thus effectively limits, perhaps more narrowly than has generally been recognized, the number of plausible interpretations of that later chapter (cf. C. H. Cosgrove, *Elusive Israel: The Puzzle of Election in Romans* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997], 22–23).

4. The definitive work on typology remains that of Goppelt, and it is his understanding of typology that will be adopted in what follows: "Only historical facts—persons, actions, events, and institutions—are material for typological interpretation; words and narratives can be utilized only insofar as they deal with such matters. These things are to be interpreted typologically only if they are considered to be divinely ordained representations or types of future realities that will be even greater and more complete" (L. Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982], 17–18; cf. x, 202, 218–23, and *passim*; cf. H. D. Betz, *Galatians* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979], 239).

ABRAHAM'S SPIRITUAL PATERNITY IN GALATIANS 3

Much of the theological argument of Galatians revolves around Abraham and the identity of his "sons" (υιοί), "seed" (σπέρμα), and "children" (τέκνα). References to Abrahamic sonship frame off and punctuate the entire argumentative section of the epistle (Gal 3:7, 29; 4:21–31). Not only is sonship the "exegetical thesis" of Gal 3:6–18, as Betz points out,⁵ it is also "the centre of the argument" of all of Gal 3–4.⁶ To the extent that descent from Abraham was one of the primary ways that Jews defined themselves in the first century,⁷ what Paul—himself a first-century Jew—does with this concept is striking. Paul's foundational OT proof-text in Gal 3, as also in Rom 4 where Abraham is first introduced, is Gen 15:6, "Abraham BELIEVED GOD AND IT WAS RECKONED TO HIM AS RIGHTEOUSNESS" (Gal 3:6; Rom 4:3, 22–23). But he does not immediately argue, as one might have expected in light of Gal 2:16, that since Abraham believed God and was reckoned righteous, therefore all who similarly believe will similarly be reckoned righteous. Instead Paul says that all who believe are *sons of Abraham* (Gal 3:7). Only after saying this does he go on to mention justification by faith, adding that the eschatological existence of justified *Gentiles* had been promised to Abraham beforehand in Scripture (Gal 3:8; cf. Gen 12:3, 18:18, 22:18). The thoroughly eschatological thrust of Gal 3:8 and the promise to Abraham on which it is based are indicated by the two prefixed verbs (cf. Rom 1:2, 9:29) and by the future tense of the key verb in Paul's OT citation: "Scripture, *foreseeing* (προϊδοῦσα) that God would justify the nations by faith, declared the Gospel *in advance* (προεσηγγέλισατο) to Abraham, namely, that 'IN YOU ALL THE NATIONS WILL BE BLESSED (ἐνευλογηθήσονται).'" The time of the fulfillment of the promises is at hand; and the fulfillment is taking place in the church.⁸

The reference to believing *Gentiles* as "sons of Abraham" is both daring and subversive. Though perhaps initially suggested by or based upon the widespread idiomatic use of the expression "son of . . ." to indicate "spiritual kinship or association,"⁹ Paul's use of the expression with reference to

5. Betz, *ibid.*, 138, 141.

6. E. De Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), 155; cf. J. G. D. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 162.

7. That the Jews were God's chosen people was "predicated on the traditional understanding that Abraham is the father of all Jews" (B. D. Chilton, "Judaism," *DJG* 398 [full article, pp. 398–405]). This connection to the great patriarch was "firmly fixed" in the minds of first-century Jews (A. R. Millard, "Abraham," *ABD* 1:36). Cf. G. Schrenck, "πατήρ," *TDNT* 5:976, 1005; Dunn, *Galatians*, 160. On Jewish self-definition more broadly, see E. P. Sanders, ed., *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); L. H. Schiffman, *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism* (Hoboken, NJ: KTAV, 1985).

8. Goppelt, *Typos*, 138.

9. For the idiomatic use of "son" to indicate ethical kinship, see B. Byrne, *'Sons of God' – 'Seed of Abraham': A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background* (AnBib 83; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1979), 148; and cf. *TDOT* 2:149,

a literal progenitor seems to strain the limits of this Semitic idiom. Abraham's faith was indeed exemplary; and all who believe as he did will be reckoned righteous as he was.¹⁰ But Paul does not stop with that. He makes it abundantly clear that the bond of kinship established by faith is of such overriding importance that it completely relativizes genetic descent and, at the same time, necessitates a redefinition of the people of God and the basis for membership in that people. Faith like Abraham's is now seen to be the defining characteristic—the *sine qua non*—of membership in the eschatological people of God. It is not literal genetic descent but faith that constitutes one a "son" of Abraham and (which is to say the same thing) a member of the people of God. Justification by faith and Abrahamic sonship are thus inextricably bound up with what in some ways is a larger and more fundamental concern: *Who are the people of God? Who are the people to whom and about whom the promises in Scripture were made?*

Much the same may also be said of Gal 3:23–29, where Paul again seems to go beyond the immediate requirements of his argument regarding justification by faith apart from the law to affirm that all who, through faith, are in Christ are "Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise" (3:29). Alongside of being justified by faith (3:24), being in Christ (3:26, 28), and being sons of God (!)(3:26), being "Abraham's seed" (3:29) seems almost anticlimactic—that is, unless it is a categorical summary affirmation that all who believe are God's (polemically redefined) people, who alone possess the aforesaid status and privileges and who alone are the heirs and recipients of God's promises to Abraham. Paul's use of the theologically freighted *σπέρμα* instead of *υἱοί* underscores that *when Paul calls believers "sons of Abraham" he means to say that they are the eschatological people of God.* They are the fulfillment of the "seed" promises to Abraham and the eschatological recipients ("heirs") of the blessings recounted in the OT.

What was it that compelled Paul to such a radical redefinition of the people of God? Doubtless it was, at least in part, the observation that through faith in the promised Jewish Messiah *Gentiles* had been reckoned righteous and had received the eschatological gift of the Spirit (Gal 3:14; cf. 3:2–5, 4:6). Believing *Gentiles* had inherited the promises made to Abraham's children, the people of God, in the OT; therefore, believing *Gentiles* had been included among Abraham's children and the people of God (cf. Acts 15:7–18). If in the popular aphorism possession is nine-tenths of the law, here it is everything. The recipients of the promises to God's people *are* God's people.¹¹ Paul is so profoundly convinced of this that he can even go

152–53; D. J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (5 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–2001), 2:186, 207–8; TDNT 8:345–47, 358–59, 365; BAGD, 833–34 1.c.

10. R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1990), 113, "Abraham's faith . . . stands as the prototype of human response to God."

11. See, in a slightly different context, W. Trilling, *Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (SANT 10; Munich: Kösel, 1964), 95: "Matthäus spricht in possessione. Der Inhalt dieses 'Besitzes' ist in 21,43 ausgesprochen, es ist nicht weniger als die βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Wem diese Basileia von Gott gegeben worden ist, wer sie 'hat', der ist Israel."

so far as to call believing Jews and Gentiles together "the *Israel* of God" in Gal 6:16.¹² God alone determines the identity of his people and the names appropriate to them. But if this is the case, if this is indeed what God has mysteriously done in the eschatological "fullness of time" (Gal 4:4), then not a few foundational OT passages needed rethinking. One such passage is Gen 16–21, which recounts the birth of Abraham's two sons; and the initial result of Paul's rethinking can be found in Gal 4.

THE TYPOLOGICAL USE OF ISAAC AND ISHMAEL
IN GALATIANS 4:21–31

The argument in Gal 3 that all believers, Jews and Gentiles alike, are Abraham's true or *spiritual* sons and seed has prepared the way for Paul's climactic typological exposition of this truth in Gal 4:21–31, where many of the same key terms and ideas reappear.¹³ Bringing together the various strands of his earlier argumentation, Paul emphatically and repeatedly affirms that Abraham is the *spiritual* father of all believers, who are, in turn, his promised children:

Abraham had two sons (υἱούς) . . . one by the free woman (4:22);
the one by the free woman was born through a promise (4:23);
the Jerusalem above . . . is our mother (4:26);
the CHILDREN (τέκνα) OF THE DESOLATE ONE (4:27 citing Isa 54:1);
You [*v.l.* we], brethren, like Isaac are children (τέκνα) of promise (4:28);
the son (υἱός) of the free woman (4:30);
we, brethren, are . . . children (τέκνα) of the free woman (4:31).

There are many noteworthy features in this passage, not least the supreme importance of the promise, the (eschatological) inheritance, and the fairly obvious and straightforward Isaac and Ishmael typologies.¹⁴ These two foundational typologies, however, are not perfectly symmetrical. As a child of promise whose birth was wholly dependent on the gracious activity of God, Isaac stands as a type of the "children of promise," namely, Jewish and Gentile believers. The Ishmael typology, on the other hand, is

12. On this verse, see esp. N. A. Dahl, "Der Name Israel, I: Zur Auslegung von Gal. 6, 16," *Judaica* 6 (1950): 161–70. See also Betz, *Galatians*, 322–23; R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 96; W. Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes: Zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus* (WUNT 85; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 251–52; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians* (repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962 [original 1865]), 224–25; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 298–99; J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians* (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 565–77; Goppelt, *Typos*, 140, 224; TDNT 3:387–88, 3:517, and 4:57; J. A. D. Weima, "Gal. 6:11–18: A Hermeneutical Key to the Galatian Letter," *CTJ* 28 (1993): 104–6.

13. For earlier uses of key terms see, e.g., "Abraham" in Gal 3:6–9, 14, 16–18; "sons" in 3:7; 4:6–7 (cf. "seed" in 3:16, 29); "slave" in 4:1–7; "heir" and "inheritance" in 3:18; 4:1–6; "promise" in 3:14–22; and "law" *passim*.

14. The promise is clearly that of Gen 18:10, 14 (cf. Gen 17:19). Though only alluded to here (as also in Rom 4:20), it is expressly cited with reference to the birth of Isaac in Rom 9:9b. The language of "heirs" and "inheritance" is also found in Gal 3:18, 29; 4:1, 7; 5:21; cf. Rom 4:13–14; 8:17.

much more restricted. As a child of flesh, Ishmael stands as a type of the children of flesh. But these children are not Jewish and Gentile unbelievers; they are not unbelievers qua unbelievers but only (nomistic) Jewish unbelievers. In addition to these cursory observations, there are two other features of this passage that warrant more extended comment. The first is the importance of the Sarah/Zion link to *realized* eschatological realities, which helps to explain why “mother Sarah” is in actuality more prominent in this passage than “father Abraham,” and the second is the typological status of Ishmael as both *slave* and *persecutor*.

The Sarah/Zion Link to Realized Eschatological Realities

With reference to the first feature, Longenecker suggests that Paul has himself conflated two distinct traditions by means of the common exegetical technique of *gezera shawa* or “word analogy,” these traditions being Sarah as the barren wife “who was destined to be the mother of nations” and “the holy city of Jerusalem, the eschatological Zion, who symbolically is the mother of God’s own.”¹⁵ The rare term “barren” (στεῖρα = עקר) is found in both Gen 11:30 and Isa 54:1, and Paul could have used this term to associate Sarah’s barrenness and its promised removal with the promised eschatological restoration of Zion. It is also possible that the association of Gen 11:30 with Isa 54:1 was not original to Paul and that it is only the surprising use to which he puts the texts that is original. The midrash on Gen 11:30, for example, seems to suggest that these texts were part of a larger nexus of texts traditionally used to connect Sarah with Zion: “Thus: AND SARAI WAS BARREN; SHE HAD NO CHILD: eventually she did have, as it is written, *And the Lord remembered Sarah* (Gen. XXI, I). . . . Again, *She is Zion, there is none that careth for her* (Jer. XXX, 17). Yet eventually she will have [one to care for her, as it is written], *And a redeemer will come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression*, etc. (Isa. LIX, 20).”¹⁶

More important than the word “barren,” however, is the fact that the promise in Isa 54:1 consists of and is defined by τέκνα. It is in the end τέκνα rather than στεῖρα that is the more important linking word: not between Isa 54:1 and Gen 11:30, since the word is not found in that particular Genesis text, but between Isa 54:1 and the broader OT context in Genesis that Paul is summarily dealing with here in Gal 4:21–31. The probability of this is increased when one notes that Paul repeatedly quotes and alludes to the promises to Abraham in Gen 17–22 but never betrays any dependence on

15. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 215. See, for example, the reference to “Zion, the mother of us all,” in 4 *Ezra* 10:7.

16. H. Freedman, trans., *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis* (2 vols.; London: Soncino, 1983), 1:312. The citation above is from *Midr. Rab.* 38.14 on Gen 11:30. A connection, interestingly enough, is not directly made between Gen 11:30 and Isa 54:1 in this midrash but, most likely assuming and elaborating on that connection, to Isa 59:20. This text in Isaiah was of the utmost importance to Paul as well (cf. Rom 11:27).

Gen 11.¹⁷ It is also the word τέκνα that is immediately taken up in the following verse (Gal 4:28) as being directly applicable to Sarah and to her bearing of the promised child, Isaac, who typologically represents all believers. Believing Jews and Gentiles together are the promised children of Abraham. Moreover, as children of Sarah, they are also eschatological Israel and the restored Zion of prophetic expectation.¹⁸ The connection to Sarah is by no means incidental to Paul's argument: for it confirms even more clearly than his OT citation in Gal 3:8 the thoroughly *eschatological* nature of the *present* Abrahamic sonship and τέκνα-status of all believers. "Since, therefore, 'the Jerusalem that is above' is an eschatological term expressing a reality that will exist in the future, Paul's use of it here for the experience of the Galatian believers implies that, as Paul understood matters, the Galatian believers had come into the eschatological situation of already participating in that future reality."¹⁹

The promised future is here; the eschatological "now" has arrived (Gal 4:29; cf. Rom 3:21, 26; 8:1; 11:30–31; 16:25–26; 2 Cor 6:2). This is not a "side-track" away from the main argument regarding Abraham's sons;²⁰ it is an integral and indispensable part of the main argument that more precisely defines the typological identity of these sons and the *realized* eschatological nature of their sonship. One can now see that Abraham's exemplary faith, as important as it is, is only half of Paul's argument vis-à-vis Abraham. The other half is *Paul's polemical and thoroughly eschatological redefinition of the people of God*. Those who have faith like Abraham are, like Isaac, his promised "sons" and "children" and "seed." They are the ones destined to inherit the promises made to Abraham. They are the eschatological restoration of Israel. From this it is no great leap to Gal 6:16, a few verses later, where Paul calls all who believe "the Israel of God" and implies the existence of an Israel that is not "of God" in spite of its bona fide claim to genetic descent from Abraham.²¹

17. For example, Gen 17:17 = Rom 4:19; Gen 18:10, 14 = Rom 9:9; Gen 18:18 = Gal 3:8 (cf. Rom 4:13); Gen 21:2 = Gal 4:22; Gen 21:9 = Gal 4:22, 29; Gen 21:10 = Gal 4:30; Gen 21:12 = Rom 9:7; Gen 22:17–18 = Rom 4:13.

18. See Goppelt, *Typos*, 139.

19. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 216.

20. Pace Dunn, *Galatians*, 255.

21. This reference to the church as "Israel" is consistent with his transference of the LXX terms ἐκκλησία and λαός from national Israel to the church (Goppelt, *Typos*, 140–41). On λαός, see esp. H. Strathmann, "λαός," *TDNT* 4:54–57; and on ἐκκλησία, see R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; New York: Scribner, 1951–55), 1:38, who is worth quoting at some length: "In understanding themselves as Congregation or Church the disciples appropriate to themselves the title of the Old Testament Congregation of God, the קהל יְהוָה. On the one hand, this title designates Israel as the People of God, and on the other hand, it had already become an eschatological term; for Judaism expected of the end of days that it would bring the gathering together of now scattered Israel. . . . By designating itself Congregation—more exactly, Congregation of God—the earliest Church declared that it itself was the fulfilment of the hopes of the apocalyptists. Its members accordingly bear the eschatological titles 'the chosen' or 'the elect' and 'the saints.'"

The Typological Status of Ishmael as Slave and Persecutor

In addition to the Sarah/Zion link to *realized* eschatological realities, there is a second feature of this passage that warrants comment. This second feature is the dual status of Ishmael as both *slave* and *persecutor*. His *slave* status as a child of Hagar, the slave, rather than Sarah, the free woman, represents and corresponds to the present *slavery* of national Israel ὑπὸ νόμου.²² Such is clearly the implication of Paul's multilayered typology and the force of δουλεία and δουλεύω in Gal 4:24–25 (cf. 4:1–7, 5:1). It is also the force of the related verb δουλεύω in Rom 9:12b, where Paul again quotes Genesis to similar effect: namely, *that an older brother who typologically represents (unbelieving) empirical Israel will be in slavery*.²³ More will be said below on the significance of this important thematic connection between Galatians and Romans.

Ishmael's typological status as *persecutor* (Gal 4:29) expressly represents and corresponds to the present persecution of believers by unbelieving national Israel (cf. Gal 2:4–5, 4:17, 5:7–12, 6:12–13). The ὡςπερ τότε . . . οὕτως καὶ νῦν signals the presence of a similar-situation typology and reinforces the idea that *Paul is out to redefine polemically not one but two eschatological peoples*. This may be why the theme of Jewish hostility and persecution, supported by means of a variety of typologies, pervades Rom 9–11, for it is there that Paul addresses at greatest length the identity of these same two eschatological peoples along with the OT persons and events that prefigure them. This persecution typology is foundational to Paul's eschatological hermeneutic and is worth belaboring just a bit here.

Paul again refers to Ishmael in Rom 9:7–9 albeit without explicit reference to the persecution typology first found in Gal 4:29. A hint of this important typology may, however, be latent in the reference to Esau that follows in Rom 9:10–13. Readers familiar with the patriarchal narrative would know that Esau viewed Jacob as a usurper of both his birthright and his blessing and, as a result, became enraged with him and sought to kill him (Gen 27:36–45). Readers also familiar with the OT and the history of Israel more broadly would know that this hostility continued unabated in the two nations that descended from these patriarchs.²⁴ Another hint of this persecution typology may also be implicit in Paul's reference to phar-

22. Kraus (*Das Volk Gottes*, 243) rightly speaks at this juncture of “das toraobservante Judentum” and of “das empirische Israel,” for it is national Israel as a whole and not simply the Judaizers that Paul is describing. Paul's choice of prepositions is consistent with his “slave” typology in that ὑπό in Gal 4:21 (cf. Gal 3:23; 4:4, 5; 5:18; Rom 3:21; 6:14, 15) has the strongly negative connotation of being under the “power, rule, sovereignty, command” (BAGD 843) of something undesirable, in this case the law.

23. The citation in Rom 9:12b is from Gen 25:23 (cf. Gen 27:29, 37, 40). Absent the δουλ- word group, a vivid image for servitude or slavery likely stands behind Paul's citation of Ps 68:24 (“bend their backs forever”) in Rom 11:10. So also J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC; 2 vols.; Dallas: Word, 1988), 2:650.

24. See the references to Esau/Edom in, for example, Ezek 25:12–14; 35:5–6, 11; Joel 3:19; Obad 10; Mal 1:2–3 (cf. Rom 9:13).

ah, the oppressor of God's people par excellence, whose "hardening" and possibly even whose historical role foreshadows and typifies that of national Israel (cf. Rom 2:5; 9:18; 11:7, 25).²⁵ The persecution typology first introduced in Gal 4:29 with reference to Ishmael is clearest, however, in Rom 11:2–10, where Paul applies two passages to hostile national Israel that in the OT had originally referred to the enemies and persecutors of God's people. In the first of these similar-situation typologies, Paul likens contemporary national Israel to the Israel of Elijah's day that opposed God, tore down his altars, and killed his prophets (Rom 11:2–5 citing 1 Kgs 19:10, 14; cf. Matt 23:34–37; Luke 11:47–51; Acts 7:52; 1 Thess 2:15).²⁶ Though God has kept for himself a faithful Jewish remnant, yet Israel as a whole is summarily identified in Paul's hermeneutic "with the corrupt priesthood that along with Ahab and Jezebel worshiped Baal."²⁷ In the second of these similar-situation typologies, Paul likens national Israel to the enemies of David, who persecuted him and sought to kill him (Rom 11:9–10, Ps 68:22–23). In a terrible and ironic eschatological reversal, national Israel reenacts the role of David's enemies and persecutors (cf. ἐχθρῶν and κατεδιώξαν in Ps 68:19, 27) and merits the same devastating

25. According to N. A. Dahl, "The Future of Israel," *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 145, "Paul puts the non-believing Jews of his time on the same level not only with Ishmael and Esau, but also with pharaoh and with Babylon (Jer. 50:25), the last-named a symbol for a world power hostile to God." Dahl is right to note that the conjunction of (ἐκ)φέρω, σκεῦος, and ὄργη occurs only in Jer 50[27]:25 and Rom 9:22 and is thus not likely to be coincidental. Pace Dahl, however, Paul's echo of this oracle against Babylon does not liken Israel to Babylon but to the *pagan nation(s)* that would become the catalyst for the return of God's people from exile by causing Babylon's downfall. Is it conceivable that God could harden national Israel as he had hardened pharaoh in order that it might now become the catalyst for the great eschatological exodus and return from exile of God's faithful covenant people—a redefined people inclusive of believing Jews and Gentiles? This seems to be at least one of the implications (cf. Rom 11:11–12, 15, 28) of Paul's eschatologically subversive interpretation of Scripture. On the theme of the eschatological exodus elsewhere in the NT and the redefinition of God's people that it entails, see esp. R. E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* (WUNT 2/88; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); D. W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 2/130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

26. The rare verb "tearing down" (κατασκάπτω) is found elsewhere in the NT only in Acts 15:16, where it refers to God's eschatological work of rebuilding the "fallen" tabernacle of David—that is, the church.

27. C. A. Evans, "Paul and the Prophets: Prophetic Criticism in the Epistle to the Romans (with special reference to Romans 9–11)," in *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. S. K. Soderlund and N. T. Wright; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 126. The reference to this time of national apostasy parallels the reference to the sin of the golden calf that is latent in Paul's citation of Exod 33:19 in Rom 9:15. Both of these past national sins correspond to Israel's present rejection of the promised Messiah. J. Gundry-Volf (*Paul and Perseverance: Staying In and Falling Away* [Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990], 167 n. 25) additionally notes the allusion in Rom 11:1–2 to Israel's national rejection of God as king in 1 Sam 12:22. This suggests that Paul's prayer in Rom 9:3 not only mirrors that of Moses in Exod 32:32 but also resembles that of the prophet Samuel in 1 Sam 12:23. The present eschatological fall of Israel is so great that Paul can only liken it to these times of great national disaster. On the other hand, the present eschatological salvation of believing Jews and Gentiles is so great that Paul can only liken it to times of still greater national deliverance like the exodus and the return from exile.

imprecations.²⁸ As then, so now, Israel is guilty of persecuting God's true people—those who remain faithful to God.²⁹ What should not be missed is that it is none other than *national Israel* that has incurred such a devastating imprecation: an imprecation originally spoken by David against his enemies and persecutors in a psalm interpreted Christologically and eschatologically elsewhere in Romans and the NT (e.g., Mark 15:23, 36; John 2:17; Acts 1:20; Rom 15:3).³⁰ Paul's use of Ps 68 gives evidence of a radical reversal and redefinition of two eschatological peoples, the same two peoples represented in Gal 4:21–31 and in Rom 9:7–9 by Isaac and Ishmael (and again in Rom 9:10–13 by Jacob and Esau).

These are surprising eschatological reversals, though hardly more surprising than that God's true and persecuted people should consist of believing Jews and Gentiles together. Similar eschatological reversals also stand behind and help to explain a number of other closely related passages earlier in Romans. In Rom 2:24, for example, Paul cites Isa 52:5 (cf. Ezek 36:20–23) in order to transfer the responsibility for blaspheming God from the hostile Gentile nations of Egypt and Assyria to the nation of Israel.³¹ In Rom 3:10–18, Paul cites a catena of OT texts to describe national Israel in terms originally descriptive of David's enemies in the Psalms and apostate Israel in Isaiah.³² And in Rom 8:35–36, Paul cites an OT text from the Psalms to describe the church in terms originally descriptive of God's persecuted people in the OT. This passage in Romans is especially noteworthy because it contains one of only two explicit references to persecution in Romans, the other being Rom 12:14 (cf. Matt 5:44). The term *διωγμός* in Rom 8:35 is closely tied to the immediately following citation of Ps 43:23 in Rom 8:36.³³ Paul may be engaging in a bit of hyperbole at this point, and

28. "By quoting it [i.e., Ps 68:23–24] here Paul does what he did in Rom. 3.10–18. That is, he takes a text originally directed against David's enemies and turns David's imprecations against David's own people. This is the depth of Israel's present plight" (Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 522; cf. idem, *Romans*, 2:649).

29. The words οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ (Rom 11:5) and ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας (Rom 11:8) signal and underscore the presence of these similar-situation typologies. The latter words are in a citation of Isa 29:10 (compare the allusion to Isa 29:16 in Rom 9:20). By means of this judgment oracle, national Israel in Paul's (eschatological) day is likened to apostate Israel in Isaiah's day.

30. Mark 15:23, 36 and pars. allude to Ps 68:22 and apply it to those who crucified Christ; while Acts 1:20 quotes Ps 68:26 and applies it to Christ's betrayer, Judas, along with Ps 108:8, which also originally referred to David's enemies and persecutors (cf. *κατεδιώξεν* in Ps 108:16).

31. "Paul transforms Isaiah's oracle of promise into a word of reproach" (Hays, *Echoes*, 45). Compare with D. J. Moo, *Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 166; and U. Heckel ("Das Bild der Heiden und die Identität der Christen bei Paulus," in *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem der Fremden* [ed. R. Feldmeier and U. Heckel; WUNT 70; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994], 275), who also draws attention to the typologically inverted reading of Deut 32:5 in Phil 2:15.

32. See again Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 522; cf. idem, *Romans*, 2:649. That national Israel is primarily in view in Rom 3:10–18 seems to be entailed by Rom 3:19, "whatever the law says it speaks to those who are under the law" (τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ).

33. See Gal 1:13 and also Acts 8:1, where the rare term *διωγμός* introduces Paul's ravaging of the church following the martyrdom of Stephen.

he does not overtly identify those who are presently persecuting God's faithful covenant people or "sheep" (cf. Pss 78:52, 79:13, 95:7, 100:3) and putting them to death. But it is clear enough that such persecution as the early church faced during Paul's lifetime came primarily from those whom Paul knew only too well: from Israelites who were zealous for God and for the law (Acts 8:1–3, 9:1–2, 22:3–5, 26:9–11; Gal 1:13–14; Phil 3:6). The meaning of the Ps 43:23 citation in Rom 8:36 is thus twofold. Not only is Paul "identifying himself and his *Christian* readers with the suffering Israel of the psalm,"³⁴ but he is also indicating that national Israel now, eschatologically, stands in the role of the enemies and persecutors of God's true people.³⁵ As in Gal 4:29, Paul again seems almost to be assuming the validity of an "if persecuted, then God's people" syllogism. The impetus for this is, of course, *Christological* (cf. Matt 10:24–25, John 15:20, Acts 9:4–5) and *typological* rather than strictly logical.

Ishmael's typological status as *persecutor* of God's people in Gal 4:29 is thus clearly not an isolated instance; it is part of a much larger pattern of Scripture interpretation and contemporary application. And while the specific link between Ishmael and persecution is not *overtly* made in Romans, nevertheless the underlying theme of persecution and hostility that was introduced by, and embodied in, the original Ishmael typology in Galatians pervades Romans and serves to accentuate the underlying hermeneutical connectedness of the two epistles. The same may also be said of the connection between Ishmael and slavery, which reappears in the description of Esau in Rom 9:12 and, even more so, of the corresponding typological connection between Isaac and the people of God, whose existence is defined by faith, promise, and *spiritual* descent from Abraham. These typologies reflect and at the same time are determinative of the identities of the two eschatological peoples that Paul is defining. It now remains to examine the texts in Romans that deal with Abraham and the patriarchs in order to determine whether Paul's thinking continues along similar lines or whether he significantly modifies the subversive typological trajectories set in Galatians.

ABRAHAM'S SPIRITUAL PATERNITY IN ROMANS 4

Paul takes up Abraham again in Rom 4, where his intent appears to be much the same as it had been in Galatians: to demonstrate that righteousness comes only by faith *and* that all who have faith—Jew and Gentile alike—are reckoned as Abraham's children and members of God's

34. Hays, *Echoes*, 60 (emphasis added).

35. Similarly E. E. Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991), 109–10 n. 135, who classifies Rom 8:36 and Rom 2:24, along with Rev 11:8 as examples of "judgement typology" in which texts originally referring to Gentiles are applied to (persecuting) Jews. To such texts one must also add Paul's use of the epithet "dogs" in Phil 3:2 as well as the stunning eschatological inversion depicted in Rev 3:9 (cf. Isa 45:14, 49:23, 60:14).

eschatological people.³⁶ Paul introduces Abraham “rather abruptly” in Rom 4:1, as Hays points out, though in point of fact no more abruptly than he had been introduced previously in Gal 3:6 (or in Gal 4:21).³⁷ Paul then refers to him somewhat polemically as the forefather of Jews “according to the flesh” (κατὰ σάρκα). Though the syntax of this verse is awkward, it is not intrinsically odd or unlikely that Paul would designate Abraham as the forefather of Jews κατὰ σάρκα.³⁸ It is no more odd or unlikely than that he should speak of his “brethren” in Rom 9:3 (cf. 11:1; Gal 1:14) and then immediately clarify that by this he means his “kinsfolk according to the flesh” rather than his new Christian family. Paul is simply speaking in Rom 4:1 as a Jew in genetic solidarity with his Jewish kinsfolk.³⁹ Likewise, the qualifying phrase κατὰ σάρκα in Rom 4:1 is not only understandable but necessary at this juncture if Paul wishes to clarify that by ἡμῶν he means *us Jews* rather than *us Jewish and Gentile Christians*.⁴⁰ Very shortly Paul will go on to say that Abraham is the father of all who believe (i.e., Rom 4:11–12, 16–17); but he makes it clear enough with κατὰ σάρκα in 4:1 that he has not said it yet.

A similar qualifying or delimiting use of κατὰ σάρκα appears in 1 Cor 10:18 (cf. Eph 6:5, Col 3:22) in reference to the existence of an Israel κατὰ σάρκα, the implication being that there also exists an Israel κατὰ πνεῦμα or an Israel τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Gal 6:16) that stands over against it.⁴¹ In 1 Cor 10:18, the qualifying phrase circumvents the confusion that could arise in part from Paul’s having spoken without qualification of the patriarchs of the exodus and wilderness generation as “our fathers” in 1 Cor 10:1. No such

36. T. H. Tobin (“What Shall We Say That Abraham Found? The Controversy behind Romans 4,” *HTR* 80 [1995]: 437–52) unduly magnifies the differences between the epistles to the point that in Galatians Abraham is religiously relevant only to Gentiles, while in Rom 4 he is relevant to both Jews and Gentiles. Such a skewed reading of Galatians, not least given that Paul is a Jew and that there are Jewish Christians in his audience, is unwarranted. In fact, it is actually in *Romans* (cf. Rom 4:10–12) that the theoretical priority of Gentiles comes closest to articulation. Much closer to the mark is Hofius, who argues that there are no “material/theological differences between Galatians and Romans. The differences here concern only the style and manner of argumentation” (O. Hofius, “‘All Israel Will Be Saved’: Divine Salvation and Israel’s Deliverance in Romans 9–11,” *PSB* 11 [1990]: 19 n. 2).

37. R. B. Hays, “‘Have We Found Abraham to Be Our Forefather according to the Flesh?’ A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1,” *NovT* 27 (1985): 86.

38. Pace Hays, *ibid.*, 77–78.

39. Paul immediately proceeds to relativize this solidarity in the verses that follow these uses of κατὰ σάρκα (cf. Phil 3:2–9); and he may have significantly relativized it at the outset simply by choosing a phrase with such strongly negative connotations (Dunn, *Romans*, 1:199).

40. F. F. Bruce, *Romans* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), 114.

41. See G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 470 n. 38; L. Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958), 146; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *The First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), 215; E. Schweizer, “σάρξ, κτλ.,” *TDNT* 7:127. Compare, for example, C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1968), 235; W. Schrager, “‘Israel nach dem Fleisch’ (1Kor 10,18),” in *Wenn Nicht Jetzt, Wann Dann?* Aufsätze für Hans-Joachim Kraus zum 65. Geburtstag (ed. H.-G. Geyer et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983), 150.

phrase is used to qualify the word Israel anywhere in Romans, but one should not conclude from this that similar conceptual delimitations are not contextually mandated. In Rom 9:6, for example, the second occurrence of the word "Israel" simply must be qualified contextually, at least mentally, as *true* Israel or *spiritual* Israel (see further below), and the same can be said of the word "Jew" in Rom 2:28–29 and of the word "circumcision" in Phil 3:3.⁴²

What was it, then, that the great forefather of the Jews κατὰ σαρκά found? *He found himself the forefather of Gentiles!* Or, perhaps more accurately, he found himself the forefather of *all believers*—Jew and Gentile alike. This understanding makes eminent sense of Rom 4:1 in the immediate context of the argument of Rom 4.⁴³ The qualifying phrase κατὰ σαρκά here as elsewhere implies an antithesis of some kind, and this is precisely what Paul provides in the remainder of the chapter as he emphatically argues that Abraham is "the father of *all who believe*" and "the father of *us all*" (Rom 4:11, 16). Wright sees the antithesis to the κατὰ σαρκά of Rom 4:1 in the distant κατὰ χάριν of 4:16.⁴⁴ But in spite of their formal similarity it is probably better to understand κατὰ χάριν more narrowly as explicating only the gift nature of the promise (see the κατὰ χάριν already much earlier in 4:4) and to see the antithesis to κατὰ σαρκά more broadly in Abraham's "dual paternity."⁴⁵ Abraham is the spiritual father of two closely related yet distinguishable groups, to whom righteousness is reckoned solely on the basis of faith:⁴⁶ Gentiles who believe while in a state of uncircumcision (Rom 4:11);⁴⁷ and Jews who not only are circumcised but who also follow in the footsteps of the faith that Abraham had while he

42. "The reversal of categories is startling. The literally uncircumcised Gentile church of Paul's mission is given the honorific title of 'the circumcision'" (R. B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation* [New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996], 410; cf. R. Meyer, "περιτέμνω, κτλ.," TDNT 6:83).

43. Compare Hays, "Have We Found Abraham," 76–98; idem, *Echoes*, 54; M. Palmer, "τί οὖν: The Inferential Question in Paul's Letter to the Romans with a Proposed Reading of Romans 4.1," in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek* (ed. S. E. Porter and D. A. Carson; JSNTSup 113; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 206–13; N. T. Wright, "Romans and the Theology of Paul," in *SBL 1992: Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 191–92. All of these repunctuate Rom 4:1 as two rhetorical questions and argue that Abraham as the κατὰ σαρκά forefather of Jews (Hays) or Christians (Palmer; Wright) is a *misunderstanding* of the gospel that Paul states only to reject with an implied μη γένοιτο. Criticisms of this punctuation and interpretation are noted, for example, by Dunn, *Romans*, 1:199; and T. R. Schreiner, *Romans* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 6; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 213–14.

44. Wright, "Romans and the Theology of Paul," 191.

45. P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTSMS 10; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 142.

46. The term λογίζομαι is "of fundamental importance in this epistle" (C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [BNTC; London: Black, 1962], 181). It is crucial to the argument of Rom 4 and reappears significantly in Rom 9, where the threads of this argument are again taken up (Rom 2:26; 3:28; 4:3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24; 9:8; cf. Gal 3:6).

47. "In a state of" attempts to render Paul's unusual διά of attendant circumstance (cf. BAGD 180).

was uncircumcised (Rom 4:12).⁴⁸ The common denominator in both cases is faith—in effect *Gentile* faith (Rom 4:10–12, 16; cf. Gal 2:15–17). It is faith and not genetic descent from Abraham or circumcision or law (Rom 3:21, 4:13) or works of the law (Rom 3:28, 4:2–5) or *anything specifically Jewish* that determines the true nature of Abraham’s paternity and the identity of his seed. “The decisive thing is no longer physical but spiritual descent.”⁴⁹ All who believe are de facto children and seed of Abraham and, as a result, become not only his heirs but members of the eschatological people of God.

The language of heirs and inheritance was integral to the earlier argument of Galatians (Gal 3:18, 29; 4:1, 7, 30), especially as that argument centered on Abraham and the eschatological blessings promised to his seed. It is thus not surprising that Paul introduces that same language into his argument here in Rom 4:13–14. Not only does God promise Abraham innumerable seed, but he also promises that seed an inheritance. The statement that Abraham’s “seed” (σπέρμα) would be “heir of the world” (κληρονόμον . . . κόσμου) alludes to Gen 22:17, where the promise to Abraham refers to his seed’s inheriting the “gates” (MT) or “cities” (LXX) of their enemies.⁵⁰ But in a surprising reversal, it is not national Israel taking possession of what belonged to its (Gentile!) enemies but *Gentile believers* inheriting what was ostensibly promised to Israel (cf. Rom 9:4–5). Paul’s pervasive, almost relentless, type-casting of Israel in the traditional roles of the persecutors and enemies of God’s people elsewhere (see above) could suggest that Israel is once again being implicitly cast in a similar role here via Gen 22:17.

In addition to alluding to Gen 22:17, Paul’s wording in Rom 4:13 echoes the many references to Abraham’s seed’s inheriting the “land” (γῆ) found throughout the OT (e.g., Gen 12:7, 13:15, 15:18, 17:8, 24:7). But Paul likely preferred κόσμος over LXX γῆ in view of the undesirable nationalistic or territorial overtones of the latter term. He gives no evidence of any interest in the OT land promises per se except in the typological or spiritual ful-

48. Paul’s οὐ μόνον ἀλλά construction in Rom 4:12 is strongly adversative: circumcision without faith counts for nothing. Note also the rare term στοιχέω (“follow, be in line with”) that is suggestive of a connection between Paul’s argument here and his earlier argument in Gal 6:16 (cf. Gal 5:25 and the prefixed form συστοιχέω in Gal 4:25), where he had described “the Israel of God” as those who “follow” the new creation rule that neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything. Paul’s fourth and last use of this rare term in Phil 3:16 occurs in a similar context—that is, it follows a reference to physical circumcision as nothing and to believers as the true or spiritual circumcision.

49. J. Jeremias, Ἀβραάμ, TDNT 1:9.

50. The LXX has likely understood “gates” as metonymy or synecdoche, and Paul appears to have followed the trajectory to its logical—and eschatological—conclusion. The promise to Abraham in Gen 22:15–18 contains a number of unique and emphatic features, on which, see esp. R. W. L. Moberly, “The Earliest Commentary on the Akedah,” VT 38 (1988): 315–18. Note also the echo of this important promise in Isa 54:3 (“your seed will inherit nations”), this being the continuation of the Isa 54:1 prophecy regarding Sarah/Zion that Paul had quoted earlier in Gal 4:27.

fillment of those promises under the new covenant.⁵¹ If Paul's inheriting the world language has any bearing on the world to come, that is, if it is analogous to his formally similar language about inheriting the kingdom,⁵² then the thought may not be unrelated to the expectation reflected in texts such as 2 Bar. 44:11–15 (cf. 14:13, 51:3), which speaks of the righteous inheriting the promised new world that is to come, and *m. Sanh.* 10.1, which says that "all Israelites have a share in the world to come, for it is written, *Thy people also shall be all righteous, they shall inherit the land forever*" (Isa 60:21).⁵³ For here too there is a collective reference to the people of God along with a broadened eschatological understanding of their inheritance that is closely tied to the original land promises to the patriarchs.

No less important than the "seed" (σπέρμα) promised to Abraham in Gen 22:17 are the "nations" (ἔθνη) promised to him in Gen 17:5. Paul explicitly cites this key OT verse in Rom 4:17–18. Perhaps by following the text of Gen 17 closely, and by noting the parallelism there between seed and nations (cf. Gen 22:17–18, 35:11–12, 48:19), Paul was able to infer that the two terms had the same referent. Indeed, the logic of Paul's argument in Rom 4 seems to bear this out. For he cites a text about *nations* in 4:17 to validate what he says about Abraham's *seed* in 4:16 and then immediately proceeds to do the reverse, citing a text about *seed* in 4:18b to validate what he says about *nations* in 4:17–18a.⁵⁴

¹⁶For this reason it is by faith, in order that it may be according to grace, so that the promise will be guaranteed to all the *seed*, not only to those who are of the law, but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all, ¹⁷as it is written, "A FATHER OF MANY NATIONS HAVE I MADE YOU." . . . ¹⁸In hope against hope he believed, so that he might become A FATHER OF MANY NATIONS according to what had been spoken, "SO WILL YOUR *SEED* BE." (Rom 4:16–18)

Abraham's promised "seed" is inclusive of both Jews and Gentiles. For, to paraphrase Paul in another place, it does not say "a nation," as referring to one, but rather to many, "nations," which is the church. Believing Jews and Gentiles together are the "nations" that would be blessed in Abraham; and together they are also Abraham's promised "seed." Righteousness does indeed come by faith alone, but so also does membership in the

51. See J. Eichler, "κλῆρος, κτλ.," *NIDNTT* 2:300; and Moo (*Romans*, 274), who suggests that inheriting the world "probably refers generally to all that God promised his people."

52. Paul speaks of "inheriting" or having an "inheritance" in the kingdom of God in 1 Cor 6:9–10, 15:50; Gal 5:21; Eph 5:5. Similar language is found in Matt 25:34.

53. Danby, *Mishnah*, 397. The term "share" or "portion" is in the same semantic domain as "inheritance" and is often used together with it as a hendiadys or in simple parallelism (M. Tsevat, "קֶלֶח," *TDOT* 4:449).

54. That the two OT prooftexts are very tightly woven together is further indicated by the semantically equivalent formulas that introduce them. These formulas are καθὼς γέγραπται (Rom 4:17) and κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον (4:18). A similar alternation between the same two introductory formulas occurs a few verses later in Rom 9:12–13 and also in Paul's Pisidian Antioch speech in Acts 13:33, 40.

eschatological people of God. A number of "theoretical and theological first principles" have thus been set forth in the early chapters of Romans,⁵⁵ foremost among which is the fact that God's people are defined by *spiritual* descent from Abraham and not by literal genetic descent or works of the law. Fuller elaboration of this principle must, however, wait until Rom 9.

SPIRITUAL PATERNITY AND PATRIARCH TYPOLOGY IN ROMANS 9

The identity of the people of God is clearly at the heart of Paul's argument in Rom 4, and it is this that comes to the fore in Rom 9–11, the "climax" and "heart" of the whole epistle.⁵⁶ It is therefore not surprising that his argument here in Rom 9 is heavily dependent both terminologically and conceptually on Rom 4 (esp. Rom 4:11–18),⁵⁷ as well as on Gal 3–4 (esp. Gal 4:21–31).⁵⁸ But this is not all. As has often been noted, the argument in Rom 9 is also heavily dependent on Rom 8.⁵⁹ The dense clustering of key terms from Rom 4 and 8 in the early verses of Rom 9 signals that Paul is resuming the arguments of those earlier chapters and resuming them precisely in order to bring them together to a satisfactory resolution. *The intractable problem of election cannot finally be resolved without reference to*

55. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 126.

56. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 234; Hays, *Echoes*, 63.

57. See M. Cranford, "Abraham in Romans 4: The Father of All Who Believe," *NTS* 41 (1995): 85; Dunn, *Romans*, 2:541–42; idem, *Theology of Paul*, 510 n. 54; S. Lyonett, "Le rôle d'Israël dans l'histoire du salut selon Rom 9–11," in *Etudes sur l'Épître aux Romains* (AnBib 120; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989), 264. According to Dunn, *Romans*, 2:542 (cf. 2:548), "he would presumably have expected the substantial echoes of the argument of chap. 4 (see particularly 9:8) to have signaled his train of thought clearly enough to his readers." Similar is B. Lindars, "The Old Testament and Universalism in Paul," *BJRL* 69 (1987): 515, "Of course the reader of Romans already knows from the earlier treatment of the faith of Abraham in chapter 4 that the children of promise are to be identified with Gentiles as well as Jews, and that the criterion for inclusion is not physical descent or works of the law, but faith."

58. Note esp. the references to Ἀβραάμ in Rom 4:1, 2, 3, 9, 12, 13, 16; 9:7; cf. Gal 3:6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 29; 4:22; as well as the programmatic use of ἐπαγγελία in Rom 4:13, 14, 16, 20; 9:4, 8, 9; cf. Gal 3:14, 16, 17, 18 (*bis*), 21, 22, 29; 4:23, 28; λογίζομαι in Rom 2:26; 3:28; 4:3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24; 9:8; cf. Gal 3:6; and σπέρμα in Rom 4:13, 16, 18; 9:7 (*bis*), 8, 29; cf. Gal 3:29. Parallels in Romans to Galatians are by no means limited to Rom 4 and 9–11. There are also many "striking parallels" to Gal 4:3b–7 in Rom 8:2–17 (Moo, *Romans*, 497–98 n. 5). If Paul's thinking is moving along the lines of Gal 3–4 in Rom 4, and Gal 4:3b–7 in Rom 8, this significantly increases the likelihood that it is indeed Gal 4:21–31 that stands behind and is determinative of the meaning of Paul's typological use of the same patriarchs in Rom 9. As aptly stated by C. K. Barrett ("The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians," *Essays on Paul* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982], 168), "The disputed interpretation of the story in Genesis becomes the root of the argument . . . of Rom. 9–11."

59. For example, J.-N. Aletti, "L'argumentation paulinienne en Rm 9," *Bib* 68 (1987): 41–56; Byrne, *Sons of God*, 127–28; Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 502–4; N. Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's "Dialogue with Judaism"* (JSNTSup 45; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 261–63; Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 161–62; cf. U. Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1968), 19–22; Wright, "Romans and the Theology of Paul," 193.

spiritual paternity. Who is elect and on what basis—and how secure is their election? Who and what is "Israel"—and has God's word come to naught because the blessings and privileges promised to "Israel" are being enjoyed by the nations? As Wright correctly observes, "the list of Jewish privileges in 9.4 f. is not arbitrary, but echoes precisely those privileges which, throughout Romans up to this point, Paul has shown to be transferred to the Jews' representative Messiah, and, through him, to all those who are 'in him', be they Jewish or Gentile."⁶⁰ Surely this requires an explanation; and Paul is quick to give it.

*The Typological Use of Isaac and Ishmael
in Romans 9:6–9*

Paul's succinct but profound explanation begins with a deceptively simple redefinition of one of the pivotal terms in the debate: *Israel*. God has indeed been true to his word. His promises to Israel have not failed because "not all Israel is Israel" (Rom 9:6b).⁶¹ Not all Israelites according to the flesh, that is, not all members of *national* or *empirical* Israel, are members of *true* Israel.⁶² This is Paul's answer *in nuce*. It is the same basic answer that was given in Rom 4 and, before that, in Galatians; and from it everything else in Rom 9–11 directly follows. "What counts, exactly as in Romans 3.21–4.25 or Galatians 3–4, is grace, not race. And the cross-reference to Romans 4 in particular shows how unwise it is to imagine that the true 'seed' of Abraham in 9.7 is simply a subset of ethnic Israel. In 4.16 it is already clearly a worldwide family."⁶³ Over against "the Israel of the old covenant," Paul thus sets "the Israel of the new covenant, consisting of believing Jew and Gentile."⁶⁴ This *true* Israel to which not all Jews belong and to which believing Gentiles do belong is a larger and not a more restricted

60. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 237; cf. idem, "Romans and the Theology of Paul," 193; and, similarly, E. J. Schnabel, "Israel, the People of God, and the Nations," *JETS* 45 (2002): 54. Byrne (*Sons of God*, 128) pointedly notes that "the 'Israel' problem of Ch 9 arises immediately out of Paul's attribution of the eschatological blessings to the Christian community comprised of Gentiles as well as Jews." See also the conclusion of the more wide-ranging study of D. Judant, *Les deux Israël: Essai sur le mystère du salut d'Israël selon l'économie des deux Testaments* (Paris: Cerf, 1960), 109 (cf. pp. 81–110), "La nouvelle communauté de salut a reçu en héritage tous les privilèges de l'ancien Israël. . . . L'Église est l'héritière directe d'Israël."

61. An interesting parallel to the somewhat awkward οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ of Rom 9:6b is the [sc. πάντες] οἱ ἐκ πίστεως οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσὶν Ἀβραάμ.

62. The expression οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ is equivalent to τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα in 9:3 and to Ἰσραηλῖται in 9:4 (compare the grammatically similar community descriptors οἱ ἐκ νόμου in Rom 4:14 and οἱ ἐκ πίστεως in Gal 3:7, 9). The expression does not refer to the eponymous patriarch himself who is not mentioned till several verses later and then only by the name of Jacob. Rightly, for example, U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKKNT; 3 vols.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978–82), 2:192 n. 850; contra Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 131; D. W. B. Robinson, "The Salvation of Israel in Romans 9–11," *RTR* 26 (1967): 84.

63. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 238; cf. E. P. Sanders (*Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983], 174), who also sees the argument of Gal 3 and Rom 4 "reiterated in Romans 9."

64. Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 508.

entity than national Israel.⁶⁵ The *church* is the eschatological restoration of Israel and “the fulfillment of the promises to Abraham.”⁶⁶ The *church* thus stands as the final proof that God’s word has not fallen.⁶⁷ The salvation of a believing Jewish remnant, important as it is, affords no such proof. It affords no such proof simply because God had promised Abraham *a multitude of nations* and *seed as innumerable as the stars in the heavens* (Gen 15:5, 22:17; cf. Rom 4:13–14). The believing Jewish remnant is neither; and to see it as the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham is to be looking through the wrong end of the telescope. The remnant is but a (small) part of the larger multiethnic community whose identity Paul is grappling with in Rom 9 even as he had grappled with it earlier in Rom 4 and, before that, in Gal 3–4. The promises that were actually made (that is, the word that has not fallen) and the eschatological reality of a multiethnic people of God consisting primarily of Gentile nations are fully convergent.

The argument that immediately follows in Rom 9:7–9 takes up where Paul’s earlier argument in Romans (Rom 4:11–18; cf. Gal 4:21–31) had left off and confirms that the most likely referent of Israel in Rom 9:6b is the church and not a Jewish remnant. The corporate descriptors for the people of God in these verses (σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, τέκνα θεοῦ, and τέκνα ἐπαγγελίας) quickly confirm this interpretation, for they all have the same referent as Ἰσραήλ in Rom 9:6b—namely, the believing community consisting of both Jews and Gentiles.⁶⁸ To these descriptors, one should probably also add

65. Rightly, for example, J. W. Aageson, “Typology, Correspondence, and the Application of Scripture in Romans 9–11,” *JSNT* 31 (1987): 54–55; E. Dinkler, “The Historical and the Eschatological Israel in Romans Chapters 9–11: A Contribution to the Problem of Predestination and Individual Responsibility,” *JR* 36 (1956): 126 n. 22; E. E. Ellis, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 137; Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 163–64; S. K. Williams, “The ‘Righteousness of God’ in Romans,” *JBL* 99 (1980): 281; Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 238. See also T. De Bruyn, trans., *Pelagius’s Commentary on St Paul’s Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 116, “if not all Israelites are from Israel, then some [true Israelites] in whom there is no guile’ are [also] from the Gentiles (cf. John 1:47)” (brackets and parentheses are De Bruyn’s).

66. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 178; cf. Schnabel, “Israel, the People of God, and the Nations,” 54.

67. On the close connection between the λόγος of God that has not fallen (Rom 9:6; cf. 9:9, 28) and the ἐπαγγελία referred to in 9:8, 9 (cf. 9:4), see Williams, “Righteousness of God,” 281. One of the paradoxical results of this surprising fulfillment of God’s word is that the failure and hardening of national Israel (cf. Rom 9:6–18, 27–28, 32–33; 10:20–21; 11:4–10) does not contradict but actually *confirms* and can be adduced as ancillary proof that the word of God has not fallen!

68. The present argument follows Rese and others, who have argued convincingly on syntactical and contextual grounds that σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ in Rom 9:7a refers to the same group as σπέρμα in Rom 9:7b–8. Thus, it is not that Abraham has σπέρμα not all of whom are τέκνα (Rom 9:7a), but that he has τέκνα not all of whom are σπέρμα. See M. Rese, “Israel und Kirche in Römer 9,” *NTS* 34 (1988): 209–10; and cf. Barrett, *Romans*, 180–81; Dunn, *Romans*, 2:540; Hays, *Echoes*, 65, 206 n. 61; Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes*, 298–99 n. 175; Moo, *Romans*, 575 n. 25. T. Zahn (*Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* [3rd ed.; Leipzig: Deichert, 1925], 439) had also, earlier noted that σπέρμα in Rom 9:7 is a technical term: it is not, like τέκνα, “ein religiös neutraler Begriff” but “ein heilsgeschichtlicher Begriff.”

υἱός in Rom 9:9 (cf. 8:14, 19; 9:4, 26; Gal 3:7, 26; 4:5–7, 22, 30). Such terms or similar ones, possibly including even Ἰουδαῖος in Rom 2:28–29, refer so clearly to *Gentile believers* earlier in Romans that Gentile readers who had attended to that argument would likely have seen all of these terms as descriptive of themselves. This applies above all to the key term σπέρμα that is taken up from Rom 4. By means of a careful juxtaposition of terms, Paul is now able to draw the term Ἰσραήλ into the semantic domain of the other terms whose referent has been fixed by his previous discourse. If, however, Paul has only the believing Jewish remnant in view, a group that he does not formally introduce until much later in Rom 9:27, then his argument at this point simply proves too much. He has at the very inception of his argument chosen the very terms that would (wrongly!) suggest an expansive rather than a restrictive understanding of Israel. But this is most improbable. Paul's point is reasonably clear: if, that is, it is essentially the same point he had made earlier with reference to Abraham's promised spiritual "seed" in Rom 4. This is the primary context in which Paul's redefinition of Israel in Rom 9:6b takes place and in which, initially at least, it ought to be understood.⁶⁹ As Cosgrove observes, the first four chapters of Romans "appear to teach some version of ecclesial Israelism. We can therefore say that the letter's linear manifestation is a strong warrant for interpreting the rest of the letter as equating the church with true Israel. . . . Romans is structured in a way that puts the burden of proof on those who would argue that Paul affirms some sort of national Israelism."⁷⁰

But the same basic reasoning that applies to the *linear* manifestation of Romans can also be applied with minor changes to the *historical* or *diachronic* manifestation of Galatians and Romans. Not only is Paul the undisputed author of both, his argument in Rom 9:7–8 closely resembles and in part even seems to assume what had been explicitly proved in Gal 4:21–31, namely, the existence of a typological antithesis between Isaac as a child of Abraham according to promise and Ishmael as a child according to the flesh with all that κατὰ σαρκά often entails. The sudden introduction of *multiple* children of promise along with *multiple* children of flesh in Rom 9:8 only follows exegetically (τοῦτ' ἔστιν) from the bare mention of Isaac in Rom 9:7 if the respective typological identities of *both* of Abraham's sons can be taken for granted—identities that are not fully articulated here but in Galatians. In fact, only here and in Gal 4:23, 28–29 do we find the antithesis between "children of flesh" and "children of promise." This makes the Galatians passage with its considerably greater elaboration indispensable for a proper understanding of Rom 9:8.⁷¹ This is not to say that Paul's

69. See nn. 57–58 above.

70. Cosgrove, *Elusive Israel*, 22–23. That the remnant interpretation works as well as it does is due in part to the fact that the remnant is a subset of the church, and thus what applies to the church as seed of Abraham, children of promise, and so on also naturally applies to the remnant.

71. H. Lietzmann, *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe: An die Römer* (5th ed.; HNT 8; Tübingen: Mohr, 1971), 91. The importance of Gal 4:21–31 to Rom 9 had already been

audience in Rome actually knew Galatians;⁷² only that they were familiar enough with a typological approach to Israel's patriarchs to follow this otherwise astonishing leap of logic. It should also be noted that the citation of Gen 21:12 ("in Isaac will your seed be called") in Rom 9:7 is no arbitrarily chosen proof-text; it is the climax of the story that includes Gen 21:10 ("throw out the slave woman and her son"), the very text to which Paul had appealed at the climax of his highly polemical argument in Gal 4:30.⁷³ The polemical situation has, of course, changed, but the typological significance of the patriarchs has not. Isaac remains a type of the believer and of the eschatological believing community consisting of both Gentiles and a faithful Jewish remnant;⁷⁴ while Ishmael, on the other hand, remains a type of the unbeliever and, more specifically, of the Jewish unbelief that has arisen out of nationalism, ethnic pride (cf. Rom 2:17–24), and a false understanding of the place and purpose of the law (cf. Rom 9:30–10:3).

Paul's citation of Gen 21:12 in Rom 9:7 is clearly of the utmost importance. By means of this citation, he is able to evoke the larger OT narrative context that stands behind both Rom 4 and Gal 4:21–31. He is also able at the same time to reintroduce the important term *καλεῖν* from Romans 8 into his present argument.⁷⁵ As has often been noted, *καλεῖν* is a "key word" in the structure and argument of Rom 9:6–29.⁷⁶ It thus bears heavily on the pressing question of Israel's election—an election now seen to be inextricably bound up with Abraham's seed, that is, with believers typified by Isaac who are Abraham's spiritual children according to promise.

noted by the reformers, for example, Martin Luther, *Lectures on Galatians, 1535: Chapters 1–4*, in *Luther's Works* (ed. J. Pelikan; vol. 26; St. Louis: Concordia, 1963), 435; cf. p. 237; and esp. James Arminius, *Analysis of the Ninth Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, in *The Works of James Arminius* (trans. J. Nichols and W. Nichols; London ed.; 3 vols.; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996 [original 1875]), 3:490; cf. 3:489–98.

72. Pace Tobin, "What Shall We Say That Abraham Found," 442 n. 11.

73. B. Chilton, "Romans 9–11 as Scriptural Interpretation and Dialogue with Judaism," *Ex Auditu* 4 (1988): 28; cf. Byrne, *Sons of God*, 188–89. W. R. Stegner ("Romans 9.6–29: A Midrash," *JSNT* 22 [1984]: 44) notes also that the rabbis "frequently quoted Genesis 21.12 to show who belonged to Israel."

74. See Dunn, *Romans*, 2:542, "As in Gal 4:28 . . . Isaac's birth and its circumstances are understood typologically."

75. The term *καλεῖν* is found in Rom 4:17; 8:30 (*bis*); 9:7, 12, 24, 25, 26, with cognate terms appearing in Rom 8:28 (*κλητός*), 33 (*ἐκλεκτός*); 9:11; 11:5, 7, 28 (*ἐκλογή*); and 11:29 (*κλησίς*).

76. For example, Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 510; J. D. Kim, *God, Israel, and the Gentiles: Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9–11* (SBLDS 176; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 126; Stegner, "Midrash," 40–41. See also Hays (*Echoes*, 65), who observes that, "The key terms of this programmatic quotation ('In Isaac shall be called for you a seed') are recapitulated in quotations from Hosea and Isaiah (in Rom. 9:25–29) that create an inclusio encompassing verses 6–29." As if to underscore this, Paul has added the key term *καλέσω* to his OT proof-text where it did not originally appear (Rom 9:25, Hos 2:25). He has also changed the verbs in that proof-text from *ἐλεῆσω* . . . *ἠγαπήμενην* to *ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην*, possibly in order more clearly to conform the eschatological reality envisioned by Hosea to the typological pattern set forth by "Jacob," whom God *ἠγάπησα* (Rom 9:13, Mal 1:2).

The meaning of the critical term *καλεῖν* is carefully qualified in Rom 9:8 immediately following its introduction.⁷⁷ By means of exegetical *τοῦτ' ἔστιν* and language strongly reminiscent of Rom 4, an equivalence is established in 9:7–8 between *calling* seed for Abraham in Isaac and *reckoning* as seed the children of promise.⁷⁸ Byrne is close to the mark when he says that "λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα is a comment on κληθήσεται: the only significant offspring are those recognized by God."⁷⁹ However, *λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα* is not so much a comment on κληθήσεται as a veritable definition.⁸⁰ This call is certainly "effectual," though perhaps not exactly as that term has traditionally been understood. It is as effectual as God's reckoning for it is his reckoning. By it God identifies, defines, and establishes an eschatological people—an "Israel"—whose single entrance requirement and condition for membership is faith (cf. Rom 11:17–24; Matt 3:9, 8:10–12).

This initial section of Paul's argument culminates in Rom 9:9b with a conflated citation of Gen 18:10, 14 ("At this time I will come and Sarah will have a son"). The citation is well chosen and well described as a "word of promise." For not only does it evoke the pivotal argument of Rom 4:17–21, being in essence the linchpin of that earlier argument, it also represents and embodies the very word that Paul has been at pains to prove has not failed. And it has not failed. The child of promise was born, and all that his birth prefigured has become a reality—not in a Jewish remnant but in the multitude of nations that constitute the "children of promise" and the eschatological "seed" of Abraham.⁸¹ Paul has emphasized the promise by moving the word *ἐπαγγελίας* forward in its clause.⁸² He has also amplified the decidedly "eschatological overtones" of the promise by substituting the term *ἐλεύσομαι* for LXX *ἀναστρέψω* and by suppressing the other temporal indicators in the two conflated OT texts.⁸³ If this is correct, and it certainly agrees with the eschatological thrust of *ἐπαγγελία* in Rom 4 and Gal 3–4, then it seems very likely that the future tense of κληθήσεται in Rom

77. The equally critical term *σπέρμα* needs no such qualification, for that had already been accomplished in Rom 4, where *σπέρμα* had been delimited by faith and then equated with τὰ ἔθνη, *understood inclusively*.

78. Additional examples of the exegetical use of *τοῦτ' ἔστιν* may be found in Rom 7:18; 10:6, 7, 8; Phlm 12; Heb 2:14, 7:5, 9:11, 10:20, 11:16, 13:15; 1 Pet 1:25, 3:20. The pregnant expression *λογίζομαι εἰς* is elsewhere used "only when referring to Gen. 15:6, a text that Paul quotes to prove that Abraham's faith brought him into righteous relationship with God" (Moo, *Romans*, 577).

79. Byrne, *Sons of God*, 132.

80. Cranfield (*Romans*, 2:474 n. 3) rightly notes that the term κληθήσεται in Rom 9:7 has the nuance "be recognized as." In support of this meaning, see further BAGD 399 1.δ.; L. Coenen, "Call," *NIDNTT* 1:275; as well as the felicitous renderings of the NIV and A. Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1949), 362. See, on the other hand, Moo (*Romans*, 575–76 n. 28; 582 n. 59), who states that *καλεῖν* has no such nuance but always refers to God's sovereign, irresistible summons or effectual calling.

81. See Williams, "Righteousness of God," 281.

82. Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:476, following Sanday and Headlam.

83. Dunn, *Romans*, 2:541–42; cf. Byrne, *Sons of God*, 133.

9:7b should also be seen as having a similar eschatological thrust.⁸⁴ The emphasis in Rom 9:7–9 is not, then, on God’s selectivity throughout Israel’s past history (the implication being that God is no less selective in the present) but on the miraculous creation (cf. Rom 4:17d) of an *eschatological* people who as “children of promise” are the antitype of the patriarchal Isaac type and the multiethnic fulfillment of the promises to Abraham.

The Typological Use of Jacob and Esau in Romans 9:10–13

The next closely linked chain in the argument that God’s word has not fallen begins with Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καί. In this way, the typology of Rom 9:7–9 is clearly extended in 9:10–13 to the second generation following Abraham. The point is not further to restrict an already severely restricted progeny, much less to buttress an inherently problematic opening argument,⁸⁵ but to illustrate further by means of Jacob and Esau the truth of what has just been said about Isaac and Ishmael.⁸⁶ Once again, there is a word of promise to a woman who, like Sarah, was “barren” (Gen 25:21; cf. Gen 11:30, Isa 54:1). As a result of this word of promise, the experience of Isaac, Rebecca, and Jacob mirrors the experience of Abraham, Sarah, and Isaac. This is why Paul can call Isaac the father of *believers* in Rom 9:10b (“Isaac *our* father”) in precisely the same way that he had earlier called Abraham “the father of *us* all” and “*our* father” in Rom 4:12, 16. In the absence of clear evidence to the contrary (see the qualifying expression κατὰ σαρκά in Rom 4:1, 9:3, 11:14), Paul’s audience would naturally have seen themselves included in his use of first-person-plural pronouns.⁸⁷ Paul’s Jewish kinsmen, on the other hand, are typically referred to in the third person as in Rom 10:1–2 and 11:13–15. Note also the οἱ τινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλιταί earlier in Rom 9:4, which seems to set Paul and his audience over against national Israel immediately after he has just affirmed his own lim-

84. Compare H. Hübner, *Gottes Ich und Israel: Zum Schriftgebrauch des Paulus in Römer 9–11* (FRLANT 136; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 18.

85. Fitzmyer, *inter alia*, suggests that the appeal to Jacob and Esau was made because “Paul sensed that his first argument might not be too valid, because only Isaac was born to Abraham of his real wife. . . . Now he makes use of a clearer example” (J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* [AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 562). There is, however, no hint here or in Gal 4 that Paul finds the typological argument from Isaac defective in any of its particulars. All Paul does now is apply the Gal 4 typology one stage further to the next generation, most likely after further reflection on the Genesis passage in the intervening years.

86. See E. Brandenburger (“Paulinische Schriftauslegung in der Kontroverse um das Verheißungswort Gottes [Röm 9],” *ZTK* 82 [1985]: 16, 22), who in addition argues (cf. p. 10) that Rom 9:6b–13 is structured chiasmatically such that “Jacob” (Israel) in Rom 9:10–13 corresponds to and explicates “Israel” in Rom 9:6b.

87. Pace, e.g., Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:194; C. E. B. Cranfield, “Changes of Person and Number in Paul’s Epistles,” in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett* (ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson; London: SPCK, 1982), 285. Similar inclusive first-person pronouns can be found in Rom 4:24–25, 8:31–39, 9:24; and Phil 3:3, to which one may add the unqualified use of ἀδελφοί in Rom 10:1 and *passim* (compare Rom 9:3). Note further the audience-inclusive reference to “our fathers” in 1 Cor 10:1 and the equally inclusive reference to “our mother” in Gal 4:26.

ited or relativized (i.e., *κατὰ σαρκά*) kinship with them. This means that it is precisely here in Rom 9:10 that the argument begun in Rom 9:6b is resoundingly confirmed: for if Isaac is *our* father then *we* are "Jacob" and, by implication, Israel.⁸⁸

As was the first generation after Abraham, so also is the second generation defined by a word of promise. This word of promise is cited in Rom 9:12b and is taken from the oracle to Rebecca in Gen 25:23, "Two nations (*ἔθνη*) are in your womb, and two peoples (*λαοὶ*) will be separated from your womb; and one people will surpass the other people, and the elder will serve (*δουλεύσει*) the younger." Already in the original oracle, the two patriarchs clearly stand for and represent two nations or peoples. It is Paul, however, who points out the *eschatological* significance of the oracle and the two corporate destinies that it delineates. Paul cites the oracle selectively in Rom 9:12b but in such a way as to highlight precisely the point at issue: the identity and status of two eschatological nations or peoples. These are the same two peoples that had just previously been described as Abraham's *σπέρμα*, *τέκνα θεοῦ*, and *τέκνα ἐπαγγελίας*, on the one hand, and as Abraham's *τέκνα* and *τέκνα σαρκός*, on the other (Rom 9:7–8). That the peoples in view are once again *eschatological* peoples is indicated, first, by the fact that the word of Gen 25:23 is understood to be a word of *promise* (Rom 9:9a; cf. Rom 1:2; 4:13, 14, 16);⁸⁹ and, second, by the future tenses of the key verbs in this promise, especially the one verb (*δουλεύσει*) that is actually singled out and explicitly cited. The tense of this verb must be given its full eschatological weight at this stage in Paul's argument.⁹⁰ That the *elder* or firstborn will serve the *younger* indicates an unexpected reversal of status: a reversal that corresponds to the eschatological reversal of the fortunes of Israel, God's "firstborn" (Exod 4:22), as over against the fortunes of Gentile (and Jewish) believers. That the elder *will serve* (*δουλεύσει*) the younger indicates that national Israel's eschatological status is one of servitude or "slavery" (Rom 7:6; Gal 2:4; 4:1, 3, 7–9, 24–25; 5:1). This single verb concisely summarizes the more involved typological argument of Gal 4:21–31 and distinctly bespeaks the servile condition of those who are *ἐξ ἔργων* and *ὑπὸ νόμου*. As noted above with reference to Paul's typological treatment of Ishmael in Galatians, the presence of the key term *δουλεύω* in the very word of promise relating to Jacob and Esau would not have gone unnoticed by Paul and was doubtless one of the reasons he found this second word of promise so

88. "After the Babylonian exile the name Jacob was a synonym for *all the Hebrews of the restoration community*—apart from tribal affiliation" (A. E. Hill, *Malachi* [AB 25D; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 149 [emphasis added]). Paul has simply broadened the restored community to include Gentiles. Jacob no less than Isaac thus stands as a type of all who as a result of the promise are members of the restored eschatological community.

89. "The content of the promises . . . is always Messianic salvation" (J. Schniewind and G. Friedrich, "ἐπαγγέλλω, κτλ.," *TDNT* 2:583).

90. Note the similar *eschatological* future tenses, all of which are likewise found in pivotal OT citations: Gal 3:8 (ἐνευλογηθήσονται), 4:30 (κληρονομήσει); Rom 4:18 (ἔσται), 9:7b (κληθήσεται), 9:9b (ἐλεύσομαι . . . ἔσται).

congenial.⁹¹ This key term underscores the typological equivalence of Ishmael and Esau in Paul's argument as well as the utmost importance of bringing Gal 4:21–31 to bear on Paul's polemical use of patriarchs in Rom 9.

To the foundational word of promise in the Pentateuch regarding Jacob and Esau, Paul next adds a confirmatory citation from the Prophets. By means of Mal 1:2–3, *which also has nations or peoples in its original purview*,⁹² Paul is able to describe further the status of Jacob and Esau as, respectively, loved and hated. The term "loved" that is used of Jacob anticipates the use of the same term in Rom 9:25 (cf. Hos 2:25) and, like that term, is to be understood eschatologically with reference to the restored community of prophetic expectation.⁹³ Paul may even have deliberately modified the Hosea citation to more closely conform it to the Jacob typology set forth here in Rom 9:12–13.⁹⁴ The "hatred" of Esau is also to be understood eschatologically and, as such, should not be minimized as if it referred merely to the role of Esau (or Edom) in redemptive history or as if it were simply a Semitic idiom for "loving less."⁹⁵ In the present context, this "hatred" can refer to nothing less than the eschatological condition of Israelites who reject the gospel and the promised Messiah.⁹⁶ It is thus the functional equivalent not only of "slavery" (Rom 9:12b; cf. Gal 4:24–25, 5:1) but also of "anathema" (9:3), "hardened" (9:18; cf. 2:5, 11:7), "dishonor" (9:21), "vessels of wrath" (9:22; cf. 1:18; 2:5, 8; 5:9), "stumbling" (9:32–33, 11:11), "put to shame" (9:33b), "disobedient and contrary" (10:21), "stupefied, blinded, deafened" (11:8, 10), "cut off" (11:17–24), and the like, *all of which in one way or another describe and characterize the present negative status of unbelieving Israel*. To see any of these terms (for example, "vessels of wrath") as expressive of an irreversible status eternally decreed by God or as descriptive of an everlastingly fixed and irreducible number of individuals, would be to go beyond the meaning of these terms in Paul's immediate argument. Paul is describing recalcitrant nomistic *Israel*, not the "reprobate" *humanity* of double predestinarian decretal theology. Hence the many texts that most naturally suggest the reversibility of national Israel's present negative status.⁹⁷

91. If, as is likely, the oracle in its entirety was known to Paul, he doubtless would have seen a convergence between the "nations" and "peoples" of this promise and the "nations" promised to Abraham in texts such as Gen 17:5 (see Rom 4:17–18 and comments on these verses above).

92. C. L. Blomberg, "Elijah, Election, and the Use of Malachi in the New Testament," *CTR* 2 (1987): 109–17.

93. The use of Hosea in Rom 9 once again underscores the theological and hermeneutical continuity between Gal 4 and Rom 9. For here in Rom 9:25, Paul understands the promised restoration of the ten northern tribes eschatologically and typologically, thereby making a similar point to the one made earlier in Gal 4:26–28 by means of his eschatological and typological treatment of Sarah and the promised restoration of Zion.

94. See n. 76 above.

95. Compare Gen 29:30–31; Matt 6:24, 10:37; Luke 14:26.

96. References to God's hatred are rare in Scripture. Note, however, the following texts that speak of God's "hatred" of apostate national Israel: Jer 12:8, Hos 9:15, Amos 6:8.

97. For example, Rom 2:4–5; 10:1, 21; 11:1–2, 11, 23–24; 2 Cor 3:14–16.

The positive status of Isaac and Jacob, on the other hand, no less than the present positive status of all believers, is the result of a word of promise. What is especially underscored in the case of Isaac is the fact that the promise, and the status that results from the promise, does not depend on literal, genetic descent from Abraham, while what is especially underscored in the case of Jacob is the fact that the promise, and the status that results from the promise, does not depend on works of the law (οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων; Rom 9:12a).⁹⁸ "One of the key phrases of the whole letter (ἐξ ἔργων) here reemerges into prominence. . . . This is the crux of the whole argument with his fellow kinsfolk. . . . This fuller line of argument has been implicit from the first echo of chap. 4."⁹⁹ This thematically important phrase functions as a *terminus technicus* in Paul's polemic (cf. Rom 3:20, 28; 4:2, 6; 9:32; 11:6; Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10), and its presence in Rom 9:12a can hardly be an accident.¹⁰⁰ Nor is it an accident that human "works" stand in an antithetical relationship to God's "call" (ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος). For it was this latter term that Paul had just used in Rom 9:7b (see Rom 9:25–26, where Paul's use of καλεῖν is similar) and that he had immediately explicated in Rom 9:8 in terms strongly reminiscent of the argument of Rom 4.

God's purpose in election, at least insofar as Paul has delineated it here, is to reckon as Abraham's seed *all* of the (believing) children of promise prefigured by Isaac and Jacob and to reject *all* of the (nomistic) children of flesh prefigured by Ishmael and Esau. None of this was a contingency plan. It was in God's mind from the beginning—long before the birth of the nation of Israel or its epochal apostasy and defection. This is what God "set forth publicly" (πρόθεσις) in the lives of the patriarchs (Rom 9:11b) and in the scriptures that describe them. This is the abiding purpose of God that remains firm and that proves that God's word—his promise—has not fallen. The term *μενη* in Rom 9:11b corresponds to and functions as the conceptual antithesis of *ἐκπέπτωκεν* in 9:6a.¹⁰¹ It does not imply the introduction of a qualitatively new or different ground of proof limited only to Jacob and Esau; rather, it confirms and substantiates the typological line first taken with Isaac and Ishmael in Rom 9:7–9. The typological *modus operandi* seen so clearly in the case of Isaac and Ishmael continues unbroken into the next generation and, more importantly, is definitive of the present

98. Dunn, *Romans*, 2:548; Morris, *Romans*, 355.

99. Dunn, *Romans*, 2:543.

100. The expression is not to be understood as referring to any and every human activity or as the equivalent of the arguably more general "doing anything good or bad" (πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ φαῦλον) in Rom 9:11a, where Paul breaks the expected and more idiomatic contrast between ἀγαθός and κακός in favor of the rare term φαῦλος. This rare term may have been suggested by the cognate that appears in Gen 25:34, "And Esau despised (ἐφάυλισεν) his birthright." One cannot think of Esau without recalling his willful, almost inexplicable rejection of his birthright. Likewise, if the type extends to this detail, by rejecting Messiah, national Israel has despised its birthright—namely, the glorious privileges and eschatological prerogatives adumbrated in Rom 3:1–2 and elaborated in Rom 9:4–5.

101. Similarly, e.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:478; Dunn, *Romans*, 2:543; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:192 n. 849.

age of eschatological salvation,¹⁰² an age in which not only *justification before God* but *membership in the people of God* comes by faith apart from genetic descent or “works” of the law. Believing Jews and Gentiles together are the people of God. They alone are the “seed” of Abraham and the “children of promise,” because they, and they alone, are the eschatological antitypes of Isaac and Jacob.

*Sola Fide and the Place of Romans 9:6–13
in the Argument of Romans 9–11*

This interpretation of Rom 9:6–13 fits remarkably well with what has preceded (cf. Rom 1:16–17, 3:21–4:25; Gal 4:21–31). No less remarkable, however, is the way that Rom 9:6–13 fits with what follows in chs. 9–11. The essential argument and line of thought in Rom 9:6–13 is borne out and confirmed in what follows: first, by the *explication* of this argument in Rom 9:24–29; second, by the *summation* of this argument in Rom 9:30–33; and, third, by the *continuation* of the argument in Rom 10–11. In the careful chiasmic structuring of Rom 9:6–29, it is 9:24–29 that corresponds most closely to 9:6–13.¹⁰³ And it is here, beginning with an inclusive first-person-plural pronoun in Rom 9:24,¹⁰⁴ that Paul finally and emphatically makes explicit what has thus far been presented only implicitly and typologically.¹⁰⁵ And what has been in view all along is “us,” namely, the eschatological people of God composed of the same two groups that had been in view in Rom 9:6–13 (cf. Rom 4:11–12). These two groups are *believing Gentiles*, understood by way of Hosea to be the eschatological restoration of the ten northern tribes of Israel,¹⁰⁶ and *believing Jews*, understood by way of Isaiah to be the eschatological Jewish “remnant” of prophetic expectation. To pull this Jewish remnant back into Rom 9:6b short-circuits Paul’s argument and destroys the symmetry of his carefully crafted chiasm. Similarly, to argue that Paul does not have Gentiles in view at all until Rom 9:24 vitiates Paul’s

102. See Wilckens, *ibid.*, 2:194.

103. Not only is Rom 9:6–29 as a whole structured as a large chiasm (Dunn, *Romans*, 2:537)—note especially the term “call” in 9:7 and 9:24—but the opening and closing sections (i.e., 9:6b–13 and 24–29) are themselves also structured chiasmically (Brandenburger, “Paulinische Schriftauslegung,” 10, 13, 16).

104. The emphatic and awkward pronoun in 9:24, “even *us* (ἡμᾶς) whom he has called” (cf. καλεῖν in 9:7b, 12a), gives Paul’s statement “something of the character of a confession of faith” (Cranfield, “Changes of Person and Number,” 284). See also Brandenburger, “Paulinische Schriftauslegung,” 30 (cf. pp. 31–33), “Das betonte ἡμᾶς entspricht dem Selbstverständnis und Selbstbewußtsein der (christlichen) Ekklesia gegenüber der (jüdischen) Synagoge.”

105. Brandenburger, *ibid.*, 13, “Die Erörterung hat ein starkes Achtergewicht. Daraus kann schon jetzt zweierlei entnommen werden. Zum einen wird spätestens ab V. 24 klar, was der *verborgene* Problemhorizont der ganzen bisherigen Erörterung war. . . . Gleichwohl hat Paulus die Erörterung zum anderen offenbar bewußt so gestaltet, daß das *gegenwärtige* Problemfeld erst in V. 22 f aufscheint und wirklich *direkt* erst ab V. 24 klar und eindeutig beim Namen genannt wird.”

106. E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 274, “with great audacity he takes the promises to Israel and relates them to Gentile-Christians.”

argument and does violence to its chiasmic structure.¹⁰⁷ Paul has had believing Gentiles in view all along, no less than believing Jews, for it is both together who, as children of promise, are the people of God and the eschatological antitypes of Isaac and Jacob.

The argument in Rom 9:6–29 had relied heavily on a *typological* treatment of Israel's patriarchs (9:7–13) and even of the ten northern tribes of Israel (9:25–26). Immediately following this largely typological argument, Paul provides a *theological* summation or résumé of it in Rom 9:30–33.¹⁰⁸ "What then shall we say?" (Rom 9:30a). "What," in other words, "has the foregoing argument been all about?" The answer to this rhetorical question immediately follows in 9:30b–33 and reveals that justification (righteousness) comes by faith alone and not by works of the law. Those who lack faith and rely instead on "works" find only stumbling and shame. They find themselves, in other words, in the unenviable position of Ishmael, Esau, and pharaoh.¹⁰⁹ The terms taken up in Rom 9:30–33 indicate that these verses serve to summarize all of the preceding argument and not just 9:24–29. In particular, the explicit contrast in Rom 9:30–33 between "works" and "faith" (cf. 3:28, 4:2–5) is very much dependent upon the patriarch typologies of 9:7–13, where that same contrast had been implicitly present. Note, for example, the term *σάρξ* in Rom 9:8a and the expression *οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων* in 9:12a. Note also the fact that there are numerous verbal and conceptual links between Rom 4 and Rom 9:6–9. That key terms from that earlier chapter (that is, "faith," "works," "righteousness," and "law") should also reappear in Rom 9:30–33¹¹⁰ and that two of these terms should plausibly be set forth as candidates for *the* pivotal organizing term in what follows¹¹¹ suggest that *Paul has not left the argument of Rom 4 behind, for it was, in a manner of speaking, his only argument.*

Third, and finally, Paul's argument in Rom 9 gains still greater coherence and cogency once it is seen how seamlessly it meshes with the continuation of that argument in chs. 10–11. For there is in these two chapters

107. Contra, for example, W. S. Campbell, "The Freedom and Faithfulness of God in Relation to Israel," *JSNT* 13 (1981): 32, "It is only in vv. 23–24 that Gentiles (almost in an aside) come on to the scene"; and E. E. Johnson, *The Function of Apocalyptic and Wisdom Traditions in Romans 9–11* (SBLDS 109; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 148–49 (emphasis added), "Paul has said *nothing* [in Rom 9:6–23] to which a non-Christian Jew might take exception . . . the argument to this point offers *nothing* remarkable . . . the first distinctively Christian claim of the argument" is the inclusion of Gentiles, who are first introduced in Rom 9:24.

108. See Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes*, 304, "ein rechtfertigungstheologisches Resümee."

109. The imagery in each case is, of course, different, but the resulting status is very much the same. See esp. Rom 11:7–11 where Paul equates hardening with stumbling and where (Rom 11:9) we find a recurrence of the catchword *σκάνδαλον* from Rom 9:33 (cf. Gal 5:11).

110. See Moo, *Romans*, 616–18.

111. According to Moo (*Romans*, 618), righteousness is the "key word" in Rom 9:30–10:13 (cf. Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes*, 303, "Die Berufung zum Gottesvolk wird in V.30–33 verstanden als *καταλεβείν δικαιοσύνην*. Hierin zeigt sich, wie das Gottesvolkthema bei Paulus von der Rechtfertigungslehre her zu beurteilen ist und wie umgekehrt die Rechtfertigungslehre die paulinische Antwort auf die Gottesvolkfrage darstellt"); while, according to Hübner (*Gottes Ich und Israel*, 26), faith is the "theologische Stichwort" of Rom 9:30–10:21.

a resounding emphasis on faith and the need for Jew and Gentile alike—without distinction and without works of the law—to believe in order to be justified and grafted into the community of God’s people. “Faith” is thus the determinative theological term in Rom 10–11. Faith apart from works is the sole criterion for righteousness and salvation (so ch. 10); and faith apart from works is the sole criterion for incorporation into the olive tree (which by any other name is both true Israel *and* the church; so ch. 11).¹¹² Membership in God’s people, no less than righteousness, or justification, is by faith alone. But these arguments are not new. They are merely the continuation of the typological argument of Rom 9, which was itself the continuation of the earlier argument of Rom 4 (cf. 1:16–17) and Gal 3–4.¹¹³

CONCLUSION

In the passages under consideration in Galatians and Romans, the identity of the people of God by and large reduces to a question of paternity. Who are the children and heirs of Abraham and of the blessings and promises of Scripture? In answering this question, Paul consistently spiritualizes descent from Abraham in such a way as to make faith the sole criterion for Abrahamic paternity.¹¹⁴ All who believe and only those who believe—Jew and Gentile alike—are “children of Abraham” and “children of promise.” It is these who constitute the “seed” and “nations” promised to Abraham. It is these who are the eschatological people of God and the restored community of prophetic expectation. And it is these who are, in a single polemically redefined word, “Israel” (Rom 9:6b; cf. Gal 6:16).¹¹⁵ But Paul has done more than this. Not only has he consistently viewed descent from Abraham *spiritually*, he has consistently treated Abraham’s literal progeny *typologically*. The patriarchs of the first two generations after Abraham stand in Scripture as types of still greater eschatological realities. Isaac and Jacob are types of the “children of promise”—that is, Jews and Gentiles who have faith—while Ishmael and Esau are types of the “children of flesh”—that is, genetic descendants of Abraham who lack faith in Christ, who are in slavery to the law, and who persecute the true (and polemically

112. This reading of Rom 9–11 increases the probability that “all Israel” in Rom 11:26 is a reference to the church, thus forming an inclusion with Paul’s inclusive use of “Israel” in Rom 9:6b.

113. See, rightly, Dahl (“The Future of Israel,” 142–43), who argues against the all-too-common view that Paul is setting forth two very different, even irreconcilable, theses in Rom 9 and 10 (for example, predestination as over against human responsibility); pace, e.g., C. K. Barrett, “Romans 9.30–10.21: Fall and Responsibility of Israel,” in *Essays on Paul* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982), 132–37; Morris, *Romans*, 351, 373; and Moo (*Romans*, 617), who as a result of just such a false disjunction is forced to treat all of Rom 9:30–10:21 as “something of an excursus” (p. 618).

114. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 172; cf. 29, 56–57 n. 63.

115. Since the term “Israel” is a religious or theological construct, it is inherently capable of just such a redefinition (Aageson, “Typology,” 68–69 nn. 17, 21; cf. Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 505–6; Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 139).

redefined) people of God. As the result of this surprising eschatological "role reversal" and "redefinition of Israel," national Israel now finds itself in the place of Ishmael and Esau, "who represent the foil to God's election of Israel!"¹¹⁶ The antithetical Isaac and Ishmael typology relating to the first generation after Abraham was seen to be common to both Galatians and Romans (Gal 4:21–31, Rom 9:7–9). This typology is the linchpin of the present investigation. Unique to Romans was the move to the second generation after Abraham, wherein a similar antithetical typology was also found to obtain between Jacob and Esau (Rom 9:10–13).

At the same time that these typologies were seen to be crucial to Paul's view of the people of God in both Galatians and Romans, they were also seen to be part of a larger pattern of interpretation, namely, the systematic appropriation to the church of the Scriptures, blessings, and promises of Israel. "What was predicated of Israel can now be predicated of the church."¹¹⁷ The converse of this, namely, the systematic application to Israel of texts and imprecations originally applicable to Gentiles or to the enemies of God's faithful covenant people in the OT, was also seen to be a part of the same larger pattern of interpretation. This approach to the patriarchs and the Scriptures of Israel is remarkable not only for the pervasiveness and consistency of Paul's typological hermeneutic but also for the *massive* proportions of the eschatological reversal that his hermeneutic presupposes. Though many of the specific typologies expressive of this eschatological reversal are unique to Paul and were doubtless the result of his own careful (re)reading of Scripture, the underlying eschatological reversal that they presuppose pervades the NT (e.g., Acts 4:25–28, 15:14–18; Eph 2:11–22; Tit 2:14; 1 Pet 1:1, 2:9–10, 3:14–15; Rev 1:6, 3:9, 5:10).¹¹⁸ This suggests that the underlying approach to eschatology and the frequent use of typology in the explication of that eschatology were common to the apostolic kerygma.¹¹⁹ They may even have found their impetus in the programmatic words and actions of Jesus himself.¹²⁰ For there are (apologies to Karl von Hase) not a few "thunderbolts fallen from the Pauline sky" in

116. Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 511; cf. Aageson, "Typology," 55 ("the two groups designated by the term Ἰσραήλ correspond to Jacob and Esau"); Dahl, "The Future of Israel," 145; Evans, "Paul and the Prophets," 124 ("The implication of these comparisons is that unbelieving Israelites theologially play the role of Ishmael, Esau, and Pharaoh"); Hübner, *Gottes Ich und Israel*, 45.

117. Hays, *Echoes*, 63. Goppelt (*Typos*, 140 [cf. pp. 140–51]) adduces this as "the most extensive typology found in the NT."

118. This reversal and the portrayal of the church as "Israel" in the context of a greater eschatological exodus pervades the book of Revelation, on which, see now S. Pattemore, *The People of God in the Apocalypse: Discourse, Structure, and Exegesis* (SNTSMS 128; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 136, 139, 199, 201, 216, and *passim*.

119. See, e.g., Schnabel, "Israel, the People of God, and the Nations," 47–57; as well as the seminal work of C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 74–88, 111–14.

120. See, e.g., Schnabel, "Israel, the People of God, and the Nations," 42–47; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1971), 38–80, esp. 60–75; Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*.

the Gospels. One need only think of Jesus' selection of twelve apostles to signal the eschatological restoration and regathering of the people of God with himself at its center, his giving of the kingdom to another "nation," or his emphasis on *faith* as qualifying one to sit with Abraham at the messianic banquet while those first invited (the "sons" of the kingdom) find themselves rejected and cast out. But if this is so, how can one explain it and at the same time demonstrate that the promises of God are not null and void? One can hardly improve on Paul's succinct formulation in Rom 9:6b. The word of God has not fallen, because "not all Israel is *Israel*."