

A Paul Question: What's Wrong with Wright?

Institute for Biblical Research

8 March 2014, Dallas, TX

Bruce Corley

Nicholas Thomas Wright—his surname provides the perfect target for the sort of juicy pun that scholars seem to relish like a good line for a late-night talk show host. I've collected some of the puns: There's "right reading, reading Wright"; "the Wright stuff"; the (W)right Jesus"; and then the mysterious blog "N T Wrong." In late 2000, Paul Barnett posted a lengthy blog "Why Wright is Wrong" that fueled an intramural Anglican debate. I confess to assigning a seminar the question, "Is Wright wrong or right, and if so, why?" and now I have piled on once again, "What's wrong with Wright?" In light of phrases that punctuate Wright's voluminous writings, such as "I can't believe he said that," or "about that a little more needs to be said," I will set out my version of *Sic et Non* with special reference to his latest work on Paul.

An Initial Sizing Up

Let's first begin with a seldom-quoted lesson on hermeneutics, a dialog on what a word means between Alice and Humpty Dumpty (Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*, chapter 6):

"I don't know what you mean by 'glory'," Alice said. Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously. "Of course you don't—till I tell you. I meant 'there's a nice knock-down argument for you!'"

"But 'glory' doesn't mean 'a nice knock-down argument'," Alice objected. "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you CAN make words mean so many different things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all."

Alice was too much puzzled to say anything, so after a minute Humpty Dumpty began again. "They've a temper, some of them—particularly verbs, they're the proudest—adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs—however, I can manage the whole lot of them! Impenetrability! That's what I say!"

Impenetrability or shall I say, obfuscation—“to make something difficult to understand”—my impression is that of a perplexing voice coming out of surrounding haze, like the first time I saw Durham Cathedral, a majestic, imposing castle high above the river Wear surrounded by an English fog. Does Wright, in proposing his theological method, intend to muddle things? I don’t think so—he wants to redefine and clarify. His obfuscation, however, is compounded of three items.

1. *Prolixity*. First and foremost, this work is too long. It began, by my reckoning, 40 years ago. Wright’s programmatic interests developed when his D.Phil. dissertation was submitted in 1980, it ran to two volumes, over a 1000 pages. The topic: “The Messiah and the People of God: A Study in Pauline Theology with Particular Reference to the Argument of the Epistle to the Romans.” The dissertation became a writing career; in due course, essays, monographs, and commentaries aside, the prodigious series “Christian Origins and the Question of God” has emerged. Vol. 1, *The New Testament and the People of God* (1992), was 535 pages; vol. 2, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (1996), 741 pages; vol. 3, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 740 pages. Now vol. 5 on Paul, a manuscript fermenting for more than a generation, has appeared as *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (2013), in two robust books consecutively numbered: book 1, Paul’s worldview (parts 1 & 2, 605 pages) and book 2, Paul’s theology (parts 3 & 4, 1055 pages), totaling 1660 pages. There is also a forthcoming companion book entitled *Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (2014), 384 pages, a prequel to vol. 5. On Paul alone, we have 2044 pages; for the entire series, one can browse 4060 pages! How about doing a review of Wright on Paul?

The impenetrability of Wright’s prolixity is daunting. It’s tough to get a simple read. I’ve been reading him since his and my dissertation days, writing on the same text(s), specifically Romans 9-11, and unpacking the Wright saga. Effusive, garrulous, verbose, protracted arguments are both baffling and wearisome. Sheer poundage slides into QED—methinks the gentleman doth protest too much. Succinctness can be a strong invitation to discussion: Bultmann’s “Theology of Paul” was a part volume covered in little more than 150 pages.

2. *Complexity*. Herein lies an issue. Is Paul this complex? It’s caught in the question recently asked me by a student: “Tell me about the approach of Tom Wright?” “How long do you have?” was my answer. Here’s the way I get at the approach. Wright loves a good story. He has utilized the narrative category of “story” as an index to the biblical worldview whose plot and

themes are structured by a revealed story. In *The New Testament and the People of God*, he promised a model of the biblical story encompassing both testaments in a five-act play: 1—creation, 2—fall, 3—Israel, 4—Jesus; the church and the writing of the New Testament then formed the first scene in the fifth act with other scenes to follow. Paul is the lead player in the fifth act.

The *narrative* reading of Paul, pioneered by Richard Hays on the narrative substructure of Galatians, takes its clues in the apostle's fresh reading of scripture. According to Wright, "Paul grounds his theology again and again not in isolated prooftexts but in a reading of scripture which, like many second Temple Jewish readings, picked up its fundamental quality as the story of the creator and covenant God with the world and with Israel" (*Redemption*, 77). This plot with its subplots—and there are no surprises—dominates Wright's presentation of Paul.

To the narrative bit one must add two other crucial elements. First, Wright endorses a pruned and cleansed version of the *new perspective*, making it a fresh perspective. Avoiding dead ends and false trails in Sanders and Dunn, he nonetheless rejects legalism in the phrase "works of the law" and suggests that Israel's attempt to "establish their own righteousness" (Rom. 10:3) was to procure a "status of covenant membership which would be for Jews and Jews only. . . . This has been, from the start, one of the key insights of the so-called 'new perspective on Paul'" (*Paul*, 1169). Second and last in his developing thought, Wright adds the *political dimension* in Paul's language, those aspects of his gospel purportedly countering imperial propaganda. It finds its place in part 4 as a lengthy dispute with John Barclay, followed up by various and extraneous observations on the fallout from Paul's worldview.

He would have done well to provide an idiosyncratic glossary of terms—words like exile, covenant, and righteousness carry different meanings in the Wright vocabulary. After you have worked through the bold type definitions of eschatology—seven of them—you may take pause. On nearly every page, there is a definition, a defining and refining that makes the head spin.

His thought is profound and complex, fully in keeping with the title of a new book on my desk: "He never metaphor he didn't like." On top of all the declaratives and interrogatives, Wright invokes bird watching, something of an ornithological analysis of realia in Paul's worldview, as section headings: It begins with a simple reference to Yahweh's faithfulness to Israel, "like birds hovering overhead" (Isa. 31:5; p. 77); then Greek philosophy is Athene and the owl (p. 197); the cock stands for Asclepius and religion (p. 246); the

eagle has landed with imperial Rome (p. 279); symbols and praxis ask the question “a bird in hand?” Paul the master collector gathers all them into his nest (p. 351). The birds continue flying unseen through the second book then reappear: “The flocks of unruly birds, beating their wings around the bush, now gather into one” (p. 1265); then he tires of it: “Changing the metaphor (the reader may perhaps be relieved to know that the birds will be migrating elsewhere from now on), the aim is to set up four spotlights, . . .” (p. 1270); however, a bird remains because chapter 12 is called the “Lion and the Eagle.” This feathery flock is a curious sight to behold.

3. *Anxiety*. He writes as a man under siege, like one of the valiant light brigadiers in the Crimea,

Cannon to right of them

Cannon to left of them

Cannon in front of them

Volleyed and thundered

Wright is well aware of getting it from both sides. “I have spent most of my professional career in debate with scholars a million miles outside the evangelical tradition — people like Sanders, Vermes, Crossan, Borg, and semi-scholars like A.N. Wilson. I hope my fellow evangelicals realise what is involved in this, and how many people have expressed their gratitude to me for showing them a way to retain and celebrate Christian orthodoxy with intellectual integrity. It feels odd now to be debating the other way round, so to speak, but if it’s necessary I shall do it.” (“Shape of Justification” [2001]).

Indeed, the crowd of grave diggers on the evangelical side has grown, Piper, Carson, O’Brien, Gathercole, to name but a few. I sympathize with his dilemma—how many NT scholars have found it necessary to write a lengthy monograph in response to fraternal criticism (so his *Justification*) all the while jousting with a more hostile academy? Wright spends many pages wrangling with those closest to his own theological convictions. It perhaps serves to set out his position more clearly, but the stress of a rearguard action has narrowed his design options and produced burdensome pages of rejoinder.

The Heart of the Argument

Part III, chapters 9-11 of the second book take us to the heart of Wright’s perspective on Paul. With a handy set of graphs, several actantial grids, and unswerving grip on his plan, Wright rehearses the triad of religious values at the center of Second Temple Judaism: monotheism, election, and

eschatology. Each in turn is fulfilled and transformed by the Christ event in three intertwined movements: chapter 9: the ‘one God Israel freshly revealed’ issues in trinity, frontstaging Christ and Spirit with a subplot on evil; chapter 10: the ‘people of God freshly reworked’ features election in a covenant mode—the messiah and his people with a subplot on justification; chapter 11: ‘God’s future for the world freshly imagined’ presents hope of a new creation and the role of Israel with special attention to Romans 9-11. The latter is the largest exegetical section in the book, 100 pages replete with dense footnotes.

Wright says that “the hypothesis at the heart of this book is that Paul’s thought is best understood in terms of the revision, around Messiah and spirit, of the fundamental categories and structures of second-temple Jewish understanding; and that this ‘revision’, precisely because of the drastic nature of the Messiah’s death and resurrection, and the freshly given power of the spirit, is no mere minor adjustment, but a radically new state of affairs, albeit one which had always been promised in Torah, prophets and Psalms. . . . So, as the framework for my hypothesis, I have taken from the Jewish sources themselves the basic beliefs of monotheism and election, which together generate some form of eschatology” (p. 783).

To engage all the argument(s) put forth is an insurmountable challenge for any review, thus it may prove helpful to survey key points, especially those where I have lingering doubts.

1. *Christology*. Wright laments the fact the inscriptions on the coffee-mugs distributed among the members of the “Early High Christology Club” have tended to fade over time (p. 647, n. 97). He finds that evidence produced by Hengel, Hurtado, Bauckham and their protégés, though laudable, comes short of proof. “All this indicates that, if Paul had been aware of any quasi-divine status accorded to a coming Messiah in the pre-Christian world, he does not appear to build on such a notion. Rather, he *works up to this conclusion*. He regarded the Messiah as ‘divine’, in the senses so far explored, not because ‘everyone knew’ (or some people supposed) that the Messiah would be ‘divine’, but because of Jesus himself (p. 698). How would such a proposal work, for example, in the Gospel of John? I suppose that the Johannine corpus would be ruled out as a ‘late development’, but the case can be made that both Paul and John drink from the same EHCC cup!

2. *In Christ*. A consistent piece in Wright’s logic is that the term *Christos* in Paul must be translated and understood as ‘the Messiah’, not simple a name of Jesus. Furthermore, the embodiment of Israel in Jesus himself calls for an ‘incorporative Messiah’. If there is no divine status of the

messianic figure(s) in Judaism, how does one explain the origin of Paul's *en Christo* as "in the Messiah"? Wright concedes (pp. 825-27) that the notion of "in the Messiah" is never found in Second Temple Jewish texts; neither does an appeal to 'corporate personality' in Old Testament texts provide an adequate explanation. He resorts to his previous answer: "The events of Jesus' death and resurrection compelled Paul in this direction" (p. 827). I suggest that a better starting point is Damascus: "I am Jesus whom you are persecuting" (Acts 9:5).

3. *Justification*. This topic is the most controversial. Wright often gives the impression of reducing justification to an ecclesiological doctrine of who is in the covenant; although he insists on the forgiveness of sins, he minimizes personal and individual aspects, subordinating them to corporate and covenantal dimensions. Wright does affirm the dual role of justification as covenantal and forensic ("The Shape of Justification," *Bible Review* 17 [April 2001]: 8, 50). "It [justification] is God's declaration that the person is now in the right, which confers on them the status "righteous". We may note that, since "righteous" here, within the lawcourt metaphor, refers to "status", not "character", we correctly say that God's declaration makes the person "righteous", i.e. in good standing. This present declaration constitutes all believers as the single people of God, the one family, promised to Abraham (Gal. 2.14-3.29; Rom. 3.27-4.17), the people whose sins have been dealt with as part of the fulfilled promise of covenant renewal (Jer. 31.31-34). Membership in this family cannot be played off against the forgiveness of sins: the two belong together."

What is the divine verdict? "Those who are declared or accounted 'righteous' on the basis of Messiah-faith constitute the single covenant family which the one God has faithfully given to Abraham" (p. 961). The forensic emphasis is a given; the real question is the content of the acquittal. Wright says, "You are in the covenant"; I say, "You are not guilty." There is good reason for uneasiness. Michael Bird observes, "Furthermore, by reducing (or over-emphasizing) justification to a legitimisation of identity, there is the danger that Paul's theocentric language of divine vindication and his apocalyptic framework of human rebellion, redemption and cosmic renewal are being hijacked by those who wish to take Paul as espousing a postmodern gospel of inclusivity."¹

Some other related points. The matters of imputation, substitution, representation, doing the law, and judgment are still on the table, but time constraints lead me to two curious matters. First, the *pistis Iesou/Christou* debate plays a significant role in Wright's viewpoint. "Perhaps the point of the final dense clause, *ton ek pisteos Iesou*, literally 'the one out of the

faith[fulness] of/in Jesus', is precisely to run together the two elements of [Romans] 3.22, namely Jesus' own faithfulness as the act whereby redemption is achieved and the faith of the believer which becomes the badge of membership in the Messiah's people. If this is correct we could perhaps paraphrase as 'everyone who shares in the faithfulness of Jesus' (pp. 844-45). This is a garbled expedient to unpack the genitive so as to retain the subjective reading. Second, the ecclesial tentacles of Wright's approach come to the fore in his touting of baptism: "Baptism, like justification, brings people from every background into the single family whose incorporative name is *Christos*, providing the basis for their common life" (p. 962). When did the man who said "Christ did not send me to baptize" (1 Cor. 1:17) become an Anglican?

4. *Apocalyptic*. This bridge over troubled waters Wright has yet to cross. Put in terms of the history of Pauline interpretation, How does one get from Jesus to Paul? The apocalyptic language of two ages, this age and the age to come, has been a traditional bridge, but Wright has torn it down. His position has not varied from the start: There is no good reason to suppose that anybody, he says, in the early Jewish and Christian traditions was expecting, wanting or hoping for the end of space-time universe, or that the dramatic language they sometimes employed was intended to denote such an 'event'. Apocalyptic language was used, not least by Paul, to generate powerful metaphors for socio-political realities. "They did not expect the stars to fall from the sky" (pp. 167-75).

The effects of this are immediately visible in Wright's exegesis. 1) the language of Jesus in Mark 13 does not portend the end of all things; the cosmic signs and coming of the Son of Man point directly and only to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. 2) Likewise, Paul shows no interest in "dying and going to heaven"; his focus is on a new creation. The *parousia* as an invasion of the space-time order takes a backseat. It astounds me that the author of a hefty tome, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, has little to say about its place in Paul's theology. The treatment of 2 Corinthians 5 sidesteps the real issue of how Paul views the hope of resurrection. Wright insists on the primacy of a restored creation. How can it happen without a cosmic upheaval? The missing piece is a refusal to grant apocalyptic eschatology a real place—I feel the heavy hand of George Bradford Caird. Now to a final and crucial topic.

A Long-Standing Demurral

It is to the handling of Romans 9-11 that I enter my long-standing demurral. I am in hearty agreement with most of Wright's exposition, until

he comes to the end of chapter 11 and there we part company. What Wright calls a ‘majority view’ of Rom. 11:26, “and so all Israel will be saved,” comprises four points: (a) that this refers to a *new* event over and above anything yet described, (b) that ‘all Israel’ here can only refer to Jews, (c) that this may therefore refer to a mode of salvation other than that described in 10:1-3 or envisaged in 11:14, 23, and (d) that this will take place at the *parousia* (pp. 1239-40). He rejects each of them. Setting aside the question of whether Wright’s four points accurately portray the ‘majority view’, one wonders how the story of Israel, so labored as exile and promised in restoration—the baseline narrative for a Pauline theology, can end with a letdown: Some Jews will be saved.

Romans 11 takes up a stirring theme, the unfolding of God's mercy in salvation history; this theme integrates two related ideas: the future of Israel with God is grounded in a continuing election and is certified in the preaching of the gospel. The consideration of the question, “God has not rejected his people, has he?” (11:1), which expects a negative answer, is of crucial importance. Israel, both now as a saved remnant (11:1-10) and finally as a whole (11:25-26), is the sign that God’s word is unfailing. In asserting that God had not rejected Israel, Paul in fact retains the premises of election and gospel preaching announced respectively in chapters 9 and 10.² The gravity of Israel's stumbling at Christ might hasten the presumption that the nation was forever excluded from the sphere of divine mercy. To be sure, the persistent refusal of divine love signified that a judicial hardening had come upon Israel (10:21; cf. 11:7-10), but the gospel invitation was itself proof that God had not abandoned the effort to save Israel.³

Nothing in chapter 11 contests the freedom of divine election (9:6-29) or the necessity of righteousness by faith in Christ (9:30-10:21). The election theme is represented in the remnant of Jewish Christians, a renewal of the motif from 9:27-29, who have believed in Christ (11:5). The gospel theme is represented in the Gentile reception of salvation that also becomes the means of recovery for hardened Israel (11:11, 14). Even the hope for the salvation of “all Israel” (11:26) is in the fullest sense a new covenant prophecy standing under the rule of faith in Christ. If we take Paul's expectation seriously, the final word on the fate of Israel is not a human dream but the certainty that God's faithfulness to his purpose in Christ assures mercy (*eleos*) to all, both the full complement of Gentiles and a now disobedient Israel (11:28-32).⁴ The entire discourse is theocentric, i.e., Paul's theology not his psychology, and only by a recognition of this fact will we be helped to understand what the apostle means.⁵

This unprecedented prophecy has three formal parts, connected in the grammatical pattern *hoti . . . achris ou . . . kai houtōs* (11:25-26a), and a scriptural confirmation introduced by *kathōs* (11:26b-27). The following analysis of the prophecy offers a preliminary summary which will be developed in the discussion below:⁶

1. The judgment of God upon disobedient Israel is a limited hardening, encompassing only a part of the people.
2. When the full complement of the Gentile world has received the gospel, then the hardening of Israel will disappear.
3. As a consequence, the whole of Israel will be saved by believing in Jesus the Messiah.

The Hardening of Israel

The initial proposition is that the “hardening” of Israel has distinct limitations. First, whether we read the prepositional phrase *apo merous* adverbially, “hardened to some extent,”⁷ or adjectively, “part of Israel hardened,”⁸ it clearly indicates that a portion of Israel, the “rest” (11:7), has been blinded in unbelief. Second, a temporal limit is imposed by *achris ou*; when joined to the aorist subjunctive *eiselthē* (Gentiles “come in”), it must be translated “until the time which.”⁹ The condition will remain until a crucial event in salvation history has transpired, “until the full number of the Gentiles comes in.”

The Fullness of the Gentiles

The eschatological character of this event can be fixed by two observations: (1) the verb “come in” has a technical sense, “entering the kingdom of God” (cf. Mt. 7:13; Lk. 13:24) and therefore refers to the Gentile reception of salvation; and (2) the phrase “fullness of the Gentiles” means the full complement of converts from the Gentile world, a corporate perspective parallel to the “fullness” of Israel (11:12).¹⁰ It signifies an eschatological condition, the completion of the gospel mission among the nations of the world whose fulfillment would coincide with the lifting of blindness from Israel. This missionary sign means that the presage of the end time is gospel preaching to the nations, not the course of Israel in salvation history. Paul expects Israel to remain in unbelief until the end of this era; then, as a result of the gospel strategy already at work (11:11-15), the veil of spiritual blindness will be removed.¹¹

The Salvation of All Israel

What condition is implied in the connective *kai houtōs* (“and so,” 11:26a)? The adverbial particle *houtōs* is the syntactical key because it governs the primary force of the clause “all Israel shall be saved.” There are three possible views of *kai houtōs* that fit the requirements of grammar and context: modal, correlative, and temporal.

1. In deference to the fact that Paul did not write *kai tote* (“and then”), the modal view stresses the logical sense of *houtōs* and connects it to the immediately preceding clause. The sense would be: “The hardening will subside when the Gentiles are all saved, and in this manner, all Israel will be saved.” A modal rendering emphasizes that “by the whole Gentile world coming into the kingdom and thus rousing the Jews to jealousy,” the conversion of Israel becomes a reality.¹²

2. The correlative view notes the common use of *houtōs* to introduce a following statement; in this case, it corresponds to *kathōs*. The correlative “so . . . as” would predicate the salvation of Israel upon the event described in the scriptural quotation (11:26b-27). A correlative translation would read: “In the following manner, all Israel will be saved, just as it is written, the Redeemer will come from Zion.”¹³

3. The temporal view understands *houtōs* in the sense “when that has happened” (NEB), making the fullness of the Gentiles a chronological and necessary prerequisite to Israel's salvation. Temporal *houtōs* is a well-attested classical idiom,¹⁴ used in the New Testament to summarize a preceding sequence of events (Acts 17:33; 20:11).¹⁵ A temporal meaning is preferable because it leaves room for the other two meanings and preserves a future tension that characterizes the entire chapter.

What is the scope of the phrase *pas Israel* (“all Israel”)? The designation must be understood in a collective sense, “Israel as a whole,” an Old Testament formula indicating the totality of the people, as when Rehoboam “forsook the law of the Lord, and all Israel [*kōl Yisrael*] with him” (2 Chr. 12:1, RSV).¹⁶ Gifford correctly notes that “all Israel” in the collective sense indicates “a future conversion of the Jews, so universal that the separation into an ‘elect remnant’ and ‘the rest who were hardened’ shall disappear.”¹⁷ We must reject three widely-held views of *pas Israel*.

1. Numerical *pas*, meaning “every Jew”—“all Israel” no more means the salvation of every Israelite than “fullness of the Gentiles” means the salvation of every Gentile.¹⁸

2. Restrictive *pas*, meaning “the sum total of elect Jews who believe Christ during the gospel era”—if the eschatological dimension is removed by this reductionism, the whole chapter is tautological.¹⁹ What would excite Paul about the evident fact that the present “remnant” will be saved?

3. Spiritual *pas*, meaning the "Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16) which is the church of Jews and Gentiles—the sustained contrast between Israel and the Gentiles forbids this identification. It is impossible to give “Israel” a meaning here that does not belong to it throughout the rest of the chapter.²⁰

The Redeemer from Zion

When all Israel is saved, there may yet be unbelieving Jews, but the historical entity called Judaism will become subject to the gospel so that the church will incorporate the synagogue and Jews everywhere will be recognized as true Christians.²¹ The deliverance that Israel will experience is described by a conflated quotation from Is. 59:20-21 and 27:9; it is a spiritual restoration in the new covenant granting forgiveness of sins (11:26b-27). The phrase “from Zion” probably refers to the heavenly Jerusalem (Gal. 4:26) and alludes to the redeeming work of Christ which will be consummated at the second advent.²² The hope of Israel resides in the covenant mercy revealed in Jesus the Messiah, “the Deliverer” whose saving work extends from the incarnation to the *parousia* (cf. 1 Th. 1:10). One must beware of reading particularism, or dispensationalism, or universalism into this promise. Paul says nothing of a restored theocracy in the land of Palestine or the automatic salvation of every Jew, living and dead! In contrast to such blatant denials of justification by faith, he views the conversion of Israel under the sign of the cross, connecting it with the here and now of the gospel. They will come in as we have—by the way of the cross.

We are constrained to exclude all post-historical thinking (particularly millennialism) from 9-11 because an imminent expectation, an eschatological “now” (*nun*, 11:31), pervades the entire formulation.²³ It is this gospel era, the interim period before the *parousia*, that manifests the faithfulness of God to show mercy, and in a climactic episode of salvation history, that faithfulness will be demonstrated by Israel coming under God's righteousness in Christ. It cannot be stated with precision whether this episode culminates in the *parousia* or merely precedes it in time; however, the time period for the fulfillment of the prophecy has its *modus operandi* in gospel proclamation and its *terminus ad quem* at the return of Christ.²⁴

¹Michael F. Bird, "Justification as Forensic Declaration and Covenant Membership: A Via Media between Reformed and Revisionist Readings of Paul," *Tyndale Bulletin* 57.1 (2006) 119-20 [pp. 109-130].

²If one accepts the Pauline antinomy of divine sovereignty and human responsibility that pervades 9-11, the conclusion of chapter 11 is neither surprising nor contradictory. See L. Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert* (BFChT 55; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1954) 117; and Müller, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, 38.

³T. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (KNT 6; 2d ed.; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1910) 494.

⁴In the light of 11:23, the presupposition of Paul's reasoning is *sub conditione fidei* (G. Schrenk, "leimma," *TDNT* 4 [1967] 213-14); that the apostle contemplated the salvation of Israel by any other way than righteousness by faith in Christ is highly improbable.

⁵Hübner, *Gottes Ich und Israel*, 97.

⁶Cf. the three-point summary by Theodor Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, vol. 6, 2d ed. (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1910), p. 523; followed by Michel, *Römer*, p. 280.

⁷If connected to *gegonen*, the adverbial reading would mean "partially" but would not specify in what way the hardening is limited: (so Calvin, Weiss, Robertson, Michel).

⁸It more naturally modifies *pōrōsis* and indicates a quantitative limit, only a part of Israel (so Zahn, Godet, Maier, Barrett, Käsemann). The adverbial sense could bear this meaning.

⁹Cf. Lk. 21:24; 1 Cor. 15:25; and see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1914), p. 975; W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 128.

¹⁰Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 335. The uses of *pleroma* in v. 12 and v. 25 both denote coming to "full strength" of numbers in the eschatological consummation (see Gerhard Delling, "Pleroma," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. G. W. Bromiley, vol. 6 [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968], pp. 299, 305).

¹¹This eschatological viewpoint is defended in Weiss, *Römer*, p. 556; Gifford, *Romans*, p. 198; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 335; Lagrange, *Romains*, p. 284; Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, p. 327; Gaugler, *Römerbrief*, 2:200; Michel, *Römer*, p. 280; Barrett, *Romans*, p. 223; Munck, *Christ and Israel*, p. 134; and Käsemann, *Römer*, p. 300.

¹²Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 335; cf. Gifford, *Romans*, p. 199; Lagrange, *Romains*, p. 284; Maier, "Heilsgeschichte," p. 525. It should be noted that a modal translation does not exclude the temporal sequence; an appeal to grammar does not justify the radical historicizing of the passage (as Lenski, Franzmann, and Hendriksen propose).

¹³Cf. Arndt and Gingrich, *Lexicon*, p. 602; Müller, *Gottes Volk*, p. 43, n. 88; Hans Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. 8, 5th ed. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1971), p. 104.

¹⁴For the unambiguous use of *kai houtōs* to introduce a temporal apodosis, see Xenophon *Anabasis* 3. 4. 8; Epictetus *Dissertationes* 4. 8. 13 (cf. H. G. Liddell, Robert Scott, and H. S. Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon: A Supplement*, ed. E. A. Barber [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968], p. 112). Peter Stuhlmacher's criticism of the temporal view should be reappraised in light of this evidence ("Zur Interpretation von Römer 11, 25-32," in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. H. W. Wolff [Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971], p. 559). See P. van Horst, Talbert, and Kruse, *pace* Fitzmyer.

¹⁵Cf. 1 Cor. 11:28; 14:25; 1 Th. 4:17. Among others, the temporal view is held by Zahn, *Römer*, p. 523; Michel, *Römer*, pp. 280-81; Bruce, *Romans*, p. 222; and Käsemann, *Römer*, p. 300.

¹⁶Cf. 1 Sam. 7:5; 1 Kg. 8:65; Dan. 9:11; 1 Esd. 1:21; Jth. 16:1 (Arndt and Gingrich, *Lexicon*, p. 637).

¹⁷Gifford, *Romans*, p. 199. For a list of thirty-four interpreters who hold the collective viewpoint, see Corley, "Significance of Romans 9-11," pp. 226-30.

¹⁸Schrenk, *Weissagung*, p. 35. "It should be noted that this does not imply that *pantes hoi Ioudaioi sōthēsontai*; for Israel is not just the totality of its individual members; it is the bearer of the promise and the recipient of its fulfillment" (Walter Gutbrod, "Israel," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. G. W. Bromiley, vol. 3 [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965], p. 387).

¹⁹Most of the fathers restrict the phrase to the elect remnant of Jews who will come in by faith (so Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Diodore, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret [Schelkle, *Väter*, pp. 400-401]). According to Irenaeus, 11:26 cannot be used as an excuse for Jewish unbelief (*Adversus haereses* [Migne PG 7] 4. 2. 7). Coming nearer the proper meaning, Ambrosiaster says the spiritual blindness which haunts the Jews will be removed, “so that they have the possibility to believe” (*Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Romanos* [Migne PL 17] 160). The Lutheran and Reformed traditions espouse the restrictive view (see Lenski, Franzmann, and Hendriksen).

²⁰Bruce, *Romans*, pp. 221-22. The spiritual view appears in Augustine (who was not consistent [Schelkle, *Väter*, p. 402], Calvin, and Barth.

²¹Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, p. 327.

²²Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 336; against Munck, *Christ and Israel*, p. 137. Paul’s reading “from Zion” (*ek* has no parallel in the OT versions which read “for the sake of,” or “to” Zion) is deliberate (*contra* Dunn and Fitzmyer). One need not refer the quotation to either the incarnation (so Gifford, *Romans*, p. 199; Weiss, *Römer*, p. 559; and Lagrange, *Romains*, p. 286) or the *parousia* (so Gaugler, *Römerbrief*, 2:205; Bruce, *Romans*, p. 222; and Käsemann, *Römer*, p. 301) as strict alternatives. The background of 9-11 presupposes the entire interim period associated with the preaching of the gospel.

²³The significance of the “now” with regard to Israel must be that the events preceding the *parousia* are being fulfilled in the gospel mission (Munck, *Christ and Israel*, p. 124). The reading *nun* is preferred on two grounds: (1) strong manuscript evidence and (2) discourse parallelism with 11:15 and 11:26 (see Cranfield and Fitzmyer).

²⁴Since the phrases “life from the dead” (11:15) and “all Israel” (11:26) infer a revolutionary turnabout, the contrast and future tension show that Paul anticipates a future conversion of the Jews in a proportion not presently happening. Is this event “the last act of salvation history” at the *parousia* (Käsemann, Munck) or the resurrection (Sanday and Headlam, Lagrange, Lietzmann, Michel, Barrett)? Or, is it a spiritual renewal and worldwide revival preceding the *parousia* (Calvin, Godet, Gifford, Zahn, Moule, Maier, Gaugler, Murray)? Of necessity, the event lies at the boundary of history (Ridderbos, *Paul*, p. 359).