The Influence of the Septuagint on Paul:
A Study of Romans 9-11

Michael Bigg

Wolfson College

June 2008

This dissertation is submitted for the

degree of Master of Philosophy

Contents:

Preface

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except where specifically indicated in the text. It does not exceed the 20,000 word limit given by the Faculty of Divinity Degree Committee.

The ideas behind this dissertation first began to germinate under the watchful supervision of the Department of Theology at the University of Durham. I am grateful to them not only for their early help on this project, but for their generous support as they taught me to do theology. Professor Hayward's scholarly advice was ever-gracious and demonstrated genuine interest not only in my work, but also in me as a person. Both Professors Moberly and Barclay demonstrated that theology can (and should) involve one's whole being – mind, body and spirit – while retaining academic rigour. This is a lesson I shall not forget.

I am also extremely grateful for the supervision of Dr Simon Gathercole while I actually pieced this thesis together. He has been a vigilant and encouraging supervisor, keeping me on track, gently challenging my more outlandish statements, and reassuring me that even lecturers at the University of Cambridge sometimes refer to Weingreen's *Hebrew Grammar* to check verb paradigms. Alongside his direct supervision I am thankful for the vibrant community of scholars that form Tyndale House. Unsurpassed resources, helpful advice and regular tea breaks make the occasional loneliness and tedium of research infinitely more manageable.

Endless thanks are owed to my parents who have not only housed me and fed me this year, but have provided much love and common sense advice when needed. In addition, my father is an eagle-eyed spotter of the infelicitous turn of phrase which has rescued me from any number of jarring sentences. Any that remain are the result

of my ignorance of his advice. Gratitude is also due to the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), without which this project would not have been financially viable.

Final thanks go to Paul, whose ambiguous phrases and occasionally frustrating logic still continues to produce new fruit. I'm not sure I always agree with him, but I hope this thesis does not misrepresent him too much.

Abbreviations Used

BADG	Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*: *A Translation and Adaptation of the Fourth Revised and Augmented Edition of Walter Bauer's "Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch Zu Den Schriften Des Neuen Testaments Und Der übrigen Urchristlichen Literatur"* 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979)
BDB	Brown, Francis with S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrikson, 2005)
HR	Hatch, Edwin. and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books).* 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1998)
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George. and Robert Scott, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement 1996.* 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
TDNT	Kittel and Friedrich (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76)
ZAW	Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Chapter 1: Introduction

Paul is an Israelite follower of Jesus,[1] steeped in the foundational writings of his religion and culture. As such it is no surprise that Paul should refer to the Old Testament (OT) extensively throughout his own writing.[2] However, it has long been noted that Paul does not usually refer directly to the *Hebrew* OT but to its *Greek* translation, the Septuagint.[3] It is the contention of this thesis that, consciously or not, Paul's use of the Septuagint has actually shaped his use of the OT. When the Greek is cited Paul implicitly imports the translator's own understanding of the text at hand and this can affect the way Paul is able to use the OT.

Anyone working with languages will attest that unless the original is trivial any act of translation is also an act of interpretation.[4] The semantic range of a word in one language rarely matches the range of a similar word in another; nuances are different; the idiom of one language often does not find itself at home in another. As such a translator is forced to make choices – there is no one-to-one correlation between words at their disposal. These choices are naturally informed by the translator's own understanding of the text at hand, and this is particularly of relevance when working with a text such as the Hebrew Bible which is often terse and ambiguous. What is of interest is these choices. Have they imported resonances into the Septuagint that were not there in the OT? Have resonances been lost? Does the LXX translator have an agenda that comes out in his[5] translation? If so, does this agenda then rub off on Paul?

---

1   "Christian" will be used as shorthand for "follower of Jesus" throughout in spite of the anachronism.
2   The term "Old Testament" will be used throughout out of although of course Paul would never have referred to it as such. The term "Hebrew Bible" was considered, but the nature of this thesis would have made it a confusing term.
3   Hays, *Echoes*, p. xi. The term Septuagint (LXX) will (among others) be discussed in Chapter Two.
4   Jobes, *Invitation*, pp. 21, 93.
5   Gender-specific language is not ideal, but is likely to be accurate here.

An oft-used example is the citation of Isaiah 7:14 in Matthew 1:23: ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν κτλ.[6] The Hebrew word translated as παρθένος (virgin) is עַלְמָה, usually translated as "young woman", and so the LXX gives Matthew a license to associate the tradition of Mary's virginal state at Jesus' conception with Isaiah's prophecy. Of course it is not impossible that a "young woman" should be a virgin (indeed LXX Gen. 24:64 makes the same move of Rebekah, who is implicitly a virgin);[7] the point is that an external authority reading Isaiah's prophecy as referring to a virgin lends authority to Matthew's own association of this virgin with Mary. Had Matthew done the translation work for himself he would have been on shaky exegetical ground, but instead the interpretative move has already been made for him by the LXX and this move can be appropriated by Matthew.

In that case the LXX had made an interpretative choice which facilitated the exegesis of Matthew; this thesis seeks to examine such interpretative choices in passages cited in Romans 9-11 and the manner in which Paul's exegesis is thereby aided. Does the use of the LXX play any formative role in Paul's theology? It would be a difficult task to prove such a bold case but I do seek to demonstrate some dependence on the part of Paul. I seek to show that Paul's argument within Romans 9-11, with all its appeal to scripture is actively assisted by use of the LXX. I seek to identify points at which Paul utilises the room to manoeuvre created by the inherently interpretative act of translation (whether consciously or not) in order to encourage the OT to speak in his defence. In other words, how does that which is interpretative in the LXX become normative in Paul's writing?[8]

This is not to assert that Paul somehow uses the LXX to deliberately "twist" the OT for his own ends (although he certainly makes some moves that seem surprising to the modern reader). Instead, what is of primary interest here is the flow of written ideas through cultures and languages. When the OT was translated into Greek what was created was not a neutral stream of words, transparently transmitting the contents of the OT into a new language. The LXX is, like all translations, a culturally conditioned piece of literature; it reflects the language and thinking of the translators, and to a lesser degree the language and thinking of the time and place in which it was translated. When people make use of it, this conditioning is not transparent to the reader but colours the text, and this thesis seeks to detect these colours in Romans

---

6   Greek New Testament citations are taken from Nestle-Aland 27th Edition. Septuagint citations are from Rahlfs and Hebrew is taken from BHS unless otherwise specified.

7   Menken, *Textual Form*, p. 153

8   See McLay, *Use of the Septuagint*, pp. 159-170 for a brief examination of this phenomenon in Matthew. McLay earlier discusses the impact of LXX vocabulary on NT writing.

9-11. Therefore, the broader agenda behind this thesis is to raise questions about how Christians ought to understand "scripture" as "God's Word in human words". I hope to affirm a dynamic vision of scripture as speaking to and challenging culture both from within and without culture rather than a static entity that speaks only on its own terms. If this essential dynamism can be demonstrated within the very development of scripture then I hope to affirm that the nature of scripture itself demands openness to its re-interpretation in the light of changing cultural contexts.

Literature Review

The secondary literature on Romans is enormous, as anyone working on it quickly finds. Commentaries are abundant,[9] as are monographs on other themes within the epistle, as a brief search of a library catalogue will attest. Romans, as the most "systematic" of Paul's letters, also enjoys major treatment in anything written on Pauline theology in general. The post-holocaust world has also witnessed a renewed interest in Paul's attitude to Israel and as such much has recently been written on Romans 9-11.[10] Such commentaries and articles, particularly the more exegetical ones,[11] show some interest in the LXX text and often note any wild divergence from the Hebrew.[12] However, the primary interest is in Romans as it stands, and so the influence of the LXX is not in view.

Another stream of interest has been in Paul's use of scripture. In recent years much has been written on inter-textuality in Paul and the manner in which he makes use of the Old Testament.[13] These studies have done much to illuminate the manner in which Paul invokes the Old Testament world within his arguments, but they tend to be concerned with concepts and allusions more than the actual words used. As with the commentaries, they will usually note occasions on which the LXX departs significantly from MT, but some smaller details are often missed. In addition, the interest is more focused on Paul's argument as it stands rather than the difference LXX makes to it. Therefore, while such studies are useful background for my thesis, they rarely cover the same ground.

Stanley's monograph, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, is more helpful for

---

9   See the bibliography for a select few.

10   Johnson, *Romans 9-11*; Moo, *The Theology of Romans 9-11* (in response to Johnson); Meeks, *On Trusting*; Westerholm, *Paul and the Law*; Caird, *Predestination*; Wasserberg, *Romans 9-11.* This list barely scratches the surface.

11   Cranfield, Dunn and Moo are good examples.

12   See particularly Seifrid, *Romans,* for general interest in understanding the OT in Romans.

13   Hays, *Echoes* and Wagner, *Heralds* have been major developments. Abasciano, *Paul's Use*, also explores this phenomenon within Romans 9:1-9.

my thesis, but as background rather than direct material. His work examines all of Paul's clear citations and seeks to compare his rendering with extant LXX manuscripts.[14] Where Paul diverges from LXX Stanley asks whether the divergence is from Paul's own hand, or whether perhaps some other reason might be found. The manner in which Paul weaves the LXX into his own work is explored and as a result much of the work in establishing Paul's own LXX is done. Although Stanley is very thorough he is sometimes a little conservative in preserving Paul's integrity with respect to the text he reads, so his work is not always agreed with.[15] In terms of actual relevance to this thesis, Stanley can only assist in textual work. He offers few suggestions as to how the text of the LXX itself might influence Paul's argument and vocabulary.[16]

The other major works feeding into this thesis are studies on the LXX. Wevers' *Notes on the Greek Text* series[17] offers insights into methods of translation and points of divergence from MT; however, the monographs only cover the Pentateuch so are of limited help. Also, the focus is very much upon the LXX in its relevance to Old Testament study and so never asks questions directly along the lines of this thesis. The other series of note is Marguerite Harl's, *La Bible d'Alexandrie,*[18] which offers a translation and notes on the LXX. Again, the series is incomplete (though more complete than Wevers) and is useful only in as much as it sheds light on what the text of the LXX is trying to say. Of course there are also many studies on the nature of the LXX itself and the translation strategies of the translators. Jobes represents a "maximalist" approach in explaining deviation from the Hebrew in terms of theological motivation;[19] Aejmelaeus (with many Scandinavian scholars) is more cautious in approaching such problems.[20] Similar debates go in with reference to specific books[21] but, while important, these are not of direct interest to this thesis as deviation from the Hebrew is taken as a given, not something to be explained.

This brief survey shows that much research has been done on Romans 9-11

---

14   See also Koch, *Die Schrift*, which has a similar project.
15   Lim, *Holy Scripture*, compares Paul's citation technique with the Qumran peshersists and concludes that neither Paul nor the pesherists considered scripture the unalterable word of God and so reworked it according to context (179). However, he generally resists giving Paul too much freedom to do this, and suggests that he may regularly have compared the Greek to the Hebrew and other ancient versions.
16   For a brief summary of Stanley, Koch and Lim see Wagner, *Heralds*, 6-8.
17   Part of the *Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series* published by Scholars' Press.
18   Published by Cerf.
19   See the chapter on "The Septuagint as Translation" in Jobes, *Invitation*, 86-102.
20   See "What Can We Know About the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint" in Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, 77-115 and also Olofsson, *God is My Rock*: "the choice of equivalents is rarely based on conscious theological exegesis" (149).
21   For a survey of approaches to LXX Isaiah see Van der Kooij, *Isaiah in the Septuagint*, 513-9; Baer, *When*, 11-15.

itself, Paul's use of the Old Testament in general, the LXX text Paul works from, and the text of the LXX itself. However, there is nothing explicitly looking at the influence of the LXX text on Paul's argument and vocabulary. While commentators occasionally note the more radical translations offered by LXX and used by Paul, no-one has systematically looked at Paul's argument and traced the influence of the LXX upon it.

Chapter 2: Method

Several terms which required qualification were used in the introduction, the most important of which is "LXX".[22] The designation LXX is long-disputed and slippery, with the problem of definition being compounded by the various "recensions" within its complex transmission history.[23] For the sake of convenience the term "LXX" is retained, but must be read as shorthand which includes the following caveat. "LXX", like "Bible", is a collective term; it represents a collection of translations from a variety of translators demonstrating different approaches to the task of translation. LXX Isaiah cannot be assumed to have the same qualities as LXX Deuteronomy. As much as possible this thesis will approach each book of the LXX in its own right.

Before getting too far into discussion of the method itself a comment ought to be made on the choice of Romans 9-11 as subject matter. There is no particularly profound reason for this choice as just about any passage would suffice. However, Romans 9-11 lends itself to my purposes for two reasons. Firstly, there is a notable proliferation of OT citations within these three chapters. Within the Pauline corpus there are eighty-nine OT citations, fifty-one of which are found in Romans; in chapters 9-11 many of these citations are explicit.[24] No other passage has the density of citation found here for thirty-nine percent of the text of Romans 9-11 is scriptural citation,[25] thus this small section of text offers a rich seam of raw material against which my thesis can be assessed.

Secondly, Romans 9-11 forms a relatively isolated literary unit. There are many debates about how exactly the argument of these chapters is related to the rest of Romans, but such questions are beyond the scope of this thesis. Commentators are generally agreed that these chapters form a distinct argument within the course of the letter,[26] this means that

---

22 Or "Septuagint". For general introductions see Jobes, *Introduction* or Dines, *Septuagint.*
23 The complexity is easily seen in the Greek text(s) of the book of Esther. See Jobes, *Alpha Text.*
24 Hays, *Echoes*, p. 34.
25 Guerra, *Romans*, p. 145.
26 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, p. 518: "a carefully composed and rounded unit". Ernst Käsemann. *Commentary on Romans*, p. 253: "apart from chapter 16, no part of the epistle is so self-contained as this". Johnson, *Romans 9-11*, p. 216. I am yet to come across a commentary which does not

to a degree they can be looked at in isolation which is methodologically useful for avoiding "scope creep". A final benefit of looking at Romans 9-11 is that the argument in itself is a fascinating and important one which still raises many questions for Paul's interpreters. I hope also to contribute to these ongoing discussions.

Discussion of the method used in writing this thesis will benefit greatly from a few comments clarifying what is *not* of interest. Firstly, we are not interested in the relationship between the LXX and its presumed Hebrew *Vorlage*. McLay offers four suggestions for explaining perceived differences between the LXX and modern Hebrew texts: (i) the *Vorlage* of the LXX differed from our Hebrew texts, (ii) the LXX translator(s) misread their *Vorlage*, (iii) the LXX translator(s) deliberately made an interpretative choice to make a theological point, (iv) the translator(s) assumed an error in their *Vorlage* and corrected their translation.[27] While these possibilities are all very real and interesting in themselves they are not in focus here. This thesis takes these differences as its starting point; how they got there is immaterial, what is of real interest is what Paul makes of them.

An indirect interest is that of the Greek texts used by Paul. It is acknowledged at the outset that "the LXX" may not exist as far as Paul is concerned, all he is likely to have had is individual books translated into Greek. We cannot be sure of the relationship between the Greek Paul had before him and the critical editions of the LXX available to the modern scholar. If Paul's citations differ from the Greek that we might expect it is not always easy to discern where Paul has been free with his text and where his text reads differently to our own. There can be no hard rules for adjudicating these cases, each one must be taken on its own merits. However, priorities demand that such decisions are not dealt with in the depth that they might deserve, but in deference to this problem more interest will be shown in cases where some confidence can be established in the similarity between Paul's *Vorlage* and our own reconstructions of the LXX.

The thesis proper will be divided into two main sections. The first section will take the form of an exegesis of Romans 9-11 in its own right. In order to understand how the LXX contributes to Paul's argument it is essential to have a clear picture of how the argument itself functions. Thus the first section will go step by step through Romans 9-11 and explore how the argument hangs together and, given the main focus of the thesis, special attention will be paid to OT citations and how they serve Paul's argument. This section is not intended to be a complete and thorough exegesis of the text (that would be a thesis in its own right); it is intended that this section will form a framework from which to examine Paul's use of the LXX. A helpful analogy is that of a jigsaw puzzle. The text itself is analogous to the individual pieces of the puzzle put together in a certain way in order to build up the "picture" that the

---

treat chapters 9-11 as a unit.

27 McLay, *Use of the Septuagint*, pp. 20-1.

puzzle presents. When Paul cites scripture it is as if he is taking a piece from another puzzle to build up the picture in his own. However, in order to understand why Paul takes certain pieces from the OT for his own puzzle it is important to describe the picture that he is building up, only then can we see the role each particular piece of scripture plays in Paul's picture. The first section is an exercise in describing Paul's picture.

The second section concerns itself with looking at how Paul's use of scripture in his argument is augmented by his use of the LXX. Having identified key points at which scripture is used to authenticate Paul's case in section one, the thesis will then go back to these points and trace the evolution of OT citations from Hebrew into Greek and finally into Romans 9-11. By closely examining choices made in translation I will demonstrate the way in which the LXX is, in itself, a tool which makes Paul's job more simple. To extend my puzzle analogy the second section starts from the recognition that a "piece" from the OT "puzzle" is not necessarily identical with its counterpart in the LXX "puzzle" (indeed the very nature of translation means that it *cannot* be identical). As such an OT piece will inevitably be of a slightly different "shape" to the LXX piece, and the details and emphases the OT piece adds to the picture will not be quite the same as the details and emphases added by the LXX. The interest of section two is therefore to examine the extent to which the LXX "pieces" are actually better suited as resources when compared to the Hebrew "pieces"; that is, the way in which the pieces provided by the LXX slot more naturally into Paul's picture.

One final comment on the nature of the argument employed. I will examine several places at which I believe the LXX has shaped Paul's argument; some examples will be more compelling than others, some may rely on my exegesis of the passage while some may be more generally clear. The force of the whole argument is therefore cumulative. It does not rely on each individual piece of the puzzle fitting exactly into place, it is about discussing how well the pieces fit. If one example does not persuade the reader then I hope others may be more convincing. The thesis will not stand or fall on every example being indisputable but on building up an overall picture of the way the LXX shapes Paul's work.

Chapter 3: Romans 9-11 – An Overview

Though it is never explicitly declared the problem giving rise to Paul's lament (9:1-5), which requires three chapters of discussion, is implied by the soaring conclusion to chapter eight.[28] He argues that the Christian hope is well-founded because it is associated with God's purpose (8:18-39).[29] But what of the Jews? It is clear to everyone that they are resisting the gospel in vast numbers and this is precisely the problem. Were they not children of promise, chosen to be God's people and he their God (Jeremiah 24:7, 31:33, 32:38)? If God is now to be found through faith in Jesus Christ has not the rug been pulled from beneath Jewish feet? If this unhappy state of affairs were accepted the worrying corollary for Christians would be the undermining of their own hope. Paul resists such a conclusion and chapters 9-11 are his defence.

The argument is, on one level, a case study on the relationship between a sovereign God and free (if stubborn and intransigent) people, and Paul neither attempts to dissolve the tension by negating one half of the equation, nor does he resolve the tension by neatly tying up every loose end. Instead, Paul sets both halves of the equation down side-by-side and affirms both. He then proceeds to affirm that the merciful purposes of God are being worked out within this apparently problematic situation; indeed, this problem is part of the solution! This brief chapter will discuss in outline the manner in which such an argument is put together. Detailed exegesis will be reserved for later; at present I hope that the shape of Paul's argument will help us to see the way in which his scriptural citations function for him. Between the introductory lament (9:1-5) and the concluding hymn of praise

---

28 That Romans 9-11 are integral to the letter, not a mere "excursus", seems to be the current consensus (Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 519-20; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 540-52).

29 Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, p. 446.

(11:33-36) commentators generally divide the bulk of Paul's argument into three sections: 9:6-26, 9:30-10:21, and 11:1-32. These sections relate to a threefold argument and will be looked at in turn.

Romans 9:6-29

9:6-29, variously headed "Defining the Promise (1): God's Sovereign Election"[30], "God's Sovereign Freedom"[31], "The Call of God"[32] or "Israel's Failure is Not Contrary to God's Direction of History"[33], asserts as its primary theme the right of a sovereign God to act as a sovereign God pleases. This is demonstrated in a series of scriptural references starting from the Patriarchs, moving through the Exodus story, and finally into the Prophets. The persistent claim is that when God wills something it occurs, and humans are not in a position to resist (9:19). Two things are notable about the nature of this claim. Firstly, it is not to be read as a general point about the predestination of all individuals in accordance with the sovereign will of God,[34] but notes particular instances in Israel's history in which God has expressly willed something. This is made particularly clear when one recognises that the corporate nature of Israel is more important to Paul than the individuals within it.[35] Although God (of necessity) works out his purposes though individuals it is the corporate purpose that is primary; to over-individualise is to focus on the wrong target. Secondly, and related to the first point, it is a mistake to make Paul's language over-soteriological. When he notes the choosing of Isaac over Ishmael (9:7-9), he is not suggesting that God chooses one to be "saved" while the other is cast into darkness; the purpose of the election is to enact God's saving will. This is the nature of the election of Israel in general; it is not primarily an election to salvation, but an election to a vocation by which God might save.[36] This is made clear in the programmatic statement to Abraham: "I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, *so that you will be a blessing*" (Genesis 12:2). The purpose of Abraham's calling (and, by extension, the calling of Israel) is not personal salvation, but to bring salvation to all.

With these thoughts in mind we can work through Romans 9:6-29. Paul lays

---

30   Moo, *Romans*, 568.
31   Morris, *Romans,* 351.
32   Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 536
33   Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 558.
34   Moo, *Romans*, 548; Kasemann, *Romans*, 253; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 519-20.
35   Abasciano, *Paul's Use*, 41-44, 183-9.
36   Wright, *Romans and the Theology*, 56-7

out his thesis in 9:6a: "It is not as though the word of God had failed". The phrase is grammatically somewhere between a statement and a question,[37] intended to introduce his theme in response to a potential objector. How is this? Not all Israel are *Israel* (9:6b), that is not all *ethnic* Israel are channels through which *vocational* Israel works out God's purposes. This is demonstrated by the scriptural examples of Isaac and Jacob, both of whom are chosen to be the channel of God's purpose according to God's sovereign will (emphatically not on account of what one does in the latter case). That the election is to Israel's vocation (and not to "salvation") is demonstrated by the case of Ishmael; although he is clearly not the chosen channel for Israel's vocation, as Paul demonstrates, he is not thereby abandoned by God. Immediately after the verse Paul cites from Genesis 21, God affirms to Abraham that "as for the son of the slave woman, I will make a nation of him also" (21:13), and later in the chapter it is stated that "God was with the boy [Ishmael]" (21:20). To suggest that Paul here argues for God's predestining of the individual to salvation or not is to suggest that Paul does not know his scripture; God may predestine but he does so to a vocation.

Immediately Paul moves to counter the objector tempted to say, "It's not fair" on account of God's apparent partiality. God's un-meritocratic method of election might be deemed unfair as it is so contrary to human sensibilities.[38] Mercy, however, is God's to give in accordance with his purposes (9:15), and Paul is quite insistent that the divine will must have primacy. He also notes that divinely given vocations are not necessarily glamorous, as Pharaoh discovers (9:17-18). This only leads to another objection, for if God chooses without reference to human merit how can he be just in finding meritless humans at fault? The common image of the potter and clay is evoked as an analogy for God's relationship to creation (9:20-24). While the paradigmatic example of this image occurs in Jeremiah 18, and balances the authority of God as creator with human response as free agent,[39] Paul here sticks to the former and emphasises the simple authority of God to work out his purposes according to his own agenda.[40] This is not a doctrine whereby some are created for destruction in order to somehow increase God's glory, but recognition of the varied purposes of human agents in the divine plan.[41] Paul acknowledges the free agency of humanity (as we will see), but at this point is content to emphasise the divine will.

At the end of 9:24 Paul introduces the Gentiles as a group into the equation.

---

37 See Johnson, *Romans 9-11*, 216 n.22; Aageson, *Scripture and Structure*, 268
38 Moo, *Romans*, 591
39 Moberly, *Prophecy*, Ch. 2. The theme of the relationship between creator and created is explored in narrative form in Salley Vickers' novel *Mr Golightly's Holiday*.
40 Seifrid, *Romans*, 644-5; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 655-6.
41 Caird, *Predestination*, 326.

This introduction paves the way for the idea that God is free to choose those outside of Israel just as easily as insiders. The two citations from Hosea serve this purpose, in demonstrating God's freedom to declare whomsoever he pleases to be "my people". Finally, citations from Isaiah introduce the remnant theme which will be picked up in chapter eleven. The predicted remnant parallels the present poor response of Israel to the gospel;[42] presumably, given the context, this is the result of the divine will.[43] It also implies something important about the nature of Israel. The term "remnant" must suggest a bigger category from which the remnant remains and the bigger category in this case is obviously ethnic Israel. As such, we cannot say that ethnic Israel is no longer a valid category for Paul's thought for the remnant language clearly presupposes it; what can be said is that Paul makes a distinction between ethnic Israel whom he called to be his people, and the individual members of that family whom God calls explicitly to outwork his merciful purposes.

Therefore what we must look for when examining Paul's citations in the next section is the way in which scripture serves to emphasise the primacy of the divine will. This is the major theme running through this section so we will look for points at which the LXX translation emphasises God's freedom more than the MT.

9:30-10:21

The second section of Paul's argument (9:30-10:21) has been subtitled "Understanding Israel's Plight: Christ as the Climax of Salvation History"[44], "The Word of Faith",[45] "The Fulfilment of Promise in Christ"[46], "Human Responsibility"[47] and "Israel's Failure: It Is Derived From Its Own Refusal".[48] These have varied emphases, but all stem from the recognition that Paul is grappling with the manner in which Israel has responded to Jesus.

He begins by noting a curious irony. The Gentiles, not striving for God's righteousness, receive God's righteousness through faith (9:30); but Israel, striving for the very law of righteousness ($νόμον\ δικαιοσύνης$), do not attain it (9:31). It is not because of Israel's disinterest that they have missed the boat, but because of their pursuit of the law "as if it were based on works" (9:32). Thus, they have stumbled

---

42 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 575.
43 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 574.
44 Moo, *Romans*, 616.
45 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 576.
46 Seifrid, *Romans*, 650.
47 Morris, *Romans,* 373.
48 Fitzmyer, *Romans, 576.*

over the stumbling-stone that God has placed before them. This neat phrase manages to hold together the two parts of the argument, for on the one hand it is Israel that has actively stumbled while God is the author of their stumbling. The two agencies are held together, as was common in Jewish thought.[49]

It is Paul's contention that Christ is the goal or culmination of the law (10:4).[50] Following Paul's high view of Torah (7:12, and taking seriously the reference to Torah as "the law of righteousness" in 9:31)[51] it seems best to say that the righteousness promised by the law is that attained through faith in the goal of the law rather than arguing that it comes as a result of the law's cessation.[52] The γάρ in 10:5 strongly connects the verse to that which proceeds it, suggesting that 10:5-13 explain the consequences of righteousness through Christ as the goal of the law. While Hays may go a little too far in saying that here "righteousness from faith" is synonymous to "righteousness from Torah",[53] he is certainly right to resist setting the two up as antithetical.

Paul's basic line of argument through chapter ten is that Israel has been given every opportunity to respond to the gospel and responsibility for their failure lies squarely at their door. The gospel is not far away so that Israel needs to strive in searching for it, for righteousness by faith does not say in its heart[54] that we must go here or there to bring Christ to us (10:6-8). Simple faith is within the reach of all as it takes the burden away from human work in favour of divine favour. Jew and Gentile are in the same position here – both are reliant on a God who is generous to all who call on him (10:12). This is exactly what Israel has failed to do in understanding Torah-observation to procure grace, rather than being the channel through which God made his grace available to her.

Having argued that justification and salvation come through a response of faith and confession Paul moves to counter a possible line of objection. How could Israel call on the name of a lord in whom they do not believe (10:14)? And how can they believe if they have not heard the message (10:14)? And how can they hear the message if no-one tells them the word of Christ (10:14, 17)? And how can someone announce the message to them if they are not sent (10:15)? With a series of scriptural

---

49   Westerholm, *Paul and the Law*, 224.
50   Wright, *Letter to the Romans*, 655-8; Hays, *Echoes*, 76. The many different ways of understanding τέλος νόμου are discussed in Badenas, *Christ: The End of the Law*
51   Meeks, *On Trusting*, 115.
52   Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 584.
53   Hays, *Echoes*, 76.
54   Probably an allusion to the motif that runs throughout Deuteronomy affirming that Israel's election is predicated upon God's love for them, not their own merit (Deut. 8:17). Part of Paul's critique of Israel is lapsing into belief in the latter. Cf Meeks, *On Trusting*, 117-8.

quotations Paul refutes all of these objections; Israel has heard and understood but is stubborn and unyielding to God's graciousness. Thus, as Isaiah says, God has the experience of holding out his hands to a disobedient people (10:21). The purpose of this section is a little difficult to express without reading too far ahead but, as Paul will finally conclude, if the hardness of Israel is actually used to further God's purposes then these verses serve to emphasise that Israel is still guilty for her own failure to respond to the gospel. She cannot turn to God later and claim a divine amnesty upon her transgressions because God has used her transgressions to progress divine purposes.

In the next chapter we will be looking for examples of the LXX helping Paul to place responsibility for failure to respond to the gospel at Israel's door. However, the argument requires that God still remains in control of the situation and is actually using Israel for the purpose of bringing about the salvation of the Gentiles; if the LXX can help Paul to affirm Israel's own accountability while also being aware of the divine action behind it then all the better.

11:1-36

In chapter 11 Paul begins by summarising his argument thus far (11:1-10),[55] and then moves to bring the threads of his argument together (11:11-32) and finally closes with a doxology (11:33-36). The summary re-asserts that God has not rejected his people on account of the faithful "remnant" who have believed. First of all there is Paul's own example (11:1); a Jew with faith in Christ providing a continuity for the path of God's promise to Abraham.[56] The existence of a remnant is also inferred from God's words to Elijah (11:2-5); just as God preserved a remnant for himself then so he does now.[57] This present remnant is chosen on the basis of grace alone (11:5-6), but on the other side those who have not come to faith have been hardened (11:7). Israel has, in effect been divided into "elect" and "hardened" based on God's will; this hardening is supported by two final citations in 11:8-10. Remembering that Paul has pointed to Pharaoh as one who was hardened by God in order to bring about his merciful purposes (9:17-8), which might suggest a similar purpose in the hardening of faithless Israel.

11:11-24 explains the logic behind the remnant and hardened Israel. It is, as

---

55 Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 633.
56 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 603-4.
57 Indeed Wright, *Romans*, 675-6, argues that Paul identifies himself with Elijah and his plea, and has received the same divine assurance of a remnant.

Achtemeier says, almost a spatial analogy.[58] Firstly, Paul says that their "stumbling" will not cause them to fall, indeed it is *through* their transgression that salvation has come to the Gentiles (11:11). The logic here is that salvation can only come to the Gentiles if some of Israel falls away to make space; if faith in Jesus was embraced by Judaism then the tendency might be to keep Gentiles out and retain national and ethnic practises, thus further alienating them. It is *only* if a large part of Israel is hardened that "Christianity" can become a multi-ethnic movement, and in this respect hardened Israel is actually *more* important than the remnant who are there to provide continuity. Paul believes that Gentiles will not come in fullness while Jewish Christians still wear their "badges betokening race and nation",[59] as would be the tendency if Christianity continued to have a Jewish majority. This logic is elaborated in the analogy of the olive tree (11:17-24). Israel is an olive tree, with roots sunk deeply into the grace given to them by God in the covenant, but others can only be introduced into the tree if some existing branches are first removed.

The other thread running through these verses is that of Israel's jealousy.[60] He foresees a time when Israel will be frustrated by what they see as the transfer of their promises and privileges (9:4-5) to the Gentiles. Thus the hardening of Israel will both make space for the Gentiles, but also re-invigorate their own passion for God. The logic may seem odd, indeed Sanders asks: "Does [Paul] really think that jealousy will succeed where Peter failed?"[61] However, it appears to be the case that he thinks precisely this.[62]

And so Paul comes to the climax of the argument: "And so, all Israel will be saved" (11:26). Although it is disputed as to whether καὶ οὕτως is modal ("in this manner") or more temporal,[63] the meaning of "all Israel" must put the emphasis on the "all". It is *all* Israel that will be saved,[64] not all *Israel*, that is, the elect Israel as redefined in 9:6b. That Paul is referring to ethnic Israel must be conceded given that the redefinition of 9:6b is not then applied to Paul's use of the term "Israel"; the redefinition is temporary and polemical, Paul then spends the rest of chapters 9-11 using it in an ethic/national sense.[65] To propose that Paul at this point refers only to

---

58 Achtemeier, *Romans*, 180.
59 Dunn, *New Perspective*, 198.
60 "Jealousy" has perhaps more negative overtones that the Greek suggests. The root strongly links with zealotry and so ζηλόω should be read more as "re-invigoration" or "provoking concern and eagerness" than "jealousy".
61 Sanders, *Paul, the Law*, 198.
62 Johnson, *Romans 9-11*, 232.
63 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 681; of course the meanings are not mutually exclusive.
64 Though it does not follow that this refers to each individual Israelite; see Sanday & Hedlam, *Romans*, 335 and Morris, *Romans*, 421.
65 Longenecker, *Different Answers*.

remnant Israel firstly makes the usage awkward, but also fails to provide a satisfactory solution to Paul's initial problem. The hardening has come on Israel (11:25), but it does not follow that they cannot be unhardened as the Exodus 33:19 citation suggests (9:15). The phrase ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν (11:15) is useful here; the ambiguity of whether to read a subjective or objective genitive enables Paul to neatly bundle up God's hardening of Israel with her own hardness. This, says Paul, can be transformed when God no longer wishes his covenant people to be hardened.

The actual means of salvation is also disputed. That the "Deliverer" (ῥυόμενος) should come "out of Zion" suggests that Paul identifies him with Christ himself,[66] perhaps in more recognisably messianic form. Given that Paul takes salvation to be a *future* event,[67] it is not a great problem for him for salvation to occur on account of a Messiah Jesus from Zion.

That Paul should be talking about ethnic Israel is finally confirmed by 11:28-32. Though enemies of God as far as the gospel is concerned, it is *for the sake of* the Gentiles (11:28).[68] They are beloved because God has chosen them and this vocation now brings them into a temporary enmity towards God, yet this enmity serves the purpose of bringing mercy to the Gentiles (11:30).

If the LXX is to help Paul's argument in 11:1-10 it will again enable him to affirm both the self-induced hardness of Israel and the divine purposes behind it. The essential balance between human responsibility and divine purposes runs throughout these chapters and the LXX needs to help Paul maintain it. The final section (11:25 onwards) looks forward to God's final act of salvation as the Redeemer comes. This is God's act of un-hardening Israel once the Gentile mission has been fulfilled (11:25) and the hardness has served its purpose. If the LXX can provide a vision of such a redemptive act (against the Hebrew text) then it will have supported Paul's argument and this thesis will be demonstrated.

---

66 *Ibid.*, 98.
67 σώζειν always appears in the future tense. The exception to this is Romans 8:24 which is arguably set in a future context and certain done "in hope".
68 Cranfield, *Romans*, 580.

Chapter 4: Romans 9-11 and the Septuagint

The main chapter of this thesis works through Romans 9-11 and analyses the citations found therein. Each time the text of the citation will be compared to the LXX with a discussion of any variants that are found, then a comparison of the LXX with its presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* will follow. Differences, obvious and subtle, will be considered to see how translational moves in the LXX then become embedded into Paul's letter. Some will be fundamental shifts of emphasis useful for Paul's argument, others will be subtle nuances which help rhetorically or make use of a catch-word employed by Paul. Sometimes LXX may be counter-productive for him. I hope that over the course of this chapter a picture of the influence of the LXX on Paul will begin to emerge.

9:6-13 – It is not as though the word of God has failed

The first clear citation comes in 9:7 (from Genesis 21:12). The verbal parallels between Paul and the LXX make it an indisputable citation.[69] The translation of this short and simple phrase is devoid of any surprises,[70] so does not further this thesis. However, in terms of Paul's argument, the important terms "to call" (καλεῖν)[71] and "seed" (σπέρμα) are used.

---

69 Stanley rates it U+ (full agreement, with no significant variant readings in either tradition), *Paul and the Language*, 103.
70 Siefrid, *Romans*, 639. Even the Hebraic idiom "call to you" is retained.
71 Note the passive used – it is not Abraham who determines his seed, but God.

Romans 9:9 and Genesis 18:

Romans 9:9[72]	LXX Gen. 18:14	MT 18:14	LXX Gen. 18:10	MT 18:10
<u>κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον</u>	εἰς <u>τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον</u>	לַמּוֹעֵד	<u>κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον</u> εἰς ὥρας	כָּעֵת חַיָּה
ἐλεύσομαὶ	ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σὲ εἰς ὥρας	אָשׁוּב אֵלֶיךָ כָּעֵת חַיָּה		
<u>καὶ ἔσται</u>	<u>καὶ ἔσται</u>	וּלְשָׂרָה	<u>καὶ</u> ἕξει υἱὸν Σαρρα ἡ γυνή σου	וְהִנֵּה־בֵן לְשָׂרָה אִשְׁתֶּךָ
<u>τῇ Σάρρᾳ</u>	<u>τῇ Σάρρᾳ</u>	בֵן		
<u>υἱός</u>	<u>υἱός</u>			

Paul's use of Genesis 18:14 a few verses later (9:9) offers a little more hope to our thesis. It may be argued that the citation conflates Genesis 18:10 and 18:14,[73] but the primary basis for this is the use of κατά instead of εἰς to start the quote. It does not help that LXX has smudged some of the distinction between the two verses,[74] but to suggest a conflation only confuses the issue when the change can just as easily be attributed to a memory slip (perhaps under the influence of 18:10) or an unattested variant in Paul's manuscript.[75] It appears that the phrase כָּעֵת חַיָּה from 18:10 is (understandably) translated as κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον is then transposed into 18:14 at the wrong point.[76] The important thing to note is that the Hebrew phrase is probably a reference to Sarah's period of gestation.[77] The Greek, however, is a phrase devoid of any such explicitly temporal reference. Therefore, after Paul strips out some other temporal elements and changes the verb to emphasise God's coming over the angel's returning,[78] the verse which in context refers to Sarah's pregnancy is in Paul's citation a more general phrase about God's power to do things in his own time according to his own agenda. Given that Paul's use of scripture is intended to demonstrate the congruence of God's action in the past with current situations (and indeed future ones),[79] it is useful that here the LXX already removes some of the explicitly temporal context and so allows Paul a little space in which to link Sarah's experience with the present.

---

72 The <u>underlined</u> Greek words indicate agreement between Romans and Genesis.
73 Dunn, *Romans*, 541 for example.
74 Wevers, *Genesis*, 253.
75 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 104.
76 Wevers, *Genesis*, 250, 253.
77 Gruber, *Reality*.
78 A move that can only be Paul's (Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 104).
79 Hays, *Echoes*, 64.

In rounding off the section on the Patriarchs Paul does three things. Firstly, realising that the explicit reference to God's electing power was not present in the previous citation Paul introduces Malachi 1:2-3, with its first-person pronouncements, into 9:13 to cement his case. Secondly, the rejection of Esau that comes with the choosing of Jacob both notes the fact that choosing one entails the rejection of another and hints that rejection might be used in its own right.[80] Finally, the context of Malachi allows Paul to bring the argument back to a national scale and so shows that Israel (Jacob) as a nation is loved,[81] although it is now clear that not every individual will be explicitly used for her vocation. In terms of this thesis LXX Malachi offers no meat; the bringing of Jacob to the front is Paul's work and emphasises the importance of Israel,[82] and in every other respect Paul agrees with LXX, which correlates nicely with the Hebrew.[83]

9:14-18 – Is there injustice on God's part?

The anticipated objection to Paul's argument is met with two responses in 9:14-18:[84]

14a So what will we say? Is there injustice on God's part?
14b Certainly not!
15   A   For (γάρ) he says (λέγει)...
16   Therefore (ἄρα οὖν)...
17   B   For (γάρ) Scripture says (λέγει)...
18   Therefore (ἄρα οὖν)...

These roughly parallel the love of Jacob and hatred of Esau (9:13) in bringing out the dimensions of God's activity in creation. The first answer (9:15-16) strongly emphasises God's sovereign freedom to choose the objects of his mercy, resisting any notion that Israel can claim some automatic right to God's favour.[85] That the words are delivered as present tense brings them into the present situation,[86] and also begins to affirm that God's mercy is not the exclusive possession of Israel. The semantic ranges of the Greek verbs used to translate Exodus 33:19 matches well with

---

80 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 550.
81 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 563.
82 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 105-6.
83 Seifrid, *Romans*, 641.
84 Moo, *Romans*, 594.
85 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 566.
86 Seifrid, *Romans*, 642.

the Hebrew,[87] the most significant move is the change of tense in the second half of each clause.[88] Both times a pair of Hebrew imperfects become a Greek future and a Greek present; the distinction might be understood as a move from a general right to freedom in future actions to the specific right to freedom in present actions:

MT:
I will have mercy upon whom *I will have* mercy.

LXX:
I will have mercy upon whom *I am having* mercy.

The difference is subtle but important. Even if this section is regarded as a "detour" in Paul's argument,[89] the language still prepares the ground for what is to come. While until now the discussion has focussed on election and rejection within Israel, it will soon open up into the present election of Gentiles into God's purposes. The present tense introduction to the citation[90] and the present tense referents to the objects of mercy in the LXX enable Paul not only to defend the freedom of God in election, but also to hint at where his argument might lead.

When Exodus is cited again (Exodus 9:16 in Romans 9:17) the function is to show that God can involve individuals in his plans in the doing of evil just as much as in doing good. Pharaoh is an example of precisely this, and the point is that God may use hardness of heart to bring about his purposes too, thus God's apparent "rejection" of Pharaoh on one level is actually the outworking of God's purposes *through* such a rejection. This is "the darker melody in a minor key which played counterpoint to the major key of God's powerful call to Israel" which, as the reader will later realise, Paul says is now being played in Israel.[91]

The textual relationship between LXX and Paul's citation is a little complex and the texts are best looked at side-by-side:**[92]**

---

87 *Ibid.*
88 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 566.
89 Moo, *Romans*, 589.
90 Of course the reference to Moses is historic, but Paul introduces in the present tense to emphasise that scripture also speaks to the present; Seifrid, *Romans*, 642.
91 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 563.
92 Underlined text indicates agreement between Exodus and Romans.

MT Exodus 9:16	LXX Exodus 9:16	Romans 9:17
וְאוּלָם בַּעֲבוּר זֹאת	ἕνεκεν τούτου	εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο
הֶעֱמַדְתִּיךָ	διετηρήθης,	ἐξήγειρά σε,
בַּעֲבוּר הַרְאֹתְךָ	ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ	ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ
אֶת־כֹּחִי	τὴν ἰσχύν μου,	τὴν δύναμίν μου,
וּלְמַעַן סַפֵּר	καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ	καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ
שְׁמִי בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ	τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ	τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ

That Paul had a text very similar to our LXX at his disposal is clear from the strong verbal similarities between the two versions and is confirmed when noting that ἐνδείκνυμι is a rare word unique here as a translation of רָאָה in the Hiphil.[93] However, both textual traditions are stable at this point so the discrepancies must be accounted for. The replaced introductory formula is probably Pauline in origin and would seem to be an attempt to remove a potential ambiguity from LXX; ἕνεκεν τούτου can be understood to point forwards or backwards, whereas Paul's phrase is clear in pointing forward.[94]

The source of the significant change of passive verb διετηρήθης ("you were preserved") to ἐξήγειρά σε ("I raised you up") is difficult to pinpoint. While the sense of "preserve" or "spare" given in LXX is probably closer to the Hebrew's context,[95] it is grammatically quite different (2nd person passive); Paul's version is grammatically much closer (1st person active, as Hebrew), but is a rather wooden rendering of the Hebrew[96] which does not get the sense of the word. There is no textual evidence for Paul's reading in the LXX tradition,[97] but then Paul is not in the habit of correcting LXX against the Hebrew.[98] If it *were* Paul's word then it would be a surprising choice; as a translation of עָמַד in Hiphil it would be unparalleled,[99] and his only other use of the term comes in 1 Corinthians 6:14 with reference to the resurrection. This is not a problem easily solved, but if this reading were in Paul's LXX then a clear case is made for our thesis. The sense of ἐξήγειρά σε here is best paralleled in Habbakuk 1:6 and Zechariah 11:6 among others, meaning that God "raised up Pharaoh onto the scene of history and brought him to his place of power."[100] That is, the phrase is now much

---

93 HR, 469.
94 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 106-7; Piper, *Justification*, 166.
95 Childs, *Exodus*, 158; Sarna, *Exodus*, 46.
96 Although not a standard one.
97 But note that some manuscripts correct the grammar, see Wevers, *Septuaginta: Exodus*, 143.
98 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 107-8.
99 Though not entirely unreasonable. The Hebrew is translated in a variety of ways elsewhere, see Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 122.
100 Piper, *Justification*, 166.

more one of calling to a role in history than it once was.

This move towards Pharaoh's role as God's agent in salvation is complete thanks to a simple preposition. In the Hebrew, the purpose of the preservation is "to show you my power";[101] the power is to be revealed to Pharaoh. However, LXX's purpose is ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν ἰσχύν μου, "in order to reveal my power *in* (or *through*) you". The preposition ἐν[102] shifts the focus of the revelation; rather than being the recipient, Pharaoh is to be the channel for the revelation. Taken together we see that Pharaoh moves from being preserved to receive a revelation to being brought by God's hand to this particular place in history in order to be the agent through which God reveals his power.

9:19-29 – Why does he still find fault?

And so God is free to enlist for his purposes both those within Israel and those without. He may use those faithful and open to his will, and the hard of heart who oppose him. The question of whether it is fair for God to find fault if his will is irresistible (9:19) is not accepted. The "myopic view" of humanity is not to trump the bigger picture of God's will within the world.[103] Again, the temptation to treat this as a discussion of the eternal destiny of individuals is strong,[104] but this must be resisted and the focus kept on Israel as a whole in relation to the gospel and her vocation. That the focus is vocation is confirmed by the reference to "noble" or "menial" uses[105] for the potter's work, and also by use of the words ἐνδείκνυμι and δυνατόν in 9:22, which refer back to the vocation of Pharaoh (9:17).[106]

The final step in the argument is to make it explicit that God's plan was always to involve the Gentiles, which is achieved with a conflated quote from Hosea. The keyword καλέω links through from 9:7 into 9:24, 25 and 26;[107] showing that just as God called Isaac now he calls the Gentiles, making a pun on the double-meaning of καλέω as "name" and also "call" to a task as he has been doing all along.[108] Hosea 2:25

---

101 Childs, *Exodus*, 125; Sarna, *Exodus*, 46 translates in the same way; Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 289 says "... to show you my strength".

102 Propp, rightly, refers to this as a "theological reinterpretation" rather than a variant, *Exodus 1-18*, 301.

103 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 568.

104 Morris, *Romans*, 363; contra Moo, *Romans*, 600-1.

105 Cranfield, *Romans*, 492.

106 *Ibid.*, 494. One might extend the parallelism one step further and ask whether φέρω in 9:22 means not only "endure" (its rather rare, passive sense) but also "lift up" (in the common, active sense) as God "raised up" Pharaoh (see Kasemann, *Romans*, 271).

107 Hays, *Echoes*, 66.

108 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 573. An "effectual naming", Cranfield, *Romans*, 500.

(LXX) is cited with the second, altered, clause brought to the front and λέγω replaced with καλέω. The origin of καλέω here is almost certainly Pauline,[109] although perhaps he is given some license to do this thanks to the Hosea 2:1 (LXX) which does use καλεῖν to translate אָמַר.

Romans 9:25-6 and Hosea 2:

Romans 9:26	Hosea 2:25 (LXX)

καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου
   καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην
	καὶ ἐλεήσω τὴν οὐκ ἠλεημένην
	   καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ οὐ λαῷ μου, Λαός μου εἶ σύ

Establishing the provenance of ἀγαπάω in Paul's reading is problematic. The reading does appear in some manuscripts (B V 407 inter alia), and some of these manuscripts even read it earlier in Hosea also (V 407).[110] Given the conflation and contortion of the citation it is unlikely that Paul's text might be read back into LXX which suggests that ἀγαπάω is pre-Pauline; however, ἐλεέω is clearly the original reading.[111] Lindars suggests that the whole quote is Paul's own translation,[112] but then the second Hosean citation is strongly reliant on LXX which would make a direct Pauline translation of the first strange. If Paul's LXX did read ἐλεέω then commentators apparently have difficulty in finding a reason for Paul to choose ἀγαπάω instead,[113] but reason enough is only as far away as 9:13. Here Paul balances the task he has of retelling Israel's history while also using that history to illuminate the present situation. Traditionally the Gentiles are associated with Esau, so to call those "not loved" now "beloved" is to say that Esau (the hated) has become like Jacob (the loved), the Gentiles have become like the Israelites. However, the present situation also has a story to tell. As Paul is later to explain, Israel has become hardened (11:7), like Pharaoh, and so is in some way to be associated with Pharaoh and Esau; "the contemporary situation is exactly analogous to the situation of unfaithful Israel addressed by Hosea",[114] and so the textual link to Esau serves a double purpose in interpreting the past and also preparing for where Paul

---

109 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 110.
110 Hosea 1:6, 1:8 and 2:3 also read ἀγαπάω. The witness of the Minor Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever does not assist here; Tov, *Greek Minor Prophets*
111 *Ibid.*, 112.
112 Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 243.
113 Moo, *Romans*, 612 n. 9; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 112.
114 Hays, *Echoes*, 67.

understands Israel to be at present as he will argue in chapter 11.

As already mentioned, LXX makes the obviously useful move of translating אָמַר as καλέω in Hosea 2:1 (LXX); other than this the verbatim citation of this verse does not aid our thesis. It could be argued that there is a shift towards a geographical reference in the Greek; if בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יֵאָמֵר in Hebrew means "instead of its being said",[115] then the presence of ἐκεῖ in the Greek would indicate a shift to geography, "in the place where it was said".[116] The location of this "place" is unclear and makes little difference to the argument; Paul probably used this verse because of the "not-people" becoming "people" theme.[117]

---

115 Cranfield, *Romans*, 501; BDB, 880, section 7b.
116 Morris, *Romans*, 370.
117 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 572.

Romans 9:27-9 and Isaiah 10:22/1:9:[118]

Isaiah 10:22-23 LXX	Romans 9:27-28	Hosea 1:10a LXX
²²καὶ <u>ἐὰν</u> γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραηλ *ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης* <u>τὸ</u> κατά<u>λειμμα</u> αὐτῶν <u>σωθήσεται</u>	²⁷Ἡσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· <u>ἐὰν</u> ᾖ <u>ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν</u> Ἰσραὴλ *ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης* <u>τὸ</u> ὑπό<u>λειμμα</u> <u>σωθήσεται</u>	καὶ ἦν <u>ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν</u> *Ἰσραηλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης*
		Isaiah 28:22b LXX
<u>λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν</u> *καὶ συντέμνων* ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ²³ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον *ποιήσει* ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ	²⁸<u>λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν</u> *καὶ συντέμνων* *ποιήσει* <u>κύριος</u> <u>ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς</u>	Διότι *συντετελεσμένα* *καὶ συντετμηένα* πράγματα ἤκουσα παρὰ <u>κυρίου</u> σαβαωθ ἃ *ποιήσει* <u>ἐπὶ</u> πᾶσαν <u>τὴν γὴν</u>

The use of two LXX Isaiah passages and the remnant theme in 9:27-29 echoes both Isaiah's note of judgement and note of hope for Israel and holds these discordant notes in tension.[119] Paul uses this tension to affirm the present situation again, but also point to where his argument is going. The form of the citation strongly follows LXX, only weaving in the words from Hosea (ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν) to smooth the link, replacing LXX's κατάλειμμα with ὑπόλειμμα,[120] replacing LXX's ὁ θεὸς with

---

118 Taken from Wagner, *Heralds*, 95. <u>Single underline</u> indicates agreement between Isaiah 10 and Romans, <u>double underline</u> indicates agreement between Romans and either Hosea 1:10 or Isaiah 28:22, *italics* indicate agreement between all three columns.

119 Wagner, *Heralds*, 92-116; "a tension that derives ultimately from their larger setting in Isaiah's story of a God who determines not only to judge, but also to redeem, his people" (p. 92), "the prophet's words in Romans function as they do in Isaiah – as a message of *hope* in the midst of disaster, as a *promise* that Israel yet has a future" (p. 107).

120 Surely Paul's change. The LXX witness is univocal on this reading, and the NT reading in P⁴⁶ ℵ¹ D F G κτλ. is almost certainly an assimilation to LXX. The reason for such a change is not obvious, as the words are almost synonymous as is shown in Paul's use of the root elsewhere in Romans 9-11 (cf. 11:3-5 in particular); Wagner, *Heralds*, 96 n. 165; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 116.

κύριος,[121] and introducing ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς for ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ.[122]

A significant departure from the Hebrew text is found in the LXX translation of שׁוּב[123] as σώζειν, which is unparalleled elsewhere in LXX.[124] Paul's "salvation" language is closely associated with response to Christ (cf. 10:9-11), while the context of Isaiah was "returning" from exile. Therefore, the LXX enables Paul to fit this verse much more snugly into his own framework and read him as predicting a remnant who will accept Jesus which is exactly what Paul is arguing has purposefully happened.[125] The general tone of Hebrew Isaiah 10:22 is not a happy one for Israel,[126] the announcement is one of iminent "annihilation" (כִּלָּיוֹן).[127] By contrast the LXX speaks more of a "swift accomplishment of redemption for the remnant"[128] and completion of promises.[129] Given that Paul will eventually bring the argument around to the salvation of all Israel a message of complete destruction would not have been so helpful in the argument.

The final text called in support is Isaiah 1:9. That this text is intended to support the Isaiah 10 citation is suggested by the use of καθώς, the verbal links with the -λείπω root (ἐγκαταλείπω in 9:29 and ὑπόλειμμα in 9:27) and the use of the name κύριος in both.[130] The text Paul quotes is a rare example of precise agreement between Paul and LXX,[131] but the agreement between LXX and the Hebrew at this point is not so strong. The first and most obvious departure is the translation of שָׂרִיד ("survivor"[132]) as σπέρμα,[133] which has obvious rhetorical use for Paul. The "seed"

---

121 This binds the quotation to the next one from Isaiah 1:9; Wagner, *Heralds*, 97. Stanley thinks that this is likely to represent Paul's *Vorlage* but the most significant witness to this is B, well-known as a Hexaplar witness to LXX Isaiah and of generally inferior quality; see Barr, *Paul and the LXX*, 596-7.

122 Possibly under the influence of Isaiah 28:22; see Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 119; Wagner, *Heralds*, 97-8.

123 The Hebrew is assured here; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 123 n. 197.

124 HR, 1328-30. This is all the more remarkable given that LXX has previously treated the phrase שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב as a proper name, translating as ὁ καταλειφθεὶς Ἰασοὺβ in 7:3 and absorbing it into the Hebrew in 10:21 (שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב שְׁאָר יַעֲקֹב becomes τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ιακωβ); Brockington; *Septuagint and Targum*, 81.

125 In the context of emphasis on divine action the movement into the "divine passive" is also a help.

126 "Extermination is decreed... Assuredly determined destruction" (Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 434), "destruction is decreed" (Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 256), though Childs, *Isaiah*, 95 sees a hint of hope.

127 BDB, 479.

128 Wagner, *Heralds*, 103.

129 TDNT 8:64 sees that LXX could be read as a promise although denies that this could carry through to Romans; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 573: "[the phrase] must have in mind God *accomplishing* his purpose in a (temporarily) *diminished* Israel" (Dunn's italics).

130 Wagner, *Heralds*, 110.

131 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 119 rates it U⁺.

132 BDB, 975.

133 An almost unparalleled equivalence in LXX. HR, 1283, deems it too tentative to be regarded as a translation but this move is also found in Deuteronomy3:3 (as noted by Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 144).

theme throughout Isaiah ensures the ultimate continuance of Israel (41:8-10, 43:5, 44:2-3 45:25, 65:9, 66:22) while the "seed" of other nations will be destroyed (14:22, 14:30, 15:9); the preservation of the seed is a symbol of God's continuing commitment to his people.[134] This is exactly the point Paul wishes to make here in affirming that God is still committed to Israel despite their current intransigence. In addition, the use of the word σπέρμα brings back one of Paul's key words and makes a pleasing *inclusio* around the section.

There is, however, another way of reading the citation which is thrown up by the rather curious translation of hiphil יתר as ἐγκαταλείπειν. The Hebrew word, which is fairly rare but clearly means "cause to remain" or "preserve",[135] is translated by a Greek word that means something closer to "abandon", "forsake" or "desert"[136] - most commonly used to translate עָזַב which connotes abandonment. In fact, Isaiah 1:9 seems to be one of the only times that ἐγκαταλείπειν is used in a positive sense.[137] What if it was actually intended negatively: "If God had not abandoned a seed..."? If we were right to argue that Israel is a vocational entity (whether a glorious one or not), then "seed" applies to those carrying out the God's plan for salvation as "vessels of wrath" too. As such, although it is not Paul's primary meaning, the ambiguity of the Greek used can also perhaps refer to the "seed" now enacting God's will by their failure to accept the gospel, and so Isaiah also has a darker subtext. If we may read forward to the olive-tree analogy of chapter 11, not only has God "preserved" a faithful seed to ensure the continuity of the tree, but he has also "abandoned" an unfaithful seed to be vessels of wrath. As Paul will later make clear disaster would have come had either of these things not happened – the failure to include Gentiles (a possibility without hardened Israel) would just as surely have led Israel to become like Sodom and Gomorrah.

---

134 See Wagner, *Heralds*, 110-6 for a fuller disucussion.
135 That is, "leave over" / "preserve" / "leave a remnant", BDB, 451.
136 Lust, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 168-9; BAGD, 214.
137 The same translation is made in Isaiah 1:8, but the intent is a little ambiguous. The consistently negative sense is found throughout the NT, including the "cry of dereliction" (Matthew 27:46, Mark 15:34) and elsewhere (Acts 2:27, 13; 2 Corinthians 4:9; 2 Timothy 4:10, 16; Hebrews 10:25, 13:5). Only in Romans 9:29 is ἐγκαταλείπειν conceivably positive.

9:30-33: The Stumbling of Israel

The first issue to deal with in this section is the text of Romans 9:33 and its provenance. Paul appears to have conflated Isaiah 28:16 and Isaiah 8:14, as laid out below:[138]

Isaiah 28:16 LXX	Romans 9:33	Isaiah 8:14a LXX
διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως λέγει κύριος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιων λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογώιαῖον ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ	ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυνθήσεται	καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ἦς ἔσται σοι εἰς ἁγίασμα καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι

A primary question here is about the source of Paul's quotation. The presence of the two Isaiah passages side by side in 1 Peter 2 leads to some interesting observations. Firstly, 1 Peter 2:6 reads τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν as does Romans 9:33, secondly 1 Peter 2:8 reads πέτρα σκανδάλου along with Romans;[139] both of these agree against the vast majority of LXX tradition.[140] This kind of inner-NT agreement against the LXX has led some to propose the existence of 'Testimony Books' within the early Christian communities which gathered together valuable OT citations for use in apologetics and evangelism.[141] Such a source could easily explain the provenance of such a reading, especially given the awkwardness of looking up citations in a scroll the length of Isaiah.[142] It is highly unlikely that these readings originated with Paul himself.[143]

---

138 Taken (with alterations) from Wagner, *Heralds*, 128. Single underline indicates agreement between Isaiah 28:16 and Romans 9:33; double underline indicates agreement between Isaiah 8:14 and Romans 9:33; *italics* indicates agreement between all three columns.

139 With appropriate change of case.

140 Only Aquila agrees on the reading of σκανδάλου (Wevers, *Isaias*, 152) and Paul and Peter are alone in reading τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν (Wevers, *Isaias*, 218). Note that the Pauline/Petrine reading is in some respects an adjustment towards the Hebrew.

141 See Carleton Paget, *Barnabas*, 90-4 for a summary of research on this hypothesis.

142 Wagner, *Heralds*, 20-1.

143 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 121-4. While this dissertation is strictly about "the LXX" and its

The correction from εἰς τὰ θεμέλια to ἐν is a helpful correction towards the Hebrew (בְּצִיּוֹן) in that it moves away from LXX's assimilation to the corner-stone context of Isaiah 28:16. The context of Isaiah 28 paints this stone in a very positive light (as picked up by 1 Peter), but the stone is, in Paul's reading, more of a problem for Israel.

Another slight divergence from the Hebrew text is the presence of ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ, which has no equivalent Hebrew phrase.[144] This, combined with the LXX's addition of the conjunction καί changes the general tone of the phrase. Where the implication in the Hebrew is perhaps that faith itself is the foundation stone being placed in Zion,[145] the LXX emphasises the stone itself as the object of faith. Paul, like 1 Peter, takes verse in a clearly Christological sense – Jesus, as Messiah, has been placed within Zion and (although a stumbling block to Jews) is to be recognised as the object of faith for salvation.[146] Of course this is not an impossible link to make if the extra words were not there, but it demonstrates some degree of shifting the Hebrew in a way Paul finds useful.[147]

The final major departure from the Hebrew comes in LXX's translation of יָחִישׁ as καταισχυνθῇ, an otherwise unparalleled translation in LXX.[148] It looks quite possible that the LXX *Vorlage* read (or was misread as) יֵבִישׁ,[149] but the treatment of the verb חוּשׁ elsewhere (5:19, 60:22) suggests that perhaps the translator did not understand it.[150] Whatever the origin of this reading, it produces a difference in sense. The meaning of חוּשׁ in Hiphil is something like "make haste" or "flee away",[151] or more broadly "be agitated".[152] Watts understands the most common meaning, while encouraging the interpreter to hear the other overtones,[153] which leads to the NRSV translation: "panic". The general sense one gets is that the believer has a sure footing in faith which will be a source of confidence. The LXX reads καταισχύνω, which

---

influence on Paul, the use of extra-biblical sources for biblical citations is also of interest.

144 The translator of LXX Isaiah also supplies this type of phrase elsewhere (12:2, 20:5, 30:3, 32:3); see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 269.

145 Wagner, *Heralds*, 143. See also the NRSV translation: "See, I am laying in Zion a foundation stone... a sure foundation: 'One who trusts will not panic'."

146 Although Meeks is right that at this point the "stone" could refer to Jesus, Torah or God, the reference in 10:11 is surely to Jesus (*On Trusting*, 115). Paul's point here is that Israel has *not* put her faith in Christ and is accountable for it.

147 Note the Messianic shift in the Targum too; Cranfield, *Romans*, 511.

148 HR, 731-2.

149 Lust, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 313. בּוֹשׁ is translated by καταισχύνω in Isaiah 1:29, 50:7 and 54:4. The Hebrew text is fairly stable here.

150 Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 269.

151 BDB, 301.

152 Driver, *Studies*, 253-4; bringing in the sense of the Akkadian cognate.

153 Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 366-8.

means "put to shame" or "dishonour",[154] which in context refers to hoping in something falsely (cf. Romans 5:5). While the overall tenor of both texts is similar (sure footing, believer need not flee; sound hope, believe will not be revealed as a fool), the change in voice is important. In the Hebrew, the emphasis is very much on the believer in response to trouble, whereas the Greek emphasises God's trustworthiness and the good grounding of the believer's faith. The shift in emphasis serves Paul's purpose in as much as it keeps the focus on God's activity in justification. Seifrid sees more of an interpretative move, linking with the wider theme of the epistle (1:16),[155] but at best there is a keyword link between the cognate verbs used. This seems to be an occasion on which a fairly significant move away from the Hebrew text does little to advance Paul's argument.

The wider contexts of both LXX Isaiah 8 and 28 are also foundational for Paul's case.[156] Firstly, both occur in a time of division within Israel; those categorised by Isaiah as "this people" have forsaken God, while a remnant remain faithful. The groups are divided on their trust (or lack thereof) in God's power and faithfulness. This leads on to a discussion of understanding of the law; in neither passage does Isaiah set law observance against faith and trust in God, but recognises that faith in God is the fullest way to adhere to the law. In Isaiah God uses pagan nations to discipline Israel, and it is those people who refuse to submit to God's methods who are thereby attempting to secure their own righteousness in the protection of foreign rulers. This is all paralleled in Romans 9:30-10:4; Israel is resisting God's plan for salvation by putting her trust in the law as a means of attaining righteousness in itself.

10:5-8: The Word is near you

There is some debate over whether Paul's use of Deuteronomy 30:12-14 in Romans 10:6-8 counts as a quotation or not. On one hand, Paul offers no explicit introductory formula as is often the case,[157] and the actual words cited are far enough away from the original to be unrecognisable as a "quotation".[158] The initial phrase seems to have become proverbial and is used freely in Baruch 3:29-30 and Philo's *De*

---

154 BADG, 411.
155 Seifrid, *Romans*, 651.
156 The following summarises Wagner's findings (*Heralds*, 136-55). See also van der Kooij on Isaiah 8, *Isaiah in the Septuagint*, 519-29.
157 Although Cranfield suggests that ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει is a paraphrastic way of introducing a citation, *Romans*, 522.
158 Sanday & Hedlam, *Romans*, 288-90.

posteritate Caini,[159] and there are strong resemblances to the *Palestinian Targum* which may have been influential.[160] However, the use of the Deuteronomic wording and presence of the threefold *Pesher*-like[161] τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν suggests that Paul is doing more than just introducing a common phrase to make his point. While these two options are not mutually exclusive,[162] the lack of clear introductory formula and the wide divergence from LXX make this an unhelpful case for this thesis.

10:9-13: Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved

Having re-iterated the climax of Isaiah 28:16 and affirmed that God is God of both Jew and Gentile, responsive to all who call, Paul finishes the section 10:5-13 with a quotation from Joel 2:32 (3:5 MT/LXX). Both Paul and LXX are in agreement on the text here and there are no textual variants of any significance in either. One move almost obvious enough to be missed is the translation of יהוה as κύριος. As Paul has already said, "Jesus is Lord" (10:9), and Jesus is clearly understood as the referent here also.[163] It is one thing to refer to Jesus as κύριος, but quite another to associate Jesus with YHWH in such a direct manner; had Paul been writing in Hebrew, or had LXX not existed, this move would have been much more difficult for while Paul clearly associates Jesus with God, he is the one enacting the sovereignty of YHWH, not YHWH himself.[164]

There is another slightly unusual translation in rendering יִמָּלֵט as σωθήσεται. This is far from an unparalleled move,[165] but it is an unusual one. מלט usually means "escape" or "slip away",[166] as is attested by most examples, and seems mostly to retain this sense when translated by σώζειν. Joel 2:32 is such an example; set in the context of the day of the Lord it is clear that those calling on the name of the Lord will escape (be saved from) the terrors described. The "salvation" in Joel is not the same as in Paul's thinking, but the word itself is helpful to Paul's idea of salvation coming through confession of Jesus' lordship (10:10). The proximity of this quotation to the

---

159 Fitzmyer, *Romans, 588.*
160 McNamara, *Palestinian Targum*, 76-8.
161 See Cranfield, *Interpretation*, 392.
162 As we have already seen, there is something of a spectrum in citation from clear and precise quotations to barely audible echoes or allusions.
163 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 617.
164 See the section on "Jesus as Lord" in TDNT, vol. III, 1088-1094.
165 Cf. Gen 19:17, 20, 22; 1 Samuel 19: 11, 12, 18, 27:1, 30:17; 1 Kings 18:40, 19:17, 20:20; 2 Kings 19:37; 2 Chronicles 16:7; Job 1:15, 16, 17, 19, 6:23, 20:20; Psalm 22:5, 33:17; Isaiah 20:6, 31:5, 46:2, 4, 49:24, 5; Jeremiah 32:4, 34:3, 38:18, 39:18, 48:6, 8 , 19; Ezekiel 17:15, 18; Amos 2:14, 15; Malachi 3:15.
166 BDB, 572. Usually from an enemy.

one from Isaiah 28:16 also brings to mind Psalm 22, a very important Psalm for early Christianity. Psalm 22:5 links both of these ideas;[167] "crying out" (κράζω) to God results in salvation,[168] and also hope (ἐλπίζω) is not put to shame (καταισχύνω).[169]

Joel 3:5a LXX	Psalm 21:6 LXX	Isaiah 28:16c LXX
πᾶς ὅς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου <u>σωθήσεται</u>	πρὸς σὲ ἐκέκραξαν καὶ <u>ἐσώθησαν</u> ἐπὶ σοὶ ἤλπισαν καὶ <u>οὐ</u> <u>κατῃσχύνθησαν</u>	ὁ πιστέυων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ <u>οὐ</u> μὴ <u>καταισχυνθῇ</u>

As Dunn notes, Paul may well have the wider context of the Joel quotation in mind, with its echoes of a remnant theme.[170] Yet this context is also useful as he closes off one section of argument and moves into another with the inclusion of the verb εὐαγγελίζειν; this verb does not correspond to any Hebrew word from Joel,[171] but as Paul now begins to discuss the preaching of the gospel this kind of language is a useful bridge.[172]

10:14-17: Faith comes through what is heard

Paul's citation of Isaiah's words (52:7) in 10:15 deviate quite widely from the standard LXX version of events. That Paul is citing a Greek *Vorlage* close to LXX seems assured from the shared unique rendering of מַשְׁמִיעַ as ἀκοὴν and the plural ἀγαθά for the singular טֹוב;[173] the divergences are, however, still notable. The current consensus is that Paul was using a *Vorlage* already corrected towards the Hebrew, resembling something more like the Lucianic recension of LXX. Paul has done some of his own redaction in order to remove the geographic particularity (ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων), but generally follows a proto-Lucianic *Vorlage*.[174] That said, the revision towards the Hebrew text means that for the purposes of this thesis Paul's citation is actually not helpful as an obvious translation is offered.

Skipping a few verses of Isaiah brings Paul to 53:1, which in 10:16 Paul quotes

---

167 See table: <u>underline</u> denotes agreement between Joel and Psalms, <u>double underline</u> denotes agreement between Isaiah and Psalms.
168 Again מלט is translated σώζει.
169 Cf. Romans 5:5.
170 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 611.
171 HR, 568 marks it as an obelus.
172 See Wagner, *Heralds*, 174 n. 165.
173 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 136 n. 170.
174 For full discussion see Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 134-41; Wagner, *Heralds*, 170-4.

without modification. The vocative "Lord" (κύριε) is only found in the LXX and Paul,[175] but it allows a neat rhetorical flourish. Paul, backed by Isaiah, calls upon the name of the Lord with reference to those who should have, but have not.

10:18-21: Have they not heard? Did they not understand?

One possible objection to Paul's position is that Israel has not *heard* the gospel. This angle is countered with a verbatim citation from Psalm 19:4 LXX (19:5 MT).[176] The Hebrew is a little odd here which has led to various suggestions about its meaning. קַוָּם most naturally means "their measuring-line" (cf. 2 Kings 21:13, Ezekiel 47:3)[177] which rather ruins the parallelism with 19:3; as a result Craigie suggests that the ל has dropped out of קוֹלָם, based on the Greek text.[178] Dahood follows Jacob Barth in relating it to the second meaning of קָוָה, "to collect", and so reads the word as "their call" which presumably was understood by the LXX translator (cf. Psalm 40:1; Psalm 52:9).[179] Muraoka implicitly suggests that the translator read קוֹלָם,[180] but if this were the case then the Greek would still be a unique translation.[181] Whatever the precise meaning of φθόγγος here,[182] the LXX certainly pushes the meaning in the direction of something heard which is exactly what Paul wishes to affirm of the Jews.

The other translation of interest is rendering מִלָּה as ῥῆμα. This poetic term, especially prevalent in Job and Daniel, might have been translated in any number of ways, λόγος being the most common.[183] However, here ῥῆμα was chosen and this is convenient for Paul as it can be used as a catch-word for the gospel (ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως [10:8] inspired from Deuteronomy 30:14; ῥήματος Χριστοῦ [10:17]).

Romans 10:19 makes use of Deuteronomy 32:21 in a way that almost exactly follows LXX; the only significant change is the object of both clauses which moves from the 3rd person pronoun to the 2nd person. This is probably Paul's work.[184] One of

---

175 Against MT, 4QIsaᵃ, Targum, Peshitta, Vulgate. There is a lacuna before 53:1 in 4QIsaᶜ, but this probably represents a space indicating the start of a new section. See Wagner, *Heralds*, 179 n. 181.

176 The change of voice clearly indicates a citation even though it is not introduced as such. LXX is reproduced precisely; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 141-2.

177 BDB, 876.

178 Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 178. 11QPsᶜ has as lengthy lacuna here which frustrates the confirmation of such a claim; Abegg, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 518.

179 Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, 121-2. Anderson, *Psalms*, 1:169 takes this line too.

180 Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 129.

181 HR, 1430.

182 If it does mean "voice" then the meaning is unusual.

183 See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 83 for the list.

184 Though changing between 2nd and 3rd person is common in Deuteronomy the LXX tradition is united behind the 3rd person here; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 143-4. The Dead Sea Scrolls

the most interesting aspects of the translation is the use of ἐπί for בְּ. While the primary sense of ἐπί here is clearly instrumental ("I will make you jealous with/because of a not-people"), there is also a possible causal sense here,[185] which is not found in the Hebrew equivalent. This plays nicely into the dynamics of Paul's argument. While in a primary sense he refers to the non-people of his own Gentile mission as provoking jealousy and anger,[186] which Israel should have expected as Moses foretold it,[187] in a secondary sense the jealousy and anger aroused by Gentile acceptance of the gospel has in fact made the people of Israel a non-people: "I will make you jealous causing (ἐπί) you to be non-people".[188] Just as the Hosea 2 quotation played on the question of the identity of God's people, the slight ambiguity of the preposition begs the same questions.

Two things are of interest in Paul's use of Isaiah 65:1-2 in 10:20-21, but first we must deal with the textual issues. The largest problem is the ordering and pairing of the verbs from Isaiah 65:1. The most strongly attested text for the LXX (offered by Ziegler's Göttingen edition) pairs ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην with ζητοῦσιν and εὑρέθην with ἐπερωτῶσιν, which rather spoils the parallelism found in Paul/MT. Romans has paired "being found" with "seeking" and "revelation" with "asking" as MT, but has swapped the order of the clauses. There is no easy solution to ascertaining the provenance of Paul's reading, but two considerations lead me to conclude that the reading is pre-Pauline. Firstly, the awkwardness of LXX's mismatched verbs make it quite plausible that a scribe would have corrected the pairing.[189] Secondly, the strong introductory formula increase the likelihood that Paul will have referred to his *Vorlage* and not wilfully modified it.[190]

A first point of interest is the interpretation of the Hebrew niphal verbs, which many OT commentators read as "tolerative", that is, "I allowed myself to be sought".[191] If this is the correct way to understand the Hebrew then the LXX has shifted the emphasis away from God's permissiveness towards what has been done; God has been found by those not seeking. This change of emphasis suits the bold use

offer no evidence; Abegg, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 191.

185 Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 521. See also BAGD*, 287.*

186 Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 625.

187 Wagner, *Heralds*, 191.

188 Compare Galatians 5:13, 1 Thessalonians 4:7, 2 Timothy 2:14 for other Pauline uses of ἐπί causally.

189 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 145.

190 ἀποτολμάω (to be bold) is used no-where else in the Greek Bible; Moo, *Romans*, 669 n. 47. No convincing reason for swapping the order has been offered when arguing that Paul himself had been correcting against the Hebrew.

191 Moo, *Romans,* 669 n. 49.

which Paul gives the Isaiah text. Another small note arises from the second half of Isaiah 65:1, which Paul does not quote. The reason for the abridged citation is fairly obvious as the reference to "a nation that did not call on my name" would be confusing given the recent claim that calling on the name was the way to salvation (10:13). Some argue that the Hebrew here should be understood as "a nation not called by my name",[192] which would have been more acceptable to Paul's argument. Perhaps this is an example of unhelpful translation being omitted.

With the exception of advancing the phrase ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν to the front,[193] Paul follows Isaiah 65:2 exactly.[194] The presence of καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα in LXX does not represent a particular Hebrew word. The entire clause could be a hendiadys representing both the disobedience and contrariness of the people, or could represent some confusion within the Hebrew *Vorlage*. MT reads סוֹרֵר here ("stubborn" or "rebellious"[195]) which fits quite well with ἀπειθοῦντα, but 1QIsaᵃ may read מוֹרֶה[196] which would perhaps fit better with ἀντιλέγοντα.[197] The presence of ἀντιλέγοντα adds a certain force to the context of Israel's failure to believe; if faith comes through what is heard (10:17) then Israel ought to be listening. Instead Israel is talking back which adds further evidence to Paul's case that Israel is responsible for her own failure to respond to the gospel.

---

192 *Ibid.*

193 Possibly to emphasise the continual divine action and concern for the people; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 600.

194 Stanley, *Paul and the* Language, 146-7. The variant readings ἐπὶ λαόν and the omission of καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα are probably later.

195 BDB, 710.

196 Although Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, Plate L1 sees סורה.

197 ἀντιλέγω is a fairly rare word. Isaiah uses it without no Hebrew antecedent in 22:22 and again in 50:5, 3 of the 4 uses in the OT. The only other use comes in Hosea 4:4, translating either ריב or possibly מרה (see BDB, 598 for this possibility). See Wagner, *Heralds*, 208 n. 267 for a full discussion.

11:1-10 – Has God rejected his people?

Before the climax of his argument Paul briefly summarises the position.[198] God has emphatically not rejected Israel (11:1); this is proven by the faithful remnant that has accepted the gospel.[199] However, the remainder have been hardened in the present time, and this is just as much God's work as the choosing of a remnant. As usual this position is supported by numerous appeals to scripture.

Generally speaking LXX 1 Kings 19:10 follows the Hebrew closely.[200] However, ignoring all the reworking of 1 Kings 19:10[201], which serves no obvious purpose,[202] the citation in 11:3 is still useful to Paul. Crucial is the use of the verb ὑπολείπω, which reintroduces the "remnant" language from 9:27.[203] LXX has used this verb to translate יתר in 1 Kings 19, and the same root has been used to translate שאר in Isaiah 10:22, as quoted in 9:27. Therefore the LXX allows Paul to make a keyword link to produce a smooth transition back into his remnant theology.

The rendering of the "authoritative divine answer"[204] (χρηματισμός) back to Elijah in 1 Kings 19:18 (Romans 11:4) is a rare case of quite wide divergence from LXX. Stanley tries to trace the textual transmission into Paul's version,[205] but one cannot help but agree with Cranfield that Paul is quoting from memory.[206] I hope it is not too presumptuous to wonder whether, just as sometimes LXX is helpful to Paul, sometimes it is not so helpful and perhaps in such a case Paul may grant himself a freedom to abandon it if required. If such a case were to exist this would be a fine example of it. LXX makes the curious move of translating God's first-person act of "causing to remain" (וְהִשְׁאַרְתִּי) into Elijah's second-person act of "leaving behind" (καταλείψεις). Paul keeps the verb but renders it as first-person,[207] throwing in the emphatic ἐμαυτῷ for good measure, which thus returns the focus onto the action to God where he would like it to be. The action is also made relevant to the immediate situation by moving from a future action to a past:[208] the future is assured because a

---

198 Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 633.
199 Moo, *Romans*, 671.
200 Seifrid, *Romans*, 668.
201 Or 1 Kings 19:14, they are almost identical.
202 See Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 147-151 for a discussion of the changes. Paul may well be quoting from memory; Cranfield, *Romans*, 546.
203 Paul has changed the form of the verb, or perhaps used a "Lucianic" recension of LXX, *ibid.*, 150-1.
204 Moo, *Romans*, 676 n. 27.
205 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 152-8.
206 Cranfield, *Romans,* 546.
207 As happens in the Lucianic LXX; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 152.
208 This move is *not* replicated in the Lucanic texts.

remnant is already prepared.

Now that Paul has established the existence of an Israelite remnant on account of God's grace (11:5), he also moves to describe the status of the rest of (ethnic) Israel. They have been hardened (πωρόω), literally turned to stone,[209] by God.[210] Paul understands this in terms of Israel's vocation (as he will spell out later),[211] a necessary hardening to facilitate Gentile faith.[212] That God is the author of this is supported by two more scriptural references.

In spite of his general tendency to preserve Paul's use of the LXX as pure, even Stanley must admit that the form of Deuteronomy 29:4 (29:3 MT) is Paul's creation.[213] It is not only that God has not *revealed* the truth of the gospel to Israel, God has actively *hidden* the truth by giving "not-seeing eyes" and "not-hearing ears".[214] The LXX accurately translates Deuteronomy here, so nothing is present to help our thesis. However, Paul also introduces a phrase from Isaiah 29:10 – πνεῦμα κατανύξεως[215] – which is worth some examination. The apparent purpose of this replacement is to move the meaning away from lack of understanding,[216] towards a sense of "spiritual insensibility".[217] The noun κατάνυξις translates the Hebrew term תַּרְדֵּמָה, which means "deep sleep"[218] or "very great inertness"[219]. This term is used throughout the OT of sleep brought on for divine purposes; Genesis 2:21 (of Adam's sleep in order to remove a rib), 15:12 (Abraham is made to sleep so that God can speak in a dream), 1 Samuel 26:12 (Saul's camp sleeps so that David can get to him), Job 4:13, 33:15 (sleep and dreaming used as a conduit for God's communication).[220] Unfortunately for Paul, LXX has translated this useful concept in a wide variety of ways,[221] so the association between the divine purposes and the sleep is lost. It is not

---

209 BAGD, 739.
210 Reading this as a "divine passive" is surely correct. However, to dismiss any implication of human responsibility for the hardening (as Cranfield, *Romans*, 549) is surely wrong as Paul holds both causes.
211 Charles, *Romans 11:1-10*, 285.
212 Achtemeier, *Romans*, 180. This is akin to the glory of God being shown through Pharaoh's hardening (9:17-18). Paul uses a different word for "harden" in both cases, the former presumably influenced by the regular usage for Pharaoh's hardening in Exodus, the latter Paul's preferred word for Israel's state (cf. 2 Corinthians 3:14).
213 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 158-63
214 Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 641. The articular infinitive is here read as adjectival; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 681, n. 57.
215 The form varies slightly from LXX, but this is probably Paul's contextual modification. See Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 161 n. 258.
216 Perhaps on account of Paul's insistence that Israel has heard and understood to a degree (cf. the reference to "heart" [καρδία] in 10:8 now omitted here).
217 Cranfield, *Romans*, 550.
218 BDB, 922.
219 Gesenius, *Hebrew Lexicon*, 874.
220 The exception to this rule is Proverbs 19:15.
221 φόβος for Job 4:13, 33:15; ἔκστασις for Genesis 2:21, 15:21; θάμβος for 1 Samuel 26:12.

obvious that LXX is useful to Paul in any way here. κατάνυξις is a rare word, and the only other use of it in the Greek Bible is in Psalm 60:3 [60:5 MT; 59:5 LXX]. This makes a reference to hardness (σκληρά) which is contextually relevant but hardly an obvious link. It is possible that the concept of "pricking" or "stabbing" in the verbal root κατανύσσω may prefigure some of the "jealousy" or "needling" language of Romans 11:11-24.[222]

The final appeal to scripture drives home the hardening of Israel once more with a quote from Psalm 69 [68 LXX]. With the exception of adding καὶ εἰς θήραν, swapping σκάνδαλον and ἀνταπόδομα, and replacing ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν with αὐτοῖς the reading follows LXX exactly.[223] One imagines that the reference to a σκάνδαλον has probably been made more prominent because of its usage in 9:33, but the reason for the rest of the changes remains opaque. One must assume that Paul found some of contemporary relevance in these words, otherwise it is difficult to see what they add to his case.[224] The "table" (11:9) may be a reference to the cult,[225] or perhaps to the table-fellowship that could be so divisive.[226] ἀνταπόδομα here means the "occassion of retribution"[227] so Israel's table (whatever this refers to) is to be the reason her punishment.

The correlation between LXX and the Hebrew is strong, but Moo is wrong to say that the final clause is the only exception.[228] In fact, LXX apparently reads לְשִׁלּוּמִים for the Hebrew's וְלִשְׁלוֹמִים,[229] and so changes the Hebrew's table of a two-part phrase: "Let their table become a snare for them, and for those that are secure a trap"[230] into a table of multiple outcomes as is found in LXX and Paul. This is extremely useful for Paul as until now his summary of the situation had lacked one vital ingredient – Israel's own culpability for her hardness. By introducing the note of retribution or punishment the LXX helps Paul to bind together divine hardening with Israel's own sinfulness in rejecting Jesus.

The other major change LXX makes to Psalm 69 is the translation of "make their loins tremble" (מָתְנֵיהֶם הַמְעַד) as "keep their backs bent" (τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν σύγκαμψον). The meaning of trembling loins is far from obvious,[231] but those who

---

222 LSJ, 903; BAGD, 416.
223 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 163-6.
224 Contra Cranfield, *Romans*, 551. Moo, *Romans*, 683.
225 Dunn, *Romans 9-11*, 642-3.
226 Perhaps see Galatians 2:11-14?
227 Kasemann, *Romans*, 302.
228 Moo, *Romans*, 683 n. 62.
229 Perowne, *Psalms*, 538. The versions differ on what to read here as the plural of שָׁלוֹם is rare; see
    Tate, *Psalms 51-100*, 190 for a summary.
230 Leupold, *Psalms*, 507; as agreed by many commentators on the Psalms.
231 As perhaps suggested by the number of commentators who fail to comment here.

venture a guess generally understand it as deprivation of strength in a physical sense.[232] The meaning of a bent back is also not obvious,[233] but there is a general trend towards understanding it in a more spiritual and metaphorical sense: "keep them continually in spiritual bondage, stooping under a load too heavy to be borne".[234] This, coupled with the earlier reference to spiritual blindness (11:8), ensure that a reference to what is originally a very physical/literal can become a reference to Israel's spiritual/metaphorical crookedness.

11:11-24 – Have they stumbled so as to fall?

This section is notable for its lack of direct citation. The reason for this is not obvious, but perhaps Paul's direct comments to the Gentiles required a move away from scriptural reasoning to the familiarity of an analogy from arboriculture. An absence of suitable passages would also suffice as a reason. Either way, the lack of scriptural reference here can only mean that our thesis is of no relevance at this point.

11:25-32 – And so all Israel shall be saved

The citation of Isaiah 59:20-1 in Romans 11:26-7 is an important one. Here Paul's prediction of the future salvation of Israel is associated with a "Redeemer" coming "out of Zion". Whether the preposition ἐκ is Paul's creation is disputed; the LXX term ἕνεκεν is unique as a translation of לְ,[235] so it is possible that Paul's LXX deviated from the standard reading.[236] It seems clear that Paul is identifies Jesus with this "Redeemer" as one who returns out of the heavenly Zion (cf. Hebrews 12:22),[237] and as such if the ἐκ is present in Paul's LXX then this clearly supports the thesis. The identification of the "Redeemer" with Jesus is also supported by the LXX in its translation of בוא, which is here done by ἥξει. As Baer notes, ἥξειν is not entirely unusual as a translation,[238] but it is not nearly as common as ἔρχεσθαι.[239] When looking for an explanation he notes that the latter is generally avoided when the

---

232 Perowne, *Psalms*, 538; Anderson, *Psalms*, 507; Plumer, *Psalms*, 683.
233 See Cranfield, *Romans*, 552 for some of the options.
234 Denney, cited in Morris, *Romans*, 405. See also Sanday & Hedlam, *Romans*, 316 for a similar idea.
235 The general sense is not impossible, though clearly inappropriate in this context; Baer, *When*, 227 n. 73.
236 Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 166-8.
237 Moo, *Romans*, 727-8. Although it is possible that Paul refers to the incarnation
238 30 occurrences in Isaiah.
239 53 occurrences.

subject is God;[240] if he is right this translation supports the thesis that Paul is identifying Jesus with this "Redeemer" figure.

A much more significant departure from the Hebrew comes in the second clause. The participial phrase וּלְשָׁבֵי פֶּשַׁע בְּיַעֲקֹב ("to/for those in Jacob who are turning from transgression"),[241] looks to have been read as an infinitive (perhaps וּלְשׁוּב?) and so reads ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ ("and he will turn godlessness from[242] Jacob"). So while the Hebrew talks of a Redeemer coming *to* Zion to or for those *in* Jacob *already* turning from transgression, the LXX knows of a Redeemer coming *on behalf of* Zion who will *himself* turn Godlessness *from* Jacob. The Pauline context of a hardened Israel unable to return to God of their own accord requires exactly the latter kind of reading; it is not that the redeemer will come to those already in Christ and thus further emphasise the difference between faithful and unfaithful Jews. Paul's point is the God himself will come and do the turning.

There is also a question over what exactly is being turned from Jacob. ἀσέβεια is a fairly common Greek word but occurs only here in Isaiah,[243] coming from the common the Hebrew noun פֶּשַׁע, which elsewhere in Isaiah is usually translated as ἀνομία;[244] the distinction is important. Baer thinks that in the context of Isaiah it is a nationalist reference to God's ridding Israel of Gentile irreligion,[245] but for Paul it functions rather differently. In 1:18 he has used ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία as a hendiadys to sum up the total condition of human sinfulness.[246] However, here on its own ἀσέβεια gets away from the notion of moral failing in favour of failing in relationship with God. What Paul is envisioning is not the rectification of moral wrongdoing on the part of hardened Israel, but the "sending home"[247] of their failure to embrace faith in Christ. Those who have been hardened and given eyes that cannot see will have the powers that had trapped them turned away so that they too might be free to receive the gospel. This particular noun, being a surprising translation of the Hebrew, brings

---

240 Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 121 n. 115.

241 A text supported by the Dead Sea Scrolls (Abegg, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 369). Targum Pseudo-Jonathan looks more like the LXX reading, although the objection definitely emphasises the sinfulness of Jacob; see Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 227 n. 74.

242 The change from "in" to "from" suggests the reading of בּ as מ in the Hebrew, which is not unknown. The sense of the Hebrew is clearly "turning from sin", so the transfer of the subject of the turning may account for this. Perhaps the translator understood בְּיַעֲקֹב to mean "from in Jacob". The potential semantic overlap between בּ and מ makes this not impossible; see Schiffman, *Interchange* on this.

243 HR, 170.

244 24:40, 43:25, 44:22, 50:1, 53:5, 53:8, 59:12

245 Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 206 n. 18.

246 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 278.

247 Baer's translation, *When We All Go Home*, 227 n. 71.

with it connotations that make part of the argument for Paul and clarifies the nature of the redeemer's work.

11:33-36: O the depth of the riches!

One more citation is found in Paul's doxology. Isaiah 40:13 is quoted in 11:34 (although it is not introduced as a citation) and forms the last of Paul's recognisable uses of the OT;[248] other than swapping Isaiah's καί for a ἤ Paul follows LXX precisely. The most interesting move here is not one that helps Paul as such, but one that makes the translation usable where the expected translation would not. LXX has translated רוּחַ as νοῦς, which is an otherwise unparalleled move.[249] Where one would have anticipated the extremely common πνεῦμα,[250] a unique translation occurs. This is something of a relief for Paul, as had LXX read, "who has known the spirit of the Lord (πνεῦμα κύριου)?", a clear problem would have been raised regarding what Paul has already written about God's Spirit. In 8:1-17 particularly,[251] Paul has spoken extensively about Christian experience of the Spirit, indeed it seems to be a distinctive mark of Christian life; without the LXX's unique translation of רוּחַ this quotation from Isaiah would be rather uncomfortable.

---

248 Some find a citation of Job 41:3 (41:11a in ET) in 11:35, but this is wildly different to any LXX version so unhelpful for this study; see Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 701.
249 HR, 950.
250 Used dozens of times for the same Hebrew; HR, 1151-3.
251 Also 5:5, 8:23, 26-7.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

This thesis began with the assumption that all acts of translation are simultaneously acts of interpretation. Whether consciously done or not, a translator will (indeed must) use their own pre-understood ideas about a text and their own linguistic world to express the source text in the target language. In addition, translators may misread texts, work with corrupted *Vorlagen*, or have deliberate points to make in their work. As a result, translations which may well be valid as translations inevitably import new meanings and nuances into a text (or remove meanings from the source), they introduce verbal links to other texts which were not there before, in extreme cases they can completely transform the meaning originally intended. Thus when Paul uses the LXX (or something like it) he brings with it all of its translational import and this thesis has explored the effect of this phenomenon in Romans 9-11.

Firstly a brief exegesis mapped the contours of Paul's argument. By starting with the passage in its own right we began to see the way in which Paul's many appeals to scripture functioned in his argument. Without going into too much detail we began to see how the "pieces" of scripture fitted into the "puzzle" of Paul's argument. Chapter 4 examined these pieces in more depth in order to reveal the impact of the LXX on the passage. By comparing the many citations with their presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* we saw that subtle and not-so-subtle elements of interpretation in the LXX translation informed Paul's argument.

Throughout the text of Romans 9-11 we have found examples of how the LXX has played to Paul's advantage. This ranges from subtle shifts in emphasis, to the fortuitous use of one of Paul's key words, to clear changes of meaning. The influence

of the citations studied may be tabulated as follows:[252]

No influence	Subtle influence	Clear influence
Genesis 21:12 (9:7)	Genesis 18:14 (9:9)	Exodus 9:16 (9:17)
Genesis 25:23 (9:12)	Exodus 33:19 (9:15)	Isaiah 28:16/8:14 (9:33)
Malachi 1:2-3 (9:13)	Hosea 2:23/1:10 (9:25-6)	Isaiah 59:20-21 (11:26-27)
Deut. 30:12-14 (10:6-8)	Isaiah 10:22/1:9 (9:27-29)	
Isaiah 52:7 (10:15)	Joel 2:32 (10:13)	
Deut. 29:4 (11:8)	Isaiah 53:1 (10:16)	
	Psalm 19:4 (10:18)	
	Deut. 32:21 (10:19)	
	Isaiah 65:1-1 (10:20-21)	
	Psalm 69:22-23 (11:9-10)	
	1 Kings 19:10/18 (11:3-4)	
	Isaiah 40:13 (11:34)	

As this table demonstrates there is neither a clear and consistent pattern of LXX translation influencing Paul's exegesis, nor is the influence rare or minimal. As one would expect, some translations stick very closely to the original and thus have little influence, some stick close but occasionally make lexical choices that are fortuitous for Paul, sometimes the translation makes a considerable move away from the sense of the *Vorlage* and makes a significant difference to Paul's argument. In concluding, the three clearest examples of influence will be rehearsed.

Though there are some questions about Paul's text at Romans 9:17, there is just enough evidence to suggest that his reading here pre-dates him. If this is correct then Paul's text serves his purpose by emphasising the fact that God uses Pharaoh in the Exodus narrative to bring about the divine purposes through his hardness; he is not "preserved", but is "raised up" onto the stage of history. The introduction of the preposition ἐν also helps by making Pharaoh the channel by which God's power is shown rather than the recipient of the display of power. This understanding of Exodus sets up Paul's line of argument that Israel is in some sense a Pharaoh figure, hardened in order to enact God's will.

When Isaiah 28:16 is quoted in Romans 9:33 the argument is augmented in

---

252 Obviously these categories are fairly broad and each citation sits on a spectrum of influence, but I hope that this table may visually show some of this spectrum.

two ways. Firstly, the LXX adds ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ which makes it clear that faith must have an object namely, for Paul, Jesus. There is a useful balance made between identifying Jesus as the stumbling stone and also as the object of faith, which mirrors the predicament of Israel. The surprising translation of יָחִישׁ as καταισχυνθῇ provides a useful change in voice (even if the sense is generally the same); the emphasis in the Hebrew was on the action of believer, but the divine passive of the Greek enables Paul to keep the focus on God's action in providing solid ground for the one with faith.

Probably the clearest example available is the citation of Isaiah 59:20 in Romans 11:26; the redeemer coming on behalf of Zion to those in Jacob turning from their sins in the Hebrew becomes a redeemer coming from Zion to turn Jacob from sin. The change is considerable and fits well with what Paul envisages. Given the emphasis placed on God's action in hardening Israel as part of his purpose for salvation it was important that the voice of scripture could offer a clear picture of divine intervention in the godlessness (ἀσέβεια) of Israel in order to complete his work with her; it is clear that Paul is enabled to make a scriptural argument from Isaiah 59 that he would have found difficult had the move not already been made by the LXX translator.

My intention throughout has not been to look at where the LXX "got it wrong" and in so doing imply that Paul "gets it wrong". Beneath the study of the influence of the LXX on Paul there lies a question about the nature of scripture, the phenomenon of God's Word in human words. The very nature of language requires that the meaning of the written word is influenced by its context and the world-view and context of the reader. I would not argue that the meaning of texts is entirely determined by the reader, but if there is "a meaning" infused into a text by the author then it is never possible for a reader to extract that meaning without remainder and without influence. Just as science recognises the "observer effect" in which one making observations will influence the subject, the arts must recognise the reader effect and note that reading itself is a form of interpretation.

When it comes to "scripture" it is a mistake to assume that by virtue of being "God's Word" the Bible loses the properties of the "human words" in which it is written. To affirm that God's word is "truth" and thereby can be understood to have a "true" meaning at any point is fallacious. In interacting with a text a reader's world-view interprets that text and thus meaning is (to a degree) subjective.[253] The

253 Though let it be clear that I do not wish to advocate "anything goes" relativism when it comes to interpretation. While it may not be possible to interpret a text definitively, it does not follow that

contribution I hope to make to this position is to demonstrate exactly these dynamics within the pages of scripture itself. By exploring the impact of the LXX upon Paul I have shown that the act of reading and translating the OT (undertaken by a now-unknown group of scholars) has directly affected scripture itself. One ancient translation of scripture, with its naturally interpretative elements, has influenced a letter that interprets that same scripture and is now recognised as scripture itself.

To take seriously the human words of scripture we must recognise that such words can never be reduced to a rule-book for living. Instead it should be read as a place in which God meets humanity and speaks to them; as we read scripture and bring our world to it we interpret scripture in the hope that in the process God will interpret us and transform us.

---

no interpretation can be wrong!

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Greek New Testament:

Aland, K. and Aland, B., *Novum Testamentum Graece (27th Revised Edition)* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993)

Masoretic Text:

Kittel, R. (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997)

Septuagint:

Rahlfs, Alfred, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979)

Wevers, J. W. (ed.), *Deuteronomium, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* vol. III.2 (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977)

———, *Exodus, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* vol. II.1 (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Ziegler, Joseph, *Isaias, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* vol. XIV (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939)

———, *Duodecim Prophetae, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* vol. XIII (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943)

Secondary Sources:

Romans:

Aageson, James W., "Scripture and Structure in the Development of the Argument in Romans 9-11" in *CBQ* 48 (1986), pp. 265-89

Abasciano, Brian J., *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1-9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis* Library of New Testament Studies, no. 301 (London: T&T Clark, 2005)

Achtemeier, Paul J., *Romans: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985)

Battle Jr, John A., "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:25-26" in *Grace Theological Journal* Vol 2. no.1 (1981), pp. 115-29

Charles, "Romans 11:1-10" in *Interpretation* vol. 58 no. 3 (2004), pp. 283-6.

Caird, G. B., "Predestination - Romans ix-xi" in *Expository Times* no. 68 (1956-7), pp. 324-7

Cranfield, C. E. B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* two volumes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979)

Dunn, J. D. G., *Romans 9-16,* Word Biblical Commentary vol. 38b (Dallas: Word Books, 1988)

Esler, Philip F., *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003)

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible vol. 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993)

Guerra, Anthony, *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995)

Johnson, E. Elizabeth, "Romans 9-11: The Faithfulness and Impartiality of God" in Hay & Johnson (eds.) *Pauline Theology* vol. III (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 211-239

Käsemann, Ernst, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980)

Longenecker, B. W., "Different Answers to Different Issues: Israel, the Gentiles and Salvation History in Romans 9-11", in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 36 (1989), pp. 95-123.

Meeks, Wayne A., "On Trusting an Unpredictable God: A Hermeneutical Meditation on Romans 9-11" in Carroll, Cosgrove and Johnson (eds.) *Faith and History: Essays in Honour of Paul W. Meyer* (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1990), pp. 105-124.

Moo, Douglas, "The Theology of Romans 9-11" in Hay & Johnson (eds.) *Pauline Theology,* vol. III (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 240-258.

———, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996)

Morris, Leon, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988)

Piper, John, *The Justification of God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 9:1-23* 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993)

Sanday, William & Arthur Hedlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, The International Critical Commentary,* 5th ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920)

Seifrid, Mark A., "Romans" in G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (eds.) *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), pp. 607-694.

Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul ´in Concert´ in the Letter to the Romans, Supplement to Novum Testamentum (NTS)*, 101. (Leiden: Brill, 2002)

Wasserberg, Gunter, "Romans 9-11 and Jewish-Christian Dialogue: Prospects and Provisos" in Greholm and Patte (eds.) *Reading Israel in Romans: Legitimacy and Plausibility of Divergent Interpretations* (Harrisburg, Penn: Trinity Press, 2000), pp. 174-86.

Westerholm, Stephen, "Paul and the Law in Romans 9-11" in James D. G. Dunn (ed.), *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: Clark, T & T, 1998), pp. 215-237.

Wright, N. T., "Romans and the Theology of Paul", in David M. Hay & E. Elizabeth Johnson (eds.) *Pauline Theology Volume III: Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 30-67.

———, "The Letter to the Romans" in *New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. X (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), pp. 395-770.

Other:

Abegg, Martin, Peter Flint, Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays, Contributions to*

Biblical Exegesis and Theology, 50; rev. and expanded ed. (Leuven: Peeters, 2007)

Anderson, A. A., *The Book of Psalms, New Century Bible*, 2 vols (London: Oliphants, 1972)

Badenas, Robert, *Christ: The End of the Law; Romans 10.4 in Pauline Perspective, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series*, 10 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985)

Baer, David A., *When We all Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (JSOTS)*, 318, The Hebrew Bible and its Versions (HBV), no. 1. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001)

Barr, James, "Paul and the LXX: A Note on Some Recent Work" in *JTS* vol. 45 no. 2 (1994), pp. 593-601

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, The Anchor Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 2000)

Brockington, L. H., "Septuagint and Targum" in *ZAW* vol. 66 (1954), pp. 80-6

Burrows, M., with the assistance of John C. Trever. and William H. Brownlee (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. 1, *American Schools of Oriental Research Publication* (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950)

Carleton Paget, James, *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament*, 2/ 64 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1994)

Childs, Brevard S., *Exodus: A Commentary, The Old Testament Library* (London: SCM, 1974)

———, *Isaiah: A Commentary, The Old Testament Library* (Louisville: John Knox, 2001)

Craigie, Peter C., *Psalms 1-50, Word Biblical Commentary*, v.19 (Waco, Tex: Word Books, 1983)

Cranfield, C. E. B., "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New" in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (eds.) *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: CUP, 1970), pp. 377-411

Dahood, Michell, *Psalms 1-50: Introduction, Translation and Notes, Anchor Bible*, v.16, Facsimile of 1965 ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1965)

Dines, Jennifer M., *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004)

Dunn, J. D. G., "The New Perspective on Paul" in *Jesus, Paul and the Law* (London: SPCK, 1990) pp. 183-214

Gesenius, Wilhelm., *Gesenius´s Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*. Translated by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (London: S. Bagster, 1857)

Gruber, Mayer I., "The Reality Behind the Hebrew Expression כָּעֵת חַיָּה" in *ZAW* no. 103 (1991), pp. 271-4

Hasel, Gerhard F., *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah, Andrews University Monographs*, v.5. (Berrien Springs, Mich: Andrews University Press, 1972)

Hatch, Edwin. and Henry A. Redpath., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)*. 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1998)

Hays, Richard B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (London: Yale University Press, 1989)

Jobes, Karen H., *The Alpha Text of Esther* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996)

———, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000)

Koch, Dietrich-Alex, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie*, 69 (Tübingen:

Mohr, 1986)

Kooij, Arie van der, "Isaiah in the Septuagint" in Broyles, Craig C. and Craig A. Evans. *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah Vols. 1 & 2*: *Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, 70 1,2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 513-29.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim, *Psalms 60-150*: *A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989)

Leupold, H. C., *Exposition of the Psalms* (Welwyn: Evangelical Press, 1977)

Lim, Timothy H., *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)

Lindars, Barnabas, *New Testament Apologetic*: *The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961)

Lust, Johan (et al.), *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint,* rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003)

McLay, R. T., *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003)

McNamara, Martin, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, Anelecta Biblica*, 27 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966)

Menken, Martinus, "The textual form of the quotation from Isaiah 7:14 in Matthew 1:23." in *Novum Testamentum* 43 no.2 (2001), pp. 144-160.

Moberly, R. W. L., *Prophecy and Discernment* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006)

Muraoka, Takamitsu, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint*: *Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998)

Olofsson, Staffan, *God is my Rock*: *A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint, Coniectanea Biblica*, 31, Old Testament series (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990)

Perowne, J. J. Stewart, *The Book of Psalms*. 3rd ed. (London: Bell & Daldy, 1873)

Plumer, William S., *Psalms*: *A Critical and Expository Commentary with Doctrinal and Practical Remarks*, *A Geneva Series Commentary* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1975)

Propp, William H. C., *Exodus 1-18*: *A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, *The Anchor Bible*, 2. (New York: Doubleday, 1999)

Sarna, Nahum M., *The JPS Torah Commentary, Exodus*: *The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991)

Schiffman, Lawrence H., "The Interchange of the Prepositions *Beth* and *Min* in Biblical Hebrew", *Textus* vol. 10 (1982), pp. 37-43.

Stanley, C. D., *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Techniques in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992)

Tate, Marvin E., *Psalms 51-100*, *Word Biblical Commentary*, vol. 20 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990)

Tov, Emanuel, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)*, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 8 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)

Troxel, Ronald L., *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (Leiden: Brill: 2008)

Wevers, J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series,* vol. 30 (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1990)

———, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series,* vol. 35 (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1993)

———, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series,* vol. 39 (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1995)

Wildberger, Hans, *Isaiah* 1-*12 a Commentary, Continental Commentaries*. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991)