There is no doubt’, stated Martin Luther in the preface to his commentary on Romans, ‘that he who carries this epistle in his heart carries the light and power of the Old Testament with him’. It is no accident that the letter which is ‘a short summary of the whole of Christian and evangelical doctrine’, to cite Luther’s earlier words, also provides ‘an access to the whole of the Old Testament’. For to understand Paul’s use of the Old Testament ‘is to understand in no small measure his theology’ (R. V. G. Tasker1.) Nor is this surprising when it is remembered that for the early Church the Scriptures were not the New Testament, as almost exclusively for so many Christians today, but rather the Old Testament. This is why C. H. Dodd gave to his book According to the Scriptures the sub-title The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology2. Was Luther going too far when he observed: ‘There is no word in the New Testament which does not look back to the Old wherein it was already declared’?3

It is an axiom of the New Testament that the Old is the very Word of God: ‘We know from the general tone of the New Testament that it regards the Old Testament, as all the Jews then did, as the revealed and inspired word of God and clothed with His authority’ (C. H. Toy).4 B. Metzger, comparing the Christian and Rabbinic attitude to the Old Testament, concludes that ‘the contributors to the New Testament and to the Mishnah had the highest view of the inspiration of the Scriptures which they quote’.5 J. A. Fitzmyer, comparing the Qumrân and Christian views, states: ‘The introductory formulae used by the Qumrân and New Testament writers reveal a profound reverence for the Old Testament as the word of God’.6 In Romans i-viii, which is an exposition of the theological basis of the Gospel, the formula to introduce quotations is generally ‘as it is written’.7 J. Denney has written of Paul’s use of this phrase ‘There is a challenge in the words, as if he had said, “Let him impugn this who dare contest the Word of God”’.8

The Old Testament had the authority of God. But for the early Church it pointed not to itself nor to the Law but to Christ. As the very voice of God, it bore witness to Jesus: ‘This is my beloved...’

---

1 The Annual Public Lecture of the College given in the Summer Term, 1964.
4 In ‘Sermon on John i. 1-14’, cited by Ellis, ibid., 115.
8 Comm., on ii. 24.
Son: hear him’. When therefore the early Church read the Old Testament it was with the joyful conviction: ‘We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write.’\(^9\) It was read in the light of Christ and the Messianic age which He had inaugurated. E. Earle Ellis, whose book *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* has been a primer for our present study, has noted how ‘Scripture is adduced as a final authority and one divinely planned whole whose significance is bound up inseparably with the New Covenant community of Christians’.\(^10\) All the past salvation-history of God is viewed as culminating in Jesus Christ, just as all future development is regarded as the outworking of the decisive and germinal events of AD 33 when Jesus died and rose again. F. F. Bruce has well said that ‘the New Testament
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interpretation of the Old Testament is not only eschatological but Christological’,\(^11\) Christ is the focus of Old Testament fulfilment, whereas at Qumrân there is no focal point but still an unfulfilled waiting.\(^12\)

The Christian Gospel is the fulfilment of hopes inspired by God Himself ‘he had promised [it] afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures’ (Romans i. 2). As W. F. Lofthouse observed, ‘The religion of every part of the Old Testament is the religion of promise. With their feet firmly set on a track that leads back to certain indubitable events, and with keen attention to all that is happening around them, the best of the Hebrews fix their eyes on what lies in front, and even... on what is hidden on the other side of the horizon.’\(^13\) The Old Testament itself knows much of this concept of promise and fulfilment. G. von Rad has traced the theme as it runs like a deep, wide river through the historical books.\(^14\) For instance, in 2 Samuel vii. 13 it is foretold that David’s son would succeed him and build a house for the name of the Lord; in 1 Kings viii. 20 the fulfilment is duly noted: ‘The Lord hath performed his word that he spake, and I am risen up in the room of David my father... as the Lord promised, and have built an house for the name of the Lord God of Israel’. The Old Testament rings with the realization of God’s word: ‘Thou didst speak with thy mouth, and with thy hand hast fulfilled it this day’ (1 Kings viii. 24., RSV). Von Rad sums up this theme as follows: ‘The history of the two kingdoms is simply the will of Jahweh and the word of Jahweh actualized in history.’\(^15\) Scripture ever looks forward, and as it moves forward finds the confirmation of its forward look. This note rings out in the New Testament. As in the Old Testament, so in the New, God is still working His purposes out. The same God continues His work and brings it to a climax in Christ. There is fulfilment not only of the prophetic word, but also of Old Testament precedents: creation, the Exodus, God’s choice of a people for Himself and all such things point forward as a pattern of the way in which God still acts—in Christ. Inevitably the fulfilment transcends and often supersedes the promise of event or

---


\(^11\) *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 1960, 77.


\(^13\) In art. ‘The Old Testament and Christianity’ in *Record and Revelation*, ed. 11. W. Robinson, 1938, 460.

\(^14\) *Studies in Deuteronomy*, E.T. 1953, 74 ff. See, e.g., 1 Kings xi. 29 ff. and xii. 15; xiii and xiii. 16 ff.; xiv. 6 ff. and xv. 29; xvi. 1 ff. and 12; Joshua vi. 26 and 1 Kings xvi. 34; 2 Kings xxi. 10 ff. and xxiv. 2.

\(^15\) *Ibid.*, 83.
word. For instance, ‘the Law has been superseded by Christ as the central point of revelation’. There is thus an element of contrast as well as of continuity in the Christian approach to the Old Testament. When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part is done away. But one must beware of so stressing this contrast that in effect one gives the Old Testament less honour and finds there less practical worth than does the New Testament.

The earliest Christians were taught by their Lord what the Christian approach should be (cf. Luke xxiv. 25 ff.) and, sustained by the conviction that the Holy Spirit was guiding them into all the truth (John xvi. 13), read their Bibles with eyes that had focused first on Christ. The Apostle Paul entered into the labours of other Christian teachers, and both developed and adapted their work. In the letter to the Romans he reveals in quotation, allusion and theological themes the great debt he owes to the Old Testament Scriptures. For him the Word of God is alive and contemporary, speaking to the consciences of all who read it (iii. 10 ff.) and revealing God’s present plan of salvation (iv. 23 f.).

I. THE INFLUENCE OF HABAKKUK II. 4

In Romans i. 17 the Apostle quotes Habakkuk ii. 4, substantially from the LXX, in order to support his contention that God’s righteousness as revealed in the Christian gospel depends upon faith. The prophetic oracle is viewed as an anticipation of the Gospel, setting down God’s requirements whereby a man may be accepted by Him and given entry into the life of the age to come. In its primary historical setting the oracle was an assurance to the people of God that, despite the threat of Chaldaean invasion and national upheaval, the man whose life was in line with God’s will would be preserved and prosper under God’s good hand, on account of his firm loyalty to God. In both orthodox and sectarian Judaism the scope

---

17 See A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 1961, 58 ff. and 131 ff.
18 So Ellis, op. cit., 11, sums up Pauline usage of the Old Testament. On 114 note 4 he warns against hasty assumption that reference to the Old Testament is merely for language colour.
19 Paul follows LXX in keeping δε, but omits μον which follows δικαιοσύνης in the Alexandrian text and πίστεος in the Vatican. M. J. Lagrange, comm. ad loc. suggests that the omission of μον is simply because Paul is not making God speak. LXX, which Paul is probably adapting, presupposes be μινατιον instead of MT be μινατιον and takes it to mean God’s faithfulness to His covenant (R. Bultmann and A. Weiser, Faith, E.T. of TWNT, 1961, 18 note i). Paul no doubt interpreted it as ‘faith in Me’, and objective genitive. His practice of speaking of faith in Christ rather than of in the Father was perhaps a further inducement for him to omit μον.
20 ‘From faith to faith’ is probably not a rhetorical idiom, ‘a matter of faith from start to finish’, but means rather ‘based on faith and addressed to faith’ (NEBmg.: cf. iii. 22).
21 See the following section on Righteousness.
23 The Hebrew ‘מיעות is primarily ‘steadiness’ and then comes to mean ‘faithfulness in the covenant relationship’. On man’s side it has a basis of faith: the use of the cognate verb ה餮 ‘min ‘believe’ must have had some influence in bringing out this element in the noun (cf. C. F. Burney, The Gospel in the O.T., 1921, 129 f., cited by E. E. Ellis, Paul’s Use of the O.T., 1957, 117). The LXX translates by πίστις, which means both faithfulness and faith, and paves the way for the NT usage.
of the prophecy was considered to be much wider than its context in history.\textsuperscript{24} Rabbinic theology no doubt already saw in it the essence of God’s revealed will to man: ‘The myriad of Torah injunctions are reduced by the prophets: e.g. Isaiah reduced them to two principles, “to do justice and righteousness”, and Habakkuk to one, “the righteous shall live by his faithfulness”.\textsuperscript{25} ‘Faithfulness’ was interpreted as a meritorious work of devoted obedience. The Qumrân commentary on Habakkuk saw the fulfillment of the book in contemporary and imminent events\textsuperscript{26} and viewed it as an apocalypse. The ‘faithfulness’ of Habakkuk ii. 4 becomes adherence to the leader of the sect, the Teacher of Righteousness.\textsuperscript{27} It is on this ground that Jews who keep the Law are to be delivered from persecution. The occasional use of Habakkuk by the early Church is Messianic and eschatological as ‘a tract for a time of persecution’.\textsuperscript{28} Paul’s missionary experience led him on further to use the Old Testament text in Galatians iii. 11 in anti-Jewish polemic. He strips faithfulness to its core of faith in God. No doubt he interpreted the context of war as a reference to the Divine warfare against sin.\textsuperscript{29} He defined the promised life as life in the Messianic age, the very life of the risen Christ shared by those in Him. He links ‘faith’ closely with ‘righteous’ as the means of a man’s acceptance with God: ‘the just-by-faith shall live’.\textsuperscript{30}

The quotation of Habakkuk ii. 4 has often been regarded as a passing and incidental confirmation of Paul’s gospel. On the other hand, it has recently been viewed as having a much more integral and important rôle as a headline for the whole theological argument of Romans i-viii.

\textsuperscript{24} See A. Strobel, Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem (Suppl. ii. Nov. Test.), 1961.
\textsuperscript{25} Babylonian Talmud, Makkoth, 24a, cited by E. E. Ellis, ibid., 56.
\textsuperscript{26} See F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumrân Texts, 1960, 11 ff. and 81 ff. For an English translation of this and other Qumrân documents see G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Penguin Books) 1962.
\textsuperscript{27} S. E. Johnson (\textit{HTR} lxxxviii, 1955, 157 ff.) notes that at Qumrân Paul’s text had already been used to refer to a relationship to a religious leader. But W. H. Brownlee, ‘Messianic Motifs of Qumrân and the NT’, \textit{NTS} iii, 1956, 209 points out ‘the great chasm’ that lies between the Qumrân and the Pauline interpretations.
\textsuperscript{28} B. Lindars, New Testament Apologetic, 1961, 232. He refers to the use of Hab. i. 5 in Acts xiii. 41, and of Hab. i. 6 in Rev. xx. 9. Hab. ii. if. is of course used in Heb. x. 37 ff. Nestle’s \textit{Index locorum} adds a reference to Hab. iii. 18 in Luke i. 47.
\textsuperscript{29} See the following section on the holy war. C. H. Dodd (\textit{According to the Scriptures}, 1952) has shown that OT texts were quoted as pointers to the whole context rather than as proof-texts in themselves. Cf. Lindars, \textit{ibid.}, 19; Ellis, \textit{op. cit.}, 12 note 2; 104 f.
\textsuperscript{30} So RSV & NEB in sense; among commentators H. Lietzmann, M. J. Lagrange, P. Boylan, A. Nygren, C. K. Barrett, F. F. Bruce. Note the use of such combinations as δικαιοθέντες εκ πιστεύς (Rom. v. 1) and εκ πιστεύς δικαιοσύνη (x. 6). It is commonly objectcd, e.g. by W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, \textit{comm. ad loc.}, that the order εκ πιστεύς δικαιοθέντες would be necessary, but A. Feuillet (‘La Citation d’Habacuc ii. 4 et les huit premiers Chapitres de l’Épitre aux Romains’, \textit{NTS} vi, 1959, 52 ff.) counters this objection with the observation that Paul can write τον Ἰσραήλ κατὰ σάρκα (1 Corinthians x. 18) as well as τοὺς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίου (Ephesians vi. 5). F. C. Synge, \textit{Hebrews and the Scriptures}, 1959, 33 ff. claims that Hebrews x. 37 ff. takes Habakkuk ii. 4 in the sense ‘The just-by-faith shall live’.
\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Comm. ad loc.} A. M. Hunter, \textit{comm. ad loc.}, follows Nygren’s suggestion. Cf. too F. F. Bruce, \textit{comm.}, 78; A. Strobel, \textit{op. cit.} 177, note 2.
\textsuperscript{32} Cf. the suggestion made by S. Kistemaker, \textit{The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews}, 1961, 101; 130 f. that the structure of Hebrews is built upon four quotations from the Psalms.
\textsuperscript{33} He subdivides chapters v-viii into freedom from the wrath of God, sin, the Law and death.
Feuillet has taken up Nygren’s suggestion and developed it in a thorough exegetical and statistical study of the structure of Romans i-viii. The words of Habakkuk ii. 4. are the key words of these chapters. Vocabulary connected with righteousness and faith is used much more frequently in the section i. 17-v. 11 than in v. 12-viii. Words related to life and death are used constantly in v. 12-viii, while almost completely absent from the earlier section. The first half of the theme-text—‘the just-by-faith’—prefaces God’s offer of righteousness by faith (iii. 21 ff.) with the analysis of the unrighteousness of Gentile and Jew (i. 28-iii. 20). The rest of chapters v-viii is a Christian commentary on the second part of the theme-text—‘shall live’. First, life in Christ is set over against death in Adam (v. 12-vii. 6), and then life in the Spirit is set over against the destructive side-effects of the Law (vii. 7-viii). Each section is concluded with a homiletic application of earlier theological themes. The Apostle lifts up his heart in fervent assurance of the salvation of the people of God (v. 1-11; viii. 31 ff.).

II. RIGHTEOUSNESS AND WRATH; HOLY WAR AND LAWSUIT

‘Righteousness’ is perhaps the most complex term in the whole of Scripture. Its rich heritage from the Old Testament has given it an elasticity surprising to the modern reader of Romans. It is a veritable kaleidoscope of concepts which demand careful analysis and evaluation. Probably the most important Old Testament usage for its influence upon Pauline thought is its forensic connotation. To be ‘righteous’ in a court of law meant primarily to be ‘in the right’, ‘in the clear’. For a Hebrew judge to ‘justify’ one of the parties before Him implied a sentence of acquittal: so far as the judge was concerned the man was ‘in the clear’ or ‘righteous’ in this specialized forensic sense. He was reinstated in the community, and had a favourable standing in the eyes not only of the judge but also of his fellow-citizens. His ‘righteousness’ was the welcome acknowledgment that he was ‘in the right’. When Jeremiah pronounces that ‘the

34 Art. cit.
35 The δικ—group, including δικαιοσύνη, δικαιώμα, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη occur thirty-eight times in i. 17-v. 11 (omitting δικαιοσύνη in v. 7) and eighteen times in v. 12-viii. Feuillet (p. 55) counts only the first three words and gives a total of twenty-nine in the first section and seven or eight in the second; he omits the instances in vi. 13-20 on the ground that faith-righteousness is not in view. The πιστ—group (πιστεύω, πιστεύον, πιστεύον) occur thirty-eight times in i. 17-v. 11 and not at all in v. 12 ff. (the irrelevant πιστεύον in vi. 8 may be omitted). Feuillet lists πιστεύω only as occurring about thirty-four times in the first section.
36 ζωή, ζωοστάσιον, ζωή, ζωοστάσιον, ζωοστάσιον, ζωοστάσιον, ζωοστάσιον occur three times in i. 17-v. 11 and twenty-six throughout v. 12-viii. Feuillet includes only ζωή and ζωή in his statistical table and gives twenty-two times in the second part and once in the first. The θυσιν—group (ἀποθυσία, θυσία, θυσία, θυσία) occur six times in i. 17-v. 11 and thirty-nine times throughout v. 12-viii. Feuillet counts only the first two words and finds them used about thirty-seven times in the second section and twice in the first.
37 Feuillet speaks only of v. 1-11 in these terms, but we suggest that it has a parallel in viii. 31 ff.
backsliding Israel hath justified herself more than treacherous Judah’ (Jeremiah iii. 11), he is reporting God’s verdict. The Lord was more inclined to acquit Israel than Judah. Israel had more right on her side when the pros and cons of her case were weighed.

‘Righteousness’ could be applied not only to a man on trial before a judge but also to the judge himself. Hebrew law did not put the same stress upon impartiality as Roman or British law. In the ancient Orient a judge’s frequent task was to champion the oppressed against their oppressors. His was a protective and vindicative function. The judge was ‘righteous’ insofar as he came to the aid of the victimized. In Luke xviii. 6 it is the judge’s reluctance to try the case of the wronged widow that earns him the epithet ‘unrighteous’.

The forensic sense of the word has of course a close link with a moral connotation: one hopes that the plaintiff who was acquitted received the verdict because he had acted in a morally right way. But the forensic and moral senses of ‘righteous’ are strictly not synonymous: when a judge acquitted a man-made him forensically ‘righteous’—he did not thereby make him morally righteous. As we shall see, the lines of development of the two senses eventually grew further and further apart, and in fact only converge in the New Testament.

One of the outstanding contributions of the eighth century prophets to Old Testament theology was their stress upon the moral holiness of God. Immoral living was incompatible with the worship of Israel’s God. ‘Hate evil, and love good’, prophesied Amos, ‘and establish justice in the gate’ (v. 15, RSV). He was preaching against the social injustice of Israel’s leaders. The poor were being trampled down; the law courts were infested with bribery and corruption. But it was certain that when the Lord intervened as Judge in a court of appeal, as it were, the moral standards He would apply would be the highest, for He was morally holy and pure (Isaiah iii. 13-15; vi. 1-5).

The term ‘righteousness’ in its forensic sense developed in the Old Testament into part of the vocabulary that described the covenant-relationship between God and His people. It became a covenantal term with both a personal and a national reference. When Abraham’s faith was counted ‘as righteousness’ (Genesis xv. 6, RSV), ‘righteousness’ is ‘a right relationship to God conferred by a Divine sense of approval’, as J. Skinner put it.40 The patriarch had a favourable standing of acceptance with God. He was not only ‘in the right’ before God his judge, but also ‘right with’ his covenant-God. The national use of ‘righteousness’ as a covenant word is an extension of this idea. God’s ‘righteousness’ is His keeping to the terms of His covenant and standing by His people when they needed help. The covenant He had made with Israel involved obligations and the fulfilment of promises, as surely as did any ancient Eastern treaty an overlord made with a vassal-king. Since He was the covenant-God of Israel, any Israelite had the right to come to His court and seek help against oppression: ‘Judge me, O Lord my God’, cried the psalmist, ‘according to thy righteousness’ (Psalm xxxv. 24). God can be trusted to protect His

39 For a popular study of this aspect of Hebrew justice see C. S. Lewis, Reflections on the Psalms, 1958, chapter ii.  
own people. When foreigners invade, the Divine court is open for Israel to appeal for execution of judgment against them: let God set right those who are thus wronged. This appeal is made even when Israel has broken her side of the covenant and is strictly no longer entitled to claim His ‘righteousness’. This is paving the way for the New Testament where God shows His ‘righteousness’ to those completely outside a covenant-relationship, in fulfilment of His own promises of grace.

God’s ‘righteousness’ comes to describe His activity in defending His people against His foes. This concept can be traced to the twelfth century BC: in the Song of Deborah the ‘righteousnesses’ of the Lord are His ‘righteous acts’ (Judges v. i i) or His ‘triumphs’ (RSV) in vanquishing the Canaanites for Israel. His ‘righteousness’ in this sense is His intervention in warfare. The Judge executes His judgment as a Warrior; the law court is the very field of battle. Linked with this idea is the Old Testament concept of the holy war. “The book of the wars of the Lord” (Numbers xxi. 14), as R. Leivestad has said, ‘might have been a suitable title of the whole of the Old Testament.’ In Israel’s history books God Himself is often the Commander-in-chief who delivers the enemy into His people’s hands, frequently with Israel doing little or nothing to assist: ‘The Lord thy God is he which goeth over [the Jordan] before thee; as a consuming fire he shall destroy them, and he shall bring them down before thy face: so shalt thou drive them out, and destroy them quickly’ (Deuteronomy ix. 3). The prophets take up this motif and look forward to the intervention of God whether in imminent judgment upon Israel’s oppressors (e.g. Isaiah xxxi. 1-5) or in the great judgment of the last days (Ezekiel xxxviii ff.). In Isaiah xl ff. the redemptive acts of God are summed up in what is a technical term of both the Divine law-court and Divine warfare: ‘righteousness’ is the activity of God Himself in delivering His people from heathen oppression. It is often placed in synonymous parallelism with ‘salvation’ (xlv. 8, xlvi. 13, li. 6, 8).

Forensic language is not only used in the description of Israel’s warfare under her Divine Commander. In the Prophets God’s complaints either against His people or against the heathen are put in a law court setting. For instance, Micah vi. 1-8 passes on God’s charges against His covenant-people: ‘The Lord has a controversy with his people’. Isaiah xl. 1-2, 21-24, xlvi. 20-21 challenge the heathen in forensic terminology to present their case for their idols and submit to arbitration the question whether they are better than the true God.

In Romans i-viii Paul draws together the many strands contributed by the imagery of the law court, sometimes with explicit reference to the Old Testament, often by making implicit allusions to the Book that was never far from his

---

41 The term also occurs in 1 Samuel xii. 7, Micah vi. 5, Psalm ci. i 6.
42 G. von Rad, Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel, 1951; idem, op. cit. in note 14, chapter 4.
43 Christ the Conqueror, 1954, 3.
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thinking.46 The Pauline doctrine of justification has its psychological starting point in the Jewish expectation of a last judgment, as Adolf Deissmann once said.47 The fears of Saul the Pharisee with regard to his acquittal at the Divine court of law were removed by Christ. Chapter ii presents the threat of this judgment to the unconverted Jew, especially when it uses future tenses. The futures of iii. 20, 30, v. 9, 19, are probably references to the-final day of judgment.48 The Christian has an assurance of acquittal at that court. So believed the men of the Qumrân community too.49 But Christian justification, probably unlike the Qumrân doctrine,50 is not only a hope for the future, but a present certainty: the Christian is already acquitted in Christ (iii. 26, 28, v. 1, 9, viii. 30). His future justification is sure, because, in a sense, it has already taken place. No one ‘shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect’ then because God ‘justifieh’ now; no one ‘shall condemn’ (RV) because Christ now pleads for them (viii. 33f.).51 ‘Justification is an anticipation of God’s verdict at the last judgment’ (C. K. Barrett).52 Underlying the Greek verb ‘justify’ is the Hebrew verb with its sense of ‘making righteous’ in the purely forensic sense of ‘making in the right, in the clear’ by a Divine verdict.53 The parallelism of ii. 13 shows that to be ‘just’ before God is the equivalent of being ‘justified’.

Jewish fear of the last judgment was based upon the conception of God as morally righteous, a part of the Old Testament heritage which Pharisaism stressed54 and Qumrân echoed.55 With reason therefore we expect that his conception will be one of the elements that go to make up the term ‘righteousness’ as applied to God in Romans. To deny this, as some have done, is to be false to both the contemporary and the Old Testament background of the term. The significance of this element we shall examine later. But it is obvious that ‘righteousness’ is more than a moral attribute of God, important though that fact is. The Biblical history of the term with reference to the saving activity of God among men comes to its climax in Romans. F. J. Leenhardt (*comm. ad loc.*) maintains that i. 16 f. is inspired by Psalm xcviii. 1-3, 8-9: ‘The Apostle on the basis of his own Christian experience renews the psalmist’s theme of joy: God has done great things, He has manifested His power to save’. The notes of salvation and universalism struck by the psalmist certainly seem to be echoed by the Apostle.56 The words of Psalm xcviii. 2b, ‘his righteousness hath he revealed in the sight of the nations’ (cf. RV, RSV), appear to find a Christian application in the revelation of God’s righteousness mentioned in Romans i. 17.

46 Note iii. 21: ‘witnessed by the law and the prophets’. No reference has been made in what follows to the use of δίκαιοςόνη as a Christian ethical quality in vi. 13 ff.
48 Rather than logical or gnomic futures.
53 C. K. Barrett, *comm. 75 f.; Schrenk, op. cit.*, 44 f.
54 Cf. x. 3ff. R. Travers Herford, *The Pharisees*, 1924, 154: ‘If any knowledge of God at all was vouchsafed to the intuition of Prophet, Pharisee or Rabbi, it was the knowledge of Him as just and righteous; and in this direction Judaism has said the last word that so far has ever been said.’
55 E.g. *IQH* iv. 30 f.: ‘Righteousness, I know, is not of man,. to the Most High God belong all righteous deeds’, G. Vermes, *op. cit.*, 163.
56 Cf. the use of Psalm xcviii. 9 in the account of Paul’s speech at Athens, Acts xvii. 31.
Leenhardt (comm. ad loc.) has also suggested the influence of Psalm cxliii upon Romans iii. 21. In iii. 20 Paul quotes freely from Psalm cxliii, 2,\(^57\) and amplifies it with an introductory phrase ‘by the works of the law’.

The verse was obviously fundamental to Paul’s thinking about the failure of Judaism because he had cited it in exactly the same way in Galatians ii. 16. But this is surely no proof-text ripped from its Old Testament context. The psalmist’s statement of human unrighteousness is prefaced by an appeal: ‘In thy faithfulness answer me, in thy righteousness! Enter not into judgment with thy servant’\(^59\). Are not these words taken up by the Apostle? His analysis of mankind has revealed their unrighteousness. The verdict of the final day of judgment is a foregone conclusion. Is there then no hope? The psalmist knew the only possibility: to throw himself, unrighteous as he was, upon God's promises of salvation. To this hope Paul turns in verse 21. In Christ the
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psalmist’s appeal has been answered: ‘now the righteousness of God is manifested’.

There is an apparent inconsistency in the opening verses of the psalm. An unrighteous man claims the covenantal promise of God’s saving righteousness! These are the two lines of development which we mentioned earlier as growing further and further apart. The unresolved tension of the amoral saving righteousness of God and His attribute of moral righteousness raises an acute problem, for which neither the Old Testament nor the Qumrân use\(^60\) of the two concepts offers any solution. How could a morally righteous God justify unrighteous men? This problem Paul seems to raise and resolve in the following verses.\(^61\) In verse 22 ‘the righteousness of God’ is primarily, though not exclusively, His justifying activity, as verse 24 explains; whereas in

\(^57\) LXX óti oú δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιον σοῦ πάς ζών. Paul’s citation has διότι for ὅτι, αὐτοῦ for σοῦ and πάσα σφραγίζεται for πάς ζών. C. H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament, 1884, 131, suggested that the change to πάσα σφραγίζεται was influenced by Paul’s use of the term ‘flesh’ to signify the sinful, unrenewed nature of man.

\(^58\) Lagrange, comm. ad loc., remarks that although the psalmist did not speak of the works of the Law, yet he lived under the Law.

\(^59\) A. B. Rhodes, Psalms, Layman’s Bible Commentaries, 1961, ad loc., translates ‘In thy faithfulness answer me with thy salvation’, taking ‘righteousness’ in the sense of deliverance from sin and enemies.

\(^60\) Bruce, art. cit., 285: ‘It is not difficult to recognize the same twofold sense of “the righteousness of God” that we are familiar with in Paul’s epistles—not only God’s personal righteousness, but also (in Luther’s words) “that righteousness whereby, through grace and sheer mercy, He justifies us by faith”’. See 1QS xi. 3, 12-15 (Vermès, op. cit., 92 ff.): ‘He will wipe out my transgression through his righteousness... If I stagger because of the sin of flesh, my justification shall be by the righteousness of God which endures for ever... Through his righteousness. He will cleanse me of the uncleanness of men’. Cf. IQH iv. 35-38 (Vermès, 164). Cf. Schrenk, op cit., 33 f. for the evidence of Jewish apocryphal literature.

\(^61\) A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 2, 1961, 120 ff., cites with approval the view of R. Bultmann (Theology of the New Testament, i, 46) as it is developed by E. Käsemann (ZNTW, xlii. 1950-1, 150 ff.), to the effect that Romans iii. 24 f. is a pre-Pauline formula taken over by Paul with the insertions of ‘freely’, ‘by his grace’ and ‘through faith’ and with the addition of verse 26 as an amendment ‘to suit his own theology’. Originally, it is suggested, the formula was used in Jewish-Christian circles and δικαιοσύνη was an attribute, the covenant-faithfulness of God. Certainly the close association of the root kpr ‘atonement’ with seddgd in IQS xi. 14 (Vermès, 94) lends some support to this suggestion. If this view is right, Paul may well be taking over only the wording of the formula, re-interpreting it, filling it out with his own emphases and then expanding the adapted formula with the clarifications of verse 26.
verse 25 it appears to be narrowed down to a moral attribute. The Old Testament and Judaism do not account for this element in God’s righteousness, Paul appears to be saying. In seeming complacency God had ‘passed over former sins’ (RSV) of Jew (ii. 4) and Gentile (Acts xvii. 30)—but He had only done so because His eye was on the Cross. ‘At the present time’ (verse 26, RSV), and not before, He had acted according to His moral character. At the Cross He had made it once and for all apparent that He abhors unrighteousness. He has shown Himself to be ‘righteous even when justifying’ the believer. These observations are, we suggest, Paul’s reflections upon the paradox of Psalm cxliii. 1 f. as it is resolved in Christ.

The complex term ‘righteousness’ in Romans has thus far been divided into two elements on the Divine side: an attribute of moral righteousness and an activity of saving righteousness. But as we saw earlier the term could be applied to a man: ‘righteousness’ was first an acknowledgment of acquittal and then in a covenant setting a status of acceptance by God. In chapter iv especially this sense is echoed. We saw earlier that the other covenantal sense, that of saving righteousness, was linked with the concept of the holy war. We may reasonably enquire whether any vestiges of this association remain. Has the idea of the holy war evaporated between the Testaments? Is it rejected in the New Testament as if it were unworthy of the Christian God? The War Scroll of Qumrân shows that the concept was very much ‘in the air’ in contemporary thinking. The Dead Sea sect was preparing itself for the eschatological intervention of God in conflict with foreign oppressors. ‘The rigorous rules of the Holy War obtain in the daily regimen of the Qumrân community... This disciplined life is set in an apocalyptic understanding of history. The trumpet has sounded for God’s final Holy War.’ In the New Testament ‘the Holy war is now a conflict waged in the realm of the spirit’, and it is none the less real for that. We shall observe the use of both military and forensic language in Romans 1-8 in a way that is reminiscent of the Old Testament.

In chapter vi sin is personified by Paul as a power that controls man as an overlord his vassal subjects. In the words of J. B. Lightfoot, ‘sin is regarded as a sovereign (verse 12) who demands the military service of his subjects (verse 12), levies their quota of arms, (verse 13) and gives them their soldiers’ pay of death (verse 23)’. In verse 13 ‘present’ echoes its use as a military term. A man is on one side or the other in the spiritual holy war. In vii. 23 military language is again used: there is ‘warring’ in which prisoners of war are taken.

---

62 So, e.g., V. Taylor, ExT, 1939, 295 ff.
63 Romans i. 32 suggests God’s ‘forbearance’ inasmuch as He did not strike with sudden, merited death, as, e.g., at the Flood.
64 Denney, comm. ad loc., expresses this well.
65 The καλός is probably adverbial: cf. R. St. J. Parry, comm. ad loc., cited by F. F. Bruce, comm. ad loc., and H. C. G. Moule, comm. ad loc.
67 Cross, ibid.
68 F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis, 84; cf. K. G. Kuhn, ZThK, xlvi, 1950, 192 ff.
69 Cf. C. A. A. Scott, Christianity according to St. Paul, 1927, 47; R. Leivestad, op. cit., 115, 261.
70 Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries, 1904, 297. ὄπλα is ‘weapons’ as in xiii. 12, 2 Corinthians vi. 7, x. 4.
71 Cf. Leenhardt, comm. ad loc.
72 K. G. Kuhn, ZThK, xli, 1952, 203.
But in vii. 25-viii. 3 is celebrated the fact that God has given the victory through the Lord Jesus Christ (cf. 2 Corinthians xv. 57). In the death and resurrection\textsuperscript{73} God has intervened and fought against Sin, man’s overlord, upon its own ground, man’s ‘flesh’.\textsuperscript{74} Forensic language takes the place of military terms. ‘Condemned’ is the execution of God’s sentence upon Sin: there is Old Testament precedent for so describing the defeat of an enemy.\textsuperscript{75} The eschatological conflict of God has in a sense been anticipated in the events of the Cross and the empty tomb. Those who are in Christ already have some share in His victory: through Christ who showed His love at Calvary they have ‘overwhelming victory’ (viii. 37, J. B. Phillips, NEB).\textsuperscript{76}

The forensic language of viii. 1ff. draws the picture of a lawsuit before God between Sin and man. Sin had oppressed man and dragged him down to its own level, thereby causing the condemnation of God to fall upon him. But God has intervened against Sin and in Christ has brought about deliverance from Sin’s oppression. The same forensic-cum-military picture is probably presupposed by vi. 7: ‘He that hath died is justified from sin’ (RV).\textsuperscript{77} There is ‘a note of redemption’ struck here\textsuperscript{78}: the Christian has died with Christ and thus been freed from bondage to Sin, his overlord. There is nothing artificial about the law court symbolism of Romans: it speaks of God’s dynamic action against the powers of evil.\textsuperscript{79}

The concept of the Holy War may well underlie i. 17-18 also. It should be noted that Psalm xcviii, which may be echoed in verses 16-17, celebrates God’s victory in freeing His people from the oppression of exile. Moreover, Habakkuk ii. 4, quoted in verse 17, was an oracle given in the context of foreign invasion. J. Y. Campbell has given cogent reasons for not understanding the revelation of God’s wrath in terms of a long-term historical outworking, and suggested that the parallelism of verses 17 and 18 requires the same meaning for ‘revealed’ in both verses.\textsuperscript{80} Paul is describing the contents of his Gospel as not only ‘the righteousness of God’, but also ‘the wrath of God’ in the sense of judgment to come (cf. Acts xxiv. 25). As the Gospel is preached, so both elements are continually being revealed. Verses 19-32 on this view explain not how the wrath of God has come upon wicked men, but together with ii. 1-iii. 20, why finally that wrath will have to come (but for the gospel) upon all men.\textsuperscript{81} One wonders whether there is not an even closer link between the righteousness of verse 17 and the wrath of verse 18. Karl Barth, among others,\textsuperscript{82}


\textsuperscript{74} Cf. Hebrews ii. 14 f. The underlying thought is that sin overreached itself in exercising upon Christ the right of execution conferred by the Law and was itself condemned: cf. T. W. Manson,\textit{ On Paul and John}, 1963, 61; Leivestad,\textit{ op. cit.}, 119.

\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Yaršîa} 1 Samuel xiv. 47: literally ‘he used to condemn’, RSV ‘he put them to the worse’. There is no need to read \textit{wayyîwâwâša}’ with LXX. Syriac \textit{hayyel} means primarily ‘condemn’, then ‘overcome’. S. Lyonnet,\textit{ art. cit.} in note 51, 183, notes that Chrysostom translated \textit{kxtrpoxwv} ‘conquer’ and Cyril of Alexandria ‘destroy’.

\textsuperscript{76} The aorist \textit{âkxprpoxw} refers to the event of the Cross.

\textsuperscript{77} Sanday and Headlam,\textit{ comm.} 193, call vi. 7-10 the key to ‘condemned sin in the flesh’ in viii. 3.

\textsuperscript{78} Schrenk,\textit{ op. cit.}, 61. Paul is adapting a Rabbinic saying.

\textsuperscript{79} Cf. Leivestad,\textit{ op. cit.}, 258. A. Feuillet, RB Ivii, 1950, 339’ claims that \textit{yasdîq} in Isaiah liii. 11 means ‘achieve victory over sin and death’ and was so understood by Paul.


\textsuperscript{81} This is the force of \textit{âkxprpöw}: cf. Campbell,\textit{ ibid.}, 230; M. D. Hooker cited in note 96 infra.
has found the link in the Cross: he speaks of ‘the fire of wrath that was kindled on Golgotha’.\(^82\)

The Gospel is the word of the Cross: as the Gospel is preached the once-and-for-all revelation of both the righteousness and the wrath of God is continued. The eschatological outpouring of God’s wrath\(^83\) has been anticipated in the Cross.

This view finds support from the Old Testament. Righteousness and wrath can be two sides of a single coin. While righteousness is God’s intervention on behalf of His oppressed people, wrath is a complementary aspect of the same process—the same intervention as experienced by the enemy oppressors. This Old Testament background reinforces Barth’s view of the wrath of God.\(^84\) Isaiah lix. 16-18 (RSV) speaks of the Warrior God of Israel acting in this combination of righteousness and wrath. So too does Isaiah lxiii. 1-6. Once again Paul may well be using language which had for him both military and forensic associations. The righteousness of God is directed
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towards the restoration of man; it is also directed against Sin—‘all ungodliness and wickedness’—and takes the form of wrath. Insofar as Sin is a force that controls men’s lives, wrath must be directed against them until they are rescued from its power. At the Cross God intervened ‘from heaven’\(^85\) in redeeming power.\(^86\) William Manson has well defined the righteousness of God as ‘a way of salvation which does justice to the moral reality of God’s relations with men’,\(^87\) while at the same time enabling men’s restoration to right relations with God’. His definition is a reminder of the moral content of the term. The ‘for’ of verse 18 is probably an allusion to this element, as Campbell has pointed out:\(^88\) God is proved morally righteous because His wrath is revealed against wrongdoing.

Finally in this section, we may compare the literary form of parts of Romans i-viii with the forensic style of the Old Testament prophets. Paul is conducting the lawsuit of God against the world in chapters i-iii. There are clear echoes of the way in which the prophets brought charges in the name of their God against the heathen and their own people. First the Gentiles and then the


\(^{84}\) It also invalidates C. H. Dodd’s view (comm. ad loc.) of ‘wrath’ as an impersonal ‘process of cause and effect in amoral universe’. C. K. Barrett, *comm. ad loc.* says: ‘It is doubtful whether this view can stand... Wrath is God’s personal (though never malicious or, in a bad sense, emotional) reaction against sin’.

\(^{85}\) The phrase is so used of God’s personal intervention in the Old Testament, e.g. 2 Samuel xxii. 14, Psalm lvi. 3. Cf. *IQM* xi. 17: ‘Thou wilt fight against them from heaven’.

\(^{86}\) This is of course G. Aulen’s ‘classic’ idea of the Atonement (*Christus Victor*, E.T. 1931). It would be more true to say that it is one element in the New Testament’s many-sided theology of the Atonement.

\(^{87}\) *Loc. cit.* in note 80.

\(^{88}\) *Art. cit.*, 230 f.
Jews are charged with indefensible conduct. God’s just verdict of death looms inexorably over the Gentiles (i. 32). Threat of condemnation at the final judgment is made to the Jew in chapter ii. The indictment of that chapter is in the form of the Hellenistic diatribe, which Paul used as the contemporary equivalent of the Old Testament law speeches: these often comprised an address in the second person to the defendant in which questions were put to him and his possible arguments were refuted. In iii. 5 Paul may well be speaking of God as ‘pronouncing’ judgment of ‘wrath’ to be executed at the day of judgment. In iii. 5 he sums up the lawsuit as it has been conducted so far: ‘I have... charged that all men are under the power of sin’ (RSV). He concludes his case in verse 19 with the submission that all are guilty in God’s court: neither Jew nor Gentile have any plea to make in their defence. The triumphant exclamations of viii. 31 ff. echo Isaiah 1. 8f., which is an appeal such as is made in a court of law. Some have considered that Paul amplifies his imagery with allusions to the judgment scenes of Job i and Zechariah iii.

III. ADAM AND CHRIST

E. Earle Ellis has drawn attention to the striking extent to which the motifs of Romans may be traced back to the Pentateuch: ‘Most of the framework of Paul’s theology rests upon the accounts of the Creation, the life of Abraham, and the Exodus.’ In this section we shall consider Paul’s varied use of the Creation Story in Romans i-viii. The eight chapters fall into three divisions (see section ii). In the first part Paul erects a dark backcloth of human unrighteousness before setting against it the splendour of God’s gift of righteousness. In the first half of the second part, Adam’s failure and its fatal results for mankind serve as a foil for God’s redemptive work of renewal in Christ. The second half of this second part prefaces the triumph of life in the Spirit with the tragic failure of the Law to cope with sin. Thus each division of the letter starts with man’s sin. The second one explicitly links it with Adam, but one would not be surprised if echoes of the early chapters of Genesis were also found in chapters i and vii as Scriptural illustrations of human wrong.
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In an article entitled ‘Adam in Romans i’, Miss M. D. Hooker has made this very claim with reference to Romans i. 18-32. The evidence she adduces is twofold. Her first argument concerns the vocabulary of the passage and leans on earlier work done by N. Hyndahl. It appears that in i. 23 Paul has deliberately chosen the terminology of the Creation Story. He forsakes his usual word for ‘image’ in the sense of ‘idol’ for one which he uses elsewhere seven times to

89 ἀναπολογήτως, ἀναπολοpection in i. 20, ii. 1 are forensic: cf. NEB ‘There is... no possible defence’, ‘You... have no defence’. Liddell and Scott, s.v., give Hellenistic references. In ii. 15 ἀπολογεῖσθαι is used in opposition to κατηγορεῖν; cf. 2 Timothy iv. 16.
90 Hufmon, art. cit in note 45.
91 ἐπιφέρειν is often used forensically: see Liddell and Scott, s.v. In Jude 9 it means ‘pronounce’ (‘a reviling judgment’); cf. Acts xxv. 18 (v.l.).
93 Leenhardt, comm. ad loc.
95 Abraham will be considered in section iv and the Exodus in section viii.
96 NTS vi, 1959-60, 297 ff. C. K. Barrett in From First Adam, 17, considers her conclusions ‘fundamentally correct’.
correspond with the use of the term in Genesis i. 27. Paul is hinting that man had forgotten that he was himself the image of God, and sought that image elsewhere. The terms ‘man’, ‘birds’, ‘four-footed beasts’ and ‘creeping things’ are all found in Genesis i. 20-26. Apart from the word ‘man’ these terms occur in the same order in Genesis i. But why are there these echoes of Genesis at Romans i. 23? The second argument answers the question by finding in the events outlined in Romans i the same sequence as in Genesis i-iii. Adam rejected the knowledge of the Creator-God (verses 21, 25) in his attempt to become wise (verse 22), knowing good and evil. Instead he submitted to the created serpent (cf. verse 25). He knew God’s ‘ordinance’ (RV, verse 32) of death for eating the forbidden fruit, and yet consented with Eve and did the same (verse 32). Paul’s account of man’s wickedness has been deliberately stated in terms of the Biblical narrative of Adam’s fall. Miss Hooker proceeds to find the explanation why Paul pictures the results of that fall in terms of (a) idolatry, (b) sexual licence and perversion, and (c) wickedness in general, not only in his own observation of contemporary vice but also in specific reference to the story of Adam. Her arguments at this point become less convincing and rather over-subtle. We shall later suggest (in section viii) that the influence of Psalm cvi upon the passage has been under-estimated and that Romans i. 18 ff. is in fact Paul’s analysis of the sin of his time not only in terms of the fall of Adam but also in terms of Israel’s experience in the wilderness. His description of the contemporary scene not only portrays the sin of mankind as the fall of Adam all over again, but also as a repetition on a larger scale of Israel’s sin against her covenant-God.

It is generally acknowledged that in Romans vii. 7 ff. there is ‘a side glance at the story of the Fall of Man’. A. M. Hunter has traced four echoes (comm. ad loc.). (1) ‘Commandment’, repeated in verses 8 ff., recalls a key word of the story of the Fall, ‘commanded’ in Genesis ii. 16; iii. 11, 17. Paul like Adam was confronted with the word of God. (2) The representation of sin as a personal power (see section ii) is reminiscent of the serpent in the garden. (3) The verb ‘deceived’ is an allusion to Genesis iii. 13, where Eve complains ‘The serpent beguiled me’. (4) The connection between the sinful deed and death recalls Genesis. Paul sees in his own early

98 εἰκόνων is used instead of εἰδωλον. Cf. Paul’s use of εἰκόνων in viii. 29; 1 Corinthians xi. 7; xv. 49; 2 Corinthians iii. 18; iv. 4; Colossians i. 15; iii. 10.
99 So Hyndahl observes. The words are ἀνθρώπος, πετεινά, τετράποδα, ἔρπετά. Miss Hooker points out that it is unnecessary to link Ðmoièmati directly with Ðmo…wsij in Genesis i. 26 as Hyndahl does, because its source is Psalm cvi. 20.
100 Ibid., 301.
101 M. D. Hooker, ibid.: ‘It may perhaps be objected that there is nothing in the narrative in Genesis to suggest that Adam ever offered worship to idols... In listening to the voice of the serpent, Adam... has opened up the way to idolatry’. παρέδοκεν ‘may perhaps reflect something of the force of έξοπετετελεθεν, έξεπετελεν in Genesis iii. 23 f.’ ‘Possibly there is in the phrase του ετημέξεσθαι τα σώματα αυτῶν an echo of the shame of Adam and Eve at their own nakedness (Genesis iii. 7-11)’. Rabbinic tradition... associated the Fall with sexual desire’.
102 Miss Hooker rightly points out (ibid. 299) that Paul is speaking of men in general (ἀνθρώποιν, verse 18), although he is thinking primarily of Gentiles. So J. Y. Campbell, loc. cit. in note 80.
103 C. H. Dodd, comm. ad loc. This fact does not necessarily imply that Romans vii is an account of the sin of mankind in general: cf. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 1948, 32: ‘Paul’s treatment of his experience in Romans vii... although intensely personal, nevertheless echoes the account of Adam’s fall in Genesis.’
104 The reference is probably to the bar mišwâ (‘son of commandment’) ceremony, by which a Jewish boy was received into the community at the age of thirteen, and regarded from then on as morally responsible. Cf. Davies, op. cit., 24 f.
105 LXX ὁ ὀφς ἠπάτησεν με. But when Paul quotes the text in 2 Corinthians xi. 13 he uses ἠπάτησαν as here.
childhood a reliving of the Eden story.‘Dead’ in verse 8 may well refer to Genesis iii, as
Leenhardt, among others, has observed: ‘The suggestion that sin is “dead” apart from the law
reminds us of the serpent lying inactive, motionless, hidden, and as it were dead in the garden:
nothing resembles a dead serpent more than a living serpent so long as it does not move!’ (comm.
ad loc.). When God’s commandment came to Paul, sin ‘revived’, sprang to life again, just as it
had done long ago in Eden. S. Lyonnet has recently investigated the Genesis background of
Romans vii. 7-11. He finds with others that Paul is inspired by Genesis iii. He answers the
objection that ‘Thou shalt not covet’, as the abbreviated citation of the Tenth
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Commandment, suggests that Paul is thinking of Sinai rather than Eden. He goes back to the
Greek word for ‘covet’ and points out that it is much wider than our word, and covers any evil
desire. The same word is defined in 1 Corinthians x. 6 ff. (RSV ‘desire’) as comprising
idolatry, fornication, tempting God and murmuring. Then he refers to Genesis iii. 6 where the
very word ‘desire’ occurs: the tree from which the forbidden fruit was taken was ‘a tree to be
desired to make one wise’. Here then is the origin of the sequence ‘commandment—desiring—death’. Judaism was in the habit of talking of Adam as if he had
been under the Law. Paul is insisting that the Law-summed up in the commandment ‘Thou
shalt not eat/touch’ (Genesis iii. 1, 3) in specific terms or, as Genesis iii. 6 showed that it
implied, ‘Thou shalt have no evil desire’—so far from conferring life on Adam, was rather the
very instrument which the serpent had used to take life away from him. And Paul had found
himself the son and heir of Adam.

At Romans v. 12 Paul begins a new part of his letter concerning God’s work of renewal in
Christ. He draws an analogy between Adam and Christ, with a twofold aim: first, to explain how
the work of an individual can affect the lives of others, and secondly, to enhance the saving work
of Christ by contrasting it with the fall of Adam. There is then both comparison and contrast in
the analogy drawn between the two great individuals (‘one [man]... one [man]’). To illustrate
and enhance his theme of life in Christ, Paul then goes back to the Old Testament, to Genesis iii.
Romans v. 12-21 is in fact the result of reflection upon a number of Old Testament sources,
including Isaiah liii. 11 and Habakkuk ii. 4, as well as Genesis iii. All of them are woven
together with the unifying thread of the work of Christ. Genesis is the source of Paul’s theme of

106 Hunter, ibid.
107 ‘Tu ne convoiteras pas’ (Romans vii. 7), Neotestamentica et Patristica, Festgabe für Oscar Cullmann, ed. W. C.
108 Lyonnet cites, e.g., F. Godet, comm. ad loc. for this view.
109 C. K. Barrett, comm. ad loc., makes the same point with regard to ℓήπτομένου.
110 Hebrew נלמשד.
111 Lyonnet, ibid., adduces the following evidence. Ben Sirah refers to the commandment of Eden in terms of
Deuteronomy xxx. 15, 19. The Targum of Genesis ii. 15 states that Adam was put in Eden ‘to practise the Law’,
while at Genesis iii. 23 it identifies the tree of life with the Law.
(edd. W. D. Davies and D. Daube), 1956, 422 ff.; W. Eichrodt, ‘Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?’ in
112 See section v for the influence of Isaiah liii. 11. The term ‘life’ in the passage is derived from the ‘shall live’ of
Habakkuk ii. 4.
Christ as the Second Adam:  

Adam was ‘a type of [the man] that was to come’ (verse 14). This is perhaps Paul’s own development of the concept of the Son of Man which he had inherited from his Christian predecessors.  

There is a correlation between Adam and Christ. Just as Adam stood at the beginning of human history and his act determined the course of those that came after him, so the Second Adam stands at the head of God’s salvation-history, inaugurating a new era and determining the course of a new humanity. ‘It is characteristic of Hebrew thought to see the whole contained in the beginning’: Paul uses the Old Testament concept of solidarity, and together with contemporary Judaism applies it to mankind as inclusively represented by Adam. Sin was first let loose into the world through Adam. Once sin had ignited a fatal spark in him, it spread like wildfire through the human race. The fall of Adam meant the fall of all men after him. These widespread repercussions of an individual’s experience are an analogy which Paul uses to help explain how Christ’s work can affect others. Involved in the Second Adam are the men of the new Messianic age. One of Paul’s great principles of exegesis is eschatological: the events which take place in the Messianic age are repeating or will repeat those at the beginning of the old era. There is a new race and, as we shall see later, a new Eden, which are associated with the Second Adam just as the old race and the old Eden centre upon the first Adam. The essence of this typological thinking is that God has so ordained things that the past has not been used up in its own occurrence, but ‘gives rise to the promise of yet greater things’.  
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112a 1 Corinthians xv. 45, 47 speaks of ‘the last Adam’ and ‘the second man’.  

113 Cf. C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 1952 121: Paul’s doctrine of the Second Adam ‘has behind it the primitive “Son of Man” Christology’. O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, E.T. 1959, 171 f. regards ἄνθρωπος in verse 15 as Paul’s equivalent of the Aramaic barnasha (‘son of man’ or ‘man’), which the Evangelists translate as νικός τοῦ ἄνθρωπο. Cullmann, op. cit., 166, cites 1 Thessalonians iv. 17 as a Pauline echo of the Son of Man concept of Daniel vii: ‘this expectation must go back to Daniel’s picture of the Son of Man “coming on the clouds”.’ Is βασιλεύσωσιν in Romans v. 17 another such echo? Cf. ‘the everlasting kingdom’ given to ‘the people of the saints of the most High’ in Daniel vii. 27. Cf. E. Stauffer, op. cit., 111 and note 325. E. E. Ellis, op. cit., 97, cites C. F. Burney’s view that ‘the antithesis between the first Adam and Christ as the Second Adam had been worked out in Christian Rabbinc circles.’ He also draws attention to W. D. Davies’ objections to Burney (op. cit., 43 f.). But the conception of Christ as the Second Adam is used in Philippians ii. 6-11 and if this is a pre-Pauline hymn, as it is increasingly thought to be, then Paul’s use of it is derived from pre-Pauline Christian tradition (A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 43 f., 122 f.).  

114 C. H. Dodd, comm. ad loc., states ‘Adam is a myth (though for Paul he may have been real)’. But as C. K. Barrett, comm. ad loc., says, ‘Paul, a first century Jew, accepted Genesis i-iii as a straightforward narrative of events which really happened’. Biblical typology pre-supposes the historicity of the Old Testament material it uses: cf. J Marsh, Christ in the Old Testament in Essays in Christology for Karl Barth (ed. T. H. L. Parker), 1956, 39 ff., esp. 57 f. Dodd shares this viewpoint in ‘A problem of Interpretation’, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, ii, 1951, 17 (cited by Ellis, op. cit., 127): ‘The writers of the New Testament, then, by their attitude to the older Scriptures, authorize an historical understanding of them as an indispensable element in their interpretation and application to contemporary situations’.  

115 Lindars, op. cit., 226.  


The transcendence and superiority of the old over the new are also brought out in Romans v. 12 ff., by contrast between the fatal work of Adam and the redemptive work of Christ.

‘When all was sin and shame,  
A second Adam to the fight  
And to the rescue came.’

The Second Adam restores what was lost by the first, and this restitution constitutes not merely a repetition but a reversal of the first Adam’s work. The work of the Second Adam supersedes and surpasses His predecessor’s. He releases a glorious power for good to counteract the wretched, evil consequences of the first Adam’s sin. The superseding quality of the new compared with the old is summed up in the ‘not... so’ of verses 15 and 16. The surpassing quality is brought out in the ‘much more’ of verses 17 and 2o: ‘where sin abounded, grace did much more abound’.

Romans vi. 1 ff. is the application of union with Christ to the moral life of the Christian. It is not surprising that there is an echo of the Adam-Christ analogy at verse 6: ‘our old man was crucified with’ Christ (RV). The phrase is probably an invention of Paul’s. Christians have as it were an ‘Adam’ within them, their old selves as they are in Adam. From their new standpoint in Christ ‘the man we once were’ (NEB) is relegated to a bygone age. Through the Cross the Christian’s sinful solidarity with Adam is broken. The Church comprises a ‘new man’, Christ Himself (cf. Ephesians iv. 22-4.; Colossians iii. 9 f.).

The Apostle turns to the concept of the ‘new man’, though not using the precise term, in Romans viii. 29. God’s purpose is that the Church should be ‘conformed to the image of his Son’. The doctrine of the Second Adam under lies Paul’s use of ‘image’. Just as Adam was created ‘in the image of God’ (Genesis i. 27), so the Second Adam has His image, albeit in a greater sense, which is being imparted (2 Corinthians iii. 18) and will be imparted (cf. Philippians iii. 21) to the members of His Church. As the descendents of the first Adam, the image of God within them had been effaced: this is probably the import of ‘all come short of the glory of God’ in Romans iii. 23. Rabbinic Judaism held that one of the things that Adam lost at his Fall was ‘glory’, an indescribable brightness which radiated from his appearance. For Paul it appears to mean the reflection of God’s radiant being in the sense of moral and spiritual kinship to Him with which Adam was created as the image of God. It is only in the Second Adam that the work of restoring the image can begin.

When Adam fell, the rest of creation was dragged down with him (Genesis iii. 14-19; v. 29). He was appointed as leader of creation (Genesis i. 26), but only led it into paths of frustration and

120 See further section v.
120a So D. M. Stanley, op. cit. in note 73, 185. The phrase recurs in Ephesians iv. 22; Colossians iii. 9.
121 Cf. 2 Baruch liv. 19: ‘Each one of us has been the Adam of his own soul’.
123 Black, ibid.; Dahl, ibid.; Sanday and Headlam, comm. ad loc.
124 H. St. J. Thackeray, op. cit., 39; W. D. Davies, op. cit., 46.
125 ‘Glory and honour’ In Psalm viii. 5 appears to be a poetic allusion to ‘image’ in Genesis i. 26 f.; Genesis i. 26 underlies the whole of Psalm viii. 5-8.
failure. The Old Testament knew of a solidarity between man and the whole of creation. Thus when it looked forward to the salvation of man, and specifically of the people of God, it naturally also anticipated a renewal of creation, a sort of new Paradise on a grander scale. According to Amos ix. 13 ff., when the fortunes of Israel were restored, the very mountains and hills would share in and add to the blessings of the people of God. There is a similar hope expressed in Isaiah xi. 6-9; xxxv; li. 3; lxv. 17-25; lxvi. 22. God would make the wilderness of Zion ‘like Eden’, and her desert a
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‘like the garden of the Lord’. There would be ‘new heavens and a new earth’. Thus within the Old Testament itself there is to be found typological thinking. There was to be a correspondence between beginning and end, and ‘the primeval event is a type of the final event’. Along with typological analogy between the old creation and the new are coupled the notes of contrast, for it is a fallen creation that is to be restored—and of superiority, for the first creation will be transformed into something much more wonderful than ever it was before. These very themes of expectation are taken up and used by Paul in Romans viii. 19-22. When the Messianic age is fully come and the people of God are manifested in their true light, then will come the renewal of nature promised in the poetry of the Old Testament. Creation is dependent upon God’s glorification of the Church. In poetic idiom it ‘cranes its neck’, waiting for this signal of its own deliverance. Undoubtedly this theme of universal renewal is implicitly associated with the concept of the Second Adam. The people of God derive their title as ‘sons of God’ (viii. 19) from their Head, who is also the Second Adam. As creation fell with Adam of old, so it will rise with the Second Adam.

IV. ABRAHAM

Romans iv enlarges the claim made in iii. 21 that faith-righteousness has Scriptural warrant, and explains, by reference to the Old Testament, the assertions made in iii. 27 ff. that faith excludes any pride in human merit and that on the ground of faith God accepts both Jew and Gentile. Paul took it for granted that God would never be false to the basic principles of His Old Testament revelation. His Word is ever contemporary (cf. verses 27 f.) because He stays the same. There is an essential unity between the old and the new revelations of God. Faith-righteousness is nothing new, but the ground on which God met with the very founder of Israel. The Apostle is incidentally striking at the roots of Judaism’s national and spiritual pride (cf. iii. 27). He takes as his text Genesis xv. 6, which sums up the relationship between God and Abraham in the Genesis narratives: ‘Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness’ (RSV). In

130 E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, E.T. 1955, 225 f., remarks upon the reserve and restraint of the New Testament conception of this universal renewal, compared with the mass of detailed ‘revelations’ supplied by contemporary Jewish apocalyptic fanatics.
131 This is the literal force of ἐποκαραδόκια in viii. 19.
Galatians iii. 6 Paul had already used Genesis xv. 6 to reinforce from Scripture the doctrine of faith in God as the means of acceptance by Him. He had used Habakkuk ii. 4 as a supporting argument. It is therefore not surprising that in a letter which appears to lay so much emphasis upon Habakkuk ii. 4 he should again associate with it Genesis xv. 6 as an Old Testament precedent for justification by faith. The text was already being used within Judaism. In the first century BC Rabbi Shemaiah was arguing from it that Abraham’s faith secured merit for his children Israel.

As we have already seen in section i, ‘righteousness’ in Genesis xv. 6 is a covenantal concept, implying acceptance by God. Isaiah xli. 8 sums it up in the word ‘friend’ as James saw when he connected the two verses (James ii. 23). The idea of reckoning probably originated in priestly circles, as G. von Rad has observed. It is used, e.g., in Leviticus vii. 18, xvii. 4, to describe the judgment or estimate of the priests as representatives of God whereby they approved or rejected an Israelite’s offering. It here refers to a Divine evaluation which although it may conflict with a human assessment is in no way fictitious (cf. ii. 26). In verse 4 Paul goes on to refer to its Hellenistic use as a commercial term for crediting something to one’s account.

Romans iv is a running commentary or midrash upon Genesis xv. 6, drawing out its implications for the Christian era. The chapter falls into four parts, which are four answers to the question of verse 1. Abraham’s righteousness came by faith and so (a) not by works (verses 2-8); (b) not by circumcision (verses 9-12); (c) not by the Law (verses 13-17a). In (d) the content of Abraham’s faith is analysed with reference to the context of Genesis xv. 6 (verses 17b-25). In each part of the chapter the theme-verse is either quoted or alluded to: (c) the terms ‘faith’ and ‘righteousness’ in verse 13 come from Genesis xv. 6. In the course of each answer the Apostle shows that there is implicit in Genesis a principle at stake which is relevant to the Christian Gospel.

(a) The Apostle adduces confirmation that human merit is not envisaged in Genesis xv. 6 by applying a Rabbinic exegetical principle, the second of Hillel’s canons of interpretation, whereby when the same word occurs in two passages each can be used to explain the other. Psalm xxxii. 1 f. employs the term ‘reckon’: the parallel proves that reckoning-righteousness is

---

133 The quotation is Septuagintal except that Paul has ‘Αβραάμ for ‘Αβράμ and δε for κκι. In the Hebrew the second verb is active, not passive.
134 Ellis, op. cit., 124 note 4: ‘Paul’s own view of the Old Testament: in the Pentateuch the basic pattern of God’s plan appears; in the prophets one sees its development, interpretation, and predicted lines of fulfilment’.
136 W. D. Davies, op. cit., 269.
138 Ellis, op. cit., 46; cf. 44 note 2.
139 The analysis is Karl Barth’s, comm. ad loc.
equivalent to not-reckoning-sin, and by implication that righteousness is not acquired by personal merit. (b) Abraham’s acceptance by faith preceded his circumcision: Genesis xv comes before Genesis xvii. The order is important: it implies that circumcision was never meant to be exploited as an *ex opere operato* rite which must predispose God to accept a man. Paul observes that Genesis xvii. 11 calls circumcision a ‘sign’, which is ‘merely a visible mark, pointing to a truth that exists independently’.\(^{141}\) It was in fact a ‘seal’: in Abraham’s circumcision God was only confirming His earlier pronouncement, which was based upon Abraham’s personal trust in Him. It was made ‘to him as a man and not as the first Jew’.\(^{142}\) (c) ‘Paul parts company with Judaism. For Judaism the great thing was the deliverance from Egypt together with the giving of the Law... Judaism would read the patriarchal narratives in the light of Sinai. Paul insists on looking at Sinai from the standpoint of the promise to Abraham.’\(^{143}\)

Abraham points beyond himself and beyond the whole dispensation of the Law to the future justification by faith of Jew and Gentile alike.\(^{144}\) The narrow confines of Judaism of which the Law had become a symbol had been shattered by the Cross, and Paul found anticipation of this once again in Genesis xvii.

There to Abraham as the faith-righteous man of Genesis xv. 6 came God’s promise that his posterity would comprise ‘many nations’ or ‘many Gentiles’ (Genesis xvii. 5).\(^{145}\) (d) The Apostle now returns more directly to the chapter’s theme-text, and studies its context. Abraham’s faith was his response to God’s promise of Isaac and of descendants as many as the stars (Genesis xv. 5, quoted in verse 18). Abraham’s response had to be one of faith because his and his wife’s old age (verse 19; cf. Genesis xviii. 11 ff.) ruled out confidence in himself and pointed him to the reviving grace of God. And Christian faith is Abraham’s all over again, faith in the same God of miraculous life who had now demonstrated His power afresh in the wonder of the resurrection (verses 23 ff.).\(^{146}\) The resurrection of Christ was prefigured by the birth of Isaac.

It may well be that in Romans viii. 32 Paul is comparing the death of Christ
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with the sacrifice of Isaac on Mount Moriah.\(^{147}\) The phrase ‘he that spared not his own Son’ is reminiscent of the Septuagint text of Genesis xxii. 16: ‘Thou [Abraham] didst not spare thine only son’.\(^{148}\) Paul appears to be taking Abraham’s unhesitating but painful surrender of Isaac as an illustration of what it meant to God to give up His own Son to death. H. J. Schoeps has found here a reference to the later Jewish theme of the ‘Binding of Isaac’ which regarded Isaac’s

\(^{141}\) C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam*, 38.


\(^{143}\) Idem, *ibid*.


\(^{145}\) C. K. Barrett, *comm. ad loc.*: ‘the LXX renders the word “nations” by the word which to Paul regularly means “Gentiles” (ἔθνον). Abraham is thus proved by Scripture itself to be the father of non-Jews.’ Barrett, *From First Adam*, 34, remarks that J. Bonsirven has pointed out that this universalist promise was generally neglected in the Jewish treatment of Abraham (Le Judaisme palestinien an temps de Jésus-Christ, i, 1934, 76).

\(^{146}\) See section v for a study of verse 25.

\(^{147}\) Cf. Hebrews xi. 19: ‘When Isaac was saved from death the writer saw in it a parable and promise of the raising of Christ from the dead’ (E. Stauffer, *op. cit.*, 99). A. Richardson, *op. cit.*, 228, finds echoes of Genesis xxii in Mark i. 11 and John i. 29.

\(^{148}\) Romans viii. 32: τοῦ ἵδιοῦ γεώς οὗκ ἔφεσμον; Genesis xxii. 16: οὐκ ἔφεσμον τοῦ γεώς σου τοῦ ἐγγαπητοῦ. ἐγγαπητοῦ means ‘only’ (Hebrew y’hidekō).
sacrifice as of atoning value. As C. K. Barrett has pointed out, all the evidence for this conception is later than Paul’s time. It is therefore anachronistic on present evidence to suggest that the idea of Isaac’s atonement is a model which Paul uses to illustrate Christ’s atonement. Certainly there seems to be a deliberate echo of Genesis xxii. 16, but the point of comparison is Abraham’s surrender of his son rather than any willingness on Isaac’s part to be sacrificed, which was an integral part of the Isaac theme.

V. CHRIST AS SERVANT

The Christian Church has traditionally interpreted Isaiah liii and related passages in terms of her Lord Jesus Christ. But when one attempts to trace the tradition back to New Testament times, one is surprised that ‘the only clearly redemptive-suffering passage in the Jewish Scriptures’ is used so sparingly, and that when it is explicitly quoted it is seldom applied specifically to the Atonement. Yet although Isaiah liii is rarely quoted with reference to Christ as Suffering Servant, ‘its echoes are constant in the New Testament, as if it were the leit-motif of the great symphony of the Gospel story’. It is widely accepted that the Christological interpretation of the Servant passages in Isaiah was a feature of the earliest days of the Church, and in fact goes back to Jesus Himself. Following in their Master’s footsteps, the first Christians recognized a doctrine of the Atonement in the record of the sufferings of the Servant of the Lord. The Apostle Paul took over this rich theological heritage and could largely take it for granted as an accepted interpretation which needed no justification or apology from him. His allusions to it are often in the form of quotations of short statements of faith which had already become traditional in the

149 H. J. Schoeps, Paul, E.T. 1961, 141 ff. The Hebrew is ‘qēdat Yishāq. C. K. Barrett, From First Adam, 27, observes that at times it seems to be quite forgotten that the sacrifice did not actually take place.
150 Ibid., 26 ff.
151 Schoep’s view that the ‘qēdat Yishāq underlies iii. 25 will be considered in section vii.
153 L. L. Carpenter, Primitive Christian Application of the Doctrine of the Servant, 1929, 85, suggests that Paul tended to avoid the Servant motif because it was associated with Jesus’ earthly life of humiliation and suffering, whereas for him Christ was the heavenly and glorified Son of God. O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, E.T. 1959, 77 ff., makes the same point with regard to the New Testament writers generally. A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 142, says the same of Paul, and also suggests that ‘the phrase πα‹j υε<o would, by its lowly associations, have been offensive in Gentile ears’. C. F. D. Moule, ibid., asks whether Jewish counter-insistence that Isaiah liii was non-Messianic discouraged the Church from using it. Cf. too V. Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, 1958, 65 f. and 217.
154 W. F. Lofthouse, art. cit. in note 13, 474.
155 C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 109 f. traces back to Jesus the use of the Servant concept and its association with other Old Testament ideas. So too does O. Cullmann, Christology, 60 ff.; he interestingly argues that ‘the ebed Yahweh concept very probably dominated the Christology of the Apostle Peter’ (ibid., 74 f.; Peter; Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, E.T. 1953, 65 ff.). J. Jeremias in W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, The Servant of God, E.T. of TWNT, 1957, 79 ff., also has the same view as Dodd and traces the Christological interpretation of the Servant passages back to ‘the oldest Palestinian stage of the early church’. M. D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, 1959, minimizes the early Christian use of Isaiah lii. J. Jeremias, in his review in JTS, n.s., xi. 1960, 140 ff. accuses her of ignoring the total effect of the New Testament evidence: ‘she treats the New Testament like a mosaic and examines each stone separately’. Lindars, op. cit., 83: ‘the fact that theological allusions to Isaiah lii. are so frequent in the New Testament, while the shift of application has often taken place in actual quotations, is surely the most eloquent testimony to the extreme antiquity of the use of this prophecy in the early Church.’
156 A. M. Hunter’s Paul and His Predecessors has become the classic exposition of Paul’s debt to older Christians.
liturgy and teaching of the Church. Yet, as will be seen, there are indications that Paul developed and adapted the tradition, and put it to his own theological uses.

Romans iv. 25 has been recognized as the quotation of a confession of faith used in the early Church: ‘Jesus our Lord’ is the One ‘who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification’. Paul is quoting this traditional cre¬dal formula in order to round off and support his comparison of Abraham’s faith and the Christian’s faith. As Abraham was justified because he believed in a God who gives miraculous life, so too, according to this accepted statement of faith, Christian justification is linked with the God-given life of the risen Christ. The verse reads like a line of Semitic poetry, a feature which is probably explained by its having originated in the Palestinian churches. The use of passive verbs was a Jewish circumlocution to refer to the activity of God without using His name. A search into the Scriptural origin of this pre-Pauline formulation of faith reveals its dependence upon Isaiah lii. The first clause is a free quotation from the Septuagint of Isaiah lii. 11: ‘He was de-
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livered up for their sins’. ‘Justification’ in the second clause is an echo of Isaiah liii. 11: Christ is the Servant who justifies. From the earliest times the theme of the Suffering Servant became firmly rooted in the faith of the Church.

The citation of another confession of faith has been seen in Romans viii. 34. ‘Christ Jesus’ is the One ‘who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us’ (RSV). This cre¬dal recital of the death, resurrection and exaltation of Christ is a composite one. It contains two Old Testament allusions, the first of which is to Psalm cx. and the second to Isaiah liii. 12. In the second case the allusion is not to the Septuagint but to the Hebrew itself, a factor which reinforces the view that Paul is quoting from a traditional confession of faith. In the verb used in the Hebrew the imperfect state is used, which Christian interpreters may well have regarded as having a future reference: after His bearing the sin of the many, Christ the Suffering Servant would go on to intercede for His people in His

158 Idem, ibid., 136; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, E.T. 1952, i, 47; Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 30 ff., E. Lohse, Märtyrer und Gottesknecht, 1955, 133; Jeremias, Servant, 88 f. Stauffer, ibid., points out that justification is also linked with resurrection in Romans viii. 34. The preposition διὰ is more probably prospective than retrospective here. Christ’s resurrection is the basis of the believer’s justification. The resurrection ‘justified’ or vindicated Christ (1 Timothy iii. 16), proving Him not personally subject to God’s wrath; this condition is shared by those who are in Him.
160 Such is the impression given by the parallelismus mem¬brorum, i.e. the arrangement in a couplet.
161 Cf. note 176.
164 Jeremias, ibid., 89; Stauffer, op. cit., 245. C. K. Barrett, comm. ad loc., says that this is suggested by the parallel participles and by the balanced relative clauses.
165 See section vi ‘Christ the King’.
166 Jeremias, ibid., 95; Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 94; Lindars, op. cit., 82.
167 Hebrew yap-gia’.

exalted state. Hebrews vii. 25 borrows this same phrase from the common tradition and develops the implicit thought of the priestly work of the ascended Christ.  

In Romans viii. 3 an alternative rendering of ‘for sin’ is ‘as an offering for sin’, and this translation is probably to be preferred.  

Romans v. 19b has been recognized as virtually a quotation of the Hebrew of Isaiah liii. 11.  

We contributed a short study of the influence of this Old Testament text upon Romans v. 19 in the first issue of *Vox Evangelica*. ‘By the obedience of one man shall the many be made righteous’ sounds like a clear echo of ‘By his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous’ (RSV). The echo is even more distinct if the word for ‘knowledge’ should be translated ‘submission’, as modern Hebrew study has suggested. The active verb of the original becomes passive in the quotation in order to highlight the outworking of the overall plan of God. The Semitic phrase for the mass of men, ‘the many’ borrowed from the Servant passage has been used before in verses 15 and 19a in contrast with ‘the one’. This is an indication that Isaiah liii. 11 underlies the whole of Romans v. 12-21. However, in verses 12 and 18 Paul changes it to ‘all’, the Western equivalent of ‘the many’. ‘Justification’ in verses 16 and 18, ‘righteousness’ in verses 17 and 21, and ‘act of righteousness’ (RV) in verse 18 all find their Scriptural source not only in the adjective of Habakkuk ii. 4 but also in the verb of Isaiah liii. 10.  

W. H. Brownlee in *BASOR* cxxxii, Dec. 1953, 8 ff.; cxxxiv. April 1954, 27 f. claims that the reading mšḥty in *IQIS* at Isaiah lii. 14 implies mākahti ‘I anointed’ and indicates a belief among the Qumrān community that the Servant was the Messiah who would be consecrated for the priestly office so that he could ‘sprinkle’ others (Isaiah lii. 15). F. F. Bruce in *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumrân Texts*, 56 f. agrees and sees in the Qumrān interpretation a reference to the Levitical priestly Messiah (as distinct from the other, Davidic, Messiah). It should be noted that in ‘Messianic Motifs of Qumrân and the New Testament’ *NTS*, iii-iv, 1956-8, 195 ff. Brownlee is a little less certain about his suggestion.  

F. F. Bruce in *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumrân Texts*, 56 f. agrees and sees in the Qumrān interpretation a reference to the Levitical priestly Messiah (as distinct from the other, Davidic, Messiah). It should be noted that in ‘Messianic Motifs of Qumrân and the New Testament’ *NTS*, iii-iv, 1956-8, 195 ff. Brownlee is a little less certain about his suggestion.  

11 In Romans viii. 3 an alternative rendering of ‘for sin’ is ‘as an offering for sin’, and this translation is probably to be preferred.  

168 W. H. Brownlee in *BASOR* cxxxii, Dec. 1953, 8 ff.; cxxxiv. April 1954, 27 f. claims that the reading mšḥty in *IQIS* at Isaiah lii. 14 implies mākahti ‘I anointed’ and indicates a belief among the Qumrān community that the Servant was the Messiah who would be consecrated for the priestly office so that he could ‘sprinkle’ others (Isaiah lii. 15). F. F. Bruce in *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumrân Texts*, 56 f. agrees and sees in the Qumrān interpretation a reference to the Levitical priestly Messiah (as distinct from the other, Davidic, Messiah). It should be noted that in ‘Messianic Motifs of Qumrân and the New Testament’ *NTS*, iii-iv, 1956-8, 195 ff. Brownlee is a little less certain about his suggestion.

169 The Greek has of pollo…, ‘the many’. This reflects the Hebrew ḥattā’ but in Isaiah lii. 10 it answers to ’āḏām. RV has ‘as an offering for sin.’  

170 Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 93, points out that the sense of MT is retained, LXX having departed widely from it. J. Head in ‘Some New Testament references to Isaiah liii’, *ExT*, lxviiii, 1957, 254 f. sees in Romans viii. 3 f. part of a pattern based upon Isaiah liii. and found also in 1 Peter ii. 22-25, iii. 18 and 1 Corinthians v. 21.  

171 Λύτρον in Mark x. 45 has been traced back to ’āḏām. in Isaiah liii. to by Jeremias, *Servant*, 89 ff.; cf. Cullmann, *Christology*, 65 and 160. C. K. Barrett in ‘The Background of Mark x. 45’, *New Testament Essays* (ed. A. J. B. Higgins), 1959, 1 ff. considers the connection between Mark x. 45 and Isaiah liii ‘much less definite and more tenuous than is often supposed’.  

172 Cullmann, *ibid.*, 77; Jeremias, *ibid.*, 89 note 399; Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*.  


174 The Greek has of pollo, ‘the many’. This reflects the Hebrew lārabbim.  

175 See D. Winton Thomas, *JTS*, n.s. xxxviii, 1937, 404 f. Other references may be found in *Vox Evangelica* I. 1962.  

176 Cf. iv. 25. Another change from active to passive in an Old Testament reference is found in Hebrews ii. 9 where ἡλεττομένων replaces ἡλεττορες of Psalm vii. 5 quoted in Hebrews ii. 7. ‘The perfect participle is expressed in the passive voice, which indirectly reveals that God has been the agent in this action’. (Kistemaker, *op. cit.*, 106; cf. 168).  

lii. 11 It is the Servant’s work of justification that suggests by contrast the term ‘condemnation’ that is used of the effect of Adam’s sin. It is the obedience of the Servant that shows up Adam’s act as disobedience in verse 19a; and it is the nature of the Servant of the Lord as ‘righteous’ that enhances Adam’s work as an ‘offence’ or ‘trespass’. The whole passage v. 12-21 is a blending of the concept of Christ as the Second Adam with that of Christ as the Servant of the Lord.179 The Christological application of Isaiah liii. 11 was already current in the early
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Church, as the allusion to it in Romans iv. 25 indicates; the theme of Christ as Second Adam may also be pre-Pauline. But Paul presents a new synthesis whereby the redemptive sufferings of Christ are linked with the inclusive solidarity of a new Head of creation.180 This is the Apostle’s masterly introduction to his new subject of ‘life in Christ’.

In vi. i-vii. 6 Paul proceeds to expound the implications of the new life in Christ for the moral life of the Church. We suggest that union with Christ, which for Paul is ‘the sheet-anchor of his ethics’181 is the simple theme of this tripartite section. Because the Church is ‘alive to God in Christ Jesus’ (vi. 11), they must be one with Christ in death to sin (vi. 1-4); one with Christ as God’s righteous servants (vi. 15-23); one with Christ in a new marriage-union (vii. 1-6).182 It appears to us that the second of these passages is Paul’s own application of the Servant theme, which he had borrowed in v. 12 ff., to Christian ethics. He still has in mind the thought of Christ as the obedient and righteous servant of God of Isaiah lii. 11. Men in Christ move in this new environment of obedience and righteousness (cf. v. 18 f.)183 and have become themselves ‘servants to God’ (vi. 22).184 It is these concepts that are associated with the new era of grace (v. 15, 17, 20, 21; vi. 15). Right living is the corollary of justification. When the passage is viewed in this light it is no longer strange that Paul should use ‘obedience’ in vi. 16 not in a neutral sense but with the positive meaning of obedience to God: the obedience of Christ the Servant is the underlying and determinative factor.

The corporate interpretation of the idea of the Servant stems directly from the individual one.185 In the case of Romans vi. 15 ff. the corporate application is probably Paul’s own since it follows

---

178 It has been argued in section ii that Habakkuk ii. 4 is the theme text for the whole of Romans i-viii. Habakkuk ii. 4 contributes ‘life’ in verses 17, 18, 21.
179 Cullmann, Christology, 171 ff.
180 D. M. Stanley, op. cit. in note 73, 172 and 177: ‘a new synthesis in which there appear combined the theological values inherent in the earlier, Palestinian presentation of Christ as the ‘Ebed Yahweh together with certain advantages found in the Adam symbolism of the Old Testament creation story’.
182 The last passage will be mentioned in section viii.
183 A. Feuillet in RB Ivii. 1950, 336 ff. has drawn attention to Paul’s use of his chapter v vocabulary in chapter vi.
184 Greek δούλοι. In order to preserve the connection with Isaiah liii ‘servants’ is a better translation than ‘slaves’. But inasmuch as δούλος suggests the idea of slavery Paul can combine the metaphor of a slave with the Servant concept. In the pre-Pauline hymn of Philippians ii. 6 ff. δούλος translates the ‘gbed’ of the Servant Songs according to Cullmann, Christology, 76 f.; Jeremias, Servant, 97; Carpenter, op. cit., 78 f.
185 In the Servant songs themselves there are to be found both a corporate and an individual reference. The Qumrân community viewed itself as the Servant of Yahweh: W. H. Brownlee, BASOR cxxv, October 1954, 33 ff.; Bruce, Biblical Exegesis, 57 ff.; J. V. Chamberlain, Nov. Test. iii, 1959, 305 ff. Bruce points out that as representatives of

on so closely from a Christological use of Isaiah liii. But in other cases in the New Testament what B. Lindars has called ‘the shift of application’ has already taken place prior to the writing of the New Testament. One instance of this early development is to be found in Romans viii. 33f. The rereference is made to Isaiah 1. 8 f., which is part of the so-called third Servant Song. With no hint of novelty or departure from accepted teaching Paul can change the singular pronoun, referring to the Servant in the Old Testament passage, to a plural term, ‘the elect of God’ which may itself be borrowed from other Servant Songs. The Romans passage reveals direct dependence upon the Old Testament one in the words ‘It is God that justifieth; who is he that shall condemn?’ (RV). The clear reference to ‘He is near that justifieth me... who is he that shall condemn me?’ suggests this punctuation. Paul appears to be quoting from a Hebrew text or else from a Palestinian recension of the Septuagint. There is also a more general link between the two passages: Paul moves in the same law court atmosphere of the Old Testament passage by adding his own forensic vocabulary.

At this point reference must be made to the adjacent quotation from the Septuagint of Psalm xliv. 22 in Romans viii. 36: ‘For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter’. It is highly probable that the psalmist’s mention of ‘sheep for the slaughter’ was associated with the prophet’s ‘He is brought as a sheep to the slaughter’ in Isaiah liii. 7. Whether Paul or his predecessors were the first to forge the link. Thus within the span of a few verses the Church is regarded as sharing both in the triumph and in the humiliation of her Servant Lord. In the psalm ‘For thy sake’ refers to God:

[p.23]

strikingly Christ is here addressed. The Church is involved with Christ, and all depends upon Him. Because the Church shares in the victory (viii. 37: cf. Isaiah liii. 12) and in the exaltation (viii. 34) of the Servant, the context of the quotation is dramatically changed. The psalmist’s despairing note of complaint is replaced by the Apostle’s exultant tones of assurance. Persecution is no longer an obstacle to God’s purposes, but His appointed way for His people. As for the Servant of the Lord, so for His followers, the Cross is but the precursor of the crown.

the community individuals appropriated Servant language to themselves. However, the movement of thought in Christian circles went the other way: from Christ to the Church.

187 ἐκλεκτός is a rare term with Paul: elsewhere only xvi. 13; Colossians iii. 12. It was common in apocalyptic writings and in the Qumrân literature (J. M. Allegro, *PEQ* 1954, 69 ff.). It may well be significant that it is used of the Servant in Isaiah xlii. 1, xlv. 4.
188 Leenhardt, *comm. ad loc.*, mentions the alternatives.
189 ὁδικαίων corresponds to MT ṣadīq and ὁ κατακρινόν τῷ ἔνη. LXX has ὁδικαίωτας με and ὁ κατακρίνον με. For a possible Palestinian recension of LXX cf. Lindars, *op. cit.*, 27, 284.
189a EVV ‘lamb’ for Hebrew śeh ‘sheep’ is odd. LXX has ὤς προβατόν ἐπὶ σφαγήν in Isaiah liii. 7 and ὤς προβατίστη σφαγής in Psalm xliv. 22.
190 See Lindars, *ibid.*, 240.
191 L. Venard, ‘Citations de l’AT dans le NT’, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 1934, Suppl. ii. col. 44.
It may well be, as D. M. Stanley has maintained,\(^{192}\) that Paul went further in the shift of application of the Servant theme, and viewed not only the Church but himself as in a special way continuing and working out the mission of the Servant. If so, the word ‘servant’\(^{193}\) in Romans i. 1 not only has Old Testament associations of the dignity of a minister of state working for his king (e.g. 2 Kings xxii. 12) and of devotion to the worship and service of God (e.g. Psalm cxiii. 1), but also contains a specific allusion to the Isaiah passages about the Servant of the Lord.

**VI. CHRIST THE KING**

In the previous section we noticed that at Romans viii. 34 the Apostle appears to be using a confession of faith current in the early Church. It contains two allusions to the Old Testament, of which the first is to Psalm cx. 1. The ascended Christ is ‘at the right hand of God’. The phrase is ‘oftener used in the New Testament than any other words of the Old’.\(^{194}\) Psalm cx is one of the royal psalms, which was most probably acknowledged as Messianic in Jewish circles during the first century AD.\(^{195}\) Although already so interpreted by the Jews, it is given a new meaning in the New Testament as already fulfilled: Jesus has ascended into heaven and been enthroned as Messiah at the side of God. If Christ now reigns supreme, His people may have full assurance that none can prevail against them.\(^{196}\)

The origin of the term ‘firstborn’ in viii. 29 is also to be found in a royal psalm. Psalm lxxxi is concerned with the rise and fall of the Hebrew monarchy. In verse 27 God promises the king: ‘I will make him the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth’ (RSV).\(^{197}\) The thought and the context echo the royal promises of 2 Samuel vii. ‘Firstborn’ implies ‘a special close relationship, affection, authority and sovereignty as the preferential heir’.\(^{198}\) The royal promise is ultimately fulfilled in Christ. Here it is applied to Him as risen.\(^{199}\) The resurrection inaugurated the reign of Christ.


\(^{193}\) δούλος is used.


\(^{195}\) It was often applied to Abraham by the Rabbis: cf. Strack and Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, iv, 1, 452 ff. S. L. Edgar, *NTS*, 1958, 51, observes that Psalm cx was apparently interpreted Messianically by Jesus’ contemporaries because in Matthew xxii. 41 ff. they are represented as accepting it as such. According to J. Daniélou, ‘La Session à la droite du Père’, in *Studia Evangelica* (Texte und Untersuchungen 73: edd. K. Aland, F. L. Cross et al.), 1959, 689 ff., the Qumrân writings do not include Psalm cx among Messianic texts.


\(^{197}\) LXX πρωτότοκον as in Romans viii. 29. Cf. E. K. Simpson and F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians* (New International Commentary), 1957, 194 f. and reff.


\(^{199}\) See, e.g., Denney, *comm. ad loc.*, Lindars, *opus cit.* 212. Cf. πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν in Revelation i. 5 and the context of σύμμορφος in Philippians iii. 21.
The same thought is found at the beginning of Romans, in i. 3 f. The Gospel concerns God’s Son
‘who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of
God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead’ (RV). It is a
commonplace of exegesis to regard these verses as the citation of a pre-Pauline confession of
faith.200 At the beginning of a letter addressed to strangers in the main, the Apostle is stressing
that his Gospel is not a fabrication of his own but in line with the traditions of the Church.
According to Luke’s account of Paul’s ministry, he had made use of the themes of this early
Christian formulation before, in his sermon of God’s salvation-history at Pisidian Antioch: it was
of David’s seed that God
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had brought Jesus to Israel (Acts xiii. 23). The fulfilment of God’s promises was the
resurrection201 of Jesus, ‘as it is also written in the second psalm, “Thou art my Son, this day
have I begotten thee” ’ (xiii. 33). These two themes reappear at Romans i. 3 f. ‘According to the
flesh’ and ‘according to the Spirit (sic) of holiness’ refer to the two phases of Christ’s existence:
His incarnate life in the realm of the flesh, and His exalted life in the realm of the Spirit (cf. 1
Timothy iii. 16).202 In His earthly life His descent from David qualified Him to be King over
God’s people. Thus in His glorified life He has gone on, as great David’s greater Son, to inherit
the promise of Psalm ii. 7.

Psalm ii is a royal psalm, addressed to the king on his day of anointing and enthronement.203 In it
the king is adopted, as it were, as God’s ‘son’ and offered world-sovereignty from the God who
controls the government of the world and to whom all other kings are but vassals. The title ‘son
of God’ in the Old Testament is primarily used of Israel: it speaks both of God’s election of His
people and of the obedience which they owe Him.204 Secondarily it is used of the king in his rôle
as representative of God’s people before Him. The king is only God’s son because the people
are. The term is always figurative and there is no thought of physical generation from God. As
Lindars remarks, Psalm ii. 7 is equivalent to Psalm ii. 6 in poetic terms.205 The psalm celebrates
in Semitic poetry a royal accession. The king at his coronation entered upon the new rôle of
Israel’s representative: he became God’s ‘son’. The idea echoes the promise made by God
through Nathan in 2 Samuel vii. 14a concerning Solomon and his successors: ‘I will be his
father, and he shall be my son.’

200 See, e.g., Bultmann, Theology, i, 49. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 24 f., speaks of a ‘credal ring’ and ‘that
combination of participial and relative clauses (in verses 3 to 5) which Norden has shown to be characteristic of the
formulary style’. ‘Spirit of holiness’ is a Semitism for ‘Holy Spirit’.

201 άναστις is ambiguous, but J. Dupont in ‘Filius Meus es tu: L’Interpretation de Ps. ii. 7 dans le Nouveau
Testament’, RSR xxxv, 1948, 522 ff., observed that (a) in the vocabulary of Acts when Jesus is the object of this
verb the reference is to the resurrection rather than to the Divine mission of Christ; (b) Acts ii quotes Psalms xvi and
cx with reference to Christ’s glorification: when therefore Acts xii quotes Psalms xvi and ii in close proximity, it is
likely that Psalm ii. 7 is applied to the resurrection.

202 See, e.g., W. Manson, loc. cit. in note 80, 153; C. K. Barrett, comm. ad loc. Hunter, op. cit., 24 ff., favours a triadic
division of the formula on the basis of the Peshitta, referring to Messianic birth, baptism and resurrection, but, as he
says, ‘the chief objection to this arrangement is the lack of a participle in clause (3)’.


The psalm was already regarded as Messianic by the first century AD. The Psalms of Solomon, of first century BC origin and in general use in synagogue worship, include quotations of Psalm ii with a Messianic interpretation. At Qumrân has been found an anthology of Old Testament passages referring to the restoration of David’s royal line, which cites Samuel vii. 12 ff. It suggests an affirmative answer to the disputed question whether the term ‘Son of God’ was used Messianically in pre-Christian Judaism.

Kistemaker has noted the analogy between Romans i. 2-4 and Hebrews i. 1, 2, 5. Both passages are introductions that speak of prophets, Son of God and David’s posterity, although Hebrews does so in the form of a quotation of 2 Samuel vii. 14a: ‘While much is taken for granted in the first few verses of Romans i, the author to the Hebrews quotes the Old Testament verbally.’

‘Son of God’ may well be used as a synonym for Messiah: in Acts ix. 20 and 22 the change in terminology does not appear to involve any change in meaning. It would then have the same sense as in the Old Testament as a description of a king, now the King par excellence in the Messianic kingdom set up by God. M.-E. Boismard has argued strongly for this functional, Messianic sense. In that case ‘Son’ obviously has two different meanings in Romans i. 3, 4: in verse three it bears the usual Pauline meaning of eternal sonship in the ontological sense. One wonders, however, whether in the light of his Christian experience Paul would not have read more into the term ‘Son of God’ in the formula, even if it originally had a restricted sense.

The question is bound up with the force of the verb translated ‘declared’ and the phrase ‘in power’. The verb elsewhere in the New Testament means ‘appointed’, ‘constituted’ (Acts x. 42, xvii. 31), and probably has the same meaning here, as the underlying second Psalm suggests. Accordingly Moffatt renders ‘installed’. However, installation or constitution may itself imply merely official endorsement. In power’ is often linked attributively with ‘Son of God’. He who was the Son of God in weakness in His incarnation became ‘Son of God in power’ at His resurrection. However, Boismard has raised strong objections to this view, and more probably the NEB is correct in rendering ‘by a mighty act’, which is explained in the next few words of the verse. The resurrection was God’s work of

---


207 4Q *Florilegium*: see Vermès, *op. cit.*, 243 f. For former discussion cf., e.g., Bultmann, *Theology*, i. 50; Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, 253.


209 So Hunter, *op. cit.*, 88; Lindars, *op. cit.*, 140; C. A. A. Scott, *Christianity according to St. Paul*, 1927, 246.

210 In ‘Constitue Fils de Dieu (Rom. i. 4)’, *RB* ix, 1953, 5 ff.


213 So Cullmann, *op. cit.*, 291 f.; Hunter *op. cit.* 144 (in his later Appendix: this represents a rejection of his earlier view cited above).

214 *Art. cit.* E.g. that the fundamental contrast is not between weakness and power, but between Son of David and Son of God; ‘power’ in Pauline usage generally is God’s not Christ’s.
installation of the Messianic King upon His throne, but, even more, it was the point at which Christ entered into the fullness of God’s purposes for Him as the unique Son of God. In officially taking up His kingship He fulfilled His sonship. Jesus entered upon ‘a new phase of lordship and glory by the resurrection’ (John Murray, *comm. ad loc*.). The thought is similar to that of Philippians ii. 9-11.

Paul was no doubt aware of the dependence of the formula he cites upon Psalm ii: in verse 5 he appears to echo it in his own words. The psalm had promised not only royal honours but royal dominion to the ends of the earth. It is in line with this promise that God had commissioned Paul to work throughout the world to win allegiance to Christ’s name that every knee might bow to Him.

**VII. The Mercy Seat**

Romans iii. 25 states that ‘God set forth’ Christ as ‘a propitiation, through faith, by his blood’ (RV). The word translated ‘propitiation’ in AV and RV and ‘expiation’ in RSV (cf. NEB) has met with a variety of interpretations, which fall into two main groups. One group regards the word as a general term associated with sacrifice, while the other links it with specific Old Testament sources. As far as the general group is concerned, the word is viewed either as an adjective in apposition to ‘whom’ with the force ‘in propitiatory power’ or as a neuter noun signifying ‘a means of atonement’, ‘a means of propitiation’. Leon Morris has insisted upon the meaning ‘propitiation’ rather than ‘expiation’ it is not merely the removal of human sin that is in view, but the removal by God Himself of His wrath which had been looming in the preceding part of the letter. Morris has been followed in this respect by Vincent Taylor and R. H. Fuller.

The second group finds a specific reference to Old Testament material. Four such references have been suggested. C. A. Anderson Scott considered the brazen serpent the prototype of Paul’s expression. J. Jeremias finds here another echo of the Servant-theme. He translates ‘aton ing sacrifice’ and takes it as a rendering of ‘offering for sin’ in Isaiah liii.10. H. J. Schoeps has argued for a link with the word ‘provide’ in Genesis xxii. 8. He renders ‘God has provided Him as an expiatory sacrifice’.

---

215 So Boismard, *art cit*.
220 *Christianity according to St. Paul*, viii.
222 Paul, 246. The suggestion goes back to G. Klein. C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam*, 29, criticizes this view on the ground that it strains the verb προέθετο.
The consensus of scholarly opinion inclines to the view that Paul intends a reference to the so-called ‘mercy-seat’. It was a slab of gold with the cherubim at either end, set on top of the ark of the covenant in the holy of holies. It was the place where God met with Moses as the representative of Israel: ‘I will meet with thee, and commune with thee from above the mercy seat’ (Exodus xxv. 22). It was the place that figured in the ritual of the Day of Atonement there the High Priest sprinkled blood and made atonement for Israel’s sins of the past year (Leviticus xvi). The Hebrew word may mean either ‘lid’ or ‘thing of atonement’.223 The Septuagint took it in the latter sense and translated it by the same Greek word as Paul uses here. The old noun ‘propitiatory’ would do more justice to the Greek term than ‘mercy seat’. This rendering preserves the undoubted associations the word had for readers of the Greek Old Testament, and brings out the apparent emphasis upon the removal of God’s wrath.

The case for considering the symbolism of the mercy seat or the propitiatory to be here in view has been put in recent times by F. Buchsel, T. W. Manson, A. Nygren and W. D. Davies.224 Taylor and Morris have both criticized this position.225 It leans heavily upon the Septuagint’s usual rendering of ‘mercy seat’ by the same word as is used in Romans iii. 25,225a and upon its use by the writer to the Hebrews (ix. 5). This latter, contemporary, usage seems to counteract Morris’ objection that Josephus and Philo use different words for ‘mercy seat’.226 A further objection is that Christ is thought of both as sacrificial victim (‘by his blood’) and place where the blood is sprinkled. Sanday and Headlam (comm. ad loc.) speak of ‘the great harshness, not to say confusion’ of this combination. However, the twin concept of Christ as priest and victim in Hebrews is a partial parallel. Davies considers that this objection would only apply if Paul were writing a scientific treatise where the terms could be precisely defined.227 It has been urged that the addition of a definite article or a possessive pronoun would be expected (cf. 1 Corinthians v. 7),228 but it is surely not the equivalent of the mercy seat that is in view but the Christian counterpart. Christ is ‘a kind of new mercy seat.’229 He is ‘a new locus of reconciliation, a new meeting place for God and man’.230

But would a ceremonial reference be expected here anyway? If Paul did intend such a symbolic reference, would he not have explained it further? If, as Bultmann and Käsemann claim, iii. 25 is a citation of pre-Pauline origin,231 the Levitical analogy may go back to ex-priestly Jewish-Christian circles. But Davies has drawn attention to the Levitical element in Paul’s thinking

223 See Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew Lexicon; Köchler-Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, s.v. kappōret.
225 Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, 1946, 38 f.; Morris, art. cit,
225a See Manson, art. cit., and Morris, ibid. for details.
226 ibid. Philo’s usual rendering of kappōret is ἐπιθέμα or πῶμα. Josephus uses ἐπιθέμα.
228 I.e. τὸ ἱλαστήριον (as in LXX) or τὸ ἱλαστήριον ἡμῶν. 1 Corinthians v. 7 has τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν.
229 D. M. Stanley, op. cit., 168.
230 C. W. Swain, Interpretation, 1963, xvii, 137.
231 See note 61.
itself: ‘He could regard the Christian life as worship (Romans xii. 1); he could treat the rite of circumcision as a spiritual reality (Philippians iii. 3; Colossians ii. 11), and it was not strange for him to contrast things Christian and things Jewish.’ As for further explanation, one would often desire it in Paul’s frequently elliptic and pregnant writing. Morris has raised the pertinent point that in fact the mercy seat was no longer in use in Paul’s time. The ark had vanished long ago and the sprinkling of blood of the Day of Atonement was done on a special stone on the traditional site of the ark. Would therefore Paul have expected from his readers knowledge of an obsolete custom? In answer one may draw attention to the fact that Leviticus xvi was included in the reading from the Torah on the Day of Atonement. Annually the repeated oral mention of the mercy seat would impress itself upon the hearer, whether Jew, proselyte or God-hearer. Similarly Hebrews, comparing the Old and the New Covenants, cites the accoutrements of the now vanished ark as the basis of his comparison.

Manson has seen in Romans i-iii. 23 a confession of sin such as was recited on the Day of Atonement before the sprinkling of the blood upon the mercy seat. Such an exact parallel is rather fanciful. But iii. 25 does appear to be intended to evoke memories of that annual ceremony in which God met with man and provided a way of propitiation for his sin at the mercy seat. ‘The great day of atonement which is celebrated year after year in accordance with the requirements of the law is, in view of Romans iii. 25, a sign pointing to the cosmic day of atonement, Good Friday.’

VIII. THE PEOPLE OF GOD

In Romans i-viii there is a group of Old Testament references, not hitherto dealt with, which in their original context apply in some way to Israel as the people of God. Paul makes use of them in three ways. He either applies them to the Jews of his own day; or he universalizes them and applies them to the world at large; or else he christianizes them, applying them to the Church, the New Testament people of God.

232a The stone was called ‘eben šiyyā.
233 See E. Werner, The Sacred Bridge, 1959, 79.
234 He considers that a recent Day of Atonement service was in Paul’s mind.
235 Davies, op. cit., 241 f.: ‘The tones of confession may be audible in Romans ii. 10 ff., but in the rather philosophical explanation of the origin and growth of human sinfulness, Rabbinic in thought but Stoic in expression, which we find in Romans i. 18 ff., in the argumentative indictment of Romans ii. 1 ff. and in the tortuous thought of Romans iii. 1 ff. it is impossible to overhear them’.
236 Sanday and Headlam, comm. ad loc., and T. W. Manson, art. cit., render προθέτον as ‘set forth publicly’. Manson finds a contrast between the old ἱλαστήριον hidden away in the holy of holies and the new ἱλαστήριον brought in the open for all to see. Davies, op. cit., 241, rightly objects that it is doubtful whether the προθέτον is strong enough to admit of Manson’s emphasis.
237 E. Stauffer, Theology, 96, cf. 145. He goes on to notice the development of this theme in Hebrews ix. It may be noted here that Morris, art. cit., rightly objects that the phrase ‘being witnessed by the law and the prophets’ in iii. 21 does not necessarily lead on to a reference to the Torah, as Büchsel (art. cit.) claims: it is ‘righteousness’ that is witnessed. Nygren, art. cit. and comm. ad. loc., finds in the terms ‘glory’, ‘blood’, ‘mercy seat’ of iii. 23 ff. references to the holy of holies.
As might be expected, the first mode of application is found in the part in which Paul specifically addresses the Jews, ii. 1-iii. 20. The Apostle is attacking his fellow-Jews from Scripture itself. So far as we are aware, the dependence of ii. 5 upon Deuteronomy xxxii. 34 f. has not hitherto been observed. The Septuagint of the Song of Moses reads at this point: ‘Behold are not these things stored with Me and sealed in My treasuries for the day of vengeance....?’ This text is supported both by the Samaritan recension and by a Qumrân fragment.\(^\text{238}\) The context goes on to speak of God judging His people (verse, 36).\(^\text{239}\) Romans has three quotations from Deuteronomy xxxii (x. 19, xii. 19, xv. 10), and here there appears to be a further reference to it, an allusion applied to Paul’s Jewish contemporaries.\(^\text{240}\) The sentence of the wrath of God promised in His Word has been passed against them to be executed at the end-time. For Paul the Song of Moses speaks not only of the place of Gentiles in the purposes of God (cf. x. 19, xv. 10) but also of judgment upon the Jews. This theme is underlined in ii. 6 by a virtual quotation of the Septuagint of Psalm lxii. iz, applied to the Last Judgment.\(^\text{241}\) The same appears to be true of ii. 9: ‘Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile.’ This is a universalist statement, but in the context its chief import is a reference to the Jew. Not only the Gentile but also the ‘chosen’ Jew will be involved in the Judgment. The phrase ‘tribulation and anguish’ has been referred to Isaiah viii. 22 by C. H. Dodd.\(^\text{242}\) We suggest rather that Paul is thinking of Deuteronomy xxviii. The very pair of Greek words used here occur three times in the Septuagint of that chapter (verses 53, 55, 57) in a series of curses upon those who break the covenant-law of God.\(^\text{243}\) In Galatians iii. 10 ff. Paul had revealed his knowledge of and study in the curses of Deuteronomy xxvii ff.\(^\text{244}\) Here the Apostle is apparently reminding the Jew of the warning of his own Scriptures, which he tended to forget in his pre-occupation with the security of the elect race. Paul insists upon Scriptural authority that, if priority of privilege counts for anything, it means priority of responsibility.

The reference to ‘partiality’ (RSV) in ii. 11 goes back to 2 Chronicles xix. 7, where the judges of Israel are warned to judge God’s people aright in the light of the fact that ‘there is no perversion of justice with the Lord our God or
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\(^{239}\) In the historical context the reference is to God’s vindication, as *RSV* makes clear. See Wright’s study in *art. cit.* in note 45.

\(^{240}\) Zephaniah i. 18, ii. 3 and/or Psalm ex. 5 may also have been influential. In xii. 19 Paul apparently follows a different tradition which read *ευ* instead of *逻wm*.

\(^{241}\) As Lagrange (*comm. ad loc.*) points out, the future of the LXX of the psalm, *ἀποδώσεις*, proves that that is here quoted rather than Proverbs xxiv. 12 which has a present, *ἀποδίδωσιν*.

\(^{242}\) *According to the Scriptures*, 79; so Lindars, *op. cit.*, 178 note 1.

\(^{243}\) Greek θλώσις καὶ στενοχωρία.

\(^{244}\) Galatians iii. to quotes LXX of Deuteronomy xxvii. 26, adding the fuller phrase τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ, which is found, e.g. in xxviii. 58, xxix. 27: cf. Lindars, *op. cit.*, 228 f.
partiality’ (RSV). In Romans the reference is widened to cover God’s attitude towards all men, but especially towards the Jews. He will not condone their sinful behaviour; they cannot hope to escape His justice because of favouritism.

At ii. 24 occurs an express quotation from the Old Testament. It is substantially based upon the Septuagint of Isaiah lii. 5. In its original context the Hebrew refers to pagan oppression of Israel and pagan contempt of the Divine name which rested upon His people. It looked as if their God had deserted them and was powerless to save them. But God would deliver them and vindicate His name. In Romans ii. 24 Paul follows the Septuagint in adding ‘on your account’, and with its aid re-interprets the verse to fit his contemporary situation. The Jews were failing to attain to the moral standards of the Law; consequently Gentiles were blaspheming the name of their God. Now it is not God’s failure to deliver but Israel’s failure to keep the Law which causes scandal. Lindars has explained the exegetical principles that underlie this application. God’s expected deliverance of His people, celebrated in Isaiah lii, has now taken place in Christ, as readers in the early Church could gather from the next passage concerning the work of Christ as Suffering Servant (Isaiah lii. 13-liii. 12). Now therefore the blasphemy is no longer due to God’s inaction but to that fact that the Jews behave as if He still had not acted. In these changed circumstances the scandal is the Jews’ refusal to believe the salvation now offered, and this refusal of a new revelation of God is underlined by their refusal to obey the older revelation. This is an illustration of what Lindars calls a ‘shift of application’ of an Old Testament text. The immoral outworking of the Jews’ general rejection of God’s Word to them is a confirmation, only to be expected, of their rejection of the Christian Gospel.

In iii. 10 ff. Paul adopts a favourite Jewish practice of stringing together a series of verses from different parts of the Old Testament to establish an argument. It may have been taken from a Jewish collection, as L. Venard suggests and even be ‘a sort of psalm in use already among the Pauline communities’ (Leenhardt, comm. ad loc.). A. Feuillet considers that the mosaic of Scripture references may originally have been composed to suggest that the entire human personality has shared in sin (n.b. ‘throat’, ‘tongue’, ‘mouth’, ‘feet’, ‘eyes’). The citations are taken mainly from the Psalms, with one quotation from Isaiah. The texts are shortened or modified, probably under liturgical influence. Most, but not all, the texts apply to Israelites. Paul enlarges the application to cover all the Jews of his day. E. K. Lee has observed that the verses, thus used, are an appeal to conscience. Whenever any Jew heard these and similar verses read out in the synagogue (cf. ii. 13) he could not but think that they were no mere

---

245 The reference is non-Septuagintal. προσωποληψία is a rendering of Hebrew maššō’ pānim, which occurs only there.
246 Thackeray’s observation (op. cit., 189) that the insertion of καθός γέρακται ‘as an afterthought’ at the end of the verse shows that ‘he is conscious of using the passage freely’ is unlikely.
247 LXX adds δ’ ὑμάς and ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσι. Paul omits δ’ παντός and changes μον τοῦ θεοῦ.
248 So Sanday and Headlam, comm. ad loc.
250 Lindars also discusses the further shift in the New Testament (ibid., 22 f.).
251 See Thackeray, op. cit., 183; L. Venard, art. cit. in note 191, column 30.
252 Leenhardt, comm. ad loc., finds an interesting tripartite structure in the ‘psalm’.
253 See Lagrange, comm. ad loc.
254 A Study in Romans, 1962, 52.
description of the wicked of antiquity but the living Word of God directed there and then at his own conscience.

In the second category of interpretation, verses originally referring to Israel are applied instead to the world at large, and notably to the Gentiles. The first case is at i. 23 where Psalm cvi. 20 is quoted with adaptations.\textsuperscript{255} The history of Israel in the wilderness wanderings has been repeating itself in the Gentile world. The true God was rejected in favour of pagan idols. The influence of Genesis i ff. upon Romans i. 18-32 has already been discussed in section iii: we suggest that the influence of Psalm cvi is not exhausted in the reference at
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Romans i. 23. C. H. Dodd has stressed how the quotation of a single verse can reveal the presence of a whole passage in the writer’s mind.\textsuperscript{256} Psalm cvi with its theme of sacred history was familiar to the early Church as well as to the synagogue.\textsuperscript{257} It is echoed several times in the New Testament.\textsuperscript{258} In verses 24, 26, 28 of Romans i the threefold ‘God gave them up’ is surely an echo of Psalm cvi. 41: ‘God gave up Israel into the hands of the nations.’\textsuperscript{259} God delivered the Gentiles up to the consequences of their sin as He did Israel to theirs. There is a similarity of motif between Psalm cvi and Romans i. The Gentile world, like Israel, did not consider God’s works (Psalm cvi. 7, 13). In verses 23, 32, 40 of the Psalm and in Romans i. 18 sin merits the wrath of God.\textsuperscript{260} The ‘lusts’ of Romans i. 24 may well echo the lusting of Psalm cvi. 14.\textsuperscript{261} The sexual irregularities of Romans i. 26 f. sound reminiscent of the thought of Psalm cvi. 39: ‘They became unclean by their acts and played the harlot in their doings’ (RSV). It appears that Paul has used both Genesis i ff. and Psalm cvi as major sources to aid his description of the degeneration of pagan society.

At ii. 13 the phrase ‘the work of the law written on their hearts’ reflects the influence of Jeremiah xxxi. 33: ‘I will write [my law] in their hearts.’\textsuperscript{261a} One hesitates to call this a merely verbal parallel. The New Covenant described by Jeremiah was promised to the people of God, and Israel hopefully awaited it. But the Apostle enquires by implication whether God has not already provided an anticipation in the experience of the Gentiles. This is part of his ruthless attempt to attack the exclusive claims of Jewry that God had revealed His moral standards to themselves alone. In iii. 30 Paul uses the first part of the Shema’ or Jewish creed in a universalist argument. ‘The Lord is one’ or ‘God is one’\textsuperscript{262} was the shibboleth of Jewish orthodoxy. From this first

---

\textsuperscript{255} μόσχου ἔθνος χώρτον is replaced by φθαρτοῦ κτλ; αὐτῶν by ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ. M. D. Hooker points out in \textit{art. cit.} in note 96 that Paul’s interpretation in the latter case is in keeping with the exegesis of his time: ‘their glory’ is one of the ‘corrections of the scribes’ (some LXX\textsuperscript{249} have αὐτοῦ; Targum has ‘the glory of their Lord’).

\textsuperscript{256} E.g., \textit{According to the Scriptures}, 126.

\textsuperscript{257} Cf. Kistemaker, \textit{op. cit.} in note 32, 92.

\textsuperscript{258} In Luke i. 68, 71, 72; 1 Corinthians x. 20; Revelation xix. 4.

\textsuperscript{259} παρέδοκεν is used in both cases.

\textsuperscript{260} Psalm Cvi. 23 ὁργήν; 32 παραφόρμασαν; 40 ὀργήσθη.

\textsuperscript{261} Psalm cvi. 14 ἐπιθυμίασαν ἐπιθυμίαις; Romans i. 24 ἐπιθυμίαις.

\textsuperscript{261a} \textit{Contra}, C. H. Dodd, \textit{The Bible and the Greeks}, 1935, 36.

\textsuperscript{262} Deuteronomy vi. 4 LXX has εἰς κύριος, but this usually reappears as εἰς θεός, in the New Testament (e.g. Ephesians iv. 6, James ii. 19) and on magical amulets (cf. C. Bonner, \textit{Studies in Magical Amulets}, 1950, 174).
article of the Jewish faith the Apostle draws the shattering deduction that the God of all will treat both Jew and Gentile on the same principle—that of faith—on the Judgment Day.

There is a group of passages in Romans i-viii where terms originally referring to the Old Testament people of God are applied to the Church. Two such examples have been found at i. 7. A common greeting in the letters of the New Testament is ‘grace and peace.’ It is usually explained as a combination of the Jewish greeting of ‘peace’ and an adaptation of the standard Greek greeting. But E. Lohmeyer, supported by L. G. Champion and at least two recent commentators, has suggested that the whole phrase is an echo of early Christian worship which is derived from Jewish liturgy and ultimately from the priestly blessing of Numbers vi. 25 f.: ‘The Lord be gracious unto thee... and give thee peace.’ The blessing was often used in the Judaism of Paul’s day. It was repeated every morning in the Temple. It played an integral part in Qumrân worship as three adaptations and expansions of it show. The blessing upon Israel passed into the liturgical vocabulary of the early Church, and thence into letters which were not only addressed to churches but would be read out to their recipients at worship (cf. Colossians iv. 16). In Romans i. 7 also occurs the phrase ‘called (to be) saints’ or ‘saints by calling’ (J. N. Darby, New Translation). L. Cerfaux has noticed that it appears to be a literal translation of a phrase found in the Pentateuch and usually rendered ‘holy assembly’ (Exodus xii. 16, Leviticus xxiii [nine times], Numbers xxviii. 25). As the new people of God the Church was the heir of this Old Testament title.

A phrase which belongs to the covenantal vocabulary of Israel is ‘those who love God’ in Romans viii. 28. For instance, it occurs at Exodus xx. 6: ‘....showing mercy to thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments’. This gracious promise of Sinai is taken up and echoed throughout the Old Testament in the repetition of this phrase. The second part of the full phrase in Exodus xx. 6, etc. underlines the fact that ‘love’ in the Old Testament is no sentimental feeling but a continual activity whereby God’s followers throw themselves wholeheartedly into His service and identify themselves with His aims. Paul here lays claim to this part of the Old Testament heritage and appropriates it for the people of the New Covenant.

263 Greek χάρις... εἰρήνη.
265 Lohmeyer ZNTW, xxvi, 1927, 162; Champion, Benedictions and Doxologies in the Epistles of Paul, dissertation 1934, 29 f.; A. Nygren, C. K. Barrett, comm., ad loc. Champion, ibid., 92, finds another echo in 2 Thessalonians iii. 16: ὁ κύριος... δοθῇ... τῇ εἰρήνῃ.
266 A. Edersheim, The Temple, 1926, 170.
266a 1QS ii. 2 ff. expands the blessing: ‘May He grace thee with knowledge of things eternal, ... grant thee peace everlasting’; and adapts it into a curse (Gaster, op. cit., 22; cf. Vermès, op. cit., 73). 1Q Sbii. 4 f. is another application of the blessing (Vermès, 207).
267 LXX of Exodus, etc., has κλητὴ ἁγία; Romans has κλητοῖς ἁγίοις; Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, E.T. 1959, 118 f.; cf. Leenhardt, comm. ad loc.
267a Deuteronomy v. 10; vii. 9; Judges v. 31; Daniel ix. 4; Psalm cxxv. 20; cf. the variant reading of 4Q Psalm xxxviiiiii. 20 (J. M. Allegro, PEQ, 1954, 74).
We observed in section vi that Israel was called God’s ‘son’, a figurative expression for both their privilege of election and their responsibility of obedience. The plural ‘sons’ is also used, e.g. in Isaiah i. 2 RSV, Jeremiah iii. 22 RSV. According to Romans viii. 14 ff. members of the Church have been adopted into God’s family, as the Spirit testifies (viii. 16), and viii. 29 makes it clear that the adoptive sonship of Christians depends entirely upon the natural sonship of Christ. The recurrence of the term ‘adoption’ at ix. 4 in a description of the privileges of Israel reveals that in chapter viii Paul is consciously applying an old title to God’s new people. Indeed, as W. H. Rossell has maintained, the concept of adoption appears to come not merely from the legal vocabulary of Paul’s day, as is usually maintained, but from the Old Testament itself. It is found at Genesis xv. 2 ff., Exodus ii. 16, 1 Chronicles xxviii. 6, Jeremiah iii. 16. Another metaphor from family life is used in the Old Testament to describe the relationship between Israel and her God: that of bride and bridegroom, wife and husband (e.g. Hosea i-ii, Isaiah i. 1, Jeremiah ii). In the New Testament the picture is taken over and applied to Christ and His Church. Romans vii sounds an echo of this Old Testament figure. Indeed, in vii. 2, 3 the language Paul uses is a deliberate allusion to Old Testament expressions for marriage. The Church’s life-union with her Lord, which appears to be the theme of v. 12-vii. 6, is represented in terms of a marriage-union (cf. section v). This natural illustration of incorporation into Christ, rooted in the Old Testament and flowering in the New, is Paul’s third appeal to Christians to become what they are in Christ. A new Husband has replaced the Law. The Church has become united to Christ in marriage. She has new obligations and the responsibility of bringing forth offspring of moral characters which will be acceptable to God.

In Romans ii. 29 Paul plays upon the meaning of the word ‘Jew’. The word comes from ‘Judah’, which is linked with ‘praise’ in Genesis xxix. 35, xlix. 8. A true Jew is one who lives up to the meaning of his name by pleasing God and gaining His praise. Accordingly, non-Christian Jews are excluded from membership of the people of God. Linked with this idea is that of the limitation of physical circumcision. ‘Membership badges without loyalty and obedience are of no value,’ as E. Brunner has expressed Paul’s thought (comm. ad loc.). In verses 25 ff. the Apostle has been stressing that being a Jew depends not upon race or rite or ‘written code’ (RSV) but upon an attitude of heart. The thought of heart-circumcision may well be Stephen’s words still ringing in Paul’s ears: ‘Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears’ (Acts vii. 51). But he is also reiterating a lesson which the Old Testament often taught. Deuteronomy x. 16 had warned Israel: ‘Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart and be no more stiffnecked’ (cf. xxx. 6); and Jeremiah had underlined the warning (iv. 4, ix. 26). The logical implications which the Apostle draws are startling and foreign to Judaism: not only are Jews who are ‘uncircumcised in heart’ excluded from God’s community, but Gentiles who are heart-circumcised are included! The theme is taken up again in Romans iv. 9 ff. (see section iv): the

---

268 Hebrew banîm is rendered uíoí LXX but often ‘children’ in EVV.
269 W. H. Rossell, ‘New Testament Adoption—Graeco-Roman or Semitic,’ JBL lxxi, 1952, 233 f., cites the Nuzu archives for the Semitic practice of adoption. He considers that Paul has the idea of Abraham’s adoption of his slave Eliezer in mind here.
270 ή ὑπονόμος γυνὴ in vii. 2 is found in Numbers v. 20, 29, Proverbs vi. 24, 29, etc.; γένεσθαι ἄνδρι in vii. 3 occurs in Deuteronomy xxiv. 2, Hosea iii. 3.
true sons of Abraham are those who are one with him by faith, not necessarily by blood. Here in chapter ii it is said that Gentiles are reckoned as Jews, that is, become members of the people of God, if only they maintain the obligations of the rite. Paul appears to have Gentile Christians in mind (cf. F. Gódet, *comm. ad loc.*) as comparison with viii. 4. shows. God has chosen for Himself a new Israel made up of Jews who have acknowledged their Messiah and Gentiles who live by the power of the Spirit.

They can thus lay claim to the promise made to the people of God that He would pour out His Spirit upon them in the Messianic age. Joel ii. 28 was one of the favourite texts of the early Church. At Romans v. 5 the Apostle re-applies it in a fresh and striking way, as L. S. Thornton has observed. 271 It is not only that the Spirit has been poured out upon God’s new people with all the spectacular physical phenomena of Pentecost and the oral gifts. The chief blessing the Spirit has brought with Him is an overwhelming revelation of the love of God (cf. xv. 30, 1 Corinthians xii-xiii). Earlier in the same verse there is an echo of Psalm xxii. 5. The ancient Israelites hoped in God and were not ashamed. 272 The same confidence can be shared by the Christian people of God. The New Testament is shot through with many hues derived from Psalm xxii. 273 The cry of Jesus upon the Cross inspired the early Christians to study it as a whole. One conclusion is that Christians must go the way that Christ has trodden. The experiences of Israel are summed up in Christ and then re-enacted in the Church.

Among those experiences is the Exodus. The prophets had paved the way by declaring that God was yet to act in a new Exodus. 274 The historical events at the Red Sea are a prototype for the same God’s greater redemption of His people. Two echoes of the Exodus pattern sound out in Romans i-viii. 275 The first is a fleeting one at iii. 24.: ‘redemption’ has associations not only of the Hellenistic slave-market but also of God’s deliverance from Egypt. In chapter vi Paul’s references to baptism has Exodus typology as its background, which is not surprising as it underlay proselyte baptism. 276 ‘Jesus is the new Moses affecting the Exodus of salvation... The death and resurrection of Christ have the same meaning for the Church as the crossing of the Red Sea has for Israel’ (H. Sahlin; cf. 1 Corinthians x. 2). 277 In vi. 4. ‘glory’ is a word associated with the Exodus. In the Old Testament the miracles of the deliverance from Egypt were attributed to God’s glory or radiant power (Exodus xv. 7, 11, xvi. 7, 10). Paul attributed Christ’s resurrection to this same glory. 278 Once again God has intervened in a demonstration of His power. ‘All the promises of God find their Yes in Christ (2 Corinthians i. 20 RSV). The great truths of the Gospel and the Church are, one and all, ‘according to the Scriptures’.

272 Psalm xxii. 5 has in LXX ἐπὶ σοὶ ἥλπισαν; Romans v. 5 has ἐλπίς σοὶ καταστάσθητε.
276 Cf. Sahlin, *op. cit.*, 89.
277 *Idem*, *ibid.*, 91.
278 D. M. Stanley, *op. cit.* in note 73, 184.
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