

KINSHIP AND KINGSHIP

IDENTITY OF THE MESSIAH AS A KEY TO ROMANS

Master Thesis Biblical Studies

Course code: RTMV10013

Supervisor and reviewer: Dr H.L.M. Ottenheijm (Utrecht University)

Co-reviewer: Prof. Dr J.W. van Henten (University of Amsterdam)

Utrecht University

Faculty of Humanities

Department of Religious Studies and Theology

Student: M.M.J. Verheuver BA

Student number: 3465152

6th August 2013

CONTENTS

List of used abbreviations	5
Preface	8
1. Introduction	9
2. Romans 1.1-7 – Text and translation	11
3. The Roman audience	13
4. Interpreting Romans 1.1-4	16
4.1. Paul and his self-description (v. 1a)	16
4.1.1. Slave of the Messiah	16
4.1.2. Called and set apart	19
4.2. The good news of God (vv. 1b-3a)	20
4.2.1. Scriptural connections	21
4.2.2. Son of God	23
4.3. Rom. 1.3b-4 – A confessional formula?	24
4.3.1. Davidic descent	24
4.3.2. Advocating a confessional hypothesis	26
4.3.3. How to deal with vv. 1.3b-4?	29
4.4. Paul's confession – Jesus' identity	31
4.4.1. The meaning of <i>sarx</i> in v. 1.3b	32
4.4.2. Proposed interpretation of the parallelism	35
4.4.3. Jesus, the Messiah, our Lord (v. 4b)	40
5. Ancient epistolary theory and Rom. 1.3b-4	42
5.1. Titular expansions	43
5.2. Further expansions – Hearing and understanding	44
5.3. Conclusion and start	44
6. Intertextual exegesis and Rom. 1.3b-4	46
6.1. 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 2 – Why these texts?	46
6.2. Resurrection of the seed of David?	48
6.3. Prepared kingship	49

6.4. God and king – Father and son	50
6.6. Royal inheritance and rule	52
7. Christology – Summarising the interpretation	54
8. A christological reading of some passages in Romans	57
8.1. Completing the prescript (Rom. 1.5-7)	57
8.2. Incorporative christology (Rom. 6.1-14)	60
8.3. Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Gentiles (Rom. 15.7-12)	62
8.3.1. Quotation and co-text (Rom. 15.9)	63
8.3.2. Gentiles and peoples (Rom. 15.10-1)	64
8.3.3. The Root of Jesse (Rom. 15.12)	65
8.3.4. Inclusion	67
9. Conclusion	69
9.1. A brief summary	69
9.2. The research question and the first answers	70
9.3. The origins of Paul's christology – An excurs	72
9.4. A brief word on Paul and politics	73
9.5. The research question once more	74
Summary in Dutch	75
Bibliography	78
Index of passages cited	87

LIST OF USED ABBREVIATIONS

1 Chr.	- 1 Chronicles
1 Cor.	- 1 Corinthians
1 Kgs.	- 1 Kings
1QH	- 1 st Cave of Qumran, "Hymns Scroll" (<i>Hodayoth</i>)
1QpHab	- 1 st Cave of Qumran, <i>peshet</i> ('commentary') on Habakkuk
1 Sam.	- 1 Samuel
1 Thess.	- 1 Thessalonians
1 Tim.	- 1 Timothy
2 Cor.	- 2 Corinthians
2 Kgs.	- 2 Kings
2 Pet.	- 2 Peter
2 Sam.	- 2 Samuel
2 Thess.	- 2 Thessalonians
2 Tim.	- 2 Timothy
4Q161	- 4 th Cave of Qumran, fragment no. 161, "Commentaries on Isaiah"
4Q285	- 4 th Cave of Qumran, fragment no. 285, "The Book of War"
4QFlor	- 4 th Cave of Qumran, "Florilegium" or "Midrash on the Last Days"
4QMMT	- 4 th Cave of Qumran, "Some Works of Thora" (<i>Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Thora</i>)
AB	- <i>The Anchor Bible</i> (New York City, NY: Doubleday)
<i>Acme</i>	- <i>Acme: Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università degli studi di Milano</i> (Milan)
Am.	- Amos
<i>Ant.</i>	- Flavius Josephus, <i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>
BNT	- <i>Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments</i> (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag)
BNTC	- <i>Black's New Testament Commentaries</i> (London: A & C Black)
<i>BS</i>	- <i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i> (Andover, MA: Dallas Theological Seminary)
<i>BZ</i>	- <i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i> (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh)
CNT ³	- <i>Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament</i> , 3 rd series (Kampen: J.H. Kok)
Col.	- Colossians
<i>CTIR</i>	- <i>Center of Theological Inquiry – Reflections</i> (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary)
Dan.	- Daniel
Deut.	- Deuteronomy
Did.	- Didachè

ECB	- <i>Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible</i> (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans)
<i>Eikh. R.</i>	- <i>Eikhah (Lamentations) Rabbah</i>
Eph.	- Ephesians
<i>ExpT</i>	- <i>The Expository Times</i> (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark)
<i>EvTh</i>	- <i>Evangelische Theologie</i> (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag)
Ex.	- Exodus
Ez.	- Ezekiel
Gal.	- Galatians
Hab.	- Habakkuk
HBC	- <i>Harper's Bible Commentary</i> (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row)
Heb.	- Hebrews
Hermeneia	- <i>Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible</i> (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press)
HNT	- <i>Handbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr)
ICC	- <i>The International Critical Commentary</i> (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark)
<i>Inst. Or.</i>	- Quintilian, <i>Institutio Oratoria</i>
<i>Inv. rhet.</i>	- Cicero, <i>De inventione rhetorica</i>
Is.	- Isaiah
Jas.	- James
<i>JBL</i>	- <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> (Society of Biblical Literature)
Jer.	- Jeremiah
Jn.	- Gospel of John
<i>JR</i>	- <i>The Journal of Religion</i> (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press)
<i>JSJ</i>	- <i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i> (Leiden: Brill)
<i>JSNT</i>	- <i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i> (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications)
<i>JTS</i>	- <i>The Journal of Theological Studies</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
Jud.	- Jude
KEKNT	- <i>Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament</i> (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)
Lk.	- Gospel of Luke
LXX	- Septuagint
Mk.	- Gospel of Mark
MNTC	- <i>The Moffatt New Testament Commentary</i> (London: Hodder and Stoughton)
Mt.	- Gospel of Matthew

MT	- Masoretic Text
Neh.	- Nehemiah
NIB	- <i>The New Interpreter's Bible</i> (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press)
NIV	- <i>New International Version</i>
NovT	- <i>Novum Testamentum</i> (Leiden: Brill)
NRSV	- <i>New Revised Standard Version</i>
NRTh	- <i>Nouvelle Revue Theologique</i> (Tournai: Casterman)
NTD	- <i>Das Neue Testament Deutsch</i> (Göttingen/Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)
NTG ²⁷	- <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27 th edition (Aland et al. 2006)
NTS	- <i>New Testament Studies</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
PAST	- <i>Pauline Studies</i> (Leiden: Brill)
PFE	- <i>Paul for Everyone</i> (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press)
Phil.	- Philippians
Phlm.	- Philemon
Ps.	- Psalms
Ps. Sol.	- Psalms of Solomon
Rev.	- Revelation
RNT	- <i>Regensburger Neues Testament</i> (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet)
Rom.	- Romans
SHS	- <i>The Scripture and Hermeneutics Series</i> (Carlisle: Paternoster Press)
T. Levi	- Testament of Levi
TynB	- <i>Tyndale Bulletin</i> (Cambridge: Tyndale House)
ThHNT	- <i>Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament</i> (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt)
Tit.	- Titus
V. Vesp.	- Suetonius, <i>Vita Vespasiani</i>
WBC	- <i>Word Biblical Commentary</i> (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson)
WUNT	- <i>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i> (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr)
y. Ta'an	- <i>Talmud Yerushalmi</i> , tractate <i>Ta'anith</i>

PREFACE

By writing this master thesis on the content and function of Paul's christology in Romans, my final work is done as a student in theology and Biblical studies in Utrecht. However, during this last year, and specifically whilst writing this thesis, I have realised that my 'pilgrimage' through Paul's epistles and Pauline studies has only just commenced and will hopefully, with James 4.15 in mind, last for many more years. I have tried to interpret several aspects of an important part of Paul's theology in Romans, his christology, along the lines of intertextual exegesis. And one could ask the question why I took this exegetical method as the main line of interpretation. I did the same about a year and a half ago, since my bachelor thesis was about intertextuality in Lamentations. Perhaps it has got to do with my religious heritage and the Reformed exegetical principle of comparing Scripture with Scripture. However, it is more likely that intertextual exegesis is attractive because one can see it happen. We can perceive a quotation or an allusion and, unless we think that this intertextuality has no function at all, we can then dive into the Scriptures, searching for the meaning of two connected texts. 'The one who solves a puzzle, his reward will be another one.' And throughout the process of writing this thesis I have seen time and again that this method needs to be applied to Paul, certainly the Paul of Romans. His intended audience consisted of Roman Jewish-believers and Gentile-believers, but it might just be the case that his main conversation partner in this epistle is his Bible.

Before giving away too much of what is about to come, I would like to thank some people. First of all a word of gratefulness to my supervisor, Dr Eric Ottenheijm. His knowledge and contagious enthusiasm about the (textual) world of early Judaism and the New Testament – I have briefly pondered upon the question which of these two fields of research should come first, but I think he will be satisfied with this word-order – cannot be unnoticed. His stimulating supervision during the writing of this master thesis was useful to this slightly stubborn student. I also thank Prof. Dr Jan Willem van Henten, who was willing to be the co-reviewer of this thesis. Dr N.A. Broer, Martine Oldhoff and Hans-Dieter de Smit read some parts of my work and helped me with their advice – thank you!

I end this preface christologically, which is probably appropriate. Even though the age of theology is coming to an end at Utrecht University, it is with hope that one can say:

Sol Iustitiae Illustra Nos!

Mark Verheuveel

Schoonhoven, 6th August 2013

1. INTRODUCTION

During the close readings of some chapters of Paul's epistle to the Romans in the course *Remembering Paul: Image and Theology of Paul in Early Christianity*, I decided on writing my master thesis in Biblical studies about something related to the apostle Paul and his writings. A more specific subject came to mind whilst reading N.T. Wright's book *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*. The author of this book proposed a reading of Rom. 1.3b-4 as a statement of Jesus' Davidic Messiahship, a perhaps crucial statement in reading this letter.¹ According to Wright, "*this passage has routinely been marginalized*", but he finds himself "*compelled to the view that he [Paul, MV] really does see the argument of Romans framed by, and hence by implication consisting in, an exposition of the Messiahship of Jesus and its meanings and effects. And [...] when we read the letter this way it opens a great many doors which no other keys will unlock.*"²

I took the subject for my master thesis from this passage and formulated the following research question: How is the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 to be seen as crucial to the theology and interpretation of Romans?

In order to be able to answer this question a division in several sub-questions and sub-themes has been made. Before explaining what these questions and themes are, I have to address briefly the interpretation of the above-cited words of Wright. When I read this passage for the first time, I thought Wright was proposing that we should read Romans first and foremost as an epistle about Jesus as Messiah. This seemed to be quite different from reading it as an exposition of righteousness based on faith solely³, or as a theology for a community of united Jewish- and Gentile-believers.⁴ However, Wright is not saying the *theme* of Romans is Jesus' Messiahship, but his main point is a plea in favour of an understanding of what is the real theme – a demonstration of God's covenantal faithfulness – by means of an argument related to Jesus' Messiahship, a royal Messiahship.⁵

With this being said, I will set forth the content of the following chapters. Chapter 2 will contain a structured Greek text of Rom. 1.1-7 and, for the sake of convenience, my

¹ N.T. Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives* (London: SPCK, 2005), p. 44.

² Wright 2005, p. 44.

³ As a summarised example of the classical Protestant interpretation of Romans.

⁴ This could be a statement from a scholar of the New Testament thinking and writing within the not at all so homogeneous so-called 'New Perspective on Paul', although I think my example formulated thus sounds more like the position the late Lutheran bishop of Stockholm Krister Stendahl took in his famous essay "Paul Among Jews and Gentiles" (originally delivered as a lecture in 1963-4, included in K. Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1976], pp. 1-77).

⁵ This was pointed out to me by Dr N.A. Broer on the basis of my first research proposal for this master thesis. Having read some more of Wright's writings on Romans, I completely agree with these remarks. It is therefore necessary to formulate carefully and to distinguish themes from sub-themes or underlying lines of thought.

translation of it in English. Chapter 3 addresses briefly the question of the identity of the historical Roman audience Paul wrote to. This might give us an idea of what to expect with respect to the content and language of the letter. The 4th chapter is devoted to an interpretation of Rom. 1.1-4. It became inevitable to write this relatively lengthy chapter in order to answer various questions before the christology could be described. Chapter 5 is about ancient epistolary theory in relation to the christological argument of vv. 1.3b-4. This chapter will be followed by the 6th, where the intertextual traditions Paul probably worked with are interpreted in relation to Messiah Jesus. Chapter 7 will then briefly summarise what is said earlier about the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 and set forth what we are to expect rhetorically, intertextually, and, most of all, christologically in a further reading of Romans. This reading will be done in chapter 8, where several passages in the epistle will be examined in the light of earlier findings and expectations.

This thesis will be completed by the concluding 9th chapter, where the research question will be answered and some further thoughts arisen during the writing of this thesis are set out. A summary in Dutch, a bibliography and an index of (scriptural) passages cited can be found at the end of this thesis too.

2. ROMANS 1.1-7 – TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The Greek text for our translation of Romans 1.1-7 is thus⁶:

¹Παῦλος

δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,

κλητὸς ἀπόστολος

ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ,

²ὃ προεπηγγείλατο

διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ

ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις

³περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ

τοῦ γενομένου

ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ

κατὰ σάρκα,

⁴τοῦ ὀρισθέντος

υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει

κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης

ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν,

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν,

⁵δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν

εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως

ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ,

⁶ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,

⁷πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ,

κλητοῖς ἀγίοις,

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη

ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

⁶ Unless indicated otherwise, all translations in this master thesis are mine. The Greek text of the New Testament used is that of B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini & B.M. Metzger (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006²⁷).

This presentation of the syntactical relations and the textual structure differs in only one way from the one given in S. Byrskog, "Epistolography, Rhetoric and Letter Prescript: Romans 1.1-7 as a Test Case" (*JSNT* vol. 65, 1997), pp. 27-46, here p. 29. Samuel Byrskog connects *περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ* (*peri tou huiou autou* – 'concerning His son', v. 3) with *εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ* (*euangelion theou* – 'the good news of God', v. 1), whereas I think it to modify *ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις* (*en graphais hagiais* – 'in the holy scriptures', v. 2; see chapter 4).

¹Paul,

a slave of Messiah Jesus,

a called apostle,

set apart unto the good news of God,

²which He had promised beforehand

through His prophets

in the holy scriptures

³concerning His son,

who was born

from the seed of David

with respect to the flesh,

⁴who was appointed

as son of God with power

with respect to the spirit of holiness,

by the resurrection of the dead,

Jesus, the Messiah, our Lord

⁵through whom we have received grace and apostleship

unto obedience of faith

among all the Gentiles

for his name,

⁶among whom you too are called of Jesus, the Messiah;

⁷to all those who are in Rome beloved of God,

called saints:

Grace be to you and peace

from God our Father and Lord Jesus, the Messiah.

3. THE ROMAN AUDIENCE

Since this thesis makes use of insights from ancient epistolary and rhetorical theory and relates the author's (Paul's) intent to the intended historical audience (the Roman congregations), it is necessary to pay brief attention to those who received this letter.⁷ A full overview of the possibilities in the debate on the Roman congregations would require much more than the restricted space and time of this thesis. Therefore only the position taken by the author will be presented here.

A great deal of the socio-historical investigations made in relation to Paul's letter to the Roman Christians is based on the many names mentioned in the 16th chapter.⁸ Among these names are those of Prisca/Priscilla and Aquila (16.3).⁹ Paul has met this Jewish-Christian couple in Corinth, probably in the year 52 C.E. (Acts 18.2).¹⁰ These people lived and worked in Rome, but we are told by Luke that they were in Corinth 'because Claudius had commanded that all Jews should leave Rome'. With this information the early history of the Roman Christians can be related to the imperial policy of Claudius, who was enthroned in 41 C.E. The Roman biographer Suetonius, writing in the late first and early second century C.E., informs his readers about an edict by this emperor, who "*expelled from Rome Jews who were constantly making disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus*."¹¹ The date of this edict is put in the year 49 C.E. by most scholars.¹² Although there are several ways in which this edict can be interpreted, the most probable explanation of these words is that Claudius expelled those members of the Jewish community in Rome who were seemingly causing agitated problems in the synagogues concerning the confession of Jesus as the Christ.¹³

According to the author of Acts, however, *all* Jews had to leave Rome. Two basic objections against accepting this view as historical can be raised. Firstly, the Greek word *πᾶς* (*pas* – 'all'),

⁷ The attention paid to the one who dictated the letter can be found in the exegetical remarks throughout this thesis.

⁸ Although doubts have been cast upon the authenticity of the 16th chapter as an integral part of Paul's letter to the Romans, this hypothesis from a source-critical perspective is rejected here. For a brief overview of this debate, see J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16* (WBC vol. 38B; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1988), pp. 884-5, and O. Wischmeyer, "The Letter to the Romans", in: O. Wischmeyer (ed.), *Paul – Life, Setting, Work, Letters* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 245-76, here pp. 261-2.

⁹ Whenever I refer to source texts without the title of the work, the reference is to Paul's epistle to the Romans.

¹⁰ E. Ebel, "The Life of Paul", in: O. Wischmeyer (ed.), *Paul – Life, Setting, Work, Letters* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 97-109, here p. 108.

¹¹ "*Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit*" (Suetonius, *Vita Claudii* 25.4). The translation is by R. Jewett, *Romans – A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007), pp. 59-60.

¹² J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC vol. 38A; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1988), p. xlix.

¹³ Jewett 2007, p. 60.

used in Acts 18.2, is one of the typically Lucan words. This word is used most frequently in Acts (171 times), followed by the Gospel of Luke (158 times) and the Gospel of Matthew (129 times).¹⁴ According to Peter Lampe, this frequent use of a word indicates a Lucan way of presenting the traditions handed over to him, without necessarily reflecting the historical reality.¹⁵ Secondly, based on the absence of literary and demographic evidence, it is unlikely that *all* Jews had to leave Rome. Neither the Jewish historian Josephus nor his Roman colleague Tacitus tells anything about it. This would probably not be the case if the whole community, probably consisting of 40,000 to 50,000 Jews in the middle of the first century C.E., would have to abandon their Roman areas and eleven synagogues.¹⁶

The Christians who stayed in Rome after 49 C.E. were therefore most likely of a Gentile origin, continuing their Christianity in non-Jewish house-congregations.¹⁷ This identification of the remaining Roman Christians should be nuanced by assuming that at least some of these Gentiles became part of the Jewish community as proselytes or God-fearers, possibly at an earlier date in their religious history. When Claudius' edict lost its validity – this happened with his death in 54 C.E. and the successive assumption of the Roman throne by Nero – some members of the expelled Jewish-Christian community returned to Rome.¹⁸

Although a full description of the history of the Jews in Rome is not completely relevant for this thesis, we could ask questions about the influence of the remaining Jews on the Gentile-Christian congregations. What would be their reaction to a new movement, which disturbed the Jewish life in Rome, and is now left behind without any Jews for a couple of years? One can imagine the growth of some more hostility, although the consequence of earlier disturbances, Claudius' edict, could also prevent agitation.

Early Christianity in Rome knew of two distinguishable groups. Within a new, developing and fast spreading movement like this, tensions between these two groups can arise when they are reunited after five years of separation. One group took their Jewish-Christian identity with them abroad, while another group moved on towards a Gentile-Christian identity in the capital city of the Roman Empire. Some of these tensions and conflicts resulting from the reunion can be seen in, for example, the 14th chapter of Romans, or in the passionate ethno-conscious theology Paul developed in chapters 9-11. The epistle fits therefore neatly in this historical situation, and the letter was written not long after this return of some Jewish-

¹⁴ Counting based on the text of NTG²⁷ without considering possible variant readings.

¹⁵ P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten – Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte* (WUNT vol. II/18; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987), p. 7.

¹⁶ R. Penna, "Les Juifs à Rome au temps de l'apôtre Paul" (*NTS* vol. 28, 1982), pp. 321-47, here pp. 327 and 331.

¹⁷ Jewett 2007, p. 61.

¹⁸ We therefore meet the Jewish couple from Acts 18.2 again in Romans 16.3.

Christians in 54 C.E.¹⁹ If we allow some time for the problems to develop more clearly, dating the letter to 56 C.E. is a good and probable proposal.²⁰

The letter to the Romans was sent to congregations with a mixed identity.²¹ On the one hand we have the Gentile-Christians, living for years in a context of Roman imperial language and politics. On the other hand we have the Jewish-Christians, not being at home for years due to the edict of Claudius, and probably not feeling at home religiously when returning to Rome. We can expect therefore that the apostle spoke on two levels in his letter. For the Gentile addressees the right imperial chords were touched and for the Jewish addressees the significant Biblical and exegetical bells were rung. However, both heard the same sounds, because we can expect the Jewish-Christians to be well aware of counter-imperial language, and the Gentile-Christians to have sufficient knowledge of Scripture to understand Paul. We can perhaps encounter these two levels of language in the exegesis of vv. 1-4 in our next chapter.

¹⁹ N.T. Wright, *The Letter to the Romans* (NIB vol. 10; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2002), p. 396.

²⁰ Wischmeyer 2012, p. 261. This dating is also based on the mention on the (Corinthian) Gaius in Rom. 16.23.

²¹ That not every scholar agrees with this statement, can be seen in the next chapter, where I pay attention to M.J. Brown, "Paul's Use of ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ in Romans 1:1" (*JBL* vol. 120/4, 2001), pp. 723-37.

4. INTERPRETING ROMANS 1.1-4

This chapter will be devoted to an exegesis of Rom. 1.1-4, with vv. 3b-4 as the centre of our interpretative attention.

4.1. Paul and his self-description (v. 1a)

Paul opens his lengthy letter 'to all those who are in Rome beloved of God' (v. 7a) through his secretary Tertius (16.22) with one long sentence, consisting of 93 words.²² The length of the epistolary prescript isn't brought about by the adscription in v. 7a or the salutation in v. 7b, albeit a bit expanded in a Pauline fashion, but almost solely by the superscription (vv. 1-6).²³ This element is not merely expanded, but indeed 'severely over-extended'.²⁴ This thesis is about the christology of 1.3b-4 as an underlying category of thought in the theology of Romans, but we are, by this 'severely over-extended' prescript, urged to examine the conventions of ancient epistolary and rhetorical theory, which will be done in chapter 5.

4.1.1. *Slave of the Messiah*

As usual in ancient Greek letters, this one is opened with the name of the sender in the nominative case: Παῦλος (*Paulos* – 'Paul').²⁵ Paul isn't just Paul however, for he qualifies himself with the title δοῦλος (*doulos* – 'slave').²⁶ By this self-designation Paul put himself among those with a low status in the Roman society, unless we understand *doulos* in this letter to the Romans as referring to a member of the *Familia Caesaris*, a slave of the most powerful household at the time, as is argued by M.J. Brown.²⁷ However, the point of Brown's

²² This letter is, in fact, one of the longest letters known from antiquity with a proper epistolary form (H.-J. Klauck, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament – A Guide to Context and Exegesis* [trans D.P. Bailey; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006], p. 301).

²³ The prescript of Romans is the longest known ancient prescript, according to P.L. Tite, "How to Begin, and Why? Diverse Functions of the Pauline Prescript within a Greco-Roman Context", in: S.E. Porter & S.A. Adams (eds.), *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form* (PAST vol. 6; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 57-99, here p. 91.

The length of this one sentence is of course not equal at all to the enormous sentence in Eph. 1.3-14, but to say with regard to writing long sentences that "it simply isn't Paul's [style]" (B.D. Ehrman, *The New Testament – A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* [New York City, NY/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008⁴], p. 390), is a bit without an eye for the prescript of Romans.

²⁴ Klauck 2006, p. 302.

²⁵ Klauck 2006, p. 18. A brief yet informative commentary on the name(s) the apostle bore can be found in Dunn 1988a, pp. 6-7.

²⁶ Although, amongst others, NIV and NRSV (NRSV with a footnote attached) render this word with 'servant', which might sound less harsh and more as 'just a job' in modern ears, *doulos* means 'slave'. For an introductory article on Greco-Roman slavery and Paul's relation to it, see J.A. Harrill, "Paul and Slavery", in: J.P. Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World – A Handbook* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003), pp. 575-607.

²⁷ Brown 2001, point most clearly expressed at p. 736.

article comes about unconvincingly in two ways. Firstly, he seems to hold the possibility that the letter to the Romans is "addressed to persons who are the highest of high status slaves in the empire"²⁸, which seems to be quite incompatible with the (much better substantiated) account of socio-historical research into the early Christians in Rome as presented by Robert Jewett.²⁹ This commentator concluded that these people probably lived in crowded areas of Rome and belonged to those of the low social status, living in powerless poverty.³⁰ Secondly, Brown's argument is framed within a solely Gentile-Christian interpretation of Romans, which means that the possibility of speaking on two levels is not considered sufficiently.³¹

The title *doulos* is a not at all uncommon title for Christians in the New Testament.³² When Paul calls himself 'slave' in 1.1, he uses a self-description known from the Old Testament for the individual in prayer, Israel as a nation, or great figures in the story of Israel – a tradition continued in early Jewish literature.³³ Because the Roman slave, or the slave in general, is without a meaningful relationship without his master³⁴, it is important to see with whom Paul's loyalty is. It is with Messiah Jesus (1.1), and this might be seen as a christological adaptation of the traditional 'servant of YHWH' theme. We can note this adaptation, but we mustn't stress it too much, for the Lordship of God does not become less important because of Paul's christology. Or, as S.L. Johnson said this: "*He is the slave of the one, and he is separated to the gospel of the other, and he longs for the church to receive grace and peace from both alike and both together.*"³⁵

By translating Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (*Christou Iêsou*) as 'Messiah Jesus' instead of the more common 'Christ Jesus', the position taken in the debate on Paul's use of Χριστός (*Christos*)

²⁸ Brown 2001, p. 737.

²⁹ Jewett 2007, pp. 59-74. Cf. Tite 2010, p. 93.

³⁰ Jewett 2007, pp. 62-3, following earlier research from Lampe 1987.

³¹ My position in this debate can be found in chapter 3. An example of Brown's position can be seen when he agrees with Christopher G. Whitsett's conclusions on Jewish messianic exegesis (C.G. Whitsett, "Son of God, Seed of David: Paul's Messianic Exegesis in Romans 2:3-4" [*JBL* vol. 119/4, 2000], pp. 661-81), but completely ignores them by saying: "*I do not believe that it is necessary to assume that such sustained Jewish reflection on the messiah would have made an impact on the Roman congregation*" (Brown 2001, p. 734 n. 54 – note the singular form 'congregation', while Rom. 16 speaks of multiple house-churches).

³² Acts 4.29, 16.17; 2 Cor. 4.5; Gal. 1.10; Phil. 1.1; Col. 4.12; 2 Tim. 2.24; Tit. 1.1; Jas. 1.1; 2 Pet. 1.1; Jud. 1.1; Rev. 1.1.

³³ Examples of the three categories from the Hebrew Bible can be found in Neh. 1.6 (individual), Deut. 32.36 (Israel) and 2 Kgs. 18.12 (Moses). Further scriptural references can be found in Dunn 1988a, p. 7.

An example from Qumran is 1QH 7.16 (numbering according to E. Lohse [ed.], *Die Texte aus Qumran – Hebräisch und Deutsch – Mit Masoretischer Punktation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964], pp. 138-9).

Josephus used *doulos* in this way in *Ant.* 5.39, 11.90 and 11.101. See C. Begg, *Judean Antiquities Books 5-7*, in: S. Mason (ed.), *Flavius Josephus – Translation and Commentary*, vol. 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), p. 11 n. 111.

³⁴ Brown 2001, p. 733.

³⁵ S.L. Johnson Jr., "The Jesus That Paul Preached" (*BS* vol. 128, 1971), pp. 120-34, here p. 122.

will be clear: it is read first and foremost as a title ('Messiah'), and not as just a proper name.³⁶

A good deal of the manuscript tradition reads Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Iêsou Christou* – 'Jesus, the Messiah'). This certainly became more and more the usual order of words, but this does not mean that we should emphasise *Christos* more when it is put before *Iêsous* than when it is placed behind it.³⁷ Van Bruggen correctly notes the arbitrariness in the textual tradition with respect to the front-position of *Christos*, but this does not necessarily lead to his interpretation of *Christos* as predominantly a proper name in the Pauline literature.³⁸

It is perhaps sometimes said that messianism was a category Paul did not emphasise³⁹, but reading *Christos* only as a proper name for Paul is an interpretation to be impugned. Firstly, how could Paul, a Greek-speaking Jew in the first century C.E., hear the word *Christos* and completely ignore a thought about 'anointed', a thought that was well alive in the textual tradition of his religion, the LXX? Secondly, and here Matthew V. Novenson is quoted,

"... the fact that this tradition is preserved in the Roman historians weighs against a point that is often made in the discussion of Messiahship in Paul, namely, that Paul's Gentile auditors could not have understood what χριστός meant, that it could have suggested to them only an "oiled" athlete or a "plastered" wall. Quite apart from the consideration that Paul or other Christian missionaries might have explained the term to their converts, there is also the fact that these Roman authors know the idea of a prophesied universal rule by a Jewish king. Jewish in-speak need not have sounded like utter gibberish to Gentile ears."⁴⁰

³⁶ During the last stages of writing this master thesis, my supervisor brought to my attention Matthew V. Novenson's published doctoral dissertation *Christ among the Messiahs – Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). Although I am not able to incorporate this work into my thesis, I learned through Nijah K. Gupta's review of this work (accessed via <http://www.bookreviews.org/bookdetail.asp?TitleId=8495> on 1st August 2013) that Novenson proposed the word 'honorific' instead of 'title' for Paul's use of *Christos* (Novenson 2012, pp. 92-3). Because I do not know exactly which arguments he uses for this and what is meant by 'honorific' instead of 'title', I continue to use the word 'title' in this thesis, without implying that I disagree with Novenson.

³⁷ This is argued by C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975⁶), p. 836.

³⁸ J. van Bruggen, *Romeinen – Christenen tussen stad en synagoge* (CNT³; Kampen: J.H. Kok, 2007²), pp. 242-3.

³⁹ E. Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT vol. 8a; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1973), p. 3.

⁴⁰ M.V. Novenson, "The Jewish Messiahs, the Pauline Christ, and the Gentile Question" (*JBL* vol. 128/2, 2009), pp. 357-73, here p. 364 n. 35. Novenson refers to a tradition about an oracle that has a Jewish king ruling the world, a tradition preserved in Tacitus' *Historiae* 5.13 and Suetonius' *Vita Vespasiani* 4.5.

Thirdly, if 'Jesus Christ' would solely be a proper name, changing the place in the word-order of the *praenomen* and the *nomen* or *cognomen* would be an odd inversion.⁴¹ But, fourthly, the most powerful argument for reading *Christos* as a title is the increased exegetical sense one can make of multiple verses in Romans by reading *Christos* not as the name of Jesus, but as a reference to him in his function of Messiah.⁴²

By reading *Christos* as a title however, it is not meant that 1.1 is a text that gives us much insight into Paul's messianism. It is important to bear in mind though that when it really gets messianic, we have to understand that Paul is not speaking theoretically about a christology, for he has already described himself as a slave of that very Messiah.

4.1.2. Called and set apart

Paul not only mentions his theological status as slave, but he names himself 'called apostle' (κλητὸς ἀπόστολος – *klêtos apostolos*).⁴³ 'Called', a divine passive, refers to the moment the good news of Jesus first made a changing impact on Paul and immediately further designates this event as his vocation to be an apostle.⁴⁴ While addressing the Roman congregations, Paul is this 'called apostle', but he is also 'set apart unto the good news of God' (ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ - *aphoorismenos eis euangelion theou*). The verb ἀφορίζω (*aphoridzoo* – 'to set apart, separate') can be used in the New Testament to indicate the division between righteous and wicked people⁴⁵, or an exclusion of or by Jesus' disciples.⁴⁶ When Paul used this verb in a personal way, it is intimately connected to his call, bringing the call of the prophet Jeremiah and the faithful prophet in Is. 40-55 to mind.⁴⁷ Paul saw and construed his apostolic identity (*doulos* and *aphoorismenos*) in continuity with the covenant members of the Old Testament, especially the prophets. It is sometimes said that

⁴¹ Dunn 1988a, p. 8.

⁴² A modest commencement of this demonstration can be found in chapter 8 below.

⁴³ This quite straightforward Greek phrase is sometimes translated in a more complicated way as 'called to be an apostle' (NIV, NRSV). *Klêtos apostolos* probably refers to both a past event (Paul being called) and to his current status (apostle).

⁴⁴ Wright 2002b, p. 415.

⁴⁵ Mt. 13.49, 25.32.

⁴⁶ Lk. 6.22; Acts 19.9.

⁴⁷ Gal. 1.15 (a similar use can be found in Acts 13.2). Cf. Is. 44.2, 49.1; Jer. 1.5. On Paul's call and vocation in relation to the themes from Isaiah and Jeremiah, see Wright 2002b, p. 602; P.J. Tomson, '*Als dit uit de Hemel is...*' – *Jezus en de schrijvers van het Nieuwe Testament in hun verhouding tot het Jodendom* (Hilversum: B. Folkertsma Stichting voor Talmudica, 2002⁴), pp. 149-53; Wright 2005, pp. 161-3.

When Paul used *aphoridzoo* in a non-personal way, it carries the meaning 'to separate' and is related to the concept of 'purity', as can be seen in his scriptural quotation in 2 Cor. 6.17 and the negative way of describing Peter's actions in Antioch in Gal. 2.12.

aphorismenos can be read as a pun on 'Pharisee', because the Hebrew root פָּרַשׁ (*p-r-sh*)⁴⁸ is the equivalent of the Greek *aphoridzoo*.⁴⁹ This etymology of the word 'Pharisee' is probably correct⁵⁰, but it is doubtful whether this was in Paul's mind, for the pun would almost certainly not be received thus by his Roman readers.⁵¹ Making better sense for the Roman audience of Paul's self-description with *aphoridzoo* is the suggestion that God is making the called apostle Christ-like in the same way as in 8.29 the called believer is made Christ-like. This suggestion is partly based on the common root of *aphoridzoo* (1.1) and προορίζω (*pro-oridzoo* – 'to predestine, foreordain'; 8.29).⁵² Perhaps this explanation is on the level of language liable to the strong linguistic attack by James Barr on what he called the 'root fallacy'⁵³, but this interpretation of *aphoridzoo* is theologically in line with Paul's self-description as the Messiah's slave (1.1).

4.2. The good news of God (vv. 1b-3a)

Paul is set apart unto the 'good news of God' (εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ - *euangelion theou*).⁵⁴ This good news is on the one hand *about* God, but is derived at the same time *from* God.⁵⁵ Just as 'slave' referred both to a Greco-Roman social reality and to a Biblical theme, the word *euangelion* also has this *double entendre*, which we can expect in a letter addressed to a twofold audience. This word refers to both the Jewish world of Paul and to the challenge of

⁴⁸ It is to be noted that this verb did not solely mean 'to separate' in the Hebrew of Paul's days (M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* [reprint by BN Publishing, originally published in 1903], pp. 1241-2).

⁴⁹ Johnson 1971, p. 125 n. 15.

⁵⁰ It is maintained by L.H. Schiffman, *From Text to Tradition – A History of Second Temple & Rabbinic Judaism* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1991), p. 104, and S.J.D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Louisville, KY/London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006²), p. 152. See for a discussion of several (other) possibilities the article of A.I. Baumgarten, "The Name of the Pharisees" (*JBL* vol. 102/3, 1983), pp. 411-28.

The use of *p-r-sh* in 4QMMT, text C (translation in G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English – Revised Edition* [London: Penguin Books, 2011], pp. 228-9) points in this direction too. However, when 'Pharisee' is derived from this verb, the meaning 'to separate' should not be read as a reference to sectarianism, despite its use in a Qumranic document, but to a sanctifying action and movement, where people or things become religiously set apart (for God).

⁵¹ Dunn 1988a, p. 9.

⁵² Wright 2002b, p. 602.

⁵³ This issue is treated throughout in J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1961).

⁵⁴ I prefer to translate *euangelion* with 'good news' instead of 'gospel', for I reserve the latter term for the literary genre (e.g. Mark's gospel). In this way the clarity of speech will be improved and the meaning 'gospel' has taken won't have to be clarified by etymologising towards *gōd-spell*.

⁵⁵ It is not necessary to force oneself into an interpretation of Paul's ambiguous genitives as a subjective genitive ('good news from God') or an objective genitive ('good news about God'). Intended grammatical ambiguity was probably a theological tool for Paul.

this good news to the Roman imperial world.⁵⁶ On the Jewish side, it refers to the good news brought to Israel in Isaiah 40-55, where the exile is ended by a glorious defeat of Babylon and a return of YHWH to Zion. On the Greco-Roman side, it refers to the announcement made by a messenger about the accession to the throne of a ruler or emperor.⁵⁷ These two worlds come together in Paul's proclamation of this good news about Jesus.⁵⁸

4.2.1. Scriptural connections

However, saying 'good news about Jesus' does not mean that *euangelion theou* in v. 1 is modified by both the relative pronoun ὃ (*ho* – 'which') in v. 2 and the preposition περί (*peri* – 'concerning') in v. 3. If one connects *peri* with *euangelion theou*, it means that the content of the good news is primarily related here to what is said about Jesus in vv. 3b-4.⁵⁹ In Paul's terminology, however, the content of the good news is not solely christological, as is indicated by the use of *euangelion theou*.⁶⁰ And when the good news is defined christologically, Paul used the much more ambiguous phrases εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (*euangelion tou huiou autou* – 'the good news of His son')⁶¹, εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*euangelion tou Christou* – 'the good news of the Messiah')⁶², or εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ (*euangelion tou kuriou hēmoon Iēsou* – 'the good news of our Lord Jesus').⁶³ Besides this, not once in the Pauline letters is *euangelion* explicated by an attributive prepositional phrase.⁶⁴

God's good news (1.1b) is defined salvation-historically (the relative clause) and christologically (vv. 3b-4).⁶⁵ This christological dimension of the good news however is not directly marked out by the preposition *peri*. The christological dimension comes about through a messianic exegesis, indicated by the connection of v. 2 with the directly following

⁵⁶ This common knowledge is an important theme in the exegesis of N.T. Wright. See, for example, Wright 2002b, pp. 415-6; N.T. Wright, *Romans: Part One – Chapters 1-8* (PFE; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), p. 168; N.T. Wright, "Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire" (*CTIR* vol. 2, 1999), pp. 42-65, here p. 44.

⁵⁷ Wright 2002b, p. 415.

⁵⁸ Paul can, referring to his proclamation, even speak of 'my good news' (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου – *to euangelion mou*) in Rom. 2.16 (cf. 16.25), and 2 Tim. 2.8 (note the thematic correspondence of this latter passage with the prescript of Romans).

⁵⁹ This is the majority position taken in exegesis, by Dunn 1988a, p. 10-1, and Wright 2002b, p. 416, too.

⁶⁰ Besides Rom. 1.1, Paul expanded the word *euangelion* with this attribute in Rom. 15.16; 2 Cor. 11.7; 1 Thess. 2.2, 8, 9.

⁶¹ Rom. 1.9.

⁶² Rom. 15.19; 1 Cor. 9.12; 2 Cor. 2.12, 9.13, 10.14; Gal. 1.7; Phil. 1.27; 1 Thess. 3.2. Perhaps, but probably not, the variant reading in 1 Cor. 9.18 is to be added to this list.

⁶³ 2 Thess. 1.8.

⁶⁴ Whitsett 2000, p. 674 n. 55. Only once, in Eph. 6.19-20, can the content of the *euangelion* be modified with a preposition, but it is not at all likely that this is the case in this verse.

⁶⁵ Byrskog 1997, p. 29.

preposition *peri*.⁶⁶ The second verse of Romans already indicates that the good news proclaimed in this letter "is no startling novelty, launched upon the world without preparation."⁶⁷ The good news is promised by God beforehand (*προεπηγγεῖλατο* – *pro-epèngeilato*) through His prophets. It is important to note that Paul did not say 'predicted' but 'promised'.⁶⁸ Hereby the fulfilment of these promises is seen within a covenantal framework, the covenant with David and his son.⁶⁹ The prophets through whom God fulfils His promises are, in this instance, Nathan (2 Sam. 7) and David (Ps. 2)⁷⁰, but the re-use of prophetic voices from the past is continued throughout Romans, and is even evident in the quotation of Hab. 2.4 in the thematic statement of 1.16-7.⁷¹

Although the prophetic voices were still active in Paul's day (1 Cor. 12.28-9, 14.29, 32, 37), it is clear from v. 2c that Paul speaks here of the prophets from the Hebrew Bible, those of 'the holy scriptures'. The qualification of the good news as fulfilment of prophetic promises is a qualification of the letter to the Romans too, for more than half of Paul's scriptural quotations – although one can argue about the terms 'quotation' and 'allusion' – are to be found in Romans.⁷²

Leaving aside possible discussions about early (Jewish-)Christian ways of reading the Scriptures of Israel for now, it is important to note what Paul means in these first three verses of Romans. Paul's task is directly related to the good news of God. This good news of God is promised beforehand through the prophetic voices of the holy scriptures about God's son. What we would expect from this is that Romans can be characterised by a christocentric or, to use a better expression, christological hermeneutic. This is what Richard B. Hays came to expect from 1.2 too, but, according to him, "*the letter to the Romans does not carry through*

⁶⁶ On this matter, I go with the minority position taken by R.B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press, 1989), p. 85, and Whitsett 2000, pp. 674-5.

⁶⁷ W. Sanday & A.C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1964⁵ [1902]), p. 1.

⁶⁸ It is to be noted, but not to be stressed too much, for the alternative to 'God promised', i.e., 'God predicted', sounds a bit silly.

⁶⁹ B. Witherington & D. Hyatt, *Paul's Letter to the Romans – A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2004), p. 32. On the covenantal promises regarding David and his son, see chapter 6 below.

⁷⁰ The fact that the Psalms are strictly speaking not a part of the prophetic section of the Hebrew Bible, need not bother us too much, for, as Whitsett 2000, p. 674 n. 53, rightly remarks, David is treated as a prophet in the whole early Christian stream of (messianic) exegesis throughout. This presumably happens in the related exegetical traditions of early and rabbinic Judaism too.

⁷¹ On the interpretation of this quotation some interesting ideas are set forth in S.L. Young, "Romans 1.1-5 and Paul's Christological Use of Hab. 2.4 in Rom. 1.17: An Underutilized Consideration in the Debate" (*JSNT* vol. 34/3, 2012), pp. 277-85. Young points at some connections between the prescript of Romans and the thematic statement in 1.16-7, which lead him to think that 'the righteous' in the Habakkuk quotation is Christ. These conclusions ask for some further thought, in relation to the other Pauline quotation of Hab. 2.4 in Gal. 3.11 too.

⁷² Byrskog 1997, p. 41.

this implied program of christological exegesis."⁷³ It is true that Paul is not an expert in messianically proof-texting like the writer of the Gospel of Matthew was, but it is by no means certain that the qualification of Paul's hermeneutics as 'ecclesiocentric'⁷⁴ precludes a christological hermeneutic. This is certainly not the case if we see that Paul's christology in Romans could very well be a royal Davidic one, and therefore incorporative too.⁷⁵ What is about to happen in the prescript of Romans and perhaps in some other parts of this letter, could very well be described by using words of Paul himself: 'As many promises of God there are, they are 'Yes' in the Messiah and 'Amen' in him.'⁷⁶ For these scriptural promises concern Jesus, the Messiah, God's son.

4.2.2. Son of God

The term 'son' needs a brief clarification. Although Jesus is not yet named υἱός θεοῦ (*huios theou* – 'son of God') by Paul in this letter, it is absolutely clear that υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (*huiou autou* – 'His son'; v. 3a) is just another way of saying exactly this, but without an unnecessary repetition of *theou*, for it already is used in v. 1 and will be used shortly afterwards in vv. 4 and 7. The term 'son of God' became a name for Jesus indicating his divine nature in the first four centuries of christological debates in the Church. However, it might obscure our exegesis if we come across this term in the New Testament writings and automatically relate this to later ontological debates. When Paul described Jesus as 'son of God', his thoughts are again expressed with a *double entendre*. On one level the well-known Biblical and Jewish notions of the people of Israel or the Davidic king being God's son come to mind.⁷⁷ This means that in Paul's christology Jesus somehow continues the value of the special title 'son of God' from the old covenant, just as Paul continued the titles 'slave' and 'called'.

On another level the title 'son of God' is quite a challenge towards those who served the Roman emperor, or were him themselves. The title 'son of god' was not unusual at all as a title for the emperor, certainly not in the eastern parts of the Roman empire. Perhaps even in the western parts of it, where these thoughts were more restrained, emperors were deified

⁷³ Hays 1989, p. 85.

⁷⁴ Hays 1989, p. 121.

⁷⁵ How a Davidic Messiah is related to an incorporative christology will be demonstrated in chapters 6-8 below.

⁷⁶ Cf. 2 Cor. 1.20.

⁷⁷ See, for example, Ex. 4.22-3 as a description of Israel as the firstborn son of God, or 2 Sam. 7.14 and Ps. 2.7 (see chapter 6) with the same title for the Davidic king. For more scriptural references and a brief exposition of the Old Testament use of the term 'son of God', see Wright 2002b, p. 416, and Y. Levin, "Jesus, 'Son of God' and 'Son of David': The 'Adoption' of Jesus into the Davidic Line" (*JSNL* vol. 28/4, 2006), pp. 415-42, here pp. 418-9.

after they passed away.⁷⁸ When Paul therefore defines Jesus as 'son of God', this is meaningful for his first readers in two ways. On the one hand, Jesus is given the role traditionally reserved for Israel and/or David/the Davidic king. On the other hand, someone is described in words attributable to the emperor too, especially if this is heard by someone from the eastern parts of the Roman empire. It certainly must have sounded odd in Roman ears that a certain Paul declared at the beginning of his letter that the good news of God, present in anticipation in the age-old story of Israel, has at least something, but more likely everything to do with a certain Jesus from Galilee.⁷⁹

4.3. Rom. 1.3b-4 – A confessional formula?

This challenging proclamation of Paul about Jesus is therefore 'clarified' by the apostle in vv. 3b-4. Many questions have arisen concerning these two verses and some of these questions gave rise to the idea that Paul quoted (and edited) a pre-Pauline Jewish-Christian confessional formula here. Part of this hypothesis, which will be dealt with anon, is concerned with the claim of Davidic sonship for Jesus.

4.3.1. Davidic descent

Rom. 1.3 is, apart from the equally formulaic 2 Tim. 2.8, the only text where Paul explicitly mentions David as Jesus' ancestor.⁸⁰ Even though Paul does not go to such great genealogical lengths as Mt. 1.1-17 or Lk. 3.23-38⁸¹, and does not mention Jesus' parents⁸², it is said that "*in the Hellenistic communities, the identification of Jesus as Son of David seems to have been more of an embarrassment and hindrance than a glad and central affirmation.*"⁸³ Before we briefly examine some early Christian texts to check whether or not this statement is correct, we could ask why this title, 'son of David', would be so embarrassing in the Gentile-Christian world. James Dunn's answer to this question is that it is "*not entirely clear*", but he presumes that it is thus because Davidic sonship is a notion too Jewish and too political for easy transmission in the Gentile world.⁸⁴ However, we have

⁷⁸ Illustrated with references to ancient Greco-Roman texts on this subject is Levin 2006, pp. 419-21. Because I am not yet fully aware of the details in the discussions about the development of the cult of the Roman emperor, I try to be cautious in treating this subject.

⁷⁹ Van Bruggen 2007, p. 30.

⁸⁰ Although the name 'David' does not occur in 15.12, this quotation is quite explicit too.

⁸¹ W. Klaiber, *Der Römerbrief* (BNT; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), p. 19.

⁸² We are not sure whether or not Paul knew Mary, the mother of Jesus, for 'born of a woman' (Gal. 4.4) is a statement that applies to every human being.

⁸³ J.D.G. Dunn, "Jesus – Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans I. 3-4" (*JTS* vol. 24/1, 1973), pp. 40-68, here p. 50.

⁸⁴ Dunn 1973, p. 51.

already seen some examples of a *double entendre* in Romans, which means that Paul expressed himself on both a (completely) Jewish level and a political, counter-imperial level.

Apart from the fact that Paul or his colleagues working in Gentile communities could have explained the importance of the messianic notion⁸⁵, and apart from the fact that Jesus' Davidic sonship is a commonplace in the New Testament literature⁸⁶, some comments can be made with regard to Dunn's view on the downgrading of the title 'son of David' in the early days of Christianity.⁸⁷ Outside the New Testament Jesus is not only named 'son of David' in the Jewish-Christian Did. 9.2, but also by Ignatius, the late first, early second century C.E. bishop of Antioch. He used this phrase in his epistles to the Ephesians (18.2, 20.2), the Trallians (9.1), the Romans (7.3), and the Smyrnaeans (1.1).⁸⁸ These mentions of Jesus' Davidic descent in the writings of Ignatius are casual, not giving away any of his anti-Jewish interpretation of Paul.⁸⁹ We could therefore ask why Ignatius would use the notion of David sonship neutrally, if it was conceived as an 'embarrassment and hindrance' in Gentile-Christian circles.

There is, however, evidence of a pejorative remark about Jesus' Davidic sonship and actually an attempted denial of it by the unknown author of the epistle of Barnabas 12.10-1, probably writing around 130-135 C.E.⁹⁰ He wrote this:

"Again you see Jesus, not as son of man but as Son of God, manifest here in the flesh as a type. And so, since they are about to say that the Christ is the son of David, David himself speaks a prophecy in reverential awe, understanding the error of the sinners, "The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit at my right side until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet'" [...] See how David calls him Lord; he does not call him son."⁹¹

However, neither the neutral use of Davidic sonship in Ignatius' writings, nor the negative mention of it in the epistle of Barnabas can demonstrate that in Paul's days the Davidic

⁸⁵ Novenson 2009a, p. 364 n. 35.

⁸⁶ Mt. 1.1-17, 9.27, 12.23, 15.22, 20.30-1, 21.9, 15; Mk. 10.47-8; Lk. 1.27, 32, 2.4, 3.23-38, 18.38-9; Acts 13.22-3 (Paul's speech!); Heb. 7.14; Rev. 5.5, 22.16.

⁸⁷ The fourth century C.E. writer Eusebius of Caesarea even took upon himself the task of paying attention to the Davidic descent of Jesus in relation to persecutions by the Roman emperor Domitian in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.19-20. See Ph. Schaff & H. Wace, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1: "Eusebius" (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/William B. Eerdmans, 1991 [1890]), pp. 148-9.

⁸⁸ Text and numbering of the shorter version of Ignatius' letters according to the edition of A. Roberts & J. Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1: "The Apostolic Fathers – Justin Martyr – Irenaeus" (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/William B. Eerdmans, 1996 [1884]), pp. 57-8, 70, 77, 86.

⁸⁹ Tomson 2002, pp. 220-1.

⁹⁰ Ehrman 2008b, p. 426.

⁹¹ Translation by B.D. Ehrman, *Lost Scriptures – Books that Did Not Make It into the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 230. In this text David is speaking a prophecy (cf. p. 22 n.70 above).

descent of Jesus was problematic in the Gentile mission, or, for that matter, that it was a neutral part of the christology, for both early Christian texts are later traditions. Besides this, the epistle of Barnabas is not only a later, but also an overtly anti-Judaic tradition reworking a gospel tradition involving the quotation of Ps. 109.1 LXX (110.1 MT).⁹² To say therefore, in line with the implication of Dunn's theory, that "*for him [Paul, MV] a more significant statement of the Old Testament background out of which the Christ emerged was that he was 'born under the law'*"⁹³ shows more of the interpreter's general view of what Pauline theology is to be than of what Paul wrote down on purpose in Rom. 1.3b.

4.3.2. Advocating a confessional hypothesis

The assumption that Paul really meant what he wrote is to be kept in mind whilst addressing the issue of whether or not Paul quoted an already existing confessional formula in 1.3b-4.⁹⁴ The existence of this confessional formula is often assumed by commentators, sometimes without providing any clarifying statements. In the vast amount of literature on Romans, one can time and again read phrases as "*heute weithin anerkannt*"⁹⁵, "*as is well known*"⁹⁶, and more of these statements.⁹⁷ In fact, the only article known to me where, after a detailed examination of the arguments, a nuanced conclusion is reached without regarding vv. 3b-4 as a confessional formula, is the brief one written by Vern Poythress.⁹⁸

This widely accepted view asks therefore for an examination of the arguments, before explaining the position taken in this thesis. The reasons many commentators have come to

⁹² Mt. 22.41-5 / Mk. 12.35-7 / Lk. 20.41-4.

⁹³ C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1991²), p. 20.

⁹⁴ Wright 2005, p. 44: "*It seems very unlikely that he would place in such a prominent position an explicit statement of something he regarded as at best inadequate and at worst misleading.*"

⁹⁵ E. Schweizer, "Röm. 1,3 f, und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus", in: idem, *Neotestamentica – Deutsche und Englische Aufsätze 1951-1963* (Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), pp. 180-9, here p. 180.

⁹⁶ Byrskog 1997, pp. 41-2.

⁹⁷ L.C. Allen, "The Old Testament Background of (IIP)OPIZEIN in the New Testament" (*NTS* vol. 17/1, 1971), pp. 104-8, here p. 104; E. Linnemann, "Tradition und Interpretation in Röm 1,3f." (*EvTh* vol. 31/5, 1971), pp. 264-76, here p. 264; Dunn 1973, p. 40; P. Beasley-Murray, "Romans 1:3f: An Early Confession of Faith in the Lordship of Jesus" (*TynB* vol. 31, 1980), pp. 147-54, here p. 147; D. Zeller, *Der Brief an die Römer* (RNT; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1985), p. 35; P.W. Meyer, *Romans* (HBC; San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1988), p. 1133; W. Schmithals, *Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1988), p. 48; P. Stuhlmacher, *Der Brief an die Römer* (NTD vol. 6; Göttingen/Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989¹⁴), p. 21; J.A. Fitzmyer, *Romans – A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB vol. 33; New York City, NY: Doubleday, 1993), p. 229; S. Légasse, "Fils de David et Fils de Dieu – Note sur Romains 1, 3-4" (*NRTh* vol. 122/4, 2000), pp. 564-72, here p. 564; J. Reumann, *Romans* (ECB; Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2003), p. 1283; Jewett 2007, p. 103. This list is by no means exhaustive.

⁹⁸ V.S. Poythress, "Is Romans 1³⁻⁴ a Pauline Confession After All?" (*ExpT* vol. 87/6, 1976), pp. 180-3.

think of "that hypothetical entity the "pre-Pauline formula"⁹⁹ can be summarised in seven points.¹⁰⁰

1. These verses contain a participial construction and structural parallelism of the sentence such as are characteristic of fixed formulas.¹⁰¹
2. Rom. 1.3b-4 uses σάρξ (*sarx* – 'flesh') and πνεῦμα (*pneuma* – 'spirit') in a non-Pauline way.¹⁰²
3. V. 3b mentions the Davidic descent of Jesus, in which Paul was not interested.¹⁰³
4. The words ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ (*horisthentos huiou theou* – 'appointed as son of God') indicate an adoptionist christology rather than a (Pauline) pre-existent christology.¹⁰⁴
5. If it would be Paul who was composing these phrases, he would have added a reference to the crucifixion of Jesus.¹⁰⁵
6. The expressions *horisthentos huiou theou* and πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης (*pneuma hagioosunès* – 'spirit of holiness') are uncharacteristic to Paul.¹⁰⁶
7. Rom. 1.3b-4 is set forth as a summary of the *euangelion theou*, so we are, with 1 Cor. 15.1-4, 1 Tim. 3.16 and 2 Tim. 2.8 in mind, to expect something traditional.¹⁰⁷

Concerning these arguments, several remarks can be made.

- The first argument is hardly a proof of the non-Pauline origin of vv. 1.3b-4. The participial construction is the most natural way in Greek, at which Paul had quite a

⁹⁹ Wright 2002b, p. 416.

¹⁰⁰ In the order of points I follow the summary of Poythress 1976, p. 180. Although N.T. Wright could be right when he says that 1.3b-4 is considered non-Pauline to tone down Paul's political challenges and to de-Judaize his theology, it is quite tricky to prove this without entering the battlefield of correct and incorrect presuppositions (N.T. Wright, "Paul and Caesar: A New Reading of Romans", in: C. Bartholomew et al. (eds.), *A Royal Priesthood? – The Use of the Bible Ethically and Politically – A Dialogue with Oliver O'Donovan* [SHS vol. 3; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002], pp. 173-93, here p. 178; Wright 2002b, p. 417).

¹⁰¹ Käsemann 1973, p. 8; Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 147; Dunn 1988a, p. 5.

¹⁰² Schweizer 1963, p. 181; Fitzmyer 1993, p. 230.

¹⁰³ Schweizer 1963, p. 180; Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 148; Fitzmyer 1993, p. 230.

¹⁰⁴ C.H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (MNTC; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947 [1932]), pp. 4-5; Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 148; Fitzmyer 1993, p. 230.

¹⁰⁵ Schweizer 1963, p. 180; Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 148.

¹⁰⁶ Schweizer 1963, p. 180; Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 147; Dunn 1988a, p. 5; Fitzmyer 1993, p. 230.

¹⁰⁷ Schweizer 1963, p. 180; Dunn 1973, pp. 62-3; Dunn 1988a, p. 5.

dab hand, to express a syntactical relationship with *tou huiou autou* (v. 3a). Anyone could have written these participles, including Paul.¹⁰⁸

- Those who use the second argument argue, of course, that the use of *sarx* and *pneuma* in 1.3b-4 is non-Pauline. This requires an examination of this antithesis, which will be done later on in this chapter.
- The third point has been dealt with above, and it will of course be demonstrated in this thesis that Paul was very much interested in a Davidic descent of Jesus, only not in a genealogical way, but with a specific eye for the scriptural promises (v. 2) about the son of David.
- The fifth argument is a bit artificial for two reasons. Firstly, granted that Jesus' death on the cross is an important theme in Paul's thought, which is the assumption behind this argument, to (always) expect an occurrence of the word *σταυρός* (*stauros* – 'cross') is opposed to the relative infrequency of this word in the Pauline vocabulary.¹⁰⁹ The weight of a word or a theme in Pauline theology doesn't always come about in word statistics. Secondly, the death of Jesus is already presumed in these verses by the phrase *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν* (*ex anastaseos nekroon* – 'by the resurrection of the dead').
- The seventh argument may well be correct, but a 'traditional' summary of God's good news does not necessarily mean a non-Pauline summary, certainly not when Paul is considered as one of the more influential creators of the early Christian traditional message.¹¹⁰ Whatever we make of summaries as 1 Tim. 3.16, the truth of the seventh argument probably remains a bit intangible if it is left without any other supporting arguments.

The second, fourth and sixth argument require therefore some more thought, which will be done in the exegesis of vv. 3b-4 below.¹¹¹ It can be said in advance that the sixth argument is certainly true on the lexical level. However, if there is a way to make a Pauline sense out of these rare phrases – and we will 'seek first' for this way – the non-Pauline origin of these verses cannot be demonstrated solely from a *hapax legomenon*. If the not yet refuted

¹⁰⁸ Poythress 1976, p. 180. *Contra* Käsemann 1973, p. 8; Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 147; Dunn 1988a, p. 5. One is left a bit gobsmacked actually by Beasley-Murray's suggestion that the careful formulation points towards a non-Pauline origin of these verses. As if the by now experienced apostle would not be able to dictate such a formulaic statement (cf. Wright 2002b, p. 417).

¹⁰⁹ 1 Cor. 1.17-8; Gal. 5.11, 6.12, 14; Eph. 2.16; Phil. 2.8, 3.18; Col. 1.20, 2.14.

¹¹⁰ I presume that the word 'traditional' is used to indicate the pre-Pauline early Christian tradition.

¹¹¹ The first part of the sixth argument is closely related to the fourth argument, which can be seen as the theological implication of what is perceived lexically. The meaning of *horisthentos huiou theou* and the allegedly adoptionist christology will therefore be treated together.

arguments put forward by those who think Paul quoted a pre-Pauline formula are correct, it could be said that these points *together* make it into a probable hypothesis. However, it is hardly as certain as it is sometimes assumed to be that such a formula existed.¹¹²

4.3.3. How to deal with vv. 1.3b-4?

Say this were the case, that Paul is quoting a (confessional) formula from early Christianity not composed by him, where would that leave us in dealing with this text?¹¹³ Would that leave us going with Bultmann's idea that Paul would have said something he did not mean, as a theological *captatio benevolentiae* of unknown Roman congregations?¹¹⁴ Or would that leave us saying that Paul did not question the facts he just quoted, but wasn't really bothered about them either?¹¹⁵ When Paul quotes a text from the Old Testament, he does so with a specific exegesis in mind and an interpretation that fits right into the line of the argument he follows. If vv. 3b-4 are pre-Pauline and quoted on purpose, it is probably the wisest decision to take Paul to really mean what he writes here, so that these verses become part of what Paul wrote to the Romans.¹¹⁶ In other words, while quoting Matthew V. Novenson again: "*Pre-Pauline ideas, once used by Paul, become functionally Pauline and must be interpreted as meaningful parts of the texts in which they fall.*"¹¹⁷

Apart from the question of how we deal with quotations by Paul, some more *a priori* remarks can be made about the concept of the 'pre-Pauline confessional formula'. First of all, how are we to know this formula? Paul's writings are the first written documents we have from and about someone whose religious loyalty is with Messiah Jesus, so we don't have any 'Christian' source before him, unless we can clearly identify such a source in Paul's writings.¹¹⁸ It is therefore not easy to be sure whether or not such an identified 'creedal statement' had a *Sitz im Leben* as such in early Christian congregations. Secondly, if vv. 3b-4 contain a confessional formula or creedal statement, where is it from, how did Paul come to know it, and how would the Romans recognise it as such? If Paul used these phrases to establish his orthodox credentials with the Roman Christians, the creed would have to be known in Rome. How did Paul know the creedal phrases used in these to him unfamiliar house-churches? It is sometimes suggested that this creed came from the 'Palestinian

¹¹² Cranfield 1975, p. 57.

¹¹³ If Paul would quote a formula he himself composed earlier, it would be completely impossible to tell so (Poynthress 1976, p. 180).

¹¹⁴ R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1952), p. 50.

¹¹⁵ Barrett 1991, p. 20.

¹¹⁶ Young 2012, p. 282 n. 17.

¹¹⁷ Novenson 2009a, p. 370 n. 56.

¹¹⁸ L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI/Leicester: William B. Eerdmans/Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), p. 43 n. 41.

Church', on the basis of Davidic sonship as an exclusively Jewish value – leaving out of consideration for a moment that Jews also lived outside the Land of Israel – and on the basis of the allegedly Semitic *pneuma hagioosunès*.¹¹⁹ But if it isn't a Roman creed, how would the Romans recognise it as a creed and accept Paul's genuinely Christian ideas?¹²⁰ Thirdly, when Paul quotes an earlier Christian tradition, as in, for example, 1 Cor. 11.23 and 15.3, he says 'I received' (παρέλαβον – *parelabon*). Why would he not mention in Rom. 1.3b-4 that he quotes something he received?

These questions could be answered by pointing towards the possible exchange of information between Prisca and Aquila and Paul, but the problems arising with a certain foisted truth of the confessional hypothesis, apart from the evaluation of the above-mentioned arguments, brings us towards the position that it is far safer and much better to not speak about 'quoting a confessional formula', but to speak about 'traditional expressions and ideas'.¹²¹ This is, after all, what we are to expect as readers of Romans after reading the traditional basis of the good news in v. 2. Besides this, although it could suit Paul rhetorically to quote a confessional formula, it is rhetorically quite unlikely that he edited or corrected it at the same time, which is what most commentators advocating the confessional hypothesis also assume. Because of this position taken in this thesis, no involvement will be sought in discussions about the exact form of a pre-Pauline formula and the amount of editing undertaken by the apostle. This is done with different results by, for example, Eta Linnemann or James Dunn.

Linnemann reconstructed a fivefold Pauline *Vorlage*: Πιστεύω εἰς Ἰησοῦν / τὸν γενόμενον ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ / τὸν ὀρισθέντα υἱὸν θεοῦ / ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγιοσύνης / ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν (*Pisteuoo eis Iêsoun / ton genomenon ek spermatos Daid / ton horisthenta huion theou / en dunamei pneumatos hagioosunès / ex anastaseos nekroon* – 'I believe in Jesus / who was born from the seed of David / who was appointed as son of God / with/by the power of the spirit of holiness / by the resurrection of the dead').¹²² Dunn thinks that Paul did not alter the words, but framed them by his own statements: *peri tou huiou autou* (v. 3a) and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (*Iêsou Christou tou kuriou hêmooon* – 'Jesus, the Messiah, our Lord'; v. 4b).¹²³

¹¹⁹ Dunn 1973, p. 50. The expression 'Palestinian Church' is a bit unfortunate for both the problematical adjective and the anachronistic noun.

¹²⁰ Morris 1988, pp. 43-4.

¹²¹ Poythress 1976, p. 182. To put the confessional formula hypothesis aside however by saying that it is "*largely speculation*" (Johnson 1971, p. 127 n. 22), would not be my choice of words, for speculations and hypotheses are, provided that they are reasonable and substantiated, part of the exegetical task.

¹²² Linnemann 1971, p. 124.

¹²³ Dunn 1973, pp. 60-1.

Paul Beasley-Murray criticised an opinion other than his by saying that "*too much is left to conjecture*", but this same judgement could be applied to his and the other editorial reconstructions, for there is neither a firmly established idea about the words the earliest Christian congregations used, nor a comparable confessional formula to work with in tracing Paul's editorial habits.¹²⁴

With the necessary *a priori* reservations in mind and because of some unconvincing arguments, this central passage is considered as authentically Pauline. By this is meant that everything that is in there is said on purpose by Paul and fits in his lines of thought, but he may have used traditional words used by others too.

4.4. Paul's confession – Jesus' identity

Before we pay attention to the intertextual traditions Paul works with in 1.3b-4 and the christology to be described after careful examination of these traditions, the words themselves – not at all the most obvious in meaning – require some remarks.

Paul explains the identity of the 'son of God' in two ways. Jesus was born from the seed of David with respect to the flesh (1), and was appointed as son of God with power with respect to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead (2). This twofold explanation opens in both lines with a definite article and an aorist participle: τοῦ γενομένου (*genomenou* – 'who was born') and τοῦ ὀρισθέντος (*horisthentos* – 'who was appointed'). Although the use of participles in this way might resemble the passive participles in the Qumranic interpretation of Ps. 2¹²⁵, it is not necessary to assume that this specific Hebrew idiom was on Paul's mind. The verb used by Paul to indicate the physical descent of Jesus is γίνομαι (*ginomai*), "*to come into being through the process of birth or natural production, be born, be produced.*"¹²⁶ The only other Pauline use of this verb in the same sense is to be found in Gal. 4.4, and, both there and here, it can rightly be paraphrased 'to be born', apparently the Pauline way of describing coming into being through birth.¹²⁷

Jesus' birth is specified by his descent, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ (*ek spermatos David* – 'from the seed of David'). When Paul uses the word σπέρμα (*sperma* – 'seed'), he usually

¹²⁴ Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 150, criticising H. Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre. Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1970³), pp. 200-1, who suggested a division of 1.3b-4 in two separated confessional formulae.

¹²⁵ Allen 1971, p. 104.

¹²⁶ F.W. Danker & W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000³), pp. 196-9.

Some manuscripts have γεννωμένου (*gennoomenou*, from γεννάω – *gennaoo*, 'to give birth' or 'to beget'). This variant reading is rightly rejected in NTG²⁷, for there is no significant external evidence in this case and it evidently is a removing of the ambiguity of *genomenou* (Dunn 1988a, p. 4 n. c).

¹²⁷ Sanday & Headlam 1964, p. 6.

refers to Abraham and his offspring and indicates a collective rather than a single person.¹²⁸ However, because the phrase *ek spermatis David* evokes the words of 2 Sam. 7.12 LXX (τὸ σπέρμα σου – *to sperma sou* – 'your seed'), where it designates not a collective, but rather a specific royal successor to David, it can be used here by Paul to refer to the Davidic descent of the single man Jesus.¹²⁹ Thus far this explanation of the identity of this 'son of God' could be quite straightforward, but it is immediately complicated by two brain-racking words: *κατὰ σάρκα* (*kata sarka* – 'with respect to the flesh'). These words need to be clarified in their opposition to *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης* (*kata pneuma hagiosunēs* – 'with respect to the spirit of holiness') of the next line.¹³⁰

4.4.1. The meaning of *sarx* in v. 1.3b

One could in this case work with the conclusions of the vast amount of previous examinations of the word *σάρξ* (*sarx* – 'flesh') in the Pauline literature, such as Schweizer's: "*the contrasting pair σάρξ - πνεῦμα signifies for him [Paul, MV] the antithesis between the sinful human being and his behaviour and the holy God and his acting.*"¹³¹ However, because this conclusion might sound counter-intuitive as the meaning of *kata sarka* in v. 3b, it is perhaps better to examine the Pauline texts ourselves. By interpreting phrases and verses, the Pauline usage of the word *sarx* can be divided into nine related, but distinguishable categories. These are:

1. *Sarx* denoting an individual person ('no *sarx*' = 'no one'): Rom. 3.20; 1 Cor. 1.29; Gal. 1.16, 2.16; Col. 2.1.
2. *Sarx* as a 'neutral' term for the human body: 1 Cor. 6.16 (quotation of Gen. 2.24), 15.39; 2 Cor. 7.1, 5, 12.7; Gal. 4.13-4; Eph. 5.29, 31 (quotation of Gen. 2.24), 6.12; Col. 1.22, 24; Phlm. 1.16.¹³²

¹²⁸ Rom. 4.13, 16, 18, 9.7-8, 11.1 (Paul as a descendant of Abraham!); 2 Cor. 11.22 (again, Paul as a descendant of Abraham); Gal. 3.29. The exceptions are the quotation of Is. 1.9 in Rom. 9.29, where *sperma* indicates the people of Israel, the agricultural metaphor in 1 Cor. 15.37-8, the christological exegesis in Gal. 3.16, 19, and, of course, the Davidic *sperma* in 2 Tim. 2.8.

¹²⁹ Hays 1989, p. 85. According to Hays, the singular noun in this text makes Paul's christocentric exegesis of the grammatically singular 'seed' in Gen. 13.15 in Gal. 3.16 'less perverse', for Paul made use of the (rabbinic) hermeneutical method called '*gezera shawa*'. With this method, similar phrases in the Bible can be linked together exegetically (G. Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* [München: C.H. Beck, 2011⁹], p. 30).

Quotations from LXX are taken from the edition of L.C.L. Brenton (ed.), *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011¹⁴).

¹³⁰ The opposed phrases both begin with the qualifying *kata*, instead of an opposition of *kata sarka* with ἐν δυνάμει (*en dunamei* – 'with power'; *contra* Van Bruggen 2007, p. 245).

¹³¹ Schweizer 1963, p. 181 (my translation from German).

¹³² Even if one thinks that Paul's anthropological view always regards the human body without redemption as a sinful body, the element of sin is not emphasised nor necessarily presumed in most of these passages.

3. *Sarx* indicating the (limited) life on earth, sometimes carrying overtones of 'worldliness': 1 Cor. 7.28; 2 Cor. 1.17, 4.11, 10.2-3, 11.18; Gal. 2.20; Eph. 2.14, 6.5; Phil. 1.22, 24; Col. 3.22.
4. *Sarx* having to do with circumcision (in a negative way): Rom. 2.28-9; Gal. 6.12-3; Eph. 2.11; Phil. 3.3-4; Col. 2.11, 13.

Although the 1st and 2nd categories could be useful for the christology of the ecclesiological model 'body of Christ', and can make sense of *sarx* in that way, they are not suitable for the specific phrase *kata sarka* in 1.3b.¹³³ This same judgement applies to the 3rd and 4th categories.

5. *Sarx* meaning 'flesh' as sinful and/or religiously restricted: Rom. 7.18, 25, 13.14; 1 Cor. 15.50; Gal. 5.13; Eph. 2.3; Col. 2.11, 13, 18, 23.

This category seems to be somewhat more relevant with regard to the upcoming eighth category, but these texts lack the explicit opposition of 1.3b-4 of *sarx* with *pneuma*.

6. *Sarx* denoting the descent or physical genealogical relationship of someone: Rom. 4.1, 9.3, 5, 11.14.

In three of the texts from this category (Rom. 4.1, 9.3, 5) this descent is described with exactly the same words as in 1.3b, *kata sarka*. Unfortunately, even though 9.5 is about the Israelite descent of the Messiah, these texts would only really help in the exegesis of 1.3b if there would be any words corresponding to the antithetical *kata pneuma hagiosunès*. This is not the case, so we must take heed of the possibility that *kata sarka* can be used in a completely neutral way, but carry on looking for more useful parallels, where *sarx* is opposed to something.¹³⁴

7. *Sarx* in opposition to ἐπαγγελία (*epangelia* – 'promise'): Rom. 9.8; Gal. 4.23.
8. *Sarx* in (explicit) opposition to *pneuma*: Rom. 7.5-6, 8.3-5, 12-3; 1 Cor. 5.5; Gal. 3.3, 4.29, 5.16-7, 19-24, 6.8.

¹³³ On the ecclesiological phrase 'body of Christ' as a name for the messianic community, a subject related to the subject of this thesis, especially in Ephesians and Colossians, see the doctoral dissertation of J.J. Meuzelaar, *Der Leib des Messias – Eine exegetische Studie über den Gedanken vom Leib Christi in den Paulusbrieffen* (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1979 [1961]).

¹³⁴ The case of Rom. 4.1 seems to be a bit more complicated. Without discussing this passage, I merely refer to R.B. Hays, "'Have We Found Abraham to Be Our Forefather According to the Flesh?'" – A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1" (*NovT* vol. 27/1, 1985), pp. 76-98; Hays 1989, pp. 54-5; Wright 2002b, pp. 489-90.

Although the seventh category might somehow be relevant in interpreting the prescript of Romans ('promised beforehand', v. 2), this opposition of flesh and promise is not found in vv. 3b-4. The eighth category is more prominent in the literature on the opposition of *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma hagioosunès*.¹³⁵ In this category *sarx* carries the dominant notion of sin and inadequacy, whereas the spirit/Spirit in these passages exceeds these notions in a renewed and divine way. However, in all of these texts, the word *sarx* is not the sole negative component of the statement, but is marked in this negative way by words such as ἁμαρτία (*hamartia* – 'sin'; Rom. 7.5, 8.3); θάνατος (*thanatos* – 'death'; Rom. 7.5, 8.13); δικάϊωμα (*dikaïoma* – here: 'judgement'; Rom. 8.4); σατανᾶς (*satanas* – 'Satan'; 1 Cor. 5.5); ἀνοήτος (*anoètos* – 'foolish'; Gal. 3.3); διώκω (*diookoo* – 'to persecute'; Gal. 4.29); ἐπιθυμία (*epithumia* – 'desire'; Gal. 5.16-7, 24); φθορά (*phthora* – 'destruction'; Gal. 6.8); or a bunch of deeds opposed to the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5.19-21). One can therefore conclude that *sarx* obtains its negative meaning ('sinful flesh') by a negative context, and hardly on its own in opposition to *pneuma*. Because these negative connotations are absent from Rom. 1.3b – this is, after all, a passage dealing with birth¹³⁶ and kinship – this passage does not fit in the exegetical pattern of the regular *sarx-pneuma* antithesis.¹³⁷

Therefore an attempt will be made in interpreting *kata sarka* – *kata pneuma hagioosunès* in line with the ninth and last category of the meanings of *sarx*.

9. *Sarx* denoting a limited, one-sided or even insufficient way of knowing: Rom. 6.19; 1 Cor. 1.26, 10.18; 2 Cor. 5.16; Col. 2.5, 18; 1 Tim. 3.16.¹³⁸

The possibility of reading 1.3b-4 in line with a hermeneutical meaning of *kata sarka* was brought to my attention by Daniel Boyarin.¹³⁹ In patristic exegesis, the terms *sarx* and *pneuma* were understood and used as hermeneutical terms, referring to a literal meaning of the text and an allegorical meaning respectively.¹⁴⁰ Boyarin argues, in line with these old notions, that *kata sarka* in 1.3b is used by Paul as a neutral hermeneutical term, which

¹³⁵ The opposition in vv. 3b-4 is interpreted in line with this category by Schweizer 1963, Linnemann 1971 and Dunn 1973.

¹³⁶ Original sin is not a theological category of thought here, naturally. Nor is 'virginal conception' (!), *contra* J.C. O'Neill, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975), p. 27.

¹³⁷ Even if it would be thus, the fact that 1.3b-4 is the sole application of this antithesis to Christ could very well be the one exception to the regular pattern. Cf. Poythress 1976, p. 181.

¹³⁸ On the interpretation of 1 Cor. 10.18, a difficult passage, see Hays 1989, pp. 87-104. With regard to 2 Cor. 5.16 commentators are divided over the question whether *kata sarka* is to be connected with 'Christ' in this verse, or with 'knowing'.

¹³⁹ D. Boyarin, *A Radical Jew – Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA/London: University of California Press, 1994), especially pp. 69-73.

¹⁴⁰ Boyarin 1994, p. 69.

means that Jesus, when interpreted with respect to the flesh, literally and physically is a descendant of David.¹⁴¹ We have seen that this meaning is used in Romans in the above-mentioned sixth category too, although these passages (4.1, 9.3, 5, 11.14) lack an opposing *kata pneuma* (*hagioosunès*). The presence of this latter clause in 1.4 would then qualify the appointment as son of God with power as an allegorical way of seeing the Messiah.¹⁴² According to Boyarin, this hermeneutical term 'allegory' is not meant as merely a metaphor or as a disregard of the historical meaning, but as a true, spiritual and ontological condition of Jesus.¹⁴³ In this interpretation the *kata sarka*-view of Jesus is not evil and not pejorative.¹⁴⁴ However, this exegesis of vv. 1.3b-4 is somehow inadequate and unconvincing too. Firstly, quite some confusion can arise by using the hermeneutical term 'allegory' as a qualification of the christology. Secondly, Boyarin's statement that "*this* [fleshly, MV] *mode of Christ's existence is inferior to that of the risen Christ*", need not be the logical conclusion of what is said by him before this.¹⁴⁵ The exceeding christology of 1.4 does not automatically render the 'christology of the flesh' in 1.3b inferior. Thirdly, Boyarin's exegesis of 1.4 is not entirely satisfying, for the words in v. 4 are not merely *kata pneuma*, but *kata pneuma hagioosunès*. He paid no attention to the last word of this phrase.

4.4.2. Proposed interpretation of the parallelism

The interpretation of *kata sarka* – *kata pneuma hagioosunès* proposed in this thesis is twofold. Before this interpretation is explained, however, the meaning of the words *pneuma hagioosunès* will be elucidated. It is sometimes said that 'spirit of holiness' is a semitism, so that we actually have to read 'holy Spirit' (*πνεῦμα ἅγιον* – *pneuma hagion*).¹⁴⁶ This is by no means proved philologically, for the evidence usually cited in this case is interpreted wrongly if one reads *pneuma hagioosunès* as 'holy Spirit'. The words *pneuma hagioosunès* are supposed to be a literal translation of the Hebrew רוּחַ קֹדֶשׁ (*rūach qōdesh* – 'holy Spirit'), but LXX and the other Greek translators of the Hebrew Bible always render these words as τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (*to pneuma to hagion*), and never as *pneuma hagioosunès*.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴¹ Boyarin 1994, p. 71.

¹⁴² Boyarin 1994, p. 71.

¹⁴³ Boyarin 1994, p. 71.

¹⁴⁴ Boyarin 1994, p. 72. *Contra* Dunn 1973, pp. 44, 49.

¹⁴⁵ Boyarin 1994, p. 72. This objection applies to Légasse 2000, p. 567, too.

¹⁴⁶ Dunn 1973, p. 40 n. 3, and p. 58; Fitzmyer 1993, p. 234. This proposal does not solve the difficulty of the phrase, for *kata* is not used instrumentally, as if Jesus was appointed as son of God with power *by* the holy Ghost.

¹⁴⁷ Ps. 50.11 LXX (51.11 MT) and Is. 63.10-1 LXX. Quotations from MT are taken from the edition of K. Elliger & W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997⁵).

There are actually only two non-Pauline occurrences of the words *pneuma hagioosunès*. The best known of these two is from the second century B.C.E. Testament of Levi 18.11. In this text, however, one can hardly interpret *pneuma hagioosunès* as 'holy Spirit', as a divine identity, instead of an operational power of holiness. Besides this, it is not certain at all that there is a Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic) *Vorlage* of the Greek text of the Testament of Levi.¹⁴⁸ The second non-Pauline occurrence of *pneuma hagioosunès* is found on a Jewish amulet (φυλακτήριον – *phulaktèrion*), the so-called amulet of Acre.¹⁴⁹

Unfortunately, I have not been able to find important information about this amulet of Acre¹⁵⁰, such as its date, the exact form of the text or the context in which it was found. Peterson refers to an Italian article from 1948 and I presume that the information could be found there, but since I have not been able to see this article, I am not certain about that.¹⁵¹ The Greek text I cite comes from Peterson's reconstruction of the phylactery. Because there seems to have been a brief discussion about whether it is a Jewish or Christian amulet¹⁵², I presume that it is dated in the first or second century C.E.

One can ask whether an amulet can be cited as (sufficient) evidence in discerning a Semitic *Vorlage* to a Pauline phrase. In fact, because the text of this amulet does not contain the words *pneuma hagioosunès* in the exact word-order of the Pauline use, but [τ]ὸ ἁγίωσόν[ης πνε]ῦμα ([*t*]o *agiooson[ès pne]uma*), the answer to this question will be clear: one cannot use this amulet to prove a Semitic (and therefore non-Pauline) origin of Rom. 1.3b-4.¹⁵³ However, we can use this phylactery in clarifying the meaning of the rare combination of *pneuma* and *hagioosunè(s)* in Rom. 1.4.

In the so-called amulet of Acre the words *to hagioosonès pneuma* signify the glory (δόξα – *doxa*) of God.¹⁵⁴ Although this word does not occur in T. Levi 18.11, it is in the background of this text and there are two reasons to assume this. Firstly, T. Levi 18.7 uses in a synonymous parallelism both *doxa* and πνεῦμα ἁγιασμοῦ (*pneuma hagiasmou* – 'spirit of

¹⁴⁸ H.C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha – Volume One: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011²), pp. 775-828, here pp. 776-7.

¹⁴⁹ For an interpretation of this amulet, see E. Peterson, "Das Amulett von Acre", in: idem, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen* (Freiburg: Herder, 1959), pp. 346-54.

¹⁵⁰ A clarification is perhaps useful for Dutch readers. In English, and sometimes in German too, 'Acre' is the name for the Galilean city called 'Akko' in Dutch. This amulet in Greek is found therefore in the Land of Israel.

¹⁵¹ Peterson 1959, p. 346, cites A. Vogliano & R. Preisendanz, "Laminetta magica siciliana Tav. 1" (*Acme* vol. I, fasc. 1/2, 1948), pp. 73-85.

¹⁵² Peterson 1959, p. 353. He argues for a Jewish origin, which I will accept in this thesis.

¹⁵³ *Contra Légasse* 2000, p. 569 n. 24.

¹⁵⁴ Peterson 1959, p. 352.

holiness/sanctification'), with the latter phrase being really close to *pneuma hagioosunès*: "And the glory [doxa] of the Most High shall burst forth upon him [the priestly Messiah, 18.2, MV], and the spirit of understanding and sanctification [pneuma... hagiou] shall rest upon him."¹⁵⁵ Secondly, T. Levi 18.11 refers to the 'Tree of Life' (ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς – *xulon tès dzooès*): "And he [the priestly Messiah, MV] will grant to the saints to eat of the tree of life; the spirit of holiness [pneuma hagioosunès] shall be upon them."¹⁵⁶ This 'Tree of Life' is the place where God's glory (*doxa*) takes a rest, according to, amongst other texts, the late first century C.E. Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch (2 Enoch) 8.3.¹⁵⁷

It is therefore not true that the Pauline use of *pneuma hagioosunès* is a synonymous semitism for *pneuma hagian* as a to be distinguished divine being.¹⁵⁸ Far more likely to be true is the interpretation of the phrase *pneuma hagioosunès* in Rom. 1.4 as signifying the spiritual and divine force of holiness, coming from God's glory, operative in human beings, as in T. Levi 18.11.¹⁵⁹ This does not rule out the possibility that the holy Ghost is somewhere behind this operative power of God's glory, but the attention is not drawn towards that divine person, but towards what happens to human beings in this spiritual way.¹⁶⁰

The first interpretation of the *kata sarka – kata pneuma hagioosunès* succession, concluding from what is said above about both *sarx* and *pneuma hagioosunès*, could be named a christological interpretation, by which it is meant that the words mean something in relation to the stages of Jesus' life. The *kata sarka*-clause points at the human descent of Jesus: born from the seed of David.¹⁶¹ This is not said pejoratively or in a derogatory way, but quite matter-of-factly¹⁶², just as 'all flesh' (πᾶσα σὰρξ – *pasa sarx*) has a human birth and

¹⁵⁵ Translation by Kee 2011.

¹⁵⁶ Translation by Kee 2011.

¹⁵⁷ F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch", in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha – Volume One: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011²), pp. 91-221. See for further textual references Peterson 1959, p. 351, especially n. 24.

¹⁵⁸ Without the textual evidence used as arguments as above, this is noted by Sanday & Headlam 1964, pp. 2, 7; Johnson 1971, p. 132; Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 151; Klaiber 2009, p. 19.

¹⁵⁹ Peterson 1959, p. 352. On its own the amulet of Acre cannot prove this idea behind the words *pneuma hagioosunès* in Rom. 1.4 (so J.M. Scott, "ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in Romans 8:15, 23", in: idem, *Adoption as Sons of God* [WUNT vol. II/48; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992], pp. 221-66, here p. 228 n. 28). However, combined with the interpretation of T. Levi 18.11, it probably can.

¹⁶⁰ The words ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου (*en dunamei pneumatos hagiou* – 'in/with the power of the holy Spirit') of Rom. 15.13 are within the epistle lexically the closest to the phrase of 1.4 and can therefore point at the holy Ghost being in the background of 1.4. Cf. Whitsett 2000, p. 673.

¹⁶¹ A translation of *kata sarka* as 'with respect to his flesh' could be proposed, for in densely formulated phrases as Rom. 1.3b-4 an omission of αὐτοῦ (*autou* – 'his') is not unthinkable (F. Blass, A. Debrunner & F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001¹⁸], §479, pp. 409-10). Even if there is a grammatical improbability in this proposal, it is not too far off from what is possibly meant by Paul.

¹⁶² As, for this same Messiah, in 9.5.

origin.¹⁶³ This human descent could therefore be described as the way Jesus shared in Adamic humanity and represented it.¹⁶⁴ The *kata pneuma hagiosunēs*-clause points towards the event by which Jesus' functional identity was 'updated' to being 'son of God with power', the resurrection of the dead.¹⁶⁵ Connected with this event was a 'spirit of holiness', an attribute of this heightened identity.¹⁶⁶ This needs to be clarified by paying attention to the words ὀρισθέντος (*horisthentos* – 'who was appointed'), ἐν δυνάμει (*en dunamei* – 'with power') and ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν (*anastaseos nekroon* – 'resurrection of the dead').

The participle *horisthentos*¹⁶⁷, from the verb ὀρίζω (*horidzoo*), is a word that, in an exegetical tradition related to Ps. 2.7, has to do with a royal decree and/or with an enthronement.¹⁶⁸ A certain reluctance can be noticed among some commentators to attach this meaning to it, for it would create a new status of the person being appointed, but this reluctance might be due to an unnecessary christological confusion.¹⁶⁹ Although the pre-existence of the Messiah is not an intended category of thought in these verses¹⁷⁰, the appointment of Jesus by the resurrection of the dead does not mean that only at that moment Jesus truly became son of God.¹⁷¹ The reader of the epistle to the Romans – not regarding for this moment earlier instruction in the apostolic faith by other people – already

¹⁶³ Johnson 1971, p. 131; Cranfield 1975, pp. 60, 836; Fitzmyer 1993, p. 234; Byrskog 1997, p. 43. Cf. Rom. 3.20; 1 Cor. 1.29; Gal. 2.16.

¹⁶⁴ Fitzmyer 1993, p. 234; Wright 2002b, p. 418. This idea works best with an incorporative christology. More about that in chapters 6-8.

¹⁶⁵ Dunn 1988a, p. 14. Even though I would agree in saying that this post-resurrection identity of Jesus includes a higher christological status in comparison with the *kata sarka*-identity, I do not conclude from this that this first stage of Jesus' life is therefore now to be seen as inferior. According to Paul, Jesus' earthly life was qualified messianically too and is intimately connected to the post-resurrection messianic identity.

¹⁶⁶ This quality, the 'spirit of holiness', can be appropriated in anticipation by the believers in a pre-resurrection or pre-glorification state of life, if we reckon with an incorporative christology. Cf. 2 Cor. 7.1 and 1 Thess. 3.13.

¹⁶⁷ The variant reading of the Latin manuscript tradition (in Greek: προορισθέντος – *pro-oristhentos* – 'predetermined') is to be dismissed. This theological adaptation of the text is perhaps elicited by προεπιγγείλατο (*pro-epèngeilato*) in v. 2.

¹⁶⁸ This is demonstrated by Allen 1971, pp. 104-8. Other New Testament texts with this meaning are Acts 10.42, 17.31, and Heb. 4.7. To be added are probably, but less obviously, Lk. 22.22 and Acts 2.23.

Perhaps this reference to an enthronement also refers to the enthronement (or apotheosis) of an emperor. However, because of the strong exegetical tradition that stands behind this word, I doubt whether this is a *double entendre* by Paul too. It doesn't seem to be impossible.

¹⁶⁹ For example, both Wright 2002b, p. 417 n. 26, and Van Bruggen 2007, p. 245, present alternative translations that mean something like 'to define more clearly what was already there'. Not wrong, but slightly confusing the point of a transition in the functional status of the *huios theou*.

¹⁷⁰ *Contra* P. Stuhlmacher, "Theologische Probleme des Römerbriefpräskripts" (*EvTh* vol. 27/7, 1967), pp. 374-89, here p. 382. Pre-existence as a theological category of thought suits passages like Gal. 4.4, Phil. 2.6-11, or, for that matter, John 1 better than Rom. 1.3b-4.

¹⁷¹ *Contra* Dunn 1973, p. 55 n. 3, who, at the time of writing (note the absence of this notion in Dunn 1988a, pp. 13-4) seems to read too much adoptionism of later centuries in this verse (cf. Poythress 1976, p. 181).

knew Jesus as *huiou autou* (v. 3a). Jesus is not appointed as (Davidic) son of God, but as (Davidic) son of God *with power* (*en dunamei*).

The words *en dunamei* should probably be connected adjectivally with *huiou theou* instead of adverbially with *horisthentos* ('appointed powerfully'), for this verb is strong enough in itself.¹⁷² This syntactical connection contrasts the use of *huiou* here with the use in v. 3a.¹⁷³ The adverbial interpretation of *en dunamei* is possibly transferred (wrongly) from 1 Cor. 6.14 and 2 Cor. 13.4.

This 'power' is a quality often ascribed to God in the Pauline letters.¹⁷⁴ By this power Jesus is enabled to rule as a Davidic son of God when his human life is continued in a distinct second phase *ex anastaseos nekroon*, 'by the resurrection of the dead'.¹⁷⁵ Instead of pointing specifically at Jesus being raised from death, Paul formulated this phrase more generally. It is therefore most likely that Paul had in mind not only Jesus' resurrection, but his resurrection functioning as an inauguration of the general resurrection of the dead expected at the arrival of the coming age.¹⁷⁶ Because this general resurrection of the dead had not come in Paul's lifetime, the fleshly mode of life isn't over yet, but somehow the spiritual mode of life has come already during the pre-resurrection human life. And therefore Jesus' identity consists of both flesh (*kata sarka*) and spirit (*kata pneuma hagioosunès*).¹⁷⁷

Because we have seen in the amulet of Acre and T. Levi 18.11 that *pneuma hagioosunès* is the operative force of God's glory, Rom. 6.4 comes to mind too.¹⁷⁸ In this verse, we read that "*the Messiah was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father*" (ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς – *ègerthè Christos ek nekroon dia tès doxès tou patros*). What this could mean in relation to 1.4 is that at the resurrection of the

¹⁷² Byrskog 1997, p. 27 n. 7.

¹⁷³ Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 153.

¹⁷⁴ Rom. 1.16, 20, 9.17, 15.13, 19; 1 Cor. 1.18, 24, 2.4-5, 4.20, 5.4, 6.14; 2 Cor. 4.7, 6.7, 12.9, 13.4; Eph. 1.19, 3.7, 16, 20; Phil. 3.10; Col. 1.11, 29; 1 Thess. 1.5; 2 Thess. 1.11; 2 Tim. 1.7-8, 3.5. For 'power' as a term for rulers who are not God, see Rom. 8.38; 1 Cor. 15.24; Eph. 1.21; 2 Thess. 2.9.

¹⁷⁵ It is not entirely clear if the preposition *ἐκ* (*ek*) signifies a temporal or a causal qualification of the resurrection of the dead. Paul's use of this preposition is not unambiguous. Perhaps this distinction need not be made, so that the resurrection is both the moment of and the basis of the functional transformation of Jesus (Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 153).

¹⁷⁶ Dunn 1973, p. 56; Wright 2002b, p. 419. These two separate events can therefore not be seen apart from each other (cf. 1 Cor. 15.12-3).

¹⁷⁷ Dunn 1973, p. 56. The diverse meanings of the word *sarx* become obvious once again, for the third category mentioned on p. 33 above can be related to these distinguished stages of life. Cf. the anthropology of 2 Cor. 7.1.

¹⁷⁸ Peterson 1959, p. 352. Unfortunately, Erik Peterson sees the instrumentality in this verse also in Rom. 1.4. If this would be true, the two different phrases would essentially mean the same. However, *kata* in 1.4 is not used instrumentally (see p. 35 n. 146 above).

dead, which happened through the *doxa* of God the Father, the operative power of this glory, the *pneuma hagioosunès*, became attached to Jesus.

However, this interpretation of Rom. 1.4 in relation to 6.4 can only happen after having read 6.4. Because the first readers of Romans did not start in the 6th chapter of the letter¹⁷⁹, but started with the prescript, we perhaps have to look for a more reader-orientated approach to the succession of *kata sarka* – *kata pneuma hagioosunès* too. The proposed second interpretation might therefore be named a 'hermeneutical' interpretation. This refers not to hermeneutics as solely a way of interpreting an (ancient) text, but, in a broader definition, as a reflection upon the way one views the textual world one lives in. For one who encounters Jesus – in this case, through apostolic proclamation and the reading of Paul's letter – the first way of seeing Jesus is with respect to the flesh. This means that his life, which began with the Davidic kinship, is seen as something that truly happened and continues to have its value, even though it has now been ended by Jesus' death. The succession of the *kata sarka*-clause with the *kata pneuma hagioosunès*-clause points therefore towards a restriction set upon this first clause. The human life of Jesus carries truth and is not to be marginalised, but by his death and resurrection it is not enough anymore to see Jesus only *kata sarka*, for this truth is not the whole truth about Jesus now.¹⁸⁰ Those who knew Jesus' identity during his earthly life, need to update their christology in the light of the new event of the resurrection, for otherwise they would not be able to process the post-resurrection christology Paul displayed. There is a christology surpassing the level of the flesh and containing Jesus' resurrected life *kata pneuma hagioosunès*. In this stage of Jesus' life he was enthroned as son of God with power and therefore the resurrection cannot be left out of the way Jesus is to be seen by human beings according to Paul.¹⁸¹

4.4.3. *Jesus, the Messiah, our Lord (v. 4b)*

Both these ways of seeing Jesus – as a Davidic son and as a divine son – form his one present identity. And, just as Paul qualified himself at the start of this letter as a slave of Messiah Jesus, he now relates himself and his Roman audience to him with a threefold confessional designation: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (*Ièsou Christou tou kuriou hèmooon* – 'Jesus, the Messiah, our Lord'), thus creating a fine chiasmic wording in vv. 1 and

¹⁷⁹ Of course, they could not have done this, for the division of the letter in chapters was done in the early 13th century by Stephen Langton (Ehrman 2008b, p. 493).

¹⁸⁰ Cranfield 1975, p. 60. This interpretation is a bit indebted to the one proposed in Boyarin 1994 and his use of the ninth category of meaning of *sarx*, but diverges from it in not viewing the *kata sarka*-clause as made inferior by the second clause, and in not using the confusing term 'allegorical'.

¹⁸¹ Even though the words are not *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma hagioosunès*, but ἐν σαρκί (*en sarki* – 'in the flesh') and ἐν πνεύματι (*en pneumati* – 'in the spirit'), 1 Tim. 3.16 could very well be interpreted with this same 'hermeneutical' succession of *sarx* and *pneuma*.

4.¹⁸² With the use of κύριος (*kurios* – 'Lord') for Jesus, there is an encounter of a *triple entendre*.¹⁸³ Firstly, besides *kurios* being a polite way of addressing someone in a higher position ('Sir'), another possible use of *kurios*, one known from life in a Greco-Roman society, is that of 'lord' as master and owner of slaves.¹⁸⁴ This meaning is used in the New Testament in several texts and will be received by any first century C.E. speaker of Greek – Jew or Gentile.¹⁸⁵ Secondly, in LXX *kurios* is the translation for the divine name YHWH. When Jesus is named thus by a Greek-speaking Jew, it is hard to imagine his Jewish auditors not thinking of the *kurios* in the Old Testament, certainly if one considers that Paul can use *kurios* to refer to God (the Father) too.¹⁸⁶ The use of *kurios* for Jesus in this way does therefore not mean that YHWH and Jesus are identical – there are separate identifiers for these two persons – but by this title a certain community of being is expressed.¹⁸⁷ Thirdly, the title *kurios* was one of the most important titles for rulers (or, perhaps, emperors) in Greek.¹⁸⁸ If Jesus is therefore proclaimed by Paul as not only son of God with power, but as 'Lord' too, this could be quite challenging and highly polemical when addressing a Roman audience.¹⁸⁹

Having interpreted the words of Rom. 1.1-4, obtaining the full christological meaning of these phrases requires an examination of the ancient epistolary and rhetorical conventions and the intertextual and exegetical traditions. This will be done in the now following chapters 5 and 6 respectively.

¹⁸² Even if the first person plural of *hèmoon* is a mere epistolary convention on this occasion (Blass, Debrunner & Rehkopf 2001, §280, pp. 230-1), which is not at all unlikely if we see the plural form of the verb in 1.5, rhetorical and theological meanings can be attached to it as well. Whatever we think of vv. 1.3b-4 being a confessional formula, it is clear that by the last five words of v. 4 Paul is encouraging his readers to a co-confession.

¹⁸³ Paul used *kurios* as a title for Jesus in Rom. 1.4, 7, 4.24, 5.1, 11, 21, 6.23, 7.25, 8.39, 10.9, 13.14, 14.14, 15.6, 30, 16.18, 20; 1 Cor. 1.2-3, 7-9, 2.8, 5.4, 6.11, 14, 17, 8.6, 9.1, 5, 10.21, 11.23, 26-7, 12.3, 15.31, 57, 16.23; 2 Cor. 1.2-3, 14, 4.5, 14, 8.9, 11.31, 13.13; Gal. 1.3, 19, 6.14, 18; Eph. 1.2-3, 15, 17, 3.11, 5.20, 22, 6.23-4; Phil. 1.2, 2.11, 19, 3.8, 20, 4.23; Col. 1.3, 2.6, 3.17, 24; 1 Thess. 1.1, 3, 2.15, 19, 3.11, 13, 4.1-2, 5.9, 23, 28; 2 Thess. 1.1-2, 7-8, 12, 2.1, 8, 14, 16, 3.6, 12, 18; 1 Tim. 1.2, 12, 6.3, 14; 2 Tim. 1.2; Phlm. 1.3, 5, 25. Readings differing from NTG²⁷ might add or delete some texts.

To these can perhaps be added many more texts, but because 'Lord' standing on its own can refer to both Jesus and YHWH, the personal identification is often not entirely clear.

¹⁸⁴ Danker & Bauer 2000, pp. 579-9.

¹⁸⁵ Mt. 6.24, 10.24-5, 13.27, 18.25, 27, 31-2, 34, 20.8, 21.40, 24.45-6, 48, 50, 25.18-24, 26; Mk. 12.9, 13.35; Lk. 12.36-8, 42-3, 45-7, 14.21-3, 16.3, 5, 8, 13, 19.16, 18, 20, 25, 20.13, 15; Jn. 13.16, 15.15, 20; Acts 16.16, 19; Rom. 14.4; Eph. 6.5, 9; Col. 3.22-3, 4.1.

¹⁸⁶ Rom. 4.8, 9.28-9, 10.13, 16, 11.3, 34, 12.19, 14.11, 15.11; 1 Cor. 1.31, 2.16, 3.20 (all thirteen verses contain quotations from the Old Testament), 5.5, 10.26, 14.21; 2 Cor. 6.17-8, 10.17 (again, five verses with quotations); 1 Thess. 5.2; 2 Thess. 2.2; 1 Tim. 6.15.

¹⁸⁷ Cranfield 1975, p. 840.

¹⁸⁸ On this, see Wright 2005, pp. 59-79. This meaning of *kurios* might stand behind 1 Cor. 8.5.

¹⁸⁹ A brief word on Paul and politics will be said in the concluding ninth chapter.

5. ANCIENT EPISTOLARY THEORY AND ROM. 1.3B-4

Having explained the content of the words of Rom. 1.3b-4, we now have to look into the function of these verses. Because Paul's epistle to the Romans is such a long letter and theologically perhaps the most refined one among the epistles of the New Testament, treating it as a theological treatise is tempting. It is, however, both in form and in content, a letter, and therefore Romans needs to be treated as such.¹⁹⁰ Consequently, if we want to argue in this thesis that the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 forms a programmatic statement for the theology of Romans, we need to take at least a look at ancient epistolary theory in relation to Paul's exceptional expansion of the prescript.

The method used in this brief analysis is that of epistolography combined with rhetoric, and not of solely rhetoric. Two reasons can be given for this. Firstly, an ancient letter belongs to another literary category than a speech, even if that speech is written down. Secondly, the epistolary function of the prescript does not fit easily into rhetorical schemes.¹⁹¹ Although 1.16-7 is generally accepted as the programmatic statement for the theology of Romans and named with a term from ancient rhetoric as *propositio*, vv. 1-15 are usually boxed together as an *exordium*.¹⁹² This, however, would mean that the prescript (vv. 1-7) and the proem (vv. 8-15) have the same rhetorical function. From an epistolary perspective, this cannot be true, for these two elements from the letter are to be distinguished. Whereas the prescript is usually formal in tone and introductory with regards to information – Paul is therefore an exceptional writer – the proem is the transition from the introductory prescript to the actual content of the letter body.¹⁹³ This is true for Paul's epistle to the Romans as well, where 1.8-15 forms the bridge from the prescript of 1.1-7 to the programmatic statement of 1.16-7, and onwards to the letter body starting in 1.18.

The conventional and shortest way of opening a Greek letter is "A to B, Greetings".¹⁹⁴ In the prescript of Romans the element called *superscriptio* is expanded more than any other part of the prescript.¹⁹⁵ Theoretically, only the name *Paulos* would have been enough to form this element, but Paul has added to this all the words from the immediately following *doulos* up to the end of v. 6. The question should therefore be asked: What do all these extra bits mean? The answers to this question will be discussed in this chapter. However, vv. 5-6 are

¹⁹⁰ This point was expressed very clearly by Paul Schubert in the early days of New Testament epistolary research, just after the discovery of thousands of Greek letters in the Egyptian sand. See P. Schubert, "Form and Function of the Pauline Letters" (*JR* vol. 19/4, 1939), pp. 365-77.

¹⁹¹ Byrskog 1997, p. 27.

¹⁹² Wischmeyer 2012, pp. 257-9.

¹⁹³ Klauck 2006, p. 21.

¹⁹⁴ Tite 2010, p. 60.

¹⁹⁵ Klauck 2006, p. 302.

left out of consideration, for it will be argued in chapter 8 that already there we have the first evidence of the christology of vv. 3b-4 being the underlying line of thought for further passages in Romans.

5.1. Titular expansions

Paul deviated from the shortest possible formal way of introducing the sender by adding, together with some more phrases, two titular nouns, both with a further qualification: *doulos Christou Ièsou* and *klètos apostolos*. In interpreting the meaning of the additional titles, it is assumed, as it is by Samuel Byrskog, that those who heard Paul's letter read in Rome – silent reading was rare in antiquity – had at least some basic understanding of what to expect from the literary genre 'epistle'.¹⁹⁶ Because the Roman audience was mostly unaware of the Pauline epistolary style, any deviations from regular epistolary communication would be noticed and trigger extra attention.¹⁹⁷ The hearer- or reader-oriented approach to the prescript of Romans also means that unconventional phrases could be related to the identity of the historical audience of the epistle, which had at least two levels of language available: a scriptural and an imperial one.

Apart from some brief remarks by the fourth-sixth century C.E. epistolary theorists Julius Victor and Pseudo-Libanius, little is known about the ancient view on the function of the letter prescript, but the basic conviction seems to be that the relationship between sender and recipient is expressed in this part of the letter.¹⁹⁸ Besides this, according to Sean A. Adams, only few Greek letters known from antiquity attribute a personal title to the sender's name.¹⁹⁹ Almost all of these letters were sent by someone occupying a high position of authority and power.²⁰⁰ It might therefore be the case that two of Paul's sizable credentials, besides their theological meaning on their own, put the apostle in the position of authority needed to write such a letter to congregations not founded by him.²⁰¹ Whether or not this powerful presence was accepted by the recipients can, however, not be demonstrated by an epistolary analysis of the prescript.

¹⁹⁶ Byrskog 1997, p. 28. This assumption is also used by Young 2012, p. 279, in making a case for the relation between the prescript of Romans and 1.16-7.

¹⁹⁷ The fact that an interpreter of the New Testament, like the present writer, could be so used to the Pauline letter style that he does not intuitively recognise the oddity of the enormous prescript of Romans makes one aware of the need to read Paul in his literary Greco-Roman context. This context makes it clear immediately that something irregular is happening in 1.1-7.

¹⁹⁸ Byrskog 1997, pp. 34-5.

¹⁹⁹ Eight are mentioned in S.A. Adams, "Paul's Letter Opening and Greek Epistolography: A Matter of Relationship", in: S.E. Porter & S.A. Adams (eds.), *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form* (PAST vol. 6; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 33-55, here pp. 49-50.

²⁰⁰ Adams 2010, p. 50.

²⁰¹ Byrskog 1997, p. 37; Adams 2010, pp. 50 and 52; Tite 2010, p. 92.

What can be assumed, however, is that by the irregular expansions of the name of the sender the attention of the Roman Christians was captured, so that they would take heed of what this *doulos Christou Iêsou* and *klêtos apostolos* had to say. This attention was also there from both 'parties' in the Roman congregations, for the second word of the letter (*doulos*) already made use of a *double entendre*.

5.2. Further expansions – Hearing and understanding

The third qualification of *Paulos*, starting with *aphoorismenos eis euangelion theou* and going all the way up to the end of the sixth verse, carries a syntactical priority and a massive peculiarity.²⁰² In ancient Greek epistolary conventions and theory, it is unheard-of that a letter writer introduces a quite lengthy sentence about a subject in the prescript of an epistle. If the first readers and hearers in Rome would have made sense out of the relational use of titular expansions, it is hard to imagine that this is the case with the evangelical expansion in vv. 1-6, for, as Samuel Byrskog said, "*their familiarity with epistolographic conventions provided only a partial understanding of the prescript.*"²⁰³ We may expect the readers and hearers of this letter to seek throughout the rest of the letter for further clarifications with respect to this unusual epistolary form.

Paul's expansions serve therefore a rhetorical function: the apostle has created – granted that the audience understood what he was talking about in vv. 3b-4 – a messianic mode of hearing with his audience. Anything that will be said in the rest of the letter that can be related to the confusing epistolary form and content of the prescript will help in filling "*the gaps left by the epistolographic approach to Rom. 1.1-7.*"²⁰⁴ With this in mind, the rhetorical function of the epistolary element called 'prescript' can be compared to the *exordium*. This introductory part of a speech should be making the audience well-disposed, attentive, and docile, according to the ancient rhetorical theorists Cicero (106-43 B.C.E.) and Quintilian (c. 35 - c. 100 C.E.).²⁰⁵ Especially the attentiveness of the audience was used by Paul in the prescript functioning as an *exordium*.

5.3. Conclusion and start

We could conclude these brief reflections upon the ancient epistolary conventions and the rhetorical function of the prescript of Romans by pointing at reader-orientated expectations. Because of the odd length of the prescript we could expect the historical Roman audience to listen carefully to what Paul wrote, especially with respect to the twofold structured vv. 3b-4.

²⁰² Byrskog 1997, pp. 30 and 40.

²⁰³ Byrskog 1997, p. 38.

²⁰⁴ Byrskog 1997, p. 45. Chapters 6-8 below present possible ways for filling these gaps.

²⁰⁵ Cicero, *De inventione rhetorica* 1.15.20; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 4.1.5. Cf. Byrskog 1997, p. 39.

If they already came across a reference to the intertextual christology in v. 5, which will be shown in chapter 8 below, they were – and we are – to expect that whatever it is Paul has to say, the Davidic Messiahship and the divine sonship of Jesus play a crucial role in it. This might therefore be, together with the hermeneutical statement of v. 2, the key for the Roman Christians to understanding the basic theme of Romans as set forth in the *propositio* of 1.16-7. If we want to use what Paul has given through a combination of epistolary oddities, we have to understand the intertextual christological meaning of the key verses and try to unlock some other passages in the epistle to the Romans.²⁰⁶ A start of this exegetical task will be made in the following chapters.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Wright 2005, p. 44.

6. INTERTEXTUAL EXEGESIS AND ROM. 1.3B-4

The importance of vv. 3b-4, functioning as a programmatic statement for Paul's christology in Romans, increases because its content alludes to scriptural texts and makes use of exegetical traditions. Because Paul already said in v. 2 that the good news of God was promised beforehand through God's prophets in the holy scriptures concerning His son, we are to expect that these scriptural promises will, whenever possible, obtain the full weight of meaning in relation to Paul's words. In this paragraph a combined reading of two important scriptural passages will be related to Paul's messianic exegesis of these texts. These passages are 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2, although other texts will be mentioned too.

6.1. 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 2 – Why these texts?

It has to be clarified why these specific texts are used for the exegesis of the prescript of Romans, for we don't have an explicit quotation in these verses. Two important reasons can be named for choosing 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 2 as the most important subtexts for Paul's christology in Romans. Firstly, there are verbatim points of contact between these texts and Rom. 1.3b-4. Paul had said that Jesus was born *ek spermatis David*, 'from the seed of David'. The word *sperma* occurs in 2 Sam. 7.12 LXX (*to sperma sou* – 'your seed') and this royal successor of David continues to be the subject of vv. 13-6. We could therefore say that Rom. 1.3b-4 and 2 Sam. 7.12-6 are connected through the alluding use of the word for offspring with a singular meaning, *sperma*.²⁰⁷ Besides this, Paul calls Jesus *huios theou*, 'son of God'. Both in 2 Sam. 7.14 LXX and Ps. 2.7 LXX the concept of a Davidic *huios theou* is used. Therefore Jesus' two titles in Rom. 1.3b-4, 'seed of David' and 'son of God', are related to 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 2.²⁰⁸

Secondly, we know that both 2 Sam. 7.12-6 and Ps. 2 were interpreted in early Judaism as texts referring to God's promises for the Messiah. In the Qumranic text called "Florilegium" or "Midrash on the Last Days" (4QFlor), dated with a certain amount of probability to the late first century B.C.E., two messianic figures appear at the end of time.²⁰⁹ These are the 'Branch of David' (צמח דוד – *tsemach dāwīd*) and the 'Interpreter of the Thora' (דורש התורה – *dōrēsh hatthōrā*), both arriving in Zion (4QFlor I, 11-2).²¹⁰ Even though 4QFlor is an anthology of biblical texts, the structure of the quotations and interpretations resembles the structure of *pesharim* like 1QpHab, albeit without the formal word פשרו (*pishrō* – 'the

²⁰⁷ Hays 1989, p. 85.

²⁰⁸ Although the title 'seed of David' is not used with exactly these words, I don't think it is a problem if we use this title as a shorthand reference to 'who was born from the seed of David'.

²⁰⁹ Lohse 1964, pp. 255-9; Vermes 2011, pp. 525-6.

²¹⁰ Text and numbering according to Lohse 1964, pp. 255-9.

meaning of this [is...]).²¹¹ In this exegetical messianic text a connection is made between the Essene beliefs about one of the two messiahs and 2 Sam. 7.10-4 (4QFlor I, 1-2 and 7-13) and Ps. 2.1-2 (4QFlor I, 18-9).²¹² Although no point of direct contact needs to be assumed between the Jews of Qumran and Paul, the connection of a royal messiah with the texts from 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 2 in 4QFlor points at the possibility of an already existing messianic exegetical tradition behind Rom. 1.3b-4, even though the way 2 Sam. 7.10-4 is interpreted in 4QFlor is quite dissimilar from Paul's exegetical moves in Romans.

There is, however, another text to be cited in making a case for an already existing messianic exegetical tradition behind the prescript of Romans. "Psalms of Solomon" is a collection of Jewish hymns, probably written in the early first century B.C.E.²¹³ Ps. Sol. 17 is a hymn about the Davidic messiah, who will establish the kingship of God in Israel by destroying the (Roman) Gentiles.²¹⁴ Allusions to 2 Sam. 7 (Ps. Sol. 17.4) and Ps. 2 (Ps. Sol. 17.23) are visible. However, with all that is being said about the Messiah and his activities on behalf of Israel and their God, the concept of kingship is not attributed to one person only. Ps. Sol. 17.32 says: "*and their [Israel's, MV] king shall be the Lord Messiah.*"²¹⁵ The hymn ends in the 46th verse, strikingly, with the confession that "*the Lord Himself is our king forevermore.*" Apparently the attribution of kingship and lordship to the God of Israel does not exclude the possibility of this same attribution to the sent Messiah – something to keep in mind for the reading of Romans. Strengthened by the idea that the Psalms of Solomon might have been written by some early Pharisaic Jews, it becomes clear that Paul wasn't alone in a combined messianic interpretation of 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 2.²¹⁶

Having established therefore that it is quite reasonable to assume that 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 2 form important subtexts for Paul's Davidic christology in Romans, we can take a look at the scriptural text.²¹⁷ Which specific promises (1.2) are given to David and his seed? Four of these can be distinguished in 2 Sam. 7.12-6 and Ps. 2.

²¹¹ Lohse 1964, p. 255.

²¹² The other texts quoted are, in this order, Ex. 15.17-8, Am. 9.11, Ps. 1.1, Is. 8.11, Ez. 37.23, and Dan. 12.10. This last quotation in 4QFlor II is not in Lohse's edition, but it is included in Vermes 2011, p. 526.

²¹³ R.B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon", in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha – Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011²), pp. 639-70, here pp. 640-1.

²¹⁴ Wright 2011, pp. 665-9.

²¹⁵ Translation by Wright 2011. The reading *christos kurios* (translated as 'the Lord Messiah') is preferred instead of the emendation *christos kuriou* ('the Lord's Messiah'; Wright 2011, p. 667 n. z). This means that the combined use of the titles *Christos* and *kurios* for Jesus in Rom. 1.4b is not unique and of a pre-Christian date and origin. Cf. Levin 2006, p. 417.

²¹⁶ Wright 2011, p. 642.

²¹⁷ In theory, 1 Chr. 17.11-4 could have been in Paul's mind instead of 2 Sam. 7.12-6, for this text deviates only slightly from the earlier text of 2 Samuel. Because both Lohse 1964 and Vermes 2011 refer to 2 Sam. 7 in

6.2. Resurrection of the seed of David?

The first promise discussed in this chapter could be the most puzzling in 2 Sam. 7 when this text is read from a perspective of the epistle to the Romans, a post-resurrection perspective. V. 12a LXX says: "I will raise up your seed after you" (ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σέ – *anastèsoo to sperma sou meta se*). The difficulty of this promise is not on account of the Hebrew text, for the words והקימתי את־זרעך אחר־יך (*wah^aqīmothī 'eth-zar^akhā 'ach^arekhā*) are quite straightforward: God will raise up, make great, the seed of David, Solomon, after David's death. This meaning is also to be attached to the Greek text Paul worked with. But could it be that *anastèsoo to sperma sou* was read as 'I will *resurrect* your seed?'²¹⁸ In other words, is there a possibility that 2 Sam. 7.12 *came to be read* as meaning that a resurrection (*anastasis*) would happen to the 'seed of David', the royal Messiah? If this is the case, the resurrection of Jesus would in Paul's mind be the evidence *par excellence* that God remained faithful towards His own scriptural promises regarding the seed of David. However, this cannot be affirmed, for there are no Biblical texts explicitly predicting the resurrection of a Messiah. In fact, a dead Messiah, let alone a crucified one, cannot possibly be a true Messiah in the eyes of any first century C.E. Jew – including Paul. The resurrection of Jesus by God was therefore necessary to confirm that he in fact was the Messiah, and still is, but now enthroned and with ruling power.²¹⁹

Only one thing could be construed to relate a scriptural promise about David's seed to a scriptural promise about the resurrection, but this solution is probably too far-fetched. If we reckon with the idea that the king of Israel, unless rejected, represented and incorporated his people²²⁰, the promise of the 'resurrection' of the people of Israel (Ez. 37) might be fulfilled by resurrecting the king of the people.²²¹ If the king is Jesus, who represents his people, and if he is resurrected and thereby inaugurates the coming age with the general resurrection of the dead, one could say that a combined reading of scriptural promises forms a scriptural basis for the resurrection of the Messiah.

This interpretation of 2 Sam. 7.12, however, doesn't seem to be established. Besides this, to see these thoughts as true would require a view of Jesus functioning as ruling king before the resurrection, whereas we said above that the resurrection of Jesus appointed and

4QFlor and commentaries on Romans usually point at this text too, the secondary tradition of 1 Chr. 17.11-4 is not regarded as the source text for Paul's exegesis in this thesis.

²¹⁸ The possibility of this reading is noted, but not proposed by Wright 2002b, p. 417 n. 24.

²¹⁹ Wright 2002b, p. 418.

²²⁰ That the ancient Israelite royal ideology was incorporative becomes clear from 2 Sam. 19.43, 20.1, and 1 Kgs. 12.16.

²²¹ See how in this chapter of Ezekiel (quoted in 4QFlor I, 16-7), dealing with the people of Israel as a whole, the idea of a Davidic king suddenly pops up in v. 24. This might tone down the appreciation as far-fetched of an incorporative resurrection a bit.

enthroned him (*horisthentos*) as king ('son of God') with ruling power.²²² It is therefore better to interpret 2 Sam. 7.12 in combination with Rom. 1.3b-4 as meaning that God will make great, raise up (the rule of) the seed of David, Jesus.

6.3. Prepared kingship

The second promise possibly read messianically is to be found in 2 Sam. 7.12b LXX: "I will prepare his kingship" (ἐτοιμάσω τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ - *hetoimasoo tèn basileian autou*). This promise, more or less repeated in v. 16, follows 'logically' from the first one, for if it is God who will provide for the rising up of David's seed, it is God who will prepare his kingship too.

Two remarks on the translation of this verse can be made. Firstly, NIV translates the Hebrew וְהִכִּינֹתִי (*wah^akhīnōthī*) as 'I will establish'. 'To establish' could point at a concrete action, for example the inauguration of the king, or the appointment. However, the *hiph'il* of כָּן (*k-w-n*) is better to be translated as 'to prepare', just as the Greek verb ἐτοιμάζω (*hetoimadzoō*).²²³ Secondly, both the Hebrew מַמְלָכָה (*mamlākhā*) and the Greek βασιλεία (*basileia*) are often translated as 'kingdom'. This could suggest a territorial dominion, which is a notion that can be applicable in these texts. However, both these words point more towards the meaning 'kingship' or 'reign', the operative rule of a king, just as in the evangelists' (and Paul's) *basileia* of Heaven/God.²²⁴

The promise that God will prepare the kingship means that the kingship of Solomon did not come out of the blue, but was in line with God's intentions in dealing with the earthly rule of His people Israel. The validity of the rule of the seed of David lies therefore not solely in the king, but is based on the preparations of it by God. If we then come across texts in the letter to the Romans where it is clear that Jesus, the seed of David, is executing royal ruling power, we might say by the intertextual linking of the christology with 2 Sam. 7.12b that Jesus' rule is built upon the foundation of God's intentional covenantal preparations, as part of the promises made beforehand (Rom. 1.2). To this can be added that this promised kingship is to last eternally, without end (2 Sam. 7.16 LXX: εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα – *eis ton aionon*; cf. 1 Kgs. 2.45).

²²² The duration of Jesus' kingship is not only limited by a starting point, but also by an expected termination, when the rule will be given back to God the Father (1 Cor. 15.24-8).

²²³ L. Koehler & W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), p. 465; J. Lust, E. Eynikel & K. Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint – Revised Edition* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003), p. 246.

²²⁴ Koehler & Baumgartner 2001, p. 595; Lust, Eynikel & Hauspie 2003, p. 104.

Before heading on towards the third promise it is to be clarified why 2 Sam. 7.13 LXX is not considered as part of the messianic promises in Paul's christological programmatic statement. First v. 13a: "He is the one who will build for Me a house for My Name" (αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου – *autos oikodomēsei moi oikon tooi onomati mou*). This promise functions solely in the narrative context of 2 Sam. 7, where Solomon – not David – is the one who will build a house for God. There is no reason to assume that Paul applied this promise to Messiah Jesus. Firstly, Paul never uses οἶκος (*oikos* – 'house') in sentences other than those where 'just a house' is meant – there are no obvious spiritual connotations for the Pauline use of this word. Secondly, if *oikos* means 'temple', as in 2 Sam. 7.13a, reading this verse as meaning that Jesus will build a new temple for God would be quite unexpected in the light of the broader Pauline theology, for it would mean that the people of the Messiah form a new temple of God, whilst the temple in Jerusalem is still standing and being used fully.²²⁵ This would be at odds with Paul's visit of the temple (Acts 21). It is therefore so unlikely that we return to what is said above: there is no reason to assume that Paul applied this promise to Messiah Jesus.

About v. 13b: "I will restore his throne forever" (ἀνορθώσω τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἕως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα – *anorthoosoo ton thronon autou heeos eis ton aioona*). The LXX of 2 Sam. 7.13 presents a text differing from MT in at least two significant ways. Firstly, the Greek has the verb ἀνορθόω (*anortho-oo* – 'to set up again, restore'), whereas the Hebrew has the more easily comprehensible *polel* of the verb כָּוַן (*k-w-n* – 'to set up, establish').²²⁶ Secondly, LXX does not have (or: omits) מַמְלַכְתּוֹ (*mamlakhthō* – '[the throne of] his kingship'). This verse is repeated, not in an identical construction, but with the same words in 2 Sam. 7.16b. However, because neither the verb *anortho-oo* nor the noun θρόνος (*thronos* – 'throne') play any significant role in Paul's vocabulary, the textual differences between the MT and LXX in 2 Sam. 7.13 will not be further discussed here.²²⁷ This promise probably wasn't applied to the messianic seed of David by Paul, and – if it is used – not in a sense differing from 2 Sam. 7.12b.

6.4. God and king – Father and son

The third promise is based on 2 Sam. 7.14a LXX ("I will be a Father to him and he will be a son to Me" – ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν – *ego esomai autoi eis patera kai autos estai moi eis huion*) and Ps. 2.7b LXX ("The LORD said to me: 'You are My son, today I have begotten you'" – κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με υἱός μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε

²²⁵ 2 Corinthians 6.14-8 is not to be cited as an argument against this interpretive anti-supersessionism. This passage should not be interpreted with reading the opposition Jew vs. Christian in it, for this text deals with the believer's (both Jew and Gentile) standing towards idolatry. The 'we are the temple of the living God' of v. 16 is not an anti-Judaic polemical statement by Paul, but a remark against the Gentile religion(s).

²²⁶ Lust, Eynikel & Hauspie 2003, p. 52, and Koehler & Baumgartner 2001, pp. 464-5, respectively.

²²⁷ The noun *thronos* is used in the Pauline epistles only in Col. 1.16. The verb *anortho-oo* only occurs in the New Testament in Lk. 13.13, Acts 15.16 and Heb. 12.12. The quotation of Amos 9.11-2 LXX in Acts 15.16 is interesting though, for this text is quoted too in relation to the task of the two messiahs in the above-mentioned 4QFlor I, 12-3. However, the exegetical traditions in early Judaism concerning Amos 9.11-2 aren't relevant enough to be discussed here.

– *kurios eipen pros me huios mou ei su ego sèmeron gegennèka se*). The importance of these texts from the Old Testament in relation to Rom. 1.4 will be clear. It will also be clear that, unless we are contented with sheer adoptionism, formulating carefully is necessary in bringing the meaning of the text from the Israelite ascension of the throne to the eschatological inauguration of King Jesus. If one would start the intertextual interpretation with Jesus' eternal sonship, then the point from 2 Sam. 7.14a and Ps. 2.7b will be missed. However, if one would transfer the royal ideology from the Old Testament ontologically to Rom. 1.3b-4, the point of *horisthentos huiou theou en dunamei* is missed. The adoption of the Israelite king as 'son of God' is not an ontological statement about the king, but a relational and functional one. The exact meaning of the relation between God as Father and the king as son is not entirely clear, but the words 'ruling unity' and 'royal mandate' might sum it up quite appropriately. This is the meaning to be transferred to the messianic king of the prescript of Romans, Jesus.²²⁸ When his resurrection and reliving happened as the first-fruits of the general resurrection of the dead, God declared his plans and decree (Ps. 2.7b): 'Jesus is My son, today I have begotten him'. It isn't said by Paul with these words, but the allusion to the royal traditions from the Old Testament indicate that Jesus, the seed of David, the Messiah, now ruling as king in Zion (Ps. 2.6; cf. Rom. 9.33 and 11.26), executes his kingship in line with God's decree and actually puts God's rule present.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the functional royal title 'son of God' in Paul's messianic exegesis comes about not only in Ps. 2.8, but in another passage in the Psalms that uses this language too. Immediately following the verse where David calls to the LORD: "My Father are You, my God, and the Helper of my deliverance" (πατήρ μου εἶ σύ θεός μου καὶ ἀντιλήπτορ τῆς σωτηρίας μου – *patèr mou ei su theos mou kai antilèptoor tès sootèrias mou* – Ps. 88.27 LXX / 89.27 MT), God says: "And I will make him a firstborn, high among the kings of the earth" (καγὼ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτόν ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τῆς γῆς – *kagoo proototokon thèsomai auton hupsèlon para tois basileusin tès gès* – Ps. 88.28 LXX / 89.28 MT).²²⁹ The qualification of the king (of Israel) as God's son puts him in a special position of power among the other kings of the earth, who lack this special relationship with the one God. Therefore the emphasis in the christological statement in Rom. 1.3b-4 about Jesus, the

²²⁸ That the text of the Deuteronomistic history (2 Sam. 7) is in Paul's mind instead of the traditions written down by the Chronicler, can also (cf. p. 47 n. 217 above) be argued on the basis of 1 Chr. 28.6. In this text the promises to the Davidic son are applied to Solomon, whilst 2 Sam. 7 does not name him. The text of 1 Chronicles 17.11-4 does not completely rule out a messianic exegesis, but it certainly is more complicated with the name 'Solomon' in the context of this scriptural promise.

²²⁹ Perhaps the Hebrew text of Ps. 89.28 is even stronger in saying "most exalted of the kings of the earth" (עליון למלכי־ארץ - *elyōn l' malkhē- 'ārets*).

seed of David, being appointed as God's son with ruling power, probably lies, with intertextual traditions in mind, on the phrase 'with ruling power' (*en dunamei*).²³⁰

2 Sam. 7.14a, the promise about the divine sonship of the king of Israel, is not unconditional, as v. 14b LXX indicates: "If his injustice comes, I", says God, "will punish him with a rod of men and with strokes of sons of men" (ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀδικία αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλέγξω αὐτὸν ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἐν ἀφαῖς υἱῶν ἀνθρώπων – *ean elthèi hè adikia autou kai elenxoo auton en rhabdooi androon kai en haphais huioon anthroopoon*). This scriptural 'promise' regarding the son of David could be applied to Jesus, perhaps combined with a christological reading of Is. 52.13-53.12, the text about the suffering servant of the LORD. If we see his life *kata sarka*, what happened to him as a human being, this conditional clause from 2 Sam. 7.14b precedes his enthronement. The suffering of the Messiah and his death on the cross can therefore be seen intertextually as a necessary stage in becoming king, son of God with ruling power. This combination of scriptural traditions with historical events in the life of Jesus is, however, not what Paul is doing in Rom. 1.1-7. We can safely say that 2 Sam. 7.14b plays no explicit role in the scriptural promises used by the apostle here. However, this brief excursus can show us how connections between new events (the death of Jesus) and ancient texts (the conditional clause in the promises to the Davidic king) can be made in a rereading of Scripture and a religious interpretation of happening history.

The conditional clause is nuanced by a declaration of God's mercy (ἔλεος – *eleos*; Hebrew: חֶסֶד – *chesed* – 'loving-kindness') in relation to the possible fathering punishment of the son of David. 2 Sam. 7.15 also mentions the story of Saul and his eventual removal and rejection. Although a narrative behind the story Paul tells in Romans could be discerned, this theme will not be discussed here for reasons of space and time. 2 Sam. 7.15 probably doesn't play a major role in the scriptural promises about Jesus' kingship and ruling power in the prescript of Romans.

6.6. Royal inheritance and rule

The last scriptural promise regarding the Messiah considered here is to be found in Ps. 2.8 LXX: "Ask from Me and I will give you the nations [Gentiles] as your inheritance and as your possession the ends of the earth" (αἰτῆσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς – *aitèsai par' emou kai doosoo soi ethnè tèn klèronomian sou kai tèn kataschesin sou ta perata tès gès*). This particular aspect of the reign of God's Davidic king has been mentioned briefly in discussing Ps. 88.27-8 LXX above, and could

²³⁰ The combination of Davidic sonship and lordship is not an unique element of the prescript of Romans (v. 4b), for this happens also in Acts. 2.24-36, 13.30-6 (Paul's speech in Pisidian Antioch), and Heb. 1.5-14. Cf. Beasley-Murray 1980, p. 151. The text of Ps. 109.1 LXX (Ps. 110.1 MT) plays a role in this combined exegesis too.

perhaps be named the purpose of Paul's confession in 1.3b-4. The importance of this purpose needs a brief introduction on the functioning of the rule over the Gentiles.

Messianism is an eschatological category of thought. At the end of time, in a transition from one phase of history to another, a messiah, an anointed one (or two messiahs), is sent by God. This is true for the Essene 4QFlor, for the (possibly Pharisaic) Psalms of Solomon, for the texts of the New Testament, for the post-70 C.E. Rabbi Akiva in the Bar Kokhba revolt (132-135 C.E.)²³¹, and for some more Jewish and Jewish-Christian eschatological traditions. This messiah usually liberates the people of Israel on God's behalf from the oppressing rule of pagans (Greeks, Romans, or perhaps Hellenised Jews), thereby bringing the Babylonian exile to a final end and restoring the rule of God in Zion.²³² In this narrative framework Ps. 2 came to take a new meaning for the history of Israel, as can be seen in 4QFlor I, 18-9, and Ps. Sol. 17. The promise of universal dominion for the Israelite king became, in Israel's historical theodicy, a promise for the messiah.²³³ He was the one who is 'at this time going to restore the kingdom to Israel' (Acts 1.6). The promise of Ps. 2.8 therefore already functioned in an eschatological context.²³⁴ It is, however, not solely this text that comes to mind. We read in Ps. 71.11 LXX (72.11 MT) that the Gentiles and their kings will worship and serve the Davidic king. And Ps. 109 LXX (110 MT) also speaks about the rule over the nations by a 'lord'.²³⁵

At this moment in reading Romans, having read only four verses, the meaning of this passage in Paul's messianic exegesis isn't clear immediately. The historical audience, probably unaware of the content of the earlier Pauline letters, will have to wait for the christological interpretation. It is therefore better if we do not anticipate on what will be said in chapter 8 below, but wait for Paul's exegesis to happen. What can be said, though, is that the intertextual christology in Romans in relation to the ruling power given to Jesus certainly isn't solely or merely a domestic affair, for it has to do with the Gentiles too.

²³¹ y. *Ta'an.* 4.8/27 (= 68d, 46-60; translation in A. Lehnardt, *Ta'aniyot – Fasten*, in: M. Hengel et al. [eds.], *Übersetzung des Talmud Yerushalmi*, vol. II/9 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], p. 144). This text has a parallel in *Eikh. R.* II.2, §4 (translation in A. Cohen, *Lamentations*, in: H. Freedman & M. Simon [eds.], *Midrash Rabbah* [London and Bournemouth: Soncino Press, 1951], p. 157). For a discussion of these texts see M.V. Novenson, "Why Does R. Akiba Acclaim Bar Kokhba as Messiah?" (*JSJ* vol. 40, 2009), pp. 551-72.

²³² Cf. Wright 2002b, p. 398.

²³³ On the history of Israel in the period of the second temple as a theodicy, see J.H. Charlesworth, "Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings", in: A. Laato & J.C. de Moor (eds.), *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 470-508; B.D. Ehrman, *God's Problem – How the Bible Fails to Answer Our Most Important Question – Why We Suffer* (New York City, NY: HarperOne, 2008), especially pp. 197-227.

²³⁴ Whitsett 2000, p. 676, places Ps. 2 in an 'apocalyptic narrative'. This is correct for the early Jewish interpretation of this text, but I would prefer the term 'eschatological', given the non-apocalyptic character of the text of Ps. 2 itself.

²³⁵ When read christologically, as was done in early Christianity (Heb. 7), this psalm contains a priestly christology too (Ps. 109.4 LXX / 110.4 MT: Melchizedek; cf. Cranfield 1975, p. 838).

7. CHRISTOLOGY – SUMMARISING THE INTERPRETATION

Before we are able to descry the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 in some other passages in Romans, it is necessary to summarise what has been said above with regard to this subject.

It can be said that the two christological titles Jesus has in Rom. 1.3b-4 ('seed of David' and 'son of God') are part of a christological *double entendre*, where 'seed of David' is especially important for the Jewish-Christian audience, and 'son of God' for the Gentile-Christian audience.²³⁶ However, this is not the position taken in this thesis, although an awareness of a possible use of the *double entendre* has been shown. Firstly, the fact that the Roman congregations consisted of at least two group identities does not mean that the separate yet mixed groups had only one way of hearing: scriptural allusions for the Jewish-Christians and imperial language for the Gentile-Christians. Both groups probably understood both levels of speech. Secondly, it is not true that 'son of God' only makes sense in imperial language – which could be suggested by Poythress's brief remark – for we have demonstrated above that this title also, and probably primarily, comes from the idea of Israel being God's son and the Davidic king being adopted as son of God. This is, therefore, a *double entendre par excellence*. Thirdly, the title 'seed of David' may not be clear immediately to a Gentile, but – once explained – it can be understood as being quite polemical on a political level.

What Paul has said in vv. 1-4 of the 1st chapter of his epistle to the Romans about Jesus can be summarised thus. Jesus was born from the seed of David with respect to the flesh. He was appointed as son of God with power with respect to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead. The focus of the first clause of the twofold christological statement in vv. 1.3b-4 is on kinship. Jesus was 'seed of David' by birth and, in the light of what happened at the end of his life, this descent made events in his life theologically extraordinary. However, the second clause of the statement, with the focus on kingship, completes what is said about the pre-resurrection state of Jesus from a post-resurrection perspective. The true meaning of the Davidic descent is not to be found in the fleshly mode of Jesus' existence, but in what happened after his death: the appointment as son of God with power.

Having established that Paul probably worked with several intertextual traditions in a messianic exegesis, we have identified four possible aspects of the ruling power of King Jesus, rooted in scriptural promises.

²³⁶ Poythress 1976, p. 182.

1. God will provide for the effectiveness of the rule of the seed of David (from 2 Sam. 7.12a).
2. The realisation of the royal rule of Jesus is in line with God's (covenantal) promises (from 2 Sam. 7.12b and 7.16).
3. The relation of King Jesus to God is that of son and Father; there is a ruling unity (from 2 Sam. 7.14a and Ps. 2.7b).
4. To the royal son of God belongs a power exceeding the borders of Israel; inheritance and possession of the Gentile world also belong to King Jesus (from Ps. 2.8; cf. Ps. 71.11 LXX, 88.27-8 LXX and 109 LXX).

It is not possible here to set up a complete christology solely on the basis of Rom. 1.3b-4, or to draw a complete image from this text. This need not be a problem, however, for the best way to see this christology is when it is used by Paul in other passages in Romans. Before moving on towards that in chapter 8, one more aspect of the royal christology deserves some words. Because Jesus has been enthroned as a king within the typically Israelite perspective of kingship, the royal ideology of the ancient Israelite religion will play a role in Paul's christology. An important aspect of this kingship is that it is an incorporative kingship. This has been mentioned in footnotes scattered throughout the preceding chapters, but here we will explain what is meant with this phrase, on its own and in relation to the christology. How it works in Romans, however, will be shown briefly in the following chapter.

In the ancient Israelite royal ideology, according to N.T. Wright, "*the king and the people are bound together in such a way that what is true of the one is true in principle of the other.*"²³⁷ The quoted sentence does, of course, not occur thus in the Old Testament, but probably summarises accurately the relational language of 2 Sam. 19.40-3 LXX (MT 19.41-4), 2 Sam. 20.1 and 1 Kgs. 12.16. In 2 Sam. 19.40-3, after Absalom's rebellion against his father David, there is a conflict between the men of Israel and the men of Judah about their claim on being closest to the king.²³⁸ The men of Israel then say in v. 43: "*We have ten shares* [literally: 'hands'; Hebrew: יָדוֹת – *yādōth*; Greek: χεῖρες – *cheires*] *in the king*". Another instance of this incorporative idiom is found in the verse immediately following the previous one, 2 Sam. 20.1. Here Sheba ben-Bichri, from the tribe of Benjamin, rebels against David by saying: "*We have no share in David, nor an inheritance in the son of Jesse.*" The words used here, 'share' (Hebrew: חֵלֶק – *chēleq*; Greek: μερίς – *meris*) and 'possession' or

²³⁷ N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant – Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (London/New York City, NY: T&T Clark International, 1991), p. 46. I have not looked into non-Israelite royal ideologies, primarily because the idea of Jesus' kingship is expressed most clearly by Paul in his messianic exegesis of the Scriptures of Israel.

²³⁸ Can this story perhaps come to mind when reading about the disciples' behaviour at the Last Supper in Lk. 22.24?

'inheritance' (Hebrew: נחלה – *nach^alā*; Greek: κληρονομία – *klèronomia*) are also used in Jeroboam's rebellion during the reign of Rehoboam (1 Kgs. 12.16), an event that led to the division of the kingdom of Israel into two separate states. This language expresses the idea that in the ancient Israelite royal ideology the king and the people were connected and bound together.²³⁹ It cannot be proved from these texts that this incorporative language was well known or familiar in the first century C.E.²⁴⁰, but the relational use of *meris* ('share') by Paul in 2 Cor. 6.15 possibly indicates that this idiom was (still) used in his days.

What does this mean then, now that we have found an Israel-shaped royal messianic ideology in Romans? This means that 'what is true for the Messiah, is true for his people too'.²⁴¹ An incorporative christology indicates that the people of the Messiah are summed up in what is said about this Messiah and that they can therefore share in his identity.²⁴² But, again, this will also be seen in the best way when we see it happen in Romans. We therefore conclude this brief chapter and start a christological reading of some passages in Romans.

²³⁹ Wright 1991, p. 46.

²⁴⁰ Wright 1991, p. 47.

²⁴¹ This phrase is used multiple times in Wright 2002b and can be regarded as one of the main lines of interpretation in this commentary.

²⁴² Wright 1991, p. 46.

8. A CHRISTOLOGICAL READING OF SOME PASSAGES IN ROMANS

In this chapter our conclusions with respect to intertextual exegesis, epistolary rhetoric and christology will be implemented interpretatively. Some passages in Paul's epistle to the Romans will be discussed from the christological perspective that is developed and adopted in this thesis. However, we will have to limit ourselves both in the number of passages discussed and in the extensiveness of the discussion of these passages. A full discussion would require the form of a biblical commentary.²⁴³ We could, for example, look into Romans 8, with its connected pneumatology and christology, or Rom. 9.5, where Paul talks about *ho Christos to kata sarka* ('the Messiah with respect to the flesh'), followed immediately by, probably, an unusually high christology.²⁴⁴ A reading of these passages will, however, not be done in this thesis.

Three paragraphs will be devoted to a christological reading of some passages in Romans. In the first paragraph I complete the exegesis of the prescript of Romans started in chapter 4. The second paragraph will deal briefly with a passage that might be best understood if one reckons with an incorporative christology. The third and last paragraph is about Rom. 15.7-12, a passage with a combination of intertextual christology and theme-related ecclesiocentric exegesis. These three passages are chosen because they might be the most suitable in trying to prove the point of this thesis, that Rom. 1.3b-4 can function as a programmatic christological statement and a key argument in Paul's theology in Romans. If we have affirmed this point three times, this could stimulate us in trying to read more difficult passages in Romans while using this christology.

8.1. Completing the prescript (Rom. 1.5-7)

We already said that the expanded prescript of the letter to the Romans urged the audience to listen carefully during the reading of the epistle. Anything that will be said in the rest of the letter that can be related to the confusing epistolary form and the christological content of the prescript in 1.3b-4 will fill the gaps in the epistolographic approach.²⁴⁵ If the Roman Christians already came across a reference to the intertextual christology in the immediately following 5th verse, still a part of the *superscriptio*, it is clear that they are to expect that the Davidic Messiahship of Jesus plays a crucial role in the letter. That this is the case will be argued in this paragraph.

²⁴³ A commentary in which this is done continuously is Wright 2002b (and of course the popular-exegetical Wright 2004a-b). I will make use of this commentary, but I intend to develop an interpretation along the lines of both intertextual exegesis and epistolary theory, as is the approach towards the letter to the Romans in this thesis.

²⁴⁴ For a brief overview of the possibilities in interpreting this doxology, see Wright 2002b, pp. 629-31.

²⁴⁵ See §5.2, p. 44 above.

After the conclusion of the twofold christological statement in 1.3b-4 with the confession of 'Jesus, the Messiah, our Lord', Paul goes back to his own ministry, the theme in the prescript with which the letter was opened. Just as Paul named himself 'slave of Messiah Jesus' (*doulos Christou Ièsou*), he now states that he has received 'grace and apostleship' (χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν – *charin kai apostolèn*) through Jesus.²⁴⁶ As an apostle, Paul was an ambassador of King Jesus.²⁴⁷ But just as his being set apart (*aphoorismenos*) was not a serving status on its own, but with a goal (*eis euangelion theou* – 'unto the good news of God'), this 'grace and apostleship' also have a goal: 'obedience of faith among all the Gentiles' (εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν – *eis hupakoèn pisteos en pasin tois ethnesin*). The words 'obedience of faith' probably mean 'obedience, which is: faith' – a so-called *genitivus appositivus*.²⁴⁸

The word 'obedience' (ὑπακοή - *hupakoè*) is related to the verb ὑπακούω (*hupakouoo* – 'to be obedient'), itself a compound from the verb ἀκούω (*akouoo* – 'to hear').²⁴⁹ Because this verb is used in LXX to translate the Hebrew שמע (*sh-m-ʿ* – 'to hear'), N.T. Wright thinks that Paul is alluding to the *Shema* (Deut. 6.4-5), the old text used as a daily prayer and confession in Judaism. The first words of this confession of the one God in LXX were ἀκούε Ἰσραήλ (*akoue Israèl* – 'hear, Israel'). "To bring the nations into "obedience" would therefore mean to bring them into the family of this one God."²⁵⁰ If this interpretation is correct, Paul would have created a very clever preparation in the prescript for his more obvious allusion to the *Shema* in 3.29-30. However, the way this compact allusion in 1.5 would fit into the broader theology of Romans seems to be too good to be true. It requires quite some linguistic intelligence from the side of the Roman Christians to hear and understand the allusion: one would have to go from the noun *hupakoè* to the verb *hupakouoo*, and from this compound to the verb *akouoo* and its specific use in Deut. 6.4-5, a passage which would then be put forward a bit out of the blue in the prescript of Romans. It is probably better to take Paul to mean that the word 'obedience' is a response to a heard and therefore spoken word, to a proclamation, to the *euangelion theou*.²⁵¹ This would also create some sort of a synonymous parallelism between the being 'set apart unto the good news of God' in v. 1, a

²⁴⁶ Although Dunn 1988a, p. 16, correctly points at the carefulness Paul usually shows when writing about apostleship, it would not be entirely clear who would be included here in the plural verb ἐλάβομεν (*elabomen* – 'we have received'). Regarding this as an epistolary plural is probably best (cf. p. 41 n. 182 above).

²⁴⁷ K. Barth, *De Brief aan de Romeinen kort verklaard* (trans. A.A. Spijkerboer; Kampen: Kok, 1997 [1956]), p. 15; Wright 2004a, p. 4.

²⁴⁸ Blass, Debrunner & Rehkopf 2001, §167, p. 138; Wright 2002b, p. 420.

²⁴⁹ Just as there is a relationship between the Dutch verb 'horen' ('to hear') and 'gehoorzamen' ('to be obedient').

²⁵⁰ Wright 2002b, p. 420. Cf. Dunn 1988a, pp. 17-8.

²⁵¹ Dunn 1988a, p. 17.

thought paused for a moment by the salvation-historical and christological clauses of vv. 2-4, and then being picked up again with the 'apostleship unto obedience of faith' in v. 5. This gives us twice a description of Paul's ministry, twice with a goal that on the one hand consists of a message, the good news of God, and on the other hand of the response to that message. And just as it will be said in 1.16-7 that this good news is for the believing Jew first, and for the believing Greek too, the reaction to the good news, the obedience, which is faith, also crosses the borders of Israel and Judaism, for it is 'among all the Gentiles'.

But why does this, which is given through the Jesus as described in vv. 3b-4, lead to obedience *among all the Gentiles*? The answer Paul might give to this question need not surprise us in the light of the discerned messianic exegesis: it was promised by God in the holy scriptures. Ps. 2.8, a text, unlike Deut. 6.4-5, certainly in mind in the prescript of Romans, promises the rule over the Gentiles by the Israelite king.²⁵² If Gentiles are therefore obedient through King Jesus, this probably is nothing else than Jesus executing his post-resurrection royal rule through the apostleship of Paul.²⁵³ This also is what the Roman Christians might have come to expect through the intertextual christology of 1.3b-4. And if the puzzlement from an epistolary perspective with regard to the expansions in the prescript finds a solution this soon, the quest for further messianic thoughts in the epistle has started.

This (worldwide) obedience has a specified goal too, named just before Paul moves on in a transition to the *adscriptio* in v. 7a. The obedience is for the sake of Jesus' name (ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ - *hyper tou onomatou autou*), thus making the part of the Messiah in the good news of God known among the nations.²⁵⁴ Paul then relates his Roman audience to these obedient and believing Gentiles in v. 6. Just as Paul has called himself a called apostle (*klètos apostolos*) in v. 1, he now calls his readers κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (*klètoi Ièsou Christou* – 'called of Jesus, the Messiah'). The Roman Christians also belong to the people of King Jesus through God's call and will therefore have a share in him.

And then, finally, the enormous expansion of the *superscriptio* has come to an end and the *adscriptio* has started in v. 7. Paul wrote to all those who are the beloved of God in Rome. The words 'beloved of God' (ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ - *agapètois theou*) have their meaning on their own and also have a rhetorical function – who doesn't want to be called 'beloved'? – but is it perhaps an attribute of the Roman Christians given through an incorporative christology? This could be the case if we take into perspective the love of God promised beforehand for the seed of David in 2 Sam. 7.15.

²⁵² Dunn 1988a, p. 18, notes this possibility, but thinks it more likely that the obedience of the Gentiles is the response to God's covenant faithfulness. These two explanations need not exclude each other, for the new fulfilment of Ps. 2.8 is to be seen within the royal covenant of God and the king.

²⁵³ Novenson 2009a, p. 370.

²⁵⁴ Dunn 1988b, p. 18.

Some Greek manuscripts omitted from this *adscriptio* the words ἐν Ῥώμῃ (*en Rhomèi* – 'in Rome'). The external evidence for this reading immediately shows that it can have absolutely no claim in being the 'original' text. Nevertheless, if it is a deliberate omission, which, with an eye for the same omission in v. 15, it probably is, it gives us a brief look into early Christian hermeneutics. Paul spoke not only to the Roman Christians, but also to the beloved believers belonging to another location in the world.

The Roman Christians are not only named 'beloved of God', they also receive the title 'called saints' (κλητοῖς ἁγίοις – *klètois hagiois*). Paul was 'called' and 'set apart' (v. 1), and now his audience is also 'called' and 'set aside' or 'dedicated', the true meaning of being a 'saint'.²⁵⁵

In his *salutatio* (v. 7b), Paul makes use of his typical greeting with a twofold wish and a twofold sender: 'Grace be to you and peace from God our Father and Lord Jesus, the Messiah'.²⁵⁶ Before this paragraph is ended, two remarks can be made about this end of the prescript. Firstly, the formality of this greeting formula probably didn't make such a formal impression on the Roman audience.²⁵⁷ They were not used to this formula and might have even related the word εἰρήνη (*eirènè* – 'peace') to the royal rule of King Jesus. Could this, in the light of the rule of a new king – with *euangelion* (v. 1) in its imperial sense and *horisthentos* (v. 4) in its royal meaning – be read as counter-imperial language, as a challenge to the highly praised *Pax Romana*, as real peace from the real Lord of the Gentiles? Secondly, as a christological end of this paragraph, it is to be noted that the two senders of grace and peace, God our Father and Lord Jesus, the Messiah, are presented here as a common source, for Paul used the preposition ἀπό (*apo* – 'from') only once, joining God and Jesus together in relation to their believers.²⁵⁸

8.2. Incorporative christology (Rom. 6.1-14)

The second passage that will be examined briefly in the light of the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 is Rom. 6.1-14. In this passage Paul deals with the effects of the power of sin and the power of grace in the believer. At this point in the letter, Paul already has said something about these themes, and therefore a full interpretation of this passage would require an interpretation of the preceding five chapters. This is not possible in this thesis and instead of this we will focus on aspects of Paul's theology of baptism, which emerges here.

²⁵⁵ Danker & Bauer 2000, p. 9-11.

²⁵⁶ Adams 2010, pp. 45-8.

²⁵⁷ The greeting is used in exactly the same form as here in 1 Cor. 1.3; 2 Cor. 1.2; Gal. 1.2; Eph. 1.2; Phil. 1.2; Phlm. 1.3. Possibly 2 Thess. 1.2 can be added to this list, but see the *apparatus criticus* in NTG²⁷ for this verse.

²⁵⁸ Johnson 1971, p. 134.

In 6.3 Paul asks the following question: "Or do you not know that all of us who have been baptised into Messiah Jesus, have been baptised into his death?" (ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν – *è agnoeite hoti, hosoi ebaptisthèmen eis Christon Ièsoun, eis ton thanaton autou ebaptisthèmen*). What does it mean to 'have been baptised into Messiah Jesus' and 'into his death'? It certainly is 'participationist language'²⁵⁹, but how does this participation work? Through a mystical experience of unity? Through a certain ritual, as in pagan mystery cults?²⁶⁰ Through the holy Spirit living in the believer's heart? Whatever the answer to these last three questions is, it is worth looking into the possibility that we have to do here with an incorporative christology, in line with the type of kingship set forth scripturally in the prescript.

The question in 6.3 isn't the only sign of this participationist language. Paul says that "we were buried with him [Jesus] through the baptism" (συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος – *sunetaphèmen autooi dia tou baptismatos*; 6.4), so that, as with Jesus' resurrection, "we too may walk in newness of life" (καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν – *kai hèmeis en kainotèti dzooès peripatèsomen*; 6.4). The theme of this paragraph in Romans, the defeat of the dominion of sin²⁶¹, is continued throughout along one dominant line of thought: what happened to Jesus *kata sarka*, fleshly, happens to the people of the Messiah spiritually (*kata pneuma hagioosunès?*). Jesus' crucifixion brings about the co-crucifixion of 'our old person' (ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος – *ho palaios hèmoon anthropos*; 6.6). Now Jesus is raised from the dead (6.8), 'we co-live with him' (συζήσομεν αὐτῷ - *sudzèsomen autooi*; 6.7). Through baptism, therefore, the believer has a share in the theologically meaningful events of Jesus' death and resurrection. The baptism into Messiah Jesus (6.3) is therefore possibly an expression of Paul's incorporative royal christology.²⁶²

That this development of the prescript happens here is even more likely when we see what the effect of baptism is (6.12-8). This is explained in terms of obedience.²⁶³ The believer is now no longer mastered by sin, but has a new obedience, 'obedience unto righteousness' (ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην – *hupakoès eis dikaiosunèn*; 6.16).²⁶⁴ This obedience then is in line with the allegiance to a king, as it was in 1.5 with Ps. 2 in mind, but now also connected with the thematic statement (*propositio*) of 1.16-7 through the word 'righteousness'. The content

²⁵⁹ E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism – A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1977), p. 463.

²⁶⁰ See for a brief overview of the discussion whether or not Paul used this concept Dunn 1988a, pp. 308-12.

²⁶¹ With 'sin' not only as an act of transgression or immorality, but as a dark ruling power.

²⁶² Wright 2002b, pp. 537-8.

²⁶³ I should point out that this is only one aspect of Paul's baptismal theology. The story of the Exodus of Israel forms another major category of thought in the early Christian thoughts on baptism (cf. 1 Cor. 10.1-2).

²⁶⁴ Wright 2002b, p. 420.

of this 'obedience unto righteousness' would then be, in line with 1.5, faith – bringing to mind again the theme of faith and faithfulness (πίστις – *pistis*) of 1.16-7.

What is therefore attempted to demonstrate briefly in this paragraph is that the incorporative christology, derived from the Old Testament royal ideology, can work in interpreting another passage in Romans. It certainly is worth further examination whether this and other passages in Romans – 4.24-5 and 5.10 for example – can be interpreted along these lines.²⁶⁵ Can the idea of an incorporative christology account for the 'in Christ'-language Paul used?²⁶⁶

8.3. Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Gentiles (Rom. 15.7-12)

In the first verses of Romans 15, Paul rounds off the theme of 'weak' and 'strong' believers from the fourteenth chapter, and moves on towards the start of what is usually called the *peroratio*.²⁶⁷ This part of an oration summarises the main points to make sure that the one listening really understands the author's intentions.²⁶⁸ Paul does this by presenting an anthology of four texts from the scriptures of Israel: one from the Thora (Deut. 32.43 LXX; Rom. 15.10), one from the Prophets (Is. 11.10 LXX; Rom. 15.12), one from the Writings (Ps. 116.1 LXX/117.1 MT; Rom. 15.11), and one that can be found in both the Prophets and the Writings (2 Sam. 22.50/Ps. 17.49 LXX/18.50 MT; Rom. 15.9). By paying attention to these four quotations, briefly or with some more words, it will be argued in this paragraph that we encounter an inclusion here, where the programmatic christology of the prescript of Romans and the theme of the letter come together one more time.

This inclusion with scriptural texts does, however, not start where the quotations begin, but is prepared by Paul by mentioning 'the scriptures' (τῶν γραφῶν – *toon graphoon*) in 15.4 and 'the promises' (τὰς ἐπαγγελίας – *tas epangelias*) in 15.8, echoing his words of 1.2. Paul's quotations are introduced by the formula "as it is written" (καθὼς γέγραπται – *kathoos gegraptai*; 15.9) and serve therefore a purpose. These texts are quoted to demonstrate "that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy" (τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν – *ta de ethnè hyper eleous doxasai ton theon*; 15.9). In each of the following quotations both the word 'Gentiles' (ἔθνη – *ethnè*) and a verb having to do with glorifying can be seen.

The exception to this combination of words might seem to be the quotation of Is. 11.10 LXX in Rom. 15.12, for there it is written that 'Gentiles hope' (ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν – *ethnè elpiousin*). However, the word 'hope', an important word in Romans, is twice in this letter connected to

²⁶⁵ And not only in Romans, but also in a text as Phil. 3.10.

²⁶⁶ 'Yes', would be the answer of Wright 1991, pp. 41-9.

²⁶⁷ Hays 1989, p. 70; Byrskog 1997, p. 44; Wischmeyer 2012, pp. 257-8.

²⁶⁸ Klauck 2006, pp. 218-20.

verbs of speech. Rom. 5.2: "We boast in the hope of the glory of God" (καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ - *kauchoometha ep' elpidi tēs doxēs tou theou*). Rom. 12.12: "Be joyful in hope" (τῆ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες – *tēi elpidi chairontes*). It is therefore likely that the hope in the Isaiah quotation carries overtones of glorification.

8.3.1. Quotation and co-text (Rom. 15.9)

Paul's first quotation in Rom. 15.9 is from the parallel verses 2 Sam. 22.50 and Ps. 17.49 LXX/18.50 MT: "Therefore I will confess You among the Gentiles and sing praise unto Your name" (διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ - *dia touto exomologēsomai soi en ethnesin kai tooi onomati sou psaloo*).

Paul only deviates from LXX in omitting κύριε (*kurie* – 'Lord'; vocative case). 2 Sam. 22.50 has ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ (*en tooi onomati sou psaloo* – 'I will sing praise in Your name'), but both Ps. 17.49 LXX and Paul omit the preposition, which could suggest that Paul is quoting the Psalm and not 2 Samuel. NIV's translation of this latter part of the verse as "I will sing the praises of your name" is peculiar.

In interpreting this quotation in its Pauline position we could ask a question borrowed from discussions about Romans 7: Who is 'I'? Who is singing and praising God here? If it is Paul, Paul would read himself into a scriptural text. Although Paul can indeed see his apostolic ministry in line with the prophetic ministries of the Old Testament²⁶⁹, such a 'paulinocentric' exegesis would be really unexpected. It is far more likely that the 'I' of the quotation is the Messiah, Jesus.²⁷⁰ There are two reasons to assume this. Firstly, Paul quoted this text to prove something that Jesus did (15.8). Secondly, in Rom. 15.3 Paul just quoted Ps. 68.9 LXX (69.9 MT), where Jesus was understood to be the speaker.²⁷¹ What we see therefore in this quotation is a combination of christocentric and ecclesiocentric exegesis: Jesus is amidst the congregation in their praise of God, and Paul emphasises here that this congregation consists of Gentiles too. This latter thought is related closely to the *propositio* of Romans 1.16-7, where the theme of a community of both Jewish-believers and Gentile-believers is introduced. But is this christocentric and ecclesiocentric quotation also related to the prescript of Romans?

There are two main reasons to assume that it is. Firstly, Ps. 17.49 LXX is part of a psalm that is explicitly Davidic-messianic and Paul presumably had this co-text in mind

²⁶⁹ Cf. p. 19 above.

²⁷⁰ Hays 1989, p. 72; Wright 2002b, p. 748. Comparable with this idea is Heb. 2.11-3.

²⁷¹ Hays 1989, p. 72.

too.²⁷² This messianic character of the psalm comes about in the verse immediately following the one quoted by Paul, for in Ps. 17.50 LXX the following is said about God: "He is magnifying the saving deeds of His king, and performing mercy for His Messiah, for David and his seed forever" (μεγαλύνων τὰς σωτηρίας τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος τῷ χριστῷ αὐτοῦ τῷ Δαυὶδ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος – *megalunoon tas sootèrias tou basileoos autou kai poioon eleos tooi christooi autou tooi Daid kai tooi spermati autou heoos aionos*).²⁷³ From this ancient royal ideology a royal messianism can be constructed and applied to Jesus. The words *Christos* and *sperma* can provide for linking this co-text to the prescript of Romans. Besides this, the word 'mercy' (ἔλεος – *eleos*), occurring in this co-text, relates this to the purpose of the anthology: a demonstration of the Gentiles glorifying God for His mercy (Rom. 15.9).²⁷⁴

Secondly, the Gentiles of Ps. 17.49 LXX are already brought into a state of obedience in this psalm, as can be seen in vv. 43b-4: "You shall appoint me as head of the Gentiles, a people whom I have not known served me, at the hearing of the ear they *obeyed* me" (καταστήσεις με εἰς κεφαλὴν ἐθνῶν λαὸς ὃν οὐκ ἔγνων ἐδούλευσέ μοι εἰς ἀκοὴν ὠτίου ὑπήκουσέ μοι – *katastèseis me eis kephalèn ethnoon laos hon ouk egnoon edouleuse moi eis akoèn ootiou hypèkouse moi*).²⁷⁵ This obedience of the Gentiles to the Messiah can then be seen in line with the appropriate response to a king, bringing Rom. 1.5 and Ps. 2 to mind again. In Paul's mind, this obedience is faith, for both Jew and Gentile alike (1.5 and 1.16-7).

With this quotation of Ps. 17.49 LXX Paul combined a messianic reading of a scriptural text through a hint of his incorporative christology ('among the Gentiles') with the theme of faith-obedience of the Gentiles. That the apostle did this near the end of the letter body means that the actual content of the letter is enclosed by the scriptural royal christology of both the prescript and the anthology in the 15th chapter.

8.3.2. Gentiles and peoples (Rom. 15.10-1)

Paul continues his inclusion by quoting Deut. 32.43 LXX in Rom. 15.10: "Rejoice, you Gentiles, with His people" (εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ - *euphranthète, ethnè, meta tou laou autou*). It is important to note that Paul used the Greek version of Deuteronomy here, for the Hebrew text would make his ecclesiocentric exegesis impossible: "Praise His

²⁷² Novenson 2009a, p. 369 n. 54.

²⁷³ This translation probably does not follow the original meaning of the verse, where the messiah was David. In that case the English should be "performing mercy for His messiah David, and his seed forever". However, the Greek text allows the interpretive translation chosen and could have suited messianic readers in early Judaism (cf. Novenson 2009a, p. 371).

²⁷⁴ Hays 1989, p. 71.

²⁷⁵ Novenson 2009a, pp. 370-1.

people, you Gentiles" (הרנינו גוים עמו) – *hamīnū gōyim 'ammō*).²⁷⁶ Paul used Deut. 32 earlier on in his letter in 10.19 and 12.19, but with this quotation of that chapter he makes the theme of his letter more clear, which is one of the functions of a *peroratio*. It is not only the Gentiles who praise God, but they are to rejoice together with those who were His people all along, the Jewish-believers.

The next text quoted by Paul is Ps. 116.1 LXX (117.1 MT): "Praise the Lord, all you Gentiles, and let all the peoples extol Him" (αἰνεῖτε, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, τὸν κύριον καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί - *aineite, panta ta ethnè, ton kurion kai epainesatoosan auton pantes hoi laoi*). Because the word λαός (*laos* – 'people') was used in the previous quotation as a reference to Israel, this latter quotation is also related to the theme of Jews and Gentiles praising God. The first part of Ps. 116.1 LXX is about the Gentiles, the second part now includes Israel too, in using a word (*laoi*) more neutral than *ethnè*. And, again, in the co-text of this quotation, Ps. 116.2 LXX, the word 'mercy' (*eleos*) is used – connecting this quotation once more to Rom. 15.9, and perhaps even back to the subtext of the christology in the prescript, for in 2 Sam. 7.15 this same word is also used.

8.3.3. The Root of Jesse (Rom. 15.12)

Paul's final quotation in this chain of Biblical texts comes from Is. 11.10 LXX and is found in Rom. 15.12: "The Root of Jesse will be even the one who rises to rule the Gentiles, in him the Gentiles will hope" (ἔσται ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν – *estai hè ridza tou lessai kai ho anistamenos archein ethnoon, ep' autooi ethnè elpiousin*). The syntax of the Greek is not easily comprehensible, especially because of the particle *kai* ('and' or 'even').²⁷⁷ Besides this, there are some differences between the Hebrew and the Greek text of Is. 11.10 that will not be discussed here. It is, however, not necessary to assume that the Greek alterations of the text really change its meaning.²⁷⁸ More significant is Paul's omission of Isaiah's ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (*en tèi hèmèrai ekeinèi* – 'in that day'). It seems reasonable, however, to assume that Paul omitted this phrase because the eschatological day he had in mind was not about the coming of the Root of Jesse, but was the final day of judgement.²⁷⁹

This text of the prophet Isaiah is about the 'Root of Jesse' (*ridza tou lessai*). This obviously would be David, but since this king did not live anymore in Isaiah's days, this text is

²⁷⁶ Hays 1989, p. 72; Wright 2002b, p. 748.

²⁷⁷ A helpful explanation of the grammar of this text can be found in B. Frid, "Jesaja und Paulus in Röm 15,12" (*BZ* vol. 27/2, 1983), pp. 237-41.

²⁷⁸ A brief overview and discussion of the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek text of Is. 11.10 can be found in Frid 1983 and Novenson 2009a, pp. 367-8.

²⁷⁹ Dunn 1988b, p. 850, with textual references.

about a David-like person. He will come at a certain time and execute God's ruling power. He therefore has the same function as a messiah, even though the word *christos* does not appear in it. This need not surprise us given the fact that messianism as a category of thought developed more in early Judaism than in the Hebrew Bible. However, 'Root of Jesse' in Paul's use is evidently a name for the Messiah.²⁸⁰ This messianic reading of Is. 11.10 is not unique to Paul, for it also appears in a pre-Pauline text from Qumran, 4Q161, fragments 8-10. This text contains a commentary on Isaiah, probably written in the first century B.C.E.²⁸¹ This text interprets Is. 11.10 from the messianic perspective of Essene theology.

This Messiah named 'Root of Jesse' is 'the one who rises' (*ho anistamenos*). The verb used here to indicate the rising of the Messiah (*ἀνίστημι* - *anistēmī*) has as first meaning that someone becomes great as a ruler.²⁸² However, to the reader whose attention was captivated by the extraordinary prescript, which is, after all, one of the functions of an expanded prescript²⁸³, this verb brings to mind the *anastasis nekroon* ('resurrection of the dead') of 1.4. C.G. Whitsett makes too much use of this allusion, however, in saying that "*Isa 11:10 predicts, in Paul's reading, the resurrection of the root of Jesse/seed of David to rule Gentiles.*"²⁸⁴ Nevertheless, it is very likely that Paul, by making use of the word *anistamenos*²⁸⁵, intends to echo 1.4.²⁸⁶ By doing this, he once more used his anthology of Biblical texts to form a messianic-exegetical inclusion. This inclusion is also visible in the purpose of the rising of the Root of Jesse: the rule of the Gentiles (*archein ethnoon*; Is. 11.10; Rom. 15.12), by an Israelite king – a thought that can be brought back to the obedience of the Gentiles in 1.5.

Having established that Paul probably concluded the letter body by going back to his christology of 1.3b-4 as a programmatic statement, we could ask whether this final quotation of Is. 11.10 can be related to the theme of the letter too. If we look at the co-text of this verse, Is. 11.1-12.6, there is a strong case in arguing that it is related to the theme of the epistle. In the verses immediately following the quoted 11.10, vv. 11-2, it becomes clear that not only the Gentiles are brought to the Root of Jesse, but that the dispersed people of Israel will

²⁸⁰ As it was, although slightly different in title, for the prophet John (cf. Rev. 5.5, 22.16). Perhaps the author of Revelation combined the titles 'Root of Jesse' and 'Seed/Son of David' and created his title 'Root of David'.

²⁸¹ Introduction and translation in Vermes 2011, pp. 497-8. Cf. 4Q285, fragment 7 (Vermes 2011, p. 189).

²⁸² Cf. our interpretation of 2 Sam. 7.12a LXX in §6.2, pp. 48-9 above.

²⁸³ See §5.2, p. 44 above.

²⁸⁴ Whitsett 2000, p. 672.

²⁸⁵ Since this participle has a middle voice, it could in theory be translated both actively ('the one who rises') and passively ('the one who is raised'). The active translation suits the verse in Isaiah better, but a passive translation might be more appropriate to refer to Jesus' resurrection. Is Paul perhaps making use of an intended ambiguity through a quotation?

²⁸⁶ Dunn 1988b, p. 850; Wright 2002a, p. 177; Wright 2002b, p. 748; N.T. Wright, *Romans: Part Two – Chapters 9-16* (PFE; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), p. 118.

come too, from all around the world. These scattered members of God's people are called "the remnant that is left of the people" (τὸ καταλειφθὲν ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ λαοῦ - *to kataleiphthen hupoloipon tou laou*; Is. 11.11 LXX) and "the lost ones of Israel and the dispersed ones of Judah" (τοὺς ἀπολομένους Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ τοὺς διεσπαρμένους Ἰούδα – *tous apolomenous Israel, kai tous diesparmenous Iouda*; Is. 11.12 LXX). This, of course, reminds one of an important sub-theme in Rom. 9-11, where Paul speaks about a 'remnant' (λεῖμμα – *leimma*; Rom. 11.5). It can therefore be said that Paul's quotation of Is. 11.10 works in three ways. Firstly, it is related to the theme of 'hope' within the 15th chapter of Romans. Secondly, it provides a final text for the christological inclusion, including the Messiah's rule over the Gentiles. Thirdly, the quotation works, as said by Richard B. Hays, "as an allusion to Isaiah's vision of God's eschatological kingdom in which the lost ones of Israel rejoin these Gentiles in being gathered at the feet of the one whom God has raised up."²⁸⁷ What God had promised beforehand through the prophet Isaiah (Rom. 1.2) – one community of salvation of both the remnant of Israel and the Gentiles²⁸⁸, in other words, believers coming from the whole of humanity – has now been realised through the Root of Jesse, the Messiah, who is, for Paul and his (Roman) audience, Jesus, the seed of David and the son of God.

8.3.4. Inclusion

We have tried to demonstrate that Paul creates an inclusion in his letter, by using the royal christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 again in a chain of quotations. We further attempted to show that in all four quotations, one way or another, one thing stood out too: the theme of the epistle, the community of Jewish-believers and Gentile-believers praising God. But what could be the rhetorical function of this inclusion? The rhetorical function of a 'severely over-extended' prescript can be compared to an *exordium*, the introductory part of a speech, which makes the audience attentive.²⁸⁹ Paul drew the attention towards the christology of 1.3b-4 and kept the Roman listeners and readers interested in what he had said about his Messiah in several passages, particularly in 1.5-7 and 6.1-14. If the apostle therefore goes back to this prescript in the anthology near the *peroratio*, he has made clear by this inclusion that what he has written in the previous fifteen chapters had very much to do with the christology of the prescript. Hereby this christology functions as a programmatic statement, serving as an important argument in Paul's explanation of the theme set forth in 1.16-7.

The inclusion of 15.7-12 isn't the only instance where the author of the epistle goes back to the words of the prescript. 15.13 can be named, where we have the words ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου (*en dunamei pneumatou hagiou* – 'in/with the power of the holy Spirit), being

²⁸⁷ Hays 1989, p. 73.

²⁸⁸ Wright 2002b, p. 748.

²⁸⁹ See chapter 5, pp. 42-5 above.

close but not similar to the *en dunamei kata pneuma hagioosunès* of 1.4, and perhaps some more of the words of the prescript occur in the last two chapters of Romans, but one passage stands out as being an even more obvious inclusion: 16.25-7. In this concluding doxology, the final words of the epistle, many words from the prescript return. In 16.25 these are the verb δύναμαι (*dunamai* – 'to be able/powerful'; cf. 1.4), the repetition of the preposition κατά (*kata* – 'with respect to'; cf. 1.3b-4; occurring in 16.26 too), the word εὐαγγέλιον (*euangelion* – 'good news'; cf. 1.1), and, of course, the name and title Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Ièsou Christou* – 'Jesus, the Messiah'; cf. 1.1, 4, 6, 7; occurring in 16.27 too). In 16.26 these repeated phrases are the words διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν (*dia graphoon prophètikoon* – 'through prophetic writings'; cf. 1.2), the goal: εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως (*eis hupakoèn pisteoos* – 'unto obedience of faith'; cf. 1.5), and the target group of this goal: εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (*eis panta ta ethnè* – 'unto all the Gentiles'; cf. 1.5).

Of course, these words are not unique to the prescript, or to this concluding doxology, but their combination in Romans is. By using key phrases from the prescript of Romans again, Paul has created an almost perfect inclusion. Except that *he* probably didn't. Rom. 16.25-7 is found in the manuscripts of the New Testament in five different ways: following 14.23 (1), following 15.33 (2), following 14.23 and 15.33, therefore existing twice within the letter (3), following 14.23 and 16.24, again twice (4), and following 16.24 (5). Besides this, three Greek manuscripts lack these verses altogether. This wandering nature of the doxology strongly suggests that it wasn't part of the 'original text' and was added at an early stage of the letter's (liturgical) use.²⁹⁰ We can conclude from this later addition that some early Christian thought that it would be appropriate to complete the letter with a reference to Paul's prescript. This might serve as another argument for the importance of Rom. 1.1-7, even if solely from an epistolary and/or rhetorical perspective. Before going to the concluding chapter of this thesis, we could ask one more question about 16.25-7, without expecting to find the answer: Has the early Christian who added these verses read and estimated Paul's prescript in the same way as it is read interpretatively in this thesis? In other words, does the addition of the concluding doxology not only stress the epistolary importance of the prescript, but also its theological function in Paul's epistle to the Romans?

²⁹⁰ Dunn 1988b, pp. 912-3 and 916-7; K. Aland & B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament – An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1989²), pp. 295-6; Wischmeyer 2012, p. 248. Wright 2002b, pp. 768-9, seems to think otherwise based on internal observations.

9. CONCLUSION

This master thesis has been built upon the following research question, as set forth in the introductory chapter: How is the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 to be seen as crucial to the theology and interpretation of Romans? Before an answer is going to be given to this question, it might be useful to summarise briefly what has been done and said in the preceding chapters.

9.1. A brief summary

It has been established in chapter 3 with a brief historical argumentation that the Roman audience Paul wrote his letter to had a mixed identity and consisted of Gentile-believers and Jewish-believers. This identification of the historical audience led to the assumption that Paul probably used at least two different types of language in his letter, to address both group-identities at the same time from different perspectives: a type of language with a scriptural background and a type of language related to the Greco-Roman ideas about (imperial) power and politics. Several words in the prescript of Romans where Paul made use of this *double entendre* have been singled out. The exegesis of Romans 1.1-4 in the fourth chapter will not be repeated here, but our exegetical statements about the important vv. 3b-4 will be summarised. These two verses weren't considered to be a fixed confessional formula Paul quoted and edited, mainly because its content can be interpreted as Pauline. Paul said that Jesus was 'born from the seed of David', according to his human descent (*kata sarka*). This stage of Jesus' life cannot, however, provide for a complete christology anymore – hence the hermeneutical or reader-orientated function of the restrictive meaning of *kata sarka*. By the general resurrection of the dead, the inauguration of the coming age, Jesus was 'appointed as son of God with power', a functional title denoting first of all his kingship. This enthronement of the Messiah happened 'with respect to the spirit of holiness', a clause pointing at a spiritual quality, operative in a human being and coming from the glory of God, according to the exegesis of the phrase *kata pneuma hagioosunès* in a combined reading of T. Levi 18.11 and the amulet of Acre. The combination of Jesus' identity *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma hagioosunès* presents the reader, from a post-resurrection perspective, with a christology surpassing the level of fleshly knowing.

Because Rom. 1.1-6 forms the 'severely over-extended' *superscriptio* of the prescript of the letter, this odd deviation from the ancient epistolary form has been examined in the fifth chapter from an epistolary and rhetorical point of view. It became clear that although Paul's titular expansions may be interpreted as sizable credentials to establish his authority, the function of the christological statement of Rom. 1.3b-4, the crucial passage in this thesis, can only be understood by the Roman audience if Paul pays further attention to it in other

parts of his epistle. With the heavy weight of his prescript Paul has created an attentive attitude with his audience, with attention paid particularly to his messianic exegesis. This scriptural messianism, as has been explained in the sixth chapter, leans predominantly on Paul's interpretation of 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 2. As has been summarised in the seventh chapter, the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 consists intertextually of four main lines of thought. Firstly, God will provide for the effectiveness of the rule of the seed of David, Jesus. Secondly, the realisation of the royal rule of Jesus is in line with God's covenantal promises. Thirdly, the relation of King Jesus to God is that of son and Father in its functional meaning of a ruling unity. Fourthly, the royal son of God has been given a ruling power exceeding the borders of Israel and including the inheritance and possession of the Gentile world.

In the eighth chapter we have tried to read (parts of) three passages in Romans (1.5-7, 6.1-14 and 15.7-12) in line with the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4. A theme in the first passage, still a part of the prescript of Romans, was the obedience, which is faith, among all the Gentiles. This effect of the good news of God can be seen as a result of Jesus' royal rule, with, amongst other texts, Ps. 2 in mind. From the perspective of epistolary rhetoric this implementation of the intertextual christology in the verse immediately following the confusing christological expansion of the prescript could have stimulated the Roman readers in thinking that what Paul had to say in his letter leaned (heavily) on his royal christology. In relation to the second examined passage it has been argued that the participationist language of being 'baptised into Messiah Jesus' and the meaning of Jesus' fleshly death and resurrection being transferred to the believer's spiritual death and resurrection can be understood if one reckons with an incorporative christology. This idea of incorporation is an element from the royal ideology of the Old Testament and, when understood messianically, means that what is true for the Messiah, is also true for the people of the Messiah. The anthology of Biblical texts in the third passage discussed can be related through a christological exegesis to the christology of the prescript, but also, through an ecclesiocentric exegesis, to the theme of the letter to the Romans as set forth in 1.16-7: a community of salvation for both Jewish-believers and Gentile-believers. Not only has Paul related his chain of quotations to both the prescript and the theme of the letter, but he created an inclusion too. From a rhetorical point of view this emphasises in retrospective the significance of the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4.

9.2. The research question and the first answers

Having summarised the main point of this thesis' content, we can return to the research question. If I would have asked *if* the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 is to be seen as crucial to the theology and interpretation of Romans, the answer would, of course, have been neither an over-simplified 'No', nor an unhesitatingly proclaimed 'Yes', although the affirming part of

the answer would have been emphasised more than the denial. However, I asked *how* the christology is to be seen as crucial. Without claiming to have discovered something new – this is, after all, a subject derived from something N.T. Wright wrote – I do think that the intertextual exegesis and the epistolary importance of Rom. 1.3b-4 are to be considered as a programmatic statement to Paul's theology in his epistle to the Romans, certainly when it can be demonstrated, as in 15.7-12, that his messianic ideas are closely related to the ecclesiological vision of God's covenant faithfulness and the believer's righteousness through Messiah Jesus. And as a programmatic statement the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 needs to be emphasised and deserves an important position in the interpretation of Romans, for this position would be appropriate from the perspective of epistolary rhetoric. But it also deserves this position because of the potential theological gain of focusing on Paul's scripturally based messianism, which would not only be a dominant aspect in describing his christology, but might also have (far-reaching) consequences for other categories of thought, such as his ecclesiology (Rom. 1.16-7, 15.7-12), his eschatology (Rom. 2.16: God's judgement through Jesus, the Messiah), his anthropology (Rom. 6.1-14), or his pneumatology (Rom. 8) – in other words, the whole of his theological thought. It would, in the light of this appreciation of Rom. 1.3b-4, be worth to read the Pauline letters from the developed perspective of a royal christology.

However, before one can go and do that, this perspective will have to be clarified further, for some questions in relation to Paul's messianic exegesis remain. For example, it doesn't seem possible to transfer the incorporative element of the ancient Israelite royal ideology, an element that comes about in texts about events preceding Paul's lifetime by around a thousand years, *directly* to King Jesus, who isn't on earth as king David was. One could ask therefore about the Jewish ideas in the first century C.E. with respect to the relationship between an Israelite king and his people, or between a messiah and the nation as a whole. And even if this incorporative part of the royal ideology can still be seen in Paul's christology – which is probably partly true – it isn't as certain as it has been argued for the sake of the demonstration in §8.2 that the idea of incorporation is the best, the sole or the complete way of explaining the analogous relationship between Jesus' fleshly death and resurrection and the believer's spiritual death and resurrection in Rom. 6.1-14.

Besides this, one could ask whether Jesus' identity in Paul's theology can be described solely in royal language. Probably not, because the not specifically royal theme of sin and reconciliation plays an important role in the epistle to the Romans too. Because the idea of a priestly messiah is well-known from the texts of early Judaism, a priestly element in Paul's christology can be presumed based on these two basic considerations. However, the royal and the priestly element should not be played off against each other, because they may very well be combined. With regard to this subject we could point at the royal and priestly

figure of Melchizedek in Ps. 109 LXX (110 MT) – a text known in its messianic exegesis in and outside the New Testament.²⁹¹

9.3. The origins of Paul's christology – An excurs

Whilst reading or writing about Paul's christology, an idea might occur about the origins of the apostle's thought.²⁹² If the character of Paul's christology is predominantly royal, why is it thus? Where did these thoughts come from? What if this Davidic messianism was there when Jesus revealed himself to Paul on the way to Damascus? When Paul spoke about his call in Gal. 1.11-7, he said that the good news he announced was received 'through a revelation of Jesus, the Messiah' (δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ - *di' apokalypseos Iêsou Christou*; Gal. 1.11-2).²⁹³ And 2 Tim. 2.8 says about Paul's gospel: "Remember Jesus, the Messiah, raised from the dead, from the seed of David, according to my good news" (μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγγεγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου – *mnenoneue Iêsoun Christon, egègermenon ek nekroon, ek spermatos David, kata to euangelion mou*). If the Davidic kinship and the post-resurrection kingship are part of 'my good news', and if the good news Paul received was received through a revelation of Jesus, the Messiah, do these christological ideas then go back to what happened when Paul was called?

It can be noticed in this thesis that I have not distinguished 'authentic' letters of Paul from 'inauthentic' letters. The reason for not doing this is that I haven't examined thoroughly the arguments for choosing a position in this discussion yet. I could have chosen to go with what seems to be the consensus in New Testament scholarship, thereby excluding Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus in my exegesis. However, I have not done this, mainly because of the theological caution I would like to observe with regard to denying a letter's authenticity. Thus far I don't think that this position has led to confusing arguments in this thesis. For example, in the nine categories of meaning attached to the word *sarx* as discussed in §4.4.1, not one category consisted solely of texts from the 'Pauline letters not written by Paul'. In fact, most scriptural references in this paragraph were to texts generally considered as authentic letters.

Luke's description of Paul's call in Acts 9.1-19, 22.6-16 and 26.12-8 could also be included in the thoughts about the origins of the royal christology. Although one can indeed ask which of

²⁹¹ Cf. p. 53 n. 235 above.

²⁹² I should point out that the following reconstruction could be described as an exegetical experimental train of thought, and not necessarily as an appropriate answer to hypothetical questions.

²⁹³ The theme of 'among the Gentiles' (ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν – *en tois ethnesin*) occurs in this passage too, in Gal. 1.16.

the three stories is closest to what really happened to Paul²⁹⁴, one sentence, said by Jesus, occurs in all three accounts of the call on the way to Damascus: "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" (Σαούλ Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις – *Saoul Saoul, ti me diookeis*; Acts 9.4, 22.7, 26.14). If in this confrontation Jesus revealed himself to Paul as son of David in its royal messianic meaning, the use of the Semitic name *Saoul* ('Saul') instead of the Graecised form Σαῦλος (*Saulos* – 'Saul') can become significant.²⁹⁵ Are we able to see in this confrontation a confrontation like the ones Saul and David had in 1 Sam. 24 and 1 Sam. 26? In other words, are the stories of Saul and David somewhere behind Paul's thoughts as a narrative?²⁹⁶ If this is the case, the fact that Paul saw himself as evidence that God did not reject Israel (Rom. 11.1) can perhaps be seen in line with 1 Sam. 12.22, where Saul is proof of God keeping his covenant with Israel.²⁹⁷

9.4. A brief word on Paul and politics

It has been said several times in this thesis that Paul's use of a *double entendre* in words as *euangelion* ('good news'), *huios theou* ('son of God') and *kurios* ('Lord') can be read as counter-imperial language, as political polemic. But what about God's declaration through the ambassador Paul that Jesus, an Israelite king from the Davidic line, has been appointed as Lord over the Gentiles? This christological statement, important as it is for Paul's theology in Romans, can be read as a political challenge too. Despite Roman claims of ruling the world, Paul said that it is Jesus, the seed of David, who does exactly that. Bearing in mind that something older was better than something new in antiquity, it is true that the house of David was much older than the Roman rule over the world, and even older than the legendary founding story of Rome by Romulus and Remus.²⁹⁸ Although most Jewish writers making use of the 'older is better' theme write about Moses preceding all Greco-Roman philosophers, Paul is also telling old stories about Abraham and his function in proclaiming God's justice. We might say that the point Paul makes about the good news of God, is that what is to be found in Messiah Jesus, is at odds with the Roman imperial policy and ideology. And this might very well be the reason Paul wrote Rom. 13.1-7. If Paul's political polemic was put into practice, powerful anti-pagan behaviour might have been the

²⁹⁴ For example, in Acts. 9.7 it is said that the men who were with Paul heard the sound, but did not see anyone, whereas Acts 22.9 says that they saw the light, but did not hear the sound. Although not seeing someone yet seeing a light isn't entirely contradictory in itself, the suggestion that Luke used different sources does not seem implausible. Or should we try to make sense out of these minor differences by pointing at Paul's quotation in 1 Cor. 2.9?

²⁹⁵ Unfortunately the difference between *Saoul* and *Saulos* is not visible in English translations, but it is in Dutch, with 'Saul' and 'Saulus' respectively.

²⁹⁶ Cf. Acts 13.21-3.

²⁹⁷ Wright 1991, p. 247 n. 39.

²⁹⁸ Wright 1999, p. 189; Van Bruggen 2007, p. 30.

consequence. This was, however, not Paul's intention and in writing Rom. 13.1-7 he probably tried to prevent situations like the Essene preparation for an eschatological war, the disturbances in the Roman synagogues in 49 C.E. or the revolutionary character of the Jewish fourth philosophy.²⁹⁹ And even this passage in the 13th chapter of Romans is polemical, for would Caesar really agree with Paul when the apostle said that the imperial authority has been given by the God of Israel?³⁰⁰

9.5. The research question once more

We return to the research question one last time: How is the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 to be seen as crucial to the theology and interpretation of Romans? The 'how' can be answered by saying that one can attempt – and I would plead for this to be done – to learn Paul's theology by starting with his christology. There are several good reasons for doing this and I will give four of them here. First of all, it was the revelation of Jesus that had an enormous impact on Paul's life and thinking – not a development of thought or a gradual change in his views. With his encounter of the crucified yet resurrected Messiah, Paul's mission received a different content. This leads us to the second reason: Paul's ministry. In Romans 1.1 Paul defined himself as a 'slave of Messiah Jesus'. Paul's allegiance is with Jesus, and this important aspect of his identity must have had an impact on his theological thought. Thirdly, it can be said that Paul's belief in the inauguration of the coming age and the Messiahship of Jesus made him stand out as a first century C.E. Jew amongst other Jews. One could object and say that it was not his christology, but his view of the Law or his pneumatology that was characteristic to Paul. But aren't these consequences of his view that with the coming and rising of the Messiah the God of Israel is faithful to the universal range of His covenantal faithfulness? Fourthly, wherever we look in Paul's letters, Christ Jesus is never far away. We have seen, through the christology of Rom. 1.3b-4, that he was related to the missionary vocation of God's people (Rom. 1.5-6), that he was there in the defeat of the power of sin in the believer (Rom. 6.1-14), and that he was with his community consisting of Jewish-believers and Gentile-believers (Rom. 15.7-12).

The christology of Rom. 1.3b-4 is to be seen as crucial to the theology and interpretation of Romans, because it functions as an important category of thought in Paul's argument. This compels us to define precisely what the content of Paul's christology is, both on its own and in relation to other traditions and theological categories. And then, I conclude, it can and probably will indeed serve as a key in the interpretation of Paul's epistle to the Romans.

²⁹⁹ Wright 1999, pp. 190-1.

³⁰⁰ Wright 1999, p. 190.

SUMMARY IN DUTCH

Deze scriptie ter afsluiting van de masteropleiding *Biblical Studies* aan de Universiteit Utrecht heeft de volgende onderzoeksvraag: Hoe kan de christologie van Romeinen 1.3b-4 als cruciaal beschouwd worden voor de theologie en interpretatie van Romeinen? Na een vertaling in hoofdstuk 2 ging hoofdstuk 3 over de historische identiteit van de huisgemeenten in Rome. Paulus schreef zijn brief aan een gemeenschap die zowel uit gelovigen uit de heidenen als uit de Joden bestond. Deze identificatie leidt tot de veronderstelling dat Paulus voor deze twee groepen, zich bediend heeft van ten minste twee niveaus van taal: een taal die teruggaat op tradities van de Schrift en een taal die verbonden is met Grieks-Romeinse ideeën over keizerlijke macht en politiek. Deze geïntendeerde dubbelzinnigheid kan bijvoorbeeld gezien worden bij de woorden 'goede boodschap' (Rom. 1.1), 'zoon van God' (1.4) en 'Heere' (1.5).

Het vierde hoofdstuk was gewijd aan een uitgebreide exegese van Rom. 1.1-4. Paulus vertelt in deze verzen dat de goede boodschap van God gegrond is op beloften in de Schrift over Jezus. Wat de identiteit van Jezus is, zet hij dan uiteen in de verzen 1.3b-4. Deze verzen worden door vele commentatoren voor een oude belijdenisformule gehouden, die Paulus dan geciteerd en naar zijn christologie gecorrigeerd zou hebben. In deze scriptie is met deze hypothese niet ingestemd, hoofdzakelijk vanwege de overtuiging dat deze woorden qua inhoud wel volledig overeenstemmen met Paulus' theologie. Wat zegt Paulus dan in deze verzen? Hij zegt: "... Zijn [Gods] zoon, die geboren is uit het zaad van David met betrekking tot het vlees, die aangesteld is als zoon van God met macht met betrekking tot de geest van heiligheid uit de opstanding der doden..." Jezus' geboorte uit het zaad van David wordt neutraal aangeduid als zijn afstamming ('met betrekking tot het vlees'). Echter, deze fase van Jezus' leven kan niet meer gezien worden als een volledige christologie, vandaar dat aan de woorden 'met betrekking tot het vlees' ook een beperkende betekenis in een hermeneutische of op de lezer gerichte functie toegekend kan worden. Door en met de algemene opwekking van de doden, een onderdeel van de komende, nieuwe tijd, die is geïnaugureerd door Jezus' opstanding, is Jezus aangesteld als zoon van God met macht, macht om te regeren. Deze titel 'zoon van God' moet hier niet gelezen worden als een aanduiding van Jezus' Goddelijke natuur, maar als een titel die op de functie van koning betrekking heeft, zoals de oudtestamentische koning ook gold als Gods zoon. Deze inhuldiging van de Messias gebeurde 'met betrekking tot de geest van heiligheid'. De woorden 'geest van heiligheid', geenszins een synoniem voor 'heilige Geest', wijzen op een geestelijke kwaliteit en eigenschap, die werkzaam is in een mens vanwege Gods heerlijkheid. Deze betekenis kan aan de zeldzame woorden *pneuma hagiosunès* worden toegekend op basis van een gecombineerde exegese van Testament van Levi 18.11 en een

amulet uit Akko. Deze combinatie van Jezus' identiteit – geboren uit het zaad van David en aangesteld als koning met macht – geeft de lezer van de Romeinenbrief, vanuit een perspectief van na Jezus' opstanding, een christologie die het niveau van het algemeen menselijke kennen overstijgt.

Romeinen 1.3b-4 maakt onderdeel uit van het *prescriptum*, een briefelement dat door Paulus op werkelijk ongekenne wijze is uitgebreid. De betekenis van deze uitzonderlijke afwijking van de normen in de antieke briefliteratuur is in het vijfde hoofdstuk nagegaan. Vanuit een epistolair en retorisch gezichtspunt is vastgesteld dat de functie van de christologische these van Rom. 1.3b-4 pas duidelijk kan worden voor de Romeinse lezers wanneer Paulus in zijn brief hier nader op ingaat. Door het retorische overwicht van zijn briefopening heeft Paulus ervoor gezorgd dat zijn publiek aandacht zal besteden aan zijn messiaanse exegese, die ten grondslag ligt aan de christologie. Dit schriftuurlijke messianisme, zoals uiteengezet is in het zesde hoofdstuk, komt vooral voort uit een gecombineerde interpretatie van 2 Samuel 7 en Psalm 2. Vanuit een intertekstueel oogpunt bestaat de christologie van Rom. 1.3b-4 uit vier hoofdgedachten. Ten eerste zal God voorzien in het gelukken en de effectiviteit van de regering van het zaad van David, Jezus. Ten tweede is de realisering van Jezus' koninklijke regering in lijn met Gods verbondsbeloften aan David. Ten derde is de relatie van Koning Jezus tot God als die van een zoon en een vader, waarbij deze functiegerelateerde uitspraak betekent dat er een eenheid in regering tussen Jezus en God waarneembaar is. Ten vierde is aan de koninklijke zoon van God regeringsmacht gegeven die niet alleen binnen Israël werkzaam is, maar ook de erfenis en de bezitting van de heidense wereld omvat. In het samenvattende zevende hoofdstuk is ook uiteengezet dat deze koninklijke christologie, door een incorporerend element uit de oudtestamentische koningsideologie, inhoudt dat wat voor de Messias geldt, ook op een bepaalde manier voor de mensen van de Messias geldt.

In het achtste hoofdstuk is gepoogd (delen van) drie passages in de Romeinenbrief te lezen in lijn met de christologie van Rom. 1.3b-4. In de eerste passage, Rom. 1.5-7, nog steeds onderdeel van het sterk uitgebreide *prescriptum*, is de gehoorzaamheid een thema. Deze gehoorzaamheid bestaat uit geloof en komt onder al de heidenvolkeren. Dit gevolg van (de proclamatie van) de goede boodschap van God kan dan gezien worden als een gevolg van Jezus' koninklijke regering, met onder andere Ps. 2 in het achterhoofd. Vanuit de epistolaire retorica bezien is deze toepassing van de intertekstuele christologie in het vers onmiddellijk volgend op de verwarrende vergroting van het *prescriptum* een aanmoediging voor de Romeinse lezers om te denken dat hetgeen Paulus zal zeggen, nauw verbonden is met zijn koninklijke christologie. In de bespreking van de tweede passage, Rom. 6.1-14, is betoogd dat de uitdrukking 'gedoopt zijn in Messias Jezus' en de overdracht van de betekenis van Jezus' lichamelijke dood en opwekking naar de geestelijke dood en opwekking

van de gelovige het beste begrepen kunnen worden vanuit een incorporerende christologie. Ten slotte is de keten van Bijbelteksten die Paulus citeert in Rom. 15.7-12 bekeken. Paulus begreep deze teksten waarschijnlijk zowel christologisch, waardoor zij verbonden worden met de christologie van Rom. 1.3b-4, en ecclesiocentrisch, waardoor de teksten verbonden worden met het thema van de Romeinenbrief, zoals uiteengezet in 1.16-7: een heilsgemeenschap van zowel Joodse gelovigen als gelovigen uit de heidenvolkeren. Met zijn christologische lezing van de vier geciteerde teksten heeft Paulus een *inclusio* gecreëerd, zodat, terugblikkend vanuit een retorisch perspectief, de christologie van Rom. 1.3b-4 van groot belang is voor de interpretatie van de Romeinenbrief.

Wanneer Paulus' christologie vanuit intertekstueel en retorisch perspectief goed begrepen kan worden – en deze christologie is niet alleen maar koninklijk van aard – kan deze theologische categorie dienen als het fundament onder Paulus' denken. Met een goed en volledig verstaan van Romeinen 1.3b-4 kan, zoals in deze masterscriptie al enigszins is gepoogd aan te tonen, deze christologie dienen als een sleutel voor de interpretatie van Romeinen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams 2010 – S.A. Adams, "Paul's Letter Opening and Greek Epistolography: A Matter of Relationship", in: S.E. Porter & S.A. Adams (eds.), *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form* (PAST vol. 6; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 33-55

Aland & Aland 1989 – K. Aland & B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament – An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1989²)

Aland et al. 2006 – B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini & B.M. Metzger (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006²⁷)

Allen 1971 – L.C. Allen, "The Old Testament Background of (ΠΡΟ)ΨΙΖΕΙΝ in the New Testament" (*NTS* vol. 17/1, 1971), pp. 104-8

Andersen 2011 – F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch", in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha – Volume One: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011²), pp. 91-221

Barr 1961 – J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1961)

Barrett 1991 – C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1991²)

Barth 1997 – K. Barth, *De Brief aan de Romeinen kort verklaard* (trans. A.A. Spijkerboer; Kampen: Kok, 1997 [1956])

Baumgarten 1983 – A.I. Baumgarten, "The Name of the Pharisees" (*JBL* vol. 102/3, 1983), pp. 411-28

Beasley-Murray 1980 – P. Beasley-Murray, "Romans 1:3f: An Early Confession of Faith in The Lordship of Jesus" (*TynB* vol. 31, 1980), pp. 147-54

Begg 2005 – C. Begg, *Judean Antiquities Books 5-7*, in: S. Mason (ed.), *Flavius Josephus – Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2005)

Blass, Debrunner & Rehkopf 2001 – F. Blass, A. Debrunner & F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001¹⁸)

Boyarin 1994 – D. Boyarin, *A Radical Jew – Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA/London: University of California Press, 1994)

Brenton 2011 – L.C.L. Brenton (ed.), *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011¹⁴)

Brown 2001 – M.J. Brown, "Paul's Use of ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥΥ in Romans 1:1" (*JBL* vol. 120/4, 2001), pp. 723-37

Van Bruggen 2007 – J. van Bruggen, *Romeinen – Christenen tussen stad en synagoge* (CNT³; Kampen: J.H. Kok, 2007²)

Bultmann 1952 – R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1952)

Byrskog 1997 – S. Byrskog, "Epistolography, Rhetoric and Letter Prescript: Romans 1.1-7 as a Test Case" (*JSNT* vol. 65, 1997), pp. 27-46

Charlesworth 2003 – J.H. Charlesworth, "Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings", in: A. Laato & J.C. de Moor (eds.), *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 470-508

Cohen 1951 – A. Cohen, *Lamentations*, in: H. Freedman & M. Simon (eds.), *Midrash Rabbah* (London and Bournemouth: Soncino Press, 1951)

Cohen 2006 – S.J.D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Louisville, KY/London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006²)

Cranfield 1975 – C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975⁶)

Danker & Bauer 2000 – F.W. Danker & W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000³)

Dodd 1947 – C.H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (MNTC; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947 [1932])

Dunn 1973 – J.D.G. Dunn, "Jesus – Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans I. 3-4" (*JTS* vol. 24/1, 1973), pp. 40-68

Dunn 1988a – J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC vol. 38A; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1988)

Dunn 1988b – J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16* (WBC vol. 38B; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1988)

Ebel 2012 – E. Ebel, "The Life of Paul", in: O. Wischmeyer (ed.), *Paul – Life, Setting, Work, Letters* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 97-109

Ehrman 2003 – B.D. Ehrman, *Lost Scriptures – Books that Did Not Make It into the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Ehrman 2008a – B.D. Ehrman, *God's Problem – How the Bible Fails to Answer Our Most Important Question – Why We Suffer* (New York City, NY: HarperOne, 2008)

Ehrman 2008b – B.D. Ehrman, *The New Testament – A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (New York City, NY/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008⁴)

Elliger & Rudolph 1997 – K. Elliger & W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997⁵)

Fitzmyer 1993 – J.A. Fitzmyer, *Romans – A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB vol. 33; New York City, NY: Doubleday, 1993)

Frid 1983 – B. Frid, "Jesaja und Paulus in Röm 15,12" (*BZ* vol. 27/2, 1983), pp. 237-41

Harrill 2003 – J.A. Harrill, "Paul and Slavery", in: J.P. Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World – A Handbook* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003), pp. 575-607

Hays 1985 – R.B. Hays, "'Have We Found Abraham to Be Our Forefather According to the Flesh?' – A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1" (*NovT* vol. 27/1, 1985), pp. 76-98

Hays 1989 – R.B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press, 1989)

Jastrow 1903 – M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (reprint by BN Publishing *sine loco et anno.*, originally published in 1903)

Jewett 2007 – R. Jewett, *Romans – A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007)

Johnson 1971 – S.L. Johnson Jr., "The Jesus That Paul Preached" (*BS* vol. 128, 1971), pp. 120-34

Käsemann 1973 – E. Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT vol. 8a; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1973)

Kee 2011 – H.C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha – Volume One: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011²), pp. 775-828

Klaiber 2009 – W. Klaiber, *Der Römerbrief* (BNT; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009)

Klauck 2006 – H.-J. Klauck, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament – A Guide to Context and Exegesis* (trans. D.P. Bailey; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006)

Koehler & Baumgartner 2001 – L. Koehler & W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2001)

Lampe 1987 – P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten – Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte* (WUNT vol. II/18; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987)

Légasse 2000 – S. Légasse, "Fils de David et Fils de Dieu – Note sur Romains 1, 3-4" (*NRTh* vol. 122/4, 2000), pp. 564-72

Lehnhardt 2008 – A. Lehnhardt, *Ta'anivot – Fasten*, in: M. Hengel et al. (eds.), *Übersetzung des Talmud Yerushalmi*, vol. II/9 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008)

Levin 2006 – Y. Levin, "Jesus, 'Son of God' and 'Son of David': The 'Adoption' of Jesus into the Davidic Line" (*JSNT* vol. 28/4, 2006), pp. 415-42

Linnemann 1971 – E. Linnemann, "Tradition und Interpretation in Röm. 1,3f" (*EvTh* vol. 31/5, 1971), pp. 264-76

Lohse 1964 – E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran – Hebräisch und Deutsch – Mit Masoretischer Punktation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964)

Lust, Eynikel & Hauspie 2003 – J. Lust, E. Eynikel & K. Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint – Revised Edition* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003)

Meuzelaar 1961 – J.J. Meuzelaar, *Der Leib des Messias – Eine exegetische Studie über den Gedanken vom Leib Christi in den Paulusbriefen* (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1979 [1961])

Meyer 1988 – P.W. Meyer, *Romans* (HBC; San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1988)

Morris 1988 – L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI/Leicester: William B. Eerdmans/ Inter-Varsity Press, 1988)

NIV – *Holy Bible – New International Version* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2011)

Novenson 2009a – M.V. Novenson, "The Jewish Messiahs, the Pauline Christ and the Gentile Question" (*JBL* vol. 128/2, 2009), pp. 357-73

Novenson 2009b – M.V. Novenson, "Why Does R. Akiba Acclaim Bar Kokhba as Messiah?" (*JSJ* vol. 40, 2009), pp. 551-72

Novenson 2012³⁰¹ – M.V. Novenson, *Christ among the Messiahs – Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

NRSV – A.-J. Levine & M. Zvi Brettler (eds.), *The Jewish Annotated New Testament – New Revised Standard Version Bible Translation* (Oxford/New York City, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011)

³⁰¹ The content of this book is only known to me through the review of N.K. Gupta (accessed via <http://www.bookreviews.org/bookdetail.asp?TitleId=8495> on 1st August 2013).

O'Neill 1975 – J.C. O'Neill, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975)

Penna 1982 – R. Penna, "Les Juifs à Rome au temps de l'apôtre Paul" (*NTS* vol. 28, 1982), pp. 321-47

Peterson 1959 – E. Peterson, "Das Amulett von Acre", in: idem, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen* (Freiburg: Herder, 1959), pp. 346-54

Poythress 1976 – V.S. Poythress, "Is Romans 1³⁻⁴ a Pauline Confession After All?" (*ExpT* vol. 87/6, 1976), pp. 180-3

Reumann 2003 – J. Reumann, *Romans* (ECB; Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2003)

Roberts & Donaldson 1996 – A. Roberts & J. Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1: "The Apostolic Fathers – Justin Martyr – Irenaeus" (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/William B. Eerdmans, 1996 [1884])

Sanday & Headlam 1964 – W. Sanday & A.C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1964⁵ [1902])

Sanders 1977 – E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism – A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1977)

Schaff & Wace 1991 – Ph. Schaff & H. Wace, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1: "Eusebius" (Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, MI: T&T Clark/William B. Eerdmans, 1991 [1890])

Schiffman 1991 – L.H. Schiffman, *From Text to Tradition – A History of Second Temple & Rabbinic Judaism* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1991)

Schmithals 1988 – W. Schmithals, *Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1988)

Schubert 1939 – P. Schubert, "Form and Function of the Pauline Letters" (*JR* vol. 19/4, 1939), pp. 365-77

Schweizer 1963 – E. Schweizer, "Röm. 1,3 f, und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus", in: idem, *Neotestamentica – Deutsche und Englische Aufsätze 1951-1963* (Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), pp. 180-9

Scott 1992 – J.M. Scott, "ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in Romans 8:15, 23", in: idem, *Adoption as Sons of God* (WUNT vol. II/48; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992), pp. 221-66

Stemberger 2011 – G. Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (München: C.H. Beck, 2011⁹)

Stendahl 1976 – K. Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1976)

Stuhlmacher 1967 – P. Stuhlmacher, "Theologische Probleme des Römerbriefpräskripts" (*EvTh* vol. 27/7, 1967), pp. 374-89

Stuhlmacher 1989 – P. Stuhlmacher, *Der Brief an die Römer* (NTD vol. 6; Göttingen/Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989¹⁴)

Tite 2010 – P.L. Tite, "How to Begin, and Why? Diverse Functions of the Pauline Prescript within a Greco-Roman Context", in: S.E. Porter & S.A. Adams (eds.), *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form* (PAST vol. 6; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 57-99

Tomson 2002 – P.J. Tomson, '*Als dit uit de Hemel is...*' – Jezus en de schrijvers van het Nieuwe Testament in hun verhouding tot het Jodendom (Hilversum: B. Folkertsma Stichting voor Talmudica, 2002⁴)

Vermes 2011 – G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English – Revised Edition* (London: Penguin Books, 2011)

Vogliano & Preisendanz 1948 – A. Vogliano & R. Preisendanz, "Laminetta magica siciliana Tav. 1" (*Acme* vol. I, fasc. 1/2, 1948), pp. 73-85

Whitsett 2000³⁰² – C.G. Whitsett, "Son of God, Seed of David: Paul's Messianic Exegesis in Romans 2:3-4" (*JBL* vol. 119/4, 2000), pp. 661-81

³⁰² The reference in the title of this article should, of course, be to Romans 1.3-4.

- Wischmeyer 2012 – O. Wischmeyer, "The Letter to the Romans", in: O. Wischmeyer (ed.), *Paul – Life, Setting, Work, Letters* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 245-76
- Witherington & Hyatt 2004 – B. Witherington & D. Hyatt, *Paul's Letter to the Romans – A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2004)
- Wright 1991 – N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant – Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (London/New York City, NY: T&T Clark International, 1991)
- Wright 1999 – N.T. Wright, "Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire" (*CTIR* vol. 2, 1999), pp. 42-65
- Wright 2002a – N.T. Wright, "Paul and Caesar: A New Reading of Romans", in: C. Bartholomew et al. (eds.), *A Royal Priesthood? – The Use of the Bible Ethically and Politically – A Dialogue with Oliver O'Donovan* (SHS vol. 3; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002), pp. 173-93
- Wright 2002b – N.T. Wright, *The Letter to the Romans* (NIB vol. 10; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2002)
- Wright 2004a – N.T. Wright, *Romans: Part One – Chapters 1-8* (PFE; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004)
- Wright 2004b – N.T. Wright, *Romans: Part Two – Chapters 9-16* (PFE; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004)
- Wright 2005 – N.T. Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives* (London: SPCK, 2005)
- Wright 2011 – R.B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon", in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha – Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2011²), pp. 639-70
- Young 2012 – S.L. Young, "Romans 1.1-5 and Paul's Christological Use of Hab. 2.4 in Rom. 1.17: An Underutilized Consideration in the Debate" (*JSNT* vol. 34/3, 2012), pp. 277-85

Zeller 1985 – D. Zeller, *Der Brief an die Römer* (RNT; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1985)

Zimmermann 1970 – H. Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre. Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1970³)

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED³⁰³

Old Testament		Old Testament		Old Testament	
<i>Genesis</i>		<i>1 Chronicles</i>		<i>Jeremiah</i>	
2.24	32	28.6	51	1.5	19
13.15	32				
		<i>Nehemiah</i>		<i>Ezekiel</i>	
<i>Exodus</i>		1.6	17	37	48
4.22-3	23			37.23 MT	47
15.17-8	47	<i>Psalms</i>		37.24	48
		1.1 MT	47		
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		2	22, 31, 46-7	<i>Daniel</i>	
6.4-5	58-9		53, 61, 64	12.10	47
32	65		70, 76		
32.36	17	2.1-2 MT	47	<i>Amos</i>	
32.43	62, 64	2.6	51	9.11 MT	47
32.43 MT	64-5	2.7	23, 38, 46, 50-1, 55	9.11-2	50
		2.8	51-3, 55, 59	<i>Habakkuk</i>	
<i>1 Samuel</i>		17.43-4	64	2.4	22
12.22	73	17.49	62-4		
24	73	17.50	64	New Testament	
26	73	18.50 MT	62-3	<i>Matthew</i>	
		50.11	35	1.1-17	24-5
<i>2 Samuel</i>		51.11 MT	35	6.24	41
7	22, 46-8, 50- 1, 70, 76	68.9	63	9.27	25
7.10-4 MT	47	69.9 MT	63	10.24-5	
7.12-6	46-7	71.11	53, 55	12.23	25
7.12	32, 46, 48-50 55, 66	72.11 MT	53	13.27	41
7.12 MT	48-9	88.27-8	51-2, 55	13.49	19
7.13-6	46	89.27-8 MT	51	15.22	25
7.13	50	109	53, 55, 72	18.25	41
7.14	23, 46, 50-1 55	109.1	26, 52	18.27	41
7.15	52, 59, 65	109.4	53	18.31-2	41
7.16	49-50, 55	110 MT	53, 72	18.34	41
19.40-3	55	110.1 MT	26, 52	20.8	41
19.41-4 MT	55	110.4 MT	53	20.30-1	25
19.43	48, 55	116.1	62, 65	21.9	25
20.1	48, 55-6	116.2	65	21.15	25
22.50	62-3	117.1 MT	62, 65	21.40	41
		<i>Isaiah</i>		22.41-5	26
<i>1 Kings</i>		1.9	32	24.45-6	41
2.45	49	8.11 MT	47	24.48	41
12.16	48, 55-6	11.1-12.6	66	24.50	41
		11.10	62, 65-7	25.18-24	41
		11.11-2	66-7	25.26	41
<i>2 Kings</i>		40-55	19, 21	25.32	19
18.12	17	44.2	19	<i>Mark</i>	
		49.1	19	10.47-8	25
<i>1 Chronicles</i>		52.13-53.12	52	12.9	41
17.11-4	47-8, 51	63.10-1	35	12.35-7	26

³⁰³ References to source texts in the table of contents, the list of used abbreviations, the titles of chapters or paragraphs, or in bibliographical information are not included here. References to texts from the Old Testament are according to the Septuagint, unless noted otherwise.

New Testament		New Testament		New Testament	
<i>Mark</i>		<i>Acts</i>		<i>Romans</i>	
13.35	41	22.7	73	4.16	32
		22.9	73	4.18	32
<i>Luke</i>		26.12-8	72	4.24	41
1.27	25	26.14	73	4.24-5	62
1.32	25			5.1	41
2.4	25	<i>Romans</i>		5.2	63
3.23-38	24-5	1.1	11, 16-21, 23	5.10	62
6.22	19		40, 43-4, 58-	5.11	41
12.36-8	41		60, 68, 74, 75	5.21	41
12.42-3	41	1.1-3	20-4	6.1-14	60, 67, 70-
12.45-7	41	1.1-4	10, 15-6, 41,		1, 74, 76
13.13	50		54, 69, 75	6.3	61
14.21-3	41	1.1-6	16, 44, 69	6.4	39-40, 61
16.3	41	1.1-7	9, 11-2, 42-4	6.6	61
16.5	41		52, 68	6.7	61
16.8	41	1.1-15	42	6.8	61
16.13	41	1.2	11, 21-2, 28	6.12-8	61
18.38-9	25		30, 34, 38, 45-	6.16	61-2
19.16	41		6, 49, 59, 62	6.19	34
19.18	41		67-8	6.23	41
19.20	41	1.2-4	59	7	63
19.25	41	1.3	11, 21-8, 31-5	7.5	34
20.13	41		37-40, 46, 49	7.5-6	33
20.15	41		52	7.18	33
20.41-4	26	1.3b-4	9-10, 16, 21	7.25	33, 41
22.22	38		24-47, 49-55	8	57, 71
22.24	55		57-61, 66-71	8.3	34
			74-7	8.3-5	33
<i>John</i>		1.4	23, 27-8, 31-2	8.4	34
1	38		35-41, 46-9	8.12-3	33
13.16	41		51-2, 60, 66	8.13	34
15.15	41		68, 75	8.29	20
15.20	41	1.5	41, 45, 57-9	8.38	39
			61-2, 64, 66	8.39	41
			68, 75	9-11	14, 67
<i>Acts</i>		1.5-6	42, 74	9.3	33, 35
1.6	53	1.5-7	57, 67, 70, 76	9.5	33, 35, 37
2.23	38	1.6	42, 59, 68		57
2.24-36	52	1.7	16, 23, 41, 59	9.7-8	32
4.29	17		60, 68	9.8	33
9.1-19	72	1.8-15	42	9.17	39
9.4	73	1.9	21	9.28-9	41
9.7	73	1.15	60	9.29	32
10.42	38	1.16	39	9.33	51
13.2	19	1.16-7	22, 42-3, 45	10.9	41
13.21-3	73		59, 61-4, 67	10.13	41
13.22-3	25		70-1	10.16	41
13.30-6	52	1.18	42	10.19	65
15.16	50	1.20	39	11.1	32, 73
16.16	41	2.16	21, 71	11.3	41
16.17	17	2.28-9	33	11.5	67
16.19	41	3.20	32, 38	11.14	33, 35
17.31	38	3.29-30	58	11.26	51
18.2	13-4	4.1	33, 35	11.34	41
19.9	19	4.8	41	12.12	63
21	50	4.13	32	12.19	41, 65
22.6-16	72				

New Testament*Romans*

13.1-7 73-4
 13.14 33, 41
 14 14, 62
 14.4 41
 14.11 41
 14.14 41
 14.23 68
 15.3 63
 15.4 62
 15.6 41
 15.7-12 57, 62, 64
 67, 70-1, 74
 77
 15.8 62-3
 15.9 62-5
 15.10 62, 64
 15.11 41, 62
 15.12 24, 62, 65-6
 15.13 37, 39, 67-8
 15.16 21
 15.19 21, 39
 15.30 41
 15.33 68
 16 13, 17
 16.3 13-4
 16.18 41
 16.20 41
 16.22 16
 16.23 15
 16.24 68
 16.25 21, 68
 16.25-7 68
 16.26 68
 16.27 68
1 Corinthians
 1.2-3 41
 1.3 60
 1.7-9 41
 1.17-8 28
 1.18 39
 1.24 39
 1.26 34
 1.29 32, 38
 1.31 41
 2.4-5 39
 2.8 41
 2.9 73
 2.16 41
 3.20 41
 4.20 39
 5.4 39, 41
 5.5 33-4, 41
 6.11 41
 6.14 39, 41
 6.16 32
 6.17 41

New Testament*1 Corinthians*

7.28 33
 8.5 41
 8.6 41
 9.1 41
 9.5 41
 9.12 21
 9.18 21
 10.1-2 61
 10.18 34
 10.21 41
 10.26 41
 11.23 30, 41
 11.26-7 41
 12.3 41
 12.28-9 22
 14.21 41
 14.29 22
 14.32 22
 14.37 22
 15.1-4 27
 15.3 30
 15.12-3 39
 15.24 39
 15.24-8 49
 15.31 41
 15.37-8 32
 15.39 32
 15.50 33
 15.57 41
 16.23 41
2 Corinthians
 1.2 60
 1.2-3 41
 1.14 41
 1.17 33
 1.20 23
 2.12 21
 4.5 17, 41
 4.7 39
 4.11 33
 4.14 41
 5.16 34
 6.7 39
 6.14-8 50
 6.15 56
 6.16 50
 6.17 19
 6.17-8 41
 7.1 32, 38-9
 7.5 32
 8.9 41
 9.13 21
 10.2-3 33
 10.14 21
 10.17 41

New Testament*2 Corinthians*

11.7 21
 11.18 33
 11.22 32
 11.31 41
 12.7 32
 12.9 39
 13.4 39
 13.13 41
Galatians
 1.2 60
 1.3 41
 1.7 21
 1.10 17
 1.11-2 72
 1.11-7 72
 1.15 19
 1.16 32, 72
 1.19 41
 2.12 19
 2.16 32, 38
 2.20 33
 3.3 33-4
 3.11 22
 3.16 32
 3.19 32
 3.29 32
 4.4 24, 31, 38
 4.13-4 32
 4.23 33
 4.29 33-4
 5.11 28
 5.13 33
 5.16-7 33-4
 5.19-21 34
 5.19-24 33
 5.24 34
 6.8 33-4
 6.12 28
 6.12-3 33
 6.14 28, 41
 6.18 41
Ephesians
 1.2 60
 1.2-3 41
 1.3-14 16
 1.15 41
 1.17 41
 1.19 39
 1.21 39
 2.3 33
 2.11 33
 2.14 33
 2.16 28
 3.7 39

New Testament*Ephesians*

3.11	41
3.16	39
3.20	39
5.20	41
5.22	41
5.29	32
5.31	32
6.5	33, 41
6.9	41
6.12	32
6.19-20	21
6.23-4	41

Philippians

1.1	17
1.2	41, 60
1.22	33
1.24	33
1.27	21
2.6-11	38
2.8	28
2.11	41
2.19	41
3.3-4	33
3.8	41
3.10	39, 62
3.18	28
3.20	41
4.23	41

Colossians

1.3	41
1.11	39
1.16	50
1.20	28
1.22	32
1.24	32
1.29	39
2.1	32
2.5	34
2.6	41
2.11	33
2.13	33
2.14	28
2.18	33-4
2.23	33
3.17	41
3.22	33
3.22-3	41
3.24	41
4.1	41
4.12	17

1 Thessalonians

1.1	41
1.3	41

New Testament*1 Thessalonians*

1.5	39
2.2	21
2.8	21
2.9	21
2.15	41
2.19	41
3.2	21
3.11	41
3.13	38, 41
4.1-2	41
5.2	41
5.9	41
5.23	41
5.28	41

2 Thessalonians

1.1-2	41
1.2	60
1.7-8	41
1.8	21
1.11	39
1.12	41
2.1	41
2.2	41
2.8	41
2.9	39
2.14	41
2.16	41
3.6	41
3.12	41
3.18	41

1 Timothy

1.2	41
1.12	41
3.16	27-8, 34, 40
6.3	41
6.14	41
6.15	41

2 Timothy

1.2	41
1.7-8	39
2.8	21, 24, 27, 38
	72
2.24	17
3.5	39

Titus

1.1	17
-----	----

Philemon

1.3	41, 60
1.5	41
1.16	32
1.25	41

New Testament*Hebrews*

1.5-14	52
2.11-3	63
4.7	38
7	53
7.14	25
12.12	50

James

1.1	17
4.15	8

2 Peter

1.1	17
-----	----

Jude

1.1	17
-----	----

Revelation

1.1	17
5.5	25, 66
22.16	25, 66

Pseudepigrapha*2 Enoch*

8.3	37
-----	----

Ps. Sol.

17	47
17.4	47
17.23	47
17.32	47
17.46	47

T. Levi

18.2	37
18.7	36-7
18.11	36-7, 39
	69, 75

Qumranic texts

1QH 7.16	17
1QpHab	46
4Q161, 8-10	66
4Q285, 7	66
4QFlor	46-8, 53
4QFlor I, 1-2	47
4QFlor I, 7-13	47
4QFlor I, 11-2	46
4QFlor I, 12-3	50
4QFlor I, 16-7	48
4QFlor I, 18-9	47, 53
4QFlor II	47, 53
4QMMT, C	20

**Other early
Jewish texts**

Amulet of Acre 36-7, 39, 69
76

Eikh. R.
II.2, §4 53

Josephus, Ant.
5.39 17
11.90 17
11.101 17

y. Ta'an
4.8/27 53

**Early Christian
Texts**

Barnabas
12.10-1 25

Didachè
9.2 25

Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica
3.19-20 25

Ignatius to the Ephesians
18.2 25
20.2 25

Romans
7.3 25

Trallians
9.1 25

Smyrnaeans
1.1 25

Latin writers

Cicero
Inv. rhet. 1.15-20 44

Quintilian
Inst. Or. 4.1-5 44

Suetonius
Vita Claudii 25.4 13

V. Vesp. 4.5 18

Tacitus
Historiae 5.13 18