PAUL'S USE OF OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN ROMANS 9 -11: A SOCIAL IDENTITY APPROACH

IBITAYO OLUSEGUN ARIKAWE

PhD

2025

TITLE PAGE

PAUL'S USE OF OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN ROMANS 9 -11: A SOCIAL IDENTITY APPROACH

IBITAYO OLUSEGUN ARIKAWE

A thesis submitted to the University of Gloucestershire in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of History, Religion, Philosophy and Politics

July 2025

Word count 86,426

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines Paul's use of Old Testament scripture in Romans 9–11 through the interpretive lens of social identity theory. It demonstrates that Paul employs citations from Genesis, Exodus, Isaiah, Hosea, and Malachi to construct a social identity framework for the formation of the Christ group in Rome. With the oracular use of these citations, Paul develops a social categorisation of the Christ group based on shared and inclusive values, such as faith, mercy, compassion, and the olive tree, etc., that distinguishes them from other groups. This is a transformative engagement that promotes unity within a socially fractured Christ group that comprises Judeans and non-Judeans. Drawing on socio-rhetorical analysis and social identity theory, the study shows how Paul addresses a real social-ethnic crisis in the Roman assembly. These citations reframe ethnic boundaries, shifting allegiance from ethnicity or Torah observance to shared participation in God's mercy and calling. Consequently, scripture becomes the foundation for forging a unified collective identity for God's people.

Importantly, this dissertation demonstrates that Paul's oracular and identity-forming hermeneutic remains relevant. His integrative model provides a theological and pastoral resource for contemporary Christian churches and organisations facing social-ethnic divisions. Moreover, it presents a scriptural framework for reconciliation in communities emerging from ethnic conflicts. In contexts still ravaged by division, Paul's strategy of invoking scripture as both divine oracle and community-building narrative offers a compelling paradigm for unity, healing, and shared identity in Christ.

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of the University of Gloucestershire and is original except where indicated by specific reference in the text. No part of the thesis has been submitted as part of any other academic award. The thesis has not been presented to any other educational institution in the United Kingdom or overseas.

This dissertation is the product of my own work and does not infringe on the ethical principles set out in the University's Research Ethics Handbook.

I agree that it may be made available for reference via any and all media and means, now known or developed in the future, at the discretion of the University.

Any views expressed in the thesis are those of the author and in no way represent those of the University.

Signed I. Ariks **Date: 31/07/2025**

Ibitayo Arikawe

DOI: 10.46289/WDWA6506

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

"For everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under heaven" (RSV)

The completion of this part-time doctoral research has been a long undertaking, pursued alongside substantial professional and personal responsibilities.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Philip Esler, for his steady guidance, encouragement, and patience throughout this work. It has been a particular privilege to undertake this research under the supervision of a scholar of such distinction, and I remain deeply grateful for his support.

I am also profoundly thankful to my family for their constant support, encouragement, and sacrifice over the years. Their steadfast presence has sustained me throughout this journey and has made the completion of this thesis possible.

Lastly, I would like to thank my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, by whose grace I can complete this program.

Indeed, there is time for everything under heaven - this is now the time for me to finish the program, although later than planned.

To God be the glory! Great things He has done.

Ibitayo Arikawe

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE i
ABSTRACT ii
DECLARATION iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS v
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS ix
PROLOGUE 1
CHAPTER ONE 4
EXPLORING ROMANS 9-11 4
1.1 Introduction 4
1.2 Historical Context and Interpretation 4
1.3 The Shift Towards Sociocultural Analysis 5
1.4 Paul's Vision for Unity 5
1.5 Research Aims and Objectives 6
1.6. Significance and Originality of the Study 6
CHAPTER TWO 8
THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE OF SCHOLARSHIP ON ROMANS 8
2.1 Introduction 8
2.2 Key Issues in Romans Scholarship 8
2.3 The Audience of Romans 10
2.4. Authorship and Purpose of Romans 19
2.5 The Ongoing Debate on Romans 9-11 22
2.6 The Debate on the Use of the OT in the New Testament (Hays vs Stanley) 25
CHAPTER THREE 32
METHODOLOGY 32
3.1 Proposed Research Method 32
3.2 Overview of SIT 32
3.3 Ethnic Identity and SIT 34
3.4 Prototypes 36
3.5 Social and Self-Categorisation Theory 37
3.6 Realistic Conflict Theory (RCT) 40

3.7 Reduction of Intergroup Bias and Conflict 40
3.9 Case Studies in Collective Memory 46
3.10 Paul's Use of Scripture in Romans as an Exercise in Collective Memory 49
3.11 Identity Markers in Romans 11 50
CHAPTER FOUR 51
USE OF SCRIPTURE IN ROMANS 9:1-29: SOCIAL IDENTITY PERSPECTIVE 51
4.1 Introduction 51
4.2. The Election, Privilege, and Ethnicity of Israel (9:1-5) 52
4.3. Use of Scripture and the Lineage of Isaac in the Framework for the Creation of Israel (9:6-8) 57
4.4. Use of Scripture and Mercy as Framework for Creation of Israel (9:14-18) 80
4.5. Use of Scripture and the Potter-Clay Framework in the Creation of Israel (9:19-23) .. 87
4.6. Use of Scripture and the Framework for the Creation of the Non-Judeans and Remnant Judeans in God's Plan (9:24-29) 89
CHAPTER FIVE 99
USE OF SCRIPTURE IN ROMANS 9:30-10:21—SOCIAL IDENTITY PERSPECTIVE. 99
5.1 Introduction 99
5.2 Israel and the Stumbling Stone (Rom. 9:30-33) 100
5.3 The wording of Isa. 28:16 and Isa. 8:14 in Rom. 9:33 104
5.4 Analysis of Isa.. 8:14 in Rom. 9:33 106
5.5 Identity of the Stone about Israel in Isaiah 8:14 107
5.6 The Context of Isaiah 8:14 Using a Social Identity Framework 108
5.7 The Zeal of Israel without Knowledge (Rom. 10:1-4) 111
5.8 Righteousness from the Law vs Righteousness from Faith (Rom. 10:5; Lev. 18:5) 118
5.9 The Wording of Leviticus 18:5 in Romans 10:5-8 119
5.10 The Message about God's Righteousness is Near (Deut. 30:12-13; Rom. 10:6-10) .122
5.11 Wordings and Analysis of Deut. 30:12-145 in 10:6-8 125
5.12 Paul's Social Use of Citation (Deut. 30:12-14) 129
5.13 Citation of Deut. 30:12-14 and Paul's Audience 132
5.14 Jesus is the Lord of All to the Judeans and non-Judeans (Rom. 10:9-13) 133
5.15 Function of Isa. 28:16 and Joel 2:32 in Rom. 10:11, 13 135
5.16 The Prerequisites of Calling upon the Name of the Lord (Rom. 10:14-18) 141
5.17 The Social Function of Isaiah 52 in Romans 10:15 143
5.18 Who has believed our report? (Isa. 53:1 in 10:16b) 145

5.19 The Social Use of Isaiah 53:1 in Romans 10:16 147
5.22 The Structure and Function of Psa. 18:5 (LXX) in 10:18 149
5.21 Paul's social use of Psa. 18: 5 (LXX) in Rom. 10:18 151
5.22 Framework of Jealousy in Rom. 10:19-21 153
5.23 The wording of Deut. 32:21 in Rom. 10:19 154
5.24 Divine Jealousy and Group Provocation in Deut. 32:21 and Rom. 10:19 155
5.25 The Social Significance of Jealousy in Deut. 32:21 156
5.26 The Social Significance of Jealousy in Rom. 10:19 157
5.27 The Wording of the Quotation in 10:20-21 159
5.28 The Role of Collective Memory in Romans 10 163
CHAPTER SIX 165
THE FULLNESS OF THE NON-JUDEANS AND ALL JUDEANS (11:1-36): SOCIAL IDENTITY PERSPECTIVE 165
6.1 Introduction 165
6.2 Outline of Rom. 11:1-36 by Group Social Categorisation 166
6.3 Paul, Ethnicity, and the Remnant, Rom. 11:1-6 167
6.4 Paul's Use of Scripture in Rom. 11:1-10 173
6.5 The Wording of 1 Kgs. 19:14, 18 in Rom. 11:3-4 175
6.6 Paul's Social Use of 1 Kgs. 19:10,14,18 in Rom. 11:3-4 178
6.7 The Remnant Christ group vs The Insensible non-Christ Group (11:7-10) 180
6.8 The Wording of Deut. 29:4 and Isa. 29:10 in Rom. 11:8 182
6.9 The Wording of Ps. 68:23–24 in Rom. 11:9-10 183
6.10 The Social Function of Deut. 29:4, Isa. 29:10, and Ps. 68:23–24 in Rom. 11:8-10 183
6.11 The Stumbling of the Judeans and the Salvation of the Non-Judeans (Rom. 11:11-15) 188
6.12 Images: Firstfruits and Whole Batch, Root, and Branches (Rom. 11:16) 202
6.13 The Olive Tree Metaphor (Rom. 11:17-24) 205
6.14 The Mystery of God's Salvation Plan for Judeans and non-Judeans in Rom. 11:25-36 215
6.15 All Israel Will be Saved (Rom. 11:25-32) 217
6.16 The Redeemer will come from Zion (11:26-27) 227
6.17 The Use of Scriptures in Rom. 11:26-27 229
6.18 Clarity of the Divine Outworking of God's Salvation Plan (11:28-32) 233
6.19 Doxology: Judeans and non-Judeans Praise God Together (11:33-36) 236
CHAPTER SEVEN 243

CONCLUSION 243
EPILOGUE 259
REFERENCES 268

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AB	Anchor Bible
AGGSNT	von Siebenthal, Heinrich. Ancient Greek Grammar for the Study of the New Testament. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019.
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
APB	*Acta Patristica et Byzantina*
ASE	*Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi*
ASMS	American Society of Missiology Series
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies*
BAGL	Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BBRSup	Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplement
BADG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDB	Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
Bibas	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
BINS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJSUCSD	Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego

BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary
BSTS	Bible Speaks Today Series
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue Biblique
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBW	Conversations with the Biblical World
ChSt	Christian Studies
CTR	Criswell Theological Review
CuadT	*Cuadernos de Teología*
CurBR	Currents in Biblical Research
CurTM	Currents in Theology and Mission
DPL	Hawthorne, Gerald F., Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
ECM	Editio Critica Maior
EGGNT	Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament
ESEC	Emory Studies in Early Christianity
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
FN	*Filología Neotestamentaria*
GOCN	Gospel and Our Culture Network
GOCS	Gospel and Our Culture Series
HALOT	*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*
HBT	*Horizons in Biblical Theology*
Hermeneia	Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible
HS	*Hebrew Studies*

HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HvTSt	*Hervormde Teologiese Studies*
IBMR	International Bulletin of Missionary Research
IBS	Irish Biblical Studies
IDS	Israel's Doctrinal Studies
Int	*Interpretation*
IRM	*International Review of Mission*
JAJ	*Journal of Ancient Judaism*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JECH	*Journal of Early Christian History*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JJMJS	*The Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting*
JOTT	*Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics*
JRE	*Journal of Religious Ethics*
JSHJ	*Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JTInt	*Journal of Theological Interpretation*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*

LNIDA	Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies,1989.
LBS	Library of Biblical Studies (T&T Clark)
LEH	Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015.
LENT	Linguistic Exegesis of the New Testament
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-EnglishLexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
McMNTS	McMaster New Testament Series
MFAR	Mission Focus Annual Review
MSJ	*Master's Seminary Journal*
MwJT	*Midwestern Journal of Theology*
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NBC	New Bible Commentary
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NKJV	New King James Version
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology

NTC	The New Testament in Context
NTM	New Testament Monographs
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTTSD	New Testament Tools, Studies, and Documents
Presb	*Presbyterion: Covenant Seminary Review*
PTMS	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
PVTG	*Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece*
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
REB	Revised English Bible
RevExp	*Review and Expositor*
RIBLA	*Revista de Interpretación Bíblica Latinoamericana*
SBJT	*Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SDSS	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SHS	Scripture and Hermeneutics Series
SICNTS	Social Identity Commentary on the New Testament Series
ST	*Studia Theologica*
StBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SwJT	*Southwestern Journal of Theology*
SymS	Symposium Series
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TD	*Theology Digest*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*

ThTo	*Theology Today*
TJ	*Trinity Journala*
TR	Textus Receptus
VE	*Vox Evangelica*
VEC	*Verbum et Ecclesia*
WATSA	What Are They Saying About Series
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WW	*Word and World*
ZAC	*Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum/Journal of Ancient Christianity*
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älterenKirche

Primary Sources & Ancient Authors

Abbreviations for primary sources and ancient authors follow the recommendations outlined in the *SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Editions,* 2nd ed. (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2014).

Electronic Sources

The text for the following sources comes from Accordance 13 Bible Software Version 13.1.4., Oaktree Software, and searches have been made using the following text versions:
Early Christian Writings:

Revised Greek Texts, edited by J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer. London: MacMillan, 1891 (version 2.0).

Works of Flavius Josephus, Greek text 1890 Niese edition, public domain (version 3.6)

Septuaginta, edited by Alfred Rahlfs, Editio altera by Robert Hanhart, 2006 Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart (version 5.5)

NA28 *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland, 28th ed (Acc. version 3.6)

A New English Translation of the Septuagint. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G.

Wright.

New York: Oxford University Press, 2007 (version 3.9).

Works of Philo, The Norwegian Philo Concordance Project 2005, Peder Borgen, Kåre Fuglseth, Roald Skarsten (version 3.9).

The Greek Pseudepigrapha, Electronic text, Craig A. Evans, Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, Nova Scotia (version 6.5).

Other searches have been carried out with:

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature (abridged), Maria

Pantelia, Project Director (open access available at http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/)

Perseus, Digital Library, Tufts University, Gregory R. Crane, Ed.-in-Chief
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/)

PROLOGUE

This study emerges from the intersection of personal experience and scholarly inquiry, situating autobiographical reflection within a rigorous academic framework. My doctoral journey has led me to draw on lived experience, both my own and others', to reflect on the lasting wounds and ongoing divisions caused by the Nigeria-Biafra War (1967–1970). This harrowing conflict, which claimed the lives of more than three million individuals, a number so staggering it eclipses the populations of many nations, emerged from the shadows cast by British colonial rule. The colonial enterprise, in its relentless pursuit of order and dominion, amalgamated disparate ethnicities into an uneasy union, privileging some while marginalising others. Such artificial amalgamation laid the groundwork for a fractured national consciousness, leaving countless citizens wrestling with feelings of alienation, resentment, and loss.

Similarly, personal experience has only deepened my awareness of these entrenched divides. As a Yoruba individual who has married into an Igbo family, descendants of the erstwhile Biafran state, I found myself subjected to intense scrutiny by my in-laws before our union was sanctioned. This episode laid bare the lingering “us versus them” mentality that pervades inter-ethnic relations in Nigeria. This mentality continues to cast the Igbos, in particular, as perpetual outsiders in the eyes of some Nigerians.

Against this backdrop of historical pain, I am drawn to the promise of Social Identity Theory (SIT) as a tool for healing and reconciliation. SIT offers a lens through which to understand the persistent ethnic rifts that haunt Nigerian society today. It is my conviction that, by applying this theory, we might chart new paths toward reconciliation and travel on the trajectory of peace and unity.

My journey has since taken me beyond Nigeria's borders, into the heart of Christian ministry within the United Kingdom. Within UK churches, these fault lines are often papered over by a superficial rhetoric of unity. Congregations may appear vibrant and growing, yet closer examination reveals that their vitality often depends on attracting those who already share a common ethnic or social background. The ideal of a richly diverse and genuinely inclusive Christian community remains elusive. From the pulpit, one frequently hears calls for oneness in Christ, but in practice, barriers to genuine integration persist.

I was again confronted with this contradiction when I once inquired why non-Westerners were rarely, if ever, invited to lead public prayers in my church. The explanation offered a vague uncertainty about the appropriateness of diverse prayer styles. It betrayed a profound lack of cultural sensitivity and an implicit bias favouring the dominant group.

I have witnessed a new dimension of identity negotiation in the corporate Christian world, one shaped by the subtle yet pervasive dynamics between African Christian leaders and their white British counterparts. Too often, African leaders are subjected to systemic stereotyping, relegated to positions deemed “lesser,” and expected to conform to the dominant cultural norms if they wish to serve effectively within Western ecclesial structures. This pressure to assimilate, frequently unspoken yet always present, raises urgent questions about authenticity, inclusion, and the survival of non-Western identities in multicultural spaces.

Such pressures are not without consequences. Resistance to conformity has led to tension, disillusionment, and even resignations among the most committed. In 2023, I, along with two fellow African leaders, felt compelled to step down from prominent ministry roles, united by our frustration with institutions unwilling to embrace our cultural particularity. This upheaval is symptomatic of a deeper reality: leadership, in its most valid form, arises from

the interplay of personal and social identities. Insisting on a single monolithic leadership paradigm not only impoverishes our institutions but also stifles the voices and gifts of those deemed "other."

These tensions are not confined to boardrooms, churches, or pulpits. I recall, with particular sadness, an incident wherein a white British family retracted an invitation to their Christmas dinner, explaining that my presence might unsettle visiting relatives due to perceived racial or ethnic differences. Such moments lay bare the tacit biases embedded within our communities, which SIT seeks to uncover and address. They remind us that categorisation, even when unconscious, can breed exclusion and discord, undermining the very foundations of community.

This struggle between unity and diversity, inclusion and exclusion, echoes the apostle Paul's vision in his letter to the Romans. Paul envisaged a church in which believers from all backgrounds, Judean and non-Judean alike, could find common cause in Christ without erasing the distinctive threads of their cultural and social identities. He called for a unity that did not demand uniformity, a togetherness that honoured the rich mosaic of the early Christian movement.

It is my aspiration, through this dissertation, to explore how Paul's use of Old Testament (OT) quotations in Romans 9–11 can, within the framework of SIT, illuminate contemporary struggles around social and ethnic identity both within the church and in broader society. By drawing on both ancient texts and modern theory, I hope to outline a vision of reconciliation that celebrates difference, fosters belonging, and paves the way toward an inclusive and harmonious community.

CHAPTER ONE

EXPLORING ROMANS 9-11

1.1 Introduction

The passages found in Romans chapters 9 through 11 have long been pivotal in scholarly discussions. Traditionally, these texts have been scrutinised primarily through theological and historical lenses, focusing on the concepts of election and the relationship between individuals and divine salvation, especially in the context of Israel.

1.2 Historical Context and Interpretation

Throughout history, prominent church fathers, notably Augustine of Hippo, have recognised the significance of Romans 9–11 in shaping doctrines such as predestination. Augustine not only emphasised individual election but also advocated for the inclusion of non-Judeans in the divine narrative of salvation (Holmes and Wallis 1887). Similarly, John Calvin's seminal work on Romans laid the foundation for Reformed thought, highlighting God's sovereign election, which is independent of human merit. Calvin's assertions in his 1540 treatise elucidate God's autonomous decision-making processes regarding salvation, while theologians like Hodge (1886) reinforced traditional Calvinistic views on individual election and Israel's temporary rejection.

Scholars such as Barrett (1957) and Sproul (1986) have further developed the Reformed perspective, emphasising divine authority in salvation and challenging notions of free will. In contrast, N.T. Wright (2013) offers a broader perspective, arguing that Romans 9–11 reflects Paul's understanding of God's covenantal faithfulness and his inclusive plan for both Judeans and non-Judeans. Moo (1996) emphasises the significance of the temporary hardening of Judeans and their eventual inclusion, illustrating God's commitment to His promises.

1.3 The Shift Towards Sociocultural Analysis

Recent scholarly endeavours have shifted towards examining the social and ethnic dimensions present in Romans 9–11, addressing the dynamics between Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ. This emerging perspective seeks to understand how Paul's letters resonate with the social and ethnic tensions experienced by early Christians in Rome. Scholars such as Sanders (1977), Dunn (1998), Esler (2003), and Campbell (2023) have proposed that Paul's epistles can be better understood through the lens of Second Temple Judaism and SIT (Campbell 2023). These frameworks provide insights into the ethnic identities and communal struggles faced by early followers of Christ.

Understanding Romans in relation to a diverse community grappling with social tensions allows for a richer interpretation of Paul's intent. Scholars such as Bird (2016) and Campbell (2023) have employed SIT to analyse how Paul's discourse in chapters 9–11 addresses the ethnic discord between Judean and non-Judean believers.

1.4 Paul's Vision for Unity

Paul's writings in Romans 9-11 are crucial for fostering a unified Christian identity that transcends ethnic barriers. Tucker (2010:33–145) and Goroncy (2017:1–14) highlight the formation of social identity within these chapters, proposing that Paul aimed to cultivate a new communal identity in Christ that would integrate both groups. Mason (2020) further explores how Paul's ethnic reasoning reflects the early church's efforts to define collective identity amid diverse backgrounds.

Despite the valuable contributions from these scholars, a gap remains in the research concerning the application of OT references in Romans 9–11 and their implications for the interpretation of social identity. This dissertation aims to fill that gap by examining the interplay between Paul's theological discourse and SIT, particularly in the context of the

ethnic dynamics between Judean and non-Judean Christians. Our distinct contribution is to investigate how Paul integrates OT quotations into his argument to influence and unite his audience.

1.5 Research Aims and Objectives

The goals of this research are as follows:

i. To analyse the use of the OT: Using the perspective of SIT to investigate how Paul employs OT quotations in Romans 9-11 to address social and ethnic tensions in the Roman Christ-movement by promoting the concept of a shared identity among Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers, thereby encouraging reconciliation between them.

ii. Applying SIT: Critically engage with SIT as a framework for interpreting the ethnic and social tensions present in Romans 9–11, exploring the reconciliation efforts proposed by Paul. This is preceded by an examination of Romans 9-11 in its original historical and literary contexts.

iii. To draw contemporary parallels: Relate the insights gained from this analysis to modern socio-ethnic conflicts, particularly in contexts such as the Biafran conflict in Nigeria and experiences within diverse churches in the UK.

1.6. Significance and Originality of the Study

This dissertation presents an innovative approach that integrates SIT to analyse in detail the meaning conveyed by the implications of OT references in Romans 9-11. It argues that Paul's theological discourse is not merely an abstract theological exercise but a pragmatic response to the social tensions experienced by early Christians. By fostering a collective identity that transcends ethnic divisions, Paul aims to unify the diverse body of Christ and promote collective engagement in God's salvific plan.

In conclusion, this research seeks to illuminate how Paul's teachings in Romans 9-11 can be interpreted through the lens of SIT, offering fresh insights into the dynamics of early

Christian communities and their relevance to contemporary church practices. Through this exploration, we hope to offer valuable contributions to both biblical scholarship and practical ecclesiology.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE OF SCHOLARSHIP ON THE BOOK OF ROMANS

2.1 Introduction

The epistle to the Romans has been a focal point of inquiry for theologians and biblical scholars alike, generating a wealth of critical literature that addresses its intricate historical context and theological discourse. The layers of meaning embedded within this epistle invite a multifaceted examination that spans historical contexts, social dynamics, and theological controversies. As scholars engage with these diverse themes, new insights emerge regarding the interpretation and application of Romans in contemporary discourse.

2.2 Key Issues in the Scholarship on the Book of Romans

One of the seminal commentaries on Romans is by Cranfield (1975), which thoroughly investigates the epistle's historical and theological dimensions. However, a notable gap in his analysis is the exploration of social-ethnic relationships between Judean and non-Judean believers in Rome, particularly in chapters 9-11, which are central to this thesis. Dodd (1952) offers a different angle by scrutinising the scriptural foundations of Paul's teachings, presenting a detailed examination of OT references. However, he similarly overlooks the ethnic tension that I argue underlies the interactions between Judeans and non-Judeans.

Dunn (1988) provides a comprehensive commentary on the first eight chapters of Romans, recognised for its historical and contextual approach and its contributions to the New Perspective on Paul. Nonetheless, this work does not incorporate SIT—a framework that later scholars, such as Philip Esler, William Campbell, and Brian Tucker, use to dissect the social-ethnic dynamics within Romans. Donfried's (1991) edited volume presents various scholarly perspectives on Romans but lacks the application of SIT to analyse the ethnic conflict present among Christ-followers in Rome.

The interplay of ethnicity and self-identity in early Roman Christianity has been examined by Walters (1993), while Wiefel (1991) explores the role of the Judean community in the emergence of Roman Christianity. Nevertheless, both fail to utilise SIT as an analytical lens. Wright (1991) offers a thorough exploration of the relationship between Christ and the law in Pauline theology, while Gruen (2002) situates the Jewish presence within the broader historical context of the Roman Empire. Despite their contributions, neither provides a nuanced perspective on social identity dynamics.

In contrast, Esler (2003) adopts a fresh approach by examining the social context in which Paul penned the Epistle to the Romans, revealing the identity conflicts faced by the early Christian community. Although Malina and Pilch (2006) do not apply SIT, their social-scientific interpretive models offer valuable insights into the cultural and anthropological dimensions of Romans. Lee (2014) connects God's faithfulness to His promises and the inclusion of non-Judeans but does not address the intra-group conflicts among Christ-followers in Rome.

Foster (2016), while not employing SIT, offers a novel interpretation of Romans 9, challenging traditional views on election. Esler (2003:153–169, 266–306) and Tucker (2018:121–145) utilise SIT to highlight Paul's efforts in reorienting the ethnic and social identities of Judean and non-Judean believers toward a unified identity in Christ. Similarly, Campbell (2020) underscores Paul's promotion of a superordinate identity that transcends ethnic distinctions while respecting the uniqueness of both groups.

Nevertheless, a significant gap in the scholarship remains: the lack of a comprehensive application of SIT as a critical interpretive framework in the study of the book of Romans. Many scholars overlook the dynamics of in-group and out-group differentiation within the audience addressed in Romans, thereby hindering a comprehensive understanding of Paul's theological framework in its social context.

This thesis aims to address these shortcomings, specifically regarding scriptural quotations in the ongoing discourse surrounding Romans 9-11, and I will elaborate on the methodology in the following chapter.

The initial work pertinent to this thesis is Esler's (2003) text, which lacks a systematic approach to Paul's use of the OT but recognises the importance of integrating OT references as relevant to the current discussion. Esler's application of SIT to identify and address social crises among the Christ-followers in Romans is particularly noteworthy.

Gadenz (2009) presents a contrasting approach, focusing on rhetorical analysis to examine Paul's use of scripture in clarifying the relationships between Judean and non-Judean believers, without employing SIT. Lee (2014) argues that the social conflicts between these groups in both Galatians and Romans stem from their inability to navigate the tension between "difference and equality." Though Lee does not engage with SIT, his insights into Romans 14:1-15 resonate with contemporary ecclesiastical issues.

2.3 The Audience of Romans

The composition of Paul's audience has sparked considerable debate, yielding no consensus among scholars. Stowers (1994) posits that Paul's primary audience in Rome consisted of non-Jews, a view echoed by Oropeza (2019), Stark (2022), and Campbell (2023). However, this perspective overlooks the in-group dynamics present between Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers. Stowers's argument essentially rests on Rom. 1:13-14 as evidence of Paul's Gentile audience in Rome. While these verses emphasise Paul's mission to Gentiles, they do not preclude the presence of Judean Christ-followers in the audience. Even Stark (2022:45-69), who proposes a Gentile audience, highlights the limitations of Stowers' argument, noting that it fails to account for the broader context of the letter, which includes themes and references relevant to both Jews and Gentiles. Also, he overlooks evidence from Romans 16, which highlights that the names listed in this chapter include both Judeans and non-Judeans,

suggesting a mixed audience. For instance, Paul greets individuals such as Priscilla and Aquila, who were Judean followers of Christ, as well as non-Judean followers. This diversity reflects the composition of the Roman church and supports the view that Paul's audience included both Judeans and non-Judeans. In addition, Paul's extensive use of Jewish scriptures throughout Romans further challenges Stowers' thesis. Most of these scriptures are cited in Romans 9–11, and they are deeply rooted in Jewish theological concerns, addressing the relationship between Israel and God's promises. These chapters are difficult to reconcile with the idea of a purely Gentile audience, as they presuppose a familiarity with Jewish traditions and concerns. This is why Donfried (1995:1-42) argues that these sections indicate Paul's engagement with Jewish Christians as part of his audience.

Campbell's interpretation of Romans is rooted in the idea that Paul addresses the "ethnē in Christ" (Gentiles who have embraced faith in Christ) as the primary audience of the letter. He argues that Paul's primary aim is to reshape the thinking and behaviour of these Gentile Christ-followers, particularly in their attitudes toward non-Christian Jews. The weakness of Campbell's view is his excessive focus on 'ethne' without considering the broader context in which it is used in Romans. For example, in Rom. 4:17-18, Paul refers to Abraham as "father of us all" and cites Gen. 17:5- "as it is written, I have made you a father of many nations (εθνων). The context of the use of 'nations' here suggests that it refers to people, which can also include Israel; hence, Paul calls Abraham the father of 'us all', referring to both Judeans and non-Judeans. This word also serves as a synonym for the Hebrew word גוי (goy), meaning "people" or "nation", which was also applied to Israel (Exod. 19:6; Jn. 11:51-52). Also, in many passages where Paul uses the term "Gentiles", it is mostly with respect to their shared belonging with the Judeans in God's salvation plan. For example, in Rom. 10:12, Paul declares that there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile in God's eyes when it comes to salvation, as the same Lord is rich to all (Judeans and non-Judeans)

who call upon him. In Rom. 11:25-26, Paul affirms that all Israel will be saved when the fullness of the Gentiles has come in. Therefore, there is no need for Campbell to argue for a Gentile-only audience in Romans, as textual evidence shows that Paul writes to both Jews and non-Jews in Rome. The early Christian understanding of 'ethne' likely involved a complex interplay of cultural, religious, and social identities rather than a simplistic categorisation of Jews versus Gentiles (Wright 2015). This nuanced understanding challenges Campbell's interpretation, as it suggests that 'ethne' could encompass a range of peoples, including those who were culturally or religiously affiliated with Judaism, rather than exclusively indicating a Gentile audience (Horsley 2008).

Malina and Pilch (2006) argue that Romans is directed at Judeans, interpreting "Gentiles" as diaspora Judeans engaging in Hellenistic practices. However, this interpretation misrepresents Paul's use of "Gentiles" to denote non-Judeans. For example, in Rom. 1:14- “I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish.” Here, Paul contrasts “Greeks” with “barbarians,” a common Greco-Roman distinction between cultured (Greek-speaking) and non-cultured peoples. There is no sense that this refers to Jews at all. Therefore, ‘Greeks’ refer to Gentiles (non-Jews), particularly those of Hellenistic culture. Moo (1996:58) argues that the use of Greeks broadly refers to Gentiles. Paul writes in Rom 1:16, “For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.” The structure “Jew first, also the Greek” implies two mutually exclusive groups. If "Greek" meant a Hellenized Jew, this contrast would be incoherent; therefore, “Greek” means non-Jew, i.e., Gentile. Both Dunn (1988:42:43) and Fitzmyer (1993:256) confirm this verse as distinguishing between ethnic Jews and Gentiles. Furthermore, the use of “Greek” in Rom. 2:9-10 highlights a Jew/Greek dichotomy, revealing a comprehensive distinction, indicating Paul’s concern with universal human accountability, not intra-Jewish divisions. Wright

(2013:849) also argues that “Greek” is clearly outside the Jewish group. Also in Romans 3:9, Paul continues the dichotomy to argue the universal sinfulness of both Jews and Greeks. Again, there is no reason to see “Greeks” here as Hellenized Jews. The logic breaks down if both "Jews" and "Greeks" are subsets of Jews. Related to this argument, Hays (1989:52) argues, “Paul’s consistent use of ‘Jew and Greek’ distinguishes ethnic Israel from the Gentiles.” Also, Gaventa (2016:18-20) argues that “Greek” refers to non-Jews, as part of Paul’s theological vision of inclusion.” In the same way, Barclay (2015:475) affirms, “Greek” is one of the standard ethnic terms Paul uses for Gentiles, not intra-Jewish distinctions.” Even the standard lexicons, such as Bauer-Danker-Arndt-Gingrich Greek English Lexicon(BDAG), define Έλλην as “a Greek,” i.e., “a Gentile,” as opposed to Jew (BDAG, 3RD ed., s.v. Έλλην). While the term can refer to ethnic Greeks in a narrow sense, Paul uses it broadly to encompass all non-Jews, reflecting the Greco-Roman world’s binary view of “Jews and Gentiles.” The rhetorical structure of Romans would lose its force if “Greek” included Hellenised and acculturated Jews, blurring the very distinction Paul is emphasising.

Another view of the Roman audience is by Rodriguez (2014), who innovatively suggests that Paul's audience included both Judeans and non-Judeans. However, he identifies them primarily as non-Judean proselytes to Judaism. By this, he means that Paul is speaking to those Gentiles who had already adopted Jewish beliefs and customs. According to this view, the moral and theological problems Paul confronts (e.g., law observance, circumcision, dietary practices) make the most sense if the audience consists of Gentile converts to Judaism, rather than “raw” pagans. He bases his argument on texts such as Romans 2:17–29, where Paul addresses those who rely on the law; Romans 3:1–2, where he discusses the advantage of being Jewish; and Paul's frequent discussions about the Torah and circumcision in the letter. Other scholars who hold on to this view include Gager (2000), Fredriksen (2017), and Sanders (1983). These scholars generally argue that historically, the synagogue

was a centre of attraction for Gentiles interested in monotheism, ethics, and community. They also argue that Paul's frequent discussions about the Law, circumcision, and Abraham would have been meaningful to those already acquainted with Jewish tradition. Furthermore, they claimed that the prevalence of "God-fearers" in the diaspora offered a ready-made audience for Paul's message, which justifies the ethical and theological claims of early Christianity.

In contrast to the view above, we argue that Paul's rhetoric assumes a pagan background of the Gentiles. For example, Paul frequently reminds his readers of their former idolatry and ignorance of God. In Rom. 1:18–32, for example, Paul paints a picture of Gentile descent into idolatry and moral chaos—an experience far removed from that of the synagogue-attending proselytes. As James Dunn observes, "Paul's depiction of the Gentile world here is that of paganism, not of Gentiles already attached to Judaism" (Dunn 1988:54). Likewise, in Rom. 1:5–6, Paul speaks of the audience as those "called to belong to Jesus Christ." This phrase is best understood as referring to non-Judeans who joined the group of Christ-followers, not proselytes to Judaism. The use of "all the nations" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) in this passage emphasises Gentiles in the broader world, not proselytes already familiar with Judaism. Furthermore, in Rom. 2:17-29, Paul addresses those who boast in the law, an apparent reference to ethnic Judeans who are familiar with the Torah, rather than proselytes. He is criticising the Judeans for relying on the law without living by it.

Additionally, the letter suggests that some of Paul's audience lacked knowledge of Jewish rituals. In Rom. 6:19–21 and elsewhere, Paul refers to his readers' previous lives as "slaves to impurity and lawlessness." He chastises them for once being "without the law" (Rom. 2:14), a description that would not fit Gentiles who had already submitted to the Torah as proselytes. In connection with this, Moo (1996:54) writes, "Paul assumes that some of his Gentile readers were once thoroughly pagan, not partial Jews." Concerning the issue of circumcision, Paul addresses the question, "Is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God

of Gentiles also?" (Rom. 3:29). If his audience were already proselytes or God-fearers, this statement would be unnecessary. As Barclay (2015:382) notes, "Paul's argument only makes sense if his Gentile addressees had not already become Jews but were welcomed as Gentiles" (Barclay 2015:382). We concur with the consensus view that Paul's Gentile audience consisted of former pagans, not primarily proselytes (Sanders 1977:543; Dunn 1988:55). Concerning this, Wright (2013:1083) comments, "Most of Paul's Gentile converts had little or no previous engagement with the synagogue."

While Rodriguez's view and that of other scholars who hold the same view highlight the complex religious landscape of the first-century Mediterranean, they overlook the textual and rhetorical evidence in Paul's letters, which overwhelmingly suggests that some of Paul's audience were non-Judeans with little or no prior attachment to Judaism. Paul's vision was not about making non-Judeans into Judeans, but about welcoming both Judeans and non-Judeans into the people of God. To miss this is to miss the social identity framework of Paul's letter to the Romans and, consequently, to miss the heart of Paul's gospel. The evidence from Romans, particularly the frequent references to Gentiles and the universal scope of the gospel, suggests that Paul's audience consisted of a mix of Judeans and non-Judeans, with an emphasis on non-Judeans who had joined the Christ group. Paul's repeated assertions about justification by faith and his distinction between Judeans and non-Judeans indicate that his message is directed not merely to proselytes but to a broader audience of Gentiles who are coming to faith in Christ.

This dissertation argues for a mixed audience of Judean and non-Judean believers. Other scholars who hold this view include Reasoner (2005), who traces the history of Roman interpretation, affirming its diverse audience, and Das (2007), who concludes that both Judeans and non-Judeans comprised Paul's readership. Wright (2013) also emphasises the

mixed nature of the audience, a view supported by Barclay (2015) and Schreiner (2019), who discuss Paul's pastoral intentions and the intended audience of Romans.

Furthermore, the socio-historical studies of the Roman Christ-followers in the early centuries reveal a context shaped by the expulsion of Jews from Rome under Claudius and their subsequent return. This created a delicate power dynamic between Gentile Christ-followers who remained and Jewish Christ-followers returning, which Paul appears to be intent on mediating (Staples 2023).

On textual evidence, the internal structure and rhetoric of Romans itself point to a dual audience. Paul often shifts his address between interlocutors who represent different identities. For example, in Romans 2, Paul famously turns from critiquing the "Gentiles" (Rom. 1:18–32) to confronting "you who call yourself a Jew" (Rom. 2:17). This rhetorical move only makes sense if there are both Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers among his readers, or at the very least, if he expects both groups to be overhearing the conversation. Furthermore, recent quantitative reviews confirm that some scholars interpret Romans 1 as addressed to Gentiles. At the same time, subsequent sections shift to Jewish interlocutors, reflecting Paul's flexible strategy in engaging both groups (Brackens 2024). We concur with the author that Paul engages both Jews and Gentiles, but not that Paul addresses Gentiles alone in Romans 1; instead, we argue that the entire letter is written to both groups.

In Rom. 1:16, Paul uses a well-established literary and rhetorical structure, "Jew first, also the Greek," which distinguishes between ethnic Jews and Gentiles. This is a clear contrast between the two groups within the early Christ-followers. The phrase "Jew first" signals that the gospel was first offered to Jews, but "also to the Greeks" emphasises that salvation extends to Gentiles. The inclusion of both groups shows that Paul's audience is not exclusively Jewish or Gentile, but a mixture of both. Gaventa (2016:20)

concurs with this, emphasising that "Jew and Greek" reflects ethnic divisions, not subgroups of Judaism, and underscores the inclusive nature of the gospel. Furthermore, in Romans 2:9-10, Paul's view of tribulation and glory among the Jews and Gentiles demonstrates that Paul sees ethnic distinction between both groups. The idea of universal judgment and reward emphasises that both groups are equally accountable to God, and both are part of the Christ group, demonstrating that the audience comprises both Jews and Gentiles.

Furthermore, Paul's explicit references to Torah, circumcision, and Abraham (especially in Romans 2–4) presume an audience familiar with Jewish law and tradition. However, his repeated emphasis on Gentile inclusion, especially in chapters 9–11 and 15, demonstrates his concern that Gentile believers do not arrogantly supersede the Jewish root (11:18). In connection with this argument, recent studies emphasise that Paul's rhetorical strategy is best understood as addressing intra-community tensions between these two groups (Oropeza 2021; Nanos 1999).

Additionally, Romans 11 serves as a rhetorical and theological centerpiece in Paul's letter, employing the "jealousy motif" (παραζηλῶσαι, parazēlōsai; Rom. 11:11, 14) and the olive tree metaphor (Rom. 11:16-24) to articulate the dynamics between Judeans and non-Judeans within God's salvation plan. These motifs assume a live, intra-community conversation—one in which non-Judean arrogance and Judean concerns must be negotiated for the sake of unity among the Christ-followers and the fulfilment of God's salvific plan. Stark (2022:45-69), on Rom. 1:13–14, underscores that the "olive tree" metaphor's rhetorical thrust—admonishing Gentiles and encouraging Jewish hope—demands an audience in which both cohorts are present or at least in close communication. Longenecker (2016) and Bird (2016) likewise stress that the argument of Romans 11 is fundamentally dialogical, that Gentile believers are cautioned against arrogance "precisely because Jewish Christians are present to hear Paul's assurance that 'God has not rejected his people'" (Rom. 11:1), and

because intra-church tensions were real and pressing. Therefore, they are not merely abstract theological constructs; they are Paul's pastoral and rhetorical response to real, lived conflicts in a mixed community of Judeans and non-Judeans. These motifs are best understood as addressing—and seeking to heal—the fractured but interdependent relationships within the Christ group. For example, some scholars (Wagner 2018; Gooch 2022) argue that Paul's intent in Rom. 11:11–14 is to argue that the jealousy motif presupposes the presence of both Gentile and Jewish believers. They show that Paul's desire to provoke Israel to jealousy is "aimed at fostering an interdependent relationship between Gentile and Jewish Christ-followers within the Roman community.

In addition to the above, Esler (2003) employs SIT to argue for a mixed audience, asserting that the epistle must be read in light of the ethnic conflicts faced by Judean and non-Judean believers. He suggests that the social and ethnic tensions within the community complicate their struggle for identity.

There is also evidence of the names mentioned in Romans 16. Head (2024) challenges the claim that those greeted in Rom. 16:3-16 were not part of the original Roman audience. He critiques scholars like Mullins, Thorsteinsson, Stowers, and Campbell, who argue that the second-person plural imperative "greet" (ἀσπάσασθε) indicates that the greeting was intended for third parties. Sumney (2012) cautions against oversimplifying the audience as either exclusively Jewish or Gentile. Instead, he argues that Paul's "double vision" with his frequent alternation of address and argumentation suggests that both groups are in view, and that the letter is crafted to be "overheard" by each, fostering mutual understanding.

.

Paul's letter to the Romans is profoundly shaped by social conflict and identity tensions between Judeans and non-Judean followers of Christ in first-century Rome. For

example, in Romans 14–15, Paul addresses disputes over food laws and sacred days, urging the “strong” (likely non-Judean Christ-followers) not to despise the “weak” (likely Judean Christ-followers). This reflects real conflicts over Torah observance and ethnic belonging. Following this, Paul exhorted them to welcome one another as Christ has welcomed them (Rom. 15:7), with the goal of reconciliation among them. In addition, in Rom. 11:11-20, Paul warns the non-Judean Christ-followers against arrogance toward the Judeans, insisting that “God has not rejected his people.” This suggests some non-Judeans were claiming theological superiority, which would have led to social conflicts among them. Furthermore, in Rom. 3:1–9 and 9–11, Paul wrestles with the question of Jewish unbelief and God’s faithfulness, indicating a community struggling to understand Israel’s role in the unfolding Christ movement following God's salvation plan. In addition, Romans 1:18-32 establishes a rhetorical strategy that Paul employs in Romans 2, turning the critique inward toward Jewish hypocrisy and highlighting mutual judgment and division. Several scholars support this view. Campbell (2023) uses SIT to show how Paul seeks to affirm both Jewish and Gentile identities without erasing either. Paul’s goal is to reconcile fractured groups into one body in Christ. Likewise, Lim (2023) highlights how Paul addresses intergroup hostility and uses inclusive identity language to foster unity. Lim notes Paul’s careful balancing act in Romans 9–11, which affirms Israel’s ongoing role.

2.4. Authorship and Purpose of Romans

The authorship of Romans is confidently attributed to Paul, who identifies himself as "a servant of Christ Jesus, called to be an apostle and set apart for the gospel of God" (Rom. 1:1).

The purpose of the letter has been the subject of considerable scholarly attention, particularly influenced by Augustine’s emphasis on predestination and salvation, which shaped interpretations throughout the Middle Ages and into the early 20th century.

Various scholars propose differing purposes for Paul's composition. Some suggest that he aimed to gain support from the Roman Christ-followers for his mission to Spain (Jewett 2007; Goswell 2019; Fitzmyer 2018; Blackwell et al. 2015). However, other scholars argue that he sought to establish his authority as an apostle to the non-Judeans (Das 2007). Das further posits that Paul's contributions to the Jerusalem church may have been met with scepticism due to conflicts among the followers of Jesus in Rome (Rom. 15:28-32). It is plausible that rumours regarding Paul's inclusive table fellowship with non-Judeans may have offended Judean believers in Jerusalem. This issue (Esler 2003: 295-296) may underlie Paul's repudiation in Rom. 6:15 of the idea that, as we are no longer under the law, we are free to sin.

According to Dunn (1988), Romans addresses the inclusion of Gentiles and redefines the people of God apart from the Law, reflecting the "New Perspective on Paul." He emphasises "works of the Law," and the reconfiguration of covenant membership, focusing on Second Temple Judaism and sociological context. Longenecker (2016) argues that Paul wrote Romans in preparation for his planned visit to Rome, to gain support for his mission to Spain. According to Schreiner (2018), Paul writes to unite Jewish and Gentile believers under the gospel of Christ. The Roman church was likely experiencing tension between these groups, and Paul wanted to show that both are equally part of God's redemptive plan, reconciling them in order to fuel his mission to Spain. Moo (1996) places slightly more weight on pastoral concerns and the doctrinal coherence of Paul's gospel rather than Schreiner's stronger emphasis on missional purpose. Wright (1995:2005) frames Romans within a narrative-historical lens, focusing on Israel's story and covenant, whereas Schreiner emphasises systematic theology and mission. Stowers (1994) offers a radically different reading of Romans compared to Schreiner, Moo, Wright, and Dunn. His interpretation is grounded in Greco-Roman rhetoric, audience analysis, and SIT, rather than traditional

theological or salvation-historical frameworks. He argues that Romans is not theological treatise about universal sin and salvation, but a protreptic letter—a form of moral exhortation where Paul uses rhetorical techniques (like speech-in-character) to engage a Gentile audience. According to him, Paul's goal is to shape Gentile moral identity and promote self-mastery through Christ, not to explain justification by faith in abstract theological terms. Stowers' view has met with some criticisms. First, he relies too much on speech-in-character, which minimises Paul's social-theological intent, especially his concern for Jewish-Gentile unity. Additionally, SIT posits that group identity is shaped not only by rhetoric but also by shared beliefs, rituals, and theological narratives—all of which are central in Romans but underemphasized in Stowers's reading. His work also reflects the neglect of intergroup dynamics under SIT, emphasising how ingroup-outgroup distinctions shape identity. Paul's repeated emphasis on Judean and non-Judean relations (e.g., Romans 2–4, 9–11) reflects this. Stowers's claim that Paul addresses only Gentiles and impersonates a Jewish teacher in Romans 2 flattens these dynamics. Timmins (2016) argues that this ignores Paul's pastoral concern for reconciling two distinct identity groups into one body in Christ (cf. Rom. 3:29–30; 15:7–13).

Horsley (2003:4) argues that Romans is a form of resistance literature against Roman imperial domination. He posits that Paul is not primarily concerned with individual salvation or abstract theology, but with renewing Israel and forming alternative communities that challenge imperial power structures. He differs from Stowers by highlighting real-world imperial violence, not just rhetorical form, and that Paul's letters are not theological treatises, but political discourse aimed at empowering communities under imperial rule.

Rodriguez (2014:37) argues that "Paul constructs a dialogue with a gentile proselyte to Judaism as his interlocutor in order to expose the limits of Torah-based righteousness. However, identifying the interlocutor in Romans 2:17 as a Gentile proselyte is exegetically

tenuous. The text does not clearly indicate this, although many scholars (e.g. Moo, Schreiner) see the figure as a representative Jew. This reading risks overcomplicating Paul's rhetorical strategy and may obscure the broader Jew-Gentile dynamics Paul is addressing.

Esler refers to Paul's leadership skills as an "entrepreneur of identity," in which he strives to reconfigure the identities of Judean and non-Judean believers into a single collective identity in Christ while preserving their distinct cultural identities. Campbell (2023) also argues that Paul writes to reconfigure the identities of Judean and non-Judean believers into a shared, superordinate identity in Christ, while affirming the ongoing covenantal role of Israel. He further suggests that Paul does not erase ethnic or cultural distinctions but reframes them within a new collective identity—the people of God in Christ. Drawing on SIT, Campbell suggests that Paul promotes a superordinate identity that allows for subgroup distinctiveness. Rather than 'ethne in Christ' replacing Israel, Campbell maintains that Paul affirms the irrevocable calling of Israel, and that simultaneously the identity of 'ethne in Christ' is also called alongside the people of Israel.

Having said all the above, it should be noted that Paul's argument in Romans reflects both a general theological concern and a local pastoral one, and the two are tightly interwoven. At the general level, he confronts the problem of Israel's widespread unbelief in the Messiah, culminating in his sustained reflection on God's faithfulness in Romans 9–11. Yet this broad concern is shaped by the local social tensions within the mixed Jewish–Gentile Christ-followers in Rome, where disputes over identity, Torah-practice, and communal status are highlighted. Paul's alternating address to Jewish and Gentile interlocutors, his exposure of mutual judgment, and his redefinition of belonging around Christ all indicate that he is responding to real conflicts on the ground. Romans, therefore, functions as a letter in which Paul's macro-theological vision and micro-communal concerns mutually reinforce one another, producing an argument aimed at both explaining Israel's place in God's purposes and

reconciling fractured relationships within the Roman churches.

This dissertation has benefited from the work of Esler and Campbell, integrating SIT and Paul's theology in Romans to underscore the themes of leadership and conflict, particularly regarding the resolution in chapters 9-11.

With this overview established, we will engage with the ongoing scholarly discussions of Romans 9-11, particularly addressing the debates that have arisen.

2.5 The Ongoing Debate on Romans 9-11

The review of Romans 9-11 has generated significant scholarly discourse, revealing a tapestry of interpretations. This section aims to contribute to that dialogue, serving as the basis for the exegesis that follows in later chapters of this dissertation.

Traditional Calvinist readings of these chapters interpret them through the lens of personal. salvation and the predestined election of a select few, highlighting God's sovereignty in matters of salvation. For example, Piper (1993) provides a detailed exegetical and theological analysis of Rom. 9:1–23, arguing that Paul teaches individual, unconditional election. He contends that God's choice of Jacob over Esau and His hardening of Pharaoh demonstrate God's sovereign freedom in salvation, apart from human merit or foreseen faith. Also, Schreiner (2018) interprets Romans 9–11 as affirming God’s sovereign election of individuals to salvation. He argues that Paul is not merely discussing national destiny but the eternal fate of individuals, chosen by God’s mercy and not by works or lineage.

However, Sanders (2001) argues that Calvinist readings misinterpret Romans 9 as teaching individual predestination, when Paul’s concern is corporate Israel and God’s covenantal faithfulness. He posits that the election of Jacob over Esau is about national roles in salvation history, not eternal destinies. Whereas Schreiner and Piper emphasise God’s sovereign choice of individuals, Sanders is correct that Paul defends God’s justice in temporarily setting aside Israel, rather than condemning individuals unconditionally.

Additionally, White (2006) argues that Calvin's (and, by extension, Piper's) interpretation of Romans 9 overlooks the OT context of the passages Paul quotes, using rhetorical and historical examples to defend God's justice in choosing how to fulfil his promises.

Conversely, some scholars reason that these chapters address the tension between Paul's affirmation of the law and the question of Israel's salvation (Rom. 9:4, 11:1, 26), suggesting that Paul grapples with Israel's current status. In this vein, Beare (1962) contends that Romans 9-11 may not constitute a core aspect of Paul's argument, perhaps reflecting his struggle to reclaim a sense of ethnic privilege for historical Israel. Raisanen (1987), known for his view of Paul's inconsistencies, argues that Paul presents contradictory messages regarding divine hardening and Israel's disobedience. Other scholars, such as Stendhal (1976) and Cranfield (1979), assert that these chapters serve as a rhetorical climax in the letter, aligning with its internal coherence and overarching themes. Some commentators, such as Käsemann (1980) and Dunn (1988), focus on the theological implications of Romans 9-11, suggesting that they are disconnected from any dialogue with the Judeans. Kasemann further characterises this section as a diatribe featuring fictitious questions and responses, arguing that it connects to the broader theme of salvation history as an expression of God's righteousness.

Aageson (1986) proposes that the stagnation in interpreting Romans 9-11 stems from insufficient attention to Paul's theological development and his method of scriptural argumentation. Johnson (1989) posits that these chapters represent Paul's theological treatise aimed at reconciling God's impartiality towards Judeans and non-Judeans concerning the covenantal faithfulness exhibited towards Judeans. However, she neglects to address the social context that pervades these discussions.

Sherwood (2015) suggests that Romans 9-11 serves to defend God's covenantal faithfulness, a central theme in this discourse. However, it is vital to recognise that Paul's

theological assertions are deeply intertwined with the social realities of group identity, particularly in terms of ingroup and outgroup differentiation. Ignoring this social context diminishes the theological significance of Paul's arguments.

The scholarly difference between Richard Hays and Christopher Porter on the question of how much of the surrounding context of an OT quotation Paul's audience may have been aware of is particularly noteworthy in the context of Romans 9-11. Their differing methodologies illuminate the complexities surrounding scriptural interpretation in Pauline theology.

2.6 The Debate on the Use of the OT in the New Testament (Hays vs Stanley)

Richard Hays and Christopher Stanley have significantly influenced scholarly discussions on the use of the OT in the New Testament (NT), particularly in Romans 9-11. Hays advocates an "intertextual" approach that emphasises the narrative and theological connections between the two Testaments, assuming among Paul's addressees a very high level of familiarity with the context in Israelite scripture of the quotations he introduces. In contrast, Stanley critiques Hays' methodology, arguing for a linguistic and rhetorical analysis that questions the NT audience's familiarity with the OT, given the widespread illiteracy in the ancient Greco-Roman world.

Hays maintains that NT authors, particularly Paul, engage with the OT in ways that presume audience familiarity. He introduces the concept of "metalepsis," suggesting that when OT texts are quoted, they prompt readers to consider the broader narrative and context of the original text. Hays (1989:14-21) identifies seven criteria for recognising OT echoes in NT writings, illustrating how Paul employs these references, for example, Rom. 9:25-26, to demonstrate the inclusion of non-Judeans in God's salvific plan.

Conversely, Stanley (1997:82-84) challenges Hays' assumptions regarding audience literacy and familiarity with the OT. He argues that Paul's use of scripture is primarily

rhetorical, serving to substantiate his theological claims rather than encouraging readers to explore the broader contexts of the texts he cites. He asserts that NT writers utilised the OT as authoritative proof rather than expecting audiences to engage with the underlying narratives. Stanley critiques Hays for lacking methodological rigour in identifying OT references in the NT. He contends that Hays does not adequately distinguish between direct quotations, allusions, and echoes, undermining the credibility of his analysis. In his more recent works, Stanley emphasises the role of oral tradition in early Christian communities, suggesting that the interpretation of scripture was a communal process rather than an individual endeavour. He further argues that first-century readers were essentially functionally illiterate and familiar only with broad, orally transmitted biblical narratives. Additionally, he argues that urban literacy rates rarely exceeded 5–10 per cent, with even lower rates in rural areas. Papyrus scrolls were expensive (a week's wages or more), so most congregations relied on communal copies and oral reading rather than private study (Stanley 2004:35–36). Therefore, scripture was primarily transmitted through public reading and storytelling, as few could read for themselves. Paul's quotations functioned as authoritative "sound bites," not prompts for detailed exegesis (Stanley 2004:37). Even Jewish believers possessed only general narrative outlines (Abraham, Exodus, monarchy) rather than precise textual knowledge. Audiences grasped the thrust of Paul's scriptural appeals without reconstructing his sources (Stanley 2004:38). For Stanley, Paul's scriptural quotations operate as "oracular utterances" in the assembly moments when the divine voice is invoked and brought to bear on his hearers, not simply proof-texts but performative acts that carry the weight of divine oracle (Stanley 2004:58–59).

Building on Stanley's argument, Esler (2021:197–203) advances a cohesive social-identity reading of 2 Cor. 6:14–7:1, arguing that Paul uses Israelite oracles to shape Christ-movement identity. Esler rejects views that 2 Cor. 6:14–7:1 is an interpolation, showing

instead that it is carefully placed within 6:11–7:4 to mark a turning point in Paul's argument about community boundaries. He demonstrates that Paul's injunctions against yoking with "unbelievers" (6:14) and the ensuing appeal to "holy, beloved" language (6:15–7:1) serve to delineate the ingroup (*pistoi)* of Christ-followers from both pagan non-Judeans and Judaizing opponents. In his reading of 6:16c 18 (the "I will dwell…" citations), Esler argues these OT quotations function oracularly—decontextualised divine speech-acts that convey God's presence to Paul's congregations, most of whom lacked literacy (Esler 2021d:109 130). Building on the article, Esler (2021:197–203) offers a detailed exegesis of 6:16c–18, showing how Paul repurposes Ezek. 37:27 and Lev. 26:11–12 as authoritative oracles. He explains that, by invoking these texts in an oracular mode, Paul not only asserts God's dwelling among the faithful but also reinforces the social-identity shift: Christ-followers are the new temple, the renewed people of God. Esler underscores that these divine-speech moments create a shared memory and identity framework, enabling both Jewish and Gentile believers to see themselves as one body under God's promised presence.

In subsequent publications, Hays (2014) reaffirms the theological depth of scriptural echoes, arguing that the NT reframes OT narratives through the lens of Christ. He contends that this expectation of audience familiarity is crucial for understanding Paul's arguments. He challenges Stanley's "oracular utterance" model by arguing that Paul's congregations possessed sufficient scriptural competence—gained through synagogue schooling, liturgical recitation, and communal memory—to perceive the rich intertextual echoes in his quotations rather than hearing them as isolated divine "sound bites." Specifically, Hays insists that Paul's weaving of multiple scriptural layers presupposes an audience familiar with the narrative and theological contours of Israel's Scriptures. He notes that synagogue catechesis and household worship provided even Gentile converts with repeated exposure to LXX readings, enabling them to catch subtle thematic and verbal allusions (Hays 1989:17–18). He objects to Stanley's low literacy estimates by pointing to evidence of itinerant Jewish teachers

and public Scripture readings that bolstered communal literacy well beyond the levels of private reading. This, Hays argues, made it possible to detect nuanced echoes not just the blunt image of outstretched hands in passages such as Romans 10:21 (Hays 1989:35–36). Rather than viewing Paul's citations as performative oracles detached from their narrative contexts, Hays frames them as invitations into a shared story—a story his hearers knew sufficiently to reconstruct and reflect upon the trajectory from Abraham through the prophets to the Christ event (Hays 1989:20–21).

The following sections will outline how the differing views of Hays and Stanley affect the interpretation of Romans 9-11, serving as an introduction to a more detailed analysis of specific passages in subsequent chapters.

In Romans 9–11, Stanley's oracular model and Hays's intertextual model yield markedly different readings of Paul's use of Scripture concerning the audience's knowledge. In the divine speech acts versus echoed narratives, Stanley's view casts Paul's OT quotations as performative oracles, moments when God's voice breaks into the assembly to establish covenant identity and divine initiative. In Romans 9–1, this means verses such as Rom. 9:25–26 and Rom. 10:20–21 function less as exegetical proofs and more as authoritative summonses, calling Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers into the new people of God (Stanley 2004:58–59). Hays, by contrast, insists that Paul expected his hearers to perceive multilayered echoes of Israel's redemptive history, so that passages like Rom. 9:25–26 would resonate with their knowledge of Hosea and Isaiah narratives (Hays 1989:20–21).

According to Stanley's model, given the audience's level of competence and theological understanding, the predominantly non-Judean and often functionally illiterate would grasp the surface thrust of Paul's oracular citations as evidence of divine mercy and judgment, without needing to reconstruct the full Isaianic or Hosean contexts (Stanley 2004:35–38). Consequently, Romans 9–11 reads as a rhetorical drama of God extending and

withdrawing mercy, rather than a dense intertextual tapestry. Hays contests this low-literacy estimate, arguing that communal readings and catechesis equipped readers to detect subtle scriptural layers, rendering Paul's citations theologically rich and deeply interwoven with Israel's story (Hays 1989:17–18; 35–36).

This dissertation aligns with Stanley's oracular framework, which emphasises how Paul, in Romans 9–11, employs divine speech acts through OT citations to establish a unified Christ-movement identity. Each citation becomes a communal event in which God's hands are "stretched out" over an intransigent people (10:21), a drama that both legitimises Pauline authority and solidifies group boundaries. By emphasising performative oracles rather than intertextual echoes, the oracular approach provides a more accurate account of Paul's goal in constituting a new, multiethnic people under God's direct address—a reading well suited to this dissertation, which focuses on social identity dynamics.

Hays (1989) closely examines Paul's extensive use of the OT in Romans 9-11, focusing on the inclusion of non-Judeans in God's plan and the matter of divine faithfulness to Israel. He argues that Paul's citations from the OT transcend isolated references, reflecting a deep connection to their original contexts. For instance, Hays (1989:53-57) highlights how Paul's quotations from Isaiah evoke themes of fidelity and restoration. He further contends that Stanley's approach (oracular) downplays the theological significance of the OT's usage, asserting that neglecting the broader intertextual relationships obscures the depth of Paul's arguments. He contends that Paul's reinterpretation of the OT is transformative and essential for grasping his message (Hays 2005:20-25). He critiques Stanley for oversimplifying Paul's use of scripture and for focusing solely on rhetorical strategies. He maintains that Paul's OT references are intricately tied to the larger narrative of Israel and God's redemptive plan. Stanley counters Hays by questioning whether Paul's audience possessed the necessary understanding of the OT to appreciate the complexities of the cited texts. He argues that

Paul's use of scripture in Romans 9-11 is primarily rhetorical, aimed at supporting his theological claims rather than prompting deeper exploration of the OT narratives. Stanley challenges Hays's reliance on intertextuality, arguing that it imposes modern literary concepts onto ancient texts. He asserts that Paul's audience may not have had a strong foundational understanding of scripture, suggesting that oral traditions and communal processes primarily influenced their interpretation of it.

This debate between Hays and Stanley, with whom Esler sides, highlights a broader issue in NT scholarship concerning the interpretation of OT usage in the NT. While Hays emphasises theological depth and narrative connections, Stanley focuses on oracular and persuasive aspects of the subject. Nevertheless, at the level of historical criticism, the problem with Hays's view is that, if he was wrong on this, his view of the theological was not something Paul intended to communicate to his audience and may not have been in Paul's head either. In that case, Hays would have produced an undoubtedly powerful theological interpretation that was not necessarily Pauline. Nevertheless, the insights from Hays and Stanley contribute to a more nuanced understanding of Paul's theological framework and the relationship between Judeans and non-Judeans within the early Christian community.

In this dissertation, a balanced perspective is taken by considering Stanley's interpretation of the rhetorical and oracular use of the OT, while also recognising that theological contexts may, in certain instances, contribute to Paul's arguments.

We maintain that Paul's quotations from the OT were primarily intended to persuade his audience, while acknowledging that the scriptural contexts also informed his theological reasoning. In an attempt to explore the theological contexts of scripture, Hays appears to have overemphasised the interface between scripture and its use in the NT (Kostenberger 2006:255-259). Paul's use of scripture was more practical and focused on ensuring effective communication of his message. This approach will guide our exploration of Romans, using

SIT as our hermeneutical lens.

This dissertation adopts a socio-theological framework that considers how biblical texts not only communicate divine revelation but also shape social and ethnic identity. In analysing Paul's use of the OT in Romans 9–11, I approach Scripture as a theological and rhetorical instrument through which early Christ-group social-ethnic boundaries were defined, redefined and expanded. As Brett (1997:1–21) argues, biblical texts encode ethnic identity through genealogical, covenantal, and ritual schemas, all of which are central to Paul's deployment of Israel's scriptural heritage. Paul's citations of Hosea, Isaiah, and Exodus serve as rhetorical bridges, reassigning sacred identity from ethnically defined Israel to a community constituted by faith in Christ. This interpretive approach echoes Horrell's (2020:1–50) assessment of scripture as a vehicle of inclusion, demonstrating how Paul uses inherited texts to reshape communal boundaries in light of eschatological and missional visions. Moreover, following Buell (2005:1–45), this study treats ethnic reasoning in early Christianity not as static but dialogical, and scripture becomes a site of negotiation where theological and cultural affiliations intersect. Ekblad (2011:230–231) highlights the transformative reading of Scripture across barriers of race, class, and ethnicity. This concept is particularly relevant to Romans 9–11, where Paul navigates conflicts relating to the superordinate identity of the Jews while anchoring his argument in shared scriptural memory.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Proposed Research Method

This research methodology investigates Paul's use of OT quotations in Romans 9-11. This dissertation employs the historical-critical method, enhanced with social-scientific perspectives, as explained by Elliott (1993). The main social science employed is SIT, a branch of social psychology. In addition, ideas on ethnicity (mainly from anthropology) and social and collective memory (mainly from sociology) will be utilised.

3.2 Overview of SIT

SIT, formulated by Henri Tajfel and his colleagues, most notably John Turner (Tajfel et al., 1971: 1978:149-78), emerged from experimental group studies aimed at elucidating how group categorisation influences intergroup dynamics. Tajfel's initial findings, published in 1971, revealed that even minimal group distinctions could lead to significant intergroup bias and prejudice. Participants in his experiments were placed into anonymous groups without prior interactions, and results consistently indicated that mere group membership fostered favouritism toward the ingroup and bias against the outgroup.

Tajfel's foundational assertion was that individuals derive a substantial part of their identity from their group affiliations. Observations suggest that conformity to group norms fosters acceptance within the group, while deviations can lead to exclusion. Individuals who identify with a group's values perceive themselves as ingroup members, contrasting with those perceived as outgroup members, who are often subject to stereotyping. He defined a group as a collection of individuals who share a sense of belonging (Tajfel 1978:61). He identified three crucial components of group identity: (a) a cognitive component, which

encompasses awareness of group membership; (b) an evaluative component, reflecting the positive or negative implications of belonging to a group; and (c) an emotional component, which integrates feelings such as pride, fear, or rejection associated with group dynamics (1978:61).

He introduced the concepts of "social change" and "social mobility" to explain intergroup relationships, emphasising that these dynamics are primarily influenced by group interactions rather than individual characteristics. Social change occurs within large-scale social groups, such as socioeconomic, national, religious, racial, or ethnic groups, while social mobility refers to the movement of individuals between social strata (1978:33-38). Tajfel noted that rigid social boundaries could provoke extreme intergroup behaviour when mobility was constrained, in contrast to scenarios in which boundaries were more fluid (Tajfel 1978:38).

From his experiments, Tajfel posited that social identity constitutes a significant aspect of an individual's self-concept, shaped by group membership, rather than being an inherent characteristic of the group itself (Tajfel 1978:61). This understanding emphasises that while social identity is a vital part of self-perception, it functions alongside other identity dimensions. Moreover, the concept of "social comparison" pertains to how individuals view their group identity in relation to others, thereby shaping attitudes and behaviour within and between groups (Tajfel 1978:62).

This framework offers insights into the experiences of Judeans who joined the Christ-following community as they transitioned from a traditional group identity to one centered on Christ. This transition underscores the fluidity of identity and the quest for belonging, particularly in diverse social landscapes.

Tajfel's minimal group experiments also demonstrated how social contexts shape behaviour and attitudes, particularly about ethnicity and perceived group worth. Historical examples, such as the divisions between Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda and the dynamics of the Nigeria-Biafra War, illustrate how colonial favouritism exacerbates ethnic distinctions and conflict. These cases highlight the need for inclusive identities that transcend ethnic divisions, a goal reflected in Paul's aim in Romans 9-11 to unify the Judeans and non-Judeans under a shared identity in Christ.

3.3 Ethnic Identity and SIT

When he first formulated SIT, Tajfel (1978:1-23) made explicit that the social groups he had in mind included ethnic groups. But what was "ethnic' identity?" The modern foundation for understanding it dates back to a celebrated essay by Fredrik Barth in 1969. He redefined how scholars understand ethnic identity. Rather than treating ethnicity as a fixed set of cultural traits, Barth argued that what truly defines an ethnic group is the boundary it maintains between itself and others. These boundaries are not passive or natural, instead they are actively constructed and preserved through social processes of inclusion and exclusion. Barth further emphasised that ethnic groups persist even when individuals cross cultural lines or adopt traits from other groups. What matters is not the internal content of a group's culture, but the ongoing negotiation of group membership. Ethnic identity, in his view, is relational and dynamic, shaped by interaction rather than isolation. This perspective challenged earlier anthropological models that assumed ethnic groups were culturally homogeneous and geographically isolated. Barth's work laid the foundation for modern theories of identity, multiculturalism, and social categorisation. However, apart from saying that ethnic identity was not presumptively determined by one's origin and background (Barth 1969:9-38), he did not offer much help in what identifies a group as ethnic in nature. On this point, the views of

John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith in 1996 proved very useful. They have suggested six diagnostic (not essentialist) indicators. These are;

(a) a common proper name to identify the group;

(b) a myth of common ancestry;

(c) a shared history or shared memories of a common past, including heroes, events, and their commemoration;

(d) a common culture, embracing such things as customs, language, and religion;

(e) a link with a homeland, either through actual occupation or by symbolic attachment to the ancestral land, as with diaspora peoples; and

(f) a sense of communal solidarity.

Of particular significance for this dissertation is the strong case that first-century Judeans had an ethnic identity. In connection with this, Esler (2009:73-91; 2017:12-19) illustrates the point concerning Philo's discussion of the proselyte in De virtutibus (102-103), showing that each aspect of Philo's account can be found in the Hutchinson and Smith indicia.

The Greeks, too, can be regarded as an ethnic group (Hall 1997). Both Judeans and Greeks are mentioned in Romans. Relevant to this dissertation is that the superordinate identity I will argue is non-ethnic. So, I will suggest that we have two ethnic subgroups and one non-ethnic superordinate group. Paul navigates the complexities of ethnic identities, advocating for the coexistence of both Judean and non-Judean sub-ethnic groups within the superordinate identity in Christ, without allowing any sub-group to dominate the group's collective identity. His call for acceptance among the diverse members of the Christ group reflects his keen awareness of the potential for ethnic divisions to undermine communal

unity. By framing ethnic characteristics as part of the Christ group's sub-identity while promoting a shared faith and superordinate identity, Paul illustrates the fluidity of ethnicity and its interplay with social identity.

Incorporating these insights enables a deeper understanding of how collective memory can shape identity formation, particularly in settings characterised by ethnic and social diversity.

3.4 Prototypes

In SIT, a prototype refers to a cognitively constructed set of attributes—beliefs, behaviour, and norms that define what it means to be a typical member of a group and distinguish that group from others. However, prototypicality is the degree to which an individual embodies these attributes, influencing their perceived legitimacy, influence, and leadership potential within the group. Hogg (2001:185–186) explains that group members tend to conform to the prototype, and those seen as most prototypical often emerge as informal leaders due to depersonalised social attraction and perceived representativeness. This dynamic reinforces group cohesion and identity salience, especially in contexts of uncertainty or intergroup tension.

Additionally, a critical concept in understanding group dynamics is the prototype. Eleanor Rosch, a pioneer in cognitive research on categorization, proposed that human categories often revolve around a prototype—an ideal or typical member of a category (Rosch 1978; Lakoff 1987:39-55). Prototypes are not static; they evolve based on context and experience, suggesting a preference for discussing "prototypicality" rather than fixed prototypes (Turner et al. 1987:61; Luomanen 2007:168).

3.5 Social and Self-Categorization Theory

In 1985, John Turner, a former student of Tajfel, introduced Self-Categorisation Theory (SCT) to bridge the gaps in SIT. In 1987, Turner published a book, co-authored with four other social identity theorists (Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, and Wetherell), that further developed his ideas. While SIT primarily explores intergroup discrimination, SCT examines the processes within and between groups, addressing how individuals perceive themselves in relation to their collective identity. Turner argued that group formation hinges on shared perceptions of similarity and difference, fostering a sense of collective identity (Turner et al. 1987:15–16). He provided the foundational understanding of how people came to categorise themselves (as group members) in the first place. Categorisation is an inherent trait among living beings, extending from the simplest organisms to complex social structures. Every entity categorises its experiences, discerning between beneficial and harmful encounters. It is argued that social identity arises when individuals cognitively classify themselves and others, using salient prototypes to define group membership (1987:50-52). This process of self-categorisation leads to depersonalization, whereby people perceive themselves more as interchangeable members of an in-group than as unique individuals. As group prototypes shift with context and experience, so too does one's self-definition and behaviour in intergroup settings (1987:24). Likewise, Jung, Hogg, and Choi (2019:98-100) reaffirm that depersonalization is a cognitive process through which individuals adopt prototypical group norms, reducing uncertainty and reinforcing group identity.

In 2012, three social identity theorists (Alexander Haslam, Stephen Reicher, and Katherine Reynolds) published a special issue of the British Journal of Social Psychology that explored Turner's distinctive contribution to the field. They identified John Turner's key discovery as the formalisation of social identity and self-categorisation processes into a generative, testable theory that explains not only intergroup differentiation but also the very

mechanisms of social influence and social change. They demonstrate that by anchoring social behaviour in individuals' self-definitions as group members, Turner revealed how collective power, solidarity, and transformation emerge directly from shared identities, rather than from fixed individual traits or external structures (Haslam, Reicher, and Reynolds 2012:202–204).

Some other scholars have extended Tajfel's foundational insights and Turner's self-categorisation framework into new domains, refining core concepts and applying them to contemporary social issues. For example, Rupert Brown appraises the "Tajfelian legacy," showing how social identity processes now inform research on organisational behaviour, political polarisation, and virtual communities (Brown 2020:5–25). In addition, Dora Capozza and Rupert Brown trace advances in category salience and implicit versus explicit identity measures, arguing that social contexts dynamically shape which identity becomes cognitively dominant (Capozza and Brown 2000:117). Furthermore, Jetten, Haslam, and Haslam introduced the "social cure," linking strong group identification to improved mental and physical health outcomes (Jetten et al. 2017:112–114). Likewise, Hornsey reviews the cognitive and motivational underpinnings of SIT and self-categorisation, clarifying how identity processes oscillate between self-enhancement and epistemic motives (Hornsey 2008:60–62).

Shared categories typically possess defining characteristics that validate membership, as exemplified by the classification of animals. Several scholars have reinforced Turner et al.'s emphasis on fluid, context-sensitive prototypes in self-categorisation theory. For example, Oakes, Haslam, and Turner (1994:110) show that prototypes are normative group constructs whose content shifts as social contexts and group norms evolve. In addition, Ellemers, Spears, and Doosje (1999:15) apply SCT to organisational life, arguing that role expectations continuously recast who or what counts as prototypical. Furthermore, Haslam et al. (2000:459) demonstrate empirically that prototypicality is dynamically reinforced or

reshaped through everyday interactions, rather than anchored in fixed attributes. Turner and Reynolds (2012:402) reaffirm that self-categorisation processes are inherently sensitive to situational cues, thus favouring discussion of "prototypicality" over fixed "prototype" definitions. Furthermore, they posit that as individuals become group members, they shift from a personal to a social identity mode, aligning their interests with the group's.
There are other scholarly views. For example, Brewer shows that social identification generates a dual identity in which group membership supplements rather than supplants the personal self, thus avoiding any actual loss of individuality (Brewer 1991:478). In addition, León (2023:217-19) argues that the depersonalization model in close relationships argues that "we-identities" in intimate contexts reflect complementarity and non-substitutability rather than interchangeability. Likewise, Ellemers et al. demonstrate that social identity processes create a multi–layered self-concept: personal and social identities coexist and interact rather than one erasing the other (Ellemers et al. 1999:5; Haslam et al. 2012:204). The need for categorisation is universal, underpinning social interactions across cultures (Roitto 2012:143-156).

Most recently, Spears (2021:367:390) reviews research on how individuals' group identities shape their susceptibility to social influence. Grounded in self-categorisation theory, this research examines the distinctive contribution of group identity processes to persuasion and norm compliance, compares these to other normative explanations, and explores the boundary conditions for their effectiveness. It explains that when individuals strongly identify with a group, they are more likely to adopt that group's norms, behaviors, and beliefs—especially those they see as central or "prototypical." This group-based influence, according to self-categorization theory, can be more powerful than other types of persuasion that do not focus on shared identity.

3.6 Realistic Conflict Theory (RCT)

Realistic Conflict Theory (RCT) is a foundational concept in social psychology that explains intergroup hostility as a consequence of competition over scarce resources. Muzafer Sherif developed it in the 1950s and 1960s. RCT posits that when groups perceive their goals as incompatible, especially in zero-sum contexts, prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination intensify. For example, Sherif's Robbers Cave Experiment demonstrated that even well-adjusted individuals, when placed in competitive group settings, quickly develop negative attitudes toward outgroups. Crucially, Sherif demonstrated that hostility could be reduced through the establishment of superordinate goals—shared objectives that require cooperation (Sherif 1966:12–15).

RCT emerged from social psychology, diverging from earlier hedonistic models that reduced human behaviour to individual pleasure-seeking. Donald Campbell (1965) later formalised the theory, critiquing social exchange theorists like Thibaut and Kelley (1959) for overlooking group-level dynamics. Significant works include "Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment" (Sherif et al. 1961), mentioned above, "In Common Predicament" (Sherif 1966), and "Social Psychology" (Sherif and Sherif 1969). These texts laid the empirical and theoretical groundwork for understanding how perceived resource scarcity, not personality traits, drives intergroup conflict. RCT continues to influence studies on ethnic tension, workplace diversity, and political polarisation.

3.7 Reduction of Intergroup Bias and Conflict

A pivotal aspect of SIT and SCT is the potential to mitigate intergroup bias and conflict. Members of a group often strive for positive distinctiveness, which can lead to ethnocentrism and ingroup favouritism, as demonstrated in Tajfel's experiments. This drive for differentiation can incite conflict over resources and privileges, particularly between Judeans who adhere to traditional beliefs and those who have embraced Christianity.

While historical theories, such as Allport's contact hypothesis, suggested that personal interactions can reduce prejudice (Allport 1954:281;Vezzali et al. 2018), Tajfel's work challenges this notion, advocating for recategorization as a more effective strategy for reducing prejudice. This approach facilitates the creation of a superordinate group identity that encompasses diverse subgroups, promoting inclusivity without erasing individual characteristics or identities. (Carmona et al. 2022:41-45; Dovidio et al. 2014:4-6). Gaertner & Dovidio (2000:95-97) propose the common ingroup identity model, which shows that recategorising individuals into a shared superordinate identity (e.g., “we”) reduces bias while allowing subgroup identities to remain salient. In addition, Wenzel, Mummendey, and Waldzus (2007:334-336) use their ingroup projection model to demonstrate how superordinate identities can be inclusive when subgroup differences are acknowledged and respected. Furthermore, Brown and Hewstone (2005:84-86) support maintaining subgroup identities within cooperative superordinate frameworks through their mutual intergroup differentiation model. Also, Reicher et al (2010:1-40) offer a comprehensive overview of the Social Identity Approach, which integrates SIT and SCT. They argue that this approach has transformed social psychology by shifting the focus from individual traits to group-based processes that shape perception, behaviour, and social influence. Furthermore, they argue that group membership is central to how people define themselves and interpret the world. In addition, they argue that depersonalization is not a loss of self, but rather a shift in perspective that allows one to see oneself as a group member. Social influence is most substantial when the source is perceived as prototypical of the in-group. The approach explains phenomena like conformity, leadership, collective action, and intergroup conflict. It challenges traditional models that treat individuals as isolated decision-makers. Furthermore, Korostelina (2014:214-229) develops a systemic theory of insult grounded in SIT and power dynamics, aiming to explain how insults function in intergroup conflict. She identifies six

distinct types of insults: Identity insults – challenge the legitimacy of a group's core identity; projection insults – impose unwanted characteristics from one group onto another; divergence insults – highlight differences to reinforce exclusion; relative insults – compare groups to assert superiority; power insults – assert dominance or control; legitimacy insults – deny the rightful status or recognition of a group. She applies this framework to the case of Pussy Riot in Russia, showing how different insult types were used to delegitimise the group and its supporters.

As a broad application of SIT to Romans 9-11, I will argue that Paul undertakes a mission to unify Judeans and non-Judeans under the identity of the Christ community, emphasising shared values and norms that transcend ethnic distinctions. This framework of belonging fosters an environment where intergroup conflict diminishes, allowing for a collective identity that embraces diversity within unity.

In addition, I will argue that Paul's construction of identity in Romans 9–11 reflects key principles outlined above in the social identity approach. For example, in Romans 9, Paul redefines Israel's identity in terms of faith, promise, and divine mercy, rather than ethnic lineage, although not denying their ethnicity. This social-theological recategorization mirrors what Al Ramiah et al. (2011) describe as identity negotiation within status-diverse groups. In addition, Paul's appeal to non-Judeans to see themselves as grafted into Israel (Rom. 11:17–24) reflects a superordinate identity strategy—one that seeks unity in Christ without erasing Judean distinctiveness. However, a warning to be aware of is that such strategies can be perceived differently; some Judean Christ-followers may resist assimilation. At the same time, some non-Judean Christ-followers might assume full inclusion without recognizing

historical covenantal distinctions. This tension parallels the integration vs assimilation dilemma outlined in the article (Al Ramiah et al. 2011:49–50).[1]

Furthermore, Reicher et al. (2010) offer a clarifying synthesis of the social identity approach, arguing that depersonalization reflects a contextual shift in self-definition rather than the erasure of personal identity. From this perspective, individuals adopt the norms of a salient in-group because they perceive themselves as representative of it, not because they lose their individuality entirely. This reading aligns with Paul's goal in Romans 9–11 to reconceive the identity of Christ-followers through the framework of faith group membership rather than ethnicity, but without denying their ethnicity. Also, Korostelina (2014), whom we have already mentioned above, argues that understanding the dynamics of insult can help analyse and resolve complex intergroup conflicts.[2] For example, in Romans 10, Paul confronts Judean resistance to the gospel, but he carefully avoids identity insults—he does not delegitimise Judean identity or traditions.

---

[1] Al Ramiah et al. argue that common ingroup identities can reduce intergroup bias but often provoke tension between majority assimilationist expectations and minority integrationist preferences. This dynamic is evident in Paul's redefinition of Israel's boundaries in Romans 9–11, where Gentile inclusion is affirmed but Jewish distinctiveness is preserved (Al Ramiah, Hewstone, and Schmid 2011:49-50).

[2] Korostelina argues that intergroup conflict often hinges on perceived identity insults—rhetorical strategies that deny legitimacy, assert dominance, or reinforce exclusion (Korostelina 2014:217–219). In Romans 9–11, Paul carefully avoids such insult dynamics; his appeals to Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers challenge exclusionary prototypes while preserving the dignity of both groups. Rather than erasing distinction, Paul frames the olive tree metaphor (Rom. 11:17–24) as a reconciliatory prototype—one that grafts in without severing covenantal roots.

Instead, he appeals to scripture (e.g., Isa. 52:7; Joel 2:32) to affirm that righteousness through faith is accessible to all, including non-Judeans. By doing so, he reframes the prototype of belonging without resorting to "projection insults" or "power insults" that would impose non-Judean traits onto Judean identity or vice versa. In addition, Romans 11 deepens this strategy: Paul's metaphor of the olive tree (Rom. 11:17–24) honours Jewish covenantal history as the "natural branches" while welcoming non-Judeans through grafting. This rhetorical move aligns with Korostelina's insight that inclusive group identity can be preserved through respectful redefinition, rather than through legitimacy or divergence insults that alienate minority identities. Paul avoids framing Judean unbelief as inferiority—instead, he characterises it as temporary, urging humility among non-Judeans (Rom. 11:18-20). Thus, Paul's rhetorical posture in Romans 10–11 exemplifies a prototype revision that invites new group configurations (faith-based inclusion) without dishonouring the legacy of the original group (Israel). This affirms Korostelina's claim that reducing intergroup tension depends on avoiding rhetorical delegitimisation (Korostelina 2014:217–219). In contemporary discourse on the interplay between social identity and collective memory in Paul's letters, the success of a superordinate identity hinges on inclusivity and the avoidance of dominance by any particular subgroup, as highlighted by Mummendey and Wenzel (1999).

Ultimately, Paul's goal is to establish a common ingroup identity that respects individual subgroup identities while promoting a harmonious and inclusive community centered on Christ.

3.8 Collective Memory and Social Identity

Maurice Halbwachs (1992:38-40) introduced the concept of collective memory as socially framed recollection, arguing that memory is shaped by group contexts such as family, religion, and class. Research indicates that individuals who share common memories are likely to perceive one another as part of the ingroup, thereby enhancing their collective

identity. As Tavani et al. (2015:2-3) note, memories are integral to personal identity, but Halbwachs (1997) emphasises that collective memory and group identity are connected. Memories form a shared narrative that not only defines a group but also facilitates social categorisation, reinforcing the bonds within the group.

Collective memory encompasses a rich tapestry of past experiences and cultural artefacts, acting as a defining marker for ingroup identity. This memory is shaped by social interactions and shared narratives, creating a sense of belonging among group members (Jedlowski 2001:30-33; Licata & Klein 2005:241-243). The dynamics of collective memory suggest a reciprocal relationship with social identity, in which the latter can influence how memories are reconstructed to enhance group cohesion and protect identity. In addition, Durkheim (1995:427:430), although he did not use the term "collective memory," laid the groundwork by showing how commemorative rituals sustain group solidarity. In addition, Cordonnier et al. (2022:8) propose the 'hourglass metaphor' to explain how collective memory flows between macro (societal), meso (family), and micro (individual) levels across generations. Furthermore, Erll (2022:14) introduces the concept of implicit collective memory, focusing on the unconscious transmission of information through media, narrative schemata, and cultural framing. Most recently, Orianne and Eustache (2023:2-5) clarify the distinctions between collective, shared, collaborative, and social memory, arguing that collective memory resides in the individual consciousness shaped by group membership.

It is worth noting that Halbwachs' model of collective memory assumes a relatively stable, group-generated social framework that shapes how communities remember. Still, it does not account for the fluidity, contestation, and strategic boundary-work that SIT highlights. By contrast, Orianne and Eustache emphasise the dynamic, negotiated, and identity-regulating functions of memory, precisely the processes that SIT identifies as central to intergroup differentiation, threat management, and recategorization. Their approach aligns more closely

with SIT's emphasis on how groups actively construct, defend, and revise identity narratives in response to social pressures. For this reason, Orianne and Eustache provide a better theoretical fit for an SIT-informed analysis, whereas Halbwachs' framework risks flattening the very identity processes that SIT seeks to illuminate.

Broadly, relating collective memory and social identity formation to Romans 9–11, Paul's rhetorical strategy reflects a deliberate activation and reinterpretation of collective memory to develop a new social identity framework and boundaries that hold the Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers together. Drawing on SIT and SCT, Paul's theological narrative functions as a prototype revision grounded in shared beliefs and scriptural memory. For example, we see a connection with the assertion of Maurice Halbwachs that collective memory is constructed through social frameworks like religion and kinship (Halbwachs 1992:38-40), when Paul re-narrates Israel's story, referencing patriarchs (Rom. 9:7–13), prophets (9:25–29), and covenantal patterns to invite a new identity prototype based on the framework of promise and faith. Similarly, Cordonnier et al. envision memory as flowing across macro, meso, and micro layers—Scripture (macro), Judean and non-Judean Christ-group (meso), and personal faith (micro)—each present in Paul's identity framework (2022:8). Erll adds depth through the concept of implicit memory—unconscious memory transmission through narrative forms (2022:14). Connected to Erll's concept, Paul does not merely argue; he evokes. His selective use of prophetic texts becomes a rhetorical scaffolding for collective belief and identity revision. Furthermore, Jedlowski (2001:30–33) and Licata & Klein (2005:241–243) show that social identity is forged through shared stories. Paul's intertextual tapestry transforms Israel's foundational narratives into a bridge of inclusion, enabling non-Judeans to enter not by losing their identity, but by sharing a superordinate identity. Finally, Bar-Tal (1990:35–46) identifies group beliefs as structuring behaviour, leadership, and cohesion. Romans 9–11 exemplifies this: Paul does not dismantle Jewish belief structures in Romans 10; instead, he reinterprets them in terms of faith in God's

salvation plan, sustaining ingroup dignity while expanding outgroup access. This is a hallmark of SIT's resolution strategies: belief realignment.

Paul's integration of collective memory and social identity within his letters serves as a profound example of how shared narratives can foster unity among disparate groups. By emphasising inclusivity and mutual respect, Paul offers a model for contemporary applications of collective memory in the context of social identity. His work illustrates the potential for collective memory to shape identities, promote solidarity, and ultimately foster a harmonious community among diverse members.

3.9 Case Studies in Collective Memory

The Nigerian context provides a compelling illustration of the role of collective memory in shaping social identity. For example, the Movement for the Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB) utilizes memories from the Nigerian civil war to advocate for Igbo self-determination, countering the official narratives imposed by the Nigerian state. MASSOB advocates for the peaceful re-establishment of the Republic of Biafra, citing historical marginalisation of the Igbo people since the end of the Nigerian civil war.[3] They view the Nigerian state as structurally biased, with federal policies favouring northern and western regions. The group argues that self-determination is a legal right under international law, and that peaceful agitation should not be criminalised. Internal divisions have weakened MASSOB's influence, but its legacy continues through IPOB (Indigenous People of Biafra) and other splinter groups. Relating collective memory and social identity, MASSOB frames Igbo identity around historical victimisation, especially the legacy of the Nigerian civil war and perceived marginalisation post-war. The group emphasises distinctiveness by evoking the collective memory of Biafra, portraying Igbos as resilient, culturally rich, and yet unjustly excluded from national leadership. MASSOB reinforces ingroup solidarity by contrasting Igbo achievements with federal neglect, thereby triggering social comparison, a central aspect

of SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1979:35–40).

According to Ike (2021:36-59) and Obasi (2017), they have experienced perceived ethnic discrimination and collective victimisation. Prototype alignment occurs through Biafran symbols (flag, currency), reifying a shared narrative and promoting depersonalization into "Biafran citizens". Onuoha (2013:441-443) argues for the use of cultural repertoire as a political tool by MASSOB. He argues that they utilise myths of origin, historical narratives, symbols (such as flags and anthems), and collective memories that are strategically deployed to forge a distinct Igbo ethno-political identity. According to him, these repertoires help define who belongs to the Igbo ingroup and who constitutes the "other," reinforcing group boundaries and legitimising the call for self-determination. However, the neo-Biafran identity is not static, instead, it is invented and reinvented through cultural expression, adapting to changing political contexts while maintaining a core narrative of exclusion and resilience. Onuoha's analysis shows that the Biafran movement is not merely nostalgic; instead, it is a dynamic, identity-driven project rooted in cultural memory and political resistance. Similarly, another major ethnic group in Nigeria, the Yoruba ethnic group, is making efforts to assert its identity and political autonomy whilst reflecting a reclamation of shared historical narratives. This has been ongoing through the efforts of Yoruba self-determination movements, including the Oodua Peoples' Congress (OPC) and Yoruba Nation agitators, who advocate for regional autonomy or the restructuring of Nigeria's federal system.

---

[3] The movement emphasises nonviolent resistance, inspired by Mahatma Gandhi, and has promoted symbolic acts such as issuing Biafran passports and currency. MASSOB's ideology is rooted in Igbo nationalism, and its grievances include lack of federal investment in the Southeast, political exclusion (no Igbo president since 1999), economic frustration and high youth unemployment.

The movements emphasise control over regional resources, the preservation of Yoruba cultural identity and history, and the decentralisation of political power away from Abuja, Nigeria's capital. In addition, there is their discontent with the 1999 constitution, which is viewed as skewed against southern interests and imposed without popular consent. They call for restructuring or secession, driven by economic exclusion, insecurity, and political imbalance (Agboola 2024:1-6; Badmus 2024; Ikubanni et. al. 2024). Yoruba agitation cultivates ingroup pride by celebrating cultural excellence and governance potential. Ingroup narratives position the Yoruba as politically mature and historically sovereign, using ingroup projection to assert entitlement to autonomy (Wenzel et al. 2007:334–336).

These movements demonstrate how selective memories are employed to bolster group identity, while marginalising narratives may be perceived as detrimental. The dynamics of memory recall can thus lead to significant social mobilisation, as individuals align with narratives that resonate with their collective identity.

3.10 Paul's Use of Scripture in Romans as an Exercise in Collective Memory

In this dissertation, I will argue that in Romans 9-11, Paul adeptly utilises collective memory through scriptural references to unite Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers. By referencing texts such as Hosea and Isaiah, I will propose that Paul reinterprets historical narratives that traditionally emphasised Israel's identity, thereby creating an inclusive framework for both groups. His approach not only acknowledges the significance of Judean ancestry but also redefines it within the broader, non-ethnic context of salvation, which encompasses all those who share the framework of faith in Christ.

Through his theological arguments, I will contend that Paul effectively constructs a collective memory that transcends ethnic boundaries, fostering a unified identity in Christ. This transformation of scriptural narratives into a collective memory serves as a tool for social cohesion among diverse Christ-followers. Paul's use of the OT in Romans 9-11

exemplifies this recategorization of Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ into a unified group. He encourages them to derive their identity from their shared experience in Christ, promoting solidarity while respecting individual ethnic identities.

This dynamic resonates with the African philosophy of "Ubuntu", which underscores relational identity, emphasizing that one's sense of self is rooted in social connections. Paul's approach seeks to address these tensions by fostering a common identity in Christ and offering hope of reconciliation to non-Christ-following Judeans. By encouraging acceptance and unity among diverse groups within the Christ-following community, Paul aims to cultivate mutual respect and understanding.

3.11 Identity Markers in Romans 9-11

Although Romans 9–11 contains fewer explicit ingroup–outgroup markers than other Pauline texts, these chapters are not without identity-laden distinctions. Paul differentiates between groups through categories such as "Israel," "Gentiles," "the remnant," "the hardened," "vessels of mercy," and "vessels of wrath," and through rhetorical contrasts between those who pursue righteousness by faith and those who pursue it by works, or between branches broken off and branches grafted in. Having said all these above, my interest is not in cataloguing these labels but in examining how Paul uses Old Testament citations and narrative patterns to construct an identity story that reframes these distinctions. In Romans 9–11, Scripture serves as the framework through which Paul explains Israel's past election, present unbelief, and future restoration, while also redefining the place of Gentile Christ-followers within that story. By retelling Israel's story through the lens of God's mercy, promise, and calling, Paul provides the social-theological framework for recategorising both Jews and Gentiles into one superordinate identity in Christ, not by erasing their social-ethnic differences but by locating both groups within a single, scripturally grounded narrative of the divine salvation plan of God through Christ.

CHAPTER FOUR

USE OF SCRIPTURE IN ROMANS 9:1-29: SOCIAL IDENTITY PERSPECTIVE

4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the use of scripture in Romans 9:1-29, primarily in relation to SIT and, secondarily, to collective memory theory. In my exegesis, I will use the Revised Standard Version (RSV) translation of Romans unless I note otherwise concerning any particular passage. The RSV is used here because its more literal, stable wording aligns closely with the original languages and avoids some of the interpretive shifts introduced in the NRSVue. I will examine the theological, historical, and rhetorical details of Romans 9:1-29 in conversation with diverse scholars and then focus on exploring the notions of SIT in this passage.

We have discussed SIT theories in Chapter Three, which outlines the methodology of this thesis. We have already proposed in Chapter One that Paul cites these scriptures to provide a narrative that consolidates the social identities of both Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ in Rome. Consequently, this would create a superordinate identity out of these two subgroups to resolve their conflict.

As we proposed in the previous section, we will argue below that Paul was not primarily interested in explaining the context of the scriptural citations in 9-11 to his audience. This does not mean that Paul and his audience are necessarily unaware of these contexts. However, Paul relies more on the oracular use of these citations to motivate and promote unity among Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers. The audience might have been familiar with the narratives behind the citations, but it is unlikely that they would have understood the contexts, as Richard Hays (1989) argues. Paul is more concerned about how these citations, on their own terms, would shape the social relationships, identity, and unity of

his audience.

As discussed in our methodology, for a new group with a unified identity to emerge, there must be a new narrative, or the revitalisation of an existing narrative, that motivates this new group to develop a common and unified identity. I argue below that this is what Paul is doing with the citation of scriptures. He selects and revives certain aspects of the OT scriptures, first to establish the framework for the creation of the Christ group and then to create a common and unified identity among them. In a sense, this common identity is the work of the Spirit, and Paul has earlier affirmed this in Romans 8. However, he now needs to use these scriptures to awaken his audience's consciousness, lead them, and influence their actions toward unity among themselves.

As for collective memory, it refers to the shared pool of memories, cultural narratives, and symbolic practices that are actively transmitted and preserved within a community, shaping its identity over time through social frameworks such as religion, family, education, and public rituals (Halbwachs 1992:37–40, 52–53; Assmann 2008:49–50; Wertsch 2008:135–137; Levy 2011:140–142). It enables the past to reveal much about the present and future that would otherwise remain unspoken. Therefore, the process of election and creation of the Christ-group is not new to the past, nor strange to the future. This is why Paul mentions the narrative of Abraham and Isaac in this chapter, relating it to the creation of Israel, as its paradigm correlates with that of the creation of the Christ-group. The selection and election of both Israel and the Christ-group are not based on ethnicity or physical descent. Paul envisions that the knowledge of God's electing and selecting plan would eliminate the ethnic pride of the Judeans and the boasting of the non-Judeans when they see that God’s outworking of His salvation plan is an outcome of His grace alone.

4.2. The Election, Privilege, and Ethnicity of Israel (9:1-5)

> Romans 9 [1]I am speaking the truth in Christ, I am not lying; my conscience bears me witness in the Holy Spirit, [2] that I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart. [3] For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen by race. [4] They are Israelites, and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises; [5] to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever. Amen. (RSV)

Paul wants to explain the processes of identification, formation, and recategorization of the Christ group. In Rom. 9:1-3, Paul displays his intense emotional attachment to his fellow ethnic Judeans by calling them his kinsmen according to the flesh (συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα). In his anguish, Paul wishes that he could be accursed for the sake of his co-ethnics. Givens (2014:34-50) teases out the ethnic discourse in this section in comparison to the generic use of σάρκα by some scholars. He argues that Paul's use of σάρκα in Romans 9–11 is not merely generic or anthropological but deeply embedded in ethnic discourse, signaling Judean identity and covenantal lineage rather than universal human nature (Givens 2014:34–50). He critiques scholars who flatten σάρκα into a neutral category, showing instead that Paul uses it to negotiate ethnic boundaries and divine election within a historically situated narrative. The use of kinsmen and brothers (ἀδελφῶν) in Rom. 9:3 has caused Cranfield (1975:459) to argue that "unbelieving Israel is within the elect community, not outside of it." While Middendorf (2016:837-38) rejects Cranfield's view, Moo (1996:599) on the other hand gives an even-handed discussion of these possibilities. Cranfield is wrong if he means the "unbelieving Israelites" are part of the elect people of God, because Paul will later argue in 9:6-9 that their ethnicity does not guarantee their election as God's people. However, if he means that the "unbelieving Israelites" are still co-ethnics with the elect Israelites, then he is right. Nonetheless, Paul treats these "unbelieving Israelites" as an outgroup in comparison to

ixxi

the Judean Christ-followers.

We argue in this dissertation that in SIT terms, Paul uses "kinsmen and brothers" as identity terms to depict his shared ethnic identity and belonging with this non-Christ Israelite group. Moo (559) rightly points out that Paul uses this descriptor of "his fellow Jews" to demonstrate the degree of his continuing identification with loyalty to and concern for them. Though an apostle to the non-Judeans, Paul remained a Judean. It is also essential to note that Paul's reference to Judeans as brethren, sons, and relatives is plural. This may signify that Paul has Judeans in mind as a collective ethnic group, not just individual Judeans. We also need to remember that many individual Judeans followed the Messiah at the time of Paul's writing, though the majority rejected him. Many individual Judeans came to be baptised by John the Baptist (John 3:23). For example, John 3:23 states: "John also was baptising at Aenon near Salim, because water was plentiful there, and people were coming and being baptised." While the verse does not list individual names, it implies that many Judeans came to be baptised. This is supported by earlier passages like Matthew 3:5–6: "Then Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region about the Jordan were going out to him, and he baptised them in the river Jordan." These texts reflect a collective Judean response to John's ministry. Additionally, a sizable number of Judeans are mentioned in Romans 16. Paul greets several individuals in Romans 16 who are identified as his relatives or fellow Jews (Greek: συγγενεῖς). These include Andronicus and Junia – "my kinsfolk and fellow prisoners" (Rom. 16:7), Herodion – "my kinsman" (Rom. 16:11), Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater – "my kinsmen" (Rom. 16:21). These names reflect ethnic Judean identity within the Roman Christ-followers (Bauckham 2002:165-180; Ehrensperger 2024:539-545).

While Paul was concerned about the unbelief of Judeans toward the Messiah, there was another primary concern that Paul addressed in Romans 9-11. His concern was also related to the consequences of the unbelief in the Christ community, given their perception of

how God was "righteousing" (Campbell 2009; Negewo 2021; Wright 2013) both Judeans and non-Judeans. The question, therefore, is whether God's specific promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob still stood for the Judeans.

Since many of these ethnic Judeans also belong to the Christ group, Paul is igniting the cognitive and emotional aspects of social categorisation to gain a positive influence among them by showing affection for the group. This would boost the self-esteem of the Judeans in the Christ group, whom Paul identifies as co-ethnics. This may also increase the flexibility of the Christ group boundary, allowing more non-Christ Judeans to engage in social mobilisation and join the Christ group. Nevertheless, Paul also distances himself from this Judean group by using "they" to begin v. 4, which signifies that there is another group to which Paul belongs that excludes these Judean non-Christ group. Paul's rhetorical shift between "they" and "us" in Rom. 9:1–3 signals a layered self-identity that transcends ethnic boundaries. His grief for Israel is deeply personal, yet his use of "us" aligns him with a broader, multi-ethnic Christ-group. This reflects what social psychologists call an expanded 'social self-concept', and what NT scholars describe as identity reconfiguration in light of divine calling. James Dunn, a leading voice in Pauline studies, especially through the New Perspective on Paul, argues that Paul's identity is not a rejection of his Judean heritage but a redefinition of belonging through the framework of faith in Christ. Dunn emphasises that Paul's theology of justification and inclusion challenges ethnic exclusivity and reorients identity around Christ rather than Torah or ancestry (Dunn 1998:334-371; 2005:95-122; Buel 2005:1-45).

Then we read in Rom. 9:4-5,

> They are Israelites, and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises; to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever. Amen. (RSV).

Above, Paul mentions some ethnic prototypical characteristics of this Judean ethnic group. They have been placed in the position of the possessors of a son (adoption), and of glory, and the covenants, and to them was given the law. They are possessors of the sacred service. (temple) and the promises, of whom are the Fathers, and out of whom is the Christ according to the flesh. These are the attributes they share as an ethnic group, which shape their identity, behaviour, and beliefs. This passage is rich with ethnic markers that align with Hutchinson and Smith's indicia of ethnicity, offering a sociological framework for interpreting Paul's theological rhetoric. The shared historical memories indicator corresponds to Israel's reception of the covenants, promises, and adoption, which reflect long-standing divine interactions remembered and ritually celebrated across generations. The myth of temple worship, he taps into a distinctive culture, one defined by Torah observance and sacred rituals. The glory—often interpreted as the divine presence in the sanctuary reflects Israel's association with a homeland and sacred center, namely the Jerusalem temple. Finally, his mention of the Messiah, who comes "from them according to the flesh," underscores both a shared name and a sense of solidarity, reinforcing Paul's ethnic framing by rooting Jesus within Israel's story and affirming their eschatological role (Hutchinson and Smith 1996:6-18). This alignment shows how Paul reaffirms Israel's ethnic identity while envisioning unity in diversity—an inclusive future in which non-Judeans are grafted into the same story without erasing Israel's priority or distinctiveness. In addition to these ethnic characteristics, the use of Ἰσραηλῖται in 9:4 and Ἰσραήλ in 9:6 signifies that Paul was referring to ethnic Israel and identified with them. In Romans 9:4, Paul uses the term Ἰσραηλῖται ("Israelites") to refer explicitly to ethnic Israel, emphasising strong covenantal and genealogical connotations. This identifies Paul's "kinsmen according to the flesh" (Rom. 9:3) as the physical descendants of Jacob (Esler 2003:266–67; Moo 1996:565). This suggests that Paul is drawing on an established historical self-designation among these Judeans, marked by a shared collective name and communal solidarity (Hutchinson and Smith, 1996).

lxxi

In contrast, Ἰσραήλ in Rom. 9:6 ("not all who are from Israel are Israel") introduces a theological distinction between ethnic Israel and ethnic Israel of promise, which refers to those who belong to God by faith in the Messiah. Scholars such as Dunn and Moo agree that Paul redefines Israel in terms of divine election and promise, rather than mere descent (Dunn 1988:541–42; Moo 1996:571–72).

Thus, while Ἰσραηλῖται affirms Paul's solidarity with ethnic Jews, Ἰσραήλ in v.6 signals a remnant theology, where ethnic Israel is constituted by faith, not flesh. This dual use reflects intra-ethnic boundary negotiation through which Paul redefines the proper name "Israel" to include promise-based identity, not just ethnic descent. Paul's rhetorical move mirrors Hutchinson and Smith's idea that ethnic names can be contested and reinterpreted. The name "Israel" becomes a tool of inclusion and exclusion, based on theological criteria. I will refer to these ethnic Israelites from now on as Judeans.[4] It is also possible that Paul wants to remind the Judeans of the positive nature of these ethnic characteristics, as they had become entrenched in them rather than using them to enhance their mission as a light to the non-Judeans. The last clause of the sentence in verse 5, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς has diverse interpretations, but I suggest here that it refers to God as the Father of all. The God of the Judeans is also the universal God of the nations (Lemaire 2005:57-59)[5].

---

[4]For example, Steve Mason argues that Ioudaios in the Greco-Roman world referred to an ethnic-geographic identity, not a religious one. He prefers "Judean" to reflect ancient categories more accurately. Likewise, Adele Reinhartz engages critically with the ethical and historical implications of translating Ioudaios as "Jew." He suggests "Judean" may be more precise in certain contexts to avoid anachronism and anti-Jewish readings. In addition, Daniel Schwartz proposes a nuanced use of both "Judean" and "Jew" to reflect transitions in identity from territorial to religious frameworks. Furthermore, Shaye Cohen suggests that the term "Jew" becomes appropriate only after the Hasmonean period, when religious identity becomes more distinct.

[5] The biblical conception of God evolves in both scope and identity—from a deity intimately known among the Judeans to a transcendent, universal sovereign accessible to all nations. As Lemaire (2005:57–59) emphasises, "The God of the Judeans is also the universal God of the nations," reflecting the theological impulse in biblical literature to extend Yahweh's authority beyond ethnic and territorial boundaries. This theme resonates particularly in Paul's rhetorical shift in Romans 9–11, where he reinterprets scriptural promises not only in light of Israel's election, but also within the broader framework of non-Judean inclusion.

Some scholars like Kasemann (1980:260-261), Dunn (1987:2842-2890), and Cranfield (1975:473) has suggested that 9:6a is the theme of chapters 9-11 and is often persuaded that Paul's concern was theological. There is no doubt that Paul has theological concerns, but it would be an "idealistic fallacy" (Holmberg 1978:205-207) to assume that this was Paul's sole concern apart from the social issues. Johnson has also suggested that Paul's concern was the theological defense of God's trustworthiness. For her, Paul sought a balance of God's impartiality concerning God's faithfulness to Israel (Johnson 1989:11-75). However, there is nothing in this letter to suggest that Paul had any doubt about God's faithfulness; his concern was more about the possible misconception that God's promise had failed to achieve its purpose. This 'sole theological' focus on Romans 9-11 is the reason that many evangelical churches preach through this letter, yet socio-ethnic concerns and prejudice in our churches remain unchallenged.

We concur with Esler that it is difficult to separate the "theological" from the "social" in this letter (Esler 2003:269). In line with Esler, I will argue that the theological confusion of the Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers in Rome fueled their socio-ethnic issues. They did not understand how God was working out his righteousness among them, beginning with the Judeans and later to the non-Judeans (Rom. 1:16-17). The probable groups of Christ-followers and their challenges are listed below.

First, the Judean Christ-followers are still struggling with God's way of righteousness. They may still meet in their groups, representing the Judean model Christ-followers in Jerusalem (Acts 1:7). They are likely to devote themselves not only to the law but also to their faith in Christ. In addition, they may have felt let down that certain fellow Judeans have settled quickly into this new Christ group, comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans, and are no longer antagonistic towards observing the law and other ethnic rites, especially in relation to the prohibition on table-fellowship between Judeans and non-Judeans, probably related to

the fear of idolatry (Esler 1998:93-116). The second group are Christ followers, comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans. Some of the Judeans in this group may have come under pressure from the first group. Additionally, some Judeans in this group may feel uncomfortable with the boasting (11:16-18) of the non-Judeans regarding the Judean Christ followers in this group and the first group. The third group are the non-Judean Christ followers who may have assumed that God's promises to the Judeans had ended and were now boasting about their present status with God. This group might have been meeting separately. Esler (2003:269) has suggested a fourth group whom Paul had not persuaded to become followers of Christ. These Judeans also had the privileges mentioned in verses 1-5, but Paul had taught that they would need to place faith in the Messiah to be righteous apart from the law. Esler suggests that these Judeans may have criticised Paul because if the law could not achieve righteousness and salvation for them apart from Christ, then God's promise had not achieved its purpose. Paul may have faced this issue with these Judeans, and he was very concerned for their salvation. However, it is more likely that Paul had Judean Christ-followers in mind, as well as their relationship with non-Judean Christ-followers.

Back to Rom. 9:6, Paul articulates the framework for Israel's creation and formation. Paul asserts emphatically that God's word has not failed. He uses the perfect tense ἐκπέπτωκεν of the root form πίπτω to indicate that such a thing has never happened in the past and is unlikely to happen in the present. Paul means that God's word has not failed to produce its desired outcome among the Judeans with respect to the salvation of the non-Judeans. However, Israel's plight is nonetheless real, and her situation of unbelief is serious. However, since some Judeans are part of the Christ-group at the time of writing this letter, Paul needs to ensure that their positive distinctiveness, status, stability, and legitimacy are protected. This affirmation of God's promise will build up the honour rating of the 'Jews' (Witherington 2004:250). The Judean Christ-followers need to be assured that God's plan for their ethnic group is still ongoing in comparison to God's outworking of his promises among

ixxi

the non-Judeans. The need to be assured of one's status within a group is one reason individuals join certain groups (Reynolds and Turner 2010). Otherwise, they would not be motivated to participate in that group; hence, the group's unity would be compromised (Haslam et al. 2010:341-56). A similar case is made by Lacoviello et al. (2017:31-41), who argue that positive self-esteem helps group members adhere to the group's norms and standards.

The reason that Paul gives for the non-failure of God's word among the Judeans is that not all who are physical descendants from Israel belong to the children of God (9:6b). Some commentators quickly resolve the puzzle posed by 9:6b by suggesting that Pau redefines "Israel" but without teasing out the social implications for Paul's audience (Hübner 1984:17). There are other scholars (Dodd 1953:155; Barrett 1962:180; Dunn 1988:540) who argue that the social status of "Israel" has been redefined to include the "Gentiles." However, at this stage of Paul's argument, he is not yet about to redefine the boundaries around the Judeans such that they now include the non-Judeans. The 'Israel' referred to here still refers to historical ethnic Israel (Campbell 2006:49, 52, 129-33). The expression in 9.6b, ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, refers to Israel understood as an ethnic group, characterised by the typical indicators of ethnic characteristics found in 9.4-5. At this stage of Paul's argument, he is likely referring to a subgroup of ethnic Israel (Judeans). This is the only way Paul's argument will be consistent throughout 9-11. If Paul meant the Christ-group, which comprises both Judeans and non-Judeans, then his use of Israel in 9:6b would not be consistent in 9-11. For Paul, the Christ-group has not replaced Israel in 9-11 (although we note 'Israel of God' in Gal 6.16). However, we note that some Israelites are part of the Christ group. Similarly, Esler (2006:23-24) argues that Paul strategically reshapes the collective ethnic memory of Abraham, which was foundational to Judean identity in the first century. Drawing on theories of collective memory and ethnicity, he posits that Paul's Judean opponents in Galatia promoted circumcision as a gateway to Abrahamic lineage. Paul, however, contests this by constructing

a counter-memory in Galatians 3, redefining Abraham's descendants not by ethnicity but by faith in Christ. According to Esler, this move creates a "fictive ethnicity"—a socially constructed identity where inclusion is based on baptismal union with Christ rather than bloodline. Paul thereby excludes non-Christ Judeans from Abrahamic descent, although they are still Israelites, and centers the new Christ-following group as Abraham's true heirs. Esler describes this as a radically inclusive yet rhetorically aggressive reconfiguration of group boundaries, later tempered in Romans.[6]

Also, Paul argues that not all the descendants (σπέρμα) of Abraham are his children (τέκνα) (9:7). Rather, it is only the descendants of Isaac who are the ones called (κληθήσεταί -from καλέω). It is not all the children of the flesh (physical descendants of Abraham) who are the children of God; rather, it is the children of the promise who are counted for the offspring, according to the word of the promise (Gen. 18:14).

So, how do we resolve this puzzle in 9:6-8? The immediate problem one observes among many interpreters is their failure to note the shift in subject in 9:6b from 'descendants of Israel' to 'descendants of Abraham' in 9:7 (Tucker 2018:266; Wengst 2008:298-9). Tucker highlights that Paul's rhetorical shift from "Israel" in Romans 9:6b to "Abraham" in 9:7 signals a broadening of scope—from a national identity rooted in covenantal privilege to a genealogical framework that includes multiple lineages. He argues that this move allows Paul to introduce the principle of divine election by distinguishing between Abraham's sons (e.g., Isaac vs. Ishmael), thereby reinforcing the idea that not all physical descendants are heirs of the promise. Wengst (2008) contends that Paul affirms ethnic Israel's identity rather than undermining it, and the subsequent reference to Abraham in 9:7 serves to trace the genealogy of Israel through Isaac—not to exclude but to reinforce Israel's covenantal continuity. His post-supersessionist reading emphasises Paul's solidarity with his people and the enduring validity of Israel's election. Nonetheless, this shift from 'Israel' in 9:6b to Abraham in 9:7

immediately shows differentiation among the Judeans along the line of σάρξ (flesh) versus ἐπαγγελία (the promise) in Rom. 9:8. What is in view here is that physical descent alone does not determine belonging to Abraham's lineage, but physical lineage is not eradicated. According to Esler (2003:185-94), there is no defamation of physical descent at this point since Paul is referring to ethnic Israel to signal a positive relation to Israelite corporate identity. Also, Fitzmyer (1993:560) argues that 'Israel' in the second instance refers to 'Jewish Christians,' to those of 'ethnic Israel' who have put their faith in Christ", although he goes too far to introduce 'Christian, ' which is not Paul's point in this section. Likewise, Barrett (1957:180) is right to argue that Paul seeks to differentiate two subgroups among ethnic Israel, between τέκνα and σπέρμα. Kyrychenko (2003:218) suggests interpreting the equivocal expression "all the descendants of Israel are not equal to elected Israel" in the sense that, although all ethnic Israelites are included in the elected Israel, ethnic Israelites are not equal to the elected Israel, as the latter exceeds the former. In other words, elected Israel is a larger entity than ethnic Israel. This is because the elected Israel encompasses all those who inherit the blessings of the promise given to the patriarchs—including both Judeans (ethnic Israel) and non-Judeans or Gentiles (Gen. 12:2-3; Rom. 4:16-17; Gal. 3:8). His interpretation, therefore, suggests that ethnic identity in this case, a birthright, does not govern God's election.

---

[6] Also, Jae-Hyun Lee – His 2022 monograph, Paul's Gospel, Empire, Race, analyzes Paul's identity-making in Galatians and Romans through the lens of 'race' and fictive ethnicity, arguing that Paul's theology forms new ethnoracial boundaries. Likewise, Caroline Johnson Hodge, in If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul (2007), examines how Paul uses kinship and ethnic metaphors to build identity among Gentile believers.

Although Kyrychenko's interpretation is valid in asserting that ethnic identity does not govern God's election, its weakness lies in his hasty conclusion that elected Judeans include non-Judeans, which does not align with Paul's point at this stage of his argument in 9:6b. Paul does not expressly address this argument of non-Judean inclusion until Rom. 9:24. To assert that Paul includes the non-Judeans as part of the elected Israel, according to Kyrychenko is to deny the Judean ethnicity in the Christ-group. However, this is not Paul's argument; while he affirms that Judean ethnicity is not the basis for election, he does not deny their ethnicity.

I will revise Kyrychenko's interpretation to clarify that not all individuals identified as ethnic Israel (Judeans) are included among the Judeans (of promise) whom God has chosen to use as his instrument for displaying his righteousness. Paul draws a distinction based on God's very promise to Abraham (Wright 2002:635-36). Therefore, the privilege of Abrahamic descent, though important, is not the guarantee of God's election; rather, it is by the electing grace of God alone. Later, Paul will use the same basis to argue for the co-belonging of both Judeans and non-Judeans in the Christ-group. Next, he will introduce the concept of a new non-ethnic identity in his argument. Then we shall be in the zone of redefining God's people to include both Judeans and non-Judeans.

So, the first step in tackling the puzzle of Rom. 9:6-7a is to establish that the status of being children related to God's promises is not constituted by ethnic belonging; hence, Paul cites Gen. 21:12 in Rom. 9:7b, "but through Isaac shall your descendants be named." This citation has no introductory formula, but the use of τοῦτ' ἔστιν in v. 8 would have somehow shown that this was a quotation. Paul cites this scripture verbatim from the Septuagint of Gen. 21:12: Ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα (Rom. 9:7). It is commonly used in both Jewish and non-Jewish texts (Koch 1986: 28), and it explains the categorisation and

ixxi

distinctions for which Paul wants to argue. The word καλέω pulls together Paul's argument in Rom. 9:7,12, 24, 25, 26, suggesting calling into existence or an act of creation, not simply a random act of selecting one person or group rather than another (Gaventa 2010: 260; Barclay 2015b: 530). It is worth noting that Paul speaks in terms of groups, not just individuals. He is using this story to depict the origin of corporate Israel (Campbell 2023:267). Paul sees the calling of Isaac and Jacob in relation to Israel's call as an act of divine creation. Therefore, he uses the story to affirm that Israel is not constituted by ethnic descent but by divine promise.

Once again, we are discussing the differentiation between sperma and tekna in terms of ingroup and outgroup distinctions. This point is sharpened in Genesis 21:12, where Ishmael's ethnicity as a physical descendant of Abraham is not denied. However, it is deemed insufficient for covenantal sonship. This is because true sonship and membership in Abraham's family depend on participation in God's promise, not merely on bloodline. Concerning this, Noble (2013) argues that Paul takes a radical move to invert traditional Jewish memory, where Ishmael, the son of a slave, becomes a metaphor for those who rely on Torah observance (including circumcision), while Isaac, born through divine promise, represents those who are justified by faith. However, Noble argues that the priestly source in Genesis does not erase Ishmael but instead integrates him as a legitimate recipient of divine blessing. Ishmael is granted progeny and longevity, even if not the covenantal heir. Noble's thesis suggests that biblical memory of Ishmael is more inclusive than often assumed, which makes Paul's allegorical exclusion in Galatians 4 all the more striking. Noble's priestly inclusive argument of Ishmael is not convincing. Although Noble cites the 2009 collection of the strata of the priestly writings as his sole source for contemporary priestly scholarship (Noble 2016:12 n. 37), he entirely overlooks Christophe Nihan's essay "The Priestly Covenant, Its Reinterpretations and the Composition of 'P,'" which argues that the priestly redactor narrows the scope of Abraham's blessing, recasting it in particularist terms focused

on Isaac's lineage and effectively excluding Ishmael from covenant-heir status (Warner 2017:240). In contrast to Noble's argument, Paul's line of reasoning thus far implies that other groups may likewise be excluded from being counted among the *tekna,* even though they are Judeans by ethnicity. In this thesis, we shall argue that the Judeans, who do not believe in the Messiah, are the group that Paul is most worried about. However, they still retain their Judean ethnicity.

In Isa. 63:16, "For thou art our Father, though Abraham does not know us and Israel does not acknowledge us; thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer from of old is thy name," there is evidence of another group who claims a filial relationship with God. Still, Abraham was ignorant of them, and Israel did not acknowledge them. Therefore, it makes sense that Paul categorises a group of descendants of Abraham as different from other descendants of Israel. This reflects the self-understanding of the postexilic remnant Judeans returning from Babylon, who, having been severed from the ancestral promises, nonetheless claim direct filial status with God. Rather than appealing to Abrahamic descent, this community forges a new identity rooted in divine deliverance, asserting God's fatherhood as the very basis of their belonging. Childs (2001:580-82) reads this as the emergence of a "fictive filiation," where the exiles redefine kinship with God apart from ethnic lineage. Mays (1994:312-13) argues that Second Isaiah deliberately shifts the locus of identity from patriarchal ancestry to covenantal redemption, so that "those whom Israel has forsaken now claim God as Father on the sole ground of his saving action."

Therefore, there are other groups in Israel, but Paul argues that only God selects the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and they are children of God. This does not mean that God rejects those who are not called; instead, God uses those who are called and chosen to carry out his salvation plan among Judeans and non-Judeans.

Next, we have in Rom 9.8: 'This means it is not these children by physical descent

who are children of God, but the children of the promise are counted as progeny.' Once again, we are in the zone of differentiating an ethnic from a non-ethnic identity, where physical descent is replaced by fictive descent. It is worth noting that Paul uses the expression *tekna tou theou* ('children of God') earlier in Romans (8.6, 21) and it will appear in the next verse. This is a highly significant expression, a common ingroup designation for Christ-followers (used also in the Prologue to John's Gospel and John 11.52). It does not replace physical descent from Abraham; instead, it includes those who are physically descended from Abraham, who have believed in the Messiah.

In SIT terms, Paul is engaging in a social identity explanation of the framework for the processes involved in constituting and creating Israel, which is not based on ethnic and physical descent alone, but on God's promise to Israel. This is a redefinition of the boundaries, identity descriptors, and framework of ingroup membership, shifting from one based solely on physical descent to one based on God's promise (ἐπαγγελία). It would help the Judeans understand their transition from an ethnic-bound identity to a Christ-centered, non-ethnic group identity. It would also be relevant for Judean Christ-followers who might struggle with including non-Judean Christ-followers in the Christ-group once they understand the framework of this non-ethnic identity formation.

The background narrative is that Sarah has demanded that Abraham get rid of Hagar and Ishmael, so that Ishmael would not share in Isaac's inheritance (Gen. 21:10). This news greatly upset Abraham. However, God comforted him by reminding him that his descendants would always be called through Isaac (Gen. 21:12), not through Ishmael. God also promised to make the descendants of Ishmael great (Gen. 21:13), and they would survive and grow to become an ancestor of a great nation; however, he was not the child of the promise, unlike Isaac. Therefore, Paul's emphasis is on the differentiation that distinguishes Isaac from Ismael, through whom the posterity of Abraham will continue, in relation to the framework of

the creation of Israel.

In the Israelite tradition, it was the lineage of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, not just Isaac or Jacob, as individuals, received the promised inheritance. For example, in Exodus 3, God reveals Himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Mühling 2011:343-69). Later, it is argued that this is also true of the non-Judean Christ group; they are also called by God's grace, not by their physical descent, just as the lineage of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is called. The implication is that only the called seed (σπέρμα), in this case depicted by Isaac, is elected as a child; the emphasis is on the "calling," not ethnicity. This leads to a recategorization within the seed (σπέρμα), which is related to the promise, but this is not a recategorization based on ethnic differentiation within Israel. Instead, in a broader sense, it is a recategorization, similar to the past, when some descendants of Abraham were excluded due to the promise; this process is being repeated in the present.

This may appear to be Paul discriminating against the Judeans who are not of the promise. However, when this argument is placed in the broader context of his argument that God's promise is not without effect among them, then it becomes a reinforcement of the positive distinctiveness relating to the status of the Judean Christ followers in the Christ group. God sovereignly calls them without giving up their ethnic identity, but not by their ethnic belonging. This thought of God's sovereign calling without giving up their Judean ethnicity (although not by ethnic belonging) gives them hope that God's work is not yet over among all the ethnic Israelite non-Christ group. This will provide further basis for Paul to argue in 11:16 that all Israel will be saved.

From the SIT perspective, this redefinition has profound implications for the group dynamics within the early Judean Christ-group and the non-Christ Judeans. This is because individuals derive part of their identity from their belonging to social groups, which have clear ingroup (insider) and outgroup (outsider) differentiations. Among the Israelites, ethnic

descent from Abraham has long been a prototypical trait and identity marker, one of the six indicators of ethnicity identified by Hutchinson and Smith. Now, Paul redefines the ingroup membership of Israel to mean that being a true descendant of Abraham is based on God's promise, not ethnic descent. This election of Israel from among Abraham's other descendants means that some of the same physical descent can be called while some are not, not by ethnic distinction but by God's promise.

Did Paul's audience grasp the original context of this citation? Although the oracular sense of this citation is what Paul is deploying, Abasciano (2005:191) argues that his audience would likely have been familiar with this passage in general terms. While Abasciano is right; however, it is doubtful that they would have known its full original context. Additionally, if they were aware of the full context, the story of the conflict between Sarah and Hagar would not have enhanced the proposed unity that Paul sought to achieve among the Christ-group. Furthermore, this narrative in Genesis offers a picture of a family containing two subgroups (Sarah and Isaac and Hagar and Ishmael), which cannot be reconciled into one family and where one subgroup must be expelled. The oracular view of Stanley, earlier discussed in the methodology chapter, is surely to be preferred to that of Hays in this instance.

However, how does the new non-ethnic framework of selection affect the Christ-group? Since no group exists in isolation, Paul wants this new non-ethnic framework for ethnic Israel to be understood in comparison to the creation of the Christ group, for which physical descent is not the basis for its framework and creation. Paul is shifting the boundary and prototypical descriptors of inclusion from ethnic to non-ethnic descriptors. We shall discuss this in a later section of this chapter.

The following citation in Rom. 9:9 is from Gen. 18:14. It reiterates the promise made in Gen. 18:10. It reinforces Paul's attempt to distinguish Isaac as the child of promise (Hays

1989: 65). With ὁ λόγος οὗτος, Paul is signalling that he is quoting scripture (ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος· Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐλεύσομαι καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρᾳ υἱός). When the LXX rendering of Genesis 18:14 is placed in comparison with the formulation in Genesis 18:10, the textual variations that appear are minimal and do not materially shift the sense of the promise. These slight differences therefore offer no substantive reason to question the conclusion that Paul's wording in Romans 9:9 reflects a conscious reliance on Genesis 18:10. This is significant for Paul's argument, since the initial annunciation of the promise to Sarah in 18:10, rather than its later reaffirmation in 18:14, better supports his claim that the identity of the 'children of promise' is grounded in God's sovereign initiative rather than in biological descent.

So, it is likely that the source of this quotation is from the LXX of Gen. 18:10 or Gen. 18:14.

> **Gen. 18:14 LXX** μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σὲ εἰς ὥρας καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σαρρα υἱός
>
> **Gen. 18:10 LXX** εἶπεν δέ ἐπαναστρέφων ἥξω πρὸς σὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον εἰς ὥρας καὶ ἕξει υἱὸν Σαρρα ἡ γυνή σου Σαρρα δὲ ἤκουσεν πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκηνῆς οὖσα ὄπισθεν αὐτοῦ

Before Genesis 18, Abraham had already been given the promise of descendants many times (Gen. 12:2; 13:16; 15:5; 17:5), but here the promise is narrowed and connected to the birth of Isaac at a specific time. Paul uses Gen. 18:14 to categorise the "children of promise" to distinguish them from the larger category of the "children of flesh." Also, Paul is emphasising the reliability of the promise because his audience is allowed to hear it as God's speech in the first-person singular, rather than merely being reported by Paul (Kujanpää 2019:93).

The role of this citation is to add to the explanation of the framework for the formation and creation of Israel, which is according to promise, not ethnic descent. Paul is trying to identify who among the people is the true child of Abraham in relation to God's promise. In addition, there are groups among the Judeans who are not children of the promise. This understanding will serve as the basis for Paul to identify the hardened Judeans in chapter 10 and offer them hope of restoration in chapter 11. The essential thing to note here is that Paul categorises the Judeans into two groups, namely, those of promise and non-promise, despite the same ethnicity. This is an early indication that God's choice in his salvation plan is not based on ethnic privilege or characteristics, though they are not denied. If God's salvation plan is not based on ethnic identity, then the paradigm of God's election of the Judeans is the same as that of the non-Judeans. Bell is right to delay this observation until Rom. 9:24, where Paul mentioned that God has chosen not only from the Judeans but also non-Judeans (Bell 1994:185).

After illustrating the concept of God's election and selection process of the children of promise by quoting two examples from scripture, Paul provides the example of Rebekah being pregnant with Esau and Jacob, explaining that before they were born or had done any good or evil, God chose one and rejected the other. This concerns Gen. 25:23 and Mal. 1:2-3 (Rom. 9:10-13). Paul attempts to show how God's election bypassed a wide range of natural descendants, favouring a lineage through consecutive generations. The word of promise continued through Rebekah, as evidenced by her giving birth to Esau and Jacob. Jacob, not Esau was the promised child, even though Esau was the older sibling. This was all settled by God's election before they were born or had done anything (Rom. 9:11).

The older will serve the younger (9:12) because God loved Jacob and hated Esau (9:13). Jacob was chosen, and Esau was not. Paul was seeking to explain why the word of God (the promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) had not failed. God was working out his salvation plan, despite the rejection of many, primarily through the line of the children of promise, rather than all the physical descendants of Abraham. This procedure lays the groundwork for redefining a group identity distinct from its ethnic character or physical lineage.

However, why is this explanation of the identity framework important for Paul's audience? According to SIT, one of the implications of providing an identity framework is that it helps group members cope with the challenge of ingroup privilege. Ingroup privilege is when ingroup members resist changes that threaten their sense of superiority or exclusivity. The concept of ingroup privilege is explored in the work of social psychologists and sociologists who study group dynamics and identity (Tajfel 1982:24-26; Sidanius and Pratto 1999:31-33). Tajfel explains that ingroup members often maintain privilege by resisting structural or symbolic changes that threaten their dominant status or distinctiveness. Likewise, Sidanius and Pratto argue that dominant groups use ideological and institutional mechanisms to preserve their status, often resisting inclusionary efforts that disrupt existing hierarchies. For example, among the Judean Christ-followers, the thought that their identity as Judeans could be redefined to include a superordinate identity that includes non-Judeans who are not of Abraham's descent could have perturbed them. This is why Paul uses the example of Isaac's birth (9:9) to show that the Israelites have always in the past been defined by God's promises, rather than by physical descent. Just as Isaac was born according to God's promise, so too are the new members of God's people, both Judeans and non-Judeans, born according to God's promise in Christ.

This challenges any privileged sense of ethnic superiority and calls for a new understanding of group identity based on divine action, not ethnic belonging. Consequently, this promotes the unity of the Christ group. A good scholarly source that supports my claim here is Campbell (2006:72-74). Campbell argues that Paul's redefinition of Israel in Romans 9 undermines ethnic exclusivity and constructs a new identity rooted in divine calling. This identity, shaped by mercy and promise, fosters unity among 'Jews and Gentiles' within the Christ-following community. In addition, this identity construction would bolster the self-esteem of the Judean subgroup of Christ-followers, knowing that God's promise is being fulfilled among them despite the temporary setback among their co-ethnics. Consequently, this would increase their allegiance to the Christ-group because of its positive portrayal, rooted in God's promise.

Another decisive example of divine election, according to the lineage of promise, that Paul gives as proof is the story of Rebecca's twins. Not only is there an example of the election of a son of Abraham by one woman, and a rejection of his son by another woman, but there is also the selection and rejection of sons of the same woman (Rom. 9:9b-13). It is said that the elder (Esau) shall serve the younger (Jacob). The only reason Paul gives for the choice is 'so that the purpose of God might continue according to election'(ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένῃ), not because of works but because of his call (Keck 2005:231). It might have been argued in the case of Isaac that Ishmael is an illegitimate child, hence he has no right against Isaac, so Paul's audience could challenge the distinction between them. However, in the case of Rebecca's twins, there is no ground for making such a distinction because they both have the same father and mother, and they are twins. The only ground of distinction between them is the priority of birth. Since Jacob and Esau are twins,

the divine call or selection of Jacob could not have been contingent on anything they had done, by any difference in the occasions of their birth, or by their mother's status (Jewett 2007:578; Gaventa 2010:262: Dunn 1988b:542). However, God disregarded this and distinguished between them according to his sovereign promise to Rebecca, while the twins were yet unborn. Here again is the differentiation, based solely on God's promise. Paul now uses the narrative of the citation above as the basis of interpreting the next direct quotation from Gen. 25:23, which follows the wording of the Septuagint verbatim. Paul cites Gen. 25:23 (ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι (LXX) in Rom. 9:12 (ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῶ ἐλάσσονι·), "The older will serve the younger."

In the original context, this was God's reply to Rebecca's request concerning why the twins fought each other in her womb. The reply to her was that there were two nations (ἔθνη) in her womb; they would be divided, one would surpass the other, and the greater shall serve the lesser. However, what is important for Paul's audience is not the original context of this citation, but its oracular influence on them. As to whether the audience was familiar with the context of the citation, Abasciano (2011: 43) suggests that Paul might have expected his audience to recall the OT context of this narrative. However, an interest in the finer details of the OT context was not Paul's intention. As I have argued earlier in Chapter Three of my methodology, Paul employs the oracular use of this narrative from the past to connect with the present situation of his audience. This would have been possible whether his audience knew the context or not. What matters is for them to understand the fundamental connection between these past narratives and their present situation, as well as the actions expected of them. Although it is to be expected that the audience would have some knowledge of this narrative, not its full context. This narrative suggests that birth order is not a decisive factor in the future of these brothers (Kujanpää 2019:95; Dunn 1988b:544). It is also worth noting that although Paul quotes the last part of God's answer that connects only to the individuals

(Alleti 1987:44 n. 12; Dunn 1988b:544; Koch 1986:103-109), these individuals should not be read as such. Instead, in social and collective memory terms, they should be read as the ancestors and representatives of differing peoples, and the roles they play in Israel's narratives within the framework of their origin and creation. Paul wants his audience to know that Israel is not formed or created by physical descent but by God's promise.

Furthermore, Paul might be seen as taking a risk in suggesting that non-Judean Christ-followers (the younger generation) will be superior to Judean Christ-followers (the older generation). However, this is not Paul's point. In SIT terms, the majority and minority groups differ in their preferences for identity representations. Majorities often favour a common ingroup identity (which can mask power asymmetries), while minorities tend to prefer dual identities that preserve subgroup distinctiveness. In this case, the Judean Christ-followers (majority, older) may resist theological models that flatten distinctions. In contrast, the non-Judean Christ-followers (a minority, newer group) may embrace inclusion but risk being perceived as superior if the narrative implies a divine preference for the "younger" (Dovidio, Gaertner, and Saguy 2007:296-330). This tension mirrors Paul's rhetorical strategy: affirming divine mercy and calling while avoiding a reversal of ethnic hierarchy. One needs to be cautious not to read the reversal of ethnic hierarchy into this narrative. Instead, I argue that the emphasis is on God's sovereign mercy and calling, which concerns providing a new superordinate identity for the Christ group, rather than establishing a new ethnic or generational hierarchy. Paul's goal is to level the playing field, not flip it (Clarke n.d.:1–2; Hodges 2021:2–4; Schooley 2008:2-4)

Some scholars (Moo 1996:582; Wagner 2002:50) suggest that ἔργων ("works") in 9:11 refers to human efforts or accomplishments. However, Dunn interprets this to mean works of the law, specifically some of them as boundary markers (Dunn 1988b: 543), although the law is only implied here, not stated expressly. A significant problem with Dunn's

selection of some aspects of the law that marked the boundaries between Judeans and other peoples is that virtually every distinctive aspect of a people's identity can serve to distinguish it from others. Accordingly, it is probably preferable to relate "works" to all the ethnic characteristics, values, and practices that shape the Judean community in relation to the promise of God. Some of these could be boundaries around meals (Rom. 14:1-3), observing the Sabbath (Rom. 14:4-6), and other rites that define the social and ethnic life of the Judeans, some of whom are already mentioned in Rom. 9:4-5. It should be noted that the contrast is not between "works" and "faith," which has been the traditional view over the years, but rather between "works" and "God's call and promise" (Campbell 2003:253). Therefore, the most suitable explanation of "works" in this context is the privileges associated with ethnic or physical descent and the priority of birth in contrast to God's call and promise.

The following quotation (Mal. 1:2-3) in 9:13 is signalled clearly by a quotation formula. Paul reinforces his interpretation of Gen. 25:13. It starts with "As it is written," "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated." (9:13). As mentioned earlier, Jacob and Esau represent the nations of Israel and the Edomites, respectively (Gen. 36:8-9), portraying Edom not only as a rejected nation but also as a symbol of exclusion from covenantal blessings. Just as Malachi contrasts Israel's privileged status with Edom's desolation and failed restoration, Paul evokes this contrast to show that God's choice is not predicated on human descent but on God's mercy. Therefore, Jacob and Esau serve as representative identities: Israel and Edom, the elect and the non-elect, reshaping group boundaries within Paul's redefinition of the Christ group. Through the lens of social identity theory, Paul disrupts traditional ingroup narratives by invoking the collective memory of Edom as the perennial outsider, reframing identity around divine initiative rather than ethnic lineage. This theological move prepares the reader for Romans 10–11, where Paul anticipates a future inclusion of both Judeans and non-

Judeans, stressing that God's mercy transcends natural descent and opens the covenant community to all whom he calls. The depth of God's love for Israel (Jacob) is shown by his "hate" for Esau, though Esau was Jacob's brother. God's call is for Jacob, not Esau, and this, again, is a zone of differentiation not based on physical descent. Paul wants his oracular use of this citation to influence his audience because he did not particularly tell them that he was quoting from Malachi. Richard Hays's analysis of Paul's use of Mal. 1:2–3 in Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul (1989:54-56) prioritises the rhetorical force and theological mystery evoked by the quotation "Esau I hated," viewing it as a signal of divine sovereignty rather than a precise exegetical formulation. His emphasis on evocative function limits engagement with the emotional and theological gravity of the term "hate," particularly in light of its historical and ecclesial impact on interpretations of election and group exclusion. In contrast, Thomas Dixon (2020:567:570) argues for a more restorative framing of divine wrath in Romans 9–11, suggesting that God's judgment is provisional, interwoven with mercy, and ultimately aimed at reconciliation. This pastoral reading reframes the passage as a movement toward belonging and hope, challenging static notions of rejection. When examined through the lens of social identity theory, Dixon's view proves theologically more fruitful than Hays's, exposing how divine mercy reconfigures entrenched ingroup/outgroup boundaries. However, by juxtaposing Hays's rhetorical strategy with Dixon's reconciling theology, Paul's citation of Malachi emerges not as a doctrinal endpoint but as a disruptive invitation to imagine a community reshaped by compassion and divine initiative.

In exilic and post-exilic times, Edom was referred to as an enemy of Israel among the nations (non-Judeans), as revealed in Isaiah. 34:2, 5; Ezek. 36: 5; Joel 3: 2, 12, 19; Amos 9: 12 (Wolff 1986:63; Abasciano 2005:194 n. 136; 2011:19). However, it is important to note that when Paul cites Malachi, he leaves out the part that refers to nations and relates it more to Jacob and Esau as individuals through which he justifies God's choice of Israel before they

ever existed. This is also consistent with his use of the narratives of Isaac and Ishmael (Kujanpää 2019:96).

Therefore, Paul's point is not that God has elected Israel and therefore rejected other nations; rather, it is that God's call is based on his sovereign mercy, and backed by His promise, not physical descent. According to Mozley (1883:393-409), Paul's focus is on God's mercy, and his narrative supports a theological reading that prioritises corporate identity transformation over personal destiny. In addition, Hunter (1950:96–99) views Paul's use of ancestral examples not as proof texts for predestination, but as illustrations of divine calling that shape communal identity. Likewise, I will argue that Paul is not thinking about predestination to salvation or damnation. Instead, his point is that it is by God's choice that the line of succession is created through His promise made to Abraham. Paul is preparing the ground to make a further case for God's creative action in electing the non-Judeans in His salvation plan (Getty 1988: 465-6; Johnson 1995: 218; Tobin 2004:329). Dunn (1988:540-47) also suggests that Paul's argument is about the character and mode of election rather than the fact of election.

The example of Jacob and Esau above illustrates a pattern of reversal in the values of the object of choice (Dahl 1977:146; Käsemann 1980:274). Ishmael was older than Isaac, just as Esau was older than Jacob. In ancient Israel, the usual order of things favoured the older. Therefore, Paul's invocation of ancestral narratives in Romans 9 reflects a theological pattern long embedded in Israel's collective memory: the triumph of the younger over the elder. Frederick Greenspahn's analysis reveals that this motif—seen in figures such as Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph—illustrates the non-binding nature of primogeniture in Israelite culture and serves as a literary device to foreground God's sovereign mercy. Paul reappropriates these stories not merely to echo familiar traditions but to assert that God's election operates independently of lineage, merit, or social expectation. Just as ancient Israel

saw itself as the “younger” sibling, chosen despite status, Paul constructs a new communal identity in Christ that transcends ethnic boundaries. In this way, the preferential pattern of younger siblings becomes a theological metaphor for grace—election that overturns human hierarchies and redefines belonging (Greenspahn 1994:83–85). Additionally, this reversal logic of election is evident in the fact that the lesser is loved instead of the greater, and God chooses the opposite (Grindheim 2005:146). Barclay (2010b:98) also suggests that Paul’s concern here is not to trace the identity of the elect but how election takes place in relation to their identity. The point is to trace the framework of the creation (election) of Israel, which is according to God’s promise, not physical descent. This reversal narrative resonates with the ongoing experience of the Christ-group in Rome, especially in Rom. 1:16-17, where Paul affirms that God’s plan of salvation begins first with the Judeans and later extends to the non-Judeans. However, at the time of Paul’s writing, the non-Judeans had superseded the Judeans in the Christ group (Esler 2021:132 134; Levine 2022:161 163). Nevertheless, Paul will later affirm in 11:26 that all Israel shall be saved, despite their temporary stumbling. For Paul, the time of a group's birth or creation is not the most crucial factor in God’s plan; rather, it is that God calls by grace and through His promise. Therefore, no group is superior or inferior to the other because of the time of their calling into God’s plan. In terms of social memory, both Judeans and non-Judeans would have identified with this narrative. It would have been humbling to know that the act of God’s calling and creation among both subgroups is an upshot of God’s grace, not rooted in their descent and associated ethnic identity. This would have helped unite both group members as they share this self-esteem, rooted in God’s calling, together. Thus, this reversal paradigm becomes an identity descriptor as well as a tool for non-ethnic differentiation, which Paul applies to Israel and subsequently to the process and dynamic of God’s outworking of salvation among the Christ-group.

But how did Paul's audience grasp this citation? Paul's audience may have had a general familiarity with this narrative. Nonetheless, Kujanpää (2019:97) is right that any attempt by Paul's audience to explore the original context of the quotations from Gen. 25:23 and Mal. 1:2-3 would have been a distraction to them. The concept of loving one and hating the other, in its original context, would have been of no benefit to them amid their ongoing conflict. The contextualization of Malachi would involve identifying the non-Judeans with the Edomites, but this would not have helped resolve any conflicts between them and the Judean Christian followers. Therefore, Paul's goal is not to help them identify with the struggles between the two nations. Instead, it is to help his audience understand the framework for the creation of Israel, which is according to God's promise, not ethnic or physical descent. This would help his audience understand the differentiation among the descendants of Abraham, and consequently between 'Israel' and the Christ group. In this light, Barclay (2015b:520-521) argues that God's choice is irrespective of human norms, standards, and judgment.

What is missing in most of these interpretations above is that none of these scholars connects these quotations to Paul's social use of scriptures in SIT terms. This results in two groups: those who are children of promise and those who are not. It is the framework for this social categorisation among the descendants of Abraham that Paul argues for in these citations.

So, what are the SIT implications of the use of scriptures to the framework of the creation of Israel from among the descendants of Abraham, which is not based on physical descent or its associated ethnic identity? First, it eliminates pride among the audience, especially the Judeans, who might be boasting in their ethnic identity as the yardstick for God's call. Also, the pride among the non-Judeans (Rom. 11:18) would be minimised, knowing that God's paradigm of calling is by his grace. According to Gaertner and Dovidio (2002), the Common Ingroup Identity Model suggests that intergroup bias can be reduced

when groups recategorise themselves as members of a shared identity. Paul's rhetoric reflects this model: he undermines Judean pride in ethnic descent by inviting both 'Jews and Gentiles' to see themselves as one people of God, united by divine mercy rather than ancestral privilege (Gaertner and Dovidio 2002:258–260). Similarly, Verkuyten and Aslan (2016) demonstrate that the centrality of belief in religious group identity can moderate exclusionary attitudes. Where identity is reappraised in light of inclusive theological narratives, pride and boundary maintenance diminish. Paul's appeal to God's sovereign call over ethnic descent models this kind of identity reappraisal, urging Judeans to relinquish superiority rooted in lineage (Verkuyten and Aslan 2016:84–86). This theological boundary shift invites a humble participation in God's mercy, reframing election as a calling into a transcendent community.

Similarly, Paul's invocation of divine "love" for Jacob and "hate" for Esau (Rom. 9:13) functions not only as a theological assertion but also as a strategic activation of affective social identity processes. According to social identity theory, emotional significance is central to group belonging; individuals derive self-esteem and psychological security from their perceived status within the ingroup (Tajfel and Turner 1986:16–19). By aligning the Christ-following Judeans with the "loved" figure of Jacob, Paul affirms their inclusion in God's salvific plan, despite the temporary unbelief of many ethnic Israelites. This emotional reassurance strengthens ingroup cohesion and mitigates anxiety over divine rejection. Moreover, Verkuyten and Aslan (2016:84–86) demonstrate that belief centrality and identity reappraisal can reduce intergroup bias. Paul's rhetorical move thus encourages non-Judean Christ-followers to view the non-Christ Judeans not just as theological outsiders but also as recipients of future mercy (Rom. 11:25–32), fostering a more generous perception of the outgroup. In this way, Paul reconfigures group boundaries around divine mercy rather than ethnic descent, sustaining both theological conviction and relational unity within the Christ-group.

Most importantly, these citations help create a new social identity descriptor, where 'promise' is now the defining identity descriptor for the Judeans, who are considered the children of God, and consequently for the Christ-group, rather than physical descent. For example, Bar-Tal (2000:140-141) contends that shared beliefs act as the psychological infrastructure of a society, shaping individual identity and collective ethos through emotionally charged, symbolically mediated constructs. In addition, he argues that these beliefs, such as "promise" in theological contexts, function as group affirmations that strengthen emotional belonging and ingroup cohesion, often regulating intergroup dynamics and boundary maintenance. This view is reinforced by Verkuyten and Aslan (2016), who demonstrate how belief centrality intensifies group identification and intergroup attitudes, and Gaertner and Dovidio (2002), who show that shared beliefs can recategorise boundaries to enhance solidarity.

Within the valuable perspective set out by Daniel Bar Tab (2000) and other scholars mentioned above, I will argue that group belief forms part of the social identity that Paul's addressees derive from their membership of the Christ-movement in Rome.

4.3. Use of Scripture and Mercy as Framework for Creation of Israel (9:14-18)

Paul's argument so far seems to have raised some objections or rhetorical questions. This is indicated in his first question, Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν, followed by the second question μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ in diatribe forms. They are usually deployed to set up a logical real objection to a proposed argument (Stowers 1981: 117, 150-80). Paul asks in 9:14, "What shall we say?" and "Is there injustice in God's part?" A similar question has already been asked in 3:4-6 (Wagner 2002:51 n. 28; Raisanen 1986b:197), "If our wickedness shows the justice of God, what shall we say that God is unjust to inflict wrath on us? Paul there answered," By no means-μὴ γένοιτο!"

Paul is not, however, responding to generic questions about God's justice, as Wagner and Raisanen (above) suggest; instead, he is responding to specific questions about the character of his justice in relation to the status of the framework for the creation of Israel in his salvation plan. Having learnt that the framework for the creation of Israel is according to promise, not by physical descent, which includes this as one of its indicators, the objectors may have asked, "Is God's framework for creating Israel fair although many of them have been excluded? Or more specifically, does Israel still belong to God's people since they happen not to align with his promise?

Paul responds in Rom. 9:14 with "μὴ γένοιτο," then he cites Exodus 33:19, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy" (Ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτιρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτίρω). This statement, which concerns a single individual rather than a group, follows the golden calf episode in Exodus 32:32, where Moses offered himself as a sacrifice on behalf of his people. God has said that he would not go with them into the promised land (Exod. 33:3), and Moses beseeches him to do so. Moses is also concerned that his leadership will suffer if God does not go with them (33:12-16). God's reply, containing the words Paul quotes, is directed to Moses (note the use of the singular), not to the people. So Moses first pleads with God on his own behalf and then on behalf of his people (Exod. 33:12-16). Moses wanted God to reassure him that he would go with him as the leader of his people and also to show mercy to his people (Exod. 33:19). God explains that it is within his divine sovereignty to show mercy to His people, not because Moses desires it. God knows how to work out his plan among his people, but Moses does not know. Therefore, he will have to rely on God's ways and paradigm in this situation. This is a theme that runs through Rom. 9:16, 18, 23, 11:30, 31, 32, emphasising that divine mercy is sovereign (Jewett 2007:583).

Stanley (2015:187) affirms that the wording of this quotation could be woodenly rendered, I will mercy whomever I will mercy or I will compassion whomever I will

ixxi

compassion'. Also, to be more expressive of Greek semantics, it could be rendered, 'I can expect to have mercy on whomever I might have mercy, and I can expect to have compassion on whomever I will have compassion.' Crisler (2016:169) connects Paul's lament over Israel in 9:1-5 to Moses' lament, as Wright notes (2013a:1189). However, the passage in question (Exod. 33:12-16) is actually more about Moses' position than that of Israel, although Paul laments for Israel. The quoted words are addressed to a single person, namely, Moses, not to Israel. For example, Crisler's metaleptic approach to Romans 9:15 draws on Exodus 33:19 not merely as a proof-text for divine sovereignty, but as a narrative echo of Moses' own leadership crisis after Israel's apostasy (Exodus 32–34). He argues that Paul's citation is not an abstract theology; instead, it is a personal lament that mirrors Moses' plea for divine affirmation (Crisler 2022:9-11). Likewise, Westhelle (1984:307-310) similarly argues that Paul's lament is vocational, not just theological. He goes further to argue that Rom. 9:15 is part of a broader rhetorical strategy where Paul repositions his apostolic identity in light of Israel's rejection. His grief is not just for Israel; instead, it is a crisis of ingroup dislocation, a key concept in SIT. A crisis of ingroup dislocation poses a significant leadership challenge when members feel alienated from their ingroup due to perceived exclusion, status loss, or shifting boundaries. After Israel's idolatry with the golden calf, God threatens to withdraw his presence, destabilising the group's identity and cohesion. Moses, sensing the existential threat this poses, intercedes for relational restoration- "If your presence does not go with us, do not bring us up from here" (Exod. 33:15). Ramiah, Hewstone, and Schmid (2011:47–49) argue that dislocation often leads to dis-identification or intragroup competition. However, Moses counters this by anchoring Israel's distinctiveness in divine presence, rather than in status or mobility. His request to see God's glory (v.18) is not personal ambition; instead, it is a bid to re-establish the group's foundational narrative and secure their identity through covenantal intimacy. Therefore, Paul's leadership lament opens space for a theology that is pastorally

rich and emotionally honest. It allows Paul to model faithful grief, not just doctrinal precision. Therefore, SIT helps explain Paul's lament as a leader's identity rupture because the unbelief of his ethnic ingroup (Israel) poses a challenge to his leadership role; hence, Rom. 9:15 serves as a theological anchor to validate his leadership among the followers of Christ. Therefore, this citation of Exod. 33:19 is one example where the context has little relevance to the Roman audience. The broader context of the quotation would have been quite confusing to Paul's addressees if they had known it or given thought to it. This is primarily because the dialogue between God and Moses does not entail any social crisis that correlates with the social context of the Christ group in Romans. By citing this scripture in an oracular or rhetorical manner, Paul revalidates his leadership. "Paul, like Moses, stands between a covenantal failure and a divine promise, lamenting not just the people's rejection, but his own role in the unfolding drama of salvation." (Crisler 2022:9–11).

The use of 'mercy' becomes the framework for the identity of God's people. Mercy becomes a shared belief, and according to Daniel Bar-Tal (2000:140-141), shared beliefs act as the psychological infrastructure of a society, shaping individual identity and collective ethos through emotionally charged, symbolically mediated constructs. These beliefs, such as "mercy" in theological contexts, serve as group affirmations that strengthen emotional belonging and ingroup cohesion, often regulating intergroup dynamics and maintaining group boundaries. They are categorised as those who have received mercy from God and distinguished from those who have not. Because their calling is according to mercy, Israel's belonging to God's people is not in doubt, despite their temporary setback in God's salvation plan. After all, some Judeans have received mercy, and they are part of the Christ group. For them, the theological notion of God's mercy is proposed as a shared belief, which solidifies the distinct social identity the addressees gain from the Christ movement. Since this is the case, boasting is eliminated among the Judeans and, consequently, among the non-Judean

Christ-followers, as they too are recipients of God's mercy. Therefore, both Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers become more united as co-receivers of God's mercy, and God's mercy is free (Siefrid 2007:643). Mercy becomes a group belief that solidifies the identity framework for the formation of the Christ-group and one of its identity descriptors.

To argue this further, Paul cites the scripture about Pharaoh, which sets the stage for the discussion in Rom. 11:11-32 about the purpose of Israel's hardening with respect to the salvation of the non-Judeans. In Rom. 9:17, Paul cites Exod. 9:6, "I raised you for this very purpose, that I might display my power in you and that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth." This quotation does not match the Hebrew text of Exodus 9:16 in the LXX. Paul may likely be adapting it to suit his arguments and oracular purposes. This is likely a textual tradition that corrected the Septuagint reading in light of the Hebrew text (Stanley 1992:107-108). The LXX and Hebrew have "for this reason you have been preserved," whereas Paul has, "I have raised you up." Paul differs from the Hebrew text and the LXX by stating that God has intentionally raised Pharaoh and enabled him to obtain power over the Israelites. In contrast, the Hebrew version and the Septuagint suggest that Pharaoh has been spared and allowed to rule so long because of God's plan (Kujanpaa 2019:102). Some commentators (Wilk 1998:124-25 n.26; Wilk and Wagner 2010:122–143, Wagner 2002:55 n.36; Fitzmyer 1993c:567) suggest that God's dealings with Pharaoh correlate with his enduring patience with him, while others like (Koch 1986:112, 150-151) argue that Paul wishes to depict God's active role in making sovereign decisions. Likewise, Gaventa (2010:264) suggests that Paul's wording implies that God brought Pharaoh onto the scene. Similarly, Seitz (2001:78, 101) suggests that Paul's wording reflects the creative activity of God in selecting Pharaoh for a particular purpose in history, namely, to demonstrate God's power and glory. Tobin (2004:331) also argues that Paul's concern is not so much about the hardening of Pharaoh's heart but God's purpose in doing so. Schreiner (2018:498) says that

Paul's rendering may represent the Hebrew sense, "I have made you stand", which reflects God's sovereignty in what is happening in the world (Num. 24:19; Judg. 2:16; 3:9,15; 2Sam. 12:11; Hab. 1: 6; Zech. 11: 16; Acts 13:22). Moo (1996:595) also suggests that Paul deliberately accentuates God's initiative in this process. Paul likely sees a correlation between the hardening of Pharaoh's heart and the present hardening of the majority of non-Christ Judeans (Hübner 1984a:53). However, Paul does not make this point explicitly. Grindheim (2005:147) suggests, comparably, that Paul's argument is to align most of the Judeans with the vessels of dishonour, who are prepared for destruction (v. 22).

Having cited all these scholars and their valuable insights into Pharaoh's narrative in Rom. 9:17-18, SIT gives a new approach. Paul's invocation of Pharaoh serves as a rhetorical boundary marker that reinforces group identity dynamics among Christ-followers. Through the lens of SIT, Pharaoh embodies resistance to divine purpose, allowing both Judeans and non-Judeans to disidentify from hardened opposition and reidentify with the mercy-defined group in Christ. For example, Campbell argues that Paul's use of Pharaoh is not a deterministic assertion of sovereignty but a strategic narrative that challenges ethnic privilege and 'Gentile' triumphalism, fostering a superordinate identity rooted in divine mercy rather than ethnic lineage (Campbell 2023:25–28). This framing invites both groups to see themselves as part of a larger, inclusive community marked by God's mercy and grace. God's judgment on Pharaoh is linked to his failure to receive mercy and compassion. In contrast, the salvation of the Israelites is linked to their identity as recipients of mercy and compassion. Therefore, mercy and compassion are key group beliefs and descriptors that Paul uses further to develop his argument for the non-ethnic creation of Israel. Just as Israelites are called and defined by 'promise,' they are also called and defined by 'mercy and compassion.' Kujanpää (2019:104-05), via a rhetorical reading of this text, affirms that Paul's reason for citing the quotation about Pharaoh is to establish that God's call to Israel has been based on

mercy. However, he overlooks the basis of social implication that connects Pharaoh with his identity as a recipient of non-mercy, thereby sharpening the group belief by contrast with the position of an out-group leader. Paul employs the concepts of mercy and hardening to describe the processes of creation and Israel's formation, such that both become the defining characteristics of Israel and Pharaoh, respectively.

In addition, Pharaoh is representative of the 'nations' as a participant in God's outworking of his plan. Therefore, the citation of Pharaoh's narrative opens the way for Paul to set the stage to explain the paradigm of the inclusion of the nations (non-Judeans) in the outworking of God's plan, although later in his argument. Therefore, a question may have been raised: if non-Judeans are participants in God's outworking of his plan, can Judeans still participate in this plan, seeing that many of them are hardened like Pharaoh? This may lead to further conflict between the Judeans and non-Judeans within the Christ group. This is why Paul uses the analogy of clay and potter to develop his argument further, using the 'hardening' theme, which we shall explore in the next section.

In terms of social memory, these citations create a common non-ethnic narrative of origin that Paul will later apply to both Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers. By invoking ancestral figures such as Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and even Pharaoh (representing nations), Paul activates Israel's collective memory. He reinterprets it through the lens of divine mercy, thereby creating a shared socio-theological origin story. Baker argues that such recategorization through narrative identity allows diverse subgroups to reimagine themselves as part of a superordinate ingroup, while retaining distinct cultural features (Baker 2011:69–74). This means that neither of them will be able to boast in this group, because both sub-groups have their origin in God's promise and mercy, not in any social or ethnic status. Both have been included in the Christ group by faith in Christ. The fact that LXX and Hebrew have "for this reason you have been preserved," whereas Paul has, "I have raised you,"

represents Paul's reformulation of Israel's collective memory as a strategy to unite Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers.

4.4. Use of Scripture and the Potter-Clay Framework in the Creation of Israel (9:19-23)

Paul begins this segment of the argument by launching into another diatribe in verse 19: You will say to me then, 'Why does he still find fault? For who can resist his will?" This question is likely posed by Paul rhetorically, as part of his practice of buttressing an argument. The question that probably arises is whether God's outworking of his plan among the Judeans is consistent with his character, because many are now hardened. Also, if God is responsible for giving mercy and hardening, why does he judge man? Some scholars argue that this is Paul's attempt to balance the sovereignty of God with the volitional responsibility of man regarding man's destiny (Moo 1996:601; Kruse 2012:384; Piper 1993:179; Schreiner 2018:516-17). However, they overlook the fact that Paul's focus is not on individuals and their ultimate destiny, but on the status of 'Israel and the nations' within the unfolding of his divine plan (Leenhardt 1961: 249–50; Stowers 1994: 229). This is a continuation of Paul's argument about the creation of Israel as a paradigm for the creation of the Christ group.

Paul's reply comes back as counter-questions in vv. 20-21.

But who are you, a human being, to answer back to God concerning God's outworking of his plan? Will the mouldable material say to its maker, "Why have you made me like this?" Has the potter no right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one vessel an instrument which is for honourable purposes and, on the other hand, one which is for dishonourable use? (My revised translation from RSV)

The use of ἄνθρωπε in v. 20 is not in the sense that all *anthrōpoi* are whom Paul is talking about, but rather as a convenient catchall applicable to his audience (male and female). The first and second questions are not necessarily quotations because they lack the usual

introductory formula, they are linked to Isaiah 29:16 and Isaiah 45:9. They reflect the absurd image of a pot talking back arrogantly to the artisan who created it, reflecting the foolishness of the one who does not understand how God works out his plans in the creation of Israel, creating a relationship of ingroup favouritism versus outgroup derogation. The pot questions the function for which it was made, expressing dissatisfaction with the role it has been given, rather than with the material with which it is made. In verse 21, Paul uses the metaphor of the two pots to claim that God has the right and the ability to create out of the same material different shapes and functions, so that one receives mercy (ingroup favouritism) and the other receives hardening (outgroup derogation). As the potter moulds the clay, he creates shapes and functions from it. So, the analogy of clay and potter is Paul's continuation of God's outworking of his plan regarding the creation and formation of Israel, which, by default, omits some other children of Abraham. Paul is rejecting any challenge to God's prerogative to categorise Israel into groups as he chooses. He will later develop and use this analogy in 9:24 to categorise the non-ethnic Christ group, which comprises Judeans and non-Judeans, created by the mercy and grace of God, distinct from other groups, especially the Judean non-Christ group.

In SIT terms, this is Paul's strategy for ingroup/outgroup differentiation. For example, Esler argues that in Romans 9:19–23, Paul employs the metaphor of the potter and clay to emphasise divine sovereignty and reinforce ingroup/outgroup differentiation among his audience. By framing some as vessels of mercy and others as vessels of wrath, Paul legitimises both inclusion and exclusion as part of God's salvific design. This rhetorical strategy stabilises the identity of Christ-followers amid ethnic tension, affirming that group membership hinges on divine mercy rather than ancestral privilege (Esler 2003:280). In 9:23, the vessels of mercy are equated with Judeans and non-Judeans of the Christ-movement. It is essential to note that the Judeans are mentioned first in the pairing, as stated earlier in 1:16-17. We also need to note the movement from a single vessel of each type in 9:21 to a plurality of vessels in 9:22-23, which underlines the group dimension here.

ixxi

Additionally, we observe the explicit honour-shame dimension associated with the two types of vessels (groups) and the distinct fates awaiting them: *apōleia and makrothymía*. This suggests that even Paul cannot always avoid this group matrix.

4.5. Use of Scripture and the Framework for the Creation of the Non-Judeans and Remnant Judeans in God's Plan (9:24-29)

For the first time at 9:24, Paul introduces the inclusion of non-Judeans in the creation of the Christ movement. Up until now, he has been referring to the creation of ethnic Israel. He begins with Hosea, trumpeting the direct connection with the vessels of mercy by citing passages from Hosea 2:23 and 1:10 to affirm a new category of God's people that comprises both Judeans and non-Judeans. Below is Rom. 9:24-27.

Even "us", whom he called not only out from the Judeans (Ἰουδαίων) but also out from the non-Judeans (ἐθνῶν). As he also says in Hosea, "Those who were not my people, I will call 'my people,' and she who was not beloved, I will call 'my beloved.'" And it will happen in the place where it was said to them you are not 'my people,' there they will be called the sons of the living God. (My revised translation from RSV)

The expressions ἐξ Ἰουδαίων and ἐξ ἐθνῶν in Rom. 9:24 above can be translated to mean "out from among" the Judeans and non-Judeans.[7] The use of Ἰουδαίωνis a reference to the Judeans as an ethnic group, distinct from the non-Judeans who are referred to as "nations." Paul does not mean that the non-Judeans are now joined to "Israel" to become the "new eschatological Israel" of God, as Beale (2014:708) suggests. Zoccali (2010:109), although without the traditional supersessionist notion, interprets Paul's use of Hos. 2:23 (1:10) as pointing "to the creation of God's new covenant people that includes both Jews and gentiles in Christ." Beale and Zoccali present robust eschatological frameworks in their interpretations of Rom. 9:24, yet each exhibits critical weaknesses. Beale's vision of the church as the reconstituted eschatological Israel (Beale 2014:708) overextends typological patterns and risks collapsing ethnic distinctions that Paul preserves through remnant theology, particularly in Romans 9–11, where ethnic Israel retains a divinely purposed role. Beale's reading

overlooks Paul's socio-ethnic strategy of maintaining distinction within a superordinate identity in Chris—an oversight illuminated by social identity theory, which emphasises inclusion without erasure.

In contrast, Nanos counters this by emphasising Paul's intra-Jewish dialogue and the preservation of Jewish identity within the Christ-believing community, arguing that Gentile inclusion does not redefine Israel but affirms covenantal mercy extended beyond ethnic boundaries (Nanos 2012:115–117). Similarly, Campbell critiques Zoccali (2009:39) for imposing retrospective ecclesiology onto Paul's apocalyptic framework, asserting that Paul's language of "calling" in Romans 9:24 reflects divine initiative without necessitating a redefinition of Israel's identity (Campbell 2009:682–684). Both scholars resist the flattening of ethnic and theological categories, advocating for a more historically grounded and rhetorically sensitive reading of Paul's argument. However, Paul's argument in Rom. 9:24-26 is not really about the role of the Judeans and non-Judeans. Instead, it is just a scriptural illustration that there was precedent in the collective memory of Israel for a totally new type of group to appear, which Paul cheekily connects with one comprised of Judeans and non-Judeans. Paul speaks about God's role in the outworking of His salvation plan among the Judeans, specifically by including them in a new, non-ethnic group comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans.

---

[7] Here, ἐξ Ἰουδαίων and ἐξ ἐθνῶν (both genitive plural) mean "from among Jews" and "from among Gentiles," respectively. BDAG's entry emphasises that ἐκ in such constructions highlights God's selective calling from within larger groups, not merely a general outreach. This usage aligns with Paul's rhetorical strategy in Romans 9–11: stressing divine initiative in forming a new identity group—those called "not only from among Jews but also from among Gentiles." (Bauer et al. 2000:295)

The call to unite the Judeans with non-Judeans into one group is the surprising announcement that Paul needs to defend (Aageson 1987:272). So, Campbell misses Paul's line of argument so far concerning the framework for describing the formation of the Christ group in relation to the inclusion of non-Judeans.

Therefore, contrary to Beale and Campbell, I argue that Paul uses Hos. 2:23 to predict the creation and formation of a new, de-ethnicized Christ group that now includes both Judeans and non-Judeans. The creation and formation of this Christ group are through God's calling, which has been his catchword in his argument so far. Since Paul includes himself in this group, it presupposes that he and other Judeans have a new identity that the non-Christ Judeans do not have. In social identity terms, this is social categorisation that differentiates the Judean Christ-followers from the non-Christ Judean group. This does not obliterate other key aspects of their ethnicity, but it is not the basis of their belonging to the Christ-group. This will equally be true of the non-Judean Christ-followers. Paul now alludes to some OT texts in vv. 25-26 to buttress his point.

The first citation in Hos. 2:23, found in its original context at the end of a passage that depicts the punishment and restoration of Israel, also opens up the categories of inclusion within Israel (Porter 2015:191). The second citation is from Hos. 1:10; it also refers to Israel in context. They will not just be called God's people, but they will be called the sons of the living God. Although the original context is about Israel, Paul uses them to describe the framework of creation and the formation of the Christ group, which includes non-Judeans.

The above is one instance where the original context of the citations is not crucial to Paul's use of the OT. Some scholars propose a secondary reference to the original context of Hosea, also referred to as "echo" (Hays 1989:67; Meeks 250:112; Cosgrove 1996:275-276).

Additionally, some scholars suggest that the fulfilment of Israel should not be denied in these citations, but the fulfilment for non-Judeans should be affirmed (so, unconvincingly, Tanner 2005:101). A knowledge of the contexts in Hosea of these two quotations would not have helped either Judean or non-Judean Christ-followers. The Judeans would have known that Hosea was speaking about Israel, which is not the case here, given 9.24. The non-Judeans would have felt excluded since only Israel was in view. It is difficult to accept that Paul would have assumed knowledge of the context of the quotations amongst his audience, when that would have contradicted his point in Rom. 9.24. Paul's concern is with the oracular use of these citations. All they knew, and needed to know, was the fact that scripture foretold a paradoxical people to come who could now be identified with their mixed group of Judeans and non-Judeans Christ-followers.

In social identity terms, the concept of "Not My People" is a social categorisation that differs from "My People." Also, the use of "Not My People" is a derogatory term to stereotype members of an outgroup to differentiate them from the favoured ingroup members that are called "My People" in this text. The same is true of the "Not Beloved" and the "Beloved." When this happens, in SIT terms, the distinct aspects of social categorisation come into play. They are the cognitive dimension (knowledge of one's belonging to the group), the emotive dimension (one's emotional response to belonging to the group), and the evaluative dimension (one's response to belonging to the group). All these are aimed at influencing both ingroup and outgroup members. Ingroup members (Beloved/My People) will feel honoured by the group's identity and become more positive about participating in and upholding the group's values. Additionally, the former outgroup members who are now welcomed into the ingroup will feel proud and honoured about this new status and identity.

Paul reverses the identity of the "Not My People" and "Not Beloved," which were initially used for the Israelites, now to depict the identity of the non-Judean Christ-followers

who have become “My People” and “Beloved.” He wants both subgroups to know that they have a new superordinate identity that carries very high status in God’s view. The non-Judeans would regain any diminishment they previously had in Judean eyes by virtue of their membership in the new Christ-group, for they would understand that they hold equal belonging with the Judean Christ-followers. Therefore, they have equal opportunities and privileges in the Christ group, irrespective of their previous ethnic status. These non-Judeans would also need to understand that this is all the result of God’s mercy in His calling, and that there is nothing to boast about except to boast in God. On the other hand, the Judean Christ-followers would need to understand that their ethnic status does not give them any special status over the non-Judeans in the Christ-group. Like the non-Judeans, they too are called by God’s mercy, once they were not beloved and not God’s people, but God reversed their identity. It is this framework for the creation and recategorization of the social identity of the people of God, including both Judeans and non-Judeans, that lies at the heart of Paul’s argument. This is intended to unite the Christ-group toward joint participation in the outworking of God's salvation plan.

Therefore, Paul uses “Beloved and My People” rather than “Not Beloved and Not My People” as identity descriptors to explain the framework for the creation and formation of the de-ethnicized Christ group (Judeans and non-Judeans), in accordance with God's calling. Consequently, these identity descriptors also serve as a means of categorising and differentiating the Christ group from other groups.

The next identity honour bestowed on the Christ-followers is from the citation of Hos. 1:10 in 9:26, “They will be called ‘sons of the living God.’” These Christ-followers also now have a new status and identity of the sons of the living God as opposed to strangers and pagans that they used to be from a Judean perspective (Eph. 4:17). This brings much honour to them (cognitive and emotional aspects of social categorisation) because they would stop

ixxi

being defined and described by associations with idolatry and immorality of the non-Judeans who are not Christ-followers. It would also influence their behavioural pattern (evaluative aspect of social categorisation) because they must live up to the values associated with their new status and identity. This serves as the basis for Paul's call for unity and gracious relationships among the followers of Christ (both Judean and non-Judean) in chapters 12-16.

In case his audience is wondering about the fate of the Israelites and God's promises to them regarding the inclusion of non-Judeans in God's plan, Paul now stresses the shift in the composition of God's people to reinforce the place of the remnant Judeans. He goes beyond the framework of the Christ group's creation to describe the process of its creation, which is by God's act of saving a remnant among the Israelites. He refers to Isa. 10:22-23, which is conflated with Isa. 28:22b. An alternative formula introduces this citation (Ἠσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) which signals the contemporary application of Isaiah's words: "Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will be saved" (Rom. 9:27). Also, the conjunction δὲ indicates a transition from the previous verses which have focused on the Judeans and non-Judeans together to the following verses which now focus on Israel as mentioned explicitly at the end of the introductory formula. In Rom. 9:27, Paul uses ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ taken from the LXX of Hos. 1:10a instead of ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ from Isaiah. 10:22 (LXX). This modification from λαὸς, which Paul had used in Rom. 9:25-26 for God's people generally, to Ἰσραὴλ, which refers explicitly to the Judeans, depicts Paul's attempt to differentiate clearly between this subgroup in Rom. 9:27-29 from the superordinate category mentioned in Rom. 9:25-26.

Paul has argued earlier in 9:6b that not all those from Israel are "Israel," signifying that there are two categories or groups of Israelites, and that only one group is the "seed" and children of God. Now he categorically names this group in Rom. 9:27 as the "remnant" (ὑπόλειμμα) among the larger group called "Israel." This signifies that the groups that come

ixxi

together to form one group (people of God) are the remnant Judean Christ followers and the non-Judean followers of Christ. So, we see that the function of the quotations in 9:27 serves as Paul's attempt to identify a category of Judeans (remnant) who belong to the larger group of Judeans (in terms of ethnicity), and the group of Christ-followers (Judeans and non-Judeans). The members of this remnant remain ethnically Judean after joining the Christ group, but their ethnicity is not the basis of their belonging to the Christ group.

However, there are some questions about the identities of "Israel" and the "remnant." Some scholars distinguish between "Israel and the remnant," but they were writing before the introduction of SIT to New Testament research for the interpretation of Rom. 9:27 (Käsemann 1980:290; Moo 1996:615; Fitzmyer 1993:574; Legasse 2000:622). Also, others hold a contrary interpretation of the "remnant" and argue that it is the same as "all Israel," which is to be saved in Rom. 11:26 (Gaston 2000:140; Stowers 1994:296; Heil 2002:705). First, the problem with this contrary interpretation is that it is disconnected from Paul's consistent efforts in chapter 9 to differentiate between Israel as a whole and another subgroup, referred to as the seed, children of God, and here referred to as the remnant. Paul's view of "all Israel" that will be saved includes the "remnant" and those who would ultimately be saved among the hardened Judeans, a case that Paul develops further in chapter 11. Second, these scholars do not appreciate Paul's emphasis on a new non-ethnic Christ group, which only some Judeans now belong to, and which is formed as an act of creation by God through his gracious calling. Third, if Paul meant that "remnant" is equivalent to "all Israel," he would have made the direct connection in Rom. 9:27 instead of using Ἰσραὴλ and ὑπόλειμμα to distinguish these two groups. Therefore, Paul's point here is that some Judeans are saved and become God's children along with other non-Judeans, yet some other Judeans are not saved, though the number of the sons of Israel is as the sand of the sea. Those who are saved from this multitude of Judeans are called the "remnant." This "remnant" still holds an

ethnic identity with this larger group, who are not saved and not children of God, proving that ethnicity is not the basis of belonging to the children of God.

To buttress his point further about the "remnant" among the Judeans, Paul refers to a conflated version of Isa. 10:22 (λόγον συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων) and 23 (ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον Κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ) in Rom. 9:28 (λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) –"The Lord will act by accomplishing his utterance on earth and limiting it" (BDAG 2000:975). This citation from Isa. 10:22-23 is probably modified under the influence of Isa. 28:22 (διότι συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα πράγματα ἤκουσα παρὰ Κυρίου σαβαώθ, ἃ ποιήσει ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν). The λόγον in Rom. 9:28 is linked to God's word connected to the 'remnant' as the citation in Rom. 9:29 depicts clearly: "If the Lord of Armies had not left us seed (σπέρμα), we (Judeans) would have become like Sodom and fared like Gomorrah." This is a clear citation from Isaiah 1:9, which has already been introduced in Rom. 9:28. Again, we see God's creation of the remnant σπέρμα identity framework, so that the remnant is differentiated from other Judeans who do not share in this sonship.

However, some scholars emphasise the negative connotation of the "remnant" metaphor in Rom. 9:27-29, interpreting it as judgment over Israel (Käsemann 1980:265; Cranfield 1979:501; Wilckens 1982:207). Nevertheless, other scholars emphasise both hope and judgment over Israel on the "remnant" in these citations (Moo 1996:615-616; Shum 2002:209-210; Aageson 1987:57-58). While themes of judgment and hope are implied in these citations, they are not the focal point of Paul's use of them. Instead, Paul uses these citations to reinforce his affirmation that God's word will produce its desired effect of the "children of promise" among the Judeans (9:6-8), and the "remnant" is proof that this is already happening. Therefore, these citations are used in reference to the promise of hope for the Judeans.

ixxi

In social identity terms, Paul acknowledges the initial categorisation of the Judeans into the larger group of all Judeans (sand of the sea) and the "remnant"- a subgroup of Judeans to which he ascribes the status and identity of salvation (Rom. 9:27). Then in v. 29, Paul uses the quotation from Isa. 1:9 to draw some social comparison between the σπέρμα that God kept among the Judeans (same as remnant above) concerning Sodom and Gomorrah. The use of σπέρμα is an ingroup designation for the children of God (Rom. 9:6-8), while Sodom and Gomorrah denote a derogatory term for the outgroup who are destined for judgment. Therefore, the knowledge (cognitive-social dimension) that God keeps his σπέρμα, the Judeans, is an offer of hope to those who constitute a subgroup of Israel, even though the majority of Judeans do not believe in Christ. This would foster greater loyalty to the Christ group (evaluative dimension), which they share with the non-Judean followers of Christ. Later, Paul employs this hope of salvation and its present outworking among the "remnant" as the basis of hope that "all Israel" shall be saved in Rom. 11:26.

The essence here is that whatever God is doing among the non-Judeans to call a people for himself, he is also doing the same among the Judeans. Wagner (2010:429) puts it this way: "In the end, the entire weight of Paul's argument in Rom 9-11 comes to rest on just this point: that God alone determines the identity and destiny of Israel and the Gentiles alike."

CHAPTER FIVE

USE OF SCRIPTURE IN ROMANS 9:30-10:21—SOCIAL IDENTITY PERSPECTIVE

5.1 Introduction

There is a transition between Rom. 9:30 and Romans 10, focusing on the concept of "righteousness by faith." It highlights the distinction between non-Judeans who attain righteousness by faith and Judeans who seek it through the law and stumble. This tension is central to Romans 10, where Paul elaborates on confessing and believing in Christ for salvation, emphasising a new identity that transcends ethnic boundaries. Therefore, Romans 9:30-33 serves as a transition to chapter 10, demonstrating the unity of the section through numerous scriptural citations and reinforcing the shift from an ethnic and law-based framework to a faith-centered, inclusive identity.

Exploring Rom. 9:30-10:21 through the lens of SIT provides an instructive analysis of how group identity formation and collective memory shape the experience of group belonging. By examining the intersections of SIT and collective memory, we can gain a deeper understanding of how the collective memory and identity framework of early Christ-followers were formed and negotiated within a diverse and often hostile social environment.

As mentioned earlier, the SIT posits that individuals derive their social identity from their sense of membership in groups (Tajfel and Turner 1986). In Romans 10, Paul emphasises the need for faith in Christ for salvation, the most important group belief of the Christ-movement, thus outlining a clear distinction between Christ followers and non-Christ followers (Rom. 10:9-10). This distinction fosters a strong group identity among early Christ-followers, situating them within a divine narrative that transcends cultural and ethnic differences (Baker and Tucker 2014:89–112). The concept of group belonging is central to developing a cohesive group identity, as highlighted by Heersmink (2023), who postulates

that collective memory and identity frameworks are shaped through shared narratives and artefacts.

Halbwachs (2020) argues that collective memory is shaped by social structures, suggesting that shared experiences and memories foster a sense of community. In the context of Romans 10, the memory of the shared narrative of salvation reinforces the identity framework of the Christ-group, providing a reinterpreted narrative that unites them as followers of Christ. Also, the memory of Israel's covenant with God and the fulfilment of promises in Christ solidifies the group's understanding of their belonging to Christ (Popkin 2016).

Additionally, there is an interplay between Realist Conflict Theory (RCT) and SIT, which elucidates the competitive processes that support the group's identity formation and illuminates the dynamics of relations between external groups. RCT, as developed by Sherif, posits that conflict arises when groups compete over incompatible goals or limited resources (Sherif 1966:12–15). In the Roman context, the early Christ-followers often disagreed with 'Jewish' communities and the Roman state (Hilton and Liu 2017). The emergence of the Christ-group as a distinct movement generated significant intergroup tension, particularly with Jewish communities and Roman authorities. This framework illuminates the socio-political dynamics of first-century Judea, where early Christ-followers redefined covenantal identity around Jesus as Messiah, challenging Jewish religious authority and communal boundaries. Jewish leaders, perceiving this reinterpretation as a threat to Torah-based identity and temple centrality, often responded with exclusionary practices, such as synagogue expulsion (cf. John 9:22; Acts 13:45). Simultaneously, the Roman state viewed the Christ-group as politically subversive due to their refusal to participate in emperor worship and civic cults, undermining imperial unity (Youvan 2024:7–9). These overlapping tensions reflect RCT's emphasis on zero-sum perceptions: Jewish communities feared a loss of religious

legitimacy, while Rome feared the destabilisation of the imperial order. The result was marginalisation, persecution, and identity polarisation, which are the hallmarks of resource-based intergroup conflict. The tensions inherent in these relationships have fostered a sense of urgency to recategorise and solidify the Christ-group identity. As Roman culture struggled to affirm its superiority, Christ-followers, as a distinct group, strongly relied on their collective memory and belief systems to navigate external conflicts (Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans 2017). Consequently, Paul's inclusive message in Romans 10 promotes a collective identity that transcends ethnic and social divisions - "There is no distinction between Judean and Greek" (Rom. 10:12). In connection with RCT, Haslam et al. (2019) highlight the role of social groups in promoting identity and influencing behaviour, emphasising how shared identity can mitigate external pressures. This correlates with Romans 10, in which belief in Christ constitutes individual salvation and integrates Christ-followers with a larger narrative of group belonging, thus reinforcing their commitment to the group.

Now, let us examine how these theories play out in Romans 10.

5.2 Israel and the Stumbling Stone (Rom. 9:30-33)

> What then shall we say? The non-Judeans who do not seek to attain righteousness appropriated righteousness, a righteousness which is out of faith (δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως·). However, the Judeans who seek to attain a law of righteousness (διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης), but even out of works (ἐξ ἔργων·). They stumbled against the stone, which is a stumbling stone, even as it stands written, Behold, I place in Zion a stone, a stumbling stone, and a rock of offence. And the one who places faith in him will not be put to shame. (My revised version of RSV)

As mentioned earlier, this section serves as the link between Rom. 9:6-29 and Rom. 10:1-21. There are 14 quotations in 9:30-10:21 if we consider 30:12-14 in Rom. 10:6-8 as three separate quotations. This dense concentration of scriptures demonstrates their importance in Paul's argument. In Rom. 9:30-33, Paul compared the situation of Judeans and non-Judeans concerning their maladjustment and adjustment to God's righteousness. He is now speaking to both ethnic subgroups, within a framework that embraces them. The non-Judeans who did not pursue righteousness attained it by faith, whilst some Judeans failed to reach this righteousness because they sought it after the framework of the law. The law was never the way to achieve righteousness. As the means of righteousness is always by faith in Christ, Paul quotes a scripture, "Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence; and whoever believes in him will not be put to shame." He reworks and reconfigures Isa. 28:16 and 8:14 to challenge the Judeans to abandon the cornerstone of the law framework by which they have stumbled and now place faith in the cornerstone of Christ; then they will be saved. However, the cornerstone to be believed in order not to be put to shame is the rock of offence and scandal, a reference to Christ (1 Cor. 1:23; Gal. 5:11).

So far, we see how Paul differentiates between the two groups regarding God's righteousness. He used labels like "my people and not-my people, vessels of honour and dishonour, etc." He also used the framework of righteousness pursued through works of the law versus the framework of righteousness attained through faith to depict two groups and their respective identities. Works of the law were a stereotype of Israelite identity. Therefore, we are already applying specific aspects of SIT in this context.

Examining this section through the lens of SIT reveals the intricate dynamics of identity and cohesion within the early Christian movement. The theory of social identity, developed by Henri Tajfel and John Turner, postulates that individuals derive significant aspects of their self-concept from being members of social groups. This approach provides

valuable insights into how group association influences behaviours, attitudes, and perceptions of identity (Tajfel and Turner 1979). The transition from a predominantly Judean identity to one shared by both Judeans and non-Judeans marks a critical moment in the early Christ-movement, signalling potential conflict, but also providing a rich opportunity for group inclusion and formation. Scholars like Hogg and Abrams (1988) argue that the social identities we embrace reflect our perceptions, behaviours, and interactions with others.

Paul has not deviated from his argument so far, which is to explain the identity framework for the call and inclusion of the remnant Judeans and, consequently, to use the same framework to explain the formation of the Christ group (Rom. 9:24-27). In continuation of the development of the identity framework for the Christ group, Paul now uses the concepts of δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως versus νόμον δικαιοσύνης to categorise the Christ group and differentiate them from the non-Christ Judean group.

These two forms of seeking righteousness, namely, by law and faith in Christ, constitute the framework for differentiating between groups and identities (Esler 2003:283). In context, the Judeans do not reject God's righteousness; instead, they seek righteousness within the framework of the law. Therefore, they are hindered from God's righteousness by faith in Christ. In other words, they cannot understand the outworking of God's salvation plan in Christ because they expect to see it in the law. This is synonymous with what Paul has already mentioned as "righteousness by the works of the law (3:20), "righteousness by works" (4:2,6), "works of the law" (3:27, 28), "law" (3:21), or "works" (11: 6). Apart from the saving aspect of the outworking of God's plan, these Judeans also do not understand the implication of the belonging of the non-Judeans in this outworking of God's plan. Additionally, in this section, group categorisation emerges between those on the negative side of the stumbling stone (the Judean non-Christ group) and those on the positive side (non-Judean Christ-followers).

It is also evident that Paul is distancing himself from this stumbling group, even though they belong to the same ethnic group, by using "they" to refer to them. He says, in verse 32, "Why? Because they did not pursue it by faith but as if it were based on works. They have stumbled over the stumbling stone". Christ is this stumbling stone. This might have been misunderstood as a betrayal of his ethnic belonging by the Judean Christ-followers who continued to associate closely with the non-Christ Judean group. However, it will soon become clear that Paul continues to seek to establish a categorisation that holds this Christ-group together, not based on ethnic belonging.

Most scholars (Dunn 1988:576–77; Hays 1989:74–75; Fitzmyer 1993:576; Stowers 1994:302; Byrne 1996:308). agree that this second section, Rom. 9:30-10:21, is about Israel's failure. However, there are divergent views about the nature of this failure. The traditional interpretation (Westerholm 2001:83–184; Das 2008:247–257; Moo 1996:197–198) views Israel's failure as an attempt to achieve righteousness or salvation through their works or self-righteousness. However, some new perspective scholars (Sanders 1983:37-8; Watson 1991:165; Dunn 1988:577) argue for the nationalistic exclusion of the non-Judeans as the problem of Israel. Although popular, the former is inconsistent with Paul's argument so far, and the latter is closer to Paul's argument but needs more clarity. For example, Esler (2003:282) identifies nationalistic exclusion of non-Judeans as a central issue in Romans 9–11. He argues that Paul is confronting a social dynamic in which Judean Christ-followers in Rome were resisting the full inclusion of the non-Judeans into the covenantal identity of Israel. This exclusion, Esler suggests, stems from ethnic boundary maintenance and a reluctance to redefine group identity in light of Christ. So far, Paul's argument is not about the works or self-righteousness of the Judeans; instead, it is that they do not understand God's salvation plan being worked out in Christ because the framework of the law limits them. Due to this limitation, these Judeans do not perceive that this outworking of God's plan now

includes the non-Judeans as God's people. So, it is not so much about a nationalistic rejection of non-Judeans, per se, as the "New Perspective" suggests. Instead, it is a lack of understanding as to why the non-Judeans belong to God's people along with the Judeans. In this context, Paul's use of "righteousness" is not about intrinsic righteousness; instead, it describes the outworking of God's salvation plan to bring Judeans and non-Judeans into one family as his people. It is this 'righteousness' that comes through faith in Christ, where 'righteousness by faith' becomes a shared belief that frames a new identity for Christ-followers.

Using a narrative that responds to social memory analysis, Paul continues to explore the motifs of reversal and election, previously discussed, that he discerns in the OT scriptures (Rom. 9:33), leading to his understanding of God's dialectical activity in human history. (11:26). The two conflated scriptures quoted here are Isa. 28:16 and Isa. 8:14.

5.3 The wording of Isa. 28:16 and Isa. 8:14 in Rom. 9:33

Paul now supports his argument by conflating Isa. 28:16 and 8:14, likely to draw his audience further into his argument before he provides a fuller explanation in chapters 10 and 11 (Aletti 1998:211-212). The central part is from Isa. 28:16, while the middle part is from Isa. 8:14. He does not specify the source of the wording of the quotation, but he introduces it with the generic formula καθὼς γέγραπται (as it stands written). These Isaianic citations are "stone" passages in Isaiah and occur together in 1 Pet. 2:6-8. Therefore, Paul likely assumes that his audience was familiar with these scriptures as part of the broader Christ-movement discourse, even though they might not have understood them in their original full contexts. Having compared these two passages, some scholars suggest that they came to be known and applied to Christ by Christ-followers early in the movement's history, even earlier than "either Paul or 1 Peter" (Stanley 2011:109, 121). These agreements between Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:6-8 have led some scholars to suggest that Paul and 1 Peter might have been derived from a common

pre-Pauline tradition. In contrast, others argue that 1 Pet. 2:6-8 is dependent on Rom. 9:33 (Kujanpää 2019:135). This may suggest that Paul quoted directly from early Christian tradition instead of Isaiah (Dodd 1952), which was already a conflated text (Dunn 1998:583-585). Despite the plausibility of the above suggestions, we must not lose sight of the fact that Paul would have been familiar with the original meaning of the OT and the context of Isaiah (Barret 1991:181), but not his audience. Therefore, he could conflate these texts to speak to the present situation of his audience. The result of this conflation is that the stone is depicted negatively as a stone of stumbling, while the positive image of the stone in Isa. 28:16 is omitted (Keck 2005:244). The bases for this conflation are (1) both texts refer to a "stone" and (2) both texts refer, in the LXX but not in the MT, to someone who is trusting. This is an example of applying the hermeneutical technique known as the "comparison of equals" in rabbinic literature (Strack and Stemberger 1991:21).

Paul's wording is significantly different from the Septuagint and differs from the Masoretic text, however, in 1 Pet. 2:6-8, Isa. 8:14 and Isa. 28:16 are quoted in forms that are close enough but not exact, which agrees with Paul's wording. Notwithstanding, in 1 Peter, these texts are not conflated; instead, they appear separate and with another quotation between them. However, there is more to be said than just whether the NT writer follows the MT, the LXX, or the early Christian tradition. This is because these texts originated in oral culture, where they were intended to be heard with an aural effect in mind. In a primarily oral culture, early Christ-movement authors would have encountered Israel's scriptures in both oral and written forms, in addition to Judean and Christ-movement oral traditions, biblical manuscripts, collections of scriptural testimonies, personal notebooks, and scriptural texts committed to memory (Wagner 2003: 81). While the canon of the OT was moderately fixed and closed in the NT era for most books, such as Isaiah, the text itself was not fixed at that period (Witherington 2004:143-64).

5.4 Analysis of Isa. 8:14 in Rom. 9:33

In Isa. 8:14, many scholars consider Paul's wording to represent the Hebraizing revised version of the Greek text (Stanley 1992:123; Wagner 2002:130). Both the OT and the NT use stone metaphors in oracles and poetic speeches (Witherington 2004:80). They can be a positive metaphor (as building blocks) and a negative one (as stumbling blocks). Hence, we must pay attention to how Paul reuses these stone texts. If we place Isaiah 8:14 (both MT and LXX) in their broader contexts, we will gain a better understanding of their meanings and why Paul reuses them in this way.

> **Isa. 8:14** And he will become a sanctuary, and a stone of offence, and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. (RSV)
>
> **Isa. 8:14 (LXX)** And if you trust in him, he will become your sanctuary, and you will not encounter him as a stumbling block caused by a rock, but the house of Jacob is in a trap, and those who sit in Jerusalem are in a pit. (LXX)
>
> **Rom. 9:33** καθὼς γέγραπται Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται.

In the Septuagint, the wording of v.14 changes significantly because the MT says the Lord will be a stumbling block, while the LXX says the Lord will not. Additionally, the LXX changes to a positive statement (if you trust in Him), which would have hindered Paul from holding conflicting views of judgment and hope regarding the stone. If Paul knew both versions of Isa. 8:14 and chose the one with the harsh tone, he must have selected the one that better served his argument. This also suggests that, although Paul was aware of the context of these texts, he was probably more interested in utilising them for his oracular purposes and the benefit of his audience. His audience would not have made the connection to the original context.

ixxi

In both translations, when Isa. 8:14 is placed in a broader context, Isaiah warns against the reliance of God's people on foreign gods and armies to save them instead of trusting in God. Isaiah describes the people as stubborn, hard-hearted, and continually walking in sinful ways, provoking God through idolatry and immorality (Isa. 8:6; 9:16; 28:11; 29:13-14). The context is likely to be the Syro-Ephraimitic war amidst the widespread panic in Jerusalem (Wildberger 1991:356). Isaiah and his followers had to make a firm decision to live for God in a political and religious atmosphere that did not honour God (Smith 1998: 225). In this warning oracle, Isaiah claims that this instruction and warning have come to him "like the strong grasping of the hand," similar to what is said in 1 Kings 18:46 and 2 Kings 3:15 about God's hand on Elijah. They should not fear what others fear, because God will be a holy place, a sanctuary, or a rock for them, depending on whether they trust in God (Wildberger 1991: 356).

5.5 Identity of the Stone about Israel in Isaiah 8:14

In its original context, the stone is identified as God, who protects those who trust him. On the other hand, God will also be a stumbling stone to those who do not trust him but instead place their trust in foreign nations and armies for safety. This would have been a blessing to those struggling with the political instability of the time. God is the real threat to Israel

and Judah, not the external threat of foreign powers. The real threat hanging over them is the impending judgment from God (stumbling stone) due to the fracture in their relationship with God. The theme of reversal is evident again; Isaiah employs metaphors and images that can

be interpreted as either positive or negative (Smith 1998:227). On the one hand, God can be a solid rock and refuge (Psa. 18:2-3,31-32,46; 19:14; 62:7; 89;26) who delivers those who are trapped in the snares of evil people (Psa. 64:5-7; 91:3; 124:7; 140:4-5; 141:9), though

for other people this role is reversed if they do not fear and trust God. Therefore, the rock will

lead to ruin instead of salvation, and the people will be destroyed instead of being delivered from these snares and traps. They will fall into these traps of unbelief due to their ungodly worldview. Paul later develops this theme of unbelief in Romans 10, exploring why the Israelites of his day stumbled. Scholars have interpreted this stone variously. For example, Moo (1996:622) sees it as a messianic fulfilment that exposes Israel's failure to pursue righteousness by faith. Dunn (1988:587) emphasises the stone as a symbol of divine reversal, where Christ becomes both the foundation and the obstacle. Wright (2002:635) argues that

the stone represents the unexpected nature of God's covenantal faithfulness in Christ, which redefines identity and inclusion. These interpretations converge on the idea that Christ, as the stone, confronts human expectations and reorients the path to righteousness. However, there is an implicit reason to believe that this stone is Christ and that Israel needs to believe in him.

God is distinct from the stone, since he is the one who laid it. Therefore, Christ becomes the object of faith instead of God (Dekker 2007). Also, the mention of Christ in Rom. 10:4 parallels Rom. 9:30-33, leading to the repetition of the last phrase in Isa. 28:16 in Rom. 10:11.

5.6 The Context of Isaiah 8:14 Using a Social Identity Framework

> **Isa. 8:14** "And if you trust in Him, He will become your sanctuary; and you will not encounter Him as a stumbling caused by a stone nor as a fall caused by a rock. But the house of Jacob is in a trap, and those who sit in Jerusalem are in a pit." (LXX-Brenton's Translation)
>
> **Isa. 28:16** "Therefore thus saith the Lord, even the Lord, Behold, I lay for the foundations of Sion a costly stone, a choice, a cornerstone, a precious stone, for its foundations; and he that believes on him shall by no means be ashamed." (LXX-

ixxi

Brenton)

Rom. 9:33 "as it is written, 'Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone that will make men stumble, a rock that will make them fall; and he who believes in him will not be put to shame.'" (RSV)

Above, Paul employs an oracular fusion of Isaiah 8:14 and 28:16 to depict Christ as both a sanctuary and a stumbling stone, reflecting the dual response to divine revelation. Additionally, this oracular fusion is not a direct quotation but a midrashic synthesis, reflecting Paul's interpretive freedom and theological intent. It emphasises the paradox of Christ, rejected by some, yet the foundation of salvation for those who believe. It also reflects the Septuagint's influence, especially in the shift from "shall not make haste" (MT) to "shall not be ashamed" (LXX), which Paul adopts to underscore the eschatological security of faith. Isaiah 8:14 originally portrays Yahweh as a refuge for the faithful but a stumbling block for disobedient Israel, particularly in the context of political alignment with Assyria. Paul recontextualises this imagery to emphasise Israel's rejection of Christ, transforming the cornerstone of Isaiah 28:16 into a stumbling block by combining it with Isaiah 8:14. This theological reworking underscores the paradox of faith in that what gives life to those who believe becomes judgment to those who resist it. (Ortlund 2009; Oss 1992).

Related to the above argument, Kujanpää (2018:147) argues that the interpretation of this quotation lies in the catchword connections between the quotation and Paul's preceding remarks. First, the stone of stumbling connects to Paul's claim that Israel has stumbled over the "stone of stumbling" (9:32). Second, the phrase "and whoever believes (ὁ πιστεύων) in him will not be put to shame" corresponds to the righteousness from faith (ἐκ πίστεως) attained by the non-Judeans (9:30). This conflated quotation confirms Paul's juxtaposition between the group that has stumbled in contrast to the other group that has believed and trusted. In this way, we see a zone of social differentiation and categorisation. In 9:32, these

ixxi

groups are further distinguished and categorised by their responses to the stone, which are based on "faith" or "work" (Watson 2007:324). The faith that attains God's righteousness is faith in the stone; whereas pursuing the law of righteousness based on works, in contrast, is connected to stumbling. This quotation categorises two possible responses to the Christ event and two possible consequences. Hence, they also categorise two groups. Isaiah 28:16 praises the precious stone but says nothing about its destructive consequences. Therefore, for Paul to organise these groups and the consequences that await them, he substitutes the positive adjectives of Isa. 28:16 with the "stone of stumbling and a rock of offence" in Isa. 8:14 (Wilk 1998:164). Gadenz (2009:148-49) also argues that in describing this paradoxical situation involving the obtaining of righteousness by non-Judeans and the Judean failure to attain it, Paul uses the stumbling stone quotation to describe yet another pair of contemporary groups in God's plan. The first is already pointed out in Rom. 9:24-26, which comprises Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers; together, they form the new group called "us." The second pair, also already discussed in Rom. 9:27-29, are two groups: the remnant seed of Judean Christ-followers and the Judeans as a whole ethnic group. In this case, the remnant seed is a part of the larger Judean ethnic group in Rom. 9:6 b. It is indeed plausible that the judgment aspect of this remnant concept has raised the question of the fate of the more significant part of the Judeans as an ethnic group, which Paul is attempting to answer.

Therefore, with the rhetorical question (τί οὖν ροῦμεν;) Paul now considers the implication of the preceding verses in connection with a third pair of groups, namely, the Judeans who have rejected the gospel (to anticipate 11:7) and the non-Judean Christ-followers. What Paul does here is juxtapose their contrasting situations regarding righteousness (repeated four times in verses 31-32). This is further clarified in 10:3 and taken up again in the Christological part of the subsection in 10:4-17. Here, Paul develops this further; the discussion moves from the specific groups (Judeans and non-Judeans) to a more general

ixxi

level. At the end of the subsection in 10:19-21, these specifics about Judeans and non-Judeans re-emerge, and the horizontal relationship between them is again explored.

Paul's use of these texts above carries significant implications when viewed through the lens of SIT. Isaiah 8:14 initially presents Yahweh as both a sanctuary and a stumbling stone, depending on Israel's and Judah's response. Paul recontextualises this duality to highlight the ingroup-outgroup dynamics at play in Israel's rejection of Christ. By fusing Isa. 8:14 with 28:16, Paul constructs a theological prototype and framework by which Christ becomes the cornerstone of a new identity group defined by faith rather than ethnic lineage. This rhetorical move reframes Israel's stumbling not merely as a theological error but as a failure to align with the emerging prototypical identity and framework centered on faith in Christ (Fefferman 2023; Ortlund 2009). Additionally, SIT further elucidates how Paul's citation of Isaiah 8:14 serves to redefine group boundaries. The "stone of stumbling" becomes a symbolic fault line between those who cling to Torah-based righteousness and those who embrace Christ as the fulfilment of God's promises. Paul's midrashic fusion of texts signals a shift in prototypical leadership from Torah observance to Christ-centered faith, thereby challenging the legitimacy of the traditional Judean ingroup and inviting non-Judeans into a reconstituted Christ-group.

This interpretive strategy not only critiques Israel's response but also constructs a new collective memory centered on Christ as the cornerstone, reshaping theological identity through group belief rather than ancestral privilege (Berean Insights 2023). Therefore, the basis of identity differentiation and categorisation lies in their differing relationships with God.

Since it is clear that the wording of these texts has been conflated and changed significantly from the original wording, we, therefore, argue that Paul uses these citations to meet the needs of his audience without expecting them to understand the contexts of these

citations. It would have been complicated for his audience, especially the non-Judean Christ-followers, to make these connections to the original context of the citations. Therefore, the oracular use of the citations would have been foremost in Paul's mind.

5.7 The Zeal of Israel without Knowledge (Rom. 10:1-4)

In Rom. 10:1, Paul continues with his deep concern and prayer for the salvation (σωτηρίαν) of Israel. These deep emotions for the Judeans indicate his ethnic association with his people. Paul notes their zeal, which unfortunately is not aligned with knowledge (*epignosis* knowledge that transforms), as stated in Rom. 10:2. Some Judeans are ignorant of God's righteousness, therefore, in establishing their own, they did not submit to God's righteousness (10:3). They lost sight of the fact that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness through faith (10:4) in Him. Paul's longing for their salvation sets the stage for his argument in Chapter 11, which asserts that all Israel will be saved. What is the definition of "salvation? For whom among the Judeans is Paul praying? Who among the Judeans needs to be saved, and who does not understand God's righteousness? Were they non-Christ Judeans? Israel as a nation? Or Judean Christ-followers? What does it mean that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness? (Irons 2016; Bechtler 1993; Barnes 1984).

Stanley Stowers (1994) offers interpretive clues for Romans 10, arguing that later Christian interpreters have miscast Paul's letter to the Romans as a treatise on universal sin and individual salvation (Stowers 1994:1–3). He situates Romans within its Greco-Roman sociocultural and rhetorical context, showing that Paul, a Jew conversant with Hellenistic moral ideals, is addressing an audience of Gentiles on how to attain moral and psychological self-mastery through Christ's faithfulness rather than through Torah observance (Stowers 1994:16, 42–83). For Stowers, Christ functions not as the object of forensic justification but as the paradigm of perfect obedience and the catalyst for a new, Spirit-wrought kinship that transcends ethnic boundaries and realises divine justice as a

communal ethic (Stowers 1994:251–53). Furthermore, he argues that Paul's concern in context is that the Judeans have not understood God's righteousness because they have not understood Paul's law-free gospel to the non-Judeans (Stowers 1994:306-7). Instead of submitting to the faithfulness of their Patriarch (Romans 4) and that of Christ, they embarked on law education for the non-Judeans. It seems that Stowers overstates the role of diatribe and minimises Paul's affirmations of justification by faith as a frame of reference for the formation of the Christ-group, comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans, a view also supported by other scholars (Witherington 2004:38–41).

Davis (2014) offers some plausible interpretations; she does not read Romans 9–11 as a blanket universalisation of Israel's promise but as Paul's midrashic reallocation of Israel's inheritance, which is her "birthright" restored to a faithful remnant of Judeans. In her citations of Hosea, Isaiah, and Genesis, she shows that Paul portrays the covenant blessing as conditional on faith, so that only those "Israelites" who respond in faith are counted as Abraham's true heirs (Davis 2014:76–79). Furthermore, she proposes that salvation and righteousness in Romans encompass two aspects: the first is the justification of the unbeliever before God upon their first belief in Christ, and the second is the believer's experience of walking in righteousness (Davis 2014:121). She argues that the second aspect is what Paul means in chapter 10, and that salvation is Paul's lament over deliverance from God's discipline for the Judeans' unfaithfulness, not the initial justification of non-Christ Jews. Davis arrives at almost the same conclusion as Stowers through a different interpretive lens on Rom. 10:1, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for them is that they may be saved." While I do agree with this plausible reading proposed by Davis, she misses the fact that Paul's primary concern in 9-11 is about the non-Christ Judeans and how God would eventually save them despite their temporal unbelief. Paul's intense grief and lament in chapter 9, which is repeated here in chapter 10, indeed refers to Judeans who

had not come to faith in Christ. However, the Judean Christ-followers will also need to understand the dynamics of God's righteousness as it relates to the outworking of his plan among the Judeans and non-Judeans, especially why their co-ethnics had not turned to Christ.

Paul interprets the coming of Christ as the end or termination of the law of righteousness according to the framework of faith in Christ. Then we get to another debate about τέλος in Rom. 10: 4. Within the broader flow of Romans 9–11, Paul's succinct assertion that "Christ is the τέλος of the law for righteousness" has engendered at least four primary interpretive strands. From the termination/end perspective, Albert Barnes argues that τέλος signifies the law's cessation as a binding covenant, since Christ supersedes its authority as the means of righteousness (Barnes 1884:517). In a goal-oriented reading, Dunn contends that Christ is the realised goal toward which the law moved, bringing righteousness to those who believe (Dunn 1988:578). A fulfilment approach, articulated by John Murray, understands τέλος as the law's complete accomplishment in Christ, who perfectly executes its moral and ceremonial demands on behalf of his people (Murray 1959:296). Finally, the teleological conception, championed by Badenas, holds that the law was always directed toward Christ as its intended goal and culmination (Badenas 1985:60–61). These four readings—termination, result, fulfilment, and goal—together reveal the semantic richness of Paul's choice and invite further exegesis of its theological and rhetorical function in Romans.

All the above possibilities are interrelated in their meanings, depending on one's interpretation of the function of the law. However, Christ cannot be understood as having terminated the law, for *telos* in Romans 10:4 does not function as a word of abolition. Rather, Paul employs *telos* to signal a decisive reconfiguration of the symbolic boundaries that had previously structured Israel's ethnic identity. With the advent of Christ, the law

reached its intended goal for those who pursued righteousness outside its covenantal orientation, thereby shifting the basis for defining group membership. This is not the erasure of Torah but the renegotiation of the criteria by which ingroup and outgroup members are identified within the Christ-movement. Paul's affirmation in Romans 9:4 where the law is listed among Israel's ongoing privileges alongside the *latreia* presupposes the continued value of the law within Israel's self-understanding. What changes in Christ is not the law's existence but its function as an identity framework for the Christ group. In Paul's argument, Christ becomes the new locus of identity, displacing Torah observance as the primary ethnic boundary and thereby redrawing the contours of Christ-followers around faith rather than lineage or legal adherence. If the law was meant to bring the Judeans into a right relationship with God, Christ is not the goal of the law in this sense. Before God gave the law (Mosaic law), Israel was already his people. The law was never given for attaining righteousness. Even Abraham, their ancestor, attained righteousness by faith, not by law (Gen. 15:6, Rom. 4:3). He received God's righteousness before God asked him to leave for Ur of the Chaldees (Genesis 12), and before the law was given 400 years later. However, if the function of the law was to help the Judeans fulfil God's plan within that dispensation and be a light to the non-Judeans, then Christ could be the goal in this sense (Badenas 1985:101).

We have noted Paul's strong feelings for his people in Rom. 9:1-5, but here in 10:1-4, Paul gives the reason why Israel failed to attain its goal: they have stumbled (10:3, 21). It is not, as Cranfield (1979) and Bell (1994) suggest, that Israel failed to attain righteousness because of the legalistic way in which they sought to fulfil the law. Instead, they could not attain righteousness because they remained within the framework of the law, rather than moving on to the framework of faith. Israel has a zeal for God, but they could not fully comprehend the outworking of God's plan among the Judeans and non-Judeans.

Although the terms Paul uses do not have the same intensity as those in Rom. 9:1-5,

they convey the same heartfelt and deep-seated emotion for his relatives according to the flesh (Israelites). The use of the term "Brethren/Ἀδελφοί" is a language of fictive kinship that is charged with emotion for the ingroup but also draws our attention to a solicitude, expressed in the words that follow, for the outgroup who are outside of the fellowship which the term "brethren" implies (Murray 1979:47). Again, we are in the zone of group categorisation in continuity with Chapter 9. This is seen in the use of "they" and "them" for the Israelites in 10:2 and the use of "their" and "they" for them in 10:3. Though the Israelites are Paul's co-ethnics, and he is keen to embrace them, he wants to distance himself from them in connection to the identity of the Christ group. Paul acknowledges that they have a zeal for God, but not for knowledge (Rom. 10:2). They are ignorant of God's righteousness and have not submitted themselves to it, instead seeking to establish their own (10:3).

Now, Paul wants to expand on the idea of seeking righteousness through faith. He affirms that Christ is the termination of the law (Rom. 10:4), most probably the Mosaic law (Moo 1994:641), that anyone with faith may attain God's righteousness. It is worth noting that righteousness here is the same as in Rom. 9:31-33, which is the righteousness pursued by the framework of the law as opposed to God's righteousness, which comes by the framework of faith in Christ. It is righteousness regarding the outworking of God's salvation among the

Judeans and non-Judeans. Therefore, Paul continues to differentiate between two groups: the Christ movement and Israel, the ingroup and outgroup, respectively, based on their differing frameworks for pursuing righteousness. The juxtaposition between the two types of perception of God's righteousness mentioned here is between "their own" and "God's righteousness," which identifies where this group stands in relation to others who have obtained God's righteousness. Paul will now attempt to trace the reasons for Israel's failure

ixxi

to embrace Christ (Avemarie 2010:305), not so much as an accusation as a description of the situation.

Much debate has gone into the meaning of τέλος (the termination), and 10:4 is one of the most controverted verses in Pauline literature. Some of the possibilities are "end/terminate," "result," "fulfilment" (teleological view), or a polysemantic amalgamation of two or more of these meanings. Some scholars (Melanchthon 1992:195; Badenas 1985:79) have suggested that it is more likely to mean "goal" rather than termination, while others (Moo 1996:369; Dunn 1988b:589; Heil 2001; Schnelle 2005:346-47) argue that "end/termination" is probably the meaning of τέλος. Similar to the "goal" meaning, some scholars (Barth 1988:15; Jewett 2007:619; Osten-Sacken 1975:254-55) hold the view that τέλος means "summation," "completion," "fulfilment and climax". This translation, "goal/fulfillment," derives its defense from the racing illustration (pursuing and reaching) that some scholars see (Rom. 9:30-31; 10:6-8), with the result that Christ is the goal of the race.

To this end, they argue that the Judeans have stumbled over him, but the non-Judeans have obtained the goal (Badenas 1985 :114-15; Gaston 1987:130; Campbell 1980:76). Despite this plausible argument in favor of "goal/result" (1 Tim. 1:5; Rom. 6:21; 2 Cor. 11:15), there are stronger arguments in favor of "end/termination." For Paul, the two most common senses are "end/termination (1 Cor. 1:8; 10:11; 15:24; 1 Thess. 2:16). It is unlikely that Paul would teach that Christ comes in at the end of a process of which the law represents the earlier stages. Otherwise, this would produce an antithesis between 10:5 and 10:6, which would position Christ as the center of righteousness by faith, apart from the law. Contrary to this, Christ is the one who liberates the Israelites from the mess that the law has produced (7:2-25). For Paul, there is a revolutionary discontinuity between the Mosaic law and Christ, rather than any suggested progression from one to the other (Esler 2003:285). This is similar

ixxi

to Paul's claim in Gal. 5:14, 22), where he says that members of the Christ movement have the best that the law can provide but via an entirely different route (Esler 1998:203-4).

However, Badenas rejects the notion of "end/terminate" because it contradicts one of the main themes of Romans, namely, that salvation has always been by grace through faith (Romans 4), so that Christ could hardly put an end to what never existed. This view is based on a "salvation history" approach, which, if taken in isolation, seriously misinterprets the book of Romans. For example, earlier we noted that Paul's goal was to persuade his audience that Abraham was the prototypical father of all those who seek righteousness by faith. He was given the promise that he would have descendants who pursue righteousness by the same route of faith, who would inherit the earth. However, for Paul, no one pursued righteousness by faith. Therefore, in Rom. 4:22-25, Paul limits this possibility of righteousness by faith to Abraham and his Christ-believing audience. While Paul does agree that the promises made to Abraham were fulfilled in Christ (Rom. 4:11), he removes the term "covenant" from his source in Gen. 17:11 when speaking about this process. For Paul, Christ is not the climax of the law or the Mosaic covenant (Esler 2003:285) in terms of achieving righteousness, as Wright (1991) has suggested. The interval between Moses and Christ was a period of unresolved gloom. By insisting that Christ has terminated the Mosaic law, Paul continues to highlight the Christ group's faith framework. He downplays the law-based identity framework of the Israelites, who continue to comprehend God's plan through Christ within the framework of the Mosaic law

5.8 Righteousness from the Law vs Righteousness from Faith (Rom. 10:5; Lev. 18:5)

Now, Paul further explains the implications of righteousness from the law, quoting Leviticus 18:5 to the effect that anyone who does the law's requirements will live by them. By this, he is probably implying that the Israelites have not obeyed the law. Indeed, his approach to the law in Romans 7 does not suggest it would be obeyed. For example, Moo (2018:661–

673) argues that Paul presents the law as a standard that Israel has failed to meet, thereby necessitating righteousness through faith. Similarly, Pittman (2023:1–2) reinforces this by showing how Paul associates Leviticus 18:5 with works-based righteousness, which Israel failed to fulfil. Coffman (Romans 10:4) notes that only Christ perfectly kept the law, implying that Israel's failure is assumed in Paul's argument.

These quotations that follow Paul's assertion concerning τέλος of the law are introduced with some exceptional formulae that play a key role in Paul's argument. The first one is: "For Moses writes about the righteousness that is based on the law" (Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ [τοῦ] νόμου). The conjunction γὰρ suggests that the quotations are linked with the preceding discussion. Next, Paul deliberately contrasts Moses with the next speaker, namely, righteousness from faith, although these quotations are also derived from the Torah and consequently written by Moses: "But the righteousness based on faith speaks as follows" (ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει). The two formulae are asymmetrical (Koch 1986:294). While in 10:5 Moses speaks of the righteousness from the law, in 10:6 the righteousness from faith is personified and introduced as the speaker of the quotation. Paul did not invent this personification of righteousness. Instead, it can already be found in the Scriptures, as in Isa. 41:2; 45:8; Ps. 84:11-14 (Wagner 2002:159; Jewett 2007:625).

Since Paul frequently uses the formula "as it is written," it is likely that the contrast here is not between writing and speaking (Koch 1986:130, Kujanpaa 2019:151). Instead, the context and the word order of the second introduction suggest a contrast between the quotations (Lincicum 2010:154-55), and the use of δὲ might signal the change of speaker (Hays 1989:76, 208; Wagner 2002:161). This connects to the distinction made in 9:31-32 between the two different types of frameworks for righteousness (ἐξ ἔργων and ἐκ πίστεως). In connection to this, Bekken (2007:168) argues that the righteousness of faith in

ixxi

Rom. 9:32 and Rom. 10:6 stands in contrast to the righteousness based on the law, which is defined by 'works' (Rom. 9:32) and 'doing' (Rom. 10:5). Also, the different actions prescribed (doing the commandments versus confessing and believing) point to a contrast between 10:5 and 10:6. On the contrary, some scholars (Wagner 2002:159-161; Hays 1989:76) argue that righteousness from the law and righteousness from the works are complementary and synonymous with each other. This seems improbable when one considers Paul's polemical use of Lev. 18:5 and Gal. 3:12, in contrast with the quotation from Hab. 2:4. Even though Hays opposes the use of Gal. 3:12 to overturn the internal logic of Romans 10 (Hays 1989:208), it is unlikely that Paul completely reversed his understanding of the contents of this quotation above (Dunn 1988b:601). Jewett (2007:625) also argues against the disjunctive interpretation of Gal. 3:12 and Romans 10 because it would render invalid the premise that the law must be performed, and this would subsequently counter the thesis of 9:6 that God's word has not failed. Again, this is less likely to be the case since Paul has categorized between seeking righteousness by law and faith in 9:30-10:3. Also, we have established earlier in this thesis that 9:6 is not the thesis of Romans 9-11.

5.9 The Wording of Leviticus 18:5 in Romans 10:5-8

> **Lev. 18:5 (LXX)** καὶ φυλάξεσθε πάντα τὰ προστάγματά μου καὶ πάντα τὰ κρίματά μου καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά ἃ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν
>
> **Rom. 10:5** ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς

Paul links 10:5 to the previous segment by alluding to Lev. 18:5, rendered in the Septuagint (LXX): "So ye shall keep all my ordinances, and all my judgments, and do them; which if a man do, he shall live in them: I am the Lord your God." (Brenton 1851:172). Christopher Stanley argues that in Romans 10:5, Paul treats Leviticus 18:5 as an "oracular" text, stripped

ixxi

free from its original context, the Sinai-covenant setting, and proclaimed afresh in Christ for all who believe (Stanley 2018:208). Likewise, Joseph Marchal maintains that Romans 10:5 deploys Lev 18:5 "as a disembodied oracle of life," one that Paul deliberately emancipates from Sinai to announce eschatological life in Christ by faith (Marchal 2019:55–57). In addition, Schein argues that Paul "loses the oracle from its Levitical milieu and proclaims it as a present-tense, life-bestowing word in Christ," treating Lev. 18:5 as a living oracle addressed to the believing community (Schein 2017:78–80; Jodar 2020:48).). In contrast, Hays counters that Paul's use of Lev. 18:5 is better understood as an "echo" that, while dynamically reoriented toward Christ and faith, remains firmly rooted in its original promise of life through covenant obedience. Paul does not simply ignore the Levitical context but creatively fulfils it in his gospel narrative (Hays 1989:76–77). Likewise, Fitzmyer notes that Leviticus 18:5 carries a technical priestly-service sense in its Levitical setting, which Paul does not ignore but reinterprets as the law's own summons to obedience, pointing forward to Christ (Fitzmyer 1993:621).

We concur with the view of Stanley and other scholars with a similar view of the 'oracular use of Lev. 18:5 in Rom. 10:9. Paul argues that upholding the law does not lead to righteousness. Furthermore, the context of Leviticus 18:5 does not support Paul's interpretation of it in Rom. 10:5, suggesting that Paul is using scripture in an oracular manner. This is because in its Sinai context, Leviticus 18:5 promises long, abundant life within Israel's covenant land contingent on obeying cultic statutes and judgments—hardly a program of eternal righteousness and universal justification by faith (Vlach 2018:4; Shreiner 2002:59) which Paul proclaims in Romans. In addition, there is the semantic disjunction in that the LXX life-verb in Lev. 18:5 carries covenant-land connotations that do not map onto Paul's "righteousness" terminology, signalling he retools the verse in an oracular fashion (Mohrmann 2009:154).

According to Paul, faith is the means, not the law, and Christ is the goal of righteous benefits. What the Judeans attempted to attain by the law is now available by faith in Christ. The non-Judeans arrived earlier because they travelled on the trajectory of faith, while the Judeans stumbled because they travelled via the lane of the law. However, they will reach their destination later as all of Israel will receive salvation. This topic will be discussed further in Romans 11. While Moses taught his people to keep the law, Paul knew that the law could not lead to salvation. He now reconstructs Moses' teaching to show the need for Christ, not the law, for his compatriots and non-Judeans. He echoes Deut. 30:11-14, thus invoking the collective memory of Moses' commandment to Israel.

Moses had gone up to receive the commandment from Mount Sinai and had handed it to his people. The word was already on their lips and in their heart. They needed to obey it, but it would not give them the desired righteousness. Therefore, Paul replaced the commandment with Christ (10:6-8). There was no need to ascend to bring Christ or to descend into the abyss to resurrect him. Both events had already occurred; Christ was already with them. The word of Christ (word of faith) was already in their mouth and their heart. They did not need the law again; Paul had preached this word to them (10:8). The resurrection of Christ had already taken place; Christ is now Lord. They did not need any further effort or anything else to attain righteousness. They only needed to confess that Jesus is Lord and believe in their hearts that God raised him from the dead, and they would be saved (10:9-10). The themes of confessing (say in your mouth) and believing are all over this chapter. It forms part of the process of identity formation for the Christ group. In 10:10-13, Paul masterfully fuses heart-believing and mouth-confessing into a single salvific framework that transcends ethnic barriers, binding Judeans and non-Judeans alike into one faith group in Christ. The parallel formula—"with the heart one believes…with the mouth one confesses" (10:10)—recasts Deuteronomy's covenantal language as a faith-based regimen open to all, not a law-bound privilege for Israel alone (Dunn 1988:578). By citing

ixxi

Isaiah 28:16, “everyone who believes will not be put to shame” alongside Joel 2:32’s “whoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved,” Paul deliberately collapses the Jew–Greek divide under the banner of one Lord whose universal lordship ushers in the fulfillment of Israel’s hope (Moo 1996:664; Wright 2009:246). Schreiner likewise notes that these dual scriptural echoes reinforce the gospel’s invitation to both Jewish hearers and Gentile newcomers as coheirs of God’s righteousness, accessed solely through faith and confession (Schreiner 1998:530). Hays further observes that by weaving two prophetic promises into a unified summons, Paul signals that the foundation stones of Israel’s land-life covenant are now re-anchored in Christ for a mixed people brought together by faith (Hays 1989:76).

5.10 The Message about God’s Righteousness is Near (Deut. 30:12-13; Rom. 10:6-10)

Moo argues that this “cumulative interrogative” form is a hallmark of Jewish homiletical discourse, where a string of “how” questions ratchets the audience toward a single, compelling conclusion. Furthermore, he notes that it points to parallel question-chains in 4 Ezra 6:58–60 and 2 Baruch 15:2–4 as evidence of the same oratorical device (Moo 1996:663–64). In addition, Dunn also observes that Paul’s volley of rhetorical questions reflects the diaspora synagogue’s pedagogical style, in which successive queries function both to teach and to drive home a theological point—cf. The question-driven argumentation in 4 Ezra (7:38–39) and 2 Baruch (10:3–5) (Dunn 1988:577).

The ‘speaking’ of righteousness from faith comprises scriptural quotations from Deuteronomy. It represents a personified scriptural force related to God’s saving ability, who speaks words spoken by Moses. The second quotation of the righteousness from faith has a double introduction. It begins with the words “Do not say in your heart,” which are found verbatim in Deut. 8:17 “Otherwise, you may say in your heart, My power and the strength of my hand made me this wealth”, and 9:4 “Do not say in your heart when the LORD your

God has driven them out before you, Because of my righteousness the LORD has brought me in to possess this land," where both messages comprise two quotations joined into one entity.

However, the shorter phrase from Deut. 8:17; 8:17;9:4 is subordinate to the primary quotation from Deut. 30:12-14 and probably functions to introduce it. In addition, it also suggests that the questions arising from Deut. 30:12-13 are pointless and possibly should not be asked at all. This warning, "Do not say in your heart," perfectly agrees with 10:3 (being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God and seeking to establish their own) since Paul knows that the requirement for God's righteousness has been fulfilled in Christ (Wagner 2002:161; Jewett 2007:626).

God tells Moses to remind the Israelites of his lordship over them and also about the need to distinguish themselves from the nations around them by using the words "you" and "they" in contrast to the nations around them (v.3). The Israelites will distinguish themselves from these nations through their obedience to God's commandments. By so doing, they would obtain life through obedience to these commandments. However, this was never actualised among the Israelites; instead, what happened was a gloomy reality, against which Paul contrasts the righteousness of faith.

Paul further substantiates this contrast of righteousness via the law and faith (Rom. 10:6-8) by contesting a collective memory of Israel and reapplying it to serve his present purposes, a mode of processing the past that we discussed earlier in this thesis. This collective or social memory is found in Deut. 30:12-14. Here, we shall look at Paul's citation of the OT in Rom. 10:6-8.

The book of Deuteronomy contains four central messages from Moses to the people of Israel (Craigie 1976:20-4; Cairns 1992:2-11). The first message (Deut. 1:5-4:43) is a historical account that chronicles God's mighty acts on Israel's behalf and an

exhortation to obedience. The second message (Deut. 4:44-26:19) narrates Israel's covenantal responsibilities, including commands, warnings, and laws. The third message, from Moses (Deut. 27:1-29:1), calls Israel to covenant renewal as soon as they enter the Promised Land. The fourth passage is Deut. 30:12-14. Moses summarises the covenant demands (Deut. 29:2-30:10) and then charges the people (Deut. 30:11-20) to live distinctively among the nations by obeying God's commandments. They would be regathered from among the nations where they have been scattered (Deut. 30:3-4) if they obeyed God's commandments.

In this context, Moses states that the commandment he is enjoining on Israel is neither too hard nor too far away; it is near to them, and they can do it. So, what "is not in heaven" is "this commandment," which is referred to in verse 11, and it is the call to obey all the "commandments" in the book of the Law (Deut. 30:10). It is not far away so that they have to go to heaven (v. 12) or travel across the sea (v. 13) to hear and do it. The fact that the word is in their mouth and their heart underscores that it was a constant presence in their lives. It is as close to their hearts and mouths, which Paul will later use in Romans 10 in his use of this passage. Despite the Mosaic law's nearness to the Israelites, Paul will argue that it cannot achieve God's righteousness for them.

5.11 Wordings and Analysis of Deut. 30:12-145 in 10:6-

Rom. 10:6 τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν

Deut. 30:12 (LXX) οὐκ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστὶν λέγων Τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ λήμψεται αὐτὴν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτὸ ποιήσομεν.

The only difference in the wording in these passages is the omission of ἡμῖν in 10:6. Although ἡμῖν is repeated several times in the original literary context, it may not be reasonable for Paul to do likewise since he is only quoting a part of the verse. However, there is no significant deviation in the wording.

ixxi

Rom. 10:7 τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον

Deut. 30:13 (LXX) οὐδὲ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστὶν λέγων τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ λήμψεται ἡμῖν αὐτήν καὶ ἀκουστὴν ἡμῖν ποιήσει αὐτήν καὶ ποιήσομεν

From the above, the Septuagint reads, "Who will cross to the other side of the sea for us?" whereas Romans reads, "Who will descend into the abyss?" Kujanpää (2019:157) suggests that Paul's imagery change was probably Christological. This is perhaps because descending into the abyss can be more clearly connected to Christ than crossing the sea (Kock 1986:154; Stanley 1992:132; Wagner 2002:163-164). Additionally, heaven and abyss form a kind of antithetical pair, characterised by a vertical contrast that can enhance the rhetorical effectiveness of the imagery (Jewett 2007:627). Such an antithetical pair is also found in Prov. 30:4, "Who has ascended to heaven and descended?" and Ps. 106:26, "They go up to heaven, and they go down to the abysses." This suggests that the use of this antithetical pair is a common language in the Bible (Gen. 7:11, 8:2; Deut. 33:13; Ps. 134:6). It is plausible that Paul uses this rhetorical effect of this antithetical pair to categorise the non-Christ Judeans vis-à-vis the fruitlessness of their attempt to gain righteousness by the law.

Rom. 10:8 ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου

Deut. 30:14 (LXX) ἐγγὺς τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου αὐτὸ ποιεῖν

In the above, apart from the word order, the significant difference from the Septuagint is the absence of σφόδρα, which seems to be consistent with Paul's pattern of omitting words. Also, Paul does not reference fulfilling the commandment, "in your hands." If words are detached from their context when citing quotations, their meanings are undoubtedly altered (Sternberg 1982:145). Likewise, in this case, when Paul omits the aspect of the divine commandment and carries it out, it means that the critical element of keeping the

ixxi

commandment is never transferred to Romans. There are also some textual issues when Deut. 30:12-14 is read in the Septuagint in comparison to the Hebrew translation, as they are below:

Deut. 30:12 It is not in heaven above, saying, Who shall go up for us into heaven and shall take it for us, and we will hear and do it? 13 Neither is it beyond the sea, saying, who will go over for us to the other side of the sea and take it for us and make it audible to us, and we will do it? 14 The word is very near thee, in thy mouth, and in thine heart, and in thine hands to do it. (LXX)

If we compare the RSV with the Septuagint (LXX), we observe a relatively faithful rendering by the RSV of the LXX with the addition of "and in thy hands" in verse 14. The more significant textual issues concern how Paul uses Deut. 30:12-14 in Rom. 10:6-8. There is some debate as to whether Paul is quoting Deut. 30:12-14 or simply alluding to it (Käsemann 1980:284; Dunn 1988:602-3). Dunn argues that Paul is citing the passage to expound it based on a comparison of the LXX. Paul's citation of the text is too close to that of the Deuteronomy passage to be accidental (Dunn 603:9-16). Dunn might be stretching this too far by affirming that Paul quotes this text; instead, he might be mining the text as a citation to his audience. Moody argues that this passage is a good example of the divide between explicit quotation and allusion. He then notes: A good specimen illustrating that the line between allusion and explicit quotation is not fixed is Rom. 10:6-8, where much of the language of Deut. 9:4 (or 8:17) and 30:12-14 are used. Nevertheless, Paul seems to exercise great freedom as well, to delete whole phrases, to change words, and indeed to change the subject. Whereas Deut. 30:12-14 speaks about the commandment (i.e., the law), Rom. 10:6-8 has to do with the righteousness of faith made available through Christ (Smith 1988:266).

The change above shows just how much Paul plays fast and loose with the text to suit

ixxi

his purpose. He could do this with a memorable passage of Israelite scripture, which suggests that he was confident that no one in his audience would know the text well enough to understand its full context.

Also, the switch from law to Christ is surprising but not capricious or arbitrary, as Cranfield (1975:524) rightly pointed out. Instead, it is a deliberate act to rework the collective memory of Israel by inserting Christ where the law used to be. Also, according to Wagner (2003:164), the "doing" of the commandment has been replaced with the story of Christ.

Examining the way Paul has mined the OT texts for his citations, Sanday and Headlam (1985:289) argue that Paul is merely alluding to Deut. 30:12-14 to make his point. They argue that Paul does not intend to base any argument on the quotation from the OT. Instead, he only selects the familiar, suitable, and proverbial language to express his wishes. This is similar to the oracular use of the scripture we have argued for. Suggs (1967:300-1) also claims that there have historically been two main arguments from those who doubt that Paul intended this reference to Deut. 30:12-14 to be taken as a quotation. The first is because of the divergence from the text in 10:7a (i.e., sea to abyss). The other is that neither Moses nor the scripture speaks. Barrett (1957:199) supports the first objection that Paul's "freedom suggests that he is not using his quotation as a fixed proof of what he asserts, but as a rhetorical form". The second objection is that Paul states that it was not Moses or the scriptures that spoke, but the righteousness of faith. Suggs (1967) rejects these reasons,arguing that "such an argument would be more significant if there were good reasons for regarding 'the righteousness based on faith' as anything other than a rhetorical personification."

Lastly, the fact that Paul has not quoted from the Hebrew text and LXX verbatim can be seen in many ways. First, in Rom. 10:6, using μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου as his citation

ixxi

of the OT, Paul is not referring to Deut. 30:12-14 but Deut. 9:4. Cranfield (1979:523) has observed that Paul has omitted what one would have expected, namely, οὐκ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστὶν λέγων and substituted this opening phrase from Deut. 9:4. However, the fact that Paul refers to Deut. 9:4 instead of material from chapter 30 does not mean that he has incorrectly named the OT. Instead, Paul moves away from Deut. 9:4 and begins to quote the question from Deut. 30:12, ending his quote with οὐρανὸν while omitting the pronoun ἡμῖν. He then gives us the first of three τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν (this is) statements that he seemingly equates with Christ's incarnation.

In verse 7, Paul then proceeds to draw on Deut. 30:13, stating, τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον. There are two textual issues here. First, he substitutes καταβήσεται ("go down," "descend") for the LXX διαπεράσει ("go over"), where the reference is to crossing over the sea. Next, Paul substitutes ἄβυσσον ("abyss") for the LXX θαλάσσης ("sea"), "sea." He equates this action (τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν) with the resurrection of Christ from the dead.

Then, in verse 8, Paul does two interesting things with the text. First, he retains two Greek words from the LXX rendering of Deut. 30:14 (ἐγγὺς…ῥῆμα), keeping closer to the Hebrew text than the LXX in terms of content. He omits the phrase καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν that the LXX has additionally to the Hebrew text, and omits σφόδρα ("very"), which both the Hebrew text and LXX contain. Paul ends his quote of Deut. 30:14 with καρδίᾳ σου choosing to omit αὐτὸ ποιεῖν, which is contained in the LXX and the Hebrew text. Paul then equates this third (τοῦτ᾽ἔστιν), that is, these truths in the OT, to the preaching of the word of faith.

Therefore, in Rom. 10:6-8, Paul primarily refers to Deut.. 30:12-14. His extremely creative reworking of the text from this passage encapsulates the point he wants to make. In making his arguments in 10:6-8, Paul introduces Deut. 30:12-14, using a phrase from Deut. 9:4 before making comments on these three verses. He has strikingly reworked Deut. 30:12-

ixxi

14 to take on the form of three interpretive phrases (τοῦτ᾽ἔστιν) that equate the three verses to three respective events from the NT, pointing to Christ and the preaching of Christ through Paul

5.12 Paul's Social Use of Citation (Deut. 30:12-14)

Examining how Paul has reinterpreted these texts for an oral culture audience, it is likely that Paul does not expect his audience to be familiar with or understand them in their original context. The radical changes he has made to the meaning of Deuteronomy here would have made even identifying the source quite difficult, except perhaps for Israelite scribes.

In his effort to continue reinforcing the framework for the formation of the Christ group, Paul uses this reworking to replace the framework of the law (commandments) with the framework of God's outworking of his salvation plan through Christ. The nearness that Moses inferred from the presence of the law on the lips of the Israelites is now realised as the outworking of God's righteousness through Christ. This is not a mindless Christological hermeneutic that finds Jesus in every verse; instead, Paul discovers some striking statements about the identity of Christ in this text (Lincicum 2010:168). This brings encouragement and hope to the Judeans that their pursuit of God's plan through Christ is not far away; it is as close as the law was to them, but via a new framework of faith in Christ. This is the way to attain God's righteousness. The nearness of this new framework also eliminates boasting among the non-Judeans who have achieved God's righteousness. It is as near to the Judeans as it is to the non-Judeans via the word of faith that Paul preaches. Therefore, Paul uses this citation to continue holding together the unity of Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers as they gain a deeper understanding of the formation process of the Christ group. Judeans and non-Judeans attain God's righteousness not by ethnic belonging or privilege.

As against the view of some scholars that Paul is redefining the "doing" of the law as "believing/trusting in what God has done through Christ"' (Wagner 2002:160; Bekken 2007:170), this exegetical conclusion indicates that Paul is setting aside the framework of the law for salvation rather than redefining it to include faith, especially when he mentions Lev. 18:5 which connects the law with life. Nevertheless, he affirms that Christ is the end of the law (10:4). By citing this quotation, Paul does not get involved in denying righteousness based on the framework of the law, but rather in preparation for a counterargument to support righteousness, which is achieved by faith through the scriptures (Lincicum 2010:154). This way, Paul frames the identity of Christ-followers in relation to the framework of faith in Christ, not the law.

Therefore, the pursuit of righteousness within the framework of the law remains a gloomy and dark pathway for the Israelites. Also, contrary to the law in Deut. 30:11-14, Paul says now that it is Christ, not the law or the commandments, whom they might mistakenly think is in the abyss (not across the sea as in Deut. 30:13) and needing to be raised from the dead (Rom. 10:7). Lastly, Paul affirms that the "word" that is very near in Deut. 30:14, in one's mouth and heart, is the "word of faith" that he preaches, not the law or commandments (Rom. 10:8).

Paul's attempt here is to set aside the identity framework of the Mosaic law at the centre of one of the most vivid passages in the OT and replace it with the identity framework of Christ in Rom. 10:6-8 for the Christ group. He has used the phrase τοῦτ᾽ἔστιν to move away from the Mosaic law in Deut. 30:12-14 to Christ and the preaching of faith concerning Christ in Rom. 10:6-8. In doing this, Paul continues to explain the formation and identity of the Christ group, based on faith in Christ, to differentiate them from the Judean non-Christ group, whose pursuit of righteousness is tied to the law. This would have been bitterly resented and probably resisted by the Israelites who came to hear of it (Esler 2003:287).

While there may have been a structural affinity between Romans 9:30-33 and Paul's OT citations, there is no structural affinity between Romans 10:6-8 and Deut. 30:11-14 as Hays (1989) has suggested. Instead, Paul has created a powerful and imaginative connection to his audience's needs and their site of collective memory to buttress the claim that God's righteousness can only be attained through faith in Christ, not the law.

So far, in SIT terms, Paul uses these OT scriptures to categorise those who pursue righteousness through faith as opposed to those who pursue righteousness through the law. The non-Christ Judeans (outgroup) are on one side of this category, while the Christ group (ingroup) is on the other. The inclusion of non-Judeans in this Christ group (ingroup) is part of the outworking of God's righteousness that the Judeans do not fully comprehend, and Paul wants them to understand it. Paul aims to do this by citing Deut. 30:11-14; he is not attempting to establish a structural affinity regarding righteousness or justification between Deut. 30:11-14 and Rom. 10:6-8.

Similarly, Kujanpää argues, from a rhetorical-device perspective, that Paul uses these quotations to "differentiate" between the apparent and the "true" righteousness. However, Kujanpää (2019:164-165) implausibly suggests that Israel appears to follow the law but has not reached the law's most profound goal and intent, which is Christ. She says that Paul's critique is not directed toward the law but the manner of its pursuit (165). Contrary to her view and that of Meeks (1991:115), it is unlikely that Paul would set aside the framework of the law to attain God's righteousness and simultaneously encourage the pursuit of the law framework as a means to lead to Christ. Christ is not the goal of the law; instead, he is the end of the law that everyone who has faith may be justified (Romans 10:4, RSV). The issue is not merely the manner of Israel's pursuit but the framework itself. Paul consistently contrasts two incompatible modes of righteousness: one grounded in the law and one grounded in faith (Rom 9:30–10:3). Thus, contrary to Kujanpää (2019:164–165)

and Meeks (1991:115), Paul does not encourage continued pursuit of the law for the Christ-followers as a route that eventually leads to Christ. Instead, he redefines the entire framework of the law around Christ, asserting that Christ is not the "goal" toward which the law gradually leads but the "end" (τέλος) of the law for the Christ-followers, so that righteousness is now available only through faith (Rom 10:4). Paul's argument depends precisely on this discontinuity for the Christ-followers: the law-based pursuit of righteousness has reached its terminus, and a new Christ-centered mode of righteousness has been inaugurated for the Christ-followers

5.13 Citation of Deut. 30:12-14 and Paul's Audience

It is legitimate to assume that Paul's exegesis and use of scripture will correlate with the scriptural competence of his audience. Nevertheless, he still makes his reworking of scripture accessible to his readers, who might have had little knowledge of the context of these quotations. It is noteworthy to recall that Deut. 30:12-14 was well known and used in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple. However, probably only a small percentage of Israelites would have had the capacity to understand the full context of this passage. An oral culture allows narratives to be used for their intended purposes at specific times, benefiting the person or group that utilises the narrative. For example, Vansina (1985:27) emphasises that oral traditions are "living expressions" shaped by context, often retold to reinforce group identity, resolve conflict, or transmit values. Similarly, Goody (1987:15) argues that oral narratives are inherently flexible, allowing storytellers to reframe history or myth to suit present circumstances. Ong (1982:41) adds that the performative nature of oral storytelling enables communities to reconstruct memory in socially functional ways rather than in historically fixed ones. These perspectives highlight how oral cultures utilise narrative as a strategic resource, tailored to meet momentary needs and benefit the community. Therefore, Paul would have expected his audience to find this creative use of the passage and its

relevance to their social situation comprehensible. However, they did not understand the full context. I explained this concept of social and collective memory earlier in this thesis. Also, the fact that his audience did not need any external information to understand Paul's message is an indication that Paul's use of these quotations is not meant to support scriptural structure or affinity (though it may be necessary to Paul), but rather for his intended purpose and the needs of his audience.

Jesus is the Lord of All to the Judeans and non-Judeans (Rom. 10:9-13) In Rom. 10:9-13, Paul elaborates on the nearness of the "word" in the mouth and the heart to attain righteousness and salvation (vv. 9-11). This "word" needs to be believed, but some Judeans have rejected it in pursuit of righteousness from the law. Therefore, they did not attain God's righteousness. Paul used the "mouth" and "heart" analogy from Deut. 30:14 in Rom. 10:6-8 to establish that the Israelites do not need to go to heaven or the abyss to look for righteousness, but rather to place their faith in Christ. This is because the commandment Paul reinterprets as Christ (Rom. 10:6-8) is as near as the mouth and the heart are to the body.

Paul still uses the same analogy of "confessing with your lips" and "believing in your heart" to describe the appropriate response of faith to the "near word" that is preached. This way, Paul can categorise the Christ group (Judeans and non-Judeans) with a positive outlook based on their faith response, in contrast to the negative volition of the non-Christ Judeans, thereby encouraging them to look to Christ for righteousness. Wallace suggests that the double accusative (κύριον Ἰησοῦν) may indicate whether Paul argues for viewing Jesus as Yahweh (Wallace 1996:187-88). Additionally, Cranfield (1979:529) suggests that Paul is arguing for the resurrection of Christ. These suggestions are unwarranted if we link these verses to Paul's use of Deut. 30:12-14 previously discussed: he is not creating a structural affinity with these texts but rather reinterpreting them through the lens of Christ to promote the identity of the Christ group.

ixxi

Tucker (2014:112) has plausibly suggested that confessing Jesus as Lord (10:9) served as a social symbol, deployed as part of Paul's strategy to unify the sub-groups within the Christ group, thereby acting as a rallying point for group cohesion. In addition, this confessional formula serves as an identity framework for the formation of the Christ group's identity, establishing a precise categorisation between those within the faith community and those outside (Rosen-Zvi and Ophir 2015). Thus, this confession of Jesus as Lord serves not only as an individual statement of faith but also reflects the process of social categorisation (Turner and Tajfel 1986) upon which individuals identify themselves and are identified by others as members of the Christ community. The public affirmation of faith not only reinforces personal identity within the group but also fortifies collective cohesion. By drawing a boundary between those inside and outside the faith community, such declarations contribute to identity construction and group distinctiveness (Abrams and Hogg 2004)

Paul stresses that "believing in the heart and confessing with the mouth" applies to both Judeans and non-Judeans because the same Lord who bestows riches on all (Judean and non-Judeans) who call on him (10:12). This is a sentiment that he had earlier elicited in Rom. 3:30: since God is one. He will justify the circumcised on the grounds of their faith and the uncircumcised through their faith.

Paul continues in Rom. 10:11, 13, using the OT to support his point. In 10:11, he quotes Isa.28:16 to validate the need for believing with one's heart: "For the scripture says, 'Whoever believes in Him will not be disappointed.'" Then, in v. 13, he refers to Joel 2:32, but without indicating that he is doing so, validates the response of confessing with one's mouth: "for 'Whoever will call upon the name of the Lord will be saved.'" Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord should be read to mean Judeans and Greeks (v.12). This reference to Judeans and Greeks has already been expressed in Rom. 9: 24, "even us whom

he has called, not from Judeans only but also from the non-Judeans", and is also implied in Rom. 9:8, 30.

Paul made a similar inclusive statement earlier in the latter part of 10:4: "For righteousness to everyone who believes." This statement is connected to the scriptural references in 10:11 and 13, having its full implication in 10:12, "for there is no distinction between the Judean and the Greek.

5.14 Function of Isa. 28:16 and Joel 2:32 in Rom. 10:11, 13

In Romans 10:11 and 10:13, Paul strategically cites Isaiah 28:16 and Joel 2:32 to reinforce that salvation is accessible to both Judeans and non-Judeans through faith in Jesus Christ. Isaiah 28:16, originally referring to a cornerstone laid in Zion, is reinterpreted by Paul to emphasise that belief in Christ ensures honour rather than shame (Wagner 2002:169), thereby redefining group boundaries around faith rather than ethnic lineage (Moo 1996:658). Joel 2:32, which promises deliverance to those who call on Yahweh, is applied to Jesus, affirming his divine status and underscoring the inclusive nature of salvation—"everyone who calls" is welcomed, Judeans and non-Judeans alike (Dunn 1988:613). Together, these citations function rhetorically to support Paul's argument that salvation is not based on Torah observance but on faith and confession, reshaping communal identity around Christ as the cornerstone. Paul connects 'salvation' (10:9, 10, 13) and 'not being put to shame' (10:11) to the righteousness of God as a way of describing this group's identity, framework, and belonging before God. This is a good example of how Paul uses cognitive emotion to unite a group. Morgan (2015:297) also argues thus.

This is another example of the interdependence of cognition, emotion, action, and relationship in Paul's conception of *pistis* (faith). It illustrates how trust and propositional belief are entwined in Paul's thinking and how confession is more than cognitive-articulative: it is inextricably linked with emotion, action, and relationship (Morgan 2015).

In one sense, 10:9-11 explains the framework of being saved, and 11-13 further describes the universal dynamics of salvation. Through these texts, Paul not only evokes Israel's narrative tradition but also prototypes a new identity group in Christ, anchored by group faith confession and reinterpreted scripture.

Rom. 10:9	**Rom. 10:10**
If you confess with your lips,	for a person believes with their heart and so is justified.
and believe in your heart	and confess with lips and so is saved.

The first citation is introduced with the formula, "for the scripture says" (λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή), indicating clearly that the source is from the scripture. In citing the final part of Isa. 28:16 (also mentioned in the conflated quotation in 9:33), Paul, in a highly significant modification, adds πᾶς to the beginning to read "Judean who believes in him."

Rom. 10: 11 πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται.

Rom. 9:33 καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται

Isa. 28:16 LXX καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ

Again, we see that Paul adapts the wording of his quotations to his intended purposes and is not overly concerned with his audience's reaction (Stanley 1992:134; Koch 1986:133). If the audience had in mind the context of Isa. 28:16, Paul's use of that verse here would have been quite baffling to his mixed audience, since it is preceded in the same verse by the Lord's statement that he is laying a stone in Zion, so that this verse, in Isaiah, can only have reference to Judeans.

Rom. 10:13 πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.

Joel 2:32 καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται

Paul combines Isa. 28:16 and Joel 2:32 to gain support for 10:12, "For there is no distinction between Judean and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all and bestows his riches upon all

ixxi

who call upon him." There is also a connection between κύριος πάντων and παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι (10:4), παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι (1:16), and εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας (3:22). Therefore, "for everyone who believes" in 10:4 is further explained in more detail in 10:12 to include Judeans and non-Judeans alike. The repetition of πᾶς strengthens Paul's coherence but, more importantly, affirms that there can be no different ways of righteousness for the Judeans and non-Judeans. This is Paul's all-inclusive attempt to exclude the possibility that keeping the framework of the law could have any role when the Lord distributes richly his grace (Barclay 2015b:543).

Paul's statement that "there is no distinction between Jew and Greek" (Rom. 10:12) highlights the radical redefinition of the identity of the Christ group (Donaldson 2020). By breaking down social barriers that traditionally segregated these groups, Paul calls for a collective identity rooted in Christ that offers co-belonging to both Judeans and non-Judeans within the Christ group, without eliminating their sub-identities. This reflects the theory of social identity complexity, which suggests that individuals may belong to multiple social identities that overlap without compromising their unique origins (Kok 2014:2-3).

So far, what Paul aims to establish is not an exegetical scriptural structure or unity. Instead, he uses these quotations to delineate a different category or group that has attained God's righteousness, not by the law, ethnic belonging, or any other rationale except faith in Christ. This group is distinctively different from both the non-Christ Judeans and the non-Christ non-Judeans. Gadenz (2009:153) suggests that Paul has in mind another pair of groups, "Jew and Greek," referring to humanity as a whole. He argues that since Christ is Lord of all (πάντων) in Rom. 10:12 in parallel to all (πάντες), Paul is proposing that since there is no distinction about the problem of sin (the problem), then there is also no distinction about the solution (salvation). All human beings belong in one of two categories: Judean and non-Judean; thus, the "Greek" here means "non-Jew" (Gadenz

2009:154), therefore echoing the vocabulary of Rom. 1:16. The emphasis is on the totality of human beings as a whole set the pair/group "Judean and Greek" apart from the different pair/group "Israel and nations" used in 9:30-31. This latter pair refers explicitly to the Judeans who have not placed their faith in Christ and the non-Judeans who have placed their faith in Christ (Gadenz 2009:154). This, in turn, is distinct from the pair in Rom. 9:27, which refers to Judeans who have trusted Christ (the remnant) in contrast to other Judeans who have not trusted in Christ. It therefore seems that Paul is using these quotations to describe the situation between individuals in general and specific groups (Judeans and non-Judeans).

All these categorisations above related to the formation and identity of the Christ group and the non-Christ Judeans probably criticised the Judeans when they discovered that Paul was using their scriptures to set aside the framework of law as the basis for obtaining God's righteousness, and more so that the non-Judeans were now included in this group. In contrast, the non-Christ Judeans did not have a place. This would have provoked jealousy in them, as we shall see later in this chapter. On the other hand, the inclusion of the non-Judeans at the expense of some Judeans appears to have led to the arrogance of these non-Judeans in the Christ group, leading to Paul's warning in 11:18. Simply, Paul is redefining a group "for every (Judean and non-Judean) who believes." To achieve this, Paul utilised this scriptural statement but modified its meaning so that his audience could understand his message.

Moving on to the quotation in Rom. 10:13 (Joel 2:32), it lacks an introductory formula but follows the Septuagint verbatim. Joel 2:32 correlates with the dictum in Romans 10:9-10, which states that confessing (ὁμολογέω) that Jesus is Lord brings salvation, except that the quotation in Joel uses the phrase "calling upon" the name of the Lord. Nevertheless, according to Morgan (2015:286), "for Paul, believing and confessing

is more than cognitive or cognitive-affective: they express the relationship of the faithful one to God and her willingness actively to serve and obey God and Christ." While it is true that "confessing" depicts a relationship to God and Christ, Morgan strays away from the text (10:13) by adding the axiom of "serve and obey." There is nowhere in the text where God puts service or obedience as conditions of obtaining righteousness. Instead, it is faith in Christ. To "obey" in this context is synonymous with faith in Christ. The relationship established by calling upon the Lord or confessing Jesus as Lord is one of recognising one's need and appealing for help by putting one's trust in him. This is also seen in Rom. 10:12 (εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν), which Paul, in turn, used to further promote his argument in 10:14. It is, therefore, clear that "The Lord" who is called upon and confessed to is "Christ the Lord of all." His name saves (Rowe 2000:146, 156), and Christ is the object of belief in 10:11, although God is primarily presented as the leading actor.

It is worth noting again that Paul's use of Joel 2:32 in Rom. 10:13 is not about exegetical scriptural unity with the original context of this citation. Paul would have been familiar with the way it appears to refer solely to Israelites on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and it may have influenced his thought process. However, his audience may not have been familiar with this scripture. Paul's purpose is to redefine and categorise the identity of Christ's people, focusing on the dynamics of how they are saved, which is another way of describing the process of obtaining righteousness with God. The dynamics involve calling upon Christ and confessing his Lordship; there is no other way to join this Christ group or association except through faith in Christ via these dynamics.

This Christ identity that Paul promotes hinges on the shared experience of salvation through Christ. This is further supported in Rom. 10:13, where Paul emphasises universal access to faith, reinforcing the notion that identity in Christ supersedes previous ethnic and

cultural identifiers (Campbell 2023). The result is a distinct identity of the Christ group that encompasses not only Judeans and non-Judeans but also promotes unity amid diversity (Esler 2021).

In context, Joel 2-3 points to the eschatological "day of the Lord" that follows the pouring out of the Spirit (Joel 2:28). Those who call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. Still, God's revenge will accompany their restoration on their oppressors: "all the nations" will be gathered to the valley of Jehosaphat and face judgment for all that they have done against Israel (3:2-6). Israel's blood shall be avenged, and strangers (ἀλλογενεῖς) will no longer pass through Jerusalem. Therefore, Joel's vision, which promises judgment on nations, does not seem to correlate with Paul's vision, which states that there is 'no distinction between Judeans and non-Judeans.' This suggests that Paul wants to keep his audience as far away from Joel 2-3 as possible. If they had known the context, it would have messed up the whole point that Paul was trying to make. Joel 2-3 is about the restoration of Zion, which would likely confuse his Roman audience greatly. He has not factored the 'whole context' in his use of this citation; instead, he has associated the dynamic of God's salvation for Israel with God's salvation for both Judeans and non-Judeans in Rome. They need to call upon God and confess Christ's Lordship as the dynamics of expressing faith in Christ for God's righteousness. The fact that his audience is unaware does not mean that this context does not influence Paul's thinking at the time of writing. I have argued earlier that Isa. 28:16 discusses two groups in Israel and that Isaiah encourages his group to be united in the same trajectory of keeping their trust in God, not in the strength of the nations. Those who put their trust in God shall be delivered and not be put to shame, while those who trust in foreign nations and their powers will be destroyed. So, trust in God is the key factor in salvation and the only

thing that marks those on God's side and those who are not. With these two quotations, Paul

effectively identifies and recategorises the Christ group based on their faith in Christ, and he also affirms equal belonging among the Judeans and non-Judeans, a point he will address in chapter 11.

5.15 The Prerequisites of Calling upon the Name of the Lord (Rom. 10:14-18)

Paul returns to why most Israelites did not believe in Christ and where they missed the point (Dunn 1988b:627-628). He picks up the idea of "calling upon the name of the Lord" in 10:13 to draft a list of prerequisites for "calling".

> **10:14-15b** But how are they to call upon him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without a preacher? And how can they preach unless they are sent?

In reverse order, the prerequisites are 1) preachers must be sent, 2) before they can hear the message, 3) the message will inspire faith, and 4) then they will call upon the name of the Lord. Paul probably maps out these prerequisites to note the stage at which Israel missed the point (Kujanpää 2019:172). He will do this via the following three scriptural quotations; hence, these quotations must be interpreted within the framework of these prerequisites.

Some scholars argue that because Paul did not mention Israel in 10:14-18, he must apply these prerequisites to both Judeans and non-Judeans (Bell 1994:83-87; Watson 2007:331; Jewett 2007:637). While this is probably true, they must also be understood in the context of Paul's ongoing discussion about Israel's failure and where they went astray in connection with the righteousness of God. The link in this chain at which Israel fails is what cuts them off from the Christ group. This brings pain to Paul's heart in 9:1-3, not the unbelief of the non-Judeans. Therefore, the reference to Israel in 10:19 is not a new subject but a continuation of the existing discussion about Israel's failure (Wagner 2002:178).

Paul introduces a quotation from Isa. 52:7 with "as it is written." It is significantly closer to the Masoretic text than the majority text of the Septuagint (Kujanpää 2019:173).

Rom. 10:15 As it is written, "How beautiful are the feet of those who preach good news!"

Rom. 10:15 καθὼς γέγραπται, ὡς ὡραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων [τὰ] ἀγαθά.

Isa. 52:7 (LXX) ὡς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθά,

He wants to assure his audience that messengers were indeed sent to bring the gospel to Israel (vv. 14-17) and rule out any excuse that Israel did not hear and understand the message about Christ for salvation (vv. 18-21). This citation falls within the first part of his argument, and Paul may be using a portion of Isa. 52:7 to make a point to his audience, particularly in the first half (Shum 2002:224; Koch 1986; Wilk 1998:66-69; Stanley 1992:134-41).

Additionally, the noun ὥρα ("springtime") is transformed into the adjective ὡραῖος ("lovely"), reflecting the Hebrew expression. The quotation may be based on a pre-Pauline reading of the Septuagint, which was revised to bring it closer to the Hebrew text. It is also probable that Paul further modifies this revised wording to make his argument consistent (Kujanpaa 2019:177).

In its original context, Isaiah 52:7 appears to be a word of salvation to Israel alone, given Isa. 52.1 with its mention of the uncircumcised no longer entering Jerusalem. Beyond the notion of a triumphant king is also the triumphant homecoming of the king to Zion (Motyer 1993:416; Childs 2001:406). Paul reinterprets this imagery christologically. Paul's rhetorical strategy here is profound. By invoking Zion's eschatological promise, he opens the gates of salvation to the non-Judeans. The triumphant return of the king to Zion is no longer just Israel's hope. It also becomes the Gentiles' entry point into covenantal blessing. Zion, once the exclusive domain of Israel's restoration, now becomes the inclusive symbol of the redemption of the nations. This aligns with Isaiah's vision of nations streaming to Zion (Isa 2:2–3), which Paul sees fulfilled in the proclamation of the gospel. The motif of the king's homecoming to Zion, therefore, becomes a theological bridge between Jewish messianic expectation and Gentile inclusion.

Before the homecoming of the King, a messenger is sent home from the battlefield to announce the message of victory. Therefore, the prophet Isaiah envisions that messengers will be sent to proclaim the triumph of Yahweh and his return to Zion. On the other hand, Israel's deliverance has negative consequences for the nations; the cup of God's wrath will be given to Israel's enemies (Isa. 51:4, 22-23). The catchword for Paul is the participle εὐαγγελιζόμενος, which he makes plural, reflecting numerous Christ-movement evangelists, and which has a verbal correlation with εὐαγγέλιον in Rom. 1:16. In the new context of Rom. 10:15, this good news becomes the gospel of Christ. This is because God has acted and has triumphed in Jesus Christ through his death and resurrection, so Israel's salvation has been underway. From this perspective, Paul's use of Isa. 52:7 exhibits theological harmony with its context. However, his audience would not have made this theological connection in the context, especially non-Judeans, who, if they knew the context (which seems unlikely), would have been put off by the exclusion of the uncircumcised from the picture of salvation in Isa. 52:1-10.

The messenger's identity is unknown, but Paul identifies with those who proclaim the gospel about Christ and his coworkers. This is probably because he wants to focus on the missing link in the prerequisites that have led to Israel's lack of faith in Christ. Paul's constant use of the third person to describe the messenger and those who have rejected the gospel is likely a way of socially distancing himself from the Israelites, particularly in light of their rejection of the gospel. However, Paul's heart is also greatly troubled about their plight (9:1-3).

5.16 The Social Function of Isaiah 52 in Romans 10:15

The function of this quotation is not just a scriptural proof (Wilk 1998:75-77) or to emphasise the necessity of preaching (Dunn 1988b:622) simply because more preachers are

needed. These views are problematic, especially in the light of 10:18, “Their voice has gone out to all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world.” This quotation confirms that preachers have been sent, and their lovely feet indicate they are already on the move (Kasemann 1973:281). This eliminates an explanation on Israel’s part that she had no messengers and means that their rejection of Christ is not excusable, but it also encourages them to place faith in Christ. Paul takes a logical approach by connecting the “how” question in this passage to the other “how” questions in this section, especially the third how question: “And how are they to hear without a preacher?” The prerequisite of calling upon the name of the Lord is that they must have faith, which presupposes that they must have the gospel, which in turn presumes that preachers have been sent. Therefore, the quotation in 10:15 confirms that the two most essential prerequisites have been fulfilled (Cranfield 1979:535): (1) the messengers have been sent out, and (2) they are already preaching.

The social significance of this quotation becomes apparent when we observe that, up to this point, according to Gadenz (2009:148-149), Paul is still focusing on humanity as a whole as a pair of categories or actors. He moves from a specific pair of actors in his argument to a more general pair of actors or groups. This general pair of actors categorises all humans as belonging to either Judean or non-Judean. Gadenz (2009:149) is probably right when he argues that it is only toward the end of the subsection in 10:19-21 that Paul returns to specific actors or groups.

Therefore, Paul’s argument so far with this quotation is that the prerequisites of calling on the name of the Lord for salvation also apply to all humanity as a group, as well as specific groups among Judeans and non-Judeans. This means that “calling on the name of the Lord” becomes a framework for forming the Christ group, distinguishing it from other non-Christ groups.

It is unlikely that Paul's audience would have connected the "beautiful feet" statement to the context of Isaiah 52, which is about the redemption of Zion. Therefore, Paul is using the statement as a sign of his enthusiasm for the Christ-movement evangelisation that has brought good news to the Judeans. Likewise, Paul's citation of Isa. 52:7 in Rom. 10:15 reframes the prototypical messenger from a nationalistic herald returning to Zion into a Christ-centered proclaimer of salvation. The "beautiful feet" motif, once tethered to Israel's restoration, now marks the inclusive mission of gospel messengers who cross ethnocultural boundaries. This rhetorical move redefines group identity by anchoring it in faith to Christ and participation in his message, rather than ethnic lineage or Torah observance. This is another good example of Paul's oracular interpretation of scripture.

Paul's audience would not have understood the context of the citation. What matters is how Paul uses the statement to influence his addresses. This is compatible with collective or social memory, where the narrator selects a part of a narrative for a specific purpose to influence an audience.

Paul moves on to the following two prerequisites before one can call upon the name of the Lord.

5.17 Who has believed our report? (Isa. 53:1 in 10:16b)

Rom. 10:16 For Isaiah says, "Lord, who has believed our report?"

Rom. 10:16b ἀλλ᾽οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῶ εὐαγγελίῳ· Ἠσαΐας γὰρ λέγει, κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν.

Isa. 53:1 (LXX) Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν

This quotation functions as a theological lament that reflects Israel's historical pattern of unbelief despite prophetic revelation. By invoking the Septuagint phrasing τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν, Paul draws a direct line between Isaiah's message about the suffering servant and the gospel proclamation in his own ministry, highlighting the paradox of divine communication received yet rejected. This quotation follows the Septuagint verbatim, which

ixxi

differs from the Masoretic text. Paul quotes Isa. 53:1 following the Septuagint (LXX) formulation—“Lord, who has believed our report?”—whereas the Masoretic Text (MT) contains a two-part structure: “Who has believed our message? And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?” (Isa. 53:1 MT). Paul’s selective quotation omits the second clause concerning divine revelation, thereby focusing the rhetorical force on human unbelief. This decision aligns with his broader argument in Romans 10, where the emphasis lies on the failure of Israel to respond in faith despite the widespread proclamation of the gospel (cf. Rom. 10:17). Lexically, the LXX’s use of ἀκοή (“report” or “hearing”) resonates with Paul’s auditory logic of gospel transmission. In contrast, the MT’s שְׁמֻעָה does not carry the same thematic weight in Greek.

Paul has just affirmed that God has sent preachers, and they have preached the message. Now that the two most basic requirements have been met, in vv.16-17 Paul further identifies himself as one of the messengers and says that the good news has not met with an appropriate response, “but not everyone has obeyed the gospel.” He explains this via his quotation, stating that the present situation has long been foreseen and experienced by the prophet Isaiah. Just as the Israelites of Isaiah’s day paid no attention to God’s message, in the same manner, many Israelites of Paul’s day rejected the message and the messengers (Shum 2002:225)

Some argue that since the explicit citations (Rom. 10:16/Isa. 53:1; Rom. 15:21/Isa. 52:15) seem to be in the context of mission rather than Christ's suffering, Paul did not identify the servant in Isaiah with Christ. For example, Kock (1986:234) argues that Paul did not read Isaiah 53 as a passage of passion theology because he quotes Ps. 68:10 in Rom. 15:3. Otherwise, he would have quoted Isaiah rather than the Psalm. This type of argument, which derives meaning and uses quotations based on Paul's interpretation of another quotation, is one-sided and problematic in its methodology (Kujanpää 2019:180). When Paul speaks about

the meaning of Christ's death, he likely echoes Isa. 52:13-53:12 (Watson 2009b:234-249). However, the only relevant part to Paul's argument at this juncture is the first half of Isa. 53:1, which Paul seems to have imported for his argument.

5.18 The Social Use of Isaiah 53:1 in Romans 10:16

Paul's citation above functions as a strategic invocation of Israel's collective memory of prophetic rejection. This lament, voiced initially by Isaiah in the context of the suffering servant, becomes a rhetorical device through which Paul frames Israel's present unbelief. Drawing on social identity theory, this move reinforces the continuity of group behaviour across generations, suggesting that the rejection of divine revelation is not a novel phenomenon, but a recurring pattern embedded in Israel's historical consciousness (Kujanpää 2019:234). As Abel et al. (2017:283) and Cordonnier et al. (2022:1e8) observe, collective memory operates through schematic narrative templates, enabling communities to interpret new experiences in light of entrenched group narratives. Paul's use of Isaiah evokes precisely such a template, one that legitimises the ingroup's theological claims and reconfigures prototypicality: those who respond to the gospel become the true heirs of Israel's legacy. At the same time, those who reject it remain in a historically resistant posture (Smith 2021:87). The central issue here is that Paul assumes his addressees would agree that Isaiah was prophesying what Paul (and other evangelists) would experience. This is a pretty extraordinary appropriation of the collective memory of Israel to serve the needs of the Christ group in Rome today. This rhetorical strategy aligns with Paul's broader aim in Romans 9–11: to explain Israel's unbelief without undermining the integrity of God's promises. By invoking Isa. 53:1, Paul does not dismiss Israel but situates its response within a prophetic framework that legitimises the gospel's reception among the non-Judeans. Esler (2003:182–185) notes how conflict between ethnic groups shapes identity boundaries, noting that scriptural allusions often serve to both reinforce ingroup cohesion and signal outgroup differentiation. Paul's appeal to Isaiah, then, not only interprets Israel's present disposition

but constructs a theological boundary around a reconstituted Israel centered on faith. However, Mark Nanos's intra-Jewish reading offers a critical counterpoint. Nanos argues that Paul's audience should be understood as embedded within Jewish synagogue communities and that his rhetoric is not aimed at superseding Israel but at persuading fellow Jews to recognise the Messiah within Judaism (Nanos 2018:103). Isaiah 53:1 thus becomes a resource for communal self-reflection rather than exclusion—a call to reconsider collective memory rather than redraw identity borders. Esler (2003:182–185) argues against Nanos's view, stating that Paul is not merely engaging in intra-Jewish dialogue but actively reshaping group identity to include non-Judeans as legitimate heirs of Israel's promises. This undermines Nanos's claim that Paul's rhetoric is aimed at preserving Jewish communal cohesion. Likewise, William Campbell also critiques Nanos's position by highlighting the theological rupture introduced in Romans 9–11. While Campbell affirms Paul's Jewish identity, he contends that Paul's redefinition of Israel through faith in Christ introduces a discontinuity that cannot be reduced to intra-Jewish negotiation (Campbell 2023:145–147). Paul's use of Isa. 53:1, in this view, serves to legitimise the Gentile mission and to explain Israel's unbelief as part of a divinely orchestrated plan that is not merely a communal lament. I concur that Esler's and Campbell's readings align with the broader trajectory of Romans, where Paul constructs a new ingroup identity centered on responsiveness to the gospel, rather than ethnic descent or Torah observance.

Therefore, this quotation justifies a fulfilled prophecy of Isaiah, who foresaw the limited impact of Paul's gospel (Cranfield 1979:535; Dunn 1988b:622-623). This way, Paul is deploying collective memory to influence his audience. According to Wagner (2003:180), "Isaiah becomes a living voice for Paul, one who speaks alongside the apostle as an authoritative witness to the gospel." Overall, Paul's primary interest is in the oracular use of Isaiah to get his message across to his audience, thereby influencing them. He is not keen to

connect his audience to the citation's original context.

It is essential to note the connection between the report about the servant and the word of Christ in 10:17, “So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ.” In other words, believing depends on hearing (Tobin 2004:350; Hahn 2005:183). The catchword πιστεύω also confirms the connection of this quotation to the previous argumentation.

5.22 The Structure and Function of Psa. 18:5 (LXX) in 10:18

In this last unit of the subsection, Paul returns to compare the situation of the hardened Judeans and the non-Judean Christ-followers, as it was at the beginning of the subsection (9:30-33). The use of the first-person singular with the phrase ἀλλὰ λέγω (also used at the beginning of v.19) indicates the transition from v. 17. The phrase starts with a rhetorical question with a double negative (μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν), with a view to a positive answer. Μὴ is an interrogative particle implying a negative answer, while οὐκ negates the verb, so it will read thus, “certainly it was not that they did not hear, was it?”

The question above points directly to the message of righteousness from God, which is the message of Christ, already referred to in verses 17 and 18. Paul asks whether the failure to obey the gospel is due to a lack of opportunity to hear it. His emphatic reply is that lack of opportunity is not the reason, citing Psa. 18:5 as the basis of his argument. While this is true for both Judeans and non-Judeans, the context and the mention of Israel in v. 19 make it clear that Paul is referring specifically to Israel (Stanley 1992:141-142).

> **Rom. 10:18** For "Their voice has gone out to all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world." (RSV)
>
> **Rom. 10:18** εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν

Psa. 19: 4 Yet their voice goes out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world (RSV).

Psa. 19:5 (LXX) εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ.

Despite the lack of an introduction formula, it makes sense to treat this passage as a quotation, though it would not have been evident to the audience that Paul is introducing material from an external source (Stanley 1992:141-142; Koch 1986:13-14), or better to say that he is re-contextualising the quotation to fit into his present context. First, it is straightforward for any reader who knows the source of the text that the αὐτῶν in this quotation (Psa. 19:5 LXX) cannot refer to the αὐτῶν in Paul's quotation in 10:18. The former speaks of creation's proclamation of God (natural revelation). In contrast, the latter refers to the preachers of the message of righteousness from faith. Paul did not bother to modify this quotation in 10:18 but relied on the context of his existing argument to supply the meaning to his audience from his use of αὐτῶν in preceding verses.

What is Paul's motive behind using this quotation in this way? Does he completely ignore the original context, or is the creation's praise of God a big theme for him? Hays (1989:175) rightly argues that Paul has not wrestled with the texts of this citation but has "simply appropriated its language to lend rhetorical force to his discourse, with minimal attention to the integrity of the semiotic universe of the precursor." Some suggest that Paul argues that natural revelation, as evidenced by the praise of creation to God, implies that knowledge about God is accessible to everyone (Wright 2013a:1180; Wagner 2002:186). The problem with such a reading is that Paul does not mention anything about the praise of creation to God in his use of this quotation in his argument in this subsection. This means that his audience would have to recognise this verse in its original context to supply the idea of creation (natural revelation). Even if his audience knew this psalm (Jewett 2007:643), Paul would be asking for too much from them to assume that they could connect the original

ixxi

context (creation's proclamation) of the quotation to his present context of the failure of the Judeans to accept the message of righteousness from faith in Christ.

5.21 Paul's social use of Psa. 18: 5 (LXX) in Rom. 10:18

Paul's use of Psa. 18:5 aims to explain the process and formation of the Christ group, created by believing in Christ's message and distinguishing it from the non-Christ Judean group that has not believed. He wants to affirm that there was no reasonable explanation for the Israelites' failure to accept the message. At first, they heard the prophecies about the Messiah, which were fulfilled through Christ. The message began to spread rapidly, yet they did not embrace it. It was evident to Paul's Judean audience that he was not defending the Judeans for their failure and was also distancing himself from them, despite his affection. This is seen in Paul's consistent use of "they" to refer to them concerning their failure to believe the message. He is categorising the non-Christ Judeans in comparison to the Judeans Christ-followers based on their temporal inability to accept the message of faith in Christ, not on ethnic distinction.

Also, since the issue is not in sending and preaching, Paul now moves to the following requirement: hearing and using wordplays. In vv. 16-17, he plays with the double meaning of ἀκοὴ, which can refer to both the act of hearing and what is heard (i.e., a report). This word links the citation from Isa. 53:1 to verse 17, which is also connected to the three steps (proclamation, hearing, faith) mentioned in verses 14-15. This confirms v. 17, "So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ." The second wordplay is the use of "obeying" (ὑπακούω), which comes from the same root as hearing (ἀκούω). This allows Paul to create distinctions in the use of hearing in vv. 16-19 (Siegert 1985:155). He seems to distinguish between three levels of receiving the message: 1)physical hearing, which is the privilege of hearing the message (10:18); 2) hearing and understanding the message perspicuously (10:19); and 3) accepting the message (Dunn

1988b:622; Jewett 2007:641). This third level is contingent on steps 1 and 2 but not automatically derived from them. The use of these wordplays and these distinctive levels of hearing probably represents Paul's attempts to make his argument coherent and understandable to his hearers. He uses these levels of receiving the message to explain the process of forming the Christ group, differentiating it from other groups, especially the non-Christ Judeans. I suggest that Paul uses these three levels to categorise the Judeans who have not accepted the message about Christ from those who have accepted this message, by locating the exact link where the hindrance lies: "accepting." Therefore, "accepting" becomes prototypical for the Christ group. This also explains why some Judeans are not in the Christ group. This may be Paul's way of helping this group, which has not believed in identifying the missing link and coming to faith in Christ. Paul uses the four quotations in 10:18-21 as vehicles for a message about the present situation (Hultgren 2011:391). As Paul raids the collective memory of Israel, he sees the quotation above as speaking to people of his generation. Regarding social and collective memory, Paul possibly sees events and history repeating themselves in his day, but he does not necessarily expect his audience to make these connections. Paul's use of scriptural citation reflects the dynamics of collective memory, where past events are reinterpreted to shape present group boundaries (Halbwachs 1992:38–45; Assmann 2011:124–130; Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Levy 2011:301–308; Berger and Koller 2024:1–17). Therefore, he is interested in using this collective memory through the quotation to influence his audience, not to promote their understanding of the original context.

Lastly, I suggest that Paul's use of a scriptural passage that speaks of their voice going out to the ends of the earth (Psa. 18:5 LXX) is a way of asserting that the good news has extended beyond Israelite boundaries to the foreign nations. Therefore, the Judeans are not only indicted for not believing the message but also for not taking the inclusion of the non-Judeans in the message of righteousness from faith seriously. As mentioned earlier in this

dissertation, the theme of a new Christ group comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans is one that Paul takes seriously in Romans 9-11.

5.22 Framework of Jealousy in Rom. 10:19-21

In Rom. 10:19-21, Paul continues to use rhetorical questions and scriptural citations to explain the stumbling block that the Judeans face, resulting from their negative response to the message of Christ. Whereas the question in vv. 17-18 concerns whether the Judeans have heard the message of Christ, as mentioned in v. 19. The question is whether they have understood or comprehended the message in a more profound way that evokes a positive response from them (Wilckens 1980:230; Dunn 1988b:625). A closer look at the three quotations in vv. 19-21 discussed the points below to the fact that the Judeans should have known the message that God was revealing himself to the non-Judeans (Kock 1986:28; Tobin 2004:351). Watson (2004:447) further suggests that the Judeans should have been aware of the non-Judean mission as part of God's message. The non-Judeans are to be included through Christ as part of God's people (Shum 2002:230). This motif of Judean incomprehension (v. 19) is found in Isa.1:3 (Wilk 1998:314-315) and in Isa. 40:21, 28 (Wagner 2002:181-182). It is more likely than not that Paul's audience would not have made these textual connections because they lived in an oral culture, especially the non-Judeans to whom these scriptures were new. However, compared with 10:2, 3, they suggest that the Judeans have heard and understood the message but rejected it because of their continued reliance on righteousness through the law (Wagner 2002:187-188; Kujanpaa 2019:188). Paul will later refer to this as the hardening or insensibility of the Judeans in Chapter 11.

This context of comprehending but rejecting the message (Stuhlmacher 1989:145) provides the frame for interpreting the quotations in 10:19-21. Paul introduces these rhetorical questions with three introductory formulae that will support his interpretation of them. The first one, where Paul says, "First Moses says" (πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει), evokes Moses as the first witness to the indictment against the Judeans. Then the next one, "Then Isaiah (next

ixxi

witness) is so bold as to say (Ἠσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει), which indicates that Paul is evoking another witness or source boldly against the Judeans, though God is still the source of both quotations. The last one, "But to Israel, he says," (πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει), indicating that Isaiah is speaking.

5.23 The wording of Deut. 32:21 in Rom. 10:19

Rom. 10:19 Ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπ' ἔθνει ἀσυνέτῳ παροργιῶ ὑμᾶς

Deut. 32:21 κἀγὼ παραζηλώσω αὐτοὺς ἐπ᾽ οὐκ ἔθνει ἐπ᾽ ἔθνει ἀσυνέτῳ παροργιῶ αὐτούς (LXX)

Apart from the use of Ἐγὼ instead of κἀγὼ and the use of ὑμᾶς (second person) instead of αὐτούς (third person), the changes in the wording are not too significant. Some scholars suggest that these changes are Paul's attempt to avoid any mismatch with the preachers mentioned earlier (Koch 1986:110; Bell 1994:96); however, this is unlikely to be the case. The fact that ὑμᾶς does not correspond with the use of αὐτῶν in v. 18 suggests that these words do not apply to the preachers (Jewett 2007:645). In addition, Paul has already mentioned "Israel" in his discussion, which would have been sufficient to avoid any mismatch between the Judeans and the preachers (Stanley 1992:431). Kujanpää (2019:190) is probably correct in suggesting that Paul is trying to create a contrast between Deut. 32:21, which refers to the Judeans with the following citation from Isa. 65:1(in Rom. 10:20), which relates to the non-Judeans. If this were true, this would reflect the use of social categorisation in Paul's wording, though Kujanpää does not argue for social categorisation. According to Kujanpää , this change in wording may prompt Paul's audience to pay careful attention to the addressees (the Judean group). It also highlights the intensity of rhetorical force in Deut. 32:21 as a direct word spoken to the Judeans of Paul's day (Stanley 1992:143-144; Wagner 2002:190). However, Reinbold (1995:124-127) interprets the replacement of αὐτούς with ὑμᾶς to mean Paul's way of addressing his non-Judean group. Therefore, he interprets the

"not my people" and "foolish nation" to mean the Judean group. Reinbold's argument seems implausible because it does not account for the use of "not my people" in 9:25-26 as Paul's consistent pointer to the same group in chapters 10 and 11. So far, Paul has described the non-Judeans as "not my people." Now, he is about to deploy the motif of jealousy to explain the inclusion and role of non-Judeans in the outworking of God's plan. The role of these Judeans in the outworking of God's plan would lead them to believe and obey the message of Christ. It is, therefore, unlikely that Paul would refer to the Judeans as "not my people" because they are already God's people living in reversionism but needed to be brought back via jealousy of the non-Judeans.

5.24 Divine Jealousy and Group Provocation in Deut. 32:21 and Rom. 10:19

In Deut. 32:21, Yahweh expresses jealousy (קנאה) in response to Judean idolatry—provoked by worship toward "what was not a god." His retaliatory response is a counter-provocation: elevating a "not my people" and a "foolish nation" to replace Judeans in covenantal privilege temporarily. The Judeans then experience divine judgment through famine, enemy hostility, and wild beasts (Deut. 32:23–26), yet Yahweh, concerned about enemy arrogance, ultimately reclaims and restores his people, avenging their blood (32:36–41). Significantly, the LXX concludes with a call for joint praise where non-Judeans and Judeans, formerly divided, worship together (32:43).

This provocation motif situates two categories of worship—God and "no god"—against two people groups—Judeans and non-Judeans. Esler notes that God's jealousy reflects his passionate concern for what is his, especially his honour and covenantal claim (Esler 2003:289–293). Judean idolatry blurs ethnic and theological boundaries, inviting divine jealousy and reversal: God uses non-Judean inclusion to provoke Judean return. While provoking jealousy risks tension between groups, Deut. 32 anticipates resolution in shared worship under a superordinate identity. This is what social identity theory (SIT) describes as

social categorisation.

Paul echoes this dynamic in Romans 10:19 and later in 11:11–14 through the verb παραζηλόω. As a transitive verb with the prefix παρα-, it indicates movement toward ζῆλος, focusing the action on the object of jealousy, not the subject (Lappenga 2015:74, 185). Lappenga suggests that Paul's use of the ζηλ is rhetorically shaped to promote rightly directed zeal and identity transformation. Here, Paul applies the Deuteronomic pattern to his context: Judean rejection of God's plan invokes divine jealousy, which in turn leads to the inclusion of non-Judeans, provoking the Judeans to return. Though the contexts differ, Paul's narrative mirrors the Song of Moses—Judean hostility toward God is met with divine strategy that uses outsiders to restore insiders.

5.25 The Social Significance of Jealousy in Deut. 32:21

Jealousy in Deut. 32:21 and Rom. 11:11, 14 must be understood within their ancient socio-literary context, not through modern psychological frameworks that see jealousy as a negative human emotion (Villareal 2022:72–73; Amzallag 2015:234). Misreading divine jealousy as emotionally petty overlooks its covenantal logic. Villareal (2022:74)[8] argues that Yahweh, as head deity, assigns lands and peoples, including the Judeans, to himself,

[8] Villareal critiques modern interpretations of divine jealousy that separate it from social frameworks. He argues that Yahweh's jealousy must be understood within the context of Israel's election, covenantal exclusivity, and land allocation, making it a response to socio-theological betrayal rather than emotional instability (Villareal 2022:72–74).

5.26 The Social Significance of Jealousy in Rom. 10:19

Paul's invocation of Deut. 32:21 in Romans 10:19—"I will make you jealous by those who are not a nation"—introduces jealousy not merely as an emotion, but as a strategic and restorative instrument within ancient honour–shame frameworks. Malina (2001:131–133) interprets jealousy as a communal corrective tool, triggered when covenantal fidelity is breached. Paul applies this by temporarily shifting honour from unbelieving Judeans to non-Judean Christ-followers. Esler (2003:288–292) reinforces this, showing Paul's rhetoric as a socio-rhetorical manoeuvre designed to provoke boundary renegotiation and realignment with covenantal faithfulness. This provocation draws on cultural views of honour as a limited resource. Malina's concept of "limited good" (2001:109) highlights envy (φθόνος) as dyadic and resentful in response to restricted resources. At the same time, Pratt (2008:345–360) distinguishes jealousy (ζῆλος) as triadic—centered around fear of loss and concern for a valued relationship. Parrott (1993:906–920) supports this empirically, noting jealousy evokes insecurity and self-doubt, whereas envy promotes resentment and shame. Pauline distinction is evident: φθόνος is condemned (Rom. 1:29), whereas ζῆλος describes divine relational concern.

Therefore, jealousy in Paul's theology is not punitive. Esler (2003:290) conceptualises jealousy as a triadic configuration—subject, object, and rival—which explains its divine application. Malina & Pilch (1993:56) assert jealousy preserves honour when exclusivity is threatened, and Malina (2002:126) shows it can be aspirational or defensive. Within this framework, Gentile inclusion serves not to shame Israel into submission, but to incite covenantal restoration through emulation. Bell (1994:68–70) ties this restorative motive to

---

[9] Weinfeld explores the patron–client dynamic within Deuteronomic theology, emphasizing that Yahweh's land grant to Israel comes with covenantal obligations. This framing reflects an ancient Near Eastern suzerain-vassal treaty structure, whereby loyalty secures land and divine favor, and disobedience leads to dispossession (Weinfeld 1972:58–72).

Deut. 32:15–27 and identifies παραζήλωσις in Rom. 10:19 as Paul's means to redirect Israel's misguided zeal (ζῆλος θεοῦ, 10:2).

SIT offers a lens through which to understand how jealousy operates as an identity renegotiation mechanism. Prototypicality—how strongly a member embodies group norms—shifts in Paul's narrative from Judean law-centered fidelity to the Gentile embodiment of faith in Christ. Lappenga (2014:18, 100) argues that Judean zeal in Rom. 10:2–3 functioned as an ethnic boundary marker. Paul reconfigures this zeal through jealousy to challenge exclusivist norms and foster a sense of shared belonging, a trajectory that culminates in the grafting metaphor in Romans 11. Jealousy also activates collective memory—a key aspect of SIT that sustains identity through shared narratives. By citing Deuteronomy 32, Paul recalls Israel's history of idolatry and divine response, not to condemn but to affirm God's enduring covenantal intent. Ryan (1997:18–21) emphasises this continuity: Gentile inclusion fulfils prophetic anticipation of multinational worship and reaffirms God's faithfulness to Israel.

Psychologically, Parrott and Smith (1993:915–916) describe jealousy as a triadic emotion—comprising fear of loss, anger at a rival, and insecurity—dynamics Paul mobilises to prompt Judean repentance. This aligns with Paul's rhetorical strategy throughout Romans 9–11, where he categorises groups to reframe belonging. In Rom. 11:7, the Judean collective is split between elect (believers) and "the rest" (hardened non-believers). Hilton and Liu's (2017:770–772) Ethnic Competition Theory explains how perceived honour displacement incites intergroup tension: Judeans, seeing Gentiles occupy covenantal space, experience jealousy as a theological and sociological provocation.

Though divine resources are unlimited, Paul's rhetorical move functions within perceived scarcity. Paul reframes zeal—not as misguided nationalism (Gadenz 2014:160–161), but as a tool for inclusive transformation. Bell (1994:39–43) and Alleti (2020:229–230) agree that this provocation is restorative, not punitive, culminating in Israel's anticipated re-

inclusion (Rom. 11:26). Paul's rhetorical shift from third person “them” to second person “you” (παραζηλώσω, παροργιώ) in Rom. 10:19 intensifies this provocation, personalising the call to rejoin God’s salvific plan.

5.27 The Wording of the Quotation in 10:20-21

Rom. 10:20 Εὑρέθην ἐν τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν.

Isa. 65:1 ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμηντοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν εὑρέθηντοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν (LXX)

Rom. 10:20 Then Isaiah is so bold as to say, “I have been found by those who were not looking for me; I have manifested myself to those who did not ask for me.” (RSV-my revised version).

As Paul introduces the motif of jealousy in vv. 19-21, which brings some encouragement to the Judeans and a warning to the non-Judeans (Rom 11). Israel’s stumbling has always been known by God and factored into his dealings with them, which are temporal.

In Rom. 10:20, Paul’s quotation is from Isa. 65:1, and it seems clear that Paul uses words as the majority text of the Septuagint, except that the phrases are arranged in a different order. Paul is also comfortable with the translation of “I have been found,” which points to the dramatic inclusion of the non-Judean Christ group (Kujaampa 2019:195), rather than “I was made visible,” which might suggest a type of theophany (Wilk 1998:43; Wagner 2002:211)

Rom. 10:21 Ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα.

Isa. 65:2 (LXX) ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα

Rom. 10:21 But to Israel, he says, “All day long I have extended my hands to a

ixxi

disobedient and stubborn people" (RSV).

Paul's following quotation in v. 21 is from Isa. 65:2, and it follows the Septuagint almost verbatim except for the phrase ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, which is repositioned to the beginning. Since these variations are more about arrangement than textual differences, these modifications might have had a Pauline origin.

In terms of social identity and social categorisation, Paul continues his argument from verse 19, using the behaviour of the non-Christ Judean group to categorise them in relation to the non-Judean Christ-group. The disobedience and stubbornness of this group have provoked God's jealousy. Therefore, God also provokes them to jealousy by allowing them to stumble, so that the non-Judean Christ group can flourish in God's salvation plan for the nations. Consequently, the flourishing of the non-Judeans in God's plan would motivate them to take their rightful place in God's plan by orienting themselves to God's righteousness through the framework of faith in the message of Christ.

In citing Isa. 65:1, which in its original context refers to the Israelites, Paul uses it to refer to the non-Judean Christ group, while he uses Isa. 65:2 (πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει) to refer to the non-Christ Judeans. This is possibly why he inserts a second introductory formula to begin v. 21, to show that he refers to this new group. Having applied Isa. 65:1 to the "Gentiles," Paul now applies Isa. 65:2 to "Israel" (Moo 1996:669). We should recall that Paul, in 9:26-27, applies Hos. 1:10b (LXX) to the non-Judeans, but he cites Hos. 1:10a (LXX) to refer to the Judeans (Gadenz 2014:162). Therefore, Paul's use of these quotations and group categorisation is consistent in both chapters 9 and 10. Further justification for this split application of these two verses in Isaiah 65 can be noted in the use of the word ἔθνος in Isa. 65:1 LXX (though Paul does not cite it) and the use of λαός in Isa. 65:2. This distinction is further confirmed in the Hebrew MT: גּוֹי in Isa. 65:1 and עַם in Isa. 65:2. It seems, therefore, that Paul transforms this scripture in which έθνος is used for the non-Israelites. In contrast,

ixxi

λαός is used to refer to the Israelites (Wagner 2002:212).

The use of the term λαός in verse 21 raises further questions about the definition of God's people in Rom. 11:1, particularly regarding the status of the Judeans. It appears that the use of the term "God's people" in Rom. 10:21 and 11:1 refers to the Judeans, whom Gadenz (2014:164) calls "ethnic Israel," particularly the non-Christ Judean group (also in Rom.). 9:31; 10:19). This further suggests that Paul uses these quotations to categorise the relationships between the non-Christ Judean and non-Judean Christ groups regarding God's righteousness. This categorisation through God's relationship is more nuanced here than in Rom. 9:30-31, as God speaks directly through the prophets Moses and Isaiah in Rom. 10:19-21. The concept of pursuing righteousness by the non-Judean Christ group in Rom. 9:30 is replaced with the expression of "seeking" God in 10:20. Similarly, the failure of the non-Christ Judean group in Rom. 9:30-31 is now expressed as lack of trust and stubbornness in 10:21. Will this unbelief of the non-Christ Judeans permanently affect their status as God's people? It is this question that Paul attempts to unpack in chapter 11. Despite these concluding remarks about the disobedience of the Judeans at the end of this chapter, there is a ray of hope because God's hands are still outstretched toward them (Aletti 2009:230).

The social significance of Isa. 65:1 in Romans 10:20 is to reinforce the belonging of non-Judean Christ-followers in the creation and formation of the Christian community, which non-Christ Judeans do not fully comprehend. The fact that Isaiah had prophesied about this non-Israelite inclusion in the outworking of God's salvation plan would help resolve some possible misconceptions that the Judeans might have about the role and inclusion of the non-Judeans. This inclusion has always been in God's plan. Yet Paul's statement at the start of Rom. 10:20 that Isaiah was speaking boldly suggests that he appreciated Judean Christ followers (or Judeans generally contemporary with him) would find this quite a big thought to digest.

On the other hand, if the role of the non-Judeans in God's plan has stirred up arrogance among them concerning the Judeans, Paul uses Isa. 65:2 to remind them that God's hands have always been outstretched toward the Israelites/Judeans despite their disobedience. Therefore, these two verses in Isaiah 65 serve as reconciliatory citations to minimise the possible conflicts that might have arisen between the Judeans and non-Judeans in the Christ group. They both have their belonging and roles in the outworking of God's salvation plan, so they need to welcome one another (Rom. 15:7).

5.28 The Role of Collective Memory in Romans 10

We note that the group memory articulated in Romans 10 strengthens the group's identity and unites Christ-followers against the world's hostility. As Molden (2016) observed, the negotiation of memory in the dynamics of power highlights the struggles of identity formation. Therefore, Romans 10 reflects these complexities as Christ-followers seek to maintain their identity framework within conflicting cultural narratives that often marginalise their group.

The role of collective memory in Romans 10 also resonates with Schwartz et al. (2014), who claim that identities evolve through relationships and contexts. In this sense, the concept of belonging to the Christ group transcends individual experience; it is substantiated by shared narratives that reinforce the group's identity framework. The collective memory of past events, as recorded in the scriptures, serves as the basis for their current faith, reinforcing their identity as people who stand out for a divine purpose (Johnston 2017).

As the early Christ-followers emphasised their faith, they were also involved in collective acts that promoted their identity framework, such as baptism and community worship, reinforcing the meaning of shared beliefs and practices connected to their collective memory (Galinsky 2016). Paul wanted these Christ-followers to understand their identity

framework within the broader Roman social landscape, which usually portrayed them as outsiders. For example, Mbwangi (2020:3–4) expands this view by showing how Paul's rhetoric in Galatians and Romans reflects a multivalent identity construction that embraces political, religious, and economic dimensions, challenging dominant Roman prototypes of honour and belonging. This struggle for acceptance within the Roman Empire reflects the broadest topics of conflict, identity, and the recovery of belonging (Hansen 2019).

In conclusion, the analysis of Romans 10 through the lens of SIT elucidates the influence of group belonging on individuals' identities, the realistic theory of conflict, and collective memory on notions of group belonging. This chapter encapsulates a crucial moment when Paul wanted these early Christ-followers to articulate their identity through faith and navigate their identity in the face of various challenges and conflicts. The interaction between individual beliefs and collective identity emphasises the importance of narrative and memory in forming a cohesive community of faith. Finally, the use of OT highlights how the notions of belonging are intricately woven into the fabric of the group identity, shaping the primitive experience and expanding its relevance to contemporary discussions about faith and group formation.

Now, we shall examine chapter 11 to see how Paul continues to use scriptural citations to categorise the Judeans and non-Judeans concerning belonging to God's people through obedience to the law.

CHAPTER SIX

THE FULLNESS OF THE NON-JUDEANS AND ALL JUDEANS (11:1-36): A SOCIAL IDENTITY PERSPECTIVE

6.1 Introduction

In the last two chapters, we have considered some key passages about the Judeans and non-Judeans in Rom. 9:6-9 and Rom. 9:30-10:21. Here, we will now focus on Rom. 11:1-36, where Paul provides a more detailed understanding of the relationship between these two groups. Paul finally explains the mystery behind the unbelief of the non-Christian Judeans and how this serves a function in relation to God's plan for both the Judeans and non-Judeans. Ultimately, he attempts to reveal this "mystery," which is a topic of intense debate among many scholars. Paul argues that "all Israel" shall be saved, but the manner and time are not explicitly revealed. Will Paul's solution to the salvation of "all Israel" fit with Paul's arguments so far in Chapters 9 and 10? Or will it take a different turn at the end of this chapter?

In this chapter, we will demonstrate the consistency of Paul's argument with the previous chapters, particularly considering SIT and social categorisation, as well as his use of scripture in his argumentation. We shall continue to argue that Paul uses these scriptures to identify and categorise the Judeans and non-Judeans in relation to the law of righteousness while describing the process of forming the Christ group. In addition, Paul's goal is to resolve the conflict among these groups by inviting them into a shared vision of a unified group without erasing their distinctiveness. It is worth noting that Paul uses quotations in this chapter only at the beginning and at the end. However, he uses metaphors in between them.

6.2 Outline of Rom. 11:1-36 by Group Social Categorisation

Before we delve into detailed exegesis in this section, it is necessary to outline its composition. This will help us see how Paul's argument develops in relation to the previous chapters. Some scholars (Sanday & Headlam 1902:308, Käsemann 1980: 288) consider vv. 1-36 as one subsection of 9-11 but divided into three units (vv. 1-10; 11-24; and 25-36). For these scholars, the main thrust of this chapter is usually that God has not rejected his people (Moo 1996:671). However, other scholars do not consider this chapter a unified subsection. So, they (Walter 1984:172-195, Schreiner 2018:473-474, Ludemann 1984, Laato 1991: 32-33) take Rom. 11:1-10 as part of the second subsection of Romans 9-11, hence having Rom. 9:30-11:10, then leaving Rom. 11:11-32 (or 11:11-36) as the third subsection of 9-11. Nonetheless, some suggest that Rom. 11:1-10 constitutes a separate subsection, distinct from what precedes and follows it. The key point to note about the mapping criteria above is that they are semantic, literary, rhetorical, and theological, but not social-identity- or social-categorisation-based.

In terms of group categorisation, I will argue that Paul uses Rom. 11:1-10 to make a case for the relationship between God and the Judeans. He argues that God has not abandoned them, using himself as an example (vv. 1-2). By appealing to Scripture, Paul categorises the Judeans into two groups: the remnant (vv. 1-6) and those who are hardened (vv. 7-10). Thus, 11:1-10 serves as the first part of chapter 11, focusing on the Judean Christ-followers (the remnant), the non-Christ Judeans (those hardened), and, of course, God Himself as the main actor. The second part (Rom. 11:11-32) focuses on the relationship between two groups: the non-Christian Judeans and the non-Judean Christian group. Paul also appeals to specific scriptural motifs (jealousy, election, and remnant) and other metaphors (root, branches, dough, and olive grafting) to categorise these groups within social contexts. Finally, Rom. 11:33-36 (third part) closes Paul's argument by offering praise to God

for his matchless wisdom in fulfilling his plan of salvation from among the Judeans and non-Judeans.

6.3 Paul, Ethnicity, and the Remnant, Rom. 11:1-6

The use of the phrase Λέγω οὖν (I ask) at the beginning of Rom. v. 1 signifies the start of a new unit. According to Gadenz (2009:226), this is connected to the previous unit (especially 10:18-21) by the inferential particle (οὖν). More importantly, this οὖν should be linked to the whole of Romans 9-10 (Käsemann 1980:289) since Paul is building upon the issues that he has raised in 9:6-29 and 9:30-10:21. This rhetorical question is met with an expected negative answer (μὴ γένοιτο), probably depicts a false conclusion that Paul wants to debunk (Malherbe 1980:231-232). This rhetorical question, negated and turned into a statement, is repeated in verse 2 as a link to the rest of Rom. 11:1-32 and reveals the thrust of this chapter: namely, that God has not rejected the non-Christ Judeans. The use of the noun λαὸς in both vv. 1-2 signifies that Paul is referring to the Judeans as an ethnic categorisation, just as he has done in 10:21. Paul makes the point very clearly that the election of the non-Christ Judeans cannot be abrogated despite the disobedience of those hardened ones (Moo 1996:674-675).

With the use of καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλείτης εἰμί, Paul identifies himself as a kinsman (ethnic Israelite) of those Israelites (Rom. 9:3-4) who are in disobedience (Rom. 10:21), and for whom he prays in Rom. 9:1-3 and Rom. 10:1. As mentioned in previous chapters, the term Ἰσραηλείτης was used in Paul's time to denote an aspect of one's cognitive self to indicate one belongs to the people of Israel (Gadenz 2009:230). It was, I believe, an ingroup expression, whereas *Ioudaios* was used by outsiders and by Ioudaioi themselves when other ethnic groups were present. Even though Paul attempts to recategorise "Israel" in Rom. 9:6b, he still uses the term Ἰσραηλείτης as ethnic identification for the Judeans.

In social identity terms, we also see an emotion-charged situation (Esler 2003:293), as Paul identifies himself as an ethnic Israelite (Judean), revealing the cognitive, emotional, and

ixxi

evaluative aspects of his "self". He boldly affirms that he is an Israelite from the tribe of Benjamin and that God (vv. 1-2) foreknows him and his people. Paul is attempting to identify with the group categorisation, which is his focus in vv. 1-10, namely the Israelites (non-Christ Judeans). He does this by highlighting his Israelite ethnic identity, among other aspects of his self-cognitive representations. Additionally, by doing this, Paul is also identifying with another group categorisation, which he calls the "remnant" (Rom. 9:27), upon which he will lay further arguments in this chapter.

Why does Paul make this bold assertion about his ethnicity? Some commentators have suggested that it is an expression of ethnic pride (Käsemann 1980: 299; Schlatter 1995:219). However, Moo (1996:673) suggests that it is a reflection that Paul is a living example of God's willingness to continue to save his people; he is not willing to reject them. While there are arguments from several commentators for or against these two views, I suggest that ethnic assertions are connected to Paul's ongoing argument. In describing the process of the formation of the Christ group, Paul wants to assert that the Israelites still have a place in God's plan despite the hardness of the hearts of the majority of them. This will help promote the self-esteem of these Israelites. Esler (2003:293-294), in agreement with Dunn that the Israelites have a place in God's plan despite the hardness of their hearts (Dunn 1988b:635), has rightly argued in favour of Paul's ethnic pride with convincing reasons.

According to Gadenz (2009:230), the use of καὶ with Ἰσραηλίτης indicates that the disobedient Judeans in context are still Israelites (Haacker 2003:221; Penna 2006: 337), as the use of the present tense already suggests in Rom. 9:4 (οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλίτης). On the other hand, Paul himself (ἐγὼ), as an Israelite believer in Christ, remains an Israelite; his faith in Christ has not disqualified him as an Israelite. This way, Paul can connect with the Israelites in the Christ group based on ethnicity, although Paul's goal is to promote a non-ethnic Christ-group. The example of Paul as an Israelite Christ-follower is probably proof that

God has not rejected the Israelites. This also sets the stage regarding the evidence for the remnant (Judean-Christ group).

At this juncture, let us examine Paul's use of "*Ioudaios* and Israelite". The term "*Ioudaios*", which often translates as "Jew," requires careful analysis within the sociohistorical framework of early Christianity. Miller (2014:216-265) notes that the meaning of Ioudaios in ancient contexts is not monolithic and can include various ethnic, religious, and cultural identities. According to him, this fluidity is evident in Romans, where Paul outlines the distinction between *Ioudaios* and Israelites, presenting an intricate notion of identity that extends beyond mere ethnicity to include spiritual and theological dimensions. In Romans 9-11, Paul identifies himself as an Israelite (Rom. 11:1), situating the concept of Israel within a theological narrative in which the promises made to Israel remain significant (Eyl 2017:148-162).

Novenson (2022:167) also argues that in the context of Second Temple Judaism, the terms were often used interchangeably but carried specific connotations that must be differentiated according to the context. For Paul, the identity of an Israelite transcends ethnic boundaries, addressing a relationship with God established through faith, thus remodelling the very notion of what it means to be an Israelite. Mason (2023:79-107) emphasises that the early Christ-movement, which originated within Judaism, was characterised by complex dynamics involving intra-community relationships between Jewish groups and Gentile converts. The term Ioudaios, in this context, often referred to those who rigorously adhered to the law or Jewish customs. At the same time, Paul redefines the identity of the Israelites to include all those who have faith in Christ, thereby expanding the boundaries of belonging (Mason & Esler 2017:493-515). I posit that it is unlikely that Paul would recategorise non-Israelites to become Israelites. However, he would have recategorised Israelite status beyond ethnic boundaries to encompass a framework of faith in God. This recategorisation

contributes to the formation of the first Christ-group identity, promoting inclusiveness while also challenging the traditional understanding of Jewish identity.

Likewise, Ehrensperger (2024:539-545) highlights Paul's pragmatic approach in Romans, arguing that his distinction between *Ioudaios* and Israelites serves as a theological framework that affirms the continuity of God's promises while posing a challenge to Jewish exclusivity. This fluidity enabled a reimagination of identity that appealed to both Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ, reflecting a new understanding of what it meant to participate in Israel's history through faith in Christ. In addition, Furstenberg (2020:183-189) discusses the temporal dimension of identity as it transitions from an Israelite understanding, focused on ethnic inheritance, to a broader vision of inclusion within the body of Christ. This intuition claims that early Christian identity has evolved into a pluralistic environment, reflecting the tensions and negotiations inherent in its formation. Paul's theological rhetoric not only differentiated the terms but also underscored a dynamic faith that transcends ethnic and cultural boundaries, effectively expanding the frontier of faith in Christ. Paul's speech in Romans serves as a model for understanding how identities were formed and recategorised through the complex interactions of the time (Owiredu 2022; Arbitol 2021:218-239; Du Toit 2024:1217; Sanders 2016).

We agree with the views of these scholars that Paul's use of Israelite has some socio-theological connotations that redefine the Israelites' boundary beyond the ethnic dimension because their belonging to God was never based on their ethnicity. However, it is unlikely that Paul used 'Israelite' or '*Ioudaios*' to include the Gentiles in Romans 9-11. Rather, Paul aimed to prove that the Israelites as an ethnic group had not been abandoned by God, which set the pace for him to argue later that 'all Israel' shall be saved (11:26). Paul tried to demonstrate the relevance of the Israelites in God's plan by emphasising their Israelite sub-identity. However, his chief aim was to promote the superordinate identity in Christ. As

Snyder (2015) suggests, the concept of double identities has been used to model the understanding of belonging, illustrating a tension that supports Christian ecclesiology. Paul's ability to articulate these differences in Romans was a pivotal moment in marking the borders, simultaneously promoting a sense of unity among believers.

Paul is likely presenting himself as a representative Israelite, linked to the group membership of the "remnant," thereby forming a representative ethnic group to demonstrate that God has not abandoned His people. This further suggests that Paul's goal of ethnic affirmation is toward ethnic pride in his argument, but also with a view to proving that God had not rejected his people despite the disobedience of some non-Christ Judeans. This argument will be crucial to Paul in Rom. 11:11-32, where he further explains the relationship between the stumbling or hardened group (the Judean non-Christ group) and the non-Judean Christ group (vv. 11-15). Similarly, Paul will explain the relationship between the remnant group (the Judean Christ group) and the stumbling group (the Judean non-Christ group), as seen in vv. 16-21.

Another ethnic attribute can be deduced from the expression ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ. Paul has used the catchword σπέρμα twice earlier, in Rom. 9:7; hence, this strongly suggests that Paul is referring to his ethnic belonging to the remnant (the Judean Christ group). The last ethnic expression to be considered is φυλῆς Βενιαμείν, which also occurs in Phil. 3:5. In both cases, it indicates Paul's pride concerning his origin (Bianchini 2006:71; Cohen (1990:22-27). It is also probably a way for Paul to reveal that he still thinks in terms of the twelve ethnic tribes of Israel in his use of the scriptures (Rakocy 2006: 5-24). It appears that the phrase φυλῆς Βενιαμίν is intended to reinforce the phrase ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλείτης εἰμί. Gadenz (2009:231), citing Rakocy (2006), argues that the phrase "all Israel" in 11:26a, according to its OT usage, refers to the tribal structure of the descendants of Jacob/Israel. Weaving all these together, it is likely that Paul's argument is meant to commence with himself as one

Judean from one tribe (Benjamin) in 11:1b, before proceeding to many Judeans from all twelve tribes (all Israel) as in 11:26a. (Rakocy 2006), suggests that "all Israel" can refer to a "representative selection from the full complements of the tribes." Scott (2019:127) goes on to suggest that Paul may have the regathering of the twelve tribes in mind. Therefore, it may have played a crucial role in the unification of the twelve tribes. Benjamin is also the quasi-representative ambassador of the Northern Kingdom (Israel) within the Kingdom of Judah. Therefore, Paul, a Benjaminite, may have considered himself a citizen while belonging to Judah, but also representative of "all Israel" (Barth 1983). All assertions above will not be immediately clear until we get to the end of the exegesis of Rom. 11:26 vis-à-vis the whole of chapters 9-11. We shall argue against this proposition by Scott that by "all Israel," Paul is referring to the twelve tribes of Israel. This is reading too much of the unwarranted history of the Israelites beyond the scope of Paul's literary use and context of "all Israel." There is no doubt that "all Israel" refers to the ethnic Israelites, but only to those Israelites who come to faith in Christ, even from among the hardened Israelites. This makes sense when we follow Paul's argument, which describes the process of forming the Christ group to which both Israelites and Gentiles belong. However, one thing is clear: Paul's affirmation of his ethnic identity is likely to be an emblem of his ethnic pride.

A reasonable question to ask at this juncture is about the function of Paul's ethnic identification and pride. First, in social identity terms, this would have helped promote unity among the Judean-Christ group and the Judean non-Christ group, recognising that they are still connected through their shared ethnicity, despite differences in their faith in Christ. Second, it would also have given Paul more access to preach Christ to the Judean non-Christ group. Third, this would have encouraged some members of the Judean Christ-group, especially those who continued to maintain close ties with their Judean kinsmen. This group might have misunderstood Paul's indictment of unbelief against the Judeans in chapter 10 to

mean that Paul rejected his people in favour of the non-Judean Christ group. Fourth, it would have served to limit the arrogance of the non-Judean Christ group (Rom. 11:18) if they had assumed that God had rejected the Judeans and that Paul shared this view. Overall, this would have been part of Paul's strategy to unite these Judean and non-Judean Christ groups in Rome. In his attempt to recategorise them into one Christ-group, Paul must ensure that the identities of both groups are not minimised in favour of one over the other. Later, Paul will promote the place of non-Judeans in God's plan until their full number is reached (Rom. 11:25). Neither the Judeans nor the non-Judeans need to change their identity to belong to the Christ group.

6.4 Paul's Use of Scripture in Rom. 11:1-10

Let us first examine Paul's use of μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ (1a) and οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω (2a). Paul begins this chapter by reinforcing the truth that God has not rejected the Judeans, a strong expression in Greek, μὴ γένοιτο (11:1), which can be translated, 'certainly not', 'never', 'absolutely not', etc. God still preserves a remnant, while he hardens some. This theme flows from Rom. 11:1-10. He gives the first reason, "For I myself am an Israelite, a descendant of Abraham, a member of the tribe of Benjamin, God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew. Do you not know what the Scripture says of Elijah, how he appeals to God against Israel?" (Rom. 11:1-2).

Above, Paul highlights his ethnic identity as a Judean and descendant of Abraham (ethnic pride), even though he identifies himself as an apostle to non-Judeans. In case some Judeans (co-ethnics) or non-Judeans thought that Paul had abandoned his heritage or that God had abandoned the Judeans, Paul says an emphatic "no" to that. The number of faithful Judeans, like Paul, who have believed in Israel's Messiah may appear small, but God's plan concerning his people has never been about numbers. God always preserves a faithful remnant, some seven thousand in Elijah's day (Rom. 11:2-5), and who knows how

many in Paul's? Paul links his ministry to the non-Judeans to provoke jealousy among his fellow Judeans (Rom. 11:13-14). Some commentators, such as Käsemann (1980) and Moo (1996), argue that Paul presents himself as a counterexample to the notion that God would abandon his people. They suggest that Paul portrayed himself as a corporate representative of the Judeans to foster solidarity and representative headship on behalf of Israel. Dunn calls this "an authentically Jewish viewpoint" (Dunn 1988). However, Esler (2003:293-94) disagrees with this suggestion that Paul projects himself as a representative of the Judeans collectively. Instead, he argues that Paul wants to promote his ethnic pride, which he does first by affirming that he is a descendant of Abraham and the tribe of Benjamin. Second, Paul made the case in Rom. 9:27 that God had preserved some Judean remnants who believed in Christ. Thirdly, this marks the third instance in Romans 9-11 where Paul has formed an intimate bond with his people. Fourth, it would be odd since Paul is about to correct Elijah's claim that he is the last. Meanwhile, God has preserved seven thousand people who have refused to bow down to Baal (Rom. 11:2-5). Esler's argument seems more plausible in this context. It is unlikely that Paul is projecting himself as a corporate representative of the Judeans. Instead, he might be promoting his ethnic pride in the sense of celebrating his ministry among the non-Judeans with the intention that both Judeans and non-Judeans participate collectively in the salvation plan of God. This ongoing development of the non-ethnic Christ-group is at the heart of Paul's ministry and underlies his argument in Romans 9-11.

Therefore, Paul shifts his attention from himself to Elijah's assertion that seven thousand people had not bowed to Baal (Rom. 11:2-5). God always keeps a remnant in Israel (11:5). Paul alludes to 1 Kgs 19:10-18 to buttress this point. This moment was when Elijah pleaded with God that Israel had slain all their prophets and destroyed all altars, but God replied that he had preserved seven thousand men who had not bent their knee to Baal (11:3-

4). This remnant is elected according to grace, not works, because grace and works are mutually exclusive (11:5-6).

He does not use these as scriptural quotations; instead, he uses them as part of this scriptural language to link to his quotation in the next verses. They have a strong affinity with Ps. 94:14 (Ps. 93:14 LXX) and 1 Sam. 12:22 (1Kgdms. 12:22 LXX).

> **1 Sam. 12:22** (1 Kgdms. 12:22 LXX) οὐκ ἀπώσεται κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸὄνομα αὐτοῦ τὸ μέγα
> **Ps. 94:14 MT** (Ps. 93:14 LXX) ὅτι οὐκ ἀπώσεται κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψε

> **Rom. 11:1a** μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ

> **Rom. 11:2a** οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω

There are two changes that Paul has made, plus his own addition. First, he replaces κύριος with ὁ Θεὸς, probably to avoid any ambiguity that this phrase refers to God rather than to Christ. Second, he changes the future tense of the verb to an aorist indicative to turn the promise into an affirmation that God has not rejected his people, which fits more with the context. Lastly, Paul adds ὃν προέγνω to recall what he has said earlier in Rom. 8:29 (Wagner 2002:222-223; Jewett 2007:654), to reinforce his reason for his argument that God has not rejected his people because they are already foreknown by him (Moo 1996). All these are preparations for Paul's clear citation of scriptures, which will follow shortly.

6.5 The Wording of 1 Kgs. 19:14, 18 in Rom. 11:3-4

Paul continues his argument that the existence of the remnant is proof that God has not rejected the Judeans. By citing these scriptures about the dialogue between Elijah and God at Mount Horeb in the OT, Paul is likely creating a parallel between God's unfolding of His plan in the past (Elijah's time) and in the present (Paul's time).

The first introductory formula ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει starts with a rhetorical question which Paul craftily connects to the formula before citing the

ixxi

scripture. Paul also specifies that the quotation is located in the narrative concerning Elijah, though the scripture is the subject of the quotation, not Elijah (Koch 1986:27). However, in stating the quotation, it is Elijah who speaks of his own experience with God, bringing a formal accusation against the Israelites as opposed to Paul's hope for the Judeans. This should not be seen as an inconsistency but rather as a feature in Paul's introductory formula (Kujaampa 2019:211). Sometimes, Paul begins his introduction with either the grammatical subject or the alleged speaker of the quotation, but he always makes it clear that the words are those of God (ibid:212). This means the audience needs to determine who the speaker is, as they are familiar with the narrative in certain instances, such as this one. Paul allows Israel's scriptures to testify against Israel for their disobedience, as he does in 9:33, 10:18, 19, 21; 11:8-10.

The second introductory formula concerns God's response to Elijah's mistaken assumption that he is the only faithful one left in Israel. It is introduced with ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός. The use of ἀλλά shows the contrast between Elijah's proposal and God's response. Elijah accuses Israel, but God does not. Whereas Elijah speaks of accusations against Israel, Paul uses this quotation to anticipate hope for the people of Israel. As characteristic of Paul, he does not directly make God the grammatical subject of the quotation, though God is the speaker. Instead, he asks, "But what is God's divine response (the oracle) to him?" Both quotations in verses 3-4 deviate in diverse ways from the majority text of the Septuagint. In contrast, in four places, they correlate with the so-called Lucianic (L) or Antiochene text (ibid:213). The Lucianic text is of Christian origin and aims to promote clarity and style in Greek. It is based on an old textual tradition that sometimes preserves the original readings against other witnesses. No wonder its importance as a witness to the original Greek translation is widely discussed in Septuagint studies (Kreuzer 2013:23-31).

Kujanpää (2019:214) further discusses the agreements between Paul's wording and

the Lucianic text, though they also deviate from each other in major ways. He concludes that Romans and the Lucianic text agree only on the person but not on the tense (Kujanpää 217). For example, the aorist in Romans should be attributed to Paul, emphasising that the preservation of a remnant is not a future event but an already realised merciful act: the remnant already exists (Kujanpää 217-218). Kujanpää concludes that Paul's text and the Lucianic text both contain a reading that is a lexical correction. Therefore, he suggests that there is a common textual tradition behind Romans 11 and the Lucianic text (Stanley 1992:147-158; Stanley 1993a:43-54; Pickering 1994:14-17).

Considering the original context of this dialogue between Elijah and God, Paul has condensed it to serve his argument. He omits the aspect of Elijah's zeal and the accusation that the people of Israel have forsaken God. He also overlooks the theophany, the repeated questions from Elijah, the king's anointing, and the killing of the apostates (2 Kgs. 19:15-17). Paul has intentionally selected the most positive aspect of this narrative, which is the preservation of the remnant (Wagner 2002:236). This is what resonates most with Paul's argument in chapter 11. In social memory terms, it is called selective social or collective memory, the art of selecting a particular aspect of a narrative to highlight the positive aspects of a group or an event. Paul addresses an important aspect of the original narrative and elaborates on it by framing and introducing the quotations in a specific manner, as well as by modifying their wording. The group that would have been most influenced by this selective social/collective is the Judean Christ group, also known as the remnant group. They would have easily found their own story and God's faithfulness toward them in Paul's use of the Elijah story; hence, it would be easier for Paul to lead them toward the purpose for which he is writing to them, which is unity among the Christ groups.

The reference to Elijah seems to depict the analogous progression of one individual to a remnant, which in this quotation suggests a parallel between Elijah and Paul (Siegert

1985:165; Belli 2010:367). Both Paul and God, as represented by Elijah, speak as individuals about a remnant in different situations during their respective times.

6.6 Paul's Social Use of 1 Kgs. 19:10,14,18 in Rom. 11:3-4

The primary function of this scriptural quotation about the Elijah narrative is to help categorise a particular group that existed in Paul's time. They are called the remnant group (Judean Christ group) who have been chosen by grace (Barclay 2015b:545), as in 11:5 (οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος γέγονεν'). Their election is not based on works, as seen in Rom. 11:6 (Wagner 2002:234). The existence of this Israelite group is proof that God has not rejected the Judeans.

This point of social categorisation helps Paul distinguish between two groups among the Judeans: the Judean remnant Christ group and the non-Christ Judean group. So, when Paul goes further to speak about the hardened Judeans, it is a reference to this non-Christ Judean group and does not include the remnant group. Paul will now expatiate on the relationship between this remnant group and the hardened group in vv. 7-10 to take his argument further to prove that God has not rejected his people. The fact that Paul identifies with this group strengthens his membership and sense of belonging within it, thereby influencing them. However, Paul's overall goal is to unite both Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers.

The same social reading applies to the original context in 1 Kgs. 19:10, 14, 18. The narrative depicts two categories or groups. First, there is the disobedient Israelite group, and

then the faithful remnant group, comprising seven thousand Yahweh worshippers. Just as in Paul's time, when there seemed to be no hope that God's plan would be achieved, so it is also in the time of Elijah. However, God has kept a remnant (seven thousand Yahweh worshippers) who have not bowed the knee to Baal. Hence, God will use them to accomplish his plan.

The logic of Paul's argument in terms of social memory is that God keeps his promises by saving the remnant, just as Paul stated earlier in Rom. 9:27–29. Therefore, although it appears that the hope for "all Israel" to be saved is slim, Paul keeps this possibility open, believing that God will fulfil His promise through the remnant (Wagner 2002:237). This is one way to utilise social memory to influence people. Lastly, in Rom. 11:4-5, Paul links the remnant in Elijah's day to the remnant of his time, affirming that they are chosen or elected by God's grace. This suggests that grace, not ethnicity, is the identity framework for forming the Israelite group called by God. This point of the incongruity of grace (Barclay 2015b:545) will be helpful to Paul and his audience when he later explains that the hardened Judean group still holds their election despite their disobedience (Rom. 11:28).

Scriptural support for this Judean remnant group would have strengthened their hope and identity among Rome's diverse community of Christ-followers, comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans. Also, if they had been boasting (Rom. 11:18) that God's plan for the Judeans were over; this would have humbled the non-Judean Christ group. The combination of hope among the Judean Christ group and humility among the non-Judean Christ-group would have provided avenues for Paul to facilitate conflict resolution between them.

6.7 The Remnant Christ group vs The Insensible non-Christ Group (11:7-10)

Paul begins the next stage of his argument in v. 7, affirming what he has been building up. Paul begins to explain why some of the Judeans did not find what they sought; the elect received it, but the rest were hardened (Rom. 11:7). However, this hardening of the heart is not beyond the sovereign hand of God. It is God who put a stumbling block in the path of the Judeans, by making them drunk but not with wine and not because of liquor, as it is written, "God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that would not see and ears that would not hear, down to this very day." The phrase,τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας ("this very day"), does not mean that the hardening is about to end at that time. Instead, it may have meant that the hardening was still happening.

God hardened the people's hearts as a form of discipline for their rebellion, just as He did with Pharaoh. Paul connected this incident to the condition of Israel; they stumbled on their path in God's plan as Pharaoh did, as though their senses had been impeded. Then Paul quotes another set of scriptures as an analogy to Israel's hardening. This second scripture is from Ps. 69:22-23- And David says, "Let their table become a snare and a trap, a stumbling block and a retribution for them; let their eyes be darkened so that they cannot see and bend their backs forever." (11:9-10)

These were the words of David (Ps. 68:22-23; 34:8 LXX), asking for vengeance against his enemies. Now, Paul turns to Israel again because their actions resisted God's righteousness, which is according to faith. The mention of "table" in Rom. 11:9 may have referred to the same table that Paul mentioned in 1 Cor. 10:21-22: "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons. Shall we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?" The Jewish sacrificial system may have been a trap and a snare, as it obscured their need for Christ's death (Moo 1996). Minear connects this phenomenon to the situation of the Judean Christ-

followers, who, through their belief in the Torah, excluded non-Judean Christ-followers from the table fellowship (Minear 1971:78-79).

It is a fact that the Israelites are categorised into two groups (9:6b), namely, the elect/remnant Christ group (Rom. 9:27) and the non-Christ group. Dunn (1987:648) supports this view by suggesting that what Paul has hinted at in Rom. 9:22-23, 33 is now spelt out. The reason for this division, according to Paul, is their attitude to the outworking of God's righteousness through Christ. The insensible group does not attain it because they seek their righteousness (Rom. 10:3-4), but the remnant attains it by submitting to God's righteousness. The relationship between these two is key to developing Paul's argument. Paul probably correlates these insensible Judeans with the idolatrous Judeans in the previous narrative about the Judeans of Elijah's time (Wagner 2002:238; Evans 1999:126-127).

The word ἐπωρώθησαν is usually translated "were hardened." However, πωρόω primarily means obtuseness and insensibility, and it should be delineated from σκληρύνω, which is typically the word used for hardening in the Septuagint (Kujanpää 2019:226-227) and used of Pharaoh in Rom. 9:17 and Exod. 9:16 (Robinson 1901:81–82, 92; Tobin 2004:358; Wright 2002:580). The passive form of ἐπωρώθησαν signifies a divine initiative of God over the δὲ λοιποὶ (the non-Christ Judean group) to make them insensible (Barrett 1962:210; Hübner 1984:106; Hofius 1986:303). This contrasts with Rom. 10:21, which depicts the volitional responsibility of the non-Christ Judean group.

To confirm the insensibility of this Judean non-Christian group, Paul cites a conflated version of scriptures from Deut. 29:4 and Isa. 29:10 in Rom. 11:8 and Ps. 68:23-24 in vv. 9-10. Paul quotes from Isa. 29:9-10 and Deut. 29:3 to highlight Isaiah's warning to Jerusalem in their state of spiritual degeneracy, false security, and complacency, also as a similar warning to the hardened Judeans of his day. Now, let us consider the first quotation.

6.8 The Wording of Deut. 29:4 and Isa. 29:10 in Rom. 11:8

Rom. 11:8 Ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁΘεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

Deut. 29:4 καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν κύριος ὁ θεὸςa ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης (LXX)

Isa. 29:10 ὅτι πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς κύριοςc πνεύματι κατανύξεως καὶ καμμύσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν (LXX)

Paul's quotation above is unique because he derives most of it from Deut. 29:4, but he adopts the peculiar phrase πνεῦμα κατανύξεως (a spirit of stupor) from Isa. 29:10. It seems that he uses Isa. 29:10 to intensify the meaning of Deut. 29:4 (Walters 2006:204). This is another instance of the oracular use of scripture, as it is unlikely that Paul's audience would have understood his reworking of these scriptures.

Despite the changes this conflation brings, Paul introduces these quotations as directly from scripture (γέγραπται) rather than the singular, probably because he does not expect them to know these scriptures. He modifies the negations so that the divine passive action is well described. In Deut. 29:4, the negation precedes the finite verb (οὐκ ἔδωκεν), whereas in Romans 11, Paul negates the infinitives (τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν). This means that in Deut. 29:2-3, God has not given the Judeans an understanding heart, but in Romans, Paul omits οὐκ and negates the infinitives instead. Therefore, Paul can say that God gives the non-Christ group a heart of stupor. This fits very well with Paul's use of Isa. 29:10 and is probably the reason why Paul conflates Deut. 29:4 with Isa. 29:10. Another reason for Paul's use of "spirit of stupor" to describe the insensibility of the non-Christ group may be that it helps him to argue that this is a temporal setback for them (Rom. 11:15, 25). This stupor will be removed in the future (Stanley 1992:161, Wilk 1998:54; Shum 2002:234), and they will be restored. Also, by changing the pronoun from the second person (ὑμῖν) to the

third person plural (αὐτοῖς), Paul wants his audience to know clearly that this hardening or insensibility refers to a particular Judean non-Christ group (οἱ λοιποί in Rom. 11:7) and not to the whole of the Judean group. This refers to social categorisation, as earlier discussed under SIT. Likewise, in vv. 9-10, Paul quotes Psalm 69:23-24 using the third person to categorise and confirm that he is still referring to the same group (non-Christ Judean group). Paul also omits the title κύριος and keeps ὁ θεός as the subject of the rhetorical question, which correlates with the opening statements in Rom. 11:1–2. Finally, the phrase ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας (instead of ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης) might be attributed to Paul, as the use of σήμερον may have helped him connect the quotation more effectively to his own time (Stanley 1992:162–163; Wagner 2002:72; Jewett 2007:663). Altogether, the variation among the sources is not sufficient to call into question the fact that Paul is quoting from scripture.

6.9 The Wording of Ps. 68:23–24 in Rom. 11:9-10

> **Rom. 11:9** καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει, Γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς θήραν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς 10 σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον
>
> **Ps. 68:23-24** γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσινα καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον· σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον (LXX)
>
> **Ps. 69:22-23** Let their own table before them become a snare; let their sacrificial feasts be a trap. 23 Let their eyes be darkened, so that they cannot see; and make their loins tremble continually (RSV)

The quotation is introduced with καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει where καὶ denotes the link with the previous quotation (Deut. 29:4 and Isa. 19:10). There is not much deviation from the Septuagint. Paul's inclusion of αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἰς θήραν, and the change from ἀνταπόδοσιν to ἀνταπόδομα do not introduce any significant changes to the quotation. Hence, they should be attributed to Paul.

ixxi

6.10 The Social Function of Deut. 29:4, Isa. 29:10, and Ps. 68:23–24 in Rom. 11:8-10

Though these quotations differ, the connecting factor among them is the use of "eyes" that cannot see. This is usually referred to as "hardening," but a more accurate translation would be "insensibility" induced by a spirit of stupor. The group in focus here is the non-Christ Judean group. This correlates with the idea that this group has stumbled because they do not understand Christ as the τέλος (end) of the law (Rom. 9:31-33; Rom. 10:4). This concept of insensibility prepares Paul for the continuing use of the stumbling image in Rom. 11:11 (Wagner 2019:263). We know from Rom. 9:33 that Christ is the stumbling stone, and this further connects to the use of Ps. 69:22-23, which was read in the light of Christ as a passion narrative in the early church (Gadenz 2009:237; Wagner 2002:259-261; Hays 1989:141).

In the original context, Deut. 29:4 is used as part of the curses pronounced on the Israelites under the law. The use of Isa. 29:10 further elaborates on the meaning of Deut. 29:4. However, it is unlikely that Paul uses these quotations to rain down curses on the Judeans of his day. It is more likely than not that Paul wanted these quotations to be analogous to describing the situation of the Israelites of his time and to be able to propose a ray of hope amidst their present gloom.

Isaiah 29:10 is part of Isaiah 29:16, which Paul has used in Rom. 9:20 earlier to introduce the imagery of the potter and the clay, vis-à-vis the vessels for honour and dishonour (Wright 2002:677). The identity of these vessels becomes more explicit in Rom. 11:7, when Paul distinguishes between the insensible/hardened Judeans and the remnant Judeans. It is, therefore, the vessels of dishonour that are analogous to the insensible non-Christ Judeans in Rom. 11:7-10, hence in need of salvation.

Is there any hope for these non-Christ, insensible Judeans? These quotations do not explicitly affirm whether this state of insensibility is permanent or not. Instead, Paul takes

that further in the next stage of his argument. This allows Paul to explain when the insensitivity will end and to clarify the purpose behind this insensitivity in relation to the non-Judean Christ group. However, the use of διὰ παντὸς in Rom. 11:10 is better translated as "continually" instead of "forever" (Cranfield 1964:550). In contrast to Cranfield, Wright (2002:678) argues that there is no salvation for ethnic Judeans and that "all Israel" in Rom. 11:26 does not refer to ethnic Judeans but to the church comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans. Wright's position is motivated by replacement theology, but this is unlikely to be Paul's argument.

We propose that this state of insensibility will continue and is not about to end in Paul's day, as reinforced by a similar expression in 2 Cor. 3:14-15. Here, Paul says that the minds of the Judeans are hardened until this day (ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας), veiled upon their reading of the old covenant, and that this veil can only be taken away through Christ. Paul goes further, saying that until today (ἕως σήμερον), when Moses is read, the veil remains on their hearts. This implies that Paul does not envision this situation as having reached its conclusion and is about to end (Esler 2003:295), nor does Paul assume that some of the hardened Judeans would not turn to Christ during his time.

In Rom. 11:9, Paul cites David using the metaphor of "their table," which has become a snare, a trap, and a retribution to the Israelites. The table, in the context of the Eucharist, is fundamental to understanding the identity and practice of the early Christ-followers. Feeley-Harnik (2017:107-149) outlines the sacredness of the eucharistic table, which was often a point of dispute in Judean-non-Judean interactions. Reference to the table is the refusal of the Judeans to dine with non-Judeans, which symbolises their failure to accept them into God's scheme of salvation. Consequently, it becomes their snare, their trap, their pit, and their retribution. The idea that this table can be served and simultaneously become a snare to the Israelites reflects the complexity of the formation and interaction among

members of the Christ group. Paul's warning indicates that the same source of unity could also be a cause for division, creating boundaries that echo the historical animosity between 'Jews and Gentiles' (Kruse 2019:77-92). Among the early Christ-group, exclusion practices showed significant implications for Christ-followers. The ritualistic compliance, or its lack, was a remarkable barrier that hindered the establishment of a cohesive identity (Moxon 2022a:62-91). Some Judean Christ-followers who adhere rigorously to the Mosaic law often consider their customs integral to their identity, leading to the potential marginalisation of non-Judeans who lack these traditions (Simon 2022:89-112). However, as Keown (2021:471-474) suggests, God's mission is undermined when the ritual serves as a means of exclusion rather than inclusion, a challenge that Paul addresses. The context of Rom. 11:9 underscores the existential threat posed by this metaphorical table snare and trap of the Israelites, suggesting that the same practices intended to support the superordinate identity in Christ could ultimately lead to the promotion of ethnic sub-identities. This dynamic is illuminated by Runesson (2016:17-42), who discusses how common borders, often established through ritualistic observance, can lead to the exclusion of others within the community. This underlines the need for an understanding of the grace that transcends ritualistic observance (Missler 2015; Davidiy 2015), like the Gentiles, identified as "wild olive sprouts," are grafted into the cultivated tree of Israel, meaning their full acceptance (Luff 2019). This table snare forms part of the expression of the hardened Israelites' insensibility, and it hinders the framework of grace identity that Paul is attempting to construct.

Another important theme that is worth exploring as part of the social dimension of this insensibility or hardening of this non-Christ Judean group is jealousy in Rom. 11:11-15. We have affirmed in this thesis that the Judean insensibility is toward Christ as the end of the law. This is because they do not seek God's way of righteousness. While this is true, it does not explain why it affects the group formation of Paul's audience, which comprises both

Judeans and non-Judeans. As already argued earlier in this thesis, the Judeans are not only insensible to Christ and the gospel but also to the inclusion and belonging of the non-Judeans in the outworking of God's righteousness. They are insensible to the fact that the non-Judeans have been granted access to privileges they assumed were their ethnic privilege alone (Watson 2004:448). They are insensible to the fact that the non-Judeans are also meant to be joint carriers of God's mission to the world. If my propositions are true, this would have looked like a displacement of or competition with the Judeans for their ethnic rights, privilege and position (Rom. 9:1-5). Suppose God is the divine patron of the Judeans (already mentioned earlier), and they are bound to him in covenantal rights, blessings, status, land, etc. In that case, it makes sense that the Judeans would perceive this as a social disruption and an intrusion into their group. They might have even thought of God betraying them. Now, we can understand why there may have been a social conflict between the Judean Christ group and the non-Judean Christ group, as well as between the Judean remnant Christ group and the non-Christ group among the Judeans. The insensible Christ group may have felt betrayed by the remnant Christ group for accepting the non-Judeans to belong to their group. All these factors contribute to the social explanation of the hardening of some Judeans, rather than just the rejection of the gospel. These ideas will help us explore the jealousy motif that Paul repeats in Rom. 11:11-15.

In conclusion, the function of these quotations is more social than theological. As suggested above, Paul likely uses them to identify and categorise the group that is hardened and consequently in need of salvation. He does so with social narrative and memory by citing scriptures that are analogous to the situation of the non-Christ Judean insensible group so that they can find themselves in this narrative and be invited to believe in Christ. To achieve this, Paul divides the Judean group into two groups: the Judean Christ group (remnant) and the non-Christ Judean group. It is this non-Christ Judean group that needs salvation, and we shall

seek to bolster this further in Rom. 11:26. In resolving social conflict, it is better to use a social narrative to locate the situation of the conflicting groups than to confront the problem directly. This is likely what Paul is doing as a leader seeking to resolve conflict among his audience and effect a change. Otherwise, Paul will lose them, and the conflict will continue to escalate.

6.11 The Stumbling of the Judeans and the Salvation of the Non-Judeans (Rom. 11:11-15)

> **11** So I ask, have they stumbled so as to fall? By no means! But through their trespass salvation has come to the Gentiles, so as to make Israel jealous. **12** Now if their trespass means riches for the world, and if their failure means riches for the Gentiles, how much more will their full inclusion mean! **13** Now I am speaking to you Gentiles. Inasmuch then as I am an apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify my ministry **14** in order to make my fellow Jews jealous and thus save some of them. **15** For if their rejection means the reconciliation of the world, what will their acceptance mean but life from the dead? (RSV)

Paul's affirmation that Israel has not fallen out permanently hinges on a pair of questions in Rom. 11:11, which were asked earlier in Rom. 11:1, introduced by "I ask, then" (λέγω οὖν), to which he supplies his unmistakable answer, "By no means!" (μὴ γένοιτο).

God has only put some blocks in their path so that they would stumble (ἔπταισαν); their progress has been impeded, but not to fall (πέσωσιν) out of the race. There seems to be a progression from stumbling to falling. One may stumble but get up to continue the race, and another may fall and lie on the ground (Schmidt 1968:45). Paul is convinced that the former is the case with the hardened Judeans. Spencer articulates it like this: "Have they stumbled to become stuck? Or have they faltered to fall? In any case, the answer is a resounding "No"! Currently obstructed, non-Christ Judeans are not disqualified from the race; they may be

ixxi

down, but they are by no means out" (Scott 2006).

Instead, their transgression has paved the way for the salvation of the non-Judeans (11:11), by making the Judeans jealous (παραζηλῶσαι). Paul insists that through the trespass of the Judeans, salvation has come to the non-Judeans to make Israel jealous (Rom. 11:11), casting Judean unbelief as the very means by which God extends mercy to the nations and simultaneously provokes his own people to come to faith in the Messiah. This divine tactic mirrors the divine self-description, "I the Lord your God am a jealous God" (Exod. 20:5; 34:14), and echoes Moses' oracle, "I will provoke you to jealousy by a nation that is no nation" (Deut. 32:21), which Paul previously cites in Rom. 10:19 to frame Gentile inclusion as God's corrective strategy. In this way, Gentile salvation both displays God's universal mercy. Also, it functions as an instrument of divine jealousy designed to reclaim Israel from unbelief and incorporate both Judeans and non-Judeans into one Christ group. The stumbling of some Judeans, which facilitates the salvation of non-Judeans, may be linked to the vicarious suffering-servant role of Israel and her Messiah on behalf of all nations (Nanos, 1996). Hays argues this way:

> If Paul can write in Galatians that Jesus became a curse for us in order that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the non-Judeans (Gal 3:13), he can say in Romans 11 something remarkably similar about the Judean role in the drama of salvation. The Judeans are undergoing rejection for the sake of the non-Judeans, bearing suffering vicariously (Hays 2017).

While this may be theologically plausible, the goal in Paul's mind would probably have been to use this theological reflection to resolve the socio-ethnic crisis among Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ in Rome. My argument is that Paul is attempting to promote the non-ethnic Christ group and unite Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers by explaining to them the outworking of God's salvation plan, which is not marked by ethnicity, and how both

groups have their belonging in this plan. Paul argues that the Judean stumbling has slowed the eschatological clock, giving time for the non-Judeans to participate and enjoy their share of the riches (Spencer 2006). In early Jewish apocalyptic literature, it was commonly believed that the repentance and restoration of Israel were the climax of history (Hanson 1975:115; Collins 1998:22–24). This means that if and when "all Israel" accepts God's plan and God's Messiah, then the goal has been reached, and the opportunity for non-Judean salvation will be closed (Johnson 1989). Donaldson affirms the same in his article on Israel's rejection (Donaldson 1993). In a sense, if all the Judeans had received the offer of God's kingdom from Christ, then the non-Judeans would have no riches left to pursue, an example of limited good in the community. Consequently, Paul's ministry as an apostle to the non-Judeans would have been unnecessary (Rom. 11:13). God's tripping of many Judeans extends the salvation plan long enough for the non-Judeans to catch up (Dunn 1998). The Judeans' temporal disqualification is meant to open the righteousness of faith to the non-Judeans more fully and freely. However, God will not leave the hardened Judeans in this state permanently, as their stumbling triggers the non-Judeans' participation in God's plan, so also will the participation of the non-Judeans now stimulate the hardened Judeans' restoration to the salvation plan of God, by making them jealous" (Rom. 11:11, 14; 10:19).

How exactly will this jealousy work out concerning the salvation of the hardened Judeans? What is the object of jealousy that will provoke the hardened Judeans? Commentators differ in their perspectives on how the non-Judeans will provoke the Judeans to envy. Jewett expresses his concerns in this way: "Since Jewish legalists viewed the early Christian proclamation as heretical, no satisfactory explanation has ever been given to explain why they would have been "jealous" when the non-Judeans accepted this allegedly mistaken doctrine (Jewett 2007). Many scholars adopt the "no-yes-yes" schema of Johannes Munck, that the Judeans have responded 'no' to the gospel, which has led the non-Judeans to

say ‘yes,’ which will later cause the Judeans to say ‘yes’ (Munck 1967). This interpretation assumes that the verb παραζηλοῦν (provoke to jealousy) is ‘negative’ in Rom. 10.19 and ‘positive’ (persuade to emulation) in Rom. 11.11, 14. Some commentators, such as Wright (1994), Garlington (1994:39), Moo (1996), and Watson (2004), suggest that the object of jealousy is a gift of eschatological blessings that non-Judeans have received through faith in Christ. Others, such as Lincicum (2010:149, 164), Longenecker (1989:95-123), and Dodd (1946), propose that the object of jealousy is the salvation of the non-Judeans through faith. Nanos does not believe it is the salvation of non-Judeans. Rather, it is Paul’s ministry he magnifies that he expects to provoke some of his “fellow countrymen” to jealousy when the non-Judeans come to the obedience of faith (Rom. 1:5; 15:15-18) (Nanos 1996). The notion of Nanos is unlikely correct in this context of jealousy because Paul’s ministry is not what the Judeans are given, provoking jealousy among the non-Judeans. This obedience of faith (Longenecker 2016:870) from among the non-Judeans is nothing less than their faith in Christ, which entails more than mere ‘belief’ or ‘mental assent.’ Still, it encompasses the Christian’s new way of life led by the Spirit (Miller 2000). Nevertheless, there are those, such as Aletti (2011), Schuhmacher (1994), and Baker (2005), who do not see any link between the jealousy motif and the salvation of the Judeans. Räisänen argues that the jealousy motif serves an apologetic function among Judean Christ-followers but does not contribute to Paul’s missionary effort (Räisänen 1988:176-206). Spencer argues that the idea that the Judeans will become jealous of the divine blessings that non-Judeans have at the expense of the Judeans, thereby provoking them to jealousy in an attempt to acquire the blessings of non-Judeans may be an oversimplified one (Spencer 2006). He further argues that the phenomenon may induce a sense of inferiority complex among the Judeans, which he considers absurd (Spencer 2006).

Contrary to Spencer’s view above, this is precisely how the jealousy motif is meant to

function. It will stir the Judeans to lay hold on the honour that rightfully belongs to them, which the non-Judeans enjoy during the Judeans' stumbling. Therefore, the most plausible object of jealousy that will provoke the Judeans is the salvation of the non-Judeans (Rom. 11:11). Jealousy affects self-esteem, so we can assume that the Judeans will be provoked to do what God wants. Nevertheless, suppose the Judeans felt inferior to non-Judeans; Paul would soon remind them via the olive analogy that the reverse is the case; they are superior to the non-Judeans because they were first called.

Despite all these helpful contributions from commentators about the jealousy motif, the issue is often not articulated clearly: the intended outcome or social impact of this motif. In this regard, it is helpful to delineate "being jealous" from being "provoked to jealousy," the latter being the case for Israel. Most commentators address the outputs, the fact that the non-Judeans are now admitted into the eschatological blessings, salvation, and belonging in the people of God, therefore provoking the Judeans to jealousy. Some commentators even suggest that jealousy could arouse the anger and wrath of the Judeans against the non-Judeans. This is plausible, but it is more likely than not that this was Paul's intention for the motif of jealousy. Instead, Paul uses jealousy in a positive sense (Lappenga 2016). Jeong (2018:161-176) explores the views of Paul's contemporaries, Philo and Josephus, and argues that the non-Judeans provoke the Judeans to emulation through their Torah observance, enabled by the Spirit. According to David Lincicum (2010), Paul teaches that 'true circumcision is an eschatological state determined by the Spirit that enables one to fulfil the law.' While this interpretation may be plausible, it contradicts Paul's argument about the law in 10:4; Christ terminates it. Aletti, on the other hand, argues that even if the jealousy motif were positive and meant to drive the Judeans toward the law, it would drive them away from Christ (Aletti 2011). Unlike these views mentioned, we argue that the jealousy motif is meant to drive them to Christ and to embrace the new Christ group comprising Judeans and non-

Judeans, whose boundary will be non-ethnic, though their ethnicities are not eradicated.

But what social impact do these changes have on the Judeans in relation to the non-Judeans? We must assess the social implications for the Judeans in light of the problem Paul raised in Rom. 10:2-3. The first is zeal (righteous jealousy) without knowledge, meaning that they sought after their rightful honour in God's salvation plan, but without knowledge. God's self-revelation to them about his salvation plan relates to this rightful honour. Additionally, the role of the Judeans includes the responsibility of participating in God's mission alongside the non-Judeans (Gen. 12:2-3). At the heart of the Judeans' role is to accept non-Judeans into God's salvation (Rom. 1:16-17) and, together, form a united, non-ethnic community of God's people, embodying God's salvation plan. In this, the Judeans have failed. Therefore, the social impact on them is a restoration and renewal that will provoke them to "accept and participate" alongside the non-Judeans in God's salvation. This was Paul's intended social outcome among the hardened Judeans. The result goes beyond the idea that the hardened Judeans will seek her rightful honour (output) or emulate the non-Judeans (another output). The hardened Judeans will return to God's intended participation with the non-Judeans in God's salvation plan. They would redirect their zeal toward a combined effort and healthy competition with non-Judeans to advance God's salvation purposes (Spencer 2006). For this to happen, the hardened Judeans would seek Christ for God's righteousness, not the law, desisting from teaching the non-Judeans to do the same (Rom. 10:3-4; 2:17-29). This can only happen through the humility of the Judeans, their non-insistence on ethnic privileges or merits, and their submission to God's sovereignty to work out his plan. The Judeans must embrace the non-Judeans as part of their shared membership in the group that follows Christ.

Paul turns to the non-Judeans, saying, "Now I am speaking to you non-Judeans. Since I am an apostle to the non-Judeans, I magnify my ministry to make my fellow Judeans

jealous and thus save some of them (Rom. 11:13-14). The phrase διακονίαν μου δοξάζω represents Paul's assertion of honour regarding his ministry and its influence on the non-Judeans, particularly because many of them have turned to Christ. This is quite significant because they have gained something that was Israel's prerogative, and this would provoke Israel to jealousy to lay hold of what rightly is theirs. The joint participation and belonging in this new, non-ethnic Christ group are at the heart of Paul's ministry.

Furthermore, this does not mean that Paul was writing primarily to non-Judeans (Thiessen 2016:43–72); instead, it should be read as a shift in focus to the non-Judeans among his mixed audience, which comprised both Judeans and non-Judeans.

He did not want the non-Judeans to think that all his efforts so far were aimed at sorting out the Judeans. Instead, Paul wanted to admonish non-Judeans not to look down on the Judeans in their temporal stumbling. If the non-Judeans believed they were superior to the Judeans, Paul would soon remind them, through the olive analogy, that they were inferior to the Judeans. Paul wanted them to know that, despite his ministry's focus on the non-Judeans, he hoped God would use it to get the Judeans back on track in the race through the jealousy motif. By doing so, he maintains his identity with his fellow co-ethnics, as he has established ethnic belonging with them in Rom. 9:1-5; 10:1-2; 11:12. According to Esler, "his heart lies with Israel and not with foreigners" (Esler 2003:269). We catch a glimpse of this as Paul used the Israelites' designation (έθνος) of the non-Judeans, not their self-designation as "Greeks" (Rom. 1:14, 16; 2:9, 10; 3:9;10:12). The non-Judeans are not in charge; God has only given them their opportune moment in the salvation plan, along with the Judeans. Roetzel (1999:129) puts it this way, "In the ultimate path of God's people to salvation, no one (or group) must lose for others to win—a 'preposterous game plan." Again, he says, Paul argued that the eschatological pathway differs significantly from traditional athletic events, combining the rules of the game and popular understanding. Winners do not require losers.

ixxi

The gentile prize does not require that Israel endure its loss in shame, nor do Israel's laurels leave the Gentiles empty and wanting (Roetzel 1999). Israel's rejection is the reconciliation of the world; their acceptance is likened to the resurrection of the dead (11:15).

He moves from the remnant as proof of future salvation of the non-Christ insensible Judean group and evidence that God has not rejected them to consider that there is hope of future salvation for these insensible Judeans (Rom. 11:25-26). Paul argues that the destinies of both the Judeans and the non-Judeans are mutually connected. He does not quote scriptures, but he returns to the jealousy motif, which is taken from Deut. 32:21 in Rom. 10:19; therefore, it is essential to pay some attention to this section.

The rhetorical question that triggers the argument in this section is in Rom. 11:11, where Paul asks if the stumbling of these insensible Judeans means a permanent fall for them. Paul's response affirms that these insensible Judeans have not fallen permanently; rather, the purpose of their temporary stumbling is to bring salvation to the non-Judeans so that the insensible Judean group will be made jealous.

Before looking at the jealousy motif again, we must discuss the two verbs πταίω and πίπτω used in Rom. 11:11. In the process of describing the formation of the Christ group, Paul uses these verbs as identity descriptors of the hardened Israelites, whom he will later argue will belong to the Christ group when they are finally saved. πίπτω suggests a more complete fall, a theological and spiritual decline, particularly in the context of Israel's rejection of the Gospel. It means to fall (Mt. 15:27, Lk. 10:18; to fall), fall prostrate, fall down (Mt. 17:6; 18:29; Lk. 17:16), fall down dead (Lk. 21:24), to fall, fall (Mt. 7:25, 27; Lk. 11:17), become null and void, fall to the ground (Lk. 16:17), fall into a worse state (Rev. 2:5), come to ruin (Rom. 11:11; Heb. 4:11), and fall into sin (Rom. 11:22; 1 Cor. 10:2). Paul indicates that through their disobedience and the inability to recognize Jesus as the Messiah, some Israelites have "fallen," leading to a temporary hardening of their hearts (Rom. 11: 7).

This is fundamental because it describes the idea that the fall of Israel has a double purpose within divine sovereignty. However, πταίω indicates a more specific act of stumbling. It is an intransitive verb meaning to stumble, to stagger, to fall, to make a false step, to err, to transgress (Rom. 11:11; Jas. 2:10;3:2), to fail of an object (2 Pet. 1:1). It describes a common failure in grasping the fullness of God's revelation in Christ. Ben-Abba et al. (2019) argue that modern writers suggest a human tendency to deal with personal and collective stumbling with an intrinsic recognition of the need for hope amid despair. Similarly, Paul states that while some stumbled on the message of the cross, this stumbling was not an end in itself but a part of the redeemed plan of God (Rom. 11:11). Paul articulates this concept, suggesting that the "fall" of Israel allows a surprising openness of grace to the non-Judeans, which emphasises God's sovereignty in redemptive history (Owen 2018). Also, Morley and Delk (2009:117-134) suggest that there is a reflective process through which individuals evaluate their relationships and failures, allowing a deeper understanding of grace when false spiritual steps are taken. The complexity of historical interpretation within the context of Israel's narrative further complicates the understanding of these Greek terms. The scholarship surrounding Israel's identity in relation to divine favour faces a dialectical tension. As Sanders (2020) states, such tensions often result in dichotomous interpretations, demanding a commitment to the question of faith itself, whether perceived failures mark the end of divine promises or serve as fundamental lessons for future generations. The works of historians and theologians often illuminate the patterns of power, authority, and rebellion present in these biblical stories, which reinforces the narrative that the fall of Israel embodies the temporal oscillations and a potential final (Trattner 2019). Probably this is the reason Song (2004:104–5) translates Rom. 11:11a as “When they stumbled was their fall final?” Paul replies that such a thing cannot happen (μὴ γένοιτο).

In this segment, Paul attempts to combine the two motifs of insensibility (Isa. 29:10

and Deut. 29:4) and jealousy (Deut. 32:21, quoted in Rom. 10:19) as two paths to explain the temporal nature of the Judeans' stumbling and the future purpose that jealousy is meant to achieve. According to Paul, all these are being worked out by God, even in his acknowledgement of the Judean volitional responsibility (chapter 10).

As suggested earlier, the motifs of insensibility and jealousy have social implications. Esler (2003:296) argues that jealousy will provoke Israel's passionate concern for what she has lost- salvation, to which she has a prior claim and a desire to reclaim it now that she sees the inferior "others" attaining it. Therefore, these Israelites are not simply insensible to the gospel or to God's way of righteousness; they are also insensible to the fact that God's way of righteousness means the inclusion and belonging of the non-Judeans into God's community. This is symbolised in the mixed Judean/non-Judean table fellowship, especially in the Eucharist. Consequently, this means a shared and equal privilege of divine blessings and status (Wright 2013:1202; Barclay 2015:548; Nanos 2010:350).

As also argued earlier, this would have provoked jealousy from the insensible Judeans if they saw that these non-Judeans were competing with them for their resources and status in God's community. For example, if the non-Judean Christ-followers are seen having table fellowship with the Judean Christ-followers to whom they are not invited, this could provoke the insensible Judeans to jealousy. Additionally, suppose the non-Judean Christ-followers are seen claiming the covenant identity markers mentioned in Rom. 9:4-5, particularly sonship, glory, worship, and patriarchs. In that case, this might stir jealousy among the insensible Judeans, prompting them to reclaim their rightful status and identity markers. However, Paul does not outline the exact processes through which jealousy will practically lead these insensible non-Christ Judeans to salvation (Sanders 1983:198). He only affirms that some will be saved in the present through his ministry, and the rest (all Israel) will be saved later when the redeemer comes out of Zion (Rom. 11:26-27). It seems likely primarily that this

salvation would be connected to the outworking of the gospel (Baker 2005:471), but what will this look like? Some scholars cannot even imagine that jealousy might be the motivation for the salvation of the insensible non-Christ Judeans (Räisänen 1988:187).

So, what is the proof that this jealousy will lead the Judean, insensible, non-Christian group to recovery from their stumbling? Also, what does Paul believe will be the motivation, not the result, of this jealousy? The solution to this question may be found by paying closer attention to the social realities of Paul's context and audience. We have suggested earlier that jealousy has social realities in the ancient context of Paul. God is seen as the divine patron who has invited his people (Judeans) into an exclusive relationship with himself. This relationship requires absolute obedience from the Judeans, and in return, God guarantees His continued blessings upon them by upholding their exclusive status and its associated privileges. We have also suggested that the non-Judeans' access to the status and privileges of the Judeans would have instigated social conflict between the insensible non-Christ group and the non-Judean Christ group, as well as between the Judean Christ remnant and the insensible non-Christ Judean group.

Additionally, the debate about whether jealousy in this context is negative or positive (already discussed in Rom. 10:19) reflects the Western internalised understanding of jealousy. Some scholars have even argued that jealousy is intended to prompt the Judeans to emulate the non-Judeans (Koch 1986:281; Bell 1994:43), thereby achieving a positive outcome. On the contrary, Villareal (2022:9) argues that nominal and verbal attestations of jealousy may include affective emotion. Therefore, it is risky to understand jealousy solely as an internal state. Internalising jealousy may lead the interpreter to overlook the social, economic, and juridical concerns conveyed in biblical passages about jealousy (Villareal 2022:9). She goes further to suggest that this "biblical jealousy is often used where there is conflict between two or more parties in some kind of relationship" (Villareal 2022:9). The conflicts stemming from

jealousy reveal the essential social roles and expectations within the Israelite groups.

However, the existence of these conflicts does not directly explain Paul's confidence that these insensible non-Christ Judeans will be saved, although they may be motivated to claim what rightly belongs to them. Some scholars who argue for the metaphor of the Greek footrace in Rom. 11:11-14 have suggested that since the non-Judeans have run ahead of the Judeans and have reached the finish line ahead of them, this might be the motivation for the insensible Judeans to regain their zeal and run toward the goal (Stowers 1994:316; Wagner 2002:267). While the footrace metaphor is a plausible interpretation of Rom. 11:11-14, Paul does not explicitly explain the salvation of the insensible non-Christ Judeans in light of this footrace metaphor.

Suppose my earlier suggestions are correct about the Judean exclusive status and privilege under their divine patron (God). In that case, it is likely that the realisation of the implications of a breakdown in this relationship motivates the Judean zeal or jealousy. The Judeans would have been well aware that the lack of exclusive loyalty in this covenant relationship with God would make either party jealous. Also, they would have been aware that when they are disloyal to God, he brings cursing on them. He also relocates their blessings toward their enemies, sometimes temporarily letting Israel's enemies take over the land and its blessings (Deuteronomy 28). It is, therefore, likely that Paul assumes that the non-Judean inclusion and their blessing in God's mission could be interpreted by the insensible non-Christ Judeans as a sign of arousal of God's discipline through their disobedience. However, Paul would also have believed that this inclusion was always God's plan. The implication of this broken relationship and its associated consequences for the non-Christ insensible Judeans is what I suggest might be Paul's confidence in the motivation for jealousy and zeal that will bring the insensible, non-Christ Judeans to restoration. This motivation, linked to their relationship with God, is more compelling than the competition

from non-Judeans for the status and blessings of the Judeans. However, these things also trigger jealousy in any social group.

Maybe this is the reason why Paul uses the ἔπταισαν (root-πταίω), which means to stumble, in connection with πέσωσιν (root-πίπτω), meaning to fall, and then connects these with παραπτώματι (root- παράπτωμα), which implies transgression or misstep (Oesterreicher 1961:322), and ἥττημα (failure, v. 12). Paul denies that the Judean stumbling leads to a fall beyond recovery. However, he links both imageries to the transgression and failure of the Judeans. The use of transgression and failure denotes that something has gone wrong with the exclusive loyalty of these Judeans to God. Hence, it is described as a temporary stumbling. However, God's purpose in the stumbling of the Judeans is not that they should fall beyond recovery, but that salvation should go to the non-Judeans (Gadenz 2009:239).

Therefore, when the motifs of jealousy and stumbling are considered in the light of social implications, they are seen to be connected, which might be the reason Paul makes the connection. So, Kujanpää (2019:237) misses this point when he suggests that Paul uses the motifs of jealousy and stumbling disjointly as alternate ways to describe the paths to God's plan of salvation. Instead, they should be read as different but interconnected motifs leading toward the same path of salvation for the insensible non-Christ Judeans, when the social implications are taken seriously.

At this stage, Paul offers two elements of the Israelites' current condition. First, some among the Israelites have stumbled. This opened a way for 'Gentiles' to come in, which he describes in Rom. 11:12 as "riches for the world." Then, in Rom. 11:15, Israel's temporary stumbling also brought reconciliation to the world. Paul hoped that the new availability of these riches for Gentiles would rouse a sense of fervour among his kinsmen so that they, too, would become convinced by the gospel.

Another important word that needs an explanation is salvation (σωτηρία). It appears

to be a reality in the present which will be fulfilled in the eschatological future (Foerster et al 1971:992). To prove that this σωτηρία is not just a future phenomenon, Paul affirms that this provocation to jealousy is also due to his ministry among the non-Judeans in the present. The purpose of this provocation to jealousy is so that some of the insensible non-Christ Judeans might be saved (Rom. 11:14).

Here again, in vv. 13-14, we see how Paul affirms his kinsmen. He claims that his ministry to the 'Gentiles' would make some of his kinsmen jealous and consequently save them. This is Paul's way of showing his salient identity in this situation by affirming his love for his ethnic kinsfolk. He hopes that his ministry will inspire jealousy so that some may be saved. Paul's language of affection for fellow ethnic Judeans is profound.

Gadenz (2009:249) is right in his point of categorisation here, that those who are to be made jealous and thus saved (καὶ σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν) refer to two different groups of people (11:14). One group of Judeans is being saved through the mission of Paul to join the remnant, while the others (hardened ones) are those who are provoked to jealousy and will be saved in the eschaton (Gadenz 2009:249). Therefore, Paul assumes that the jealousy motif in his ministry will result in two groups of Judeans among the hardened Judeans. The group that remains insensible despite ongoing jealousy will be saved when the deliverer comes out of Zion (11:26).

So, God is using the non-Judean Christ group as a tool of jealousy against the insensible non-Christ Judean group, not just by including the non-Judeans into the community of God's people, but God is also working out his mission among these non-Judeans. It is by Paul's conducting God's mission to the non-Judean Christ group that some of the insensible non-Christ Judeans will also be stirred to jealousy and will be saved. Paul could imagine how great it would be when these insensible Judeans were restored to their mission (Rom. 11:12, 15). Aletti (2009:221) makes a similar case, but he goes off track to

ixxi

suggest that the function of the jealousy motif in Rom. 10:19 is different from its function in Romans 11. He agrees that the jealousy motif in Deut. 32:21, cited in Rom. 10:19, functions as God's judgement on the Judeans, but not so in chapter 11. There is no reason the jealousy motif does not function similarly in chapters 10 and 11. It is the internalised reading of jealousy that disconnects it from its social meaning and implications. It is therefore likely that the jealousy motif has the same function in both chapters 10 and 11.

In Rom. 11:11:15, Paul continues to explain the purpose of the stumbling of the insensible Judeans, as well as its consequences under their divine patron, God. So, he argues that their temporal rejection or discarding (Moo 1996:693) by God is divinely orchestrated by God as an opportunity for the reconciliation of the world. This is a "divine exchange" language that is similar to Rom. 5:10, used by Hooker (2016: 49-62,69), where Paul says that God gave Jesus Christ up to death to reconcile the world to himself. The salvation of the world is almost contingent upon the restoration of the insensible Judeans, which consequently is almost aligned with the general resurrection at the eschaton.

We see that in ancient contexts, jealousy is an emotion that has social implications. It is not only meant to provoke the insensible Judeans to what rightly belongs to them but, more importantly, to provoke them to the understanding that the non-Judeans have a claim to what the Judeans consider to be their ethnic privilege. This is because jealousy is usually triggered when exclusivity over status or belonging is betrayed. Beyond this, Paul is also using the jealousy motif to sensitize the insensible non-Christ Judeans to the implications of a broken relationship with their divine patron due to betrayal of exclusive obedience and loyalty to God so that they may be saved. Paul likely hopes that all these would motivate some to recover from stumbling, but the others will be saved when the deliverer comes out of Zion (11:25-26).

6.12 Images: Firstfruits and Whole Batch, Root, and Branches (Rom. 11:16)

Rom. 11:16 If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches (RSV).

Paul uses 11:16 as a bridge between the past and the future, in relation to his argument for the hope of future salvation for the insensible Judeans, leading into the next segment of his argument (vv. 17-24). He uses the images above to convey a message rather than a discursive argument (Esler 2003:298); the message is that of the holiness of the Judeans, which begins with a small beginning and culminates in a final consummation, also encompassing the holiness that extends from one (Abraham) to many (all Judeans).

It is best to identify the firstfruits (ἀπαρχή) as the remnant of the Judean Christ group in the present time, which represents the hope of salvation for all Judeans in the future. Otten (2019:83-104) postulates that the concept of "primitive" metaphorically represents God's loyalty towards the Jewish remnant who has embraced Christ. He emphasises the importance of this concept in elucidating God's ongoing relationship with Israel, particularly in light of the question of divine fidelity (Otten 2019:83-104). This perspective aligns with Paul's broader narrative, as outlined in Romans 9-11, in which the remnant emerges as a sign of hope rather than despair. Nanos (2021:147-176) expands on this idea, highlighting that the concept of "primitive" signifies the preservation of a faithful remnant within Israel. He argues that current Jewish believers symbolise a divine promise of salvation that extends not only to them but, most importantly, to all of Israel. Nanos states that understanding the "first fruits" in this context underlines a theological bridge between the past pact with Israel and the Pauline vision of future inclusion for all Jews (Nanos 2021:147-176)).

Kelderman (2021:71-85) provides an exhaustive examination of the interpretive implications associated with the remnant in Rom. 11:16. He suggests that by identifying Jewish believers as the "first fruits," Paul effectively reinforces the idea that these individuals are pioneers of a more inclusive salvation narrative. This is essential to understanding how Paul positions the Jewish faith within the broader context of the Christian community, which

suggests a future in which "all Israel will be saved" (Kelderman 2021:71-85). When examining the theological reflections of Gregory of Nyssa, Zachhuber (2018) illustrates how the notion of "first" transcends mere theological nomenclature, embodying a salvific paradigm that reveals the general redemption of human nature. By linking this concept to the broader implications of Paul's thought, the remnant can be seen not only as a current reality but also as an omen of universal salvation yet to be fully realised (Kelderman 2021). This redeeming arch is vital to understanding the lasting nature of God's promise to Israel. Through several academic lenses, it becomes apparent that the present Jewish remnant of Christ's believers acts not only as a symbol of God's lasting promise but also as an omen of a more inclusive future for all Israel when salvation is fully realised (Cranford 1993:27-41).

A similar analogy is found in 1 Cor. 15:20–23, where the resurrection of Christ represents the firstfruits of eschatological salvation of the body. Also, in Rom. 8:23, Paul teaches that the Spirit is the firstfruits representing the future consummation of the redemption of the body. Some other scholars argue that firstfruits depict the patriarchs (Gale 1964:205-209). Others suggest that it represents Christ (Barth 1957:285; Rengstorf 1978:128-135).

About the "root," we agree with Gadenz (2009:260), who interprets the "root" to mean Abraham and the patriarchs (Penna 2006:358). He also suggests the possibility of a mixed interpretation of images of both first fruits as remnant and root as Abraham and the Patriarchs (Lietzmann 1933:104; Leenhardt 1995:161-162; Dunn 1987:659; Fitzmyer 1993:614).

Recalling that remnant is represented as the "seed" of Abraham and Isaac (Rom. 9:7-8-8:27, 29), this concept of mixed interpretation should not be an anomaly in Romans 9-11. Therefore, it can be interpreted to mean that if the remnant is holy, then the patriarchs are also holy, or vice versa. If the root is holy, then the firstfruits are holy as well. Consequently, the

Judeans are holy. Therefore, the 'first fruit' image representing the remnant appears to symbolise the bridge (seed) from the past (patriarchs) to the future salvation of the Judeans, which will include non-Judeans who would gain access to the blessing of Abraham through faith in Christ. It is worth remembering that Paul initially hinted that this remnant (the seed of Abraham) includes non-Judeans (Rom. 9:24-26, 30-33). Now the stage is set for the olive tree metaphor.

6.13 The Olive Tree Metaphor (Rom. 11:17-24)

> **17** But if some of the branches were broken off, and you, a wild olive shoot, were grafted in their place to share the richness[a] of the olive tree, **18** do not boast over the branches. If you do boast, remember it is not you that support the root, but the root that supports you. **19** You will say, "Branches were broken off so that I might be grafted in." **20** That is true. They were broken off because of their unbelief, but you stand fast only through faith. So do not become proud but stand in awe. **21** For if God did not spare the natural branches, neither will he spare you. **22** Note then the kindness and the severity of God: severity toward those who have fallen, but God's kindness to you, provided you continue in his kindness; otherwise you too will be cut off. **23** And even the others, if they do not persist in their unbelief, will be grafted in, for God has the power to graft them in again. **24** For if you have been cut from what is by nature a wild olive tree, and grafted, contrary to nature, into a cultivated olive tree, how much more will these natural branches be grafted back into their own olive tree.

Paul begins the section with a rich metaphor to continue his message about the priority of the Judeans in relation to the inclusion of non-Judeans in the people of God. In both ancient and modern times, branches from cultivated olives are grafted onto wild olive trees. The picture here is the reverse of this. It is almost the 'barbarianization' of the cultivated olive tree, a

ixxi

negative image that must be considered (Esler 2003:298-305). Gale (1964) suggests that Paul's use of metaphor is always subordinate to Paul's thought and has limited scope. However, Paul's use of metaphor is always intended to convey a message that reflects his thoughts, which can also be linked to an intellectual argument that supports the message he wants to convey.

He begins with two metaphors that illustrate the concept of holiness, depicting its development from a small beginning to final consummation. Rom. 11:16, 'If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump, and if the root is holy, so are the 'branches". He uses this argument to illustrate the current relationship between the Judeans and the inclusion of non-Judeans, with a view to the future that he will later propose at the end of this chapter. We must not immediately equate the holiness here with the holiness that characterises the Judeans; this must be related to the holiness of their patriarchs, such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and, much later, Christ, their Messiah. According to Zuck (1994:30), "the principle is that what is considered first contributes its character to what is related to it."

Paul now shifts to the metaphor of the olive tree, explicitly focusing on the Judean followers of Christ mentioned in verses 17-24. The illustration depicts a specified root that grows to become a cultivated olive tree, from which some natural branches have been removed to allow for the grafting of wild shoots. These natural branches removed refer to the insensible Judeans who have not believed in Christ, while the wild shoots refer to the non-Judeans who have also believed in Christ. The passage conjures the image of a root (11:16) and a trunk, with some branches remaining after others have been cut off. Wild olives are grafted onto this tree, resulting in a tree with prominent, distinctive features, partly Judean and partly non-Judean. Paul attempts to categorise the community of Christ by advocating a common group identity (a tree) that is not determined by ethnicity but does not eradicate it (Esler 2003). He wants to clarify that there is one Christ group (the tree), but the members (the branches)

differ in their characteristics. The distinctiveness of the members of the Christ group cannot be annulled; each has a specific sub-identity, yet Paul calls them to a common superordinate identity in Christ. This position goes against Boyarin's view that the difference between the Judeans and non-Judeans has been erased (Boyarin 1994:13-38).

This engrafted olive tree analogy is Paul's way of warning the non-Judean Christ group against arrogance (11:18) and also telling Judean Christ-followers not to boast about their ethnic characteristics. Regarding the cause and purpose of this pruning, Paul explains that it results from the unfaithfulness and unbelief of some of the Judeans (Rom. 11:20, 23); however, he does not mention Christ at all in this chapter (Stendahl 1976), although he has done so in previous chapters. Although Paul does not provide full details, the purpose of this metaphor is related to Israel's unfaithfulness or unbelief, which is linked to a failure to recognise the Messiah and to participate in God's plan to incorporate non-Judeans into His salvation alongside the Judeans (11:17–19, 23–24). Paul has in mind the idea that the non-Judeans share in Israel's goodness (Donaldson 1997), not that they replace Israel (11:17). However, the

metaphor would have been unflattering, close to representing the barbarianization of the tree.

The Greco-Roman olive culture provides the context for this metaphor, and the pertinent question is whether Paul's metaphor aims to explain ancient Mediterranean agriculture. Some commentators believe that Paul is not keen about the olive tree but used it as a metaphor to disguise the realities he had in mind (Dodd 1932). Pansiot and Rebour (1961) describe the olive tree (11:17-ἐλαίας ἐλαίας) as comprising both the cultivated olive (11:24-καλλιέλαιος) and wild olive (11:17-ἀγριέλαιος). However, in modern times, grafting cultivated branches onto wild stock is the usual method to improve olive propagation (Forbes 1982:254-55). The reason is that wild olives are believed to have deep and extensive roots. systems for water intake and have greater disease resistance. On the other hand, branches

from cultivated olives yield the best fruit. Therefore, grafting cultivated olives onto wild olives gives the best of both worlds. Davies (1984) argues that the olive tree is a symbol of Greco-Roman culture, pride, prowess, and victory, against which the Romans measured their superiority over less sophisticated peoples, such as the Judeans. Judeans. Against this backdrop, Paul reversed the process to depict the Judeans as cultivated branches and the non-Judeans as wild and underprivileged ones. The non-Judeans must learn that they are only secure in God's grafting grace. If God did not spare the natural branches (insensible Judeans), he would also not spare them. To humble the non-Judeans further, Paul affirms that grafting the wild shoots (non-Judeans) onto cultivated roots (Judeans) is contrary to nature (11:24). Nevertheless, others suggest that Paul's metaphor reflects aspects of ancient Mediterranean oleiculture, in which trees that did not bear proper fruit could be rejuvenated and enhanced to produce more by grafting them with shoots from wild olives (Baxter and Zeisler 1985:25-32). Some commentators also project the cultivated olive tree (Israel) in a negative light in comparison to the wild olive (non-Judeans), as though the wild olives are meant to rejuvenate the cultivated olive (Bryan, 2000). Regarding ancient Mediterranean olive farming, two prominent writers, Columella and Theophrastus, present differing opinions that reflect the differences between Eastern and Western Mediterranean practices. Columella's view is the latter case, where an unproductive cultivated tree is made to yield more growth by grafting a wild olive scion into its trunk. As a result, the tree becomes more productive (*Res rustica* 5.9.16). This is not what Paul is describing here, but if it were a widespread practice, it would not make sense for Paul to deem it "against nature." Esler (2003:187-89; 103-24) argues that this conclusion is entirely opposed to Paul's emphasis on the richness of Israel's foundational root and the wild Gentiles' complete dependence on Israel's supporting root (11:18). On the other hand, Esler finds Theophrastus's different view more helpful to Paul's olive metaphor. Theophrastus reports that olive-growers customarily graft scions from domesticated (cultivated) olive varieties onto the rootstocks of wild olive trees to combine the

ixxi

former's superior fruit qualities with the latter's hardy vigour (Theophrastus 1916:369).

After comparing the writings of Columella and Theophrastus, both of whom wrote extensively about ancient Mediterranean grafting, Esler suggests that Paul and his non-Judean audience were aware of the Eastern Mediterranean practice of grafting a cultivated olive stock onto a wild olive (Esler 2003:302). However, Paul deliberately reverses this process to undermine the boastful pretensions of the non-Judeans in Rome (Esler 2003). He suggests that this reversal of it is, linked to Jer. 11:16 and Hos. 14:6. No wonder Paul describes the grafting in this metaphor as unnatural (11:24). Paul digresses from the accepted mode of practice in horticulture by describing the Judeans (stock) as cultivated olives and the non-Judeans (grafted branches) as wild olives. Doing this and knowing that his audience would understand that wild olives do not bear edible fruit was Paul's way of humbling the non-Judeans (11:18, 20) and explaining why this is contrary to nature. According to Davies (1984), Paul's representation of the non-Judeans as wild olives is a most forceful formal accusation of them. They would need to depend on the cultivated olives to be productive. Restoring cultivated olives would yield more, as wild olives do not contribute (Esler 2003:188-89). The non-Judeans are reminded that they have no grounds to boast over the Judeans, since they have received new life because of God's in-grafting power. They do not support the root. Instead, the root supports them (11:18). They are parasitic (Esler 2003:188-89) upon Israel's cultivated root. The roots have not been weakened because some natural branches have been broken off. It is even possible that Paul has in mind a redemptive function (God's suffering servant (Isa. 53:8,11) of the broken natural branches to create time, not space for 'wild country cousins,' (Wright 2002) to come in before the final harvest.

Mark Nanos argues that Paul's olive-tree allegory in Romans 11:11–24 serves primarily as a warning to Gentile believers against presumption rather than a botanical model of inclusion. In addition, he argues that Paul portrays non-Christ-believing Israelites as "broken" (wounded yet still on the tree) in vv. 11–21 and only later speaks of "cut off" branches (vv. 22–24), to underscore God's sovereign power to judge or restore, thus confronting Gentile arrogance more than illustrating grafting practice (Nanos 2018:112–52).

While all the above interpretations are valid, what is missing is the social interpretation of these texts (except Esler's). Svetlana Khobnya and Lyle Story echo Esler's boundary-inversion thesis by seeing Paul's olive-tree allegory as a deliberate subversion of everyday grafting practices to unite Judeans and non-Judeans under one Messiah-rooted covenant (Khobnya 2013:257–58; Story 2015:48–50). Khobnya argues that Paul's olive-tree image in Romans 11:16–24 emerges from his conviction that Christ himself is the eschatological "root," so that both the remnant of Israel and the newly grafted non-Judean Christ-followers draw life from the same Messianic source, thus uniting Judeans and non-Judeans (she says Jews and Gentiles) in a single, fulfilment-driven covenant community (Khobnya 2013:257–58). Story reads the olive allegory as part of Paul's rhetorical diatribe to Gentile Christians in Rome, designed to check Gentile boasting by portraying them as wild shoots entirely dependent on Israel's holy root, while also foreshadowing the future restoration of broken-off Jewish branches and so reinforcing Paul's vision of an inclusive people of God (Story 2015:48–50).

In line with the views above, I argue that Paul's olive metaphor is an attempt to recategorise the two subgroups comprising Judeans and non-Judean Christ-followers into one group in which ethnic characteristics of the Judeans or social arrogance of the non-Judeans do not mark belonging.

To achieve this unity between the two groups, Paul engages in some form of internal differentiation (cf. 12:4-8) but also invites both groups into a superordinate group with a shared identity in Christ. Paul's allegiance to his ethnic group is also revealed in this passage. While he is clear about his mission to the non-Judeans, he does not see it as an end in itself, but rather as a means to a greater end: to provoke his fellow Judeans to believe in Christ and, more importantly, to take up their rightful role in participating in God's salvation plan alongside the Judeans. Although both Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers form one social category in Christ, Paul is still keen to emphasise their differences and the temporal priority of Israel, not necessarily superiority, as Esler suggests (Esler 2003:267). For Paul, unity in diversity is his goal.

In this section, Paul continues his argument for the future hope of salvation for the insensible non-Christ group among the Judeans. However, he categorises them in relation to the non-Judean Christ group. He has been clear that the insensibility or hardening of this non-Christian Judean group has a role to play in the salvation of the non-Christ Judean group.

While Paul uses Rom. 11:11-15 as a ground for future hope for the insensible Judeans, he deploys vv. 17-24 to ground the hope of these insensible Judeans in their past heritage. Then verse 16 serves as the bridge between this future and the past of the insensible Judeans in Paul's argument. According to Paul's evidence of the future hope and past heritage, he affirms that all hope is not lost for these insensible Judeans and that God can graft them back into their tree (Israel).

Also, Paul wants to affirm that the non-Judeans have been grafted into this same tree, suggesting the image of the Christ movement (Esler 2003:300). The metaphor is such that from an olive tree (part of Israel that has joined the Christ group), some insensible Judeans are broken off, and some wild olives (non-Judeans) are grafted into the same tree. In v. 24, Paul calls the Judean part of this olive tree "cultivated," suggesting he is referring to the

remnant Judean group. So, what we have here is an image of a tree that comprises both Judeans and non-Judeans. Esler (2003) describes this as a unity of structure but with a noticeable differentiation of features. This is particularly important for us to remember because it is pivotal to Paul's argument. This image relates to the central focus of my thesis, which is that Paul is attempting to recategorise the Christ group in Rome into a single, superordinate identity in Christ, while retaining their distinctiveness and other sub-identities. In this way, Paul acts as a leader who can resolve the social conflicts between Judeans and non-Judeans.

I have interpreted the olive tree as part of Israel that refers to the Christ group (Schwindt 2007:71-91). However, Bourke suggests that the olive tree represents the Messiah with respect to the church (Bourke 1947:103). Others also suggest that it is a reference to God (Walter 1984:220). It seems most plausible to interpret the olive tree image as part of Israel because it fits best with the context of Paul's ongoing argument. From Israel, God works out his plan of salvation to save the world. However, care must be taken not to take this too far to suggest that since the non-Judeans now participate in the Judean blessings by being grafted into Israel, this now means that Israel is the root of the church (Mübner 1979:68-74), which is similar to Boyarin's view (1994:22-25), which is the idea that Paul erases the distinction between Judeans and non-Judeans so that the church and Israel become one. This is unlikely to represent Paul's idea about the "root" and the church.

In Rom. 11.18, Paul's warning that non-Judean Christ-followers should not boast about their position toward the Judeans suggests some group conflict among them. This boasting may have been specifically targeted at the Judean Christ-group during their mixed-fellowship meetings. Paul further reminds this non-Judean Christ group that they did not bring themselves as branches to this; instead, the work of grafting into the tree was done for them, and that they are inherently linked to the support of the root (vv. 18-19).

Also, Paul reminds them that some others (insensible Judeans) are specifically broken off so that these non-Judeans could be grafted into the tree. A work of divine exchange in grace has taken place, benefiting the non-Judean Christ group at present. Therefore, there are no grounds for boasting among them.

Paul continues to explain the reason for this non-meritorious participation in this tree. It is by faith alone for both the Judean and non-Judean Christ groups. The insensible Judeans are broken off because of their lack of faith in Christ. Since faith has no merit of itself apart from the object of faith (Christ), the non-Judeans are warned not to boast because they will experience the same plight of the insensible Judeans if they stop acting in faith (vv. 20-21).

The attention of this non-Judean Christ group is now drawn to both sides of God's integrity (his kindness and severity) as they relate to both groups. At this moment, the insensible Judeans are experiencing the severity of God by being cut off, while the non-Judean Christ-group is enjoying God's kindness. However, their position could be exchanged for that of the insensible Judeans if they stop acting in faith (v. 22). Paul again reaffirms that there is hope for the insensible Judeans if they do not continue in unbelief and that there is the supernatural power of God available to graft them in again (v. 23).

Furthermore, Paul provides an a fortiori argument to support the salvation of the insensible Judeans. If the non-Judeans have been cut from a wild olive tree and grafted into a cultivated olive tree, how much more will these natural branches (insensible Judeans) be grafted back into the tree from which they were cut initially off (v. 24). The expected answer to this a fortiori is that it would be easier for God to regraft the insensible Judeans to the olive tree than he did for the non-Judeans; however, both are possible by God's power and not by any human means or ability. This is a very brilliant way for Paul to argue for the future salvation of the insensible Judeans based on the divine power of God.

Some scholars have argued that the above grafting process is the opposite of what was known in the ancient Mediterranean world. Therefore, Paul must have the constraints that most cosmopolitan folk would have, which Dodd (1932:180) and Barrett (1962:201) think are absurd. They both argue that Paul would have known he was describing a process contrary to nature. However, other scholars respond to this argument by suggesting that even if the process was not the customary practice, it was performed to rejuvenate the olive tree (Ramsay 1905:20:27). Both the argument and counterargument about this agricultural process tend to miss Paul's key argument. Paul's key point is that the grafting of the non-Judeans into the root of Abraham is unnatural. Instead, it takes the supernatural power of God to achieve it (v. 23). Therefore, the fact that it is the opposite of the natural agricultural process works out in favour of Paul's argument. Esler (2003:304-305) suggests that Paul's use of wild olives, when he and the audience know that their branches do not bear edible fruit, is a conscious way for him to build the most unflattering image of the non-Judean Christ group. This is another way to discourage the non-Judean Christ group from adopting an arrogant attitude toward the Judean Christ group. It is unlikely that Paul is referring to an exceptional process of grafting a wild olive into a cultivated olive, a practice he is unlikely to know. Moreover, he does not assume the olive rejuvenation theme, which would have been the goal of this exceptional process (Esler 2003:303-304). Additionally, most scholars concur that the image of regrafting the cut-off natural branches does not correspond to any known agricultural practice (Baxter and Ziesler 1985:28).

What, then, is the function of the olive tree metaphor? First, Paul uses this olive metaphor to support his argument for hope for the insensible non-Christ Judeans and their regrafting. Additionally, Paul employs this metaphor to illustrate the concept of recategorising the two subgroups comprising the Judeans and non-Judeans, whom he aims to unite as one group. This olive metaphor helps Paul further explain the role and expectations of these subgroups in the outworking of God's plan of salvation. This strategy does not

eradicate their distinctiveness and other sub-identities as members of one Christ group.

Regarding social identity, Paul is a skilled "entrepreneur of identity" who can unite distinct groups toward a particular goal through shared identity, meaning, purpose, and values (Esler 2003:38). On the one hand, he calls out the insensible non-Christ Judeans for their disobedience, and then he affirms hope for them. However, he warns non-Judean Christ-followers not to boast. Otherwise, they, too, could experience stumbling. He says that they are attached to the olive tree but do not contribute to it. This may sound negative, but he quickly affirms God's rich kindness to them in the present. This way, neither subgroup could accuse Paul of taking sides with one group over the other. This would have helped Paul lead them toward the unity he expected among them. Paul, indeed, is an entrepreneur of unity.

Additionally, this metaphor demonstrates that Paul remains deeply connected to his ethnic Judean identity, despite his passion for his mission among non-Judeans (11:13-14). In terms of social memory, he recognises that the narrative of Abraham and the patriarchs is the same as that of the remnant Christ-Judeans and, even more so, the same narrative as that of the insensible non-Christ Judeans. When the Judean groups, both those who follow Christ and those who do not, hear this narrative, they will be motivated to listen, and the non-Christ group will be motivated, by jealousy, to return to their heritage through faith in Christ. Referring to the remnant Judean Christ group as a "cultivated olive" and being part of the remnant himself is a sign of his ethnic pride among his fellow Judeans. This would have gone exceptionally well with the Judeans, especially those who would have been concerned about Paul's overt pride in his mission among the non-Judeans.

Lastly, Paul employs the olive tree metaphor and other motifs, such as jealousy and stumbling, as an identity framework for the Judean Christ-followers and the insensible Judeans, respectively, in his attempt to describe the process of forming the Christ group,

which he began in chapter 9. At the end of this argument in the chapter, Paul affirms that all Israel will be saved (11:26), meaning that the groups of Judeans identified so far will ultimately belong to the group of Christ-followers.

Now, we move to the mystery of the redemption of the insensible non-Christian Judeans.

6.14 The Mystery of God's Salvation Plan for Judeans and non-Judeans in Rom. 11:25-36

Paul wants the non-Judeans to understand the mystery behind the stumbling of some of the Judeans so that they might be included in the group of Christ-followers, and that God designs this to display His glory and divine agenda. Therefore, he warns the non-Judeans not to be conceited or wise in their own eyes. God has put a partial hardening among the Judeans so that the fullness (πλήρωμα) of the non-Judeans would come in, but not replacing the Judeans, instead including them. Having mentioned the fullness of the Judeans in Rom. 11:12, Paul now speaks of the fullness of the non-Judeans in Rom. 11:25. This hardening is both partial because there is a remnant according to grace (11:5) and also temporal, because it has a termination point until the fullness of the non-Judeans comes in. This hardening is πώρωσις (dullness), different from σκληρύνει used for Pharaoh in Rom. 9:18 and σκληρότητά (stubbornness) used in Rom. 2:5. After the fullness of the non-Judeans, then all Israel will be saved (Rom. 11:26). To confirm his point, Paul quotes Isa. 59:20-21, 27:9 LXX, concerning the deliverer who will come from Zion (11:26-27). In context, the deliverer in Isaiah 59 is Christ at his Parousia, and the sins he delivers from are acts of violence and injustice (Isa. 59:3-4, 6-9, 11-15). Paul may have had Isaiah's socio-ethical deliverance in mind and hoped that this deliverance (salvation) of the Judeans would come from God through Christ (11:26).

By this, Paul means that the hardened Judeans will come to believe in Christ and be delivered from God's judgment. It is more likely than not that Paul has a different mode of salvation for the Judeans, as Mussner (1984:139-140) suggests. Paul goes on to summarise

God's divine agenda for both Judeans and non-Judeans. To bring the gospel to the non-Judeans, God would treat some of the hardened Judeans as enemies, but concerning the election of their forefathers, they are beloved of God (11:28). He affirms this point by stating the principle that God's gifts and his calling are irrevocable (11:29). God's plan is always to show mercy to all, in context, to both Judeans and non-Judeans. In the past, the non-Judeans were disobedient (Rom. 1:20-23), but now they have received mercy. The Judeans who have received mercy in the past are now disobedient, yet they will receive mercy again. For this to happen, God has consigned (συνέκλεισεν) all under disobedience so that he may show mercy to all in the context of the Judeans and non-Judeans (11:30-32).

The interplay between mercy and judgment among the Judeans and the non-Judeans is Paul's theological tactic for recategorising them into a single group united in Christ. When one group was disobedient and under God's judgment, they were an outgroup compared to the group that received mercy at that time. Similarly, when the other group was disobedient and under God's judgment, they too were an outgroup. However, God now offers mercy to both groups, allowing them to receive it and co-belong to the Christ group, thereby becoming ingroup members. Ethnic characteristics do not define this Christ group, although they are not eradicated.

The above is the mystery Paul aims to reveal to his audience through scriptural citations (11:25-27). He also wants to further explain the significance of his mystery in relation to God's plan of salvation in Rom. 11:28-32 for both Judeans and non-Judeans (Jewett 2007:695). Paul's reason for disclosing this mystery is to ensure that the non-Judeans do not think that they are wise concerning God's plan for the salvation of the hardened Judeans. What is happening to the hardened Judeans is only temporary until the fullness of the non-Judeans has come into God's plan of salvation. Nanos (2018:291) rightly describes this temporal setback of the hardened Judeans by translating the second part of Rom. 11:25 as

"because for a while a callus/shield has formed around Israel, making her unresponsive until the fullness of the nations shall commence."

Let us now examine Romans 11:25-32 in light of the mystery Paul seeks to expose.

6.15 All Israel Will be Saved (Rom. 11:25-32)

This is the climax of Paul's argument, not just for Romans 11 but for the whole of Romans 9-11. As discussed earlier, Paul is keen to defend his assertion that the insensitivity or hardening of the non-Christ Judeans is not permanent and does not lead to a final fall. Therefore, God has not rejected His people, for all Israel will indeed be saved.

This section in Rom. 11:25-26a starts with a disclosure formula (οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί) to indicate that what he is about to say about this mystery is crucial. A similar formula is seen in 1 Thess. 4:13 (Zeller 1973:246-247).

> **1Thess. 4:13** οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων, ἵνα μὴ λυπῆσθε καθὼς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα.
>
> **Rom. 11:26** οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα μὴ ἦτε [παρ᾽] ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι, ὅτι πώρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῶ ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ,

Although this formula appears in several letters of Paul, it is found only in 1 Thess. 4:13 that it is followed by ἵνα, which is an indication of the importance of what Paul wants to reveal to his audience, in both cases here, especially with regard to the attitude of the non-Judean Christ-followers toward the Judeans (Metzger 1994: 465). It seems that a thematic parallel between these two passages (1 Thess. 4:13; Rom. 11:26) can help us understand the eschatological nature of Paul's message (Gadenz 2009:272-273), especially with the use of ῥυόμενος to describe Jesus' descent from heaven (Sanders 1983:194), and the regathering of believers in 1 Thess. 4:13-17 (Wood 2006:670-679), which in Rom. 11:25-27 is explicitly connected to the restoration of the Judeans.

In Rom. 11:25, the term μυστήριον, as previously mentioned, denotes that what Paul

ixxi

wants to say is new to his audience, but it does not extend beyond the OT Scripture. Instead, it is the fact that Paul views it as a revealed truth, known to him or inferred from Scripture, that he needs to unpack for his audience. This is what I seek to demonstrate below.

The contents of this mystery are broken down into three parts, namely (1) a hardening in part has happened to the hardened Judeans—πώρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῶ ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν (2) until the fullness of the non-Judeans come in; ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ, (3) and so all Israel shall be saved—καὶ οὕτως πᾶς ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται. The first part indicates that this hardening, in part, has occurred among some Judeans (the rest, λοιποὶ), already mentioned in v. 7, which suggests God's initiative behind it. This passive form is also used in Rom. 11:7. Gadenz (2009:273) argues that this hardening "in part" is quantitative; a particular group has been hardened, but the rest has not. Therefore, he suggests that it is not a partial hardening (qualitative) of the Judeans (cf 2 Cor. 1:15; 2:5), otherwise it could be inferred that this hardening also includes the remnant. This argument seems plausible because Paul has earlier distinguished between the remnant and the λοιποὶ, so it makes sense to assume that he is explicitly referring to the λοιποὶ who are hardened and, therefore, have not believed in Christ.

This is further explained in the second part of this mystery, which Paul has already hinted at in Rom. 9:22-23, where the σκεύη ὀργῆς is linked with the σκεύη ἐλέους. However, Campbell (2023:310-311) misses this point when he argues that the mystery Paul wishes to disclose to the Romans is not just that a "hardening" has come upon a particular group of Judeans (λοιποὶ), but that this is a general hardening among the Judeans which would last only for a while, that is, temporary, not permanent. He goes further to argue that Ἀπὸ μέρους is best read not as referring to part of Israel but as a time limit, defined as ending with (ἄχρι) the coming of the fullness of the nations. According to Campbell, this hardening does not refer to part of Israel but to a temporary stage in Israel's history. Despite this argument,

Campbell agrees that there is a division that is represented by “the remnant of Israel” and “the rest of Israel,” which Paul expects to be temporary and will be terminated by the restoration of “all Israel” (Campbell 2023:311). While he acknowledges these two groups, Campbell fails to recognise that the hardening of one group distinguishes it from the other, non-hardened group (the remnant). Consequently, he fails to see how distinguishing between these two groups relates to Paul’s overall argument about the process of the formation of the Christ group, which includes both Judeans and non-Judeans. I have previously argued in earlier chapters that Paul’s goal in Romans 9-11 is to describe the process of forming the Christ group by using specific identity frameworks to categorise the groups within it. In this chapter, the hardening of some Judeans, which is temporal, becomes part of the framework that Paul uses to describe the formation of the Christ group.

The second part of this mystery shows that the temporal dimension (καὶ αὕτη) of the Judean insensitivity or hardening will last until the full number of the non-Judeans enters, which in context refers to the entrance into salvation for the non-Judeans (Rom. 11:11). Another view is that this is an entrance into the kingdom (Sanday & Headlam 1902:335), a view that Jewett (2007:700-701) suggests is unlikely. Some scholars also suggest that this is associated with the eschatological pilgrimage to Zion in connection with the non-Judeans' offerings to Jerusalem (Aus 1979:260-261). This interpretation is unwarranted at this point (Jewett 2007:700).

The third part of this mystery explains the result that follows the entrance of the fullness of the non-Judeans in a logical (Gundry-Volf 1990:179-181) and temporal way (Van der Horst 2000:9-17, Scott 2001:490-496,527). This way, the salvation of all Israel comes after and next to that of the non-Judeans, but it is not caused by the salvation of the non-Judeans, according to Gadenz (2009:274-275). Sanders (1983:193) suggests that the salvation of all Israel is intimately linked to the salvation of the non-Judeans, as the non-Judean

mission evokes jealousy that will ultimately lead to the Judeans' salvation (11:13-14).

Next, let us examine the meaning of the phrase πᾶς ἰσραὴλ, a subject that is highly disputed. An overview of the literature review suggests that this phrase is interpreted in one of five ways (Keller 1998:223-241, Seo 1999:181-189, Fung 2004: 190-210; Zoccali 2008).

The first view is that all Israel encompasses both Judeans and non-Judeans, a perspective common among the Church Fathers and, most recently, among contemporary scholars like Wright (1991:249-251). Wright argues that this salvation will occur within the present historical trend rather than in the eschatological future. However, this view now lacks much support among many contemporary scholars (Moo 1996:720-721). This is problematic because Paul has been referring to ethnic Israel in this chapter; therefore, a sudden change in the use of 'Israel' without making it explicitly clear is unlikely. The second view is that all Israel means the elect Judean Christ-following remnant (Zoccali 208:303-314; Horne 1978:333-334; Robertson 1979:225-226; Fung 2004:188-189). The third view depicts all Israel to mean ethnic Israel (Judeans), those who are of the twelve tribes of Israel. Most scholars hold to this view, as teased out in the article by Vasholz (2004:36-45). However, there are divergent opinions as to whether "all" refers to every individual Judean (Bell 1994:139; Bell 2005: 263-264; Penna 2006: 377-378; Jewett 2007:702) or reference to a collective whole but not every individual (Gundry-Volf 1990:183-184; Dunn 1987:681; Käsemann 1980:303; Moo 1996:722; Byrne 1995:131,13). The fourth dimension to this argument, usually connected to the third view, is whether the phrase "all Israel" should be interpreted synchronically (Moo 1996:723; Gundry-Volf 1990:184-185) as referring to Judeans of the end times or diachronically (Mübner 1979:241-245; Hofius 1989:195; Keller 1998:241; Bell 1994:140-141;) as the Judeans of all time.

A fifth is related to what I suggested earlier in this thesis. When the context of Romans 11 is taken into consideration, the meaning of all Israel seems likely to be the sum of

the remnant Judeans and the λοιποὶ (hardened Judeans) (Käsemannn 1980:303; Gundry-Volf 1990:184; Mübner 1979:54-55). Paul focuses on these two groups in vv. 1-10 and vv. 11-24 respectively (Gadenz 2009:277). While Paul is clear about the salvation of the remnant in Rom. 9:27; 11:5,7, he feels that the present insensitivity or hardening of the λοιποὶ needs further examination and explanation. In Rom. 11:11-24, he provides probable reasons why there is hope for the λοιποὶ (hardened Judeans) and later affirms it through the mystery in Rom. 11:25, where the λοιποὶ are revealed to be saved. In this mystery (v. 25), Paul confirms that a group of Judeans has been hardened, which, by implication, means that there is another group that has not been hardened, and consequently, this group has believed in Christ. Paul's conclusion about this mystery is that this hardening is temporal, and thus, the λοιποὶ will join the remnant Judeans. Hence, the sum of these two groups, which Paul refers to as "all Israel," will be saved. He has affirmed this bisection among the Judeans in Rom. 9:6b, and now he applies it to the Judeans of his own time in Rom. 11:7, but that consequently, this bisection will be over in the eschatological last days.

In connection with the above, it appears that the term πᾶς ἰσραὴλ in Rom. 11:26 echoes the phrase οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ in Rom. 9:6b, although they are not identical; the former is a collective singular, while the latter refers to a plural number of individuals. Up to this point, Paul has used the term "Israel" to depict Judeans as an ethnic group, even when he refers to a group within the whole group. Therefore, it does not make sense to include non-Judean Christ-followers in "all Israel." He continues to refer to the non-Judeans as ἔθνη (v. 13) so that the contrast between the Judeans and non-Judeans remains clear all through Rom. 11:11-25. This thread would be distorted if suddenly non-Judeans were included in all of Israel (Das 2007: 236-245; Gadenz 2009:277).

In its broader OT background and other Jewish literature, scholars agree that "all Israel" is better understood in its ethnic and historical sense (Fitzmyer 1993:623; Scott

2001:498-507). It has been noted that this term refers to the "tribal structure (Scott 2001:507) of the descendants of Jacob/Israel, whether to all twelve tribes, to the northern tribes, or the southern tribes." They also agree that "all Israel" can mean "the representative selection from the full complement of the tribes" (Scott 2001:507; Refoule 1984:80). Scott (2001:507) argues that this term is always used collectively, never to refer to all individuals within the nation, and is always a synchronic term. With a few exceptions, it always refers to the contemporary people of God (Osborne 2019:287).

Although Scott and Refoule agree on the ethnic meaning of "all Israel," their conclusions differ. For Scott, "all Israel" is quantitative and refers to the total number of Judeans who would be saved through the eschatological events, including the previously saved remnant and the presently hardened Judeans (Scott 518). Refoule, on the other hand, insists that "all Israel" is qualitative, referring to "Israel as election," which means the sum of the Judean remnants and the hardened Judeans (Refoule 181). My preferred view is that the quantitative and qualitative readings of "all Israel" cannot be divorced from each other. There will be a certain number (quantitative) of both remnant Judeans and hardened Judeans that will be saved in the eschatological times. Both groups will also form part of "Israel as election" (qualitative), so long as this qualitative reading does not include the hardened Judeans who have not put their faith in Christ in the eschatological era.

Also, the contrast between the non-Judean Christ followers and the hardened non-Christ Judeans is seen in Rom. 11:28, 30-31, which further confirms that the non-Judeans are not included in "all Israel." Moreover, the inclusion of the non-Judeans in "all Israel will run counter to Paul's warning to the non-Judeans not to boast against the Judeans (Moo 1996:721). The argument in this chapter also counters the view that "all Israel" refers only to the elect in Israel (Waymeyer 2005:64-66).

In connection with the above, as the sum of the two groups, "all Israel" should be

understood collectively, not referring to all individuals in these two groups that comprise the Judean remnant and the λοιποὶ. This is parallel to the phrase "until the fulness of the Gentiles" (v. 25), which does not mean every individual non-Judean; rather, it is a collective phrase for the non-Judeans (Gadenz 2009:278; Leenhardt 1995:165). Further, Paul's argumentation about "all Israel" should be read synchronically (Gadenz 2009:278) because the generation of Judeans contemporary to the time when the fullness of the non-Judeans occurs is the generation for which this hardening is removed. This is how the bisection within these two Judean groups will be taken away and "all Israel," that is, both groups (remnant and λοιποὶ) of that generation will be saved.

Another vital investigation involves the timing (Rakocy 2006:21-23) when "all Israel" will be saved. Paul has already drawn a distinction between the present hardening of one group of Judeans (λοιποὶ) and the future salvation of the non-Judeans, in connection with God's acceptance and all its associated blessings (vv. 12, 15). Paul goes further in Rom. 11:25 to affirm through this "mystery" that the time for such an event coincides with the coming of the fullness of the non-Judeans, thus signifying an eschatological event.

As to how to understand the nature of the salvation to be obtained by "all Israel," some scholars suggest that it is helpful to understand σωθήσεται· in terms of the Judean traditions of national restoration (Scott 2001: 519-526, Dunn 1987:681). Scott observes that the Septuagint frequently uses σώζω to mean the gathering and bringing home of the dispersed from the entire world (Scott 2001:520), e.g., Jer. 38:7-8 LXX (31:7-8 MT); Jer. 26:27 LXX (46:27 MT); Zeph. 3:19; Zech. 8: 7-8; 10:6; Ps. 105:47 LXX. This observation is consistent with the claim that Paul's use of "all Israel" should be understood collectively and synchronically (Gadenz 2009:278). This means that the generation of the Judeans living in the eschatological era will experience restoration. Additionally, πᾶς ἰσραὴλ appears in Deut. 27:9, 27:9,14; 32:45; Dan. 9:7, 11, and in all these texts, this term has a collective meaning

(Scott 2001:503; Hofius 1986:194), just as it is in other Jewish literature (Scott 2001: 507-515).

From the above considerations, I argue that there is no plausible reason to read the inclusion of the non-Judeans into "all Israel." It is a term that refers to both Judean groups that Paul has been referring to: the Judean remnant and the hardened Judeans. To say that the non-Judeans are included with the Judeans as the people of God is undoubtedly correct in the broader context of Romans 9-11, but this is not the case with the use of the term "all Israel" in 11:26. Also, "all Israel" is to be read in the light of synchronic and collective interpretation.

To summarise this section, Paul's focus is not just on explaining how "all Israel" will be saved as a mystery that stands in isolation. Instead, his point is to describe the salvation of "all Israel" vis-à-vis the salvation of the non-Judeans, while most of the Judeans continue to reject Christ. This temporal setback has led to boasting among the non-Judean followers of Christ; therefore, Paul warns them not to boast (11:18-21). He warns the non-Judeans that they, too, could have the same experience of falling if they do not stand in faith and that their salvation is an upshot of God's mercy alone, just as it is for the Judeans. Paul is sure that this insensitivity of the hardened Judeans was neither total nor permanent. Instead, it is meant to serve a purpose, and the insensitivity would be lifted once that purpose has been achieved. He wants the non-Judeans to distinguish the present appearance of the Judeans from reality with respect to their future, in line with God's plan for both Judeans and non-Judeans. They must disassociate the present as the apparent failed realisation of God's promises from the future as the complete realisation of God's purposes in history since the full revelation of God's salvation is yet to come (Elliott 2008:107-109). The non-Judean Christ-followers need to realise that this temporary hardening of the Judeans and the entry of the full number of the non-Judeans are part of God's way through which 'all Israel' shall be saved. Paul's mystery is wrapped up in this paradox (Tobin 2004: 371). Rather than being

mutually exclusive, the rescue of the non-Judeans and the restoration of the Judeans are consistent with God's plan of salvation for both.

The above paradox is also mentioned in the Vatican document, "The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irreversible" (Rom. 11:29). Sections 21-26 of this document affirm that God has not revoked His calling over Israel, despite her disobedience. It also states that the Church has not replaced Israel despite being called the new people of God," (section 23). It further states that Christian confessions unite in Christ, while Judaism finds unity in the Torah. For Jews, the Word of God is most present in the Torah. Both faith traditions find their foundation in the One God, the God of the Covenant, who reveals himself through his Word. This paradox apexes at the assertion that there are two paths to salvation according to the expression, "Jews hold to the Torah, Christians hold to Christ." Therefore, God can choose any expression to save either the Jews or those who are inclined to the Christian faith.

In our view, this document is correct in its assertion that God has not revoked his calling over Israel and also that the church has not replaced Israel. However, it is incorrect to say that salvation comes from the Torah and, simultaneously, through faith in Christ. This contradicts Paul's argument in 10:4, "For Christ is the end of the law, that everyone who has faith may be justified." That Paul has both Judeans and non-Judeans in mind when using "everyone" is evident from his previous statement in Rom. 1:16, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel: It is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." Therefore, according to Paul's argument, salvation is available to both Judeans and non-Judeans through faith, rather than the Torah. However, the issue is the nature of the outworking of this salvation to save "all Israel, and this is what Paul seeks to explain to his audience regarding the formation of the Christ group.

In social identity terms, Paul is attempting to resolve any conflict that may arise from the boasting of non-Judean Christ-followers over Judean Christ-followers, which would

ixxi

otherwise continue to fracture their unity as a community of God's people, something that Paul encourages them to preserve in chapters 12-16. It is noteworthy that, in his attempt to resolve this conflict, Paul refrains from taking a stand with the Judeans because of his shared ethnic identity with them. Instead, Paul presents a theological yet social narrative that draws both groups into a deeper understanding of God's salvation plan, which encompasses them both and, more importantly, gives them a shared identity and value in Christ within that plan. This theological understanding of God's salvation plan for both groups may even help minimise any intra-ethnic conflict that may arise between the remnant Judeans and the hardened Judeans, which could be triggered by the remnant Judeans if they have not resisted the boasting of the non-Judeans against their fellow non-Christian Judeans. However, nothing in this letter to the Romans suggests this conflict.

6.16 The Redeemer will come from Zion (11:26-27)

After Paul exposed this mystery in vv. 25-26a, he now goes further to add a scriptural citation, which is introduced by the standard formula. The primary concern of this citation is identifying the Redeemer from Zion. Since Christ is not explicitly mentioned in this citation, the last explicit reference to Christ being in Rom. 10:7, some scholars have suggested a theological interpretation (Stanley 1993b:137; Getty 1988:461-464) instead of a Christological interpretation of this citation. This view is often connected to the "two-covenant" approach, which suggests that the non-Judeans are saved through Christ, but God saves the Judeans via the law apart from Christ (Stendahl 1976:4; Gaston 1987:147-148; Gager 1983:260-264). This view has received some criticism from other scholars, who argue that the mention of unbelief in Rom. 11:20-23 is Christological because the object of belief is Christ (Hvalvik 1990:89-91; Hafemann 1998; Johnson 1989:176-205; Bryne 1995:132-137; Penna 2006:381-382). Some of these scholars argue that Rom. 11:20-23 should be interpreted in connection with Rom. 10:13, which states that everyone (both Judeans and non-Judeans, 10:12) who calls on the name of the Lord (Jesus Christ, 10:9) will

ixxi

be saved. Sanders (1983:194) argues strongly thus: It is incredible that Paul thought of 'God apart from Christ,' just as it is that he thought of 'Christ apart from God.' This is where the interpretation of Rom. 11:25f. as offering two ways to salvation goes astray.

Christological interpretation is consistent with our understanding of the Redeemer from Zion in this thesis. This aligns with Paul's earlier use of salvation in Romans 9-11 and throughout his letter to the Romans. There is no point in this letter where Paul suggests that there are two different pathways to salvation for both Judeans and non-Judeans. Paul, earlier in Romans, made it clear that the gospel is the power of God to save both the Judeans and non-Judeans and that this salvation is appropriated by faith (Rom. 1:16-17).

Another common argument is the similarity in the vocabulary (the Redeemer, ὁ ῥυόμενος) found in 1 Thess. 1:10. Here, Jesus is explicitly identified as the Redeemer, and his coming from heaven to deliver believers from the future wrath parallels the coming of the Redeemer from Zion to deliver in Rom. 11:26. To buttress the Christological interpretation further, it is worthwhile to observe the use of the third person to describe the redeemer in v. 26b, and then v. 27 continues in the first person. God speaks in the citation, but it refers to another person, Christ, the Redeemer (Zeller 1973:259). Gadenz (2009:283) also argues that since it is the condition of unbelief that needs to be overcome for the re-grafting of the cut-off branches (hardened Judeans) to happen, it is better to take the redeemer in a Christological sense. Lastly, the use of mystery in Pauline letters suggests Christological and eschatological content (Gadenz 2009:284).

However, some Pauline scholars within Judaism disagree with the Christological interpretation of this text. They argue that Paul's wording in Romans 11:25-26 has a focused meaning. "The fullness of the nations and all Israel" are not mere abstractions for them. "All the nations" refers quite specifically to Genesis 10, the Table of Nations, those various ethnic groups, the goyim or ethne, produced by the progeny of Noah's three sons. Their "full

ixxi

number" - in Paul's phrasing, their pleroma - is 70 nations. Moreover, "all Israel" refers to all 12 tribes, a concept with eschatological significance. They argue that when Paul speaks of final salvation and inclusion in God's kingdom in Romans 11, he refers to all humanity, encompassing both the 12 tribes and the 70 nations (Gager 2015:7-9; Fredriksen 2017). These scholars appear to have read too much historical context of Israel and other nations from Genesis rather than the literary and theological context of Rom. 11:25-26. As mentioned, earlier, the context of Romans suggests that Paul develops faith as the means of salvation for both Judeans and non-Judeans, and also as the identity framework for the formation of the Christ group (Rom. 1:16-17; 3:23; 5:1; 10:9-17; 11:6).

6.17 The Use of Scriptures in Rom. 11:26-27

Paul's citations in 11:26-27 conflict between Isa. 59:20-2 and Isa. 27:9 (Wilk 1998:56).

> **Rom. 11 26** καὶ οὕτως πᾶς ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται· καθὼς γέγραπται, ἥξει ἐκ σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος, ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ ἰακώβ· 27 καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.
>
> **Isa. 59:20–21 LXX** καὶ ἥξει ἕνεκενα Σιων ὁ ῥυόμενος καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ιακωβ. καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, εἶπεν κύριος
>
> **Isa. 27:9 LXX** διὰ τοῦτο ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἡ ἀνομία Ιακωβ, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν

Most of it follows Isa. 59:20–21, but the last five words derive from Isa. 27:9 instead, and the change from one source to the other occurs in the middle of the sentence (Wilk 1998: 56). Some scholars suggest that, since these passages share significant structural and thematic connections, including the name Jacob, they were likely linked by an ancient interpreter (Wilckens 1980:256; Hübner 1984:119–120; Wagner 2002:280).

Regarding the identity of this ancient interpreter, Stanley proposes that these passages were already conflated in a Jewish context, arguing that this quotation is not sufficiently “Pauline” to be attributed to him (Stanley 1993:126). Since this conflated

citation supports Paul's argument and is expressed with the usual introductory formula "as it is written," it is plausible to suggest that this conflation could be traced back to Paul (Hübner 1984:114; Koch 1986:175; Shum 2002:239; Wagner 2002:294).

The descriptions of the restoration of Zion in Isa. 59:20–21 and in Isa. 27:9 differ. For this reason, Paul likely conflates the two. In Isa. 59:20–21, the redeemer "shall turn godlessness away from Jacob," then the content of the covenant is described: "My spirit that is upon you and the words that I have put in your mouth shall not fail out of your mouth or out of the mouth of your offspring." However, Paul omits the content of this covenant. He leaves out a reference to the spirit (Stanley 1993:124). If we focus on Paul's main argument here, we can see why Isa. 27:9 offered a preferable way to continue the sentence. This is probably because Isa. 59:21 focuses on the future hope of the Judeans and their life after they have been redeemed, including their descendants. However, Paul is saying that the hardened Judean godless state will be changed by God (Wagner 2002:294). Therefore, Isa. 27:9 offers him imagery to emphasise this expected change by God, not necessarily the effects of this change (Kujanpää 2019:246). Simply put, the "lawlessness" of the Judeans will be "taken away."

Isaiah describes the time of this Judean blessing with two transitional clauses: "when I remove his sin," and "turning away godlessness." Paul conflates these citations to describe the proposed change with these two clauses, giving a scriptural background to his argument. In doing this, Paul omits the other aspects of the source texts.

Paul's wording follows the Septuagint in the two halves of the conflated texts, with some minor deviations. In the Septuagint, the redeemer comes "for Zion's sake" (ἕνεκεν Σιων); on the contrary, Paul's reading says that the redeemer comes "out of Zion" (ἐκ Σιων). Several scholars suggest that the reading of the Septuagint ("for Zion's sake") would have been consistent with Paul's focus on the situation with the Judeans, so that he would not have

ixxi

needed to change it. Therefore, they argue that the reading "out of Zion" must be pre-Pauline (Koch 1986:176; Hübner 1984:115; Stanley 1992:160; Wilk 1998:39). However, some scholars, like Wilk (1998:39–40), argue that the manuscript evidence favours a Pauline origin. Although the concept "for the sake of Zion" is unique in the Septuagint, the idea of deliverance coming "out of Zion" (ἐκ Σιων) occurs in several texts (Stanley 1993:135; Wagner 2002:284). The repetition of this phrase in other similar passages is probably why Paul reads the text as "out of Zion."

Although Paul's audience would not have likely understood the contexts of these two conflated texts, they seem to refer to the restoration of the Judeans. Wagner (2002:289) observes that Isa. 59:8-10 depicts the plight of the Judeans, which corresponds to Paul's diagnosis of the Judean plight in Rom. 11:8-10, reflecting that the Judeans are under the Deuteronomic curses. However, in the subsequent verses of Isaiah 59, the hope of restoration for the Judeans is announced, from which Paul now takes his citation in Isa. 59:20-21 (Wagner 2002:289-292). Similarly, the context of Isa. 27:9 indicates that the restoration of the Judeans will be accompanied by the eradication of idolatry among them. Wagner (2002:296) notes that the unbelief of the Judeans in Romans 9-11 is compared to their past idolatry. It is therefore plausible that Paul considers the restoration of the hardened Judeans in both conflated OT citations, as their contexts reflect the hope of national restoration among the Judeans (Scott 2001:490). I suggest that this is likely going on in Paul's mind, but not that his audience would have understood it. However, Paul reverses the traditional order of the Judean restoration, followed by the inclusion of non-Judeans. Instead, he says that Judean restoration will happen only after the non-Judeans are included (Dunn 1988b:682; Wagner 2002:292). However, let us take into cognisance that the remnant Judeans have first been restored. The subsequent restoration of the hardened Judeans after the fullness of the non-Judeans is not a reversal in God's plan as such.

Regarding social identity, Paul's use of these OT citations toward restoring the Judeans is connected to the Judean groups (remnant and hardened) we have mentioned so far. When the fullness of the non-Judeans comes in, there will also be the restoration of the hardened Judeans, and this way, "all Israel" (remnant and hardened Judeans) shall be saved (restored). Paul uses these citations to invite both Judean and non-Judean Christ group members to a shared understanding of God's plan concerning the restoration of the hardened Judeans, which is linked to the restoration or salvation of "all Israel" and the salvation of the non-Judeans. The authority of scripture would help motivate them to this shared understanding of God's salvation plan concerning these three groups: remnant Judeans, hardened Judeans, and non-Judeans, thereby eliminating pride, especially among the members of the Christ group (remnant Judeans and non-Judeans). Also, if some of the Judeans have found Paul's mission to the non-Judeans offensive, especially if they feel that Paul has reversed the eschatological salvation order to put that of the non-Judeans before the Judeans, then these citations would help to resolve any conflict that might come up due to a lack of understanding of the outworking of God's plan among them. These citations not only demonstrate the salvation of the Judeans relative to the non-Judeans but also help mitigate any social conflict that might have arisen from the arrogance of members of the Christ group (Judeans and non-Judeans), stemming from their ignorance of God's salvation plan among them. It is true to say that many social conflicts among God's people today are usually related to theological misunderstandings and differences among their members. Paul is interested in using the scriptures to help the Judean and non-Judean Christ group members understand that their salvation is interdependent, not mutually exclusive, in God's plan. Therefore, any basis for boasting would be eroded, and conflicts associated with such boasting would be resolved. These group categorisations, their related conflicts, and the use of scriptures to resolve them are absent from the views of the scholars discussed so far in this chapter. Most interpreters mentioned above have focused on the identity of "all Israel," and

ixxi

some have focused on how Israel shall be saved. In contrast, others have interpreted the salvation of "all Israel" in relation to the non-Judeans. However, in the analysis of the social use of OT citations, many have failed to see the connection between these citations and the social contexts of Judean and non-Judean Christ groups, and how these citations help resolve conflicts between them, due to a lack of theological understanding of the outworking of God's salvation plan. These conflicts and Paul's scriptural instructions to overcome them are better seen in chapters 12-16.

6.18 Clarity of the Divine Outworking of God's Salvation Plan (11:28-32)

After the above citation, Paul makes his final remarks in Romans 9–11 before concluding it with a hymn of praise. Romans 11:28-32 depict Paul's further commentary on the conflated texts. They are the rewording of the relevance of Paul's mystery and its significance to the outworking of God's salvation plan (Gadenz 2009:253). Paul locates the Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers in God's divine plan, introducing a divine agenda of disobedience that results in God having mercy on all. This theme of disobedience (10:21; 11:30–32) is linked to other themes that Paul has mentioned earlier, namely, election (9:11; 11:5, 7, 28), calling (9:7, 12, 24–26; 11:29), and mercy (9:15, 16, 18, 23; 11:30–32).

In this section, Paul draws parallels that highlight the interdependence of Judeans and non-Judeans in God's salvation plan. He affirms that the Judean enmity (hardened Judeans) regarding the gospel is for the sake of the non-Judeans (11:28) and that their disobedience is so that the non-Judeans will receive God's mercy (11:31). Paul further highlights the election of the "fathers" (11:28) concerning God's faithfulness, and that God's gifts and call are irrevocable (v. 28b). In connection to the Judean privileges mentioned in Rom. 9:4-5, the gifts in Rom. 11:28 consist not only of the "fathers" (Rom. 9:5; 11:28), but also "the Messiah" (Gadenz 2009:295), who comes from among the Judeans (9:5) and who will come

out of the Zion to save all Israel (11:26b). Therefore, Paul can now give a positive interpretation of the plight of the hardened Judeans, which he has earlier declared to be painful to him (Rom. 9:1–3; 10:1). He now affirms that this Judean rejection of the gospel serves a divine purpose in God's timing in the outworking of his divine salvation plan for both Judeans and non-Judeans. This contradicts the aspect of the Vatican document mentioned earlier, which suggests that God uses both the Torah and the gospel of Christ to save the Jews and the nations differently as he pleases.

In Rom. 11:32, the principle is reinforced that God can cause all things to work together for good (Rom. 8:28; Gen. 50:20). The disobedience of the hardened Judeans leads to mercy for the non-Judeans. Therefore, the final word is mercy (Gadenz 2009:296), not ethnic privilege or any other ground of boasting, for both Judeans and non-Judeans.

It should also be noted that v. 32 does not teach that by showing mercy to all, God exercises universal salvation to all humankind. Instead, as in Rom. 11:26a, τοὺς πάντας used twice in v. 32 should be interpreted collectively to indicate the two groups (Judeans and non-Judeans) that Paul has been discussing in preceding verses. This group, comprising the Judeans and non-Judeans, constitutes the "all" in this context that receives God's mercy. Bell (1994: 138-139, 151-153; 2005:262-264, 285-289) supports this collective interpretation, although he misses this point in his interpretation of "all Israel" in v. 26, leading him to conclude like Jewett (2007:518) that every Judean without exception shall be saved. Campbell (2023:314) puts it succinctly below:

> What must be noted, however, is that at this climactic stage in Paul's argumentation, "all" is not an undefined, generalised abstraction, that is, the universal individual human condition of individuals in Christ, but groups specifically still designated as Jews or as ethnē. These designations abide as determined by God's purpose and are symbolised by the specific relation of Jews and "Gentiles" who are united with Christ.

Another thing to note in this section is that God works out his salvation plan through human responsibility (Rom. 9:30-10:21, as people call upon the Lord to be saved) and, conversely, through His sovereign grace by having mercy on all (11:30-32).

Instead of trying to explain the full outworking of God's divine activity and human responsibility, Paul invites both Judean and non-Judean Christ groups to a doxology in Rom. 11:33-36. He asks them to understand and accept God's inscrutable wisdom and knowledge, the outworking of his salvation plan, and therefore glorify God together (v. 36) and say "Amen" (Jewett 2007:723).

We can see Paul's coherent and consistent argument so far. He is not teaching an abstract concept of God's salvation plan for humanity, though this would apply to all humankind. Instead, his goal is to help the Christ group, comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans, understand that God's mercy supersedes ethnic belonging and all their human activities, whether through obedience or disobedience. The mercy of God is the foundation of salvation for both groups, as they are both bound by disobedience. Mercy is one aspect of the identity framework that underpins the formation of the Christ group. Therefore, all grounds for boasting are eliminated, knowing that boasting would create social conflicts among them. In terms of social identity, Paul is an entrepreneurial leader. He aims to shape collective beliefs and modify the behaviour of this group, comprising both Judeans and non-Judeans, so that they can become unified. He achieves this by using scriptural citations to explain the current situation of the Judeans and non-Judeans, inviting them into a shared understanding that God's salvation plan encompasses both, regardless of their temporary setbacks. No group is more important than the other in God's plan. Hence, any superiority or inferiority should be eliminated, and the group members should be united.

Paul also plays the role of an entrepreneurial social identity leader by inviting the members of this Christ group into a shared understanding of God's mercy toward his divine

plan. He is helping them share a common identity in this divine plan, knowing that the salvation of one group is interdependent with the salvation of the other within their shared group. This understanding would help members of this group live for the benefit of the group and their shared values in Christ, regardless of their ethnic or social contexts, thereby enhancing the group's unity. One who recognises that he is a recipient of mercy is obliged to respond in mercy toward others in the same group.

Finally, we need to recognise that, despite Paul's emphasis on uniting the Christ group, which comprises Judeans and non-Judeans, he never downplayed their distinctiveness, whether ethnic or social. Instead, Paul appealed to their common salient identity in God's divine salvation plan, revealed in Christ.

Now, let us examine the concluding doxology and the scriptural citations.

6.18 Doxology: Judeans and non-Judeans Praise God Together (11:33-36)

Paul concludes this discussion on 9-11 with a doxology of praise to God (11:36), which draws on the old-time Israelite theology and Hellenistic philosophy of deity (Dunn 1988). The riches of God's wisdom and knowledge in salvation are fathomless. His judgments are unsearchable (ἀνεξεραύνητα), and his ways are inscrutable (ἀνεξιχνίαστοι), that is, incapable of being tracked by footprint. Paul now quotes from Isa. 40:13, that God is the sole architect of his plan. No one knows his mind to advise him (11:34). He follows with quotations from Job 41:11 and 35:7, stating that God is solely responsible for his plans and is sovereign over all things. He is not obligated to repay anyone because no one has ever given him anything of value. God does not incur a debt, because all things are from him, through him, and to him. Glory be to Him forever! Amen. (11:36)

It is worth noting that Paul started this segment by asking if the word of God concerning the Judeans has failed. In Chapter 9, he argues that God still has a plan for the

hardened Judeans, despite their present setbacks. He further explains their stumbling as a result of unbelief (chapter 10). Finally, he argues that all hope is not lost for the hardened Judeans; their stumbling is partial and temporary, and they will be saved by God's mercy (chapter 11). However, all this must be read against the backdrop of Rom. 1:16-17, where Paul explains God's righteousness among both Judeans and non-Judeans, beginning with the Judeans and then moving on to the non-Judeans. Lack of understanding of God's salvation plan among the Christ group has led to social-ethnic conflict among them. This trend is mapped progressively from Romans 9 through to 11.

Paul's general tone in Romans 9-11 is one of reconciliation rather than condemnation. He addresses the arrogance and prejudice that have the propensity to jeopardise the unity of Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers in Rome. Paul challenges the unenlightened zeal of the hardened Judeans, which may have hindered their faith in Christ and the welcome extended to non-Judeans (10:2-3). On the other hand, Paul warns the non-Judeans against their arrogance toward the Judeans; they owe their salvation to God's mercy and the righteousness of Israel's patriarchs, especially Israel's Messiah. They cannot bear fruit apart from the Judeans, and they would need to depend on Israel's taproot from which they are being supported (11:18).

Paul writes as a leader addressing the socio-ethnic conflicts between Judean and non-Judean Christ groups. He seeks to unite them by recategorising them into a single, shared group with equal, non-ethnic membership. He does this through a theological understanding of God's salvation plan for them. He is also negotiating his mission as a Judean among the non-Judeans concerning the participation of both Judeans and non-Judeans in God's salvation plan. If God has not rejected the Judeans, then the Judean mission to participate with the non-Judeans in God's salvation plan is still valid. Consequently, Paul's mission as a Judean is still justified. Finally, he conceives of his mission to the non-Judeans as a means of stirring the hardened Judeans to jealousy, so that they might be restored to faith in the Messiah.

Paul concludes this section with a hymn of praise to God, which he expects the Judean and non-Judean Christian groups to join. In the middle of the hymn, there are two scriptural quotations. Jewett (2007:714) questions the Pauline origin of this hymn because it has no "explicit Christian elements." However, for the reasons below, I suggest that Pauline origin is more plausible. First, it is worth noting that two of the four verses are quotations, which leaves only two hapax words that Paul might have added outside of scripture. Also, there are words such as πλοῦτος or their cognate verbs, as well as motifs of this hymn that recur in Romans (Kujanpää 2019:254), such as in Rom. 2:4; 9:23; 10:12; 11:12 (twice) in ways that are compatible with 11:33. Also, the first quotation (Isa. 40:13) occurs in 1 Cor. 2:16, which strongly suggests a Pauline origin for the use of the verse in Rom. 11:34 . While pre-Pauline origin cannot be completely ruled out, the Pauline origin is thus more plausible (Käsemann 1973:305; Cranfield 1979:589; Dunn 1988b:698; Fitzmyer, 1993:633; Moo 1996:740).

Rom. 11:34 τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;

Isa. 40:13 (LXX) τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, καὶα τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν;

The scriptural citations form a series of three questions beginning with / the scriptural citations form a series of three questions beginning with τίς. The first two questions are derived from Isa. 40:13, with the wording closely resembling that of the Septuagint, but exhibiting some minor deviations. Paul inserts γὰρ to connect the citation to what precedes it, to continue the theme of "unsearchable judgments" and "inscrutable ways."

The second citation is more problematic concerning its derivation. It is mainly believed that Paul cites Job 41:3, but his wording deviates significantly from the Septuagint. Regarding its derivation, it is mainly believed that Paul cites Job 41:3, but his wording deviates significantly from the Septuagint.

ixxi

Rom. 11:35 ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεταί μοι καὶ ὑπομενεῖ (Or who has first given to him that he should be repaid)

Job 41: 3 (LXX) ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεταί μοι καὶ ὑπομενε (Or who will withstand me and endure)

Koch suggested that Paul's wording might have been his own Hebraising modification of the inaccurate revised Septuagint translation (Koch 1986:72–73). He further points out that Paul's other citation from Job (Job 5:13 in 1 Cor. 3:19) represents Hebraising revision. It is suggested that Paul changes the revised version by substituting the original μοί ("to me") with αὐτῷ ("to him") (Koch 1986:73, 111) so that God's speech changes into a statement about God, so that the citation will harmonise with the rest of the hymn, which uses the third person singular (Koch 1986:139). Although the above suggestion for this citation is plausible, another possibility is that Paul cites Isa. 40:14.

Rom. 11:35 ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;

Isa.40:14(LXX) ἢ πρὸς τίνα συνεβουλεύσατο καὶ συνεβίβασεν αὐτόν ἢ τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ἢ ὁδὸν συνέσεως τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ

Kujanpää (2019:258-260) suggests that Paul cites Isa. 40:13–14 but omits some material from the middle. He goes further to argue that omitting material from quotations is typical of Paul's practice, citing the way Paul handles the wording of Isa. 40:13 in 1 Cor. 2:16. According to Kujanpää (2019:259), it is because the words fit the context of Isa. 40:14 much better than that of Job 41:3.

It seems that Kujanpää's suggestion is more plausible because, in Isa. 40:12–14, the rhetorical questions begin with τίς and are followed by a promise of restoration (Isa. 40:9–11). These rhetorical questions point to God's unexpected divine action, which transcends human comprehension (Isa. 40:12–14), a theme explored in Rom. 11:33–36. These questions

in Isa. 40:12–14, as to whether someone has advised God in any way or has first given to him that he should be repaid, are synonymous with advising God concerning the outworking of his divine salvation plan among the Judeans and non-Judeans.

Paul uses these citations to praise God as he considers the depth of God's riches, wisdom, and knowledge in relation to the salvation of both Judeans and non-Judeans. The idea that God's judgments are unsearchable and that his ways are inscrutable (11:33) concerns the same outworking of God's salvation plan among the Christ group (Judeans and non-Judeans). It is not an isolated or generic truth about God. The conjunction γάρ at the beginning of the first quotation is an indication that the three τίς questions give credence to Paul's hymn of praise toward the divine plan of God (Wilckens 1980:269). These rhetorical questions do not affirm that no one can understand God's salvation plan. Instead, they invoke an expression of wonder and amazement because, from the human perspective, it is surprising and unexpected. No one could have foreseen it, which demonstrates that God can reconcile both divine and human freedom without compromising His integrity, and that His salvation plan for the Judeans and non-Judeans involves their interdependency. The final line of the hymn reaches the climax: "For from him and through him and to him are all things" (11:36). Consequently, Paul affirms that God controls history, and he knows how to work out his salvation for his praise and glory.

Regarding social identity, Paul seeks to unite them by invoking praise from the Christ group (Judeans and non-Judeans) concerning God's salvation plan for them. Additionally, by inviting his readers to share in praise and blessings, Paul acts as an identity impresario, embedding identity in specific acts of prayer and praise. By implication, prayer and praise become integral to the identity framework that forms and shapes the Christ group. Paul uses scripture in the context of their social realities to categorise them as a single group, called into God's plan despite their ethnic or social differences. Again, we are reminded that social

ixxi

conflicts among God's people require theological truth for reconciliation; no theology can stand alone but must always be connected to the social realities of God's people.

So far, in Chapter 11, Paul presents the salvation of Judeans and non-Judeans as fundamentally interdependent, leaving no room for boasting. Additionally, he clarifies his mission to the non-Judeans, distinct from his mission among the Judeans. Instead, the two are pertinent to God's salvation plan.

Lastly, without denying the plight of the hardened Judeans, he presents the role of the Judean Christ group in a way that strengthens their identity. At the same time, he also invites them to their salient shared identity with the non-Judeans. With this, Paul communicated a firm foundation for living together as one ἐκκλησία (Watson 2007:343). In the overall scheme of God's divine plan, everyone in this Christ group (Judeans and non-Judeans) similarly depends on God's mercy. Paul affirms that "all Israel" will be saved in connection with the fullness of the non-Judeans, although full details remain clouded. This is Paul's magisterial genius as a social identity entrepreneurial leader. It calls for a united praise of God from the Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

As we approach the conclusion of this thesis, we aim to summarise Romans 9-11, employing SIT as our interpretive framework. We have considered Paul's use of Scripture in Romans 9-11 in relation to the social context of Paul's audience, employing SIT as our hermeneutical lens. We have also done some rhetorical analysis of Romans 9-11 before applying SIT to the scriptural citations in these three chapters.

Regarding the audience of Romans, we have suggested that Paul wrote this letter to the Christ-group in Rome, comprising both Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ. These Christ-followers had a social conflict fueled by a theological misunderstanding of their shared identity in Christ. They did not understand the non-ethnic basis of their calling and group formation in Christ. Therefore, Paul wrote to them to explain their calling, the process of forming a Christ group, and their shared identity within it. He affirms that God's grace first called the Judeans, and that some then became hardened. During their hardening, God also called the non-Judeans by grace (Rom. 1:16-17; 11:7-11). The calling of the non-Judeans was meant to provoke the Judeans' jealousy so that the hardened Judeans would be saved. This way, Paul argues that 'all Israel,' which comprises the remnant and hardened Judeans, will be saved.

By explaining the formation process of this group, Paul, in line with SIT, uses scriptural citations to recategorise the members of this Christ group so that their shared identity in Christ becomes the superordinate identity above other identities they possess. This way, Paul could help them identify with the "in Christ" values that shape this group, leading to a resolution of the social conflicts among them. Additionally, as a group of Judeans and

non-Judeans in Christ, they can appropriate their “in-Christ” identity in contrast to the identities of the non-Christ Judean and non-Judean outgroups.

As argued in this dissertation, Paul appears to have recognised that the social conflicts within the Christ group in Rome stemmed from their theological confusion regarding their shared identity and their place in God's divine plan. Therefore, he utilises the authority of scriptural citations pertinent to their present social context to recategorise them into a unified Christ group, sharing a common belonging in God's salvation plan.

We do not claim that Paul was a social identity theorist during his days; instead, the principles of SIT serve as a hermeneutical lens to reveal Paul’s resolution of the crisis among the Christ group in Rome. Hence, we have undertaken an exegesis of the texts, including a rhetorical analysis in connection with their social-identity interpretation.

In Rom. 9:1-5, Paul laments that most of the Judeans have rejected Christ. He categorises himself as belonging to the same ethnic group as the Judeans (9:3), yet he distances himself from them using the third-person plural pronoun “theirs” in Rom. 9:4-5. While he was certainly proud to be a Judean (cf. 2 Cor. 11:22), this is likely Paul’s strategy to affirm the Judeans' ethnicity and his shared sub-identity with them before he explores their shared identity in Christ with non-Judeans. This is especially important in conflict resolution, where the peacemaker does not overlook the social, ethnic, and other contexts of the group members involved in the conflict, yet can invite them to a more superordinate identity and sense of belonging. Also, the non-Judeans would not see Paul as taking sides with the Judeans, since any such action would make them less likely to respond to his appeal for unity.

However, what does this mass rejection of Christ mean for the Judeans concerning God’s integrity about his promises to them? Does this mean that God’s promises have failed?

If this were so, how could the non-Judean Christ group rely on God's integrity concerning his divine plan of salvation? While this question is not the thrust of Paul's argument in Romans 9-11, Paul nevertheless seeks to answer them later in chapter 11, but he first addresses objections to his proposed arguments.

He argues in Rom. 9:6a that God's word has not failed. This is not an abstract affirmation about God's faithfulness to his word, to which he devotes the rest of his argument. Instead, it should be understood in the context of God's word concerning the framework of the salvation of the Judeans, which Paul deems necessary to defend, as he would later argue that the salvation of the Judeans is interdependent with that of the non-Judeans. In terms of SIT, Paul has just begun a long argument that will invite the Judean and non-Judean members of the Christ-group into a shared, superordinate identity and sense of belonging, thereby fostering unity among them.

In the affirmation that God's word has not failed (Rom. 9:6-29), Paul gives some evidence of God's word concerning the remnant Judean Christ group (9:27). From the time of Abraham, God has been consistent with his purpose of election, of which this remnant group is the proof (9:11, 11:5). In connection with this, Paul additionally affirms that the scripture also foretold the inclusion of the non-Judeans in the calling of God (9:24-27). What Paul is trying to achieve here is referred to as social re-categorisation within SIT. He wants the Judean and non-Judean members of the Christ group to see themselves primarily as one group called by God through Christ, with a shared belonging in Christ. This then ought to be the foundation for ongoing unity among them.

In terms of SIT, group members identify themselves by comparison with others outside their group. Therefore, Paul compares the non-Judean Christ group and the Judean non-Christ group. From this comparison, it would become evident that belonging to the

Christ-group is not due to any ethnic advantage of the Judeans or through any social advantage of the non-Judeans. Belonging is by faith in Christ alone, and this eliminates all boasting.

It is possible that some people objected to the idea of faith in Christ as the framework for salvation. They might have argued that the Judeans have rejected Christ because he is also the saviour of the non-Judeans, and that they are saved via the law, not through Christ. Paul responds to this false notion in Rom. 10:4-17 by asserting that Christ is the end (τέλος) of the law; hence, the way of salvation for both Judeans and non-Judeans is by faith in Christ. This does not mean the Judeans have nothing to do with the law as a sub-identity in their group formation. Instead, it means that the law has been terminated in Christ as the superordinate framework for forming the Judean Christ group. Therefore, if it is by faith, no merit or demerit can lead to superiority or inferiority in terms of belonging to the Christ group. Both Judeans and non-Judeans have equal opportunities and privileges in Christ.

Paul concludes this section by showing that the Judean rejection of the gospel is not due to a lack of opportunity to hear or understand it; rather, Scripture has foretold their disobedience (10:18-21). Since the Judean rejection of Christ is not due to the inability of God or Christ to save them, Paul goes on to argue strongly in Rom. 11:1a (μὴ γένοιτο·), insisting that God has not rejected the Judeans (11:2a), using himself and the remnant Judeans as prototype Judeans who have experienced God's salvation (11:5). As for the hardened Judeans ("others" in 11:7), Paul argues that their hardening is also factored into God's divine plan. Regarding the SIT terms, Paul categorises the Judeans into two groups: one comprising those who follow Christ and the other comprising those who do not. He wants the Judean Christ-followers to know that they, including himself, belong to the same Christ group, not just by ethnicity but through faith in Christ, although they share an ethnic background with the non-Christ Judeans. The Judean Christ-followers need to know that

ixxi

while their ethnicity is not unimportant, their superordinate identity is in Christ. They belong to a different group from the non-Christ Judean group, though they share the same ethnic identity with them. Considering the argument Paul proposes, he expects the Judean Christ group to maintain their "in-Christ" group identity amidst conflict with non-Judean Christ-followers without relinquishing their Judean ethnic identity. This would also be true for the non-Judean Christ-followers; they, too, need to work out their "self" in the light of the common identity and values of the "in Christ" group membership that they share with the Judeans, but without losing their non-Judean sub-identities.

Finally, knowing that God's divine plan also covers the hardened Judeans, who in SIT terms are outgroup members temporarily, the Christ group (ingroup) needs to develop a positive stereotype toward them, instead of the negative stereotype imposed on outgroup members. Paul hopes that these three groups will form the Christ group, comprising Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ, and the non-Christ, hardened Judean group. He will later affirm that belonging to the Christ group is a matter of God's mercy. Therefore, there is hope for the hardened non-Christ Judeans, too. All these efforts aim to unite the Christ group (ingroup members) toward a shared identity in Christ, without compromising the status of the non-Christ Judean group, as they too are encompassed by God's divine plan.

The divine mercy of God upon the hardened Judeans (non-Christ Judeans) in relation to the salvation of the remnant Judeans and the non-Judean followers of Christ is what Paul refers to as a mystery in Rom. 11:25-26. The term "mystery" should not be understood as a revelation not found in the scriptures; rather, it is a revelation that needs to be unpacked to Paul's audience because of its paradoxical nature. This is why Paul concludes this section by calling both Judeans and non-Judeans to praise God once this mystery is revealed (11:33-36).

Concerning the use of Scripture, Paul affirmed that his apostleship and gospel are in accordance with what was promised in the holy Scriptures (Rom. 1:1-2). However, in Romans 9-11, Paul cites more of these OT texts than in any other part of his letter to the Romans (Stanley 1992:83–184, 252). We have already undertaken a rhetorical analysis (Stanley 1992:45, 49–56) of Romans 9-11, examining the background and function of the citations and, ultimately, how SIT aids in understanding the nature and function of these citations.

Concerning the use of Scripture, we argue that Paul's audience relied on its contextualised authority, even if they did not understand the original contexts of all the references. We argued that Paul's oracular use of these citations made his point perspicuous to his audience (Stanley 1992:38-61, 178-180). It is doubtful that his audience would have understood many of the citations conflated by Paul, which deviate from the original contexts of those passages in the process. This means that Paul had the liberty to modify, add to, or combine some of the citations to achieve his goal, taking into account the context of his audience at the time. Paul's interest was in resolving the social conflicts among his audience by helping them understand the process and identity framework of the formation of the Christ group, which is not ethnic.

We have identified some citations by the introductory formula used, "as it is written," or by the way they are sometimes reworked and applied by Paul. An example is Rom. 10:20-21, where Isa. 65:1-2 is applied to two distinct groups. In its original context, Isa. 65:1-2 refers to Israel, but Paul reworks it so that the first part in Rom. 10:21 refers to non-Judeans, while the second part in 10:22 refers to Israelites. We have also observed that, although the scriptural citations serve rhetorical purposes for Paul's argument, we have woven SIT into this rhetorical analysis.

While a detailed rehearsal of our discussion of the citations is unnecessary here, it is worth highlighting some of them from the perspective of SIT in this conclusion. In Rom. 9:25-26, Paul cites Hosea 2:23 and 1:10, respectively. In their original contexts, the term "non-people" in these passages refers to the Judeans, but Paul now rhetorically applies it to the non-Judeans. When these citations are interpreted within the framework of Paul's argument in Romans 9, he is using them to explain his trail of argument starting from 9:6, leading to his affirmation in 9:24 that God's calling includes both Judeans and non-Judeans. Paul wants the Judeans to know that the non-Judeans also belong to God's people through faith in the Messiah. This means that belonging to this group is not based on ethnicity or any other status or criterion for non-Judeans. Hence, there should be no boasting by either Judeans or non-Judean Christ-followers. In social identity terms, Paul uses these citations to recategorise both Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers into one group, highlighting their shared salient identity and values that should shape their behaviour, without losing other traits of self that they may exhibit in different contexts or groups. This way, the members of this Christ-group will be united toward a common goal through a better understanding of the basis of their group membership, and they will also differentiate themselves from other non-Christ outgroups that may share some common identities with them outside of Christianity.

Paul begins this argument in Rom. 9:6b when he affirms that not all who are descended from Israel are Israel. In social identity terms, he is recategorising the Judeans into two distinct groups despite their shared ethnicity. Therefore, he must give further explanation about this recategorization of the Judeans. He explains why the children of God are not defined solely by their ethnic connection to Abraham but by God's promise (9:7-9). This means that the Judeans can retain their ethnicity, but this is not the basis for belonging to the group of the children of God. The calling of God is not based on works (9:11), but rather on the mercy and compassion of God (9:14-16, 18). The above is the basis for God's calling

and belonging to the Christ group, which encompasses both Judeans and non-Judeans, leading to the citation of the Hosea passage. God calls those who are "not-people" to become his people, Judeans and non-Judeans alike. Paul argues that the Scripture has spoken about this a long time ago.

He goes further to cite Isa. 10:22, 23 in 9:28, confirming his argument from 9:27 that among the Judeans, the remnant shall be saved. By this, Paul is still categorising the Judeans into two groups: the remnant Judeans, who are part of the Christ group and are saved, and the non-Christ Judeans, whose fate he would discuss later in chapter 11 as hardened Judeans.

We suggest that Paul's argument remains consistent so far; there is no reason to indicate that the non-Judeans are included in the remnant group, which would not align with Paul's argument up to this point. Instead, he argues that the people of God are called from among both the remnant of Judeans and also from among the non-Judeans. The non-Judeans are not part of the remnant Judeans; rather, they are included with them to form the children of God. Judeans remain Judeans, but they are part of the Christ group, not because of their ethnicity. Later in chapter 11, Paul will explain the apparent contradiction which may seem to exist between "the remnant will be saved" in Rom. 9:27 and "all Israel will be saved" in Rom. 11:26. We have noted earlier in this dissertation that the phrase "all Israel" refers to the combination of the remnant of Judeans (9:27) and the hardened Judeans (11:7).

In Romans 10:11, Paul cites Isa. 28:16, interpreted to mean that anyone (in the context, Judean or non-Judean) who believes in Christ will not be put to shame. This means that in Romans 11:12, Paul envisions no fundamental distinction in status between Judeans and non-Judeans. Both groups participate equally in the salvific 'riches' generated through Israel's stumbling and, ultimately, through Israel's future fullness. Paul's logic, therefore, undermines any hierarchical differentiation between the two groups within the Christ-movement. It is the same Lord who is Lord of all (Judean and non-Judean Christ-

followers), and God richly blesses all (Judeans and non-Judeans) who call on Him for salvation. Then Paul finally affirms that everyone (Judean or non-Judean) who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved (Rom. 10:13; Joel 2:32).

In Rom. 10:19, Paul cites Deut. 32:21 that the Judeans will become jealous of the non-Judeans ("not-nation"). This is a prophetic statement made by Moses to the Israelites. When Paul employs the jealousy motif in Rom. 11:11, 14, he connects it with the salvation of the hardened Judeans. The remnants are not saved through jealousy (11:5, 7), likewise those who are saved by Paul's present ministry (11:14), but the Judeans who are provoked to jealousy are the "other" who are hardened (11:7). Here again, Paul uses this citation and the jealousy motif to categorise the Judean Christ group as distinct from the non-Christ Judean group (hardened Judeans). This is to be understood in connection with the salvation of "all Israel" in 11:26. As previously indicated above, the Judeans need to realise that belonging to God's people is not determined by ethnic identity, and they do not have to relinquish their ethnicity because they belong to God's people. However, the remnant Judean Christ-followers also need to understand that membership in the Christ group does not include the hardened Judeans simply because they are connected by shared ethnicity, yet at the same time, they should never assume that God has abandoned the hardened Judeans. The non-Judean Christ-followers, too, need not boast (11:18) about their membership in the Christ group because God has not given up on the hardened Judeans.

In all these citations, Paul argues that membership in the Christ-group is open to both Judeans and non-Judeans, and the boundary involved is faith in Christ, not ethnicity or any other social advantage. The Christ group is inclusively exclusive to both Judeans and non-Judeans, meaning that it is open to both but could exclude individuals due to a lack of faith in Christ.

Therefore, for the members of the Christ group, their behaviour should be motivated by their superordinate identity in Christ, whose goal is to love one another. Otherwise, any boasting from either the Judeans or non-Judean Christ-followers will reflect an exclusive inclusivity, meaning that some others are denied belonging based on other criteria apart from faith in Christ. This boasting related to this factor will continue to foster more social crises in the Christ group.

In Rom. 11:15, Paul affirms God's sovereignty in Israel's rejection, stating that it has a positive purpose for the salvation of the rest of the world. He goes further to say that the restoration of Israel will bring life to others. This means that the salvation of both Judeans and non-Judeans is interdependent in the unfolding of God's plan. He knows the proper process of forming the Christ group. This helps to strengthen his argument of the "first fruits" and "olive tree" metaphors that follow.

We have suggested that Paul's use of metaphors, such as "first fruits" in Rom. 11:16, refers to the remnant of Judeans who are saved and serve as a sign of hope for the future salvation of the hardened Judeans. Additionally, the use of "broken branches" (11:17a) refers to the hardened Judeans, while the "wild olive" (11:17b) refers to the non-Judean followers of Christ. In SIT terms, this is another indication that Paul is categorising between the Christ group (Judean and non-Judean) and the hardened, non-Christ group. These branches include both Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ. In addition, God grafts these branches, and so God can graft the hardened Judeans if they believe in Christ. The picture of the olive tree represents the inversion of regular practice, in which cultivated olive branches were grafted onto wild olives. This is a means by which Paul reflects his pride in his Judean ancestry (Esler 2003:103-24). It also eliminates the boasting of non-Judean Christ followers (11:18), thereby minimising any further social conflicts within the Christ group.

All these steps of argumentation bring Paul to the conclusion that "all Israel," the combination of the remnant and hardened Judeans, will be saved (11:26). This will happen when all the fullness of the non-Judeans comes in (11:25). The salvation of all Israel is meant to be understood in collective terms, not that every single Judean will be saved. On this note, Paul calls both Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers to the praise of God (11:33-36). The inscrutable wisdom of God reveals the outworking of the divine plan of salvation among the Judeans and non-Judeans. Their salvation is interdependent, and it is by the mercy and grace of God alone. Neither the Judean nor the non-Judean Christ followers should boast; instead, they should rejoice in God's inscrutable wisdom concerning their salvation.

In social identity terms, we have seen how the scriptural citations are linked to Paul's recategorization of the Christ group in relation to other groups mentioned in Romans 9-11. This categorisation is necessary for the Christ group because they need to see themselves first as belonging to the same group due to their faith in Christ. This is because humans do not claim a "self" solely based on personal attributes. Instead, SIT has demonstrated that humans perceive the concept of "self" in relation to a spectrum that spans from the individual to the social, the latter being reflected in their membership in various groups. Once categorisation in terms of group belonging occurs, members of the group identify with the shared identity, which now becomes their superordinate identity. This is why Paul emphasises in Romans 9-11 that faith in Christ is the basis of belonging to the Christ group. These Christ-followers, both Judean and non-Judean, do not lose other aspects of their lives; however, their behaviour should align with their superordinate identity as a group (Romans 12-16). No one in the group should be seen as superior or inferior, as they are simply different yet share the same identity in Christ. Lastly, they will be able to lead their lives in ways distinct from those of outgroup members. The Christ group should act like Christ and as Christ-followers. Knowing that their belonging to the Christ group is an upshot of God's grace, they need to show grace

toward one another and even to the outgroups. This is why Paul warns the non-Judean Christ-followers not to boast in their salvation in comparison to the hardened Judeans. God can save the hardened Judeans, and when he does save them, then all Israel will be saved.

The norms and standards of the Christ group are well laid out by Paul in Romans 12-16. We have suggested earlier in this thesis that Paul's encouragement to the Christ group to live in harmony in chapters 12-16 is evidence of social conflict among them. A clear example is Rom. 15:7, "Accept one another, therefore, as Christ has accepted you, for the glory of God." There would have been no need for Paul to ask these Christ-followers to accept or welcome one another if they all had accepted one another. This issue was previously addressed in an earlier section of this thesis.

We have also suggested that Paul utilises collective memory and social narrative to unite the Judeans and non-Judeans within the Christ group. One of the most effective ways to resolve social conflicts within a group is to share a common narrative that unites group members. Connected to this leadership paradigm, Paul had earlier affirmed that the scripture foretold that the non-Judeans are included in God's divine plan of salvation alongside the Judeans. He then uses these citations in Romans 9-11 to elaborate on this narrative, which reveals the interdependence of the salvation of Judeans and non-Judeans.

Social or collective memory is not just the recognition of "the past" but also something that is created rather than recorded, so that the recollection serves to develop and sustain identity. While it is true that the impact of memory is to reproduce and reorder the past, it is also used to propel the truth toward the present, to which the past is regularly oriented (or to the future, when identity determines action). It is also the case that a group's identity can be constructed by recalling past narratives and using these to reframe the group's identity in the present (Van Eck 2011:201–212).

Therefore, through these citations in Romans 9-11, Paul recalls and relates the narrative of God's plan of salvation in the past to the present realities of his audience, ultimately establishing a shared identity and unity among them. Three foci of this narrative are found in Rom. 9:24 "even us whom he has called, not from the Judeans only but also from the non-Judeans," also in Rom. 9:27 "Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will be saved," and finally in 11:25b-26a "a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the non-Judeans come in, and so all Israel will be saved." So, the purpose for which Paul recalls the past events from Scripture is to link God's past outworking of his divine plan to the present and future, toward his argument that 'all Israel' will be saved, despite the temporary and temporal setback of the hardened Judeans, and that this salvation is interdependent on the salvation of the non-Judeans. This is why Paul's statement in Rom. 9:24 is pivotal to his entire argument in 9-11: God has called His people from among both Judeans and non-Judeans. Also, belonging to God's people is not based on ethnicity or any other social status of the group members; rather, it depends on faith in Christ.

The above can be seen in Paul's use of the past narrative of Abraham and Sarah, Isaac, and Rebecca (9:7-13, Gen. 9:7, 9; 18:10,14; 21:12; 25:23). He categorises the Judeans into two groups: those who are physical descendants of Abraham and those who are of the promise (9:6). It is those who are of the promise that are children of God. He then uses these scriptural narratives to affirm that God's calling from among the Judeans is not based on their ethnic privilege, though the Judeans who are called do not give up their ethnicity. This is the reason for the statement in 9:11b (so that God's purpose of election might continue, not because of works but because of his call). The same applies to the story of Pharaoh, which recalls God's divine work among a prototype non-Judean.

Similar is the narrative of God's dealings with Moses (Exo. 33:19; Rom. 9:15). Moses was curious about how God would work out his deliverance for the disobedient people of Israel as they entered the Promised Land, through his leadership. He knew that the unbelief of the Israelites had disrupted his leadership under God and his ability to lead his people into God's salvation. It is in this context that God replied that he will have mercy on whom he will have mercy and have compassion on whom he will have compassion. God was telling Moses that He could carry out His divine plan among His people through him, without any human help. By recalling these narratives, Paul is already indicating that God's salvation plan for both Judeans and non-Judeans is non-meritorious.

The impact of these narratives on Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers is that they develop a shared identity shaped by the electing grace of God, which is devoid of any ethnic or social merit on the part of the elect. This will serve as a unifying factor among them by eliminating boasting that can fuel social conflict. It will also help them recategorise themselves positively with respect to the outgroup members (non-Christ Judeans and non-Judeans).

In Rom. 11:1-6, Paul draws on the Elijah narrative in 1 Kgs. 19:18 to support his argument that God has not rejected the Judeans. Elijah appealed to God that all his prophets had been killed, and he was the only one left. However, God had kept seven thousand who served as a remnant during Elijah's time. From this narrative, Paul argues that there is also a remnant elected by grace (11:5) among his audience, and if this election is by grace, it cannot be based on works (ethnic belonging), otherwise grace would no longer be grace (11:6). The reason Paul invokes this narrative from the Scripture is because he sees a correlation between the Elijah event and the present situation of his Judean audience. He wants them to know that, in the outworking of God's divine plan, he keeps a remnant as a sign of hope for future salvation, more importantly, that this is an act of God's grace alone. Paul's Judean audience

would be encouraged, knowing that there is a sign of hope for the hardened Judeans through the remnant. Additionally, because the election of the remnant is by grace, it affords them an identity within the Christ group that reminds them they are not superior to any non-Judeans in the group. The non-Judean Christ-followers hearing Paul's argument would also be reminded that there is hope for the hardened Judeans. Therefore, they should not boast against the Judeans, thinking that God has rejected them (11:18). Overall, the Elijah narrative helps unite the Judeans and non-Judeans within the Christ group, as both gain a deeper understanding of God's grace, which further shapes their shared identity within the Christ group.

Next is the agricultural imagery of branches being broken off so that wild olive shoots may be grafted in, allowing the unbroken branches and the wild olive shoots to share the same nourishing sap from the olive root (Rom. 11:17-20, 23-24). We suggested in an earlier chapter of this dissertation that the wild olive represents the non-Judean Christ-followers, the broken branches represent the hardened non-Christ Judeans, and the unbroken branches represent the Judean Christ followers (the remnant). However, Paul reverses the usual agricultural grafting practice in this image to boost his ethnic pride, although his goal was to unite both Judeans and non-Judeans. In social-identity terms, Paul employs this metaphor to foster a shared identity among Judean and non-Judean followers of Christ, who share the same nourishing sap from the olive root. This will help remove any social or ethnic barriers among them and, therefore, foster unity. It will also help the non-Judean Christ-followers, particularly not to boast against the Judeans, as the metaphor suggests that God can do the impossible by human standards. He can and will save the hardened Judeans, of which the remnant Judean group is a sign of hope for these hardened Judeans. According to Paul, "All Israel will be saved." By this, we argue that this means all the remnant and the hardened Judeans will be corporately saved.

Ultimately, this thesis highlights key social conflicts that have fragmented various groups of Christ-followers; more importantly, it focuses on SIT as a tool to help resolve them.

EPILOGUE

We want to suggest the following applications, which could help resolve social conflicts within Christian communities and institutions today. These proposed solutions are intended to influence the values, behaviour, and actions of Christians who adopt them.

First, scholars and bible communicators need to pay more attention to the social contexts of the NT. They need to provide a theological interpretation of texts with a clear understanding of the social contexts in which the texts originated. For example, the traditional approach, which treats Romans 12-16 as ethics or application, needs to reconsider these chapters as the social cause or reason for Paul's theology in Romans. One would gain a better understanding of Paul's theology in Romans if chapters 12-16 were read before chapters 1-11, as the social realities would come to the fore, aiding the theological interpretation of the text. When Romans is read and taught in this way, it helps shape the social realities, identity, and behaviour of Christians, rather than relying on abstract theological teachings from which Christians must work out applications. Similarly, what is called 'application' in preaching and teaching within our church ministries might be better understood as identity formation. It is more of a call to put our identity, values, and norms into action than a charge to do something temporarily after listening to a sermon.

Second, the use of social identity in the NT, as a hermeneutical tool in Romans 9-11, can contribute to the ongoing conversation on reconciliation among Christian communities worldwide. There are numerous social conflicts among churches, ecumenical movements, mission agencies, and other communities, stemming from the challenge of unity in diversity. Reconciliation is needed, and this can be achieved by promoting a healthy process of church membership formation and fostering a shared, superordinate identity among members from diverse social and ethnic backgrounds.

Our goal is to envision an eschatological, perfect reconciliation, the process of which has now begun among God's diverse children. This reconciliation is a pilgrimage that every Christian is called to participate in. The proof that reconciliation is happening among Christians is not the absence of conflicts; rather, it is the presence of pain as we journey toward unity. It is this pain that each Christian experiences in loving and accepting one another within the group, due to their shared identity in Christ. Where there is no such ongoing pain, the dominant members of the Christ group are likely assimilating the non-dominant members. At best, it can be described as the assimilation of non-dominant members, but it certainly does not convey a sense of belonging to this group. This is pseudo unity and belonging, when some are denied their "other" sub-identities before they can belong to a diverse group. It opens the door to more conflicts within the group. The path to reconciliation lies in unity through multiplicity and diversity, embracing what is fruitful in our divisions, purifying them, and welcoming the positive aspects that arise from diversity.

I recall meeting with some church leaders a couple of years back. I explained how SIT has shaped my understanding of the social realities and conflicts in Romans, but more importantly, our social conflicts in churches and Christian mission agencies in the United Kingdom. Their eyes popped open, and one of them said, "We have to organise a seminar for you to help us with these insights." This is because most churches that desire to be multiethnic usually do not get the process of formation right. The dominant or host members of the church establish their norms and standards within their identity framework and expect new members to adhere to and submit to them. This never leads to unity because new group members will soon realise that they do not share an equal sense of belonging and identity within this group. Instead, they are being assimilated into it, so that they adopt another identity framework belonging to another ethnic group.

A couple of years ago, we suddenly had a massive number of migrants from Hong Kong move into the neighbourhood of our local church in London, about three thousand families. From this vast number, approximately 75 families joined our church. This brought about a significant shift in the membership dynamics of our church, from being predominantly white British to predominantly Hongkongers. However, unlike other churches around us, our church was not taken by surprise or confused about how to welcome these new members. About two years before this incident, I had assisted our church in navigating the process of becoming a multiethnic church and establishing a common identity framework that does not eradicate or subsume the other sub-identities of church members. Therefore, upon the arrival of these Hongkongers, we introduced a new process for forming church membership, enabling both new and existing members to develop a shared identity framework centered on love, hope, and faith. Then, norms and standards were initiated to guide us. Even new roles were created so that some new members among the Hongkongers could be employed to join the church's staff team. What we observed was that the Hongkongers quickly settled into the church. They are now behind the musical instruments on Sundays, lead prayer meetings, and serve in the kitchen and at the door, welcoming members to church services. When asked how they quickly settled into the church, they said that they have a sense of belonging to the church just like the existing members, and they were not just assimilated into the church, unlike most churches. This does not mean that there is no conflict within our church. Instead, we are a church guided by an identity framework that fosters unity, embracing our agreed norms and standards to resolve disputes whenever they arise.

Last year, my church was preaching through the book of Romans, so I was asked to preach on chapters 9-11. When I preached the first session in light of SIT, the church leadership and many church members said it was the first time Romans had made sense to them. The previous preachers had focused on the theological grid leading to justification by

faith alone, but they ignored the social context of this great doctrine. Perhaps, this is why evangelical churches have been preaching this great doctrine of justification by faith from Romans for several years, yet racism and social segregation still linger to this day. They are not interested in revisiting the process of forming a church to be genuinely multiethnic and international. They want new members to be assimilated into the existing identity framework, norms, and values, which are often completely foreign to them. Rather than fostering unity, this paradigm has consistently generated more conflicts that lead to breakaways. It is not easy to theologise correctly if the social context framework of the community in which the text is situated is ignored. This is why my preaching series on Romans 9-11 from the SIT perspective, along with several seminars, has contributed to the ongoing unity in the church amidst conflicts that arise from our multiethnic church dynamic.

Paul does not present the unity of the Christ-followers as an end in itself; rather, he frames it as the essential means through which the mixed Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers can embody their renewed identity and fulfil their divinely intended purpose, which is to promote God's mission. Likewise, unity among Christian groups today correlates with the success of their mission. The challenge of coping with unity in diversity and indifference to their group's differences is the problem of our churches today. Some group members prioritize their dominant social-ethnic identity over that of others within the same group, rather than embracing their shared identity in Christ. They are asking "others" to give up their sub-identities to join the group, while these dominant group members retain their own.

In connection with the above, three Chief Executives, including myself, resigned from our respective Christian mission agencies about two years ago, and we had no idea that each of us was facing the same challenges. We did not discuss our resignation until after it was made public. It was when we met with other global Christian leaders from Africa, Asia, and

Latin America to share our struggles and pray together that we realised we were facing the same issues. So, what is this "big elephant" in the room? It is the fact that these organisations had employed us to lead global organisations with a majority of members in the southern hemisphere, or what is now called the "majority world," which includes Africa, Asia, and Latin America. However, the majority of funds came primarily from Western countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom, among others. The implication was that the paradigm of leadership and management was Western, primarily because it generated the most significant financial contributions. In social identity terms, the superordinate identity and culture of the group members were Western, which contradicted the public image of these organizations as global, diverse, and international, because the majority of the members were from non-Western social and ethnic contexts. Consequently, the norms and values of these organizations are predominantly Western, disregarding the non-Western norms and values of other members. These organizations had hired us to make a public claim that they were truly international, global, and diverse, but in reality, they wanted us to maintain and enforce their Western framework and values within our organizations. However, in my case, I chose to travel in the opposite direction by proposing a polycentric style of leadership and management, meaning that each regional group across the globe would self-govern itself but appoint its leadership from the diverse countries where our organisation has a base of operation. This way, I was trying to help the organization review its formation process to ensure that, from the regions, there would be an agreed-upon identity framework, norms, and values that could be collectively adopted at the international level of the organization, thereby enhancing unity across the different levels and regions. Not surprisingly, almost all my international team members agreed to it, except for those from some Western countries. Why? This was perceived to weaken the power dynamic that Western partner members had wielded for several years. The leadership framework of the organization did not encourage a superordinate identity, norms, and values that could hold the whole organization together;

ixxi

instead, it promoted their Western (mainly American) identity and values that constituted power dynamics that all other non-Western members were meant to adhere to under the guise of "international global partnership". Therefore, what you get on the surface is a façade of unity. However, internally, disgruntled members abound who complain about being marginalized and being forced into a "mould" that is foreign to them. This was always the complaint from staff members during our monthly meetings. Sadly, this is the state of many so-called international Christian organizations today.

Conversely, it is also a well-known fact that many leaders from non-Western backgrounds have attempted to impose their identity framework and values on the leadership of international organizations, which has led to conflicts.

Related to the issues above, the question to be asked is: Why do these challenges recur in global organizations that are supposed to promote global partnerships? In social identity terms, it is because the process of forming these organizations has not been revised. They were founded by leaders from Western countries who desired to serve churches and leaders from non-Western countries but were not established on the principle of genuine partnership. As these organizations expanded, they often overlooked or even denied that the non-Western churches and leaders they had been serving for several years had also grown in significance. Therefore, these non-Western leaders and churches are invited into "global partnerships" not based on any superordinate identity and collective values, but rather on certain Western norms, values, and identities. Non-Western leaders are often excluded from partnerships; they are not typically invited to participate. This is an anomaly that fosters conflicts and undermines the group's unity. The pathway to unity involves the group leader promoting a superordinate identity that encourages group members to uphold the collective values, norms, and standards of the group. This way, the members would derive their identity, norms, and values from the collective identity and values of the group. This can only happen

if an existing organization revisits its formation process or if newly incorporated bodies conduct due diligence during their formation process, so that members are invited to share a new common identity that will shape their collective norms and values. Consequently, conflicts can be resolved, and reconciliation and unity would emerge in organizations that embrace these social identity recommendations.

Another vital aspect of this dissertation is its relevance to the Nigeria-Biafra war (1967-1970), which I mentioned earlier in the prologue. This war, which killed an estimated 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 people, was the result of an ethnic conflict that the British government caused toward the end of their colonial era in Nigeria.[10] They created Nigeria as an amalgamation of the key ethnic tribes (Yoruba, Ibo, and Hausa), but without a proper process of formation that factored the unity of these ethnic tribes into that formation process. They did not negotiate any shared identity, norms, or values that would shape the lives of the members of these ethnic groups. It did not take long for the three major ethnic groups to fight and compete over the nation's resources, which were handed over to the Hausa ethnic leadership. This is what led to the ethnic conflict that ultimately escalated into the war. However, the real issue was the British government's creation of a disunited country, which was not in the best interest of the people. There was no established identity framework introduced during the formation process, and this situation remains unchanged to this day. Consequently, some organizations like Boko Haram, Odua, and IPOB have been formed to fight for the ethnic identities of the Hausa, Yoruba, and Ibo ethnic groups, respectively.

---

[10] For more insight into the cause of the Nigeria-Biafra ethnic war, this website is helpful. https://www.afriklens.com/the-caused-of-the-nigerian-civil-war/

Although the Nigerian government and international community would like to label these groups as terrorist groups, probably due to some of their terrorist activities, it is obvious that they are all fueled by ethnic tension and conflicts. The activities of these groups have also led to the deaths of several thousand Nigerians. The fact that these organizations continue to advocate for a breakaway from Nigeria poses a threat to the country's unity. One might ask, is reconciliation possible? Is there a pathway toward unity? Yes, reconciliation and unity among these ethnic groups are possible, but only when Nigeria is ready to revisit the process of the country's creation and formation. This is what I have argued that Paul did with the Judean and non-Judean Christ-followers in Rome. He outlined the process of forming and creating the Christ group, mapping out an identity framework based on faith in Christ that would shape their norms and values, thereby enabling unity among them. During this process, in the case of Nigeria, a non-ethnic identity framework needs to be negotiated and agreed upon, which would shape the norms and values of the people. Just before the outbreak of the civil war, a military takeover of the government occurred, and then the Head of State planned to abolish the regions; however, this plan did not materialize. Abolishing the regions was not the solution; instead, they needed to review the formation of Nigeria through a shared collective identity framework across all regions. By the time the regional leaders agreed to a consultation to discuss reconciliation, it was already too late because there had been too many ethnic massacres of some groups. All the failures were due to the leaders' failure to understand the principles and implications of SIT fully. Therefore, this is another way this dissertation is significant; it would contribute immensely to the reconciliation process of the ethnic conflicts that continue to fracture Nigeria.

Similar to Nigeria is the Rwandan genocide of 1994, when more than 800,000 civilians—primarily Tutsi, but also moderate Hutu—were killed during the campaign. Similar to Nigeria, the colonial government favoured the Tutsis over the Hutus, even though the

Hutus were the majority ethnic group. They used their indirect system of government to enthrone a Tutsi President and also to dethrone the Hutu Monarch. All these factors led to inequality in sharing the nation's economic resources, consequently fracturing the relationships within these ethnic groups, leading to the genocide. Although the post-genocide Rwandan government pursued a policy of "unity and reconciliation," by adopting a new constitution and increasing economic growth and stability, the government is continually accused of committing human rights abuses against political opponents and ethnic groups. These events would have been avoided if there had been an entrepreneurial identity leader who would have rebirthed the nation on the basis of a shared identity framework, values, and norms. This is a leader who is capable of turning 'me' and 'you' into 'us'.

In conclusion, this thesis emphasises the significance of SIT in Romans 9-11, highlighting the importance of recategorising Christ-followers into a unified group that recognises their shared identity and values in God's divine plan through Christ. Paul attempts to achieve this unity by explaining the non-ethnic process by which the Christ group is formed. God's grace calls both Judeans and non-Judeans who are part of the Christ group into this group. Like this early Christ-group, all Christians are called into God's family by the grace of God, regardless of our social or ethnic backgrounds, although these differences are not eradicated. This understanding helps to shape the behaviour of the Christians and encourages humility toward one another, leading to further unity.

Finally, we hope that the unity of the church will enhance the mission of Christ through His followers worldwide and strengthen the superordinate identity of all Christians, toward an eschatological vision of unity and reconciliation that has begun in the present as we engage in God's mission in the world.

REFERENCES

Aageson, James W. 1986. "Scripture and Structure in the Development of the Argument in Romans 9–11." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48:265–289.

Aageson, James W. 1987. "Typology, Correspondence, and the Application of Scripture in Romans 9–11." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31:51–72.

Abasciano, Brian J. 2011a. *Paul's Use of the OT in Romans 9:1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis.* LNTS 317. London: T&T Clark.

Abasciano, Brian J. 2011b. *Paul's Use of the OT in Romans 9:10–18.* New York: T&T Clark.

Ábel, F František. n.d. "Ioudaïsmos through the Lens of Remembering." *Studia Biblica Slovaca* 50.

Ábel, František F. 2019. ed. The Message of Paul the Apostle Within Second Temple Judaism. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic.

Ábel, F František. 2024. "Ioudaïsmos through the Lens of Remembering: Exploration of the Semantic Shift of the Term from Maccabees to the Early Second Century CE." *Studia Biblica Slovaca* 16(1):1–20.

Abel, Magdalena, Sharda Umanath, James V. Wertsch, and Henry L. Roediger. 2017. "Collective Memory: How Groups Remember Their Past." Pp. 280–296 in *Collaborative Remembering: Theories, Research, and Applications*, edited by Celia B. Harris and Amanda J. Barnier. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abrams, Dominic. 1999. "Social Identity, Social Cognition and the Self." Pp. 197–229 in *Social Identity and Social Cognition*, edited by Dominic Abrams and Michael A. Hogg. Oxford: Blackwell.

Abrams, Dominic, Georgina Randsley de Moura, Paul Hutchison, and G. Tendayi Viki. 2005. "When Bad Becomes Good (and Vice Versa): Why Social Exclusion Is Not Based on Difference." Pp. 161–190 in *Social Exclusion and Inclusion*, edited by Dominic Abrams, Michael A. Hogg, and José M. Marques. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Achtemeier, Paul J. 1985. *Romans: A Bible Commentary for Preaching and Teaching.* Louisville: John Knox Press.

Agboola, Olakunle. 2024. "Why Nigeria's Leadership Will Not Drive Success: Analysing the Yoruba Nation Agitation and Nnamdi Kanu's Incarceration." *African Voice Newspaper*, October 19. Retrieved July 29, 2025. https://africanvoiceonline.co.uk/.

Aletti, Jean-Noël. 1987. "L'argumentation paulinienne en Rom. 9." *Biblica* 68:41–56.

Aletti, Jean-Noël. 2009. “Romans 11: Le Développement de l’Argumentation et ses Enjeux Exegetico-Theologiques.” Pp. 197–223 in *The Letter to the Romans*, edited by Udo Schnelle. BETL 226. Leuven: Peeters.

Aletti, Jean-Noël. 2011. “Interpreting Romans 11:14: What Is at Stake?” Pp. 245–264 in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, O.P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.*, edited by Peter Spitaler. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series #48. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.

Alexander, H. S., Naomi Ellemers, Stephen D. Reicher, Katherine J. Reynolds, and Michael T. Schmitt. 2010. “The Social Identity Perspective Today: An Overview of Its Defining Ideas.” Pp. 341–356 in *Rediscovering Social Identity: Key Readings*, edited by Tom Postmes and Nyla R. Branscombe. New York: Psychology Press.

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Allport, Gordon W., and Leo Postman. 1945. “The Basic Psychology of Rumour.” *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences* 8:61–81.

Alston, Richard. 2008. “History and Memory in the Construction of Identity in Early Second-Century Rome.” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Supplementary Volumes* 7:147–159. Retrieved September 1, 2021.

Amzallag, Nissim. n.d. “Jealousy as a Negative Sentiment in Modern Thought.” *Journal of Ancient Semitic Psychology* 12(3):234–245.

Apfelbaum, Erika. 2000. “And Now What, After Such Tribulations? Memory and Dislocation in the Era of Uprooting.” *American Psychologist* 55:1008–1013. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.9.1008

Arbiol, Gemma C. 2021. “Ioudaïsmos and Ioudaizō in Paul and the Galatian Controversy: An Examination of Supposed Positions.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 44(2):218–239.

Ascough, Richard S. 2015. “Paul, Synagogues, and Associations: Reframing the Question of Models for Pauline Christ Groups.” *Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting* 2:27–52.

Assmann, Aleida. 2008. “Transformations Between History and Memory.” Pp. 49–50 in *Collective Memory and Collective Identity*, edited by Arien Mack and William Hirst. *Social Research* 75(1):49–72.

Assmann, Jan. 1992. *Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und Politische Identität in Frühen Hochkulturen.* Munich: C. H. Beck.

Assmann, Jan. 2000. *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis: Zehn Studien.* Munich: Beck.

Assmann, Jan. 2001a. “Halbwachs, Maurice.” Pp. 247–249 in *Gedächtnis und Erinnerung: Ein Interdisziplinäres Lexikon*, edited by N. Pethes and J. Ruchatz. Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Assmann, Jan. 2011b. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aus, Roger D. 1979. “Paul’s Travel Plans to Spain and the ‘Full Number of the Gentile’ of Rom. XI 25.” *Novum Testamentum* 21.

Barnes, Albert. 1884. *Barnes’ Notes on the NT.* New York, NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1962a. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Black’s New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black.

Barrett, Charles. Kingsley. 1962b. *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology.* London: Black.

Barth, Karl. 1957. *Church Dogmatics. II/2. The Doctrine of God.* Translated. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Barth, Markus. 1983. *The People of God.* JSNTSup 5. Sheffield.

Battle, John A., Jr. 1981. “Paul’s Use of the OT in Romans 9:25–26.” *Grace Theological Journal* 2(1):115–122.

Bauer, Walter, Frederick William Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 2000. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baxter, Anthony G., and John A. Ziesler. 1985. “Paul and Arboriculture: Romans 11.17–24.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 7(24):25–32.

BBC News. 2011. “Nigeria's President Goodluck Jonathan Sworn in.” *BBC News*, May 29. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13431486

Beale, Gregory. K. 1984. “An Exegetical and Theological Consideration of the Hardening of Pharaoh’s Heart in Exodus 4–14 and Romans 9.” *Trinity Journal* n.s. 5:129–154.

Beare, Francis. W. 1962. *St. Paul and His Letters.* London: Adam & Charles Black.

Boyarin, D. 1994. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bornkamm, Günther. 1971. *Paul.* Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row.

Bourke, Myles M. 1947. “A Study of the Metaphor of the Olive Tree in Romans XI.” *Studies in Sacred Theology*, 2nd ser., no. 3. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

Brackens, J. 2024. *A quantitative integrative review of personal jurisdiction in Romans 1 legal exegesis and its implications on Christian Gentile homonegative doctrines.* Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion, 20, Article 2.

Brenton, Sir Lancelot Charles Lee. 1851. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English.* Revised ed. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons.

Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. 1963. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Cairns, Ian. 1992. *Word and Presence: A Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Campbell, Douglas A. (2009). *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Campbell, D.T., 1965. Ethnocentric and other altruistic motives. In D. Levine (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 13, pp. 283–311. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Campbell, William S. 1992. "The Freedom and Faithfulness of God in Relation to Israel: Romans 9–11." Pp. 43–59 in *Paul's Gospel in an Intercultural Context: Jew and Gentile in the Letter to the Romans.* Studien zur interkulturellen Geschichte des Christentums 69. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Campbell, William S. (2006). *Paul and the Creation of a New People.* London: T&T Clark.

Campbell, William S. 2008. *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity.* New York: T&T Clark.

Campbell, William S. 2013. *Unity and Diversity in Christ: Interpreting Paul in Context.* Collected Essays. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Campbell, William S. 2023. *Romans: A Social Identity Commentary.* London: Bloomsbury/T&T Clark.

Caragounis, Chrys C. 1985. "Romans 5.15–16 in the Context of 5.12–21: Contrast or Comparison?" *New Testament Studies* 31:142–148.

Carmona, Margarida, Rita Guerra, John F. Dovidio, Joep Hofhuis, and Denis Sindic. 2022. "Unpacking All-Inclusive Superordinate Categories: Comparing Correlates and Consequences of Global Citizenship and Human Identities." *Frontiers in Psychology* 13:986075. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.986075.

Casson, Sarah H. 2019. *Textual Signposts in the Argument of Romans: A Relevance Theory Approach.* Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.

Charles, Ronald. 2014. *Paul and the Politics of Diaspora*. Paul in Critical Contexts. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Chen, Yan, and Sherry Xin Li. 2009. “Group Identity and Social Preferences.” *American Economic Review* 99(1):431–457. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.99.1.431

Childs, Brevard S. 2001. *Isaiah: A Commentary.* The Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Chryssochoou, X. 1996. “How Is Group Membership Formed: Self-Categorisation or Group Beliefs?” In *Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analysis of Social Change*, edited by G. Breakwell and E. Lyons, pp. 181–194. Oxford, UK: Butterworth.

Clarke, Adam. n.d. “Clarke’s Commentary on Romans 9.” *Bible Hub.* Accessed July 25, 2025. https://biblehub.com/commentaries/clarke/romans/9.htm

Coffman, James Burton. 1983–1999. “Commentary on Romans 10:5.” *Coffman's Commentaries on the Bible*. Retrieved July 28, 2025 (https://www.studylight.org/commentaries/bcc/romans-10.html).

Cohen, Jeremy. 2005. “The Mystery of Israel’s Salvation: Romans 11:25–26 in Patristic and Medieval Exegesis.” *Harvard Theological Review* 98(3):247–281. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816005000970.

Cohen, Kenneth I. 1990. “Paul the Benjaminite: Mystery, Motives and Midrash.” *Protocol of the Colloquy of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture* 60.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. 1999. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Collins, John J. 1998. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Collins, John J. 2000. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Concannon, Cavan W. 2014. *"When You Were Gentiles": Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul's Corinthian Correspondence.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Conway, Martin A. 2005. “Memory and the Self.” *Journal of Memory and Language* 53:594–628. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.08.005

Cook III, William F. 2022. *Jesus's Final Week: From Triumphal Entry to Empty Tomb.* B&H Publishing Group.

Cordonnier, Aline, Valérie Rosoux, Anne-Sophie Gijs, and Olivier Luminet. 2022. “Collective Memory: An Hourglass Between the Collective and the Individual.” *Memory, Mind & Media* 1:e8. https://doi.org/10.1017/mem.2022.1

Cosgrove, Charles. H. 1996. “Rhetorical Suspense in Romans 9–11: A Study in Polyvalence and Hermeneutical Election.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115:271–287.

Cosgrove, Charles. H. 1997. *Elusive Israel: The Puzzle of Election in Romans.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Craigie, Peter. C. 1976. *The Book of Deuteronomy.* NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Cranfield, Charles. E. B. 1964. “The Significance of διὰ παντὸς in Romans 11:10.” In *Studia Evangelica II*, edited by F. L. Cross, pp. 109–117. TU 87. Berlin.

Cranfield, Charles. E. B. 1975. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Vol. 2: Romans 9–16.* International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Cranford, Michael. 1993. “Election and Ethnicity: Paul's View of Israel in Romans 9.1–13.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 15(50).

Crisler, Charles L. 2016. *Reading Romans as Lament: Paul’s Use of OT in His Most Famous Letter.* Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Crisler, Channing L. 2022. *An Intertextual Commentary on Romans, Volume 3: Romans 9:1–11:36.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Dahl, Nils A. 1977. “The Future of Israel.” pp. 137–158 in *Studies in Paul.* Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Das, Andrew A. 2003. *Paul and the Jews.* Library of Pauline Studies, ed. S. E. Porter. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Das, Andrew. A. 2007. *Solving the Roman Debate.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Davidiy, Yair. 2015. *Ephraim: The Gentile Children of Israel.* Lulu.com.

Davis, Anne. 2014. *All Israel Will Be Saved: Paul’s Midrash in Romans 9–11.* Los Alamos, NM: BibleInteract.

Davies, Philip R. 1997. *Hosea.* Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

Davies, William. D. 1984. “Paul and the Gentiles: A Suggestion Concerning Romans 11:13–24.” In *Jewish and Pauline Studies*, 153–165. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Dinter, Paul E. 1980. *The Remnant of Israel and the Stone of Stumbling According to Paul (Romans 9–11)*. PhD diss., Union Theological Seminary, New York.

DiMattei, Steven. 2008. "Biblical Narratives." Pp. 59–93 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 50. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.

Dixon, Thomas P. 2020. "Judgement for Israel: The Marriage of Wrath and Mercy in Romans 9–11." *New Testament Studies* 66(4):565–581. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688519000547

Dodd, Charles. H. 1953. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.* Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Donaldson, Terence L. 1993. "'Riches for Gentiles' (Rom 11:12): Israel's Rejection and Paul's Gentile Mission." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112.

Donaldson, Terence L. 1997. *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.

Eastman, Susan G. 2010. "Israel and the Mercy of God: A Rereading of Galatians 6:16 and Romans 9–11." *New Testament Studies* 56:367–395. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donfried, Karl P., ed. 1991. *The Romans Debate*. Revised and Expanded Edition. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Ehrensperger, Kathy. 2021. "Imagine—No Works of Law! Struggling with 'Erga Nomou' in Changing Times and Places." Paper presented at the "Paul Within Judaism" section, Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA.

Ehrensperger, Kathy. 2022. "Abraham Our Forefather and Herakles Our Cousin: Paul's Genealogical Reasoning and Jewish Narratives of Belonging." In *Paul within Judaism*, edited by Mike Bird and Jörg Frey. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ehrensperger, Kathy. 2024. "Israel and the Nations: Who Does Paul Think They Are?" *Religious Studies Review* 50(3):539–545. https://doi.org/10.1111/rsr.17432

Elliott, John H. 1990. "Paul, Galatians, and the Evil Eye." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 17(4/5):262–273.

Elliot, John H. 1993. *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

Ellemers, Naomi, Robert Spears, and Bertjan Doosje. 1999. "Self and Social Identity." *Annual Review of Psychology* 50:1–30.

Esler, Philip F. 1994. *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds.* Scientific Approaches to NT Interpretation. London: Routledge.

Esler, Philip F. 1998. *Galatians.* London: Routledge.

Esler, Philip F. 2003a. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter.* Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Esler, Philip F. 2003b. "Ancient Oleiculture and Ethnic Differentiation: The Meaning of the Olive-Tree Image in Romans 11." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26(1):103–124.

Esler, Philip F. 2006. "Paul's Contestation of Israel's (Ethnic) Memory of Abraham in Galatians 3." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 36(1):23–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461079060360010302

Esler, Philip F. 2009. "Judean Ethnic Identity in Josephus' *Against Apion*." Pp. 73–91 in *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Seán Freyne*, edited by Z. Rodgers, M. Daly-Denton, and A. Fitzpatrick McKinley. Leiden: Brill.

Esler, Philip F. 2014. "Group Norms and Prototypes in Matt 5.3–12: A Social-Identity Interpretation of the Matthean Beatitudes." Pp. 147–172 in *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament*, edited by A. Coleman Baker and J. Brian Tucker. London: Bloomsbury.

Esler, Philip F. 2017. *God's Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers: Re-interpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36.* Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Esler, Philip F. 2021a. "The Adoption and Use of the Word Ἐκκλησία in the Early Christ-Movement." *Early Christianity* 17(1):109–138.

Esler, Philip F. 2021b. "Paul's Explanation of Christ-Movement Identity in 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1: A Social Identity Approach." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 51:7–24.

Eyl, Jennifer. 2017. "'I Myself Am an Israelite': Paul, Authenticity and Authority." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 40(2):148–168.

Evans, Craig A. 1999. "Paul and the Prophets: Prophetic Criticism in the Epistle to the Romans (with special reference to Romans 9–11)." Pp. 115–128 in *Romans and the People of God*, edited by S. K. Soderlund and N. T. Wright. Grand Rapids–Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Fefferman, Dan. 2023. "Has Paul Romans 9:33 changed the meaning of Isaiah 28:16?" *Biblical Hermeneutics Stack Exchange.* https://hermeneutics.stackexchange.com/q/48599

Feeley-Harnik, Gillian. 2017. *The Lord's Table: Eucharist and Passover in Early Christianity.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fiske, Susan T., Amy J. C. Cuddy, Peter Glick, and Jun Xu. 2002. "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow from Perceived Status and Competition." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 82:878–902*. https://doi.org/10.1037//00223514.82.6.878.

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

Foerster, Werner, and Georg Fohrer. 1971. "σώζω, σωτηρία, σωτήρ." *In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. 7, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Forbes, Hamish A. 1982. *Strategies and Soils: Technology, Production and Environment in the Peninsula of Methana, Greece*. PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania. Ann Arbour: University Microfilms International.

Foster, Robert B. 2016. *Renaming Abraham's Children: Election, Ethnicity, and Interpretation of Scripture in Romans 9*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/421. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Fredriksen, Paula. 2017. *Paul the Pagan's Apostle.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Fung, William C. 2004. *Israel's Salvation: The Meaning of "All Israel" in Rom 11:26.* PhD diss., Southern Theological Seminary, Louisville.

Furstenberg, Yair. 2020. "Contesting Identities: The Splitting Channels from Israelite to Jew." In *A Companion to Late Ancient Jews and Judaism: Third Century BCE to Seventh Century CE*, edited by Gwynn Kessler and Daniel Boyarin.

Gadenz, Pablo T. 2009. *Called from the Jews and the Gentiles: Pauline Ecclesiology in Romans 9–11.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Gager, John G. 2015. *Who Made Early Christianity? The Jewish Lives of the Apostle Paul.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Gaertner, Samuel L., John Mann, Audrey Murrell, and John F. Dovidio. 1989. "Reducing Intergroup Bias: The Benefits of Recategorization." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57(2):239–249.

Gaertner, Samuel L., John F. Dovidio, Phyllis A. Anastasio, Betty A. Bachman, and Mary C. Rust. 1993. "The Common Ingroup Identity Model: Recategorization and the Reduction of Intergroup Bias." *European Review of Social Psychology* 4(1):1–26.

Gaertner, Samuel L., and John. F. Dovidio. 2000. *Reducing Intergroup Bias: The Common Ingroup Identity Model.* Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Gaertner, Samuel L., and John F. Dovidio. 2002. "Categorisation, Recategorization, and Common Ingroup Identity." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 6(3):256–282. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0603_5

Gale, Herbert M. 1964. *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Garlington, Don B. 1994. *Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance: Aspects of Paul's Letter to the Romans.* WUNT 79. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Garrett, Duane A. 1997. *Hosea, Joel.* New American Commentary, Vol. 19A. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Gaston, Llyod. 1987. *Paul and the Torah.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Gathercole, Simon. (2015). *Defending Substitution.* Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Gaventa, Beverly. R. 2010. "On the Calling into-Being of Israel: Romans 9:6–29." Pp. 255–269 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*, edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Getty, Mary. A. 1988. "Paul and the Salvation of Israel: A Perspective on Romans 9–11." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 50:456–469.Giddens, Anthony. 1991. Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Givens, Terryl. 2014a. *We the People: Israel and the Catholicity of Jesus.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Givens, Terryl. 2014b. "Ethnic Discourse and the Meaning of σάρκα in Romans 9–11." Pp. 34–50 in *Feasting on the Word: Studies in Paul's Use of Scripture*, edited by David M. Allen and Steve Smith. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Godwin, Okwudili. 2012. "The Presence of the Past: Youth, Memory Making, and the Politics of Self-Determination in South-Eastern Nigeria." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(12).

Goody, Jack. 1987. *The Interface Between the Written and the Oral.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldingay, John E. 2008. *Hosea, Joel.* New International Commentary on the OT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Goroncy, Jason A. 2017. "Social Identity, Ethnicity and the Gospel of Reconciliation." *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 69(1):1–14. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v69i1.2007

Greish, Jean. 2001. *Paul Ricoeur. L'itinérance du sens.* Grenoble, France: Editions Jérome Millon.

Gundry-Volf, Judith M. 1990. *Paul and Perseverance: Staying in and Falling Away*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/37. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 1952. *Les Cadres Sociaux de la Mémoire.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory.* Edited and translated by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hall, Jonathan M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hultgren, Arland J. 2011. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Haacker, Klaus. 1999. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer.* THKNT 6. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Haacker, Klaus. 2003. *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Romans.* New Testament Theology. Cambridge University Press.

Hanson, Anthony. T. 1974. "Abraham the Justified Sinner." In *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, pp. 52–56. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Hanson, Paul D. 1975. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology.* Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Harwanto, Budi. 2020. "The Meaning of 'First Fruits' in Revelation 14:4." *Journal Koinonia: Fakultas Filsafat Universitas Advent Indonesia* 12(1):95–108.

Harmon, Mathew. 2014. "Letter Carriers and Paul's Use of Scripture." *Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters* 4(2):129–148.

Hasel, Gerhard F. 1972. *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah.* AUM 5. Berrien Springs, MI.

Haslam, S. Alexander, Jennifer Rothschild, and Tom Ernst. 2000. "The Stability of Prototypicality: Prototypes as Anchors or Dynamic Reinforcers." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 30:453–469.

Hays, Richard B. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hays, Richard B. 2005. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Hays, Richard B. 2014. *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness.* Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.

Hays, Richard B. 2016. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels.* Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.

Heil, John P. 2002. "From Remnant to Seed of Hope for Israel: Romans 9:27–29." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64:703–720.

Hendel, Ronald. 2005. *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herbert, Gaye M. 1984. *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Hewstone, Miles., and Robert. Brown. 1986. "Contact Is Not Enough: An Intergroup Perspective on the 'Contact Hypothesis.'" In *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters*, edited by M. Hewstone and R. Brown. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hewstone, Miles, Michael. Rubin, and Hazel Willis. 2002. "Intergroup Bias." *Annual Review of Psychology* 53:578–579.

Hellerman, Joseph. H. 2007. *Jesus and the People of God: Reconfiguring Ethnic Identity.* Sheffield: Phoenix.

Hillert, Stefan. 1999. *Limited and Universal Salvation: A Text-Oriented and Hermeneutical Study of Two Perspectives in Paul.* ConBNT 31. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Hinkle, Stephen., and Rupert. Brown. 1990. "Intergroup Comparisons and Social Identity: Some Links and Lacunae." In *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*, edited by D. Abrams and M. A. Hogg, pp. 48–70. New York: Springer.

Hodge, Charles. 1972. *Commentary on Romans.* Geneva Series of Commentaries. London: Banner of Truth Trust.

Hodge, Caroline Johnson. 2007. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ikeh, Chinyere Patricia. 2021. "Impact of sectional agitation for self-determination on national development: A study of IPOB and MASSOB of South-Eastern Nigeria." *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science* 9(10):36–59. ISSN(Online):2321-9467. https://www.questjournals.org/jrhss/papers/vol9-issue10/Ser-1/G09103659.pdf

Ikubanni, Oluwaseye Oluwayomi, and Mojeed Olujinmi A. Alabi. 2024. "The Yoruba people's quest for self-determination within the Nigerian constitution." *Fountain University Law Journal* 1(1). https://doi.org/10.53704/fulaj.v1i1.519

James, Myongil C. 2000. *The Obedience of Faith, the Eschatological People of God, and the Purpose of Romans.* SBLDS 177. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Jedlowski, Paolo. 2001. "Memory and Sociology: Themes and Issues." *Time & Society* 10(1):29–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X0101000

Jeong, Michael. 2018. "Obedient Gentiles and Jealous Jews: A Fresh Interpretation of Paul's Aim in Romans 11:11–14." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 41(2).

Jewett, Robert. 2007. *Romans: A Commentary.* Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Jipp, Joshua. W. 2016. "What Are the Implications of the Ethnic Identity of Paul's Interlocutor? Continuing the Conversation." In *The So-Called Jew in Paul's Letter to the Romans*, edited by R. Rodriguez and M. Thiessen, pp. 183–203. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Jodar, Etienne. 2020. "Leviticus 18:5 and the Law's Call to Faith: A Positive Reassessment of Paul's View of the Law." *Themelios* 45(1):43–57.

Johnson, Elizabeth E. 1989. *The Function of Apocalyptic and Wisdom Traditions in Romans 9–11.* SBL Dissertation Series 109. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Johnson, Elizabeth E. 1995. "The Theology of Romans 9–11." Pp. 211–239 in *Romans*, Vol. 3 of *Pauline Theology*, edited by D. M. Hay and E. Johnson. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Jonas, Kai J., and Amélie Mummendey. 2008. "Positive Intergroup Relations: From Reduced Outgroup Rejection to Outgroup Support." Pp. 210–224 in *Improving Intergroup Relations*, edited by U. Wagner et al. New York: Blackwell.

Jones, Douglas. 1955. "The Tradition of the Oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 67:226–246.

Jung, Jiin, Michael A. Hogg, and Hoon-Seok Choi. 2019. "Recategorization and Ingroup Projection: Two Processes of Identity Uncertainty Reduction." *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology* 3(2):97–114. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.37

Jetten, Jolanda, Russel Spears, and Tom Postmes. 2004. "Intergroup Distinctiveness and Differentiation: A Meta-Analytic Integration." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 86(6):862–879.

Jetten, Jolanda, and Michael J. A. Wohl. 2012. "The Past as a Determinant of the Present: Historical Continuity, Collective Angst, and Opposition to Immigration." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 42:442–450. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.865

Jetten, Jolanda, Alexander Haslam, and Catherine Haslam, eds. 2017. *The Social Cure: Identity, Health, and Well-being.* New York: Psychology Press.

Käsemann, Ernst. 1973. *An die Römer.* HNT 8a. Tübingen.

Käsemann, Ernst. 1980. *Commentary on Romans.* Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kaylor, David. 1988. *Paul's Covenant Community: Jew and Gentile in Romans.* Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Keck, Leander. E. 2005. *Romans.* Abingdon NT Commentaries. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Kelderman, Bradley. 2021. *Paul's Use of the Remnant Concept in Romans 9–11 and Its Interpretative Implications for Romans 11:26.* PhD diss., University of Otago.

Keller, Winfrid. 1998. *Gottes Treue – Israels Heil: Rom 11:25–27. Die These vom "Sonderweg" in der Diskussion.* SBB 40. Stuttgart.

Keown, Mark J. 2021. *Romans and the Mission of God*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Khobnya, Svetlana. 2013. "'The Root' in Paul's Olive Tree Metaphor (Romans 11:16–24)." *Tyndale Bulletin* 64(2):257–274.

Kirk-Greene, Anthony Hamilton Millard, and Toyin O. Falola. 2025. "Nigerian Civil War." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Last modified June 19. https://www.britannica.com/topic/Nigerian-civil-war

.Klein, Olivier, Laurent Licata, Nicolas van der Linden, Aurélie Mercy, and Olivier Luminet. 2011. "A Waffle-Shaped Model for How Realistic Dimensions of the Belgian Conflict Structure Collective Memories and Stereotypes." *Memory Studies* 5(1):16–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698011424028.

Knecht, Johannes J. 2021. "An Authoritative Unity: Shenoute on Scripture and Tradition." *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 73(1–2):17–47. https://doi.org/10.2143/JECS.73.1.3289364.

Koch, Dietrich-Alex. 1986. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Kock, Johan. 1986. *Die gebruik van Jesaja in Romeine 9–11.* Pretoria: Universiteit van Pretoria.

Kok, Jacobus. 2014. "Social Identity Complexity Theory as Heuristic Tool in New Testament Studies." *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 70(1):1–9. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v70i1.2708

Korostelina, Karina V. 2014. "Intergroup Identity Insults: A Social Identity Theory Perspective." *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 14(3):214–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2014.921170

Köstenberger, Andreas J. 2006. "Hearing the OT in the New: A Response." In *Hearing the OT in the NT*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 255–294. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kruse, Colin G. 2012. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kruse, Collin G. 2019. "Paul's Use of Scripture in Romans." In *Paul and Scripture,* edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Land, 77–92. Pauline Studies 10. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004391512_006.

Kuecker, Aaron. 2011. *The Spirit and the 'Other': Social Identity, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*. The Library of New Testament Studies 444. New York: T&T Clark. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472550989.

Kujanpää, Katja. 2019. *The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans: Paul's Argumentation by Quotations*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 172. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004382930.

Kujanpää, Aatu. 2019. *The Reception of Isaiah in Romans: Paul and the Isaiah Tradition.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/456. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Kushner, Rachel. 2021. *The Hard Crowd: Essays 2000–2020*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kyrychenko, Alexander. 2003. "The Consistency of Romans 9–11." *Restoration Quarterly* 45(4):215–227. https://www.academia.edu/1210065.

Laato, Timo. 1991. *Paulus und das Judentum: Anthropologische Erwägungen.* German Edition. Distribution: Tidningsbokhandeln.

Lacoviello, Vincenzo, Jonathan Berent, Nicholas S. Frederic, and Ana Pereira. 2017. "The Impact of Ingroup Favouritism on Self-Esteem: A Normative Perspective." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 71:31–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.12.013.

Lappenga, Benjamin D. 2014. "Jewish Identity and the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11." *Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters* 3(1):15–30.

Lappenga, Benjamin J. 2015. "I Myself Am an Israelite: Revisiting Paul's Use of Ζῆλος in Romans 9–11." Unpublished manuscript.

Lappenga, Benjamin J. 2024. "Paul's Language of Ζῆλος." *Biblical Interpretation Series* Vol. 137.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought.* New York: Basic Books.

Lamont-Turner, Andrew J. 2024. *Bible Study Guide: 1 Corinthians Volume 2: Verse-by-Verse Study of the Bible Book of 1 Corinthians Chapters 9 to 16.* Self-published.

Leenhardt, François J. 1995. *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains.* CNT 6. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé.

Légasse, Simon. 2000. "Fils de David et Fils de Dieu. Note sur Romains 1, 3–4." *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 122:564–572.

Lemaire, André. 2005. "The Universal God." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 31(6):57–59.

León, Felipe. 2023. “Being One of Us: We-Identities and Self-Categorization Theory.” *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-023-09923-0

Levine, Amy-Jill. 2005. *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus.* New York: HarperOne.

Levine, Amy-Jill. 2022. “Supersessionism: Admit and Address Rather Than Debate or Deny.” *Religions* 13(2):155–170.

Licata, Laurent, and Olivier Klein. 2005. “Regards Croisés sur la Mémoire Collective: Perspectives Psychosociales.” *Connexions* 83(1):235–254.

Liew, Tat-siong Benny. 2008. “Melancholia in Diaspora: Reading Paul’s Psycho-Political Operatives in 1 Corinthians.” In *What Is Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics? Reading the New Testament.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Lietzmann, Hans. 1933. *An die Römer.* HNT 8. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Lincicum, David. 2010. *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy.* WUNT 2/284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Liu, James H., Michael S. Wilson, Jonathan McClure, and T. R. Higgins. 1999. “Social Identity and the Perception of History: Cultural Representations of Aotearoa/New Zealand.” *European Journal of Social Psychology* 29:1021–1047. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199912)29:8<1021:AIDEJSP975>3.0.CO;2-4.

Longenecker, Bruce W. 1989. “Different Answers to Different Issues: Israel, the Gentiles, and Salvation History in Romans 9–11.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 36.

Longenecker, Richard N. 2011. *Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul’s Most Famous Letter.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Longenecker, Richard N. 2016. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Luff, Rosemary M. 2019. *The Impact of Jesus in First Century Palestine.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luomanen, Petri. 2007. “Social Identity, Prototypes, and Exemplars in Gospel Narratives.” Pp. 167–182 in *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism*, edited by P. Luomanen et al. Leiden: Brill.

Malherbe, Abraham J. 1980. “Μὴ Γένοιτο in the Diatribe and Paul.” *Harvard Theological Review* 73.

Malina, Bruce. J. 2001. *The NT World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Malina, Bruce. J., and J. J. Pilch. 2006. *Social Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

Markus, Hazel Rose, and Paula M. Nurius. 1986. "Possible Selves." *American Psychologist* 41(9):954–969.

Marchal, Joseph A. 2019. "The Living Oracle of the Covenant: Leviticus 18:5 in Romans." *New Testament Studies* 65(1):55–57.

Mason, Steve, and Phillip F. Esler. 2017. "Judaean and Christ-Follower Identities: Grounds for a Distinction." *New Testament Studies* 63(4):493–515.

Mason, Steve. 2007. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorisation in Ancient History." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38(4–5):457–512. https://doi.org/10.1163/156851507X193108.

Mason, Steve. 2023. "Second Temple Studies: The Past, Present, and Future of the Ioudaioi." In *Premodern Jewish Studies: A Handbook*, pp. 79–107.

Mays, James Luther. 1994. *Isaiah: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Meeks, Wayne A. 1987. "Judgment and the Brother: Romans 14:1–15:13." In *Tradition and Interpretation in the NT*, edited by G. F. Hawthorn and O. Betz, pp. 290–300. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Meeks, Wayne A. 1990. "On Trusting an Unpredictable God: A Hermeneutical Meditation on Romans 9–11." In *Faith and History*, edited by J. T. Carroll et al., pp. 105–124. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Medin, Douglas L., Sara J. Unsworth, and Lawrence A. Hirschfeld. 2007. "Culture, Categorisation, and Reasoning." In *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, edited by Shinobu Kitayama and Dov Cohen, 615–644. New York: Guilford Press.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek NT.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Middendorf, Michael P. 2013. *Romans 1–8.* Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House.

Middendorf, Michael P. 2016. *Romans 9–16.* Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House.

Miller, David M. 2014. "Ethnicity, Religion, and the Meaning of Ioudaios in Ancient 'Judaism.'" *Currents in Biblical Research* 12(2):216–265. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476993X13506549.

Miller, James C. 2000. *The Obedience of Faith, the Eschatological People of God, and the Purpose of Romans*. SBL Dissertation Series 177. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Miller, Patrick D. 1973. *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Minear, Paul S. 1971. *The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans.* SBT 2/19. London: SCM.

Minear, Paul S. 2003. *The Obedience of Faith—the Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock.

Misztal, Barbara A. 2003. *Theories of Social Remembering.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Missler, Chuck. 2015. *The Books of 1 & 2 Corinthians.* Self-published.

Mohrmann, Douglas C. 2009. "Of 'Doing' and 'Living': The Intertextual Semantics of Leviticus 18:5 in Galatians and Romans." In *Jesus and Paul: Global Perspectives*, edited by B. J. Oropeza et al., pp. 151–172.

Morley, Ken, and Delk, Sandra. 2009. *Grace in the Aftermath: Reflective Spirituality and Relational Healing*. Nashville, TN: Covenant Path Press.

Mübner, H. (1979). *Gottes Treue und Israels Heil: Eine Untersuchung zu Römer 9–11* [God's faithfulness and Israel's salvation: A study of Romans 9–11]. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Mussner, Franz. 1984. *Tractate on the Jews: The Significance of Judaism for Christian Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Nanos, Mark D. 1996. *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Nanos, Mark D. 2012. "Paul and Judaism." Pp. 103–148 in *The Oxford Handbook of Pauline Studies*, edited by M. D. Nanos and S. Zetterholm. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nanos, Mark D. 2018. *Reading Romans Within Judaism: Collected Essays of Mark D. Nanos, Vol. 2.* Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Nanos, Mark D. 2018. "Broken Branches: A Pauline Metaphor Gone Awry? (Romans 11:11–24)." Pp. 112–152 in *Reading Romans Within Judaism: Collected Essays of Mark D. Nanos, Vol. 2.* Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Nanos, Mark D. 2021. "New Fruit from a Familiar Olive Tree? Problems and Prospects for Post-Shoah Appeals to New Insights from Romans 11." *In Israel and Nations: Paul's Gospel in*

the Context of Jewish Eschatological Expectations, edited by Peter Dubovský and Pavol Bargár, pp. 147–176. Bratislava: Comenius University Press.

Nanos, Mark D. n.d. "'All Israel Will Be Saved' or 'Kept Safe'? (Rom 11:26)." Pp. 243–270 in *Praise for Israel and the Nations: Paul's Message and Jewish Eschatological Notions Concerning Israel's Role Towards the Nations*, edited by František Ábel. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic.

Negewo, Tekalign Duguma. 2021. "Identity Formation and the Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Narrative Reading." PhD diss., Stellenbosch University. https://scholar.sun.ac.za/items/19b45462-3be9-4886-ab52-f84aec1a8073.

Ngama, Dickson. K. Û. 2024. *Rest, Rhetoric, and Suffering in the Letter to the Hebrews.* Forthcoming.

Nihan, Christophe. 2009. "The Priestly Covenant, Its Reinterpretations and the Composition of 'P.'" Pp. 15–35 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

Nietzsche, Friedrich W. 1980. *On the Advantages and Disadvantages of History for Life.* Indianapolis: Hackett. (German original, 1874).

Noble, John Travis. 2016. *A Place for Hagar's Son: Ishmael as a Case Study in the Priestly Tradition.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Novenson, Mathew V. 2022. "Ioudaios, Pharisee, Zealot." In *T&T Clark Handbook to the Historical Paul.*

O'Donnell, Wayne. 2020. *Romans 9–11: Israel's Predestination to Glory.* Self-published.

Oakes, Penelope J., S. Alexander Haslam, and John C. Turner. 1994. "Stereotyping and Social Influence: The Self-Categorisation Perspective." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 24:102–122.

Oakes, Peter. 2018. "Pistis as a Relational Way of Life in Galatians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 40(3):255–275.

Obasi, Okechukwu. 2017. "MASSOB and IPOB Self Determination and the Nigerian State." *Academia.edu.* https://www.academia.edu/31697577/MA.

Oesterreicher, John M. 1961. "Israel's Misstep and Her Rise, Rom 9–11." In *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus.* JMO, Series 8, Box: 140, Folder: 44. Mss 0053. The Monsignor Field Archives & Special Collection Centre.

Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds. 2011. *The Collective Memory Reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Olyan, Saul M. 1996. “Honour, Shame, and Covenant Relations in Ancient Israel and Its Environment.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115(2):201–218.

Onuoha, Godwin. 2012. “The Presence of the Past: Youth, Memory Making and the Politics of Self-Determination in South-Eastern Nigeria.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(12).

Onuoha, Godwin. 2013. “Cultural Interfaces of Self-Determination and the Rise of the Neo-Biafran Movement in Nigeria.” *Review of African Political Economy* 40(137):440–457. https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2

Ong, Walter J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word.* London: Methuen.

Orianne, Jean-François, and Francis Eustache. 2023. “Collective Memory: Between Individual Systems of Consciousness and Social Systems.” *Frontiers in Psychology* 14:1238272. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1238272

Ortlund, Dane C. 2009. “The Insanity of Faith: Paul’s Theological Use of Isaiah in Romans 9:33.” *Trinity Journal* 30(2):269–284.

Ortlund, Dane C. 2010. *Zeal Without Knowledge: An Inquiry into Paul's Use of Ζῆλος in Romans 10, Galatians 1, and Philippians 3.* Doctoral dissertation, Wheaton College.

Ortlund, Dane C. 2012. *Zeal Without Knowledge: The Concept of Zeal in Romans 10, Galatians 1, and Philippians 3.* Vol. 472. London: A&C Black.

Osborne, William L. 2019. “The Old Testament Background of Romans 9–11.” In *The Letter to the Romans,* edited by Douglas J. Moo, 271–290. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic

Oss, Douglas A. 1992. “A Note on Paul’s Use of Isaiah.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 2:7–22.

Oswalt, John N. 1996. *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40–66.* NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Otten, Jeremy D. 2023. “Doubly True: The Two Sides of God’s Faithfulness in the Remnant Concept (Romans 3:9–11).” In *Let God Be True: Perspectives on Romans 3*, edited by Jacobus (Kobus) Kock, Jermo van Nes, and Jeremy D. Otten. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.

Owen, John. 2018. Nature and Causes of Apostasy from the Gospel. Lulu.com.

Owiredu, Kennedy K. 2022. Translating Ioudaios Concepts in Multifaceted Contexts: An Intertextual Approach to the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15. Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch University.

Packer, James I. 1973. *Knowing God.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Paez, Dario, José M. Marques, Jean-François Valencia, and Orsolya Vincze. 2006. “Dealing with Collective Shame and Guilt.” *Psicología Política* 32:59–78. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-23557-003.

Pansiot, Fernand P., and Henri Rebour. 1961. *Improvement in Olive Cultivation.* Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.

Parrott, W. Gerrod, and Richard H. Smith. 1993. "Distinguishing the Experiences of Envy and Jealousy." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64(6):906–920.

Passio ss. Montani et Lucii, Passio Marculi, Passio Maximiani et Isaac, Passio ss. Dativi, Saturnini presb. et aliorum. 238. In Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, PL 8. 690A, 760, 767, 774. Referred to as *Acts of the Abitinian Martyrs*.

Passio ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis. 1972. In Herbert Musurillo, ed., *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, 1.1; 21.11; 106; 130. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Penna, Romano. 2006. *Lettera ai Romani Vol. 2: Rm 6–11—Versione e Commento.* Scritti delle Origini Cristiane.

Peterson, Eugene H. 2009. *Eat This Book: A Conversation in the Art of Spiritual Reading.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Pickering, Stuart R. 1994. "The Scripture Quotations in Romans 11:3–4." *New Testament Text Research Unit* 2.

Pilch, John J., and Bruce J. Malina. 1993. *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Pittman, Joshua B. 2023. "The Person Who Does Them Will Live by It: An Analysis of Leviticus 18:5 in Romans 10:5." Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Retrieved July 28, 2025.

Plugge, R. J. 2018. *The Revelation: Chapters 6–11.* WestBow Press. https://www.amazon.co.uk/Revelation-Chapters-R-J-Plugge/dp/1973647133.

Porter, Stanley E. 1997. *The Use of the OT in the NT: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Porter, Stanley E. 2004. *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Porter, Stanley E. 2006. *Paul and His Theology.* Leiden: Brill.

Porter, Stanley E. 2016a. *When Paul Met Jesus: How an Idea Got Lost in History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Porter, Stanley E. 2016b. *Sacred Tradition in the NT: Tracing OT Themes in the Gospels and Epistles.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Powell, Mark A. 2023. *Matthew: An Interpretation Bible Commentary.* Louisville, KY: Presbyterian Publishing Corporation.

Pratt, Michael D. 2008a. "Jealousy, Envy, and Social Emotions: A Theoretical Framework." *Journal*

of Social and Clinical Psychology 27(4):345–360.

Pratt, Michael D. 2008b. "Jealousy and Envy: Distinctions and Social Functions." In *Emotion and Social Life.* New York: Academic Press.

Raisanen, Heikki. 1987. *Paul and the Law.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Raisänen, Heikki. 1988. "Paul, God, and Israel: Romans 9–11 in Recent Research." In *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*, edited by J. Neusner et al. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Rakocy, Wojciech. 2006. "'…And Thus All Israel Will Be Saved' (Rom 11:26): The Question about the Moment in the History of Salvation." *Roczniki Teologiczne* 53(1).

Ramiah, Ananthi Al, Miles Hewstone, and Katharina Schmid. 2011. "Social Identity and Intergroup Conflict." *Psychological Studies* 56(1):44–52.

Ramsay, William. M. 1905. "The Olive-Tree and the Wild Olive." *The Expositor* 6(11).

Rateau, Patrick. 2002. "Pensée sociale, mémoire collective et saillance d'un événement: L'affaire de Carpentras." *Psychologie & Société* 4:105–130.

Rateau, Patrick, Pascal Moliner, Christian Guimelli, and Jean-Claude Abric 2011. "Social Representation Theory." In *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, edited by P. A. M. van Lange et al., pp. 477–487. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Refoulé, François. 1984. "… Et ainsi tout Israël sera sauvé." Romains 11:25–32. LD 117. Paris: Cerf.

Reicher, Stephen D., Russell Spears, and Tom Postmes. 1995. "A Social Identity Model of Deindividuation Phenomena." *European Review of Social Psychology* 6.

Reicher, Stephen, and Nick Hopkins. 2001. *Self and Nation: Categorisation, Contestation and Mobilization.* London: Sage.

Reicher, Stephen D., Russell Spears, and S. Alexander Haslam. 2010. "The Social Identity Approach in Social Psychology." *Social Cognition* 25(5):1–40.

Reinhartz, Adele. 2018. *Cast Out of the Covenant: Jews and Anti-Judaism in the Gospel of John.* Lanham, MD: Lexington/Fortress Academic.

Rengstorf, Karl H. 1978. "Das Olbaum-Gleichnis in Rom 11,16ff: Versuch einer weiterführenden Deutung." In *Donum Gentilicium: FS D. Daube*, edited by E. Bammel et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Reno, Russell R., Robert B. Cialdini, and Carl A. Kallgren. 1993**.** "The Transituational Influence of

Social Norms." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64:104–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.1.104.

Roitto, Rikard. 2011. *Behaving as a Christ-Believer: A Cognitive Perspective on Identity and Behavior Norms in Ephesians.* ConBNT 46. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Roitto, Rikard. 2012a. "Forgiveness of the Sinless: A Classic Contradiction in 1 John in the Light of Contemporary Forgiveness Research." In *Cognitive Science and Biblical Interpretation*, edited by G. Theissen and I. Czachesz. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Roitto, Rikard. 2012b. "Practices of Confession, Intercession, and Forgiveness in 1 John 1:9; 5:16." *New Testament Studies* 58.

Roberts, James J. M. 2016. *First Isaiah.* Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Robinson, Joseph A. 1901. "∏ΩΡΩ∑Ι∑ and ∏ΗΡΩ∑Ι∑." *The Journal of Theological Studies* os-III(9). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rodriguez, Rafael. 2014. *If You Call Yourself a Jew: Reappraising Paul's Letter to the Romans.* Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Roetzel, C. P. 1999. *The Man and the Myth: Studies on Personalities of the NT.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Runesson, Anders. 2016. "The Life and After-Life of Canonical Psalmody: The Role of Psalm 69 in the Establishment of Eschatological Group-Boundaries in the Qumran Community and Pauline Ekklesiae."

Runesson, Anders. 2016. "Ritual Practices and the Construction of Borders: The Case of the Early Jesus Movement." Pp. 17–42 in *Exploring Early Christian Identity*, edited by Bengt Holmberg. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ryan, J. M. 1997. "God's Fidelity to Israel and Mercy to All." *The Biblical Theology Bulletin* 35(2):18–2.

Sani, Francesca. 2008. "Self-Continuity: Individual and Collective Factors." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 38:21–38.

Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. 1895. *The Epistle to the Romans*, edited by S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs, 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. 1902. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.* ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Sanders, Ed Parish. 1983. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Sanders, Ed Parish. 2016. "Israel, Hebrews, Jews, and Restoration Eschatology."

Schelkle, Karl H. n.d. "σωτηρία, ας, ἡ." In *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* III.

Schreiner, Thomas R. 1991. "Israel's Failure to Attain Righteousness in Romans 9:30–10:3." *Trinity Journal* 12.

Scheriner, Thomas R. 1998. *Romans.* Baker Exegetical Commentary on the NT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Schliesser, Benjamin. 2016. "'Christ-Faith' as an Eschatological Event (Galatians 3:23–26): A 'Third View' on Πίστις Χριστοῦ." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 38(3):277–300.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. 1968a. *The Church*. Translated by J.R. Coates. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press.

Schmidt, Karl L. 1968b. "πταίω." Pp. 883–884 in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6, edited by Gerhard Friedrich and Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Schulster, James R. 1996. "In My Era: Evidence for the Perception of a Special Period of the Past." *Memory* 4:145–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/096582196389013

Schwartz, Barry. 2005. "Christian Origins: Historical Truth and Social Memory." In *Memory, Tradition and Text*, edited by A. Kirk and T. Thatcher, SBLSS 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Schwartz, Barry. 2008. "Collective Memory and Abortive Commemoration: Presidents' Day and the American Holiday Calendar." *Social Research* 75:75–110.

Schwartz, Daniel R. 2014. *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Schwartz, Shalom. H., Naomi Struch, and Wolfgang Bilsky. 1990. "Values and Intergroup Social Motives: A Study of Israeli and German Students." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 53:185–198. https://doi.org/10.2307/2786958

Scott, James. 2001. "'And Then All Israel Will Be Saved' (Rom 11:26)." In *Restoration: OT, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, edited by J. Scott, JSJSup 72. Leiden: Brill.

Scott, James. M. 1995. *Paul and the Nations: The OT and Jewish Background of Paul's Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians.* Vol. 84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Scott, James. M. 2019. *Paul and the Nations. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Schwindt, Rainer. 2007. "Mehr Wurzel als Stamm und Krone: Zur Bildrede vom Ölbaum in Rom 11:16–24." *Biblica* 88.

Siegert, Franz. 1985. *Argumentation bei Paulus, Gezeigt an Rom 9–11.* WUNT 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Sidanius, Jim, and Felicia Pratto. 1999. *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simon, Mark D. 2022. *Romans: The Gospel of Grace.* WestBow Press.

Simon, Uriel. 2022. *Jewish Identity and the Sacred Meal: Ritual, Memory, and Marginalisation in Early Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smiles, Vincent M. 2002. "The Concept of 'The Zeal' in Second Temple Judaism and Paul's Critique of It in Romans 10:2." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64(2).

Smith, Anthony D. 1991. *National Identity.* Reno: University of Nevada Press.

Smith, David M. 1988. "It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture." In *It Is Written*, edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, p. 266. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, John. 2021. "The Social Use of Isaiah 53:1 in Romans 10:16: Collective Memory and Identity Formation in Early Christianity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 140(1):75–95.

Snyder, Graydon E. 2015. "Paul Beyond the Jew/Gentile Dichotomy: A Perspective from Benjamin." *Expositions* 9(1).

Song, Chanhee. 2004. *Reading Romans as a Diatribe.* New York: Langham Publishing.

Spencer, Scott. 2006. "Metaphor, Mystery, and the Salvation of Israel in Romans 9–11." *Review and Expositor* 103 (Winter).

Spears, Russell. 2021. "Social Influence and Group Identity." *Annual Review of Psychology* 72:367–390. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-070620-111818.

Stendahl, Krister. 1976. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Stendahl, Krister. 1980. *Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Stanley, Christopher D. 1992. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature.* SNTS Monograph Series 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stanley, Christopher D. 1993a. "The Significance of Romans 11:3–4 for the Text History of the LXX Book of Kingdoms." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112.

Stanley, Christopher D. 1993b. "'The Redeemer Will Come ἐκ Σιων': Rom 11:26–27 Revisited." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, pp. 118–142. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Stanley, Christopher D. 2004. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul.* New York: T&T Clark.

Stanley, Christopher D. 2018. "Oracular Exegesis in the Pauline Letters: Romans 10:5 and the Promise of Life." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 137(2):205–222.

Stowers, Stanley K. 1994. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews and Gentiles.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Story, J. Lyle. 2015. "An Inclusive Olive-Tree (Romans 11:11–24)." *Acta Theologica* 35(2):45–62.

Strack, Hermann L., and Günter Stemberger. 1991. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Strelan, Rick. 2020. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles: Collected Essays.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. 1994. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*, trans. Scott J. Hafemann. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Suggs, M. Jack. 1967. "'The Word is Near You': Romans 10:6–10 Within the Purpose of the Letter." In *Christian History and Interpretation*, edited by William R. Farmer et al., pp. 300–301. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thibaut, J.W. & Kelley, H.H., 1959. *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: Wiley.

Van der Horst, Pieter. W. 2000. “Only Then Will All Israel Be Saved: A Short Note on the Meaning of καὶ οὕτως in Romans 11:26.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119(3).

Van Eck, Ernest. 2011. “Social Memory and Identity: Luke 19:12b–24 and 27.” Biblical *Theology Bulletin* 41(4):201–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146107911423081.

Vansina, Jan. 1985. *Oral Tradition as History.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Vasholz, Robert I. 2004a. “All Israel Will Be Saved: Romans 11:25–27 Reconsidered.” *Presbyterion* 30(1): 36–45.

Vasholz, Robert. 2004b. “The Character of Israel’s Future in Light of the Abrahamic and Mosaic Covenants.” *Trinity Journal* 25.

Verkuyten, Maykel. 2018. *The Social Psychology of Ethnic Identity.* New York: Routledge.

Verkuyten, Maykel, and Ali Aslan. 2016. “Religious Group Identification and Intergroup Attitudes: The Role of Belief Centrality and Identity Reappraisal.” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 65:82–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.03.005.

Vezzali, Loris, and Sofia Stathi, eds. 2018. “Intergroup Contact Theory: Recent Developments and Future Directions.” *Social Justice Research* 31(4):374–385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-018-0314-9

Villareal, Erica. 2022. *Jealousy in Context: The Social Implications of Emotions in the Hebrew Bible.* University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns.

Von Rad, Gerhard. 1967. *Old Testament Theology: Volume I – The Theology of Israel’s Historical Traditions.* Trans. D. M. G. Stalker. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Von Rad, Gerhard. 2001. *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Wagner, J. Ross. 2002. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul “in Concert” in the Letter to the Romans.* NovTSup 101. Leiden: Brill.

Wagner, J. Ross. 2003. *Heralds of the Good News.* Leiden: Brill.

Wagner, J. Ross. 2008. “Faithfulness and Fear, Stumbling and Salvation: Reception of LXX Isa 8:11–18 in the NT.” In *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, ed. Wagner, Rowe & Grieb, pp. 76–106. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Walters, Craig J. 1993. *Ethnic Issues in Paul’s Letters to the Romans.* Valley Forge: Trinity Press.

Walter, Nikolaus. 1984. “Zur Interpretation von Römer 9–11.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 81. In *Praeparatio Evangelica*, WUNT 98. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Walvoord, John F., and Roy B. Zuck. 1983. *Bible Knowledge Commentary: NT.* Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Publisher.

Wang, Qi. 2008. “On the Cultural Constitution of Collective Memory.” *Memory* 16:305–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210701801467

Warner, Megan. 2017. “Review of A Place for Hagar’s Son.” *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 41(1):239–241.

Waters, Guy P. 2006. *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul.* WUNT 2/221. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Watson, Francis. 2004a. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith.* London; New York: T&T Clark International.

Watson, Francis. 2004b. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith.* New York: T&T Clark.

Watson, Francis. 2007. *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles.* Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Waymeyer, Michael. 2005. “The Dual Status of Israel in Romans 11:28.” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 16(1).

Wayne, Grudem. 2000. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Wenzel, Michael, Astrid Mummendey, and Sven Waldzus. 2007. “Superordinate Identities and Intergroup Conflict.” *European Review of Social Psychology* 18(1):331–372.

Weinfeld, Moshe. 1972. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wertsch, James V., and Henry L. Roediger. (2008). “Collective Memory: Conceptual Foundations.” *Memory* 16:318–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210701801434.

Wertsch, James V. 2008. “Collective Memory and Narrative Templates.” In *Collective Memory and Collective Identity*, ed. Mack & Hirst. *Social Research* 75(1):133–156.

Westhelle, Vítor. 1984. “Paul’s Reconstruction of Theology.” *Word & World* 4(3):307–310.

Widyapranawa, S. H. 1990. *Isaiah 1–39: The Lord Is Saviour.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Wiefel, Wolfgang. 1977. “The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome.” In *The Romans Debate*, ed. K. P. Donfried, pp. 100–119. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing.

Wildberger, Hans. 1991. *Isaiah 1–12: A Commentary.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Wilckens, Ulrich. 1978–1982. *Der Brief an die Römer.* EKKNT 6. Zurich: Benziger.

Wilk, Florian. 1998. *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus.* FRLANT 179. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wilk, F., & Wagner, T. (2010). Hardening of the heart. In M. J. Boda & J. G. McConville (Eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Prophets* (pp. 122–143). InterVarsity Press.

Williamson, H. G. M. 1998. "The Messianic Texts in Isaiah 1–39." In *King and Messiah in Israel*, ed. J. Day, pp. 238–270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Witherington III, Ben. 2004. *The Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Witherington III, Ben. 2017. *Isaiah Old and New.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Wood, Timothy R. 2006. *The Regathering of the People of God.* Diss., Trinity International University, Deerfield, IL.

Wright, Nicholas T. 1991. *The Climax of the Covenant.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Wright, Nicholas T. 1993. *The Climax of the Covenant.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Wright, Nicholas T. 1994. "The Letter to the Romans." In *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. L. E. Keck. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Wright, Nicholas T. 1996. "Paul, Arabia, and Elijah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115(4).

Wright, Nicholas T. 2002. *The New Interpreter's Bible.* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Wright, Nicholas T. 2013. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Winston, R. W. 2020. *Misunderstanding, Nationalism, or Legalism.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Youvan, Douglas C. 2024. "Jewish-Christian Conflicts in History: Analyzing the Role of Jewish Leaders in Early Christian Persecution and Resistance." *ResearchGate.* Retrieved July 28, 2025 (6).

Zachhuber, Johannes. 2018. "From First Fruits to the Whole Lump: The Redemption of Human Nature in Gregory's Commentary on the Song of Songs." In *Gregory of Nyssa: In Canticum Canticorum*, pp. 233–255. Leiden: Brill.

Zeitlin, Michael I. 2012. *Jews: The Making of a Diaspora People.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Zeller, Dieter. 1973. Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus. Studien zum Brief. FB. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1996. “Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past.” *Qualitative Sociology* 19:283–299. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02393273

Zerubavel, Eviatar. 2003. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zoccali, Brian. 2009. “And So All Israel Will Be Saved: Competing Interpretations of Romans 11:26 in Pauline Scholarship.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32(1):29–58.

Zuck, Roy B. 1994. *A Biblical Theology of the New Testament.* Chicago: Moody Publishers.