1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Orientation to the study

It is easy to imagine Sinai as a dark place for Paul. His deep ambivalence to Israel's history at the mountain is evident. It is the location for the ministry that brings death and condemnation, the setting of the paradigmatic act of Israel's idolatry; yet it is also the place where, on the basis of their election in Abraham, the people of God are consecrated in an act of covenant making. Whatever else took place at Sinai, there was an encounter with God which involved Israel's redemption, calling and formation as holy people. When Paul addresses all God's beloved in Rome, those κλητοῖς ἁγίοις (Romans 1:7), as part of his vision for a people set apart for relationship with God, it is an explicitly inclusive designation: holiness is extended to the Gentiles.

Although not exclusively so, their holiness has to do with their chosenness, and connections throughout the letter with themes of calling, election and sonship through adoption by the Spirit are intriguing.[1] The idea that Paul's language of holy people has its theological and literary origin in Exodus 19:3–24:8 and Israel's election and consecration may not be a controversial one.[2] Indeed, Paul's use of the phrase κλητοῖς

[1] 'The term ἅγιος reflects one of the most important aspects of Israel's self-understanding. Israel is essentially "holy": her "holiness" is implicit in her election – that is, in her very existence as God's people' (Deidun, 1981: 3–4). Paul Trebilco in his study of self-designations and group identity sets out Paul's use of οἱ ἅγιοι, 'one of Paul's favourite designations for Christians'. It is closely related to calling and election and has a boundary-creating function (Trebilco, 2012: 128–36). Maren Bohlen (2011) gives the topic of Christians as 'holy ones' in Paul a broad, largely semantic treatment, tracing the ἁγίος word group through OT/HB, LXX and extra-biblical material. A diachronic survey of the Pauline corpus generates different results. For Paul in general, οἱ ἅγιοι designates identity and engenders unity; it is used with the term ἐν Χριστῷ in order to distinguish Christian from other Jewish 'saints'. Bohlen continues through the NT and church history, with attention to modern ecumenical dialogue, apparently with the goal of demonstrating the disparity between ancient and modern uses of the term.

[2] 'Wie Israel, wenn es sich versammelte, ein heiliges Volk war, da ja Gott seine Glieder zusammengerufen hatte, so stellen die Christen in der zum Kult versammelten Gemeinde das neue heilige Volk Gottes dar' (Schlier, 1977: 31).

ἁγίοις (Romans 1:7) has led to the observation that, 'similar to Israel at Mount Sinai, these, as the called in Christ, are now in the realm of God, the Holy One, who calls them to be holy'.[3] But with little or no explicit evidence in the letter to connect Israel's consecration at the mountain to the consecration of the Gentiles, or explain how Paul might arrive at such a conclusion, the case is not straightforward. This study will explore Paul's engagement with the scriptural narrative of covenant making and renewal, and the inclusion of the Gentiles, in order to determine whether, or to what extent, his use of ἅγιοι is rooted in Sinai and its covenant-making tradition.

This study owes much to interpretations of the letter that have taken seriously two things, at least. The first is the occasion; that is, the letter's historical situation and the ethnic composition of the community.[4] The second is attention to Paul's use of Scripture, and recognition of Paul's theological narrative framework. N. T. Wright's *Climax of the Covenant* is significant in that his reading of chapters 9–11 has not only highlighted the narrative shape of 9–11 but also led to a focus on Romans 15:7–13;[5] and there is a consensus that this is the climax of the entire epistle.[6] Paul presents Jew and Gentile in Rome praising God as united eschatological community in fulfilment of Israel's Scripture. It is a profound expression of God's covenant faithfulness.

Reading Romans in light of Paul's reflections on Israel's narrative, or Romans as narrative, has been a major development of the New Perspective.[7] The movement of Pauline scholarship towards acknowledging

[3] Ehrensperger (2010: 102).

[4] This is not to comment on hearer competence or the merits of a reader-focused approach but on the importance of the Jew/Gentile issue. See Watson (2007); Campbell (1991); Campbell (2008). Fisk (2008) says it is 'easy to exaggerate claims of schism, resentment, social distance' (171).

[5] He provides a helpful overview of the history of interpretation of 9–11 and consequent theological possibilities. That this is the climax of the covenant is a conclusion 'further confirmed by the numerous echoes, within the section as a whole, of Jewish writings, in which the question of God's faithfulness to his covenant is uppermost' (Wright, 1993a: 235–6). Francis Watson describes Romans 11 as the place where Paul 'seeks to show that the salvation of the Gentiles may be incorporated into a Jewish covenantal framework' (Watson, 2007: 340).

[6] Mark Reasoner says: 'after centuries of neglect, Romans 12:1–15:13 is now recognised as crucial to our understanding of the letter' (Reasoner, 1995: 287–99). Richard Hays is also a proponent of this view, observing that remarkably little attention has been given here by many commentaries, although this 'functions as the peroratio for the letter as a whole, reprising its central themes' (Hays, 2005: 104, n. 11). See also Wagner (2001); Sherwood (2012).

[7] Bruce W. Longenecker credits Hays, in particular, and *The Faith of Jesus Christ* with putting the issue on the agenda for Pauline study (Longenecker, 2002b: 90). See

the shape and significance of Paul's theological narrative is compelling. Such a narrative reading, in Hays' words, 'powerfully clarifies the initiative and agency of *God* within the Pauline gospel. The message is about something God has done through Jesus Christ and through the ongoing work of the Spirit, not about human religious experiences and dispositions.'[8] And, while there are other scriptural voices in concert with Paul here, the final chapters of Deuteronomy, incorporating the concept of covenant making and renewal, have been influential.[9]

1.2 The influence of Deuteronomy and the covenant-renewal narrative

Since Richard Hays, in *Echoes of Scripture*,[10] famously declared Deuteronomy 32 to contain Romans '*in nuce*', conversation about the validity of his claim has been ongoing. Moving beyond Paul's citations from the book he calls 'one of the most surprising members of Paul's functional canon within the canon', Hays finds Deuteronomy shapes Paul's reading of Scripture, not least because the Song of Moses is 'read as a prophetic prefiguration of God's dealings with Israel through the gospel'.[11] Deuteronomy and Isaiah are 'the privileged predecessors of Paul's discourse'.[12] J. C. Beker contests Hays' findings. One cannot, Beker says, substantiate this claim on the grounds of three citations of Deuteronomy 32 (Romans 10:19; 12:19; 15:10). Moreover, Beker asserts that Paul's use of Deuteronomy 32 does not shape Paul's reading of Scripture; rather its influence is confined to Romans 9–11.[13]

James Scott also thinks Hays overstates the case: it is not a reading strategy Paul applies to the letter. Paul should be heard, Scott argues, against the prevalence of Deuteronomic theology in the Second Temple period.[14] Scott's approach, though clearly related in content to Hays' claims about Paul's reading of the Song of Moses, is a discussion of the

Hays (2001) and also Wright (1992); Grieb (2002); Keesmaat (1999); Scott (1992). For a discussion on whether and to what extent we can describe Paul as narrative, see essays in Longenecker (2002b); Hays (2004).

[8] Hays (2004: 217, his italics).

[9] Hays (1989: 163–4); Wright (1993a); Watson (2004: 415–513); Wagner (2001); Waters (2006); Lincicum (2010).

[10] Hays (1989).

[11] Hays (1989: 163–4).

[12] Hays (1989: 164)

[13] Beker (1993: 66).

[14] James M. Scott also questions how this claim might be substantiated from three explicit citations in the latter half of the letter (Scott, 1993: 646).

extent to which Paul holds to Deuteronomy's 'Sin–Exile–Restoration scheme', or a Deuteronomic framework.[15] Scott begins from Odil Steck's Deuteronomic view of Israel's History (*das deuteronomistische Geschichtsbild*) and reflects on Steck's six core elements as mediated through the text of *Baruch* 1:15–3:8.

i. Israel has been persistently stiff-necked, rebellious and disobedient, and confesses its sin 'to this day'.
ii. God constantly sent prophets with a call to repentance and obedience.
iii. Israel rejects the prophets, and the voice of God, and even kills the prophets.
iv. Israel experiences God's wrath by means of judgement of exile – understood to be the covenant curse.
v. During exile, Israel has the possibility to repent, although often its obduracy remains.
vi. Following repentance there will be restoration and covenant blessing.[16]

It is, according to Scott, the six elements of the *deuteronomistische Geschichtsbild*, the 'familiar sin–exile–restoration (SER) scheme', which provide the 'framework for Paul's thinking', and into which chapters 9–11 fit.[17] Wright, acknowledging the work of Scott, has also proposed this scheme. He finds the two sections of the end of the book of Deuteronomy, the blessings and curses and covenant renewal (27–28), and the farewell words of Moses (31–34), provide a coherent reading, and that 'the collocations of ideas . . . were in wide currency'.[18]

Guy Waters sees Paul reading Deuteronomy 'in concert' with other portions of Scripture, notably Isaiah and Psalms, but with citations from Deuteronomy 27–30 and Deuteronomy 32 as 'the primary vehicle of

[15] The term 'Deuteronomic', strictly speaking, has its origins in the work of the 'Deuteronomic' redactors of the Pentateuch, a thesis proposed by Martin Noth (Noth, 1981). Other authors reflect on the influence of the final chapters of Deuteronomy in regard to Paul without attributing the title 'Deuteronomic'. See Wagner (2001: 166, n.143, 254–7); Watson (2004: 427–34); Waters (2006: 237–41).

[16] Steck (1967: 184–9). See Scott (1997); Ciampa (2007).

[17] Scott (1993: 659).

[18] Wright (1992: 261). On the theme of the end of exile, see 299–301. For a response to Wright's position, specifically the issue the of the renewal of the covenant in the context of second exodus and continuing exile, see essays in Newman (1999). David Allen, similarly, claims that three issues – Moses' Song; the renewal liturgy; and the curses – represent the focal role Deuteronomy 28–34 played within contemporary Judaism in explaining and foretelling the outworking of Israel's broader story.

scripture that conveys the argument at hand'.[19] He challenges Scott's and Hays' respective schemes. Arguing on the basis of explicit citations and references that the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32 provides a lens through which Paul read Deuteronomy 27–30, Waters rightly warns us against assuming a citation from Deuteronomy evokes a straightforward and 'single' sin, exile, restoration narrative, and assuming the narrative is present where there is no citation.[20] Aspects of Waters' engagement with Scott and Wright seem to have less bearing on the debate. He makes several claims in respect of their work, including the following: Deuteronomy 31 should not be included because of lack of citation; they do not allow room for Paul to be a 'contingent' reader, which Waters argues he was; and that Paul's reading of Deuteronomy is not likely to have remained static as suggested. But one of Waters' strongest critiques is directed at those who follow the theme of 'continuing exile': they are 'fundamentally incorrect'.[21] Waters' careful study of Paul's use of citation and reference reinforces the case for Paul's engagement with Deuteronomy's theological narrative while nuancing the detail.

Waters' claim that Paul reads Deuteronomy 27–30 through the lens of Moses' Song (Deuteronomy 32) is persuasive. This coheres with the claims of Paul scholars that Moses' Song presents key themes which shape Paul's thought, but it also takes into account the significance of the content of Deuteronomy 27–30 for Paul – content which Moses summarises and expounds. Dense with strategic theological narrative, there is evidence that Paul reads the Song as setting out the failure of the law, the inclusion of the Gentiles, the provocation to jealousy, the ultimate restoration by divine activity and victory over the curse of the law.[22] Paul's careful concern with these categories may suggest, against Scott, that this is not just dependence on a general Deuteronomic restoration narrative but a careful reading of Moses' Song.

[19] Waters (2006: 241). See also Wagner (2005). While Ross Wagner's primary interest is Isaiah in Romans, he observes the connections between the citations of Isaiah and Deuteronomy, especially where they are cited together, concluding that Paul sees Israel's story as constituting the narrative substructure of Deuteronomy 29–32.

[20] Waters (2006: 24–8).

[21] Waters (2006: 30).

[22] According to Hays, in Deuteronomy 32, Paul finds 'not only the prophecy of Israel's lack of faith and ultimate restoration but also the prefiguration of God's intention to stir them to jealousy through embracing the Gentiles (32:21), who are invited to join with his people in praise (32:43). It is hardly coincidental that Paul quotes both these verses explicitly (Rom 10:19; 15:10)' (Hays, 1989: 164, 193–4). See also Wagner (2001: 355); Bell (1994). Bell makes the case that Moses' Song was 'a major source for Paul's theology of jealousy' (200).

While the above categories are mutually interpretative and should not be isolated, the focus of this work will be on Deuteronomy's concept of the renewal of the covenant as the means by which Paul argues that the Gentiles are incorporated into the people of God. One of the clearest suggestions of Paul's interest in this particular aspect of the final chapters of Deuteronomy comes in Wright's *Climax of the Covenant*, in which he says of the context of the Deuteronomy citation made by Paul (Romans 10:6–8):

> It describes, and indeed appears to enact, the making of a covenant in Moab, the covenant which holds out blessing and curse. Deuteronomy declares that Israel will in fact eventually make the wrong choice, and, as a result, suffer the curse of all curses, that is, exile (Deut 28:15–29:29). But that will not be the end of the story, or of the covenant. Deuteronomy 30 then holds out hope the other side of covenant failure, a hope of covenant renewal, of the regathering of the people after exile, of the circumcision of the heart, of the word being 'near you, on your lips and in your heart' (30:1–14). In other words, Deuteronomy 27–30 is all about exile and restoration, understood as covenant judgement and covenant renewal.[23]

While Wright, in his quest for coherence, is corrected at points by Waters, evidence for the influence of Deuteronomy on Paul, whether tradition or directly via text, is cumulative.[24] But Deuteronomy is not the only place where we find Paul's concern for the concept of covenant renewal. Paul's practice of using Deuteronomy's theological narrative and covenant-making seems to be that which draws in reflections on the covenant making and covenant-renewal events of the book of Exodus.[25] Paul appears to interpret the goal of Israel's salvation history, the eschatological renewal of covenant, in terms of that which happened in the past.

With a reference to the claim of Hays, Brian Abasciano says it is, rather, the pattern of the covenant renewal of Exodus 32–34 that contains Romans 9–11 '*in nuce*'. Abasciano sets Paul's prayer-wish and Israel's

[23] Wright (1993a: 140).

[24] Waters (2006: 26) critiques Wright specifically at the point where Wright argues for Paul's use of Deuteronomic restoration tradition in Romans 10:6–8 with its dependence on Deuteronomy 30:12–14, in spite of the fact that it is not explicit in either text. This is an interesting case that will be addressed in this study.

[25] Piper (1993: 55–89); Wagner (2001: 51–6).

privileges (Romans 9:1–5) in the specific context of apostasy and covenant renewal, finding some exegetical details along with 'broader themes and rhetorical movements'. He concludes that the similarities in theme and subject between the two contexts are 'striking'.[26]

> Indeed, it appears that Paul has gone to the scriptural paradigm of the fall and restoration of Israel, Exod 32–34, to understand and express the present age of salvation history and the outworking of the eschatological fulfilment of the covenant promises of God.[27]

Abasciano's thesis is ambitious in the sense that he is committed to the covenant-renewal text as background to Romans 9:1–9 on the basis of Paul's prayer-wish (9:1–3) as an allusion to Exodus 32:32. Nevertheless, his reading is coherent and plausible, and more recently greater attention has been paid to the exodus narrative at work here and in Romans 9–11 more broadly.

John Barclay has also developed the connection between Romans 9–11 and Exodus 32–34, suggesting there is a 'strong prima facie case' that the discourse of divine mercy in Romans 9–11 might be 'significantly illuminated if it were read as an interpretative extension of the theological dynamics of Exod 32–34'.[28] Barclay summons some persuasive evidence: Paul cites the words of God from Sinai (Exodus 33:19 in Romans 9:15), indicating his familiarity with the dialogical context of the mountain; the scholarly consensus of Paul's prayer-wish as modelled on Moses' offer of his life; Paul's use of the narrative of Israel's idolatry with the golden calf (1 Corinthians 10:7 citing Exodus 32:6); and Paul's deliberations on the story of Moses' shining face (2 Corinthians 3:6–18, echoing Exodus 34:29–35).[29] As opposed to Abasciano's claims to represent Paul's intention, Barclay suggests a theological reading strategy, speaking in terms of 'narrative dynamics'. The narrative of Exodus 32–34 is, according to Barclay, 'one of the threads in the scriptural tapestry of Romans 9–11'.[30]

Barclay finds that this divine demonstration of mercy is for Paul a creative act: it has a 'generative role'; it creates a people.[31] Moreover,

[26] Abasciano (2005: 143).
[27] Abasciano (2005: 143).
[28] Barclay (2010: 83).
[29] Barclay (2010: 83).
[30] Barclay (2010: 105).
[31] Barclay (2010: 98).

it is important that this mercy is directed toward Jew and non-Jew: the creation of this people is along non-ethnic lines. Barclay's sense of the possibilities of extending the discourse into the concluding chapters of Romans in order to consider how this mercy creates a people is significant for this study, not least because it emphasises that this concentrated focus on the divine mercy culminates in the creation of a people established by covenant.[32] Barclay confirms that the narrative of Scripture sees the creation of a people as a covenant-making act. In the case of the exodus narrative, Barclay says, the text

> progresses clearly, though not completely smoothly, from the catastrophe of Israel's idolatry (Exod 32:1–6), through a complex of punitive reactions, and via a series of passionate dialogues between Moses and God (32:7–14; 32:30–33:6; 33:12–23), to the climactic self-revelation of God as the God of mercy (34:6–7) and the second establishment of the covenant (34:10–28).[33]

If Barclay is right about this theological dynamic being present in Romans 9–11, it should influence our reading of Romans 12–15 in the direction of the constitution of a people, to which sacrificed bodies and the consecration of the Gentiles are a response.

While we can say with some certainty that Paul engages both with the renewal narrative set out in the book of Exodus (32–34) *and* with the renewal at the conclusion of Deuteronomy (27–30), the complex associations between the two covenant-renewal texts, especially in relation to Paul, remain largely unexplored.[34] Although it is not a primary objective, it is hoped this study will go some way to addressing this issue. Just as the Exodus 32–34 allusions and theological dynamics draw in

[32] 'The heavy concentration of "mercy" language at the climax of Romans 9–11 (11:28–32; cf. 12:1; 15:9) alerts us to the possibility that Paul's citation of Exod 33:19 in Rom 9:15 plays more than a peripheral role in his exploration of the divine promises for Israel, and their relation to the Christ-event and the Gentile mission' (Barclay, 2010: 97).

[33] Barclay (2010: 84).

[34] Sidnie White Crawford discusses the expansion of the former by means of the latter at Qumran (Crawford, 2005: 140). For a source-critical analysis, concerned particularly with Sinai and covenant-making tradition, see Nicholson (1973). Bernard Levinson deals with Deuteronomy's hermeneutics, finding direct quotations as well as legal and theological innovations in dialogue with Exodus (Levinson, 2002). Hindy Najman, in her study which emphasises the formative role of Deuteronomy in the Mosaic discourse, says these re-presentations of Sinai, here and in Deuteronomic literature, 'serve to authorize the re-introduction of Torah into the Jewish community at times of legal reform and of covenant renewal. The revelation at Sinai is not a one-time event, but rather an event that can be re-presented, even in exile' (Najman, 2003: 36).

the Exodus covenant renewal, so the Deuteronomy 30:11–14 citation in Romans 10:6–8 draws the Deuteronomy covenant renewal into Paul's narrative. What is clear, however, is that Deuteronomy has already recast the Sinai covenant-making and covenant-renewal events.

Building on what Pauline scholarship has already ascertained about Paul's engagement with Deuteronomy in terms of Scripture citation and theological narrative, this study will propose that through its own representation of the Sinai covenant-making narrative as it re-enacts the constitution of a holy people, transforming the tradition for a new setting, Deuteronomy presents a literary paradigm for the creation of a people that was to influence Paul.[35] Timothy Berkley has made an observation pointing in this direction:

> In keeping with Jewish exegetical principles, it is possible that the renewal of the covenant, in essence, a second law-giving, in Deuteronomy 29–32 is a pattern which opens the entire concept of the covenant and the people of God to reinterpretation for Paul. Narrative repetitions which introduce variations in the narrative invite reinterpretation. For Paul this appears to be particularly the case with the covenant renewal narrative.[36]

This notion of Deuteronomy's interpretation of Sinai inviting narrative interpretation resonates with Sylvia Keesmaat's work on the exodus tradition, in which she presents the exodus as the major formative event in Israel's history. Keesmaat finds narrative and theological motifs from the exodus present in Romans 8:14–39, concluding that the exodus event is re-interpreted for the present situation. The past becomes the basis for God's activity in the future, yet the story does not remain static: tradition is 'vivified, yet not fundamentally impaired' as it becomes a paradigm of God's future act of salvation.[37]

In terms of method, Keesmaat interacts in particular with the relationship between tradition and inner-biblical exegesis in Michael Fishbane's

[35] According to Lincicum (2010: 193–4) 'The sheer prevalence of Deuteronomy constitutes it as something of a hermeneutical force . . . The very givenness of Deuteronomy as divine word necessitated interpretation and re-interpretation as Jewish authors sought to understand and express their fidelity to Deuteronomy's vision in a world of changing circumstances and pressures.' Crawford (2005: 140) says that 'Deuteronomy was an authoritative text in and of itself, an important book in the creation of texts for study purposes and/or liturgical use, and was used as a base text in the exegetical creation of rewritten bible works with claims to their own authority'. See also Lim (2007).

[36] Berkley (2000: 163). See also Waters (2006: 63).

[37] Keesmaat (1999: 19).

Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.[38] But she finds Fishbane's 'inner-biblical exegesis' as an 'intentional dynamic' too restrictive. Consequently, Keesmaat turns additionally to intertextuality and Hays' categories to explore 'allusions and echoes to a larger matrix of ideas'.[39] While this study does not develop the categories of allusion and echo, it is complementary to that of Keesmaat, but with an emphasis on a particular aspect of the exodus tradition: that of covenant making as the creation and consecration of a people. Perhaps one difference is that while Scripture reinterprets the exodus tradition in a new or second exodus event, re-presentations of the Sinai covenant making in the speeches of Moses in Deuteronomy describe the Moab generation as themselves present at the mountain. Moreover, the possibility, even expectation, which is built into Deuteronomy is that the tradition of constituting Israel as a people will continue to be enacted in the future.

1.3 The significance of Sinai

Describing the ongoing significance of the events at the mountain, Jon Levenson says the Sinaitic event 'functioned as the prime pattern through which Israel could re-establish in every generation who she was and who she was meant to be'.[40] In other words, Sinai is a paradigm for the identity and constitution of a people. And Deuteronomy attempts to re-establish Israel's identity and purpose by retelling the Horeb (Sinai) event in Moses' farewell address to those on the cusp of entry to the Promised Land. The stipulations climax with a covenant-renewal ceremony on the plains of Moab as Moses narrates Israel's history through the exodus, reminding those he is addressing of their calling and identity, thus enabling them to anticipate the future.

Moses addresses his audience as if they are those who *themselves* experienced Sinai (Deuteronomy 4:10,12,14). Perhaps the most illuminating saying in this respect is 'The Lord our God made a covenant with *us* in Horeb. Not with our fathers did the Lord make this covenant, but with us, who are all of us alive here this day' (Deuteronomy 5:2–3). In this fascinating literary phenomenon, those at Moab are analogous with the Sinai generation. Brevard Childs describes this as 'actualisation': 'The writer of Deuteronomy consciously relativizes the importance of

[38] Fishbane (1985). See especially 22–8.
[39] Keesmaat (1999: 50).
[40] Levenson (1985: 18).