

## Tom Wright's Understanding of Paul's Use of Scripture

Newman University, 12th Feb 2015

Steve Moyise

### 1. Introduction

In order to compare and contrast Paul's worldview with that of Pliny, Wright opens his magisterial *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*<sup>i</sup> with a discussion of the letter to Philemon. Far from being devoid of theology, as many have concluded, Wright states that the reconciliation, for which Paul is arguing, is thoroughly biblical:

Paul, faced with a dilemma concerning a slave and a master, would naturally reach, not for our post-Enlightenment narratives of liberation, but for the material on this very subject within his own scriptures, which after all told their own large-scale narrative of the freeing of an entire nation of slaves. That was the way his mind most naturally worked – especially because he believed, and taught repeatedly, that the ultimate 'exodus' had now occurred in and through Jesus (*PFG*, 13).

Traditional questions, such as whether there is sufficient verbal similarity with another text to warrant such an inference, or whether Paul's readers/hearers would have the wherewithal to detect such a reference, are swept aside, for "Israel's scriptures were as familiar to Paul, and as readily available in his well-stocked mind, as Beethoven's sonatas to a concert pianist." (*PFG*, 13) The point is well made but it should be noted that such questions are not so much directed to what Paul could or could not have done but to *our* ability to give an accurate account of them. Thus many scholars have drawn on the seven criteria listed by Richard Hays (availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation, satisfaction) to assess the probability of particular proposals.<sup>ii</sup> Hays acknowledges that "there will be exceptional occasions when the tests fail to account for the spontaneous power of particular intertextual conjunctions"<sup>iii</sup> and these might well be important. As I have said elsewhere, one would not expect music critics to confine their comments to the loudest instruments in the orchestra.<sup>iv</sup> Nevertheless, the point of such criteria is to help *us* assess the probability of particular proposals, with the implication that we must be much more cautious if such evidence is lacking.<sup>v</sup>

Wright develops this notion of a controlling narrative or worldview in the following chapter. After a brief survey of biblical<sup>vi</sup> and post-biblical<sup>vii</sup> texts, he acknowledges that "there are considerable and obvious differences between the examples," and in particular, "there is no single picture of the 'the Messiah' which emerges even from these narrative texts, let alone from any wider consideration of the Jewish evidence." (*PFG*, 135) However, it would be wrong to conclude from this that scripture offers "a mere ragbag of examples and warnings to be drawn on at random." (*PFG*, 136) The variations merely support the fact that the "overall story was obviously well enough known for the various elements in it to retain their place in relation to one another even if quite different lessons are being drawn from it." (*PFG*, 136)<sup>viii</sup> This might be correct but we should note the rhetoric: those who hold a different view are aligned with an (unnamed) group who believe that Paul thought of the scriptures as "a mere ragbag of examples and warnings to be drawn on at random." One is bound to ask whether this is the only alternative to Wright's view.

There then follows a defence of Wright's "continuing exile" theme, which has been a characteristic of his work since, *The New Testament and the People of God*.<sup>ix</sup> A brief review of the evidence follows, concluding that

it is the combination of Deuteronomy and Daniel, and their regular retrieval in the key sources, that compels us to go on highlighting 'exile' as the best controlling metaphor to characterize this continuing moment in the single, though complex, perceived narrative of a great many Jews, including Pharisees, in the second-Temple period. (*PFG*, 162)

The importance of this for understanding Wright's view of Paul's use of scripture lies in two further comments. First, worldview trumps language-system. Wright thinks that scholars have often been led astray by finding parallels to obscure texts or themes but "it is worldview, rather than the language-system, which determines how the relevant metaphors work." (*PFG*, 166) Thus Wright very rarely refers to Jewish exegetical techniques, such as *gezera sewa*, to explain how Paul moved from one text to another: these are subsumed under the much more significant category of narrative.

Second, when Paul does allude to some aspect of this story, the presumption should be that he intends his readers to understand his words in the light of it: "When the metaphors in question come laden with earlier meanings in well-known texts, the question presses even more: what justification have we for ignoring those

earlier meanings?” (PFG, 173). Lest this sound like special pleading, it should be noted that Wright is happy to extend this principle to other Jewish writers. Thus while Qumran exegesis may seem odd to us, it was “not an arbitrary or fanciful exercise, but flowed directly from their belief that they were indeed the people of the renewed covenant, for whom therefore all the ancient prophecies must now be finding their ‘yes’.” (PFG, 176) In particular, it did not simply “foist strange and unnatural interpretations” (PFG, 176) onto the texts but did its best to take the texts with the utmost seriousness. Thus before we even discuss particular examples of Paul’s use of scripture, it is clear that Wright is going to assume that the “context of a scriptural allusion or echo is again and again very important” and that Paul “knew the material inside out and could evoke a whole world of textual reference with a word or phrase.”

Some examples will illustrate the point. Most scholars recognize an allusion to Isa 45:23 (“To me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear”) in Phil 2:10-11 (“at the name of Jesus every knee should bend . . . and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord”) but Wright goes much further: “The door which swings open when that key is turned in the lock is the door to the entire scriptural vision of Israel’s one God working out his sovereign purpose through his obedient, and as often as not suffering, servant, and then exalting that servant to power and glory.” (PFG, 688). Conscious of the lack of verbal parallels to these other passages, he says in a footnote: “The point does not depend on exact verbal echoes (against the objections of e.g. Hooker 1959, 120f.) . . . What counts is the entire flow of thought, with the explicit verbal and thematic echoes functioning as an anchor.” (PFG, 683, n.199).

Wright notes that the theme of the “unveiling of God’s righteousness” occurs five times in Rom 3:21-6 and so “the obvious thing to do is to look for a biblical passage with a similar concentration of the same theme; and the obvious candidate is Isaiah 40-55.” (PFG, 998) After a brief description of the contents of these chapters, Wright concludes that the evidence is enough “to warrant the firm conclusion that when Paul describes the death of Jesus in sacrificial language . . . he is deliberately setting up a complex chain of allusion and echo in which Isaiah 40-55 in general, the figure of the servant in particular and the fourth servant song climactically, are central and loadbearing.” (PFG, 999).

## 2. *The Significance of Deuteronomy 30*

Given the weight that Wright places on the importance of Deuteronomy 30, it is surprising to discover that the only references listed by Nestle-Aland occur in just three passages: Rom 2:26-9, 10:6-8 and Gal 3:10. It is even more surprising to find a scholar like Hays referring to Paul’s exegesis of Deut 30:12-14 in Rom 10:6-8 as “wild and disingenuous,”<sup>x</sup> although he later adds that it is perhaps not quite as arbitrary as it first appears.<sup>xi</sup> Wright begins his exegesis of Romans 9-11 by arguing that it has a chiasmic structure, with 9:1-5 corresponding to 11:33-6, 9:6-29 to 11:1-32, 9:30-3 to 10:18-21 and 10:1-4 to 10:14-17. This leaves the central section as 10:5-13 with the interpretation of Deuteronomy 30 (10:6-8) at its centre. Thus structurally, Wright argues for the central importance of Deuteronomy 30 for Romans 9-11 and indeed, the whole letter.

The difficulty that many scholars have with Paul’s exegesis here is that he appears to be driving a wedge between two statements about the Torah that all other interpreters would have taken as complimentary. According to Lev 18:5, Moses says that keeping God’s commandments will result in life (ποιήσατε αὐτὰ ἃ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς) and according to Deut 30:11-14, this is “not too hard for you” (οὐχ ὑπέρογκός ἐστιν) because it is “not in heaven” (30:12) or “beyond the sea” (30:12) but “very near to you; it is in your mouth and in your heart for you to observe” (30:14). Paul quotes Lev 18:5 as the words of Moses but personifies the author of Deut 30:11-14 as “the righteousness that comes from faith” (Rom 10:6) and equates it with the gospel that he preaches:

Moses writes concerning the righteousness that comes from the law, that “the person who does these things will live by them.” But the righteousness that comes from faith says, “Do not say in your heart, ‘Who will ascend into heaven?’” (that is, to bring Christ down) “or ‘Who will descend into the abyss?’” (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what does it say? “The word is near you, on your lips and in your heart” (that is, the word of faith that we proclaim); because if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. For one believes with the heart and so is justified, and one confesses with the mouth and so is saved. (Rom 10:5-10)

Although Wright does call this a “bold and creative” (PFG, 1173) interpretation, he denies that it is in any sense arbitrary or forced. Paul understood Deuteronomy 30 as describing a covenant renewal after a (long) period of exile and curse. Since Paul believed that this renewal had taken place in the death and resurrection

of Israel's messiah and the giving of the Spirit, he is simply expounding what he believes to be the true meaning of the text. Historical critics would want to point out that the use of "today" in Deut 30:11 ("Surely, this commandment that I am commanding you *today*") and Deut 30:15 ("See, I have set before you *today*") makes it clear that the (primary) reference is to the giving of the law and so would want to discuss how Paul thinks he can apply it directly to his own day. Wright, however, has little sympathy for such questions, commenting in a footnote that

once we see the wisdom tradition in the parallel Bar. 3 (highlighted by Suggs, 1967; made central by e.g. Keck, 2005, 253) not as an independent feature but as part of the widespread second-Temple *new-covenant* and *return-from-exile* reading of Dt. 30, the exegesis is neither capricious, wild, nor disingenuous, and poor historically sensitive readers may be put out of their misery. (PFG, 1167, n. 489).

Most scholars would agree that Paul did not share our "historically sensitive" frame of mind and it would be anachronistic to expect him to do so. However, we are not talking about modern historical criticism, with its fixation on sources: we are simply talking about the literary context of the quotation, something that Wright is deeply passionate about. Even though Deut 30:1-10 looks ahead to a future restoration, Deut 30:11-20 *appears* to be returning to the choice that Moses is told to set before the Israelites before they enter the Promised Land:

If you obey the commandments of the LORD your God that I am commanding you today, by loving the LORD your God, walking in his ways, and observing his commandments, decrees, and ordinances, then you shall live and become numerous, and the LORD your God will bless you in the land that you are entering to possess. (Deut 30:16)

It is therefore quite reasonable for readers, historically sensitive, or otherwise, to ask how Paul thought the promise "then you shall live and become numerous" refers to the preaching of the gospel in his own day.

### 3. Respect for Context

There are countless examples where "historically sensitive" scholars feel the need to explain how Paul took texts from one context and applied them to another. For example, Isaiah 52 is a glorious prophecy of salvation but Paul manages to take words from verse 5 and use them as an accusation against hypocritical Jewish teachers:

But if you call yourself a Jew and rely on the law and boast of your relation to God and know his will ... will you not teach yourself? While you preach against stealing, do you steal? You that forbid adultery, do you commit adultery? You that abhor idols, do you rob temples? You that boast in the law, do you dishonour God by breaking the law? For, as it is written, "*The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you.*" (Rom 2:17-24 abbreviated)

The problem is not only that the wider context of Isa 52 is about salvation; it is also that verse 4 and verse 5 both state that Israel's suffering is "without cause":

For thus says the Lord GOD: Long ago, my people went down into Egypt to reside there as aliens; the Assyrian, too, has oppressed them without cause. Now therefore what am I doing here, says the LORD, seeing that my people are taken away without cause? Their rulers howl, says the LORD, and *continually, all day long, my name is despised.* (Isa 52:4-5)

Wright begins his explanation by stating that the Jews are not being indicted for claiming to be morally superior but for failing (as a nation) to be the solution to the problem. He then notes that what follows in Rom 2:25-9, namely, "the spirit, the law in the heart, the fresh keeping of Torah's requirements" (PFG, 814) shows that Paul has Ezek 36:26-7 in mind and this makes it very probable that Ezek 36:20-3 lies behind Paul's accusation:

But when they came to the nations, wherever they came, *they profaned my holy name*, in that it was said of them, "These are the people of the LORD, and yet they had to go out of his land." But I had concern for my holy name, which the *house of Israel had profaned among the nations* to which they came. Therefore say to the house of Israel, Thus says the Lord GOD: It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for the sake of my holy name, which *you have profaned among the nations* to which you came. I will sanctify my great name, which *has been profaned among the*

*nations, and which you have profaned among them; and the nations shall know that I am the LORD, says the Lord GOD, when through you I display my holiness before their eyes. (Ezek 36:20-3)*

This has of course been argued before but it does not answer the question of why Paul uses the words of Isa 52:5 when the chapter is about salvation and the particular verse about God's pity for Israel. Wright argues that Paul has taken two passages which both "come in the middle of sequences of thought in which Israel's God is not only charging Israel with this fault *but also announcing the remedy*" (PFG, 812, emphasis original). Paul is not, therefore, taking the words of Isa 52:5 out of context but citing them because the "passage points dramatically forward to the revelation of God's ultimate plan of salvation, the personal obedience of the servant through which that worldwide light-to-the-nations plan would after all be put into operation." (PFG, 814).

What are we to make of this? First, Wright does not distinguish between the rhetorical effect of quotations and allusions. This is in part following the trend set by Hays to view quotation, allusion and echo as points along a spectrum but it is surely worthy of comment as to why Paul alludes to words from Ezekiel 36 but specifically quotes Isa 52:5. All the more so given that a quotation from Ezek 36:20-3 would have made his point far more effectively. Timothy Berkley has written a monograph on this, arguing that it is Paul's allusions that reveal where the exegetical activity has taken place, while the quotations are often simply convenient summaries of the point being made. It would have been useful to have had a response to this.<sup>xii</sup>

Neither is Wright bothered by the fact that Paul sometimes modifies the wording of his quotations to make his point. Thus at the climactic moment of Romans 9-11, Paul introduces a quotation from Isaiah 59, a passage of scripture that Wright says is "clearly very congenial to Paul" for its common themes of "the revelation of God's righteousness, resulting in judgment and mercy, in the renewal of the covenant, in the gift of the spirit, in the words (*rhemata*) in the mouth" (PFG, 1249). However, Wright says that Paul does not wish to reinscribe the "centripetal tradition," whereby the redeemer comes *to* Zion (MT) or *on behalf of* Zion (LXX). He therefore "radically adjusts" the wording, so that the Redeemer now comes *from* Zion (Rom 11:27, quoting Isa 59:21). He speculates that Paul may have had in mind such texts as Isa 2:3 (the law goes out *from* Zion), Deut 33:28-9 (the Lord came *from* Sinai) or Ps 14:7 (deliverance would come *from* Zion) and perhaps all three, providing support from Torah, prophets and writings. Wright does not feel this needs any justification and indeed can say that Paul's thought fits "exactly with the two lines of Isaiah 59 as Paul has adjusted them" (PFG, 1251). One feels bound to reply: "Well, it would, wouldn't it?"

Similarly, in his discussion of Gal 3:16, where Paul argues that God's promise to Abraham to give him "seed" uses the singular σπέρμα, and thus refers to an individual, namely Christ. Wright translates the verse as: "It doesn't say 'his seeds', as though referring to several families, but indicates a single family by saying 'and to your seed', meaning the Messiah." (PFG, 869). He then states that there is nothing "strange" or "rabbinic" about this exegesis for "Paul has not forgotten, as many exegetes have, the *incorporative meaning* of the honorific *Christos*." (PFG, 869). However, given his positive statements about rabbinic exegesis cited earlier, it is not clear why exploiting the particular form of a word in this way needs to be denied. Indeed, there is surely no reason why this *methodological* explanation cannot go hand in hand with Wright's *theological* explanation.

#### 4. Paul and Israel's Scriptures

Towards the end of the second volume (PFG, 1449-72), Wright has a specific section on "Paul and Israel's Scriptures," where he seeks to summarise and clarify his position.<sup>xiii</sup> He begins by crediting Hays (1989) as initiating a "right-brain" understanding of Paul as a sophisticated biblical theologian, contrary to the prevailing "left-brain" focus on the minutiae of textual form, introductory formulae and details of syntax and vocabulary. He notes that Stanley (2004) has used the probable lack of literacy among Paul's congregations to oppose this but suggests that Paul: (a) would certainly have expected his letters to be read more than once and be the subject of much study and discussion; and (b) was "quite capable of allowing a particular resonance to sit patiently, like an unopened letter, waiting to be delivered" (PFG, 1453). He reiterates the view that Paul saw Israel's story coming to a climax in Deuteronomy and that Israel's Messiah can be described as *telos nomou* (Rom 10:4) because he is the "goal, aim, ultimate fulfilment, of Torah" (PFG, 1454). In addition, "Paul is working with key texts from the Psalms and prophets, filling in the single narrative line with multiple hints of messianic fulfilment" (PFG, 1454).

The rest of the chapter is devoted to a review and critique of Francis Watson’s magisterial, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. He begins by praising Watson for two major achievements. First, Watson demonstrates that Paul is a subtle and intelligent reader of scripture, not a purveyor of proof-texts. Paul views scripture as a whole and in particular has been significantly influenced by the structure of the five books of Moses. Second, Watson locates Paul among other readers of scripture, not to argue dependence or even necessarily influence but to provide an appropriate context for understanding his writings. However, the conclusions that Watson reaches are very different to those of Wright, for he thinks that Gal 3:12 (“*But* the law does not rest on faith”) and Rom 10:6 (“*But* the righteousness that comes from faith says”) clearly show that Paul *does* see an antithesis between “faith” and “works.” However, this antithesis is not something that Paul learned from the gospel and then imposed on scripture: it is at the very heart of the Torah itself:

In reading the Torah, Paul chooses to highlight two major tensions that he finds within it: the tension between the unconditional promise and the Sinai legislation, and the tension between the law’s offer of life and its curse. These are tensions between books: Genesis and Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy (PFG, 1456, quoting Watson, 22).

The unconditional promise of Gen 15:6 is correlated with Hab 2:4, which has a pivotal role in Rom 1:17 and Gal 3:11. Wright focuses on Rom 1:17, noting that detailed comments on Gal 3:11 will have to wait for a future commentary (PFG, 1470, n.238). The point of issue is that Watson thinks that Hab 2:4 is clearly talking about a human quality (“the righteous shall live by his faith” – RSV) and this ought to determine Paul’s meaning. Indeed, Watson thinks that Rom 1:16-17 is a gloss on Hab 2:4: “*The one who is righteous* (that is, with a *righteousness* of God, revealed in the gospel) *by faith* (since this righteousness is received *by faith* and is intended for faith) *will live.*”<sup>xiv</sup> As evidence, he notes that Paul hardly came up with the unusual ἐκ πίστεώς<sup>xv</sup> (“of/from faith”) and only later noticed that its only occurrence in scripture was in Hab 2:4. Rather, both Paul and the Qumran commentator saw in Hab 2:4 the “divinely ordained way to salvation with a clarity and brevity virtually unparalleled in the rest of scripture.”<sup>xvi</sup> And once that has been agreed, the most likely origin of the equally unusual ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (“of works of law”) is a deliberate attempt by Paul to provide a suitable antithesis.<sup>xvii</sup>

Interestingly, in order to resist this conclusion, Wright is forced to counter that the actual words of a quotation do not determine Paul’s meaning:

So far from the prophet providing a fixed point around which the meaning of *dikaiosynē theou* must be reconfigured, the wider usage of the phrase and its cognates, and associated ideas in Romans, creates a massive presumption in favour of taking it to refer to the divine ‘righteousness’ in the sense of ‘faithfulness to the covenant’. (PFG, 1471)<sup>xviii</sup>

One might correlate this with our earlier discussion of Rom 2:24, where it would appear that the allusions to Ezekiel 36 that follow are more significant than the actual words of the quotation. As Wright states, “I find Watson’s account focused far too much on scripture as ‘normative’ and far too little on scripture as ‘narrative’.” (PFG, 1459).

On the other hand, Wright thinks that Watson has been unduly influenced by the supposed antithesis in Gal 3:12 and Rom 10:6 and allowed himself to see a “deep faultline” in the Torah where none exists. Of course, the Torah is a lengthy piece of writing and so there are inevitably differences of emphasis but it is more about “*two moments in Israel’s covenantal narrative*” (PFG, 1465; emphasis original) than two antithetical voices. And since Paul understands the covenant renewal of Deuteronomy 30 as having been fulfilled, his exposition of Lev 18:5 in Rom 10:6-8 is effectively, “and this is how it’s done” (PFG, 1464).

## 5. Conclusion

Undoubtedly the major feature of Wright’s account of Paul’s use of scripture is the dominance of a Deuteronomy-inspired “end of exile” metanarrative. According to Wright, this was the normative understanding of scripture by Paul’s contemporaries and much of PFG aims to show how this brings coherence to passages which scholars have often found puzzling (e.g. Gal 3:10-14; Rom 10:6-8). However, unlike other scholars who wish to emphasise continuity between the two testaments, Wright does not try to show that the events of Jesus’ life, death and resurrection were *deducible* from scripture prior to his coming. To be sure, the events are “firmly anchored in scripture” but “the reading of scripture in question was highly innovatory” (PFG, 693).

Paul the apostle was compelled by the gospel events to search the scriptures afresh, to ferret out passages and themes which might not have been central in second-Temple reflection but which now pressed themselves upon him. (PFG, 933)

This allows Wright to claim that Paul is a sophisticated contextual theologian, while also acknowledging that he sometimes felt free to change both the wording and the meaning of his quotations. For some, this will constitute a contradiction. If Paul “radically adjusts” the wording of Isa 59:20 so that the redeemer comes “from” Zion rather than “to” Zion, it is not what most people would call “contextual.” But Wright would argue that this is “left-brain” thinking which fails to distinguish the wood from the trees. What Paul has done is to interpret the text in the light of the overall “end of exile” narrative that has been *surprisingly* but *truly* fulfilled in the events of Jesus Messiah. In short, Paul’s exegesis is both a “major relativization as well as a major recalling of that most critical moment in Jewish election-theology.” (PFG, 905).

It is difficult to argue with such a statement but it should be noted that his emphasis on seeing everything in the light of the “end of exile” metanarrative does have certain consequences. For example, it intrinsically favours allusions and echoes over quotations, because their speculative nature makes it easier to posit a connection with the metanarrative. Much of what Wright says about these proposed allusions is illuminating but is it really adequate to say that Paul chose Isa 52:5 because it lies in the middle of a narrative that moves from Israel’s sin to Israel’s salvation? Would that not be true of a huge number of passages? And going to the heart of his thesis, can Deuteronomy 30 really be the key to understanding Romans when readers have to wait until chapter 10 for the first direct reference to that chapter?

Second, the emphasis on an overarching metanarrative also appears to be behind Wright’s reluctance to link Paul’s exegesis with specific Jewish exegetical techniques. Thus he suggests that Paul *may* have had in mind texts like Isa 2:3 (the law goes out *from* Zion), Deut 33:28-9 (the Lord came *from* Sinai) or Ps 14:7 (deliverance would come *from* Zion) when he modified Isa 59:20 but seems reluctant to name particular exegetical techniques. Despite the positive things he says about Qumranic and rabbinic exegesis noted earlier, it would appear that too close a link might be seen as a liability for the modern reader. On the other hand, he seems to think that an emphasis on narrative is as true today as it was then.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to evaluate whether the Deuteronomy-inspired “end of exile” theme was as prevalent as Wright claims but in closing, it is worth asking whether such a general theme could ever exert the sort of influence that Wright claims. It is rather like appealing to the theory of gravity in order to explain why I slipped on the pavement last week. It is of course true but not really the sort of explanation that illuminates the incident. In fact, the north of England was covered in snow and I should have chosen more suitable footwear. Similarly, even if Paul did think that the coming of Jesus and the Spirit are the fulfilment of Deuteronomy 30, can that really explain why he chose to use Isa 52:5 as an accusation in Rom 2:24 or Isa 59:20 in Rom 11:26, only to change its wording so that it says something different? Scholars will be indebted to Wright’s two volumes but will continue to search for specific answers to questions such as these.

- 
- <sup>i</sup> N.T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (COQG 4; London: SPCK, 2013). Hereafter cited in text as *PFG*.
- <sup>ii</sup> Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). He has since expanded on these criteria and how they should function in *The Conversion of the Imagination. Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).
- <sup>iii</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 32-3.
- <sup>iv</sup> Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 18. Stanley Porter notes that listing seven criteria like this gives a false impression of objectivity and some scholars have unfortunately attempted to use them in this way. But it is clear that judgements about “volume” are related to judgements about “recurrence” and judgements about “coherence” are related both to “historical plausibility” and “satisfaction.” See S.E. Porter, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology.” Pages 79-96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. SSEJC 5. JNTSSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- <sup>v</sup> The view that we should take into account what Paul’s first readers were capable of detecting is particularly associated with Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004).
- <sup>vi</sup> Deuteronomy 27-30, Psalms 78, 105, 106, Isa 40-55, Ezra 9, Nehemiah 9 and Daniel 9.
- <sup>vii</sup> Judith, Ben-Sirach, 1 and 3 Maccabees, *1 Enoch* 85-90, Genesis Apocryphon, 4QMMT, Josephus, *4 Ezra* and 2 *Baruch*.
- <sup>viii</sup> As also argued by Brant Pitre, *Jesus and the Jewish Roots of the Eucharist. Unlocking the Secrets of the Last Supper* (New York: Doubleday, 2011).
- <sup>ix</sup> N.T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (COQG 1; London: SPCK, 1992).
- <sup>x</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 74.
- <sup>xi</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 82.
- <sup>xii</sup> T.W. Berkley, *From a Broken Covenant to Circumcision of the Heart. Pauline Intertextual Exegesis in Romans 2.17-29* (SBLDS, 175; Atlanta: SBL, 2000). Although Hays wants to argue for the significance of allusions and echoes, his book is nevertheless structured around the quotations. His view of Paul’s use of Isa 52:5 is that Paul deliberately held back the salvation theme until Romans 10: “The letter’s rhetorical structure lures the reader into expecting Israel’s final condemnation, but the later chapters undercut such an expectation, requiring the reader in subsequent encounters with the text to understand the Isaiah quotation more deeply in relation to its original context” (*Echoes*, 46).
- <sup>xiii</sup> He cites the significant contributions by Wilk (1998), Wagner (2002) and Watson (2004) and jokes that since his name also begins with “W,” he hopes what follows will make a further contribution.
- <sup>xiv</sup> Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 48.
- <sup>xv</sup> Rom 1:17; 3:26, 30; 4:16; 5:1; 9:30, 32; 10:6; 14:23; Gal 2:16; 3:7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 24; 5:5.
- <sup>xvi</sup> Though of course the Qumran commentator took this to be a renewed faithfulness to the law.
- <sup>xvii</sup> See Steve Moyise, *Evoking Scripture. Seeing the Old Testament in the New* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2008), 49-62.
- <sup>xviii</sup> Indeed, Wright cites the majority LXX reading of ἐκ πίστεώς μου as evidence for the meaning “my faithfulness,” either as an interpretation of the Hebrew or the use of a different Hebrew text. In either case, it shows that a human quality is not as certain as Watson assumes.