

13 (1983) 17-38

best of his ability, and to reflect in his daily living the same quality of outgoing charity which marked the Lord when he was with us "in the flesh."⁵⁷

CONCLUSIONS

As the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*, the Spirit creates a relationship between Christ and the believer. Through the forgiveness of sins and the removal of guilt, we joyfully experience a moral recovery from our past which now is no longer a burden affecting our behavior in the present. Because Christ has become our life, we are liberated from our selfishness and self-righteousness. Freed from ourselves for the neighbor, we are now ready to meet the latter in Christ-like love as a genuine "thou."

This freedom can also be seen as a freedom from the Law. The Law, which formerly deceived us into sinning because our sinful nature took obedience to it as a ground for boasting, is now written on our hearts by the Holy Spirit. Since Christ, in whom the requirements of the Law have been fulfilled, has become our life, we no longer produce "works" but are prepared gratefully to bring forth "fruit," i.e., love which fulfills the intention of the Law. This interiorization of the Law entails that the Spirit, as the *interior magister*, enables us, on the basis of the Word, to make the right ethical decisions in the improvisation of the moment. As such, the Spirit prevents us from codifying the Word, which inadvertently may turn us into enemies of both God and man.

Such a spontaneous discerning of the will of God must be nurtured by a prayerful approach to life. As the Spirit enables us to pray in the name of Jesus, we confess our dependence on the One whose life of self-sacrifice provides the basis in ultimate reality for the love-command. Finally, Spirit-inspired ethical conduct is always embedded in a community of fellow-believers. Finding that through the *testimonium* Christ becomes more and more "true" to him or her, the individual believer increasingly desires to express the love of Christ, a love which sustains the Church as a community.

57. Pittenger, *Holy Spirit*, 110. Of course, this must not be understood as if believers at some point in the future could become in every respect like Christ. Cf. Pannenberg, *Jesus*, 344-49, 378-90.

THE CHURCH AS THE NEW ISRAEL AND THE FUTURE OF ETHNIC ISRAEL IN PAUL

THOMAS R. SCHREINER¹

In NT studies today the future of ethnic Israel and the role of the Church as the new Israel are keenly debated. This discussion often stems from Paul's understanding of the newness of the Gospel, a newness which arises from the significance of the cross of Christ and the outpouring of the Spirit as these relate to Israel and the newly formed Church. In this article we shall briefly examine two major issues. 1) Did the newness of Paul's Gospel extend to his definition of the people of God? To put the same question in other words: did Paul consider the Church to be the new Israel? Usually such a discussion focuses on the exegesis of Gal 6:16, but in this article we shall look at the same issue from another angle. We shall see how Paul's usage of the word "circumcision" and the phrase "seed of Abraham" relates to the issue of the Church as the new Israel. 2) The second question is related to the first. If Paul did consider the Church to be the new Israel of God, then how does this affect his view of ethnic Israel? Did he see any future salvation for the nation of Israel, and if he did, does this belief contradict the newness of his gospel? We shall endeavor to answer these two questions and explore the implications of the answers as they relate to the newness of Paul's gospel.

THE NEW PEOPLE OF GOD

Paul's transfer of circumcision terminology to the Church implies that the Church is in some sense the new people of God, and indeed the

1. Thomas R. Schreiner is a Ph.D. candidate in NT at Fuller Seminary.

new Israel. Some scholars, however, contest this claim.² D. W. B. Robinson, for example, contends that it is a mistake to call the Church the new Israel or the true Israel. Paul, he affirms, only used the term "Israel" when referring to the nation. Believing Gentiles were not identified as Israel because the two were kept quite distinct in Romans 11. Furthermore, he argues that the fact that the phrase "seed of Abraham" is used of Gentiles does not imply that Gentiles are the new Israel. After all, "Abraham had many children who were not Israelites."³ Gentiles were merely the children of Abraham in his uncircumcised state (Rom 4:9–12). Lastly, the fact that Paul saw a future for Israel in Rom 11:26 demonstrates, according to Robinson, that the Gentiles should not be described as the new Israel.⁴

Peter Richardson is in basic sympathy with Robinson's position, although he maintains that there was a tendency for the Church to apply the term Israel to itself. Justin Martyr, however, was the first to do so explicitly.⁵ Richardson claims that the Church could not appropriate the title Israel as long as there was some hope that ethnic Israel would repent. And Paul's discussion concerning Israel in Romans 11 shows that he was still confident that the nation would ultimately be converted. It was only when this hope of Israel's conversion was discontinued that the Church took over the title of Israel.⁶

Richardson concedes that Eph 2:11–22, which he thinks is Pauline, is a step in the "identification of the Church as Israel, to the exclusion of any continuation of historic Israel."⁷ Nevertheless, in Ephesians the term Israel is not yet applied to the Church. The letter is a step in that process and not the termination of the process. Richardson also concedes that Phil 3:3 with its application of the term circumcision to the Church indicates that the Church possesses the

2. D. W. B. Robinson, "The Salvation of Israel in Romans 9–11," *Reformed Theological Review* 26 (1967) 81–96.

3. Robinson, 88.

4. Robinson criticized (p. 83, n. 6) Moule for calling the Church the new Israel. Upon reading this critique (although not just because of Robinson's view) Moule has moved closer to Robinson's position. See C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (3rd ed.; New York: Harper & Row, 1982) 48–51.

5. P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTSMS 10; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969).

6. Richardson, 73, 129, 201–204.

7. Richardson, 157–58.

mark of the people of God, and that the Church was absorbing and adapting OT language to itself.⁸ But again such tendencies do not mean that the Church considered itself to be the new Israel.

The contributions of Robinson and Richardson are useful because they help to clarify matters. Robinson and Richardson both insist that the term Israel could not be applied to the Church because Paul still saw a future for ethnic Israel and because he still distinguished between believing Jews and believing Gentiles. Now these authors are certainly right that Paul differentiated between Jews and Gentiles (Rom 1:16; chapters 9–11; Phil 3:5; Col 4:10–11; *et passim*). Indeed, Rom 11:26 may be indicating that Paul saw a future for ethnic Israel. But does the fact that Paul acknowledged an ethnic difference between Jews and Gentiles necessarily imply that the Church could not have appropriated the term Israel in a spiritual sense? Robinson and Richardson seem to confuse matters because they do not notice that Paul may use the term Israel in various ways. It is obvious at once that Paul is not saying that the Church is Israel in an ethnic sense. Such a statement would be nonsense. However, Paul may be intimating that the Church is the spiritual Israel, that the people of God are no longer co-extensive with the nation of Israel but with the Church.

Phil 3:3–5 supports the idea that Paul could use OT language in two different senses. In Phil 3:5 he states that he was circumcised on the eighth day. Now there is no doubt that Paul is speaking of literal circumcision in this verse. On the other hand, in Phil 3:3 he says that the Church is the true circumcision. In Phil 3:3 Paul is not speaking literally, for the Gentile church at Philippi was not the true circumcision in the sense that it was circumcised in the flesh. Paul's point is that the true circumcision is spiritual in nature; it is manifested in spiritual worship and trust in Christ Jesus. In Rom 2:25–29 Paul makes a similar point. True circumcision is not outward but inward; it is not physical but spiritual, not external but internal. The implication for our present purposes is important. The texts in Philippians and Romans show that Paul could distinguish between the physically circumcised and the uncircumcised, and yet at the same time he asserted that Christians were circumcised in the deepest sense of the word, i.e., they were spiritually circumcised. Thus, the claim that Paul could not

8. Richardson, 115, 198.

identify the Church as the spiritual Israel because he still maintained a distinction between ethnic Israel and Gentiles is logically fallacious. To be consistent one would have to argue that Paul could not call the Church the *spiritual* circumcision because Paul still distinguished between people who were physically circumcised and uncircumcised. We have already seen, however, that Paul did identify the Church as the spiritual circumcision, and yet he still acknowledged the fact of physical circumcision. Thus, the analogy from circumcision demonstrates that in principle Paul could identify the Church as the new Israel and at the same time acknowledge the existence of ethnic Israel.

What we have said thus far does not prove that Paul identified the Church as the spiritual Israel; it simply removes one major objection to such an attribution. Paul's continued recognition and acknowledgment of ethnic Israel does not prove that the Church could not be called spiritual Israel. However, there is only one verse, Gal 6:16, where Paul may be possibly identifying the Church as the new Israel, and some scholars argue that Paul is not thinking of the Church but of believing Jews when he speaks of Israel in Gal 6:16.⁹ I think Paul is identifying the Church as the new Israel in Gal 6:16, yet the case for identifying the Church as the new Israel seems exceedingly slim if its rests on one disputed verse. Richardson has ably argued that the early Church, including Paul, was reluctant to transfer the title Israel to the Church.

Nevertheless, by concentrating on the single term Israel, one may fail to see that Paul materially viewed the Church as the new Israel, even if he did not explicitly make this assertion. For instance, Paul's claim that the Church is the seed of Abraham (Gal 3:29) is virtually a declaration that the Church is the new Israel. Robinson objects that such an attribution does not prove the Church is the new Israel because Abraham had many "Gentile" children. It is true that Abraham was both the father of the circumcised and the uncircumcised (Rom 4:9-12), but Paul's transfer of the expression "seed of Abraham" to believing Gentiles is not merely an assertion that Gentiles have been blessed via Abraham (Gal 3:8).

By NT times to be a son of Abraham or the seed of Abraham was equivalent to being a Jew. This is clear in Matt 3:9 and John 8:33, 37,

9. E. DeW. Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920) 358; Richardson, 81-84.

39. In Matthew, John the Baptist criticizes the Pharisees and Sadducees because they thought mere descent from Abraham was sufficient to shield them from wrath. John warns them that having Abraham as a physical father does not necessarily qualify them as his children (*tekna*). In John's gospel Jesus is engaged in a similar debate with the Jews. The Jews could not understand why Jesus said they needed to be free from sin. After all, they were not pagans but the seed (*sperma*) of Abraham (John 8:33, 37). To be the *tekna* was equivalent to being the *sperma* of Abraham as a comparison of John 8:33, 37 with John 8:39 shows.

The import of these passages for our present discussion is clear. Both Matthew and John show that the Jews of Jesus' day understood the expressions "children of Abraham" and "seed of Abraham" as synonyms for being Jewish, as indications of their special covenant relationship with God. Paul evidently understood the phrases in the same way. According to Paul, being the seed of Abraham was intimately connected with the promise (Gal 3:16-18; 3:29). Now not all of Abraham's offspring were recipients of the promise. The promise was restricted to the seed of Isaac (Gal 4:30; Gen 17:15-22; 21:10). Thus, Paul when he uses the phrase "seed of Abraham" in Galatians is not referring to all the children of Abraham but to the privileged seed of Abraham who had received the promise, i.e., the Jews.

But if Paul understands the seed of Abraham to be those who are the recipients of the promise, those who are the true heirs of Abraham and Isaac, then how can he apply the expression to Gentiles? Paul's answer is found in Gal 3:16, 29. He argues that Christ is the true seed of Abraham. Thus, Gentiles by virtue of their participation in Christ become the children of Abraham and the heirs of the promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. If Robinson is correct that the phrase seed of Abraham in Galatians merely refers to the non-Israelite descendants of Abraham, then Paul's point is difficult to comprehend. In Galatians Paul is not merely declaring that Gentile believers fall under the category of Abraham's non-Israelite descendants. He is maintaining that they are the true heirs of Abraham, the recipients of the inheritance promised to Abraham through Christ. They are participating in privileges which the Jews thought were reserved for themselves. In other words, Paul is transferring a title to believing Gentiles which was usually restricted to Jews.

The polemical situation of Galatians accounts for the appropriation of the phrase "the seed of Abraham" by Gentiles. Paul is arguing

that submission to circumcision is not necessary to be part of Abraham's seed (the judaizer position), but that faith in Christ was all that was necessary. The judaizers affirmed that the Gentiles had to be circumcised, that they had to become Jews to be the seed of Abraham. Paul retorted that they were already the seed of Abraham through Christ. The polemical slant of Paul's argument makes sense only if he is taking a title of the Jews and applying it to the Church. And if the Church is the true seed of Abraham, then, this is simply another way of saying that it is the true Israel—the true people of God.

It is interesting that Richardson says that the Church could not be considered the new Israel until Israel was explicitly identified with Christ, and that this process was not consummated until the time of Justin Martyr.¹⁰ However, it seems that Paul did explicitly identify the seed of Abraham as Christ in Gal 3:16. By doing this he could claim that all Gentiles who belonged to Christ were the seed of Abraham. If we are correct that the phrase "seed of Abraham" is materially the same as the term "Israel," then Paul did assert that Christ was Israel, and Gal 3:16 is a clear indication that the Church is the new Israel.

Furthermore, the application of circumcision terminology to the Church (e.g., Rom 2:25–29; Phil 3:3; Col 2:11ff.) is recognized by Richardson, but he does not draw the proper implications from this fact.¹¹ Not only does it show a process whereby the Church was adopting OT language, but it also reveals that the Church considered itself to be the true people of God. Circumcision was the necessary rite of passage into the covenant people. It was the mark that one was a Jew, that one was a member of the nation of Israel. Paul, by applying the language of circumcision to the Church and spiritualizing it, was saying that the new rite of entry into the people of God was the circumcision of the heart. Those who were physically circumcised but uncircumcised in heart could not be considered members of the new community. The spiritualization of the rite of passage into the new community was coincident with the spiritualization of the people of God. The new community was not coextensive with the nation of Israel

10. Richardson, 205.

11. For a full discussion of Paul's view of circumcision see my dissertation, "Circumcision: An Entrée Into 'Newness' in Pauline Thought," Ph.D. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1983.

but was comprised of believers from all nations. Just as the rite of entry into the people of God was spiritualized, so too the very nature of the people of God was spiritualized. To say that the Church is the true circumcision is simply another way of saying that the Church is the true Israel (Rom 2:25–29).

Eph 2:11–22, as Richardson concedes, is another passage which is on the trajectory of identifying the Church as the new Israel. Of course, Pauline authorship of Ephesians is strongly contested and thus Eph 2:11–22 cannot be accepted uncritically as Pauline.¹² However, even if Ephesians is not Pauline, the theology of Eph 2:11–22 seems to be characteristically Pauline. The contents of the passage reflect a logical development of Paul's thinking on the Jew-Gentile question. Thus F. F. Bruce's view that Ephesians is "the quintessence of Paulinism" seems to be justified; at least Eph 2:11–22 fits this description nicely.¹³ Because Pauline authorship is generally doubted it would be methodologically improper to build our case on this passage. Nevertheless, since the passage (whether or not it was actually written by Paul) is a reasonable extension of Paul's thought, it may be used as confirmatory evidence.

The author reminds the Gentiles of their pre-Christian state. They were called the "uncircumcision" (*akrobystia*) because the latter was a sign that the Gentiles were separate from Christ, outside the covenant, and excluded from the nation of Israel (Eph 2:11–22). However, the blood of Christ has transcended and abolished the barrier which existed between Jews and Gentiles. Now *both* Jews and Gentiles (the word *amphoterai* occurs three times in Eph 2:14–18) have access to God through the Holy Spirit. They comprise one new man in Jesus Christ (Eph 2:15). The Gentiles are no longer alienated from the people of God, but now they are fellow-citizens (*sympolitai*) with the people of Israel (2:19). Circumcision is no longer required to be a member of the people of God. The death of Christ has removed the enmity between Jew and Gentile by abolishing the law (2:14–15).

Thus, Eph 2:11–22 is confirmatory evidence and a logical

12. See Bruce for a survey of scholarly opinion on the Pauline authorship of Ephesians. F. F. Bruce, *Paul Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 424, n. 2.

13. The phrase was originally coined by A. S. Peake (see Bruce, 424).

development of Paul's claim that the Church is the true circumcision. Although the Church is never called the new Israel in Eph 2:11-22, the idea is there materially.¹⁴ Gentiles, who become members of the people of God through faith in Christ (Eph 2:8-9), are now fellow-citizens with the people of Israel. There are not two separate churches, one Jewish and one Gentile, but one people of God. Now if Gentiles through Christ are united with Jews and inheritors of the covenant promises, then it seems proper to infer that the author of Ephesians saw the Church, which was made up of both Jews and Gentiles, as the new Israel. The Church is God's new temple in which the Holy Spirit dwells (Eph 2:21-22).

THE OLD PEOPLE OF GOD

If we are correct that Paul considered the Church to be the new Israel, then is there a contradiction in Paul's thought because he saw a future for ethnic Israel? Is his conviction that all Israel will be saved a lingering remnant of nationalism with which Paul could not dispense (Rom 11:26)? We have already seen that both Richardson and Robinson assert that Paul's belief in the future salvation of ethnic Israel means that he could not perceive the Church as the spiritual Israel. However, is it possible that Paul could see a future for ethnic Israel and at the same time describe the Church as spiritual Israel? If such were the case, would this be a contradiction in his thought? Would his belief in the future salvation of Israel violate the newness of his gospel?

But these questions are causing us to run ahead because they assume that Rom 11:26 is speaking of a future salvation for ethnic Israel. Before we can examine the implications of Rom 11:26 for Paul's gospel, we must discuss the interpretation of the verse. Naturally many complex and interesting questions arise in the interpretation of Romans 9-11; however, for our purposes we shall focus on Rom 11:26. Indeed, so many articles and monographs have been written on Romans 9-11 (and even 11:26 alone) and the future of Israel that it is impossible to cover them all.¹⁵ We shall survey the main lines of

14. See Sahlin's article for a detailed defense of this point. H. Sahlin, "Die Beschneidung Christi. Eine Interpretation von Ephesians 2, 11-22," *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses* 12 (1950) 5-22.

15. See the forthcoming dissertation on the future of Israel by my fellow-student at Fuller Theological Seminary, John Simpson.

interpretation on 11:26 and relate it to our main purpose, viz., does Paul's theology of Israel in Rom 11:26 clash with his view that the Church is the new Israel?

The two major questions that arise upon reading Rom 11:26 are: 1) What does Paul mean by "Israel," and 2) How will all Israel be saved? There are three basic answers to the first question.

1) Both John Calvin and Karl Barth argue that when Paul speaks of all Israel that he is referring to the Church. Calvin says of 11:26, "Many understand this of the Jewish people, as if Paul were saying that religion was to be restored to them again as before. But I extend the word *Israel* to include all the people of God."¹⁶ Calvin cites Gal 6:16, which he understands to be a reference to the Church as the new Israel, to support the idea that Paul was referring to the Church when he used the word Israel. Barth's position is similar. "'All Israel' is the community of those elected by God in and with Jesus Christ both from Jews and also from Gentiles."¹⁷ In other words, Paul is referring to the Church as a whole.

The difficulty with this interpretation is that it is improbable that Paul means two different things by Israel in Rom 11:25-26. In Rom 11:25 it is clear that the partial hardening has come upon ethnic Israel while the fullness of Gentiles enters in. Since Israel in 11:25 can only refer to ethnic Israel, it is improbable that Paul is referring to another Israel, i.e., spiritual Israel in Rom 11:26.¹⁸

16. J. Calvin, *The Epistles of Paul to the Romans and Thessalonians* (ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance: CNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960) 255.

17. K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of God* (ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1952) II/2. 300.

18. Bruce says, "It is impossible to entertain an exegesis which takes 'Israel' here in a different sense from 'Israel' in verse 25." F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963) 221-22. Sanday and Headlam say, "The whole context shows clearly that it is the actual Israel of history that is referred to. This is quite clear from the contrast with *plērōma tōn ethnōn* in ver. 25, the use of the term Israel in the same verse, and the drift of the argument in vv. 17-24." W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902) 335. For the same view see the following: J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 2:96; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975, 1979) 576; W. Hendriksen, "And So All Israel Shall Be Saved": *An Interpretation of Romans 11:26a* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1945) 16-21; C. M. Horne, "Meaning of the Phrase 'And Thus All Israel Will Be Saved' (Romans 11:26)," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological*

2) The second main interpretation is that the Israel being discussed in Rom 11:26 is ethnic Israel. However, Paul is not referring to the eschatological salvation of the nation of Israel. The salvation of Israel which Paul is affirming in Rom 11:26 refers to his conviction that the Jewish elect of all ages will be saved.¹⁹ Both Charles Horne and William Hendriksen contend that the argument of Romans 9–11 supports this view.²⁰ Paul proves that God has not rejected his people Israel by citing the presence of a remnant of believers in Israel (Rom 9:6ff; 11:11ff). The salvation of a remnant within Israel reveals that God has been faithful to his people, and thus it would be superfluous for Paul to bring up the future salvation of Israel in Rom 11:26. Indeed, if Paul were thinking of the eschatological salvation of the nation of Israel in Rom 11:26, then this would seem to damage his argument concerning the remnant earlier in Romans 9–11. In any case, it would seem to demonstrate that Paul did not really think that the salvation of a remnant within Israel was an answer to his problem, and so he postulated a future salvation for all Israel. But these scholars maintain that Paul was more consistent than this. It is more probable that the salvation of all Israel in Rom 11:26 should be understood in a way that harmonizes with the whole context of Romans 9–11. Such an approach suggests that the salvation of Israel that Paul is referring to in Rom 11:26 is the salvation of the remnant, the elect from Israel of all ages.

This second interpretation is attractive because the scholars who support it detect a basic consistency in Paul's argument. Nevertheless, it does not adequately explain the language and context of Rom 11:26. First, the above interpretation does not explain the presence of the word *mystērion*. How is the salvation of all the elect of Israel's history a mystery? Is it not obvious that all the *elect* within Israel will be saved? How can the salvation of all the elect of Israel qualify as a mystery, i.e., as a divinely revealed secret, since it is a truism to say that all the elect will be saved? No revelation from God is needed to substantiate such an obvious statement.²¹

Second, to identify the salvation of Israel in Rom 11:26 with the salvation of the Jewish elect of all ages does not do justice to the word

pas. Hypothetically, of course, *pas* could refer to all the elect from Israel's history.²² But the context, as always, is decisive for the meaning of a word, and the context clearly shows that *pas* cannot be expanded to the elect of all ages. In 11:25 Paul speaks of a partial hardening of Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles come in. Then, in 11:26 he refers to the salvation of all Israel. If one accepts the interpretation of Horne, Berkouwer, and Hendriksen, then Paul is not really saying anything different in verses 25 and 26. One may infer (v 25) that since only a part of Israel is hardened that a portion of Israel is coming to faith. These Israelites would be part of the elect of all ages. In 11:26 the salvation of all Israel is similar, for it is (according to these scholars) the salvation of a remnant within Israel.

But the problem with this interpretation is that the progression of thought in 11:25–26 is ignored. Paul's point is not that the hardening of part of Israel is permanent, that only a remnant will be saved from Israel. He clearly indicates that the hardening of Israel will be temporally limited. It will cease when the fullness of Gentiles come in.²³ After the fullness of Gentiles come in, then *all* Israel will be saved. In 11:25 the present is in view—part of Israel is hardened. But in 11:26 Paul gazes into the future when this partial hardening will be lifted, when all Israel, and not just a portion of the nation, will be saved. C. E. B. Cranfield rightly points out that the interpretation favored by Horne, *et al.* is an "anticlimax."²⁴ Paul is rising to the high point of his argument in 11:26; he is not merely restating the same point he made earlier (Rom 9:6ff; 11:1ff).

3) The third interpretation is favored by most scholars today, viz., that by the salvation of all Israel Paul is referring to a future event when the nation of Israel as a whole will be saved.²⁵ It is not necessary to

22. Sanday and Headlam, 335.

23. The temporal limitation is indicated by *achris hou* in 11:25. The presence of *achris hou* in 11:25 suggests that *houtōs* in 11:26 is an adverb of time and not an adverb of manner. For a temporal understanding of *houtōs*, cf. W. D. Davies, "Paul and the People of Israel," *NTS* 24 (October 1977) 17, n. 1; B. Corley, "The Jews, the Future, and God (Romans 9–11)," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 19 (1976) 53–54. Robinson (pp. 94–95) supports the notion that *houtōs* is an adverb of manner.

24. Cranfield, pp. 576–77.

25. C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (MNTC; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932) 182–83; cf. Bruce, *Romans*, 221–22; Cranfield, 577; Sanday and Headlam, 335–36; Murray, 96–98; Davies, "People of Israel," 16, n. 2; E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 313–14; C. K. Barrett, *A*

Society 21 (1978) 332.

19. So Horne, 329–34; Hendriksen, *All Israel*; and G. C. Berkouwer, *The Return of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) 339–49.

20. Hendriksen, 22–23; Horne, 333–34.

21. So Cranfield, 576–77.

insist that Paul is speaking of the salvation of every single Israelite. The point is that the nation as a whole will experience salvation. Such an interpretation does justice to the context. It understands "Israel" in the same sense in 11:25–26; it recognizes the climactic nature of 11:26; it accounts for the presence of the word *mystērion* (for the salvation of all Israel after the salvation of the Gentiles was certainly a mystery);²⁶ and it also explains the presence of the word *pas* in 11:26. Thus, Paul is not saying that all Israelites throughout history will be saved; he looks forward to the future when a great portion of Israel will be saved.²⁷

What we are interested in is whether or not Paul's view of Israel in Rom 11:26 contradicts his claim that the Church is the new Israel. Of course, if Calvin and Barth are correct in their interpretation of Rom 11:26, then such a problem is non-existent because Paul is not speaking of the future salvation of Israel. Instead, the salvation of the new Israel, i.e. the Church, is being described. Thus, Rom 11:26 (in this view) does not pose a problem in Paul's theology; rather, the verse is seen as another support for the notion that the Church is the new Israel. However, although such an interpretation solves the problem which is before us, we have already contended that the exegesis to support such a view is not convincing.

In addition, if Rom 11:26 refers to the salvation of the elect from Israel of all ages (so Horne, Hendriksen, and Berkouwer), then there is no question of a contradiction in Paul's thought. For if this interpretation is correct, Paul is not claiming that Israel is the object of any special favor. He is merely saying that some Israelites are saved, i.e., that a remnant of Israel is being saved and will be saved by placing their faith in Christ. And since a portion of the Gentiles were being saved on the same basis, there is no distinction between Jews and Gentiles if this interpretation is correct. But we have claimed that such a view does not

Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (BNTC; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962) 226–27.

26. So N. A. Dahl, "The Future of Israel," *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977) 152; cf. J. Munck, *Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9–11* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967) 132.

27. Cranfield and Sanday and Headlam disagree on the time of this salvation. Sanday and Headlam (p. 335) place it in history, while Cranfield (p. 577) understands it as an eschatological event.

adequately explain Rom 11:26, and therefore this interpretation cannot be used to resolve the problem before us.

The view that seems most convincing is that Paul is looking forward to the future salvation of ethnic Israel in Rom 11:26. A future salvation of the nation of Israel, however, seems to clash with Paul's conviction that the Church is the new Israel. Does not his retention of special privilege for his people contradict his grand declaration that there is neither Jew nor Greek (Gal 3:28)? Is there a species of nationalism that Paul could not ultimately exorcise? Before we shall examine this question, we must deal with the second major issue in the interpretation of Rom 11:26, viz., how shall Israel be saved?

Krister Stendahl and Franz Mussner contend that the salvation of Israel is not dependent on faith in Christ.²⁸ Paul simply asserts that all Israel will be saved. Stendahl points out that nowhere is it said that "Israel will accept Jesus as the Messiah." Indeed, "it is stunning to note that Paul writes the whole section of Romans (10:17–11:36) without using the name of Jesus Christ. This includes the final doxology (11:33–36), the only such doxology in his writings without any christological element."²⁹ Mussner affirms that Israel will be saved in a "Sonderweg."³⁰ He emphasizes that nothing is said about Israel's conversion; instead the focus is on God saving Israel. God shall save Israel in a special way and thereby his grace will be magnified.

Mussner recognizes that Rom 11:23 may be raised against his thesis, for Paul says that the Jews will be grafted in again if they do not persist in their unbelief. This caveat on Paul's part seems to imply that faith was necessary for Israel to be grafted in again. But Mussner argues that 11:23 does not demonstrate the falsity of his interpretation because 1) the verse is simply a paraenetic comment to Jews; 2) Paul was merely completing the parallel construction in Rom 11:22–23; and 3) Rom 11:23 expresses the human reservation of Paul, but in 11:26 this is swallowed up by God's sovereignty. The contradiction in Paul's thinking was lost in the progressive flow of his argument.³¹

28. K. Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 4; F. Mussner, "'Ganz Israel wird gerettet werden' (Röm 11:26)," *Kairos* 18 (1976) 241–55.

29. Stendahl, 4.

30. Mussner, 247–51.

31. Mussner, 252.

If Mussner and Stendahl are right, then there is a glaring contradiction in Paul's thought. On the one hand, he can say that the Church is the new Israel, that the Jews who opposed the gospel are the object of God's wrath (1 Thess 2:14–16),³² and yet on the other hand he can claim that Israel will ultimately be saved apart from faith in Christ. Apparently Paul's devotion to his people caused him to embrace a view that was not logically consistent.

However, there are strong reasons for doubting the validity of the interpretations proposed by Stendahl and Mussner. E. P. Sanders has rightly pointed out that the omission of the name Jesus Christ in Rom 10:17–11:36 is not as significant as Stendahl would make it. Rom 10:17–11:36 may not mention faith in Jesus Christ but the necessity of faith is indicated in 11:20 and 11:23.³³ One may safely assume that Jesus Christ is the object of that faith since no other object is specified. The faith by which Gentiles stand (11:20) is faith in Christ, and there is no evidence that Paul is thinking of faith in another person in 11:23 when he is speaking of the Jews.

Sanders also criticizes Stendahl because the latter claims that justification by faith is not a soteriological statement. Stendahl says that Paul merely intended to defend the inclusion of Gentiles into the kingdom. Such a bifurcation between soteriology and the kingdom is untenable. Inclusion into the kingdom of God has soteriological significance; one could not enter into the kingdom without being saved.³⁴ Lastly, Sanders notes that Rom 11:28–32 reveals that Jews and Gentiles are saved on the same basis.³⁵ Even though faith is not mentioned as a condition for salvation, it is safe to assume that it is implied. Otherwise, one would have to maintain that all are saved without faith, i.e., both Jews and *Gentiles* are saved without faith. It is improbable, however, that Paul would make such an all-embracing declaration in Romans, for this would undercut the thesis that he formulated in the first part of the epistle where he affirms that justification is by faith.

32. Davies ("People of Israel," 6–7) says that the notion that 1 Thess 2:14–16 is an interpolation is unwarranted.

33. E. P. Sanders, "Paul's Attitude Toward the Jewish People," *USQR* 33 (1978) 182.

34. Sanders, 181.

35. Sanders, 183.

W. D. Davies also criticizes Stendahl's thesis. Davies claims that the word *rhymenos* in Rom 11:26 is probably a reference to Jesus Christ, and the parallel expression in 1 Thess 1:10 supports such an interpretation.³⁶ Moreover, even if *rhymenos* does not refer to Jesus Christ, Stendahl's view should still be rejected according to Davies.³⁷ 1) Stendahl isolates 11:25–27 too radically and thereby ignores the larger context of chapter eleven. 2) Rom 11:11 and 11:14 suggest that the salvation of the Jews was dependent on faith.

Stendahl's interpretation, therefore, should be rejected because he does not pay sufficient attention to the context of Romans 11 nor does he explain the references to the necessity of faith in the chapter. Mussner, on the other hand, gives three reasons why the references to faith in Rom 11:23 are not decisive; thus he maintains that all Israel will not be saved by faith but in God's sovereign and special way. An examination of Mussner's three reasons, however, shows that they are untenable.³⁸ 1) Mussner argues that 11:23 does not show that faith is necessary for all Israel to be saved because the verse is paraenetic. But even if the verse is paraenetic this does not mean that compliance with the exhortation is optional. Paul did not think that a response to his paraenesis was insignificant. Serious consequences would follow if one did not obey his exhortations (cf. 1 Thess 4:3–8; Romans 13). 2) The fact that there is a parallel construction between 11:22–23 does not support Mussner's interpretation. On the contrary, it undercuts the validity of his view. Paul's point is that the Gentiles only stand in faith and if they do not persevere in faith, then God will cut them off. By the same token, unbelieving Israel is separated from God because they do not believe, and yet if they forsake their unbelief, then God will graft them back onto the olive tree. The parallel construction does not show that faith is unimportant; instead, it reveals that faith is all-important. Both Jews and Gentiles are grafted onto the olive tree by faith alone. Without faith both are severed from the blessing and salvation of God.

3) Mussner's third point is that the human reservation of 11:23 is obliterated by God's sovereignty in Rom 11:26. Paul has forgotten the

36. Davies, "People of Israel," 27.

37. Davies, "People of Israel," 28.

38. See F. Hahn, "Zum Verständnis von Römer 11:26a: '... und so wird ganz Israel gerettet werden'," *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett* (ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson; London: SPCK, 1982) 221–36.

condition he set forth previously in 11:23. But it seems improbable that Paul has forgotten what he has written just three verses before 11:26. Moreover, as Sanders pointed out, 11:28–32 (esp. vv 30–32) seem to assume that Jews and Gentiles are saved on the same basis, and faith is probably the condition for salvation Paul has in mind unless he jettisoned his entire argument in Romans 1–4.

There is another way of interpreting Rom 11:26 which seems more reasonable and which takes into account more adequately the intelligence of Paul. When he asserts all Israel will be saved, he is assuming (cf. 11:23) that all Israel will be saved by faith in Christ. Paul was convinced that at some point in the future a great portion of Israel would turn to Jesus Christ in faith and thereby experience salvation. Such an interpretation fits the context of Romans 11 where Paul insists that one cannot be grafted into the people of God without faith (Rom 11:11, 14).

Even if we are correct in saying the Paul believed that the salvation of all Israel was dependent on faith, the tension in Paul's theology is not thereby resolved. If he considered the Church to be the new Israel, then why did he postulate a future salvation for the nation of Israel? How could he envision a future for ethnic Israel and at the same time identify the Church as the new Israel? Does not his preoccupation with ethnic Israel reveal that he never fully accepted his own declaration that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek (Gal 3:28)? C. H. Dodd says of Paul's argument in Romans 11 that "It is doubtful whether it is really justified on Paul's own premises."³⁹ He proceeds to explain the problem with Paul's conviction in Rom 11:26.

If the promise means ultimate blessedness for 'Israel,' then *either* the historical nation of Israel may be regarded as the heir of the promise, and Paul is justified in saying that *all Israel will be saved*, or its place may be taken by the New Israel, the Body of Christ in which there is neither Jew nor Greek; but in that case there is no ground for assigning any special place in the future to the Jewish

39. Dodd, 182. See also J. P. Lichtenberg, "Situation et destinée d' Israël à la lumière de Romains IX–XI et d' Ephésians II," *Foi et Vie* 64 (1965) 490. Lichtenberg explains Paul's change in terms of the evolution in his thought. By the time he wrote Ephesians 2 he had given up the future salvation of Israel which he asserted in Romans 11 (see pp. 494–498).

nation as such. Paul tries to have it both ways. We can well understand that his emotional interest in his own people, rather than strict logic, has determined his forecast.⁴⁰

E. Dinkler points out that the contradiction in Paul's thought is softened if in Romans 11 Paul is not speaking of the salvation of "the entire historical people" but an eschatological salvation.⁴¹ Nevertheless, even though 11:26 refers to the future salvation of Israel, there is still, according to Dinkler, a contradiction between Romans 9 and 11. Romans 9 shows that Paul thought in terms of a new Israel while in Romans 11 he perceived a future for historical Israel.⁴²

W. D. Davies argues that Paul is not favoring the nation of Israel because the only way Jews could become members of the people of God was by faith.⁴³ Davies distinguishes between the terms "advantage" and "privilege." The Jews had no greater privilege than the Gentiles, but they did have an historical advantage because they were the covenant people. Paul "realistically recognizes the significance of the history of the Jewish people as such. He wrestles with and insists on preserving the peculiarity of the people of Abraham in history."⁴⁴ Thus, according to Davies, Paul's viewpoint on the people of God was paradoxical. He saw a future for ethnic Israel and yet at the same time asserted that there is no distinction between Jew and Greek. Davies agrees with Dodd that Paul was not logically consistent here, but counters that the justification of the ungodly is not logical either.⁴⁵

We are in basic agreement with the position articulated by Davies. However the assertion (by Dodd, Davies, and Dinkler) that Paul's conviction that all Israel will be saved is illogical and inconsistent should be examined further. It must be pointed out that Paul's conviction that there is a future salvation for Israel would contradict his gospel if he were positing a future salvation for Israel simply because it

40. Dodd, 183.

41. E. Dinkler, "The Historical and the Eschatological Israel in Romans Chapters 9–11: A Contribution to the Problem of Predestination and Individual Responsibility," *JR* 36 (1956) 116.

42. Dinkler, 116.

43. Davies, "People of Israel," 31.

44. Davies, "People of Israel," 32.

45. Cf. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 74–85.

is Israel. If God were obligated to save Israel, then the nation would have a claim on God on the basis of its national heritage. But Paul is not saying in Rom 11:25ff that Israel will be saved merely because it is Israel. He argues that Israel will be saved, as were the Gentiles, because of God's mercy (the verb *eleeō* is used three times in 11:28–32 and the noun *eleos* once). Israel does not deserve to be saved because of its ethnic heritage, but God in his mercy elected to save them anyway.⁴⁶

Anders Nygren's explanation of Paul's rationale in Romans 11 is apropos.

Has Paul not contradicted what he said earlier on the same matter? When the Jew trusts in circumcision and his belonging to this holy people, Paul dissents with utmost vigor. But is he not now taking practically the same position which he earlier criticized? But this contradiction is only apparent. The Jew comes to God with his *claims*. It is that which Paul censures. The grace and election of God can never serve as the basis for human pretensions. But on the other hand, man's faithlessness can never nullify God's faithfulness. . . . But here, in chapter 11, he is not discussing a proud Israel that trusts in its advantage; to a rejected Israel he is affirming God's faithfulness, despite everything.⁴⁷

Johannes Munck explains Paul's thinking this way: "Paul maintains at one and the same time that the Jew has no right to wave his pedigree in God's face and that God, in his sovereign grace, is merciful toward the people whom he graciously chose from the beginning (cf. 11:28–29)."⁴⁸

Furthermore, 1 Thess 2:14–16 shows that Paul did not think Israel would be saved simply because it was Israel. The notion that 1 Thess 2:14–16 is an interpolation is probably wrong because there is no

46. Cf. Corley, 51; L. Goppelt, *Jesus, Paul and Judaism: An Introduction to the New Testament Theology* (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964) 164. Goppelt says elsewhere: "But it is contrary to the basic conception of Romans 9–11 when one sees the reason for the faithfulness of God in a quality inherent in Israel." L. Goppelt, "Israel and the Church in Today's Discussion and in Paul," *Lutheran World* 10 (October 1963) 368.

47. A. Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1949) 398.

48. Munck, 108.

textual evidence to support such a view.⁴⁹ Thus, it would be incorrect to argue that in Romans 11 Paul foresees the salvation of Israel merely because it was Israel. Actually, the opposite problem arises. 1 Thess 2:14–16 seems to indicate that the wrath which the Jews will experience is irrevocable. Munck's theory that "wrath till the end" means that the Jews would experience wrath *until* the end and then turn to Christ and be saved is forced,⁵⁰ for he assumes that the Thessalonians knew the contents of Romans 11 and this is improbable. Davies' solution is more satisfactory. Paul is not indicting all Jews in 1 Thess 2:14–16 nor is he saying that all the Jews are under God's wrath. "Paul is not thinking of the Jewish people as a whole but of the unbelieving Jews who have violently hindered the gosepl."⁵¹ In any case, 1 Thess 2:14–16 shows that Israel would not be saved simply by virtue of being Israel.

It is also important to recognize at this point that Davies is correct in labeling Paul's thought paradoxical. On the one hand, the Jew will not be saved simply because he is a Jew. The observance of circumcision, submission to the law, and a Jewish heritage do not merit salvation. Yet, on the other hand, God will save all Israel, i.e., the endtime generation, in faithfulness to his covenant. This is where Davies seems to be correct in saying that ethnic Israel has no privileges but they do have an advantage. The advantage is that they are the historical people of God, the people of salvation history. Nevertheless, they do not possess any privileges. They are not saved because they are Jews but because they exercise faith in Christ, and because they are the objects of God's mercy. Any Gentiles who are saved are saved on the same basis. The salvation of the eschatological generation of Israel is no more problematic than the salvation of some Gentiles rather than others, for the deliverance of both is based solely on God's mercy in election.

What we have been maintaining thus far is that Paul's conviction that there is a future salvation for Israel does not contradict the newness of his gospel because Paul believed that Israel would be saved on the same basis as the Gentiles, viz., faith. Also Israel shall be saved from

49. See G. E. Okeke, "1 Thessalonians 2:13–16: The Fate of the Unbelieving Jews," *NTS* 27 (1980–81) 127–36. Both Okeke and Davies ("People of Israel," 6–7) argue that the passage is authentic.

50. Munck, 64.

51. Davies, "People of Israel," 8.

the same motive, viz., the mercy of God. Nevertheless, does not this future salvation for Israel show that the Church cannot be the new Israel, and does it not also vitiate Paul's point that there is neither Jew or Greek?

Taking the latter point first, we must be careful to exegete Gal 3:28 correctly. Paul's purpose in the verse is not to show that all distinctions have been obliterated between Jews and Greeks. His intention is to argue that they are unified in Christ, that they are both heirs of the Abrahamic promise. M. E. Glasswell beautifully expresses the distinctions that one must be careful to guard.

The first pair—Jew and Greek—corresponds to circumcision and uncircumcision elsewhere, for instance in Gal. 5:6. Without going into the whole issue it must be pointed out that Paul does not think there is no difference at all between Jew and Greek; there is no difference in the basis for inclusion in Christ and for justification, or for ultimate salvation, but there is a historical difference within the *Heilgeschichte* itself, without this difference implying any superiority of one over the other. There is also a priority and advantage of the Jew and of circumcision, even if this points to the same principle of inclusion, i.e., faith. Eschatologically, there is also for Paul the necessary inclusion of Israel in the final outcome, not for ethnic reasons but because of the nature of God.⁵²

Thus, it is incorrect to use Gal 3:28 to argue that Paul was inconsistent in postulating a future salvation for ethnic Israel. Paul wrote Gal 3:28 to proclaim the unity of the human race in Christ, but this does not mean that Paul did not continue to recognize the fact of social distinctions and the priority of the Jew in salvation history (Rom 1:16 *et passim*).

The real issue is whether or not Paul was logical and consistent in identifying the Church as the new Israel and at the same time postulating a future for ethnic Israel. A clear understanding of the terms Paul used shows that he was not illogical. All Paul was claiming was that the Church, which was comprised of Jews and Gentiles, was the true

52. M. E. Glasswell, "Some Issues of Church and Society in the Light of Paul's Eschatology," *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett* (ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson, London: SPCK, 1982) 315.

remnant, the true people of God, and the *spiritual* Israel. At the same time, he envisioned an eschatological salvation for ethnic Israel. Such a conviction would only be inconsistent if ethnic Israel were saved on a different basis than Gentiles, but we have seen that both shall be saved on the same ground. To call the Church the new Israel does not mean that the Church wipes out the existence of ethnic Israel. It is still a logical possibility that in the eschaton the nation of Israel will be saved. There is a paradox here because Paul argues that the Church is the true Israel, and yet ethnic Israel can become part of spiritual Israel by believing in Christ.

A Jew is not a member of spiritual Israel by virtue of his race. Faith in Christ is requisite to be a member of the true people of God. The point we are making here is this: Paul can identify the Church as the true Israel and yet still claim that a great portion of ethnic Israel will eventually believe in Christ. This would be an inconsistency only if ethnic distinctives were obliterated in Christ. However, as a Christian, Paul is still aware of his heritage (cf. Gal 1:13–14; Rom 9:4–5; 2 Cor 11:22ff; Phil 3:4ff). He is careful to point out that this heritage does not grant him favor in God's sight, but he does not think that being a Christian is a denial of his race; rather, it is the truest and fullest completion of it.

It is not the case that one has to choose between the Church as the new Israel or the future restoration of ethnic Israel. After all, Paul is not saying that ethnic Israel is the true people of God. All he is saying is that a great portion of his people will place their faith in Christ in the endtime. Such a statement does not mean that the Church is not the true Israel. Rather, the implication is that in the future believing Israelites would become members of the new Israel—the Church. It is not necessary to say that either Paul believed in a future for the nation of Israel or he believed in the Church as the new Israel. Instead, Paul believed that both statements were true because ethnic Israel by trusting in Christ would become members of the new spiritual Israel. To sum up, some scholars fail to see the consistency of Paul's thought here because they do not distinguish carefully enough between *spiritual* and *ethnic* Israel.

CONCLUSION

We have argued in this article that Paul conceived of the church as the new Israel and true remnant. But Paul's conviction that in the

endtime a great portion of his people would believe posed a problem. How could Paul believe that the Church was the new Israel and still hold a future for ethnic Israel? We maintained that a retention of both these ideas was consistent because Paul affirmed that all Israel would be saved in the same way as Gentiles, i.e., by faith and through God's mercy. Moreover, Paul was not postulating a separate existence for ethnic Israel, for by placing their faith in Christ they would be grafted onto the olive tree and become members with the Gentiles in the new people of God.

The newness of Paul's gospel did not imply a rejection of Israel or the OT. Rather, the fulfillment of God's promise that all nations would be blessed in Abraham occurred in an unexpected way (Gen 12:3). Gentiles were not joined to the nation of Israel as an inferior people (cf. Isa 2:1-4). Instead, Gentiles and Jews were co-heirs in the people of God and members of the same body (Eph 3:6). The future conversion of Israel was not the retention of an emotional nationalistic conception in Paul's thought. Rather, the nation's conversion was attributed to the mercy of God and thus not explained as the right of Israel. The newness of Paul's gospel, the clear perception that the true character of the people of God was a spiritual reality and an internal circumcision of the heart, was not vitiated by the conviction that all Israel would be saved. After all, Paul maintained that they would not be saved apart from faith in Christ. The mere fact that they were Israelites would not guarantee salvation. Thus, ethnic Israel needed the true circumcision of the heart to become members of spiritual Israel.

ELIJAH AND THE LORD'S WORD: A STUDY OF I KINGS 17:17-24

MARION L. SOARDS, JR.¹

1 Kgs 17:17-24 occurs within the larger context of a body of material called "the Elijah cycle." Within this cycle the unit from 1 Kgs 17:1 through 19:21 is a continuous narrative.² The various stories which are grouped together in this large section may also be considered individually. Commentators usually speak of these smaller units (e.g., 17:17-24) as being one of two kinds of stories: (1) anecdotes associated with a legendary hero, or (2) narratives which illuminate Elijah's role in history.³ John Gray⁴ employs the concepts delineated by Georg Fohrer in order to distinguish between sober narratives which deal with the historical significance of Elijah and popular traditions of a hagiological nature which both magnify the historical figure to legendary proportions and emphasize the miraculous. An overstatement of such classifications allows us to think of one type of Elijah story in terms of *history* and another type in terms of *legend*. In these terms, 1 Kgs 17:17-24 is usually described as a legend or hero saga.⁵ The goal of this article, however, is to offer a careful study of

1. Marion L. Soards, Jr. is a Ph.D. candidate in NT at Union Theological Seminary, New York.

2. N. H. Snaith, *The First and Second Book of Kings* (IB, ed. G.A. Buttrick; Nashville: Abingdon, 1954), 3. 12-13.

3. G. G. Harrop, *Elijah Speaks Today* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975) 21.

4. J. Gray, *I and II Kings: A Commentary* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970) 371-72.

5. O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. P. R. Ackroyd; New York: Harper & Row, 1965) 46.