

Getting Some Fatherly Advice:  
Refining ‘Intertextuality’ in the Study of Paul’s Scriptural Interpretation

Matthew W. Bates  
University of Notre Dame  
mbates2@nd.edu

*1. Introduction*

The vocabulary and cadences of Scripture—particularly of the LXX—are imprinted deeply on Paul’s mind, and the great stories of Israel continue to serve for him as a fund of symbols and metaphors that condition his perception of the world, of God’s promised deliverance of his people, and of his own identity and calling. His faith, in short, is one whose articulation is inevitably intertextual in character, and Israel’s Scripture is the “determinate subtext that plays a constitutive role” in shaping his literary production.<sup>1</sup>

— Richard B. Hays

I suspect that one would be hard-pressed to find a contemporary Pauline scholar who would fundamentally disagree with the above quotation taken from Hays’s *Echoes of Scripture*. While some scholars from past generations could forcefully argue that the Septuagint played little or no role in arranging Paul’s mental furniture,<sup>2</sup> recent scholarship is more prone to view the Septuagint as not merely responsible for situating the furniture, but as the very wood, nails, staples, fabric, and stuffing from which the

---

\*The basic content contained herein is a small, preliminary portion of my forthcoming book, which is tentatively titled, *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul’s Method of Scriptural Interpretation* (Waco: Baylor University Press, anticipated 2011). Thus a special word of thanks is owed to Baylor University Press, and the director of the Press, Carey Newman, for allowing me to present this material in a preliminary form. For a fuller and more definitive statement, the interested reader should consult the forthcoming book. This paper is for private use only by the Paul and Scripture Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature on condition that it not be cited, copied, or given to another party without the written permission of the author.

<sup>1</sup> Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 16.

<sup>2</sup> See Adolf von Harnack, “The Old Testament in the Pauline Letters and in the Pauline Churches,” in *Understanding Paul’s Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches* (ed. Brian S. Rosner; trans. George S. Rosner and Brian S. Rosner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995): 27-49; trans. of “Das Alte Testament in den paulinischen Briefen und in den paulinischen Gemeinden,” (SPAW; Berlin, 1928): 124-41; Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul* (trans. William Montgomery; New York: Henry Holt, 1931), esp. his remarks on p. 208; Rudolph Bultmann, “The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christian Faith,” in *The Old Testament and the Christian Faith: A Theological Discussion* (ed. and trans. Bernhard W. Anderson; New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 8-35; trans. of “Das Bedeutung des Alten Testament für den christlichen Glauben,” in *Glauben und Verstehen I* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1933).

furniture is constructed in the first place.<sup>3</sup> And this turning of the scholarly weathervane should not be attributed to fickle, shifty breezes. On the contrary the irresistible blast of a veritable Northeaster of scholarship has caused this shift, and this gush of wind has every appearance of steadily, indeed irreversibly, holding the arrow of the weathervane in this new direction.<sup>4</sup> In this paper I have no intention to call into question the centrality of the Septuagint to Paul's thought; rather I reaffirm its centrality without reservation. However what I would like to argue is that Pauline scholarship as a whole, in pursuing a nearly single-minded focus on the Paul's relationship to the scriptures of Israel, has neglected vital data that could substantially enrich our understanding of Paul's scriptural exegesis. In fact this narrow focus on how various NT authors use the Septuagint to the exclusion of other crucial data is a problem which transcends Pauline scholarship, and is endemic to the discipline of NT studies as a whole. By revisiting the theoretical foundations of intertextuality as it was developed in literary studies, a more robust intertextual method can be crafted which is more suitable for biblical scholarship. In short, I shall argue that when trying to understand any given moment of scriptural exegesis by a NT author such as Paul, it is vital to examine not just the *pre-text* (the Septuagint), but also *co-texts* and

---

<sup>3</sup> The most forceful presentation of this position is Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

<sup>4</sup> Some of the most important full-scale studies affirming the centrality of the scriptures to Paul's thought include: Otto Michel, *Paulus und Seine Bibel* (BFCT 2/18; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972); E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957); Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 63; repr. of *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (SBLDS 56; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1983); Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1986); Hays, *Echoes*; Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Florian Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus* (FRLANT 179; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998); Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Paul and Isaiah in Concert in the Letter to the Romans* (NovTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2002); Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics*.

*post-texts*. After developing my methodological proposal more fully, I will attempt to illustrate its usefulness by showing an example of how the inclusion of *co-texts* and *post-texts* in addition to the Septuagintal *pre-text* can tip the scales of probability in new and unexpected directions when examining Paul's scriptural exegesis.

## 2. *Reappraising Intertextuality*

Richard Hays deserves the lion's share of the credit for bringing the modern literary study of intertextuality to the attention of NT scholarship with his *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, but this is not to say that the intertextual model which he employed was not without flaws.<sup>5</sup> In *Echoes* Hays's thesis is quite simply that "certain approaches to intertextuality that have developed within literary criticism prove illuminating when applied to Paul's letters."<sup>6</sup> Although as Hays acknowledges, the concept of intertextuality as "cultural codes" in literary theory is usually traced back to Julia Kristeva (who was herself influenced by Saussure and Bakhtin),<sup>7</sup> Hays adopts a different use of the term, focusing on citation and allusion, in order to keep his project concrete.<sup>8</sup> Drawing on John Hollander's *The Figure of Echo*,<sup>9</sup> Hays settles on an aural metaphor to explain the intertextual method which he seeks to employ. Much like an echo which distorts the originating sound in order to reproduce it, so also an author who cites or alludes to a source text inevitably alters the meaning of the source text by importing it into a new literary context; in so doing a new trope is generated. Thus the

---

<sup>5</sup> An important predecessor to Hays's *Echoes* in biblical scholarship is Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), although Fishbane's intertextual theory, which is built on the interplay of *traditum* with *traditio*, is not conversant with literary studies.

<sup>6</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

<sup>7</sup> See Graham Allen, *Intertextuality* (The New Critical Idiom; London: Routledge, 2000), 9-60. For a succinct overview see Stephen Heath, "Intertextuality," in *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory* (ed. Michael Payne; Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 258-59.

<sup>8</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

<sup>9</sup> John Hollander, *The Figure of an Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981). Discussion of Hollander can be found primarily in Hays, *Echoes*, 18-21.

point of such literary criticism is to identify and explain the alterations and the new trope.<sup>10</sup> Hays elaborates the method by explaining the manner in which unstated associations bound up with the source text can be tapped into by the second text (that is, the text which cites the source text), which allows for these unstated associations to be recovered and reutilized by the second text. Hays (following Hollander) calls these unstated aspects of the source text a “transumption” and their recovery within the new trope a “metalepsis.”<sup>11</sup> The important point for Pauline exegesis is that the source text which Paul echoes (the LXX) can have transumed material as part of its baggage which can then be reconstituted by the citation, resulting in a series of correspondences between the two texts which the interpreter can then tease out.

However as Hays freely acknowledges, his own intertextual method is not in sync with the way modern literary theorists use the term.<sup>12</sup> For example, Julia Kristeva, who is generally credited with the introduction of this term to modern literary studies, uses intertextuality to refer to the way in which every text is “a mosaic of quotations,” that is, every text is created by, subsumes, and reacts to other texts.<sup>13</sup> Kristeva explicitly draws on the dialogism of the Russian formalist M. M. Bakhtin. Bakhtinian dialogism stresses the *relational* nature which words serve, that is, the manner in which they bridge the gap between the speaker and the addressee. As such, the words which the speaker utters are inevitably borrowing from or somehow responding to previous discourse, which is itself inescapably part of a sociohistorical worldview complex. As Bakhtin states, “The utterance is addressed not only to its object [the addressee], but also to others’ speech

---

<sup>10</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

<sup>11</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 20. “Metalepsis” can be glossed as “participation” (LSJ).

<sup>12</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

<sup>13</sup> Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (ed. Leon S. Roudiez; trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardin, and Leon S. Roudiez; New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 66.

about it.”<sup>14</sup> In other words according to Bakhtin all utterances are double voiced, responding to the discourse of the cultural milieu which generated them as well as to the addressee. Kristeva furthers the Bakhtinian notion of double-voiced utterances, seeing not just utterances but *all texts* as exhibiting this dialogism. Every text is created by its surrounding sociohistorical environment and responds to it despite the explicit purposes which the text might otherwise serve.

For example, consider a mundane text such as a new phonebook. A phonebook’s explicit purpose is to guide the addressee in dialing the telephone, and it is perhaps obvious that any new phonebook is a response to previous attempts to create a phonebook. A new model responds to the old by (at the very least) updating obsolete information. Yet it is perhaps less obvious that a phonebook is the product of a prior sociohistorical discourse in which the use of telephones for various business and pleasure purposes makes sense in our social world. Hence the phone book is in a very real way created by the discourse of our social setting, which is reflected in the more prominent display of certain well-to-do business numbers over against the more subdued typesetting of home telephone numbers, and in a myriad of other features. The phone book is double voiced, speaking to the addressee by giving dialing information, but also speaking in an abstract way to its social matrix, saying, “You need money and a business address in order to have an *important* phone number.”

Perhaps even more crucially, the phone book, which is itself the product of prior discourse, is an agent of transformation with respect to current and future discourse. Current discourse will never be quite the same once the new phone book is introduced

---

<sup>14</sup> M. M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (ed. C. Emerson and M. Holquist; trans. V. W. McGee; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 94.

and subsequent phone books will respond in some way to this new edition. New features in the phonebook are institutionalized, perhaps by the addition of new sections like “state government” or “coupons.”<sup>15</sup> For Kristeva and others such as Roland Barthes, the result of this double voice, or better *heteroglossia*, is that the “subject” who speaks in any given text is radically destabilized and the result is that “signification” or “meaning” can no longer be equated with authorial intention, but rather multiple “meanings” or “significations” (polysemy) derive from the play of intertextual forces.<sup>16</sup>

Hays’s shows no interest in the sort of intertextuality championed by the founders of modern literary intertextuality, which valorizes dialogism, heteroglossia, and polysemy. And I believe that Hays is prudent to steer clear of some of the excesses characteristic of the poststructural context of Kristeva and Barthes, such as the “death of the author,” and indeed a number of more recent intertextual theorists concur with this judgment.<sup>17</sup> Rather, literary-critical rumors of the “death of the author” can be met with the same dry wit as was expressed by Mark Twain—“the report of my death was an exaggeration.”<sup>18</sup> The attempt to unshackle authorial intention from textual meaning has proven to be a rather messy divorce, to say the least.<sup>19</sup> Also the inordinate disdain among

---

<sup>15</sup> The phone book example does not derive from Kristeva; rather it is my attempt to ground her leading ideas in a practical example.

<sup>16</sup> Allen, *Intertextuality*, 52-56, 66-67.

<sup>17</sup> E.g., see the discussion in Susan S. Friedman, “Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author” in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (ed. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein; Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 146-80 esp. 146-56.

<sup>18</sup> As cited in Gregg Camfield, ed., *The Oxford Companion to Mark Twain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 217. Intriguingly, at least according to Camfield, this famous maxim of Twain is often misquoted as “The reports of my death have been greatly exaggerated,” which ironically but fittingly exaggerates the original!

<sup>19</sup> This is neither the time nor the place to discuss the so-called “intentional fallacy” (W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe D. Beardsley, “The Intentional Fallacy,” in William K. Wimsatt, *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry* [Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954], 3-18), which claims that we do not have the necessary extrinsic psychological access to an author’s intentions, and thus seeking the author’s intentions is a false aim. Let it suffice to say that the so-called “intentional fallacy” is itself riddled with problems, the foremost of which is that the author’s intended sense is to be sought not in the extrinsic mind

some intertextual theorists for tracing historically oriented genetic “influences” between texts is wisely avoided by Hays.<sup>20</sup> Having passed through the gauntlet of deconstruction and reader-response criticism run-wild, scholarship today is in better position to make a more sober assessment regarding the manner in which meaning is a negotiation between authorial intention, unintended meanings, and reader appropriation.<sup>21</sup> My own feeling is that Hays is well aware of these matters and negotiates this balancing act fairly well.<sup>22</sup> Much as in the work of Hays, in the revised intertextual model which I propose below, properly tracing the genetic influence between texts is not deemed marginal to the assessment of any given moment of Pauline exegesis; rather it is judged to be critical.

Yet reflection on a more fundamental disjuncture between Hays’s intertextuality, which focuses only on prior-occurring texts, and that of modern literary critics such as Kristeva, which also includes coeval and subsequent texts, results in a fresh method for analyzing Paul’s use of the scriptures and the discovery of a relatively untapped data base. The essential point I would like to make is that Hays’s introduction of intertextuality into biblical studies generally, and Pauline studies more specifically, was narrowly conceived in terms of method. Others have followed Hays’s methodological

---

of the author *but in the text itself*, to which we do have access—see e.g., Ben F. Meyer, “The Primacy of the Intended Sense of the Text,” in *Critical Realism and the New Testament* (Allison Park, Penn.: Pickwick, 1989), 15-55.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the approach taken by Roy Ciampa, “Scriptural Language and Ideas,” in *As It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 41-57 here 42 n. 3.

<sup>21</sup> Uncovering authorial intention has traditionally been the aim of historical-critical investigation, and a direct move has been made by exegetes from authorial intention to the legitimate “meaning” which a text can be said to bear (e.g., see remarks in the popular handbook by Gordon D. Fee, *New Testament Exegesis* [rev. ed.; Louisville: WJK, 1993], 27). However, if we have learned nothing else from contemporary hermeneutical and literary theory, we have assuredly learned that the “meaning” of a text cannot be equated with authorial intention alone. A multitude of other factors must be considered such as the reader’s role in constituting meaning, the community in which interpretation takes place, and the manner in which the text engages broader sociohistorical discourses apart from authorial intention. For studies which seek to take the reader more seriously, see Wagner, *Heralds*, 34-35, who advocates a rhetorical analysis centered on the “ideal reader,” and the whole of Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, but esp. 38-61.

<sup>22</sup> See Hays, *Echoes*, 25-29.

lead and the result has been an exclusion of important data. In terms of both method and content, Hays chose to focus single-mindedly on Israel's scriptures since they are "a single great textual precursor" to Paul's citations.<sup>23</sup>

Thus Hays devoted himself almost exclusively to what he correctly regarded as the single most important prior-occurring text with regard to Paul—the Septuagint. My concern is that in deviating from the theoretical formulations of intertextuality in literary-critical studies, Hays inadvertently instigated a methodological deviation in intertextual approaches among his legions of followers in the biblical studies guild<sup>24</sup>—one might go so far as to say that he is a victim in this regard of his own tremendous success. *Hays's intertextual model obscures the need to look beyond the source text to coeval and subsequent texts within a fully healthy intertextual model.* This is not to say that Hays's study in *Echoes* is methodologically faulty, nor is it to blame him for not doing the study which he should have done, as if to say, in *Echoes* Hays really *should* have studied *not only* the source texts, *but also* coeval and subsequent texts—a petty criticism indeed. It is merely to say that Hays's initial methodological description of intertextuality and

---

<sup>23</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

<sup>24</sup> Hays is undoubtedly guilty of perpetuating semantic confusion by using intertextuality in an idiosyncratic manner. But since Hays is by no means alone in this matter, it is perhaps a bit unfair to single him out—especially since Hays was aware of the deviation he had introduced in the first place and subsequently he has signaled a desire to take a broader view of intertextuality (see e.g., Hays's comments regarding Eco's concept of an intertextual encyclopedia in Richard B. Hays, "Paul and the Hermeneutics of Truth," *Pro Ecclesia* 16 [2007]: 126-40 here 131). As Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, 2, notes, "[Intertextuality] is in danger of meaning nothing more than whatever each particular critic wishes it to mean." The fact of the matter is idiosyncratic definitions and deployments of intertextuality abound. My observation here is anticipated by Hans Hübner, "Intertextualität—Die hermeneutische Strategie des Paulus," *TLZ* 116 (1991): 881-98. More specifically Hübner faults Hays for defining "intertextuality" in an idiosyncratic way, for relying on intuition rather than rigorous method, for seeing intertextuality merely in terms of content rather than also form, and for failing to identify more distant *pre-texts*. However apart from the general rebuke to Hays's for introducing terminological confusion, I am not fully sympathetic to Hübner's critique, especially in light of the practical impossibility of tracing out an infinite chain of prior occurring texts (on which see also the comments by Roy Ciampa, "Scriptural Language and Ideas," in *As It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* [ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Atlanta: SBL, 2008], 41-57 here 42).

application of this approach was incomplete inasmuch as it did not encourage the exploration of coeval texts and reception history as a tool for illuminating the use of the Septuagint by the NT authors. Due to the enormous (and well-deserved) success of Hays's intertextual model, the unfortunate consequence of this in today's scholarship is a methodological oversight that results in the exclusion of interesting data. Furthermore I would contend that this pervasive methodological weakness is manifest not only in Pauline studies, but extends to the whole scholarly enterprise which is frequently but anachronistically termed "the study of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament."

For example, the recent group effort headed up by Beale and Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, perhaps best illustrates this methodological problem. The *Commentary* surveys all occurrences of the use of the OT in the NT using an explicitly formulated six part approach. This method includes a detailed analysis of the NT context, the OT context, the use of the citation in Second Temple and early Judaism, textual analysis, explanation of usage, and theological implications.<sup>25</sup> However the method laid out in the *Commentary* does not even hint at two other crucially important questions: (1) How was this NT text which cites the OT *subsequently* understood in the early church? (2) And how was this OT quotation received in early Christianity *independent* of its instantiation in this NT text?"<sup>26</sup> Thus in the *Commentary*, in line with the recent, corrective trend emphasizing the Jewish matrix

---

<sup>25</sup> G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Baker: Grand Rapids, 2007), xxiii-xxvi.

<sup>26</sup> Sometimes this second question is tacitly asked when the commentator looks at how the OT text was used elsewhere in the NT, but the arbitrary exclusion of early Christian material which falls outside of the NT shows that this is not a methodological priority.

in which the NT was birthed,<sup>27</sup> coeval and subsequent interpretations of the OT text in Judaism are helpfully explored, but early Christian sources, especially those beyond the horizons of the NT, are systematically neglected throughout the entire commentary.<sup>28</sup> This methodological oversight is not unique to the Beale and Carson volume, it is endemic throughout the entire cottage industry which has grown up around “the use of the OT in the NT.”<sup>29</sup> It is this widespread neglect of the early Christian sources as an essential historical-critical and literary matrix for understanding Paul which I believe is in need of correction.<sup>30</sup>

### 3. A Proposed Model: Diachronic Intertextuality

In short the model which I propose can be appropriately termed *diachronic intertextuality*. Diachronic intertextuality seeks to recapture the fundamental insight of Kristeva in asserting that a text is informed by all of the sociohistorical discourse which precedes, surrounds, and follows any given text, while simultaneously dispensing of Kristeva’s problematic disregard for the role of genetic influence between texts in providing meaning.

---

<sup>27</sup> It should be stressed that this corrective trend emphasizing the Jewish origins of Christianity is necessary, commendable, and praiseworthy. For an example of this trend in the study of Paul’s interpretation of the Jewish scriptures, consider Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 1, where Watson seeks to foreground the fact that “Paul was a Jew” to such a high degree that this bald assertion is the opening sentence of his book on Pauline hermeneutics. In fact the entirety of Francis Watson’s, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, is outstanding among its peers and very admirable in its intertextual awareness of Jewish *co-texts* with respect to Paul’s *texts*; however, Watson does not avail himself of (except in rare cases) the more intertextually prominent early Christian *post-texts* and *co-texts*. For like-minded emphases on the Jewish matrix see: Boyarin, *A Radical Jew*, 1-4; DiMattei, “Biblical Narratives,” here *passim* but see esp. 75 and 93; Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 1; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 88-116.

<sup>28</sup> Of course, individual commentators may indeed consult coeval and subsequent Christian interpretations on an *ad hoc* basis; the point is that on the level of basic *method* this consultation has been deemed extraneous by the editors.

<sup>29</sup> As one example among many consider the method utilized in Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New Testament: An Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2001).

<sup>30</sup> I lay the stress on the neglect of Christian sources not because Jewish ones are less valuable, but because intertextually informed biblical scholarship is, generally speaking, not currently neglecting these texts.

Within this diachronic intertextual model, some proposed technical definitions are offered to facilitate on-going discussion with respect to the NT in general and Paul in particular: (1) A *text* shall be defined as “any specific instance in which a NT author such as Paul directly cites the scriptures.”<sup>31</sup> A *text* is the NT author’s citation of the scriptures, not the *Vorlage* itself (e.g., Paul’s citation of Hab 2:4b LXX in Rom 1:17 is a *text*). (2) Let an *antecedent-text* be “any specific instantiation of sociohistorical discourse which occurred in the past before the particular NT author penned the quotation.” However that is not to say that every discourse which occurred prior to the creation of a *text* was equally prominent or present to the NT author.<sup>32</sup> Hence, for the purposes of this study, (3) a *pre-text* shall be “a specific textual source which the NT author utilized” (e.g., Hab 2:4b LXX). Also, (4) let a *vehicle for the pre-text* be “an interpretative tradition which indirectly mediated the scriptures to the NT author” (e.g., any pre-Pauline messianic tradition associated with Hab 2:4b that affect Paul’s exegesis).<sup>33</sup> (5) A *relevant coeval-text* shall be defined as “any work contemporaneous with the *text* which shows awareness of the *pre-text* but not the *text*,” while (6) a *co-text* shall be a specific subset thereof—that is, a *co-text* is “a direct citation by a different early Jewish or Christian author of the same *pre-text* which the *text* cites independent of the *text*” (e.g., Heb 10:38a

---

<sup>31</sup> Of course, this delimitation prompts a further question, which is, What counts as a citation? This has been a surprisingly difficult question to answer. I have no interest in advancing my own theory in this regard, but rather refer the interested reader to the discussion of this matter as it pertains to Paul: Koch, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 1986), 11-24; Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 33-37. For a more general discussion see Stanley E. Porter, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology,” in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 79-96; Stanley E. Porter, “Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice* (ed. Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald and Stanley E. Porter; NTM 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007), 98-110 esp. 107-9.

<sup>32</sup> See Roy E. Ciampa, “Scriptural Language and Ideas,” 42 n. 3.

<sup>33</sup> See criticism of Hays for neglecting this dimension in *Echoes* by Craig A. Evans, “Listening for Echoes of Interpreted Scripture,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 83; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 47-51 and Christopher D. Stanley, “‘The Redeemer Will Come ἐκ Ζιὼν’: Romans 11:26-27 Revisited,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, 118-42 esp. 120.

citing Hab 2:4b independently of Rom 1:17 or Gal 3:11).<sup>34</sup> (6) A *subsequent-text* is to be defined as “any sociohistorical discourse which emerges in the wake of the *text*” whereas (7) a *post-text* shall be a subset of *subsequent-text* and shall be defined as “a subsequent direct citation of the *text* or a direct citation of the *pre-text* as otherwise mediated through *text*” (e.g., Irenaeus *Epid.* 35 citing Hab. 2:4b via Rom 1:17). (8) Finally, let an *inter-text* be a catchall for “any *relevant coeval-text* or *subsequent-text* which is not specifically a *co-text* or *post-text*, but nonetheless has special relevance to a *text* because it uses a closely related *pre-text* or a pertinent passage in the near context of the *pre-text*” (e.g., Heb 10:37 and 10:38b citing Hab 2:3b–2:4a would be an *inter-text* because this material is a *relevant coeval-text* but not specifically a *co-text* since only Heb 10:38a overlaps with Paul’s citation of Hab 2:4b).

To succinctly state my methodological rationale in light of this new vocabulary: If a particular passage in Paul’s letters which utilizes the scriptures is dubbed the *text*, then why has there been an almost exclusive focus among scholars on Jewish *pre-texts*, *vehicles for the pre-text*, *co-texts*, and *relevant coeval-texts* at the expense of the more intertextually proximate Christian *co-texts*, *post-texts*, and *inter-texts*?<sup>35</sup> Certain early

---

<sup>34</sup> Of course, it is possible that Hab 2:4b in Hebrews is actually dependent on Paul—that is, it not absolutely certain that Heb 10:38a is really a *co-text*—it might rather be a *post-text*. However as most scholars agree, this is quite unlikely since the citation is much longer in Hebrews, has a slightly different textual form (Hebrews includes  $\mu\omicron\upsilon$  whereas Paul omits), is not rhetorically foregrounded in a comparable fashion, and lacks contrast with performance of the law. See Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Fortress, 1989), 301-4, for the standard view. Nonetheless this has not stopped a few scholars from claiming that Hebrews depends on Paul at this juncture—e.g., Clare K. Rothschild, “Hebrews as a Guide to Reading Romans,” in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen* (ed. Jörg Frey et al.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2009), 537-73 here 548.

<sup>35</sup> Of course, in using the labels “Jewish” and “Christian” (and the like), I do not mean to suggest that there was no fluidity between Judaism or emerging Christianity, or that the specific nomenclature which delineated and reinforced the boundary markers between these two groups was already in full bloom—points which a number of recent studies have stressed (e.g., Daniel Boyarin, *Border lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004]; Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle* [New York: HarperCollins, 2009]). However, regardless of the fluidity, already in the earliest literature in the NT, beginning with Paul, there is

Christian authors, such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and others, have read Paul and show evidence of having borrowed his specific scriptural arguments (*post-texts*). When they depend on a Pauline scriptural argument, they are in fact providing valuable insight into how they understood that particular Pauline exegesis.<sup>36</sup> Of course, when these early Christian authors make use of a Pauline scriptural argument, they inevitably transform it in some way due to their differing sociohistorical locations, so unraveling how they understood Paul is not always a simple matter; however they nonetheless supply crucial data regarding how they understood Paul, data which must be taken seriously due to their linguistic, cultural, intertextual, and hermeneutical proximity to Paul. In a like manner *co-texts* can illuminate a *text*, even though they are less intertextually proximate than *post-texts*.

Although it is helpful to have all of these terms delineated above at our disposal for heuristic purposes in articulating the model, in actual practice the example which

---

a distinction in some basic worldview constituents between the two groups, such as symbol, story, praxis, and answer to certain key questions, as has been demonstrated by the whole of N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), but see esp. his summary on 444-64. Although the terms “Christian” and “non-Christian” are anachronistic for Paul’s situation, there is no widely accepted non-anachronistic alternative system of nomenclature which can be employed. Thus these labels are to be understood as a convenient and imperfect shorthand pointing at individuals and social groups which were offering some diverging answers to basic worldview questions, while also acknowledging that the boundaries between these groups was often porous.

<sup>36</sup> Thus studies of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Paul sometimes, albeit infrequently, make mention of the use of *post-texts*, but these treatments are *ad hoc* not systematic: Kirsopp Lake, *Paul: His Heritage and His Legacy* (Oxford, 1934); Eva Hoffmann-Aleith, *Paulusverständnis in der Alten Kirche* (BZNW 18; Berlin, 1937); Albert E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941); Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus* (ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni; trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht; 3 vols.; New Gospel Studies 5; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1990-93); K. H. Schelkle, *Paulus Lehrer der Väter: Die Altkirchliche Auslegung von Römer 1-11* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1956); Andreas Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum* (BHT 58; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1979); Rolf Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret: Zur Rezeption und Wirkung der paulinischen und deuteropaulinische Briefe im Werk der Irenäus von Lyon* (WUNT 66; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994). Yet the most careful examination of the reception of Paul’s scriptural exegesis in the early Fathers is actually found not in the *Wirkungsgeschichte* genre, but in source-critical studies such as: Robert A. Kraft, “The Epistle of Barnabas, its Quotations and their Sources” (PhD diss., Harvard, 1961); Donald A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (NovTSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1973); Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr’s Proof Text Tradition Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1987).

follows will primarily examine how a certain *text* in the Pauline corpus can be better understood when a more robust diachronic intertextuality replaces the standard intertextual model. The specific *text* I would like to examine is Rom 10:16 citing Isa 53:1. I would like to show that when early Christian *co-texts*, *post-texts*, and *inter-texts* are employed as a methodological tool, surprising dimensions of meaning are unveiled which have not been observed previously.

#### 4. *Recovering Diachronic Intertextuality: Rom 10:16 As a Test Case*

In the midst of his protracted defense of God’s fidelity to Israel as part of his covenant promises, Paul speaks about how the “utterance of faith” (ὁ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως—Rom 10:8) that is, the gospel message of Christ’s lordship (Rom 10:9), can in fact brought near (Rom 10:14-18):

14 Therefore, how shall they call upon whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe upon him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear apart from preaching? 15 And how will they preach unless they are sent? As it is written, “How beautiful are the feet of those who proclaim glad tidings” [Isa 52:7]. 16 But not all have obeyed the gospel. For Isaiah says, “O Lord, who has believed our audible message” [Isa 53:1a]? 17 Consequently, faith comes from the audible message, and the audible message through the spoken word about Christ. 18 But surely they have not “not heard,” have they? They certainly have heard, for “their voice has gone out to all the earth, their words to the boundaries of the known world [Ps 18:5 LXX].”<sup>37</sup>

On the basis of contextual considerations and the diachronic intertextual model proposed above, I shall argue that Paul did *not* regard Isaiah as the ultimate speaker of Isa 53:1 (“O Lord, who has believed *our* audible message”), the citation which appears in the

---

<sup>37</sup> Text (Rom 10:14-18): 14 Πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσωνται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; πῶς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν οὐδὲ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; πῶς δὲ ἀκούσωσιν χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος; 15 πῶς δὲ κηρύξωσιν ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσιν; καθὼς γέγραπται· ὡς ὡραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων [τὰ] ἀγαθὰ. 16 Ἄλλ’ οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει· κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; 17 Ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ. 18 ἀλλὰ λέγω, μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; μενοῦνγε· εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν. See n. 41 below regarding the complex text-critical issues pertaining to 10:15.

middle of the chain in Rom 10:16. Rather Paul has made a surprising interpretative move,<sup>38</sup> seeing Isaiah as speaking *in the character of the apostles of Christ*.<sup>39</sup> Such an identification of the speaker has not been posited by any commentators of whom I am aware.<sup>40</sup>

#### 4a. Contextual Considerations: Isa 52:7 in Rom 10:15

The citation of Isa 52:7 in Rom 10:15 immediately prior to the citation of Isa 53:1a in Rom 10:16 lends plausibility to the notion that Paul has assigned the apostles as the collective dramatic character who is the ultimate speaker of Isa 53:1a. For in his drastically modified citation of Isa 52:7 LXX in Rom 10:15,<sup>41</sup> Paul has read himself and the Christian mission into the Isaianic discourse. For example Paul has modified the

---

<sup>38</sup> The safest supposition on the basis of Isa 53:1 itself (in the MT) for the identity of the “we” might be that the “you” addressed in the oracle is now responding to God. Accordingly, modern commentators generally identify the “our” as confessing Israel throughout this oracle—so Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: WJK, 2001), 413. Paul is of course not using the MT but the Greek scriptures.

<sup>39</sup> Direct address is signaled in the LXX by the vocative form κύριε rather than the nominative κύριος, and in this regard the LXX is a plus over against the MT.

<sup>40</sup> The precise identity of the “our” (ἡμῶν) in the citation is not often discussed in the secondary literature—presumably Isaiah alone is assumed to be the speaker by most commentators for Paul. So there is little secondary literature to engage on this point. E.g., no discussion can be found in: Barrett, *Romans*, 205; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2.535-36; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2.229; Käsemann, *Romans*, 294-95; or Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 598. Wagner, *Heralds*, 179, thinks that Paul sees Isaiah as the speaker, but that Paul deliberately joins Isaiah as a co-speaker of sorts (see further below). Jewett, *Romans*, 641, follows Wagner’s conclusions. Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament*, 40-41, thinks that for Paul in Isa 53:1 the “our” is Isaiah speaking as a representative of “those who preached the gospel in Isaiah’s day [inclusive of Isaiah],” and that the person addressed dialogically by Isaiah is Jesus as really (sacramentally) present in the Old Testament. I shall argue for a different solution on the basis of intertextual evidence drawn from early Christian *co-texts*, *post-texts*, and *inter-texts*.

<sup>41</sup> Paul’s text usually approximates to our modern critical LXX, so it is surprising to see here the degree to which Paul deviates from it, so much so that a *Vorlage* of his text would appear to be closer to our modern MT. I count seven ways in which Paul deviates from the critical LXX edition of Ziegler, relying on my previous analysis in Matthew W. Bates, “Beyond *Stichwort*: A Narrative Approach to Isa 52,7 in Romans 10,15 and 11Q Melchizedek (11Q13),” *RB* 116 (2009): 387-414 esp. 408-9: (1) Isa 52:7a is regarded as an independent clause as in the MT; (2) ὡραῖοι (“lovely”) in place of ὥρα (“season”) as in the MT; (3) ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρέων (“upon the mountains”) is omitted contrary to the MT; (4) “heralds” appears rather than “herald” against the MT; (5) ὡς is omitted before “feet” as in the MT; (6) the definite article is lacking before “feet,” which is ambiguous in the MT; (7) εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοῆν εἰρήνης (“of one proclaiming an audible message of peace”) is lacking contrary to the MT and many important LXX MSS which instead read εὐαγγελιζομένου εἰρήνην (e.g.,  $\aleph^2$  D F G  $\Psi$  and Iren.—see below on Irenaeus). For additional discussion see Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 134-41. Stanley notes (p. 135) Paul’s proximity to the so-called “Lucianic” recension of the LXX here.

singular “herald” to the plural “heralds,” seemingly in order to include himself and other ἀπόστολοι within the purview of the Isaianic citation. Moreover Koch spots a second deliberate change. Paul’s omission of ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρεων (“on the mountains”) seems to be an attempt to remove reference to the mountains surrounding Jerusalem, and in so doing to universalize the text toward Gentile inclusion.<sup>42</sup> In effect, Paul has identified himself and his co-workers as “those who bring glad tidings,” in Isa 52:7 and has deliberately universalized the location in which this message is being heard in light of the Gentile mission.

This interpretation, namely that Paul has identified the apostles (himself included) as the subject of the action mentioned in Isa 52:7, is reinforced by an early Christian *post-text* to Isa 52:7 in found in Irenaeus’s *Adversus haereses*. Irenaeus polemicizes against Marcionite elevation of Paul as the teacher of truth *par excellence*, asserting that Paul himself acknowledges that other apostles were equally involved in the promulgation of the early Christian kerygma (*Haer.* 3.13.1):

For our Lord never came to save Paul alone, nor is God so limited in means, that he should have only one apostle who knew the dispensation of his Son. And again, when Paul says, “How beautiful are the feet of those bringing glad tidings of good things, and preaching the gospel of peace,” he shows clearly that it was not merely one, but there were many who used to preach the truth.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Koch, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 122. Koch is followed in this observation by Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 137; Wagner, *Heralds*, 173; and Bates, “Beyond *Stichwort*,” 409. Stanley indicates that the omission of ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρεων can be supported by only one extant and relatively minor LXX manuscript—MS 88—lending plausibility to an intentional Pauline modification. I do not, however, side with Wagner in seeing the omission of “of one proclaiming an audible message of peace” as a deliberate assimilation to the “word of Christ” in Rom 10:16-17.

<sup>43</sup> Text (Irenaeus *Haer.* 3.13.1): *Neque enim Paulum solum uenit saluare Dominus noster; nec sic pauper Deus ut unum solum haberet apostolum qui dispositionem Filii sui cognosceret. Et Paulus autem dicens: Quam speciosi pedes euangelizantium bona, euangelizantium pacem, manifestum fecit quoniam non unus, sed plures erant qui ueritatem euangelizabant* (Rousseau and Doutreleau, SC 211; trans. ANF [slightly modified]). Rousseau and Doutreleau reconstruct Irenaeus’s text of Paul’s citation of Isa 52:7 to read: ὡς ὠραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων ἀγαθά, τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην (“How lovely are the feet of

In this manner it becomes clear that Irenaeus has understood Paul's citation of Isa 52:7 as a deliberate attempt by Paul to include himself and his fellow apostles under the prophetic auspices of the Isaianic text.<sup>44</sup>

Thus when we come to Paul's citation of Isa 53:1a LXX in Rom 10:16 we already have plausible grounds for suspecting that Paul has identified himself and his fellow apostles as the referent behind the "our" in the quotation "O Lord, who has believed our audible message" (Rom 10:16), on the basis of the preceding citation.<sup>45</sup> In other words, one might posit that although the Isaianic prophet is nominally speaking, for Paul the characters who are really judged to be voicing the words are the apostles themselves, himself included. Further evidence can be produced by examining Isa 53:1 by way of the diachronic intertextual model outlined above.

#### 4b. *Isa 53:1a in Light of Early Christian Sources*

I will argue that the supposition that the apostles are speaking in Rom 10:16 is elevated from merely plausible to probable in light of the interpretation of Isa 53:1 in Justin Martyr, which is seconded by Origen. In addition to the explicit prosopological exegesis of Isa 53:1 in Justin, this text is also cited in Clement of Rome and the Gospel of

---

those proclaiming glad tidings, of those proclaiming peace"). Thus Irenaeus's original Greek text of Rom 10:15, as best as it can be reconstructed, follows Paul's probable original text in the main, but adds a clause (τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην) found in numerous other MSS of Romans, but which is probably not original to Paul (perhaps omitted due to haplography in Paul's *Vorlage* as Koch suggests). The additional clause is present in most LXX manuscripts, which suggests (among other possibilities) that Irenaeus was either citing Paul via Isaiah, or that the scribal corruption of Rom 10:15 reflected in Irenaeus's exemplar had already occurred before Irenaeus wrote, or that the extant MSS tradition for Irenaeus represent an assimilation to the LXX even though it originally stood closer to Paul's text, or perhaps that Irenaeus does indeed accurately represent Paul's original even though the evidence suggests this is less probable. One might also posit that the "corrected" text of Paul evidenced in Irenaeus followed Symmachus and Theodotion in reducing to ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης to εἰρήνην, perhaps under the influence of Nah 1:15 LXX (2:1 MT). See Koch, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 81-82 and Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 138-39 for judicious discussions of Paul's text with respect to the complex Septuagintal literary remains.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Irenaeus *Epid.* 86, on which see further below.

<sup>45</sup> Paul's citation of Isa 53:1a shows no deviation from the almost completely uniform LXX tradition regarding Isa 53:1a—cf. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 141.

John, but these latter quotations are not as decisive in fixing the identity of the ultimate speaker which Paul has assigned to Isa 53:1a in Rom 10:16.

A reading of Isa 53:1 which assigns the apostles as the collective speaker akin to what has been suggested for Paul in Rom 10:16 is clearly evidenced in Justin Martyr *Dial.* 42.2:

And Isaiah, while speaking as if from the person of the apostles [ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ἀποστόλων], has the apostles saying that certain men did not believe their audible message, but only [believed] by means of the display of power of the one having sent them. Therefore he [Isaiah] speaks thus: “O Lord, who has believed our audible message? And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed? And we proclaimed before him as if a child, as if a root in thirsty ground” [Isa 53:1-2], and the rest of the prophecy as it has already been articulated above. (*Dial.* 42.2, cf. *Dial.* 13.2-9 citing Isa 52:10-54:6 and *Dial.* 114.2)<sup>46</sup>

Thus we see that Justin, using the introductory formula ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου, explicitly identifies the apostles as the ultimate speakers of Isa 53:1, standing behind the prophetically mediated word.<sup>47</sup> Justin goes on to identify several shifts in speaker and addressee in Isa 53 while, of course, identifying Christ himself as the suffering subject in Isa 53. Nowhere else in Justin’s corpus is there an explicit identification of the apostles as the speakers of Isa 53:1, but Justin’s other references to Isa 53:1 either lean heavily in this direction (*I Apol.* 50.5) or are otherwise amenable to this interpretation (*Dial.* 13.3, 114.2, 118.4).

---

<sup>46</sup> Text (Justin *Dial.* 42.2): Καὶ ὁ Ἡσαίας, ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ἀποστόλων <λέγων>, λεγόντων τῷ Χριστῷ ὅτι οὐχὶ τῆ ἀκοῇ αὐτῶν πιστεύουσιν <ἄνθρωποι>, ἀλλὰ τῆ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτοῦς δυνάμει· διὸ λέγει οὕτως: Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῆ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; Καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίς ἀπεκαλύφθη; Ἀνηγγελάμεν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον, ὡς ρίζα ἐν γῆ διψώση, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς τῆς προφητείας προλελεγμένα.

<sup>47</sup> Hanson, *Jesus Christ and the Old Testament*, 41, has totally misconstrued the evidence—as the subsequent discussion will show—when he claims that “Justin interprets this sentence [Isa 53:1] as uttered by the Son to the Father.” On a slightly different note, it is the inclusion of Paul within the “our” which also proves to be the undoing of Hanson’s theory (p. 40) that in Isa 53:1 the prophet Isaiah himself is thought by Paul to be addressing Jesus with respect to Isa 53:1.

It is striking that Origen makes this same assignment, determining that the apostles are the true speakers of the oracle:

But Isaiah seems to prophesy this under the *persona* of the Apostles, to whom the task of preaching had been entrusted. And when they saw how ‘few’ believers there would be, especially from the people of Israel, they say to the Lord, ‘Lord who has believed our message?’ just as that also is said under their *persona*, ‘We have announced as a child before him, as a root in the thirsty ground’. (*Comm. Rom.* 8.6.2; trans. Heine, FOTC).

Thus we find corroborating evidence from the early church which suggests that Paul regarded the apostles as the collective speaker of the oracle uttered by Isaiah (who is mediating the apostolic speech) in Isa 53:1a.

There is a further connection between Justin, Irenaeus, and Paul which lends additional credibility to the notion that the apostles are the speakers of Isa 53:1 in Rom 10:16. Paul follows up his exegesis of Isa 53:1a (“O Lord, who has believed *our* audible message”) with a citation of Ps 18:5 LXX, which serves as a confirmation that the “audible message” preached by the apostles did in fact issue forth to its intended audience: “their voice has gone out to all the earth, their words to the boundaries of the known world” (Rom 10:18).<sup>48</sup> Reversing the pattern in Romans, rather than following up his citation of Isa 53:1 with that of Ps 18:5, Justin *prefaces* Isa 53:1 with a citation of Ps 18:5, claiming that the sound of the apostles’ voices rang forth throughout the earth (*Dial.* 42.1; cf. *1 Apol.* 40.1-4). In fact for Justin the high priest wore twelve bells on his robe to symbolize the twelve apostles and their ringing voices (*Dial.* 42.1; cf. Tertullian *Marc.* 4.13.3-4). Strikingly Irenaeus makes a similar move in *Epid.* 86, in which he interprets Isa 52:7 (cf. Rom 10:15) and Ps 18:5 (cf. Rom 10:18) in light of the worldwide apostolic mission of the apostles (cf. *Epid.* 68 on Isa 52:13–53:5; also *Epid.* 21 on Ps 18:5).

---

<sup>48</sup> Paul’s citation of Ps 18:5 LXX shows no deviation from the mainline LXX MSS traditions, which are unified here.

The collocation of the same basic texts in Justin (*Dial.* 42.1-2), Irenaeus (*Epid.* 86), and Paul (Rom 10:14-18) is probably not coincidental. Oskar Skarsaune believes, correctly in my opinion, that Justin is directly dependent on Romans 10:16 for Isa 53:1a in *Dial.* 114.2, making this a highly proximate *post-text* (a direct interpretation); moreover in *Dial.* 42.2 and 118.4, Justin also depends on Paul as his ultimate source although he has already looked up the *pre-text* in a full Isaiah scroll in order to expand the citation (making these indirectly mediated *post-texts*),<sup>49</sup> a practice characteristic of Justin in his use of other sources in the *Dialogue*. Meanwhile Noormann declares that the influence of Paul on Irenaeus *Epid.* 86 is certain, although he leaves open the possible mediation of Paul to Irenaeus via Justin or a *testimonia* collection.<sup>50</sup> Since Justin and Irenaeus received their respective scriptural exegeses of these passages from Paul, they are likewise the earliest interpreters of Paul's exegesis of Isa 53:1a in Rom 10:16. As highly intertextually proximate *post-texts*, the exegesis which is explicitly on display in Justin and seemingly assumed by Irenaeus, points strongly in favor of Paul's identification of the apostles as the ultimate collective speaker of Isa 53:1a in Rom 10:16.

Clement of Rome (*I Clem.* 16.3) also cites Isa 53:1. In context Clement's quotation of Isa 53:1-12 is an exhortation to leaders of the flock to imitate Christ's humility (*I Clem.* 16.1-14). It is unlikely that Clement depends in any way on Paul for his citation since it is so much longer (twelve verses of the LXX) than what we see in Rom 10:16 (half a verse). Furthermore there is nothing in context which would indicate

---

<sup>49</sup> Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof Text Tradition Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 116. As evidence that Justin had access to the full text surrounding Isa 53:1 in addition to whatever extracts were at his disposal, consider the lengthy citation of Isa 52:10–54:6 in *Dial.* 13.2-9.

<sup>50</sup> Rolf Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret: Zur Rezeption und Wirkung der paulinischen und deuteropaulinische Briefe im Werk der Irenäus von Lyon* (WUNT 66; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994), 111-12.

that Clement is making use of Romans, so the citation is a somewhat less intertextually proximate *co-text* rather than a *post-text*.<sup>51</sup> Since Clement does not provide any specific, detailed exegesis of Isa 53:1, we are not able to determine whether or not Clement makes the same identification as was explicitly made by Justin.

The quotation of Isa 53:1 in the Gospel of John has been reserved for last, and while it neither supports nor undermines the possibility of that the apostles were understood to be the collective speaker of Isa 53:1 in Rom 10:16 in a definitive fashion, its mention of the “arm of the Lord” is suggestive:

37 Although Jesus had performed so many signs in their presence, they still were not believing in him, 38 in order that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled: “O Lord, who has believed our audible message, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed” [Isa 53:1]? 39 And so they were not able to believe, and this also because Isaiah said further: 40 “He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, lest they see with their eyes, and lest they understand with their heart and lest they turn—and I would heal them” [Isa 6:10]. 41 Isaiah said these things because he saw his glory and spoke concerning him. (John 12:37-41)<sup>52</sup>

John makes two moves with the cited text. First he correlates the “signs” performed by Jesus with the display of power connected with the “arm of the Lord.” The “arm of the Lord” is often associated with miraculous divine action,<sup>53</sup> and in numerous

---

<sup>51</sup> The possibility of the dependence of *1 Clement* on Romans here is not suggested in the source-critical studies which I consulted: A. J. Carlyle, “Clement of Rome,” in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Oxford Society of Historical Theology; Oxford: Clarendon, 1905), 37-62 here 37-40; Albert E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), 88-104; Donald A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (NovTSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 214-20; Andrew F. Gregory, “1 Clement and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament,” in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 129-57 here 148-51.

<sup>52</sup> Text (John 12:37-41): 37 Τοσαῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ σημεῖα πεποιηκότος ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν, 38 ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῆ ὃν εἶπεν· κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη; 39 διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεύειν, ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας· 40 τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς. 41 ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ.

<sup>53</sup> E.g., Exod 6:1, 6; 15:16; 32:11; Deut 3:24; 4:34; 2 Macc 15:24; Ps 97:1 LXX; Isa 30:30; 52:10; Luke 1:51; John 3:2; Acts 13:17.

strands of early Christian exegesis, Jesus himself is designated as the “Arm of the Lord,”<sup>54</sup> with Tertullian expressly reading this very passage in such a fashion (*Prax.* 13.3). It may well be that John here aligns with this latter tradition and thus directly identifies Jesus as the “Arm of the Lord,” a possibility which merits serious consideration for Paul as well, even though Paul does not cite this portion of Isa 53:1, but rather only the first half of the verse (see further below). Second, John employs the Isaianic texts to highlight the response of unbelief, which puzzlingly persists in spite of the very signs which are calculated to inspire belief (John 2:11; 4:48; 7:31; 20:30-31), while noting that even this hardening was prophesied in advance by Isaiah (Isa 53:1; Isa 6:10). Ross Wagner has correctly pointed out the numerous affinities between the exegeses of John and of Paul at this juncture—affinities which increase the likelihood of a shared exegetical tradition regarding Isa 53:1.<sup>55</sup>

John does not identify the speaking character(s) which he has assigned to the “our” of the “O Lord, who has believed *our* audible message”—that is, if he has assigned any speaking character(s) at all. It is perhaps slightly less likely that John has the apostles in mind as the primary referent behind “our” since the prophecy is correlated with the rejection of Jesus himself during his earthly ministry (John 12:34-36, 42-43), not with the subsequent period of apostolic proclamation. Of course, one must be a bit cautious in this assessment, however, since John is more than capable of using the narrative about Jesus’ life as a vehicle for addressing pressing issues in his own

---

<sup>54</sup> E.g., Justin *Dial.* 11.3; 13.3; *I Apol.* 32.12; Cyprian *Test.* 2.4; Ps-Gregory *Test.* 1.8.3 (PG 46:200). I owe the reference to Cyprian *Test.* 2.4 to Martin C. Albl, *Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa: Testimonies against the Jews* (SBLWGRW 5; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 96. Also, the reference to Ps-Gregory is given per the numeration in his edition.

<sup>55</sup> Wagner, *Heralds*, 247-51 esp. 251 n. 103.

community.<sup>56</sup> Moreover John's community is seemingly preoccupied with the continued rejection of Jesus by the Jewish community in the face of Christian proclamation, which leaves open the possibility of a double entendre in the "our" of the citation.<sup>57</sup> Be that as it may, it is not clear whether or not the author of John made the same assignment of the speaker which was made by Justin and Origen, and which I am arguing, was made by Paul as well.

#### 4c. Summary of Paul's Exegesis of Isa 53:1a

The case for the identifying the apostles (Paul included) as the collective speaker of Isa 53:1a ("O Lord, who has believed our audible message") in Rom 10:16 is two-pronged. First, Paul's intentional modifications to his citation of Isa 52:7 in Rom 10:15 strongly favors the identification of the apostles as the "our" in "O Lord, who has believed *our* audible message" in 10:16 on independent grounds. Additionally the citation of Ps 18:5 LXX in Rom 10:18 points in this direction as well. In fact both Isa 52:7 and Ps 18:5 LXX are collocated in other places in early Christian exegesis, along with Isa 53:1, showing that these texts were considered mutually interpretative in some strands of early Christian literature. Second, and most vitally, the most proximate *post-text*, the first interpretation of Rom 10:16 which is found in Justin Martyr and subsequently echoed in Origen, explicitly identifies the "apostles" as the *prosopa*

---

<sup>56</sup> As is the case in all likelihood with John's repeated references to expulsion from the synagogue in 9:22, 12:42, and 16:2—see Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB 29, 29A; New York: Doubleday, 1966-70), 1.LXVII–LXXIX.

<sup>57</sup> Brown, *Gospel of John*, 1.LXXII, believes that the evangelistic mission to the Jews had essentially ceased by the time the Gospel of John took on its final form since invitation has hardened into polemic. However I think Brown has imposed a modern assumption here. Although polemic and invitation may be mutually exclusive in our hyperpolite 21st century Western civilizations, such was not the case in antiquity as a tract such as Justin's *Dialogue* makes readily apparent—see e.g., *Dial.* 141.2 for evidence of an evangelistic invitation to the Jews (despite the fierce polemic throughout the *Dialogue*) and *Dial.* 39.2 which shows that the invitation was still being accepted by Jews in Justin's day. On the abundant evidence for Christian and Jewish missionary contact and relations in the second century see Reidar Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century* (WUNT 82; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996), 216-322.

represented by the “our” of Isa 53:1. Other related early Christian *post-texts* in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus support or are congenial to this reading, while two *co-texts* in *I Clement* and the Gospel of John neither confirm nor deny this identification.

I have avoided until now one additional question which should be answered: If the apostles are the speakers, then who is the addressee? The vocative κύριε (“O Lord”) makes it clear that this is a first person address to the “Lord,” but should this Lord be identified as the Lord Christ or God? Part of the reason I have avoided answering this question is that the identity of the speakers can be fixed with greater certainty on the basis of the criteria and contextual considerations than can the addressee, and I wanted to show that the speakers are probably the apostles without having the more speculative search for addressee impinging as a distraction.

The “O Lord” in the united LXX manuscript tradition is not present in the MT, so no hint can be gained by a comparison with the probable *Vorlage* to the Septuagint by seeing whether יהוה or אֲדֹנָי is represented—a hint which would be of questionable value for Paul regardless since there is no clear evidence that Paul was in the habit of using the MT. Although the raw lexical data from Paul substantially favors the identification of the “Lord” as Christ by Paul, it also permits the identification of the “Lord” as God,<sup>58</sup> and this latter option is preferable. Assuming that Paul had access to the entire verse, the exact phraseology of 53:1 taken as a whole suggests that the addressee would be God rather than Christ: “O Lord, who has believed our audible message? And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?” The “Lord” in 53:1a is probably the same as the

---

<sup>58</sup> According to Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 25-27, 631-38 there are 12 instances in the Pauline corpus in which God is clearly identified as κύριος, and all 12 occurrences are in LXX citations. In contrast there are 152 references to Jesus or the Christ as κύριος, and these are found both inside and outside of LXX citations.

“Lord” in the expression “arm of the Lord” in 53:1b, and since the “Lord” in the phrase “arm of the Lord” would almost certainly be understood by Paul as God with the arm itself plausibly as Christ,<sup>59</sup> we can fix God as the most likely addressee. Thus, although certainty is not possible, it is probably best to see the apostles (with Paul including himself) as addressing God with their words, “O Lord, who has believed our report?” in Paul’s exegesis of Rom 10:16.

4d. *The Significance of Isaiah the Prophet for Paul:  
An Assessment of J. Ross Wagner’s Proposal*

Thus while in general I strongly endorse the magisterial work of Wagner in his *Heralds of the Good News*, with respect to Rom 10:16 I would like to offer a modest critique of the model put forward by Wagner, who suggests that Paul and Isaiah speak “in concert” in Rom 10:16 as fellow evangelists proclaiming the good news. Wagner states:

Paul allows Isaiah to speak in his own voice about the rejection of ‘our message.’ It is of tremendous significance for understanding Paul’s appropriation of the Book of Isaiah to recognize that this quotation assumes a fundamental correspondence between Paul’s apostolic proclamation and Isaiah’s message. It is not simply that Isaiah long ago predicted something that is now fulfilled in Paul’s ministry. Rather, Isaiah remains a living voice for Paul, one who speaks alongside the apostle as an authoritative witness to the gospel.<sup>60</sup>

But with the “our” in the Isaianic citation does Paul intend to refer to himself, *Isaiah*, and his fellow apostles as Wagner has seemingly assumed? I would assert, on the contrary, that the supposition that Isaiah is to be included in the “our” by Paul is not probable in light of the results obtained above, especially the manner in which the *pre-text* (Isa 53:1a) and the *text* (Rom 10:16) are interpreted in early Christian *co-texts*, *post-*

---

<sup>59</sup> In the MT of Isa 53:1b the “arm of the Lord” is the “arm of יְהוָה,” but even apart from this, the identification of κύριου as God is obvious in the LXX without any reference to the Hebrew *Vorlage* on the strength of the occurrence of this phrase or related terminology elsewhere—e.g., Exod 6:6; 15:6; Num 11:23; Isa 51:9; 59:1.

<sup>60</sup> Wagner, *Heralds*, 179-80 (his emphasis).

*texts*, and *inter-texts*. Isaiah and Paul may indeed speak in concert nominally, but Isaiah *qua* Isaiah the human prophet would seem to be a relatively trivial figure for Paul. The dramatic characters utilized by the divine author (here the apostles) in speaking through Isaiah are of much greater import, and in this case those characters are identified by Paul as himself and his fellow apostles.

### 5. *Concluding Thoughts*

It has been my intention to articulate the need for a fuller diachronic intertextual model in New Testament scholarship which takes into account not just the relationship between the *pre-text* and the *text*, but also *co-texts* and *post-texts*. Furthermore I have attempted to demonstrate the utility of this diachronic intertextual model by a close examination of how Paul's exegesis of Isa 53:1a in Rom 10:16 was paralleled and received in the early church. I hope that the diachronic intertextual model articulated and exemplified in this paper will encourage others to explore the numerous ways in which *co-texts* and *post-texts* can illuminate not just Paul, but all moments of intertextuality in the NT and other early Christian literature.