SOUTHEASTERN
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. 4, No. 2 Winter 2013

Southeastern Theological Review
Is published biannually for the faculty of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

"Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary seeks to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ by equipping students to serve the church and fulfill the Great Commission."

"The mission of Southeastern Theological Review is to equip the Church to serve the Lord Jesus Christ and fulfill the Great Commission through rigorous scholarly engagement in the disciplines of mission, biblical studies, theology, philosophical theology, historical theology, and practical theology."

Southeastern Theological Review is produced biannually (Winter and Summer), and may be themed or un-themed. *Southeastern Theological Review* aims to serve the Church and help her think rigorously so that it may serve the Lord Christ faithfully.

Unsolicited article submissions to the journal are welcomed and should be directed to the editor. All submitted articles to *Southeastern Theological Review* are evaluated by double-blind peer review. All articles that are submitted to *STR* should present original work in their field. Manuscripts should conform to the *SBL Handbook of Style*.

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database® (ATLA RDB®), a product of the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606, USA. Email: atla@atla.com, www: http://www.atla.com.

This periodical is also indexed with Old Testament Abstracts®, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC 20064, USA. Email: cua-ota@cua.edu . This periodical is typeset and indexed electronically by Galaxie Software®: http://galaxie.com .

Annual Subscription Rates: **$30 (regular) $15 (student)**
(both for ebook and hardcopy)

For more information visit: **www.southeasterntheologicalreview.com**
Direct correspondence to: **Attn: Editor, *Southeastern Theological Review***
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
PO BOX 1889, Wake Forest, NC 27588-1889 (USA)

Note: *The views expressed in the following articles are not necessarily those of the STR editorial board, the faculty, or the administration of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Individual authors are responsible for the research and content presented in their essays.*

ISSN 2156-9401

STR 4/2 (Winter 2013) 115–16

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

BOOK REVIEWS

STR 4/2 (Winter 2013) 137–54

Replacement or Fulfillment? Re-applying Old Testament Designations of Israel to the Church

Robin Routledge
Mattersey Hall, United Kingdom

Introduction

The acceptance of the OT as part of the canon of Christian scripture acknowledges that the OT is not merely an historical document relating to the faith of an ancient people but that it has relevance and authority for the Church. How that is worked out in practice is not always clear, and this article will not seek to answer that general question. However I do want to look at one aspect of it, namely: *theological issues relating to the re-application to the Church of OT texts that were addressed, originally, to the people of God in the OT.*

One question here is whether such a thing is legitimate at all. And there is serious theological opinion that it is not. OT texts that relate to Israel continue to relate to Israel, and where those texts refer to things to come, they will be fulfilled, literally, in the future national life of Israel. This is, for example, the view of classical or normative dispensationalism.[1] Others take an opposite

[1] Classical dispensationalism sees a distinction between the Church and Israel, and argues that OT prophecies relating to Israel will be fulfilled, literally, within the future life of the nation. Ryrie has offered what appears to be a restatement of the key tenets of dispensationalism (which he terms "normative" dispensationalism)—see Charles C. Ryrie, *Dispensationalism* (rev. and enl. ed.; Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1995)—though maintains that any differences are not substantial or determinative (180–1, 190–1). In the light of its generally wide acceptance (see, e.g., John F. Walvoord, "Reflections on Dispensationalism," *BibSac* 158 [2001]: 131–7 esp. 135), it is reasonable to take Ryrie's views as broadly representative of the current form of classical or normative dispensationalism. Progressive dispensationalism—see, e.g., Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock, eds., *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: a Search for Definition* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992); Craig A. Blaising and Darrell Bock, *Progressive Dispensationalism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993). Robert L. Saucy, *The Case for Progressive Dispensationalism* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993)—allows that some OT texts that relate to Israel may have a partial application to the Church, but in their final consummation will include the literal fulfillment of Israel's political expectations; see, e.g., Darrell L. Bock, "The Reign of the Lord Christ," in Blaising and Bock, *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church*, 37–67 esp. 56–57, 66; "Current Messianic Activity and OT Davidic Promise: Dispensationalism, Hermeneutics and NT Fulfilment," *TrinJ* 15.1 (1994): 55–87; Bruce A. Ware, "The New Covenant and the Peo-

position: the Church is the spiritual heir to the blessings of God promised in the OT, and these things are no longer applicable to Israel as a nation.

Discussion of these issues is important and relevant, if sometimes rather heated. In this article I will argue that while the issue is a complex one, there is some justification for the view that OT texts may be re-applied to the Church, which is viewed as continuous with the OT people of God. This raises two further issues that cannot be dealt with here: the need for an appropriate hermeneutic to ensure that such re-application is legitimate, and the issue, that Paul appears to address in Romans 9–11, of whether national Israel continues to have a role in the future purposes of God.

Replacement Theology?

There are a number of NT passages where OT texts that appear, in their original context, to relate exclusively to Israel are redirected, and related directly to the church. One key passage is 1 Peter 2:9–10

> But you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people belonging to God, that you may declare the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light. Once you were not a people, but now you are the people of God; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy.[2]

This text uses covenantal language that is central to the identity of Israel in the OT. Verse 9 echoes Exodus 19:6, where God declares to those he has just brought out of captivity in Egypt, and whom he is establishing as his own special possession by making a covenant with them: "you will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation". The following verse alludes to the words of God in Hosea 2:23—"I will say to those called 'Not my people,' 'You are my people;' and they will say, 'You are my God.'" Following the sin of the northern kingdom, Hosea announces divine judgment on the nation (fulfilled in defeat and exile by the Assyrians in 721 B.C.E.). But judgment is tempered by grace, and God also gives the assurance that he will restore his people; he will bring them back to the desert, where their relationship began (Hos 2:14), and, through a new covenant, will betroth himself to the nation forever (Hos 2:18–20). The reference to God's people being chosen to declare his praises also suggests a link with Isaiah 43:21,[3] which is also related to God's deliverance of his people, this time in a second exodus, from Babylon. These promises, which embody God's ongoing loving commitment to the

---

ple(s) of God," in Blaising and Bock, *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church*, 68–97 esp. 93–96.

[2] Unless otherwise stated all biblical references are from the NIV.

[3] See, e.g., Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press), 163–4. This link is strengthened by the reference to "chosen people" (1 Pet 2:9) which is present in Isa 43:20, but not in Exod 19:5.

people he has chosen, are taken up by Peter who applies them very specifically to Christian believers.

We see a similar pattern repeated through the NT. In the letter to the Galatians, Christian believers are addressed as "Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal 3:29). The writer to the Hebrews identifies the new relationship that believers have through Christ with the "new covenant" promised by Jeremiah (Heb 8:7–13; cf. Jer 31:31–34; see also Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6). In the OT, the promise of a New Covenant is linked with the restoration and spiritual renewal of Israel, following the sin and failure that led to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Babylonian exile.[4] And again, it is central to the self-understanding of the nation of Israel. In the NT, though, it appears to be given a much wider significance, and applied to all who have faith in Christ. Some suggest that in its opening reference to its addressees as "the twelve tribes scattered among the nations" (Jas 1:1), the Letter of James also identifies Christian believers with the OT people of Israel.[5] In the light of these and other NT passages, Wayne Grudem comments: "What further statement could be needed in order for us to say with assurance that the church has now become the true Israel of God and will receive all the blessings promised to Israel in the OT?"[6]

This view that the church has taken the place of national Israel in the purposes of God is the basis of what is referred to as "replacement theology" or "supersessionism". It needs to be noted, though, that this terminology and its definition often come from its opponents, and many who are labeled "supersessionist" do not recognize or accept the appellation. One such opponent,

---

[4] Jer 31:31–34 contains the only specific reference to the "new covenant" in the Old Testament. Other texts, though, convey a similar idea (e.g. Isa 55:3; 61:8; Jer 50:5; Ezek 16:60; 37:26; Hos 2:18–20). For further discussion of the New Covenant in the Old Testament see Robin Routledge, *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2008 / Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2009), 269–72 (and bibliography).

[5] See, e.g., Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 63; Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James* (Pillar New Testament Commentaries; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 49–50; *James* (TNTC; Downers Grove: IVP, 2009), 33. Others, however, see this as a reference to (possibly Messianic) Jews; e.g. James B. Adamson, *The Epistle of James* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 49–51; Scot McKnight, *The Letter of James* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 65–68; Ralph Martin, *James*, (WBC 48; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1988), 8–11. Opinion is also divided over the expression "Israel of God" (Gal 6:16). James Dunn suggests that this includes Gentile believers; see James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Blacks NT Commentary; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1993), 344–6; see also Richard H. Bell, *The Irrevocable Call of God* (WUNT 184; Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 178–9; R. Alan Cole, *Galatians* (TNTC; Leicester: IVP; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 235–7. However, cf. Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 405–8.

[6] Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Leicester: IVP; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 863.

Michael Vlach, has produced a comprehensive study of supersessionism.[7] He suggests that while there may be variations on the theme, supersessionism may be defined as "the view that *the NT church is the new and/or true Israel that has forever superseded Israel as the people of God*;"[8] and that any physical and political restoration of Israel as a nation is ruled out. Moderate versions of supersessionism do allow for the future salvation of Israel (or a significant part of it), as suggested, for example, in Romans 9–11, but this requires, according to Vlach, Israel's "incorporation into the Christian Church."[9] Vlach also refers to Richard Soulen, who suggests that supersessionism takes different forms. These include *punitive supersessionism*, which maintains that God's rejection of Israel is retribution for Israel's rejection of Jesus, and *economic supersessionism*, which suggests that the nation's special role ended, as it was always intended to do, with the coming of Christ and the birth of the church: the *carnal* being replaced by the *spiritual*.[10] Economic supersessionism is sometimes presented as taking a less negative view of Israel, and it certainly avoids some of the invective and hostility against Israel for that nation's part in the crucifixion of Jesus. However, it has far-reaching implications for our understanding of the OT and its relationship with the NT. Soulen addresses this in his third category: *structural supersessionism*, which, in his view, concerns not only the doctrinal issues relating to the relationship between the church and Israel, but also the way the canon of Scripture is perceived as a unity. The story of God's essential dealings with humankind incorporate creation and fall, in Genesis 1–3, but then jump to redemption through Christ in the NT. As a result, what lies between, made up, primarily, of God's direct dealings with the nation of Israel, are sidelined as having of little or no value when it comes to theological reflection. The large part of the OT has significance only in that it anticipates and pre-figures redemption in Christ.[11] This, though, is something

---

[7] Michael J. Vlach, *Has the Church Replaced Israel: A Theological Evaluation* (Nashville: B & H, 2010); other significant discussions of supersessionism include: Ronald Diprose, *Israel and the Church: The Origin and Effects of Replacement Theology* (Milton Keynes: Authentic Media, 2000); Richard Kendall Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996). See also, Craig A. Blaising, "The Future of Israel as a Theological Question," *JETS* 44.3 (2001): 435–50 esp. 435–7; Donald E. Bloesch, "'All Israel will be Saved': Supersessionism and the Christian Witness," *Int* 43 (1989): 130–42; Calvin Smith, ed., *The Jews, Modern Israel and the New Supersessionism: Resources for Christians* (Lampeter: Kings Divinity Press, 2009); Michael J. Vlach, "Various Forms of Replacement Theology," *TMSJ* 20.1 (2009): 57–69; Matt Waymeyer, "The Dual State of Israel in Romans 11:28," *TMSJ* 16.1 (2005): 57–71.

[8] Vlach, *Has the Church Replaced Israel*, 12.

[9] Vlach, *Has the Church Replaced Israel*, 23.

[10] Vlach, *Has the Church Replaced Israel*, 14; see also Soulen, *God of Israel*, 29–33; Blaising, "The Future of Israel," 436. Gabriel Fackre, in an earlier discussion suggests as many as seven variants; see Gabriel Fackre, *Ecumenical Faith in Evangelical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

[11] Soulen, *God of Israel*, 31–32.

of a caricature, and is not reflected in the commitment, by many whom Soulen would describe as supersessionists, to the whole of the OT.

The language that critics use to describe so-called supersessionists can at times, though, appear rhetorical, emotive and misleading.[12] The term "supersessionist" is, itself, pejorative. It suggests a negative view of Israel, thus raising the specter of anti-Semitism.[13] And this negative view is further emphasized by the supposed reference to Israel as "carnal" rather than spiritual. Language that sets "Israel" against the "*Gentile* church" and suggests that Israel only has a future by being "incorporated into the church" is also misleading.[14] It is true that by the second century C.E. the church had become predominantly non-Jewish, and there was an evident distinction between the Church and the nation of Israel. The *Epistle of Barnabas*, which appears to have been accorded near-canonical status, sees a clear separation between Israel in the OT, who misinterpreted God's instructions and failed to recognize his purposes, and Christians, who, alone, can properly understand the OT.[15] Following Constantine, and the close connection between the church and the political power, the distinction between Jews and what became an overwhelmingly non-Jewish church grew.[16] However, though this separation

---

[12] So, for example, Blaising suggests that the view implies that the physical descendants of Jacob "do not have a future except to linger on earth like refugees until the end of time as a witness to divine judgment. Why? Because God has disinherited them as a punishment for their rejection of Jesus, and he has replaced them with a new Israel, the Gentile Church" ("The Future of Israel," 435). By emphasizing the negative view of Israel and setting it against the *Gentile* church, Blaising presents a rhetorical caricature.

[13] In popular condemnation (for example on internet sites), the tendency towards anti-Semitism is frequently cited as a key reason for rejecting supersessionism or replacement theology (so-called).

[14] The term "church" might also be used pejoratively in this discussion. Certainly as an organized religious institution, possibly with links to political authority, the church has a poor record in its treatment of other religious groups—including Jews. In general, though, I am using the term more simply to refer to (and as shorthand for) the community of those who have faith in Jesus Christ, drawn from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

[15] So, e.g., the *Epistle of Barnabas* takes Jer 7:22 to imply that God never required animal sacrifices (*Barn.* 2); circumcision was always intended to be of the heart (*Barn.* 9) and passages that refer to forbidden foodstuffs were intended to be understood allegorically; "In these dietary laws … Moses was taking three moral maxims and expounding them spiritually; though the Jews, with their carnal instincts, took him to be referring, literally, to foodstuffs" (*Barn.* 10).

[16] Though with the accession of the Roman Emperor Julian (331–363 C.E.) who was labeled "the Apostate" because of his opposition to Christianity, this was reversed. Whilst probably having no great sympathy with the Jews, Julian saw them as allies against a common enemy. This was an aberration from the normal trend, though it may have contributed to anti-Jewish feelings in subsequent years. Those very negative feelings are reflected in Martin Luther's vicious invective against the

became a historical reality, it should not be seen, as it is by some, as inevitable. When NT writers re-apply OT texts and descriptors to Christian believers, they emphasize continuity between the OT people of God and the new community of those who have faith in Christ. And it is unlikely that it could have been any other way, since those who made up that early Christian community were themselves Jews. And, today, to argue that the future hope of Jews (as well as non-Jews) lies in Christ is not necessarily to imply that they must renounce their Jewish identity, as the (somewhat emotive) language of "incorporation into the church" suggests.

Fulfillment Theology

In my view it is not helpful to talk about the church "replacing" or "displacing" Israel. That kind of language creates an unnecessary dichotomy between the two. It seems better to see an essential continuity between the people of God in the Old and New Testaments, and to view the coming of Christ, and the community of God's people that comes into being through him, as fulfilling, rather than negating, the hope of Israel expressed in the OT. In this context, God's dealings with Israel in the OT are not irrelevant, as Soulen suggests, but play an important part in understanding God's dealings with his people more generally. This includes noting typological correspondences, and also identifying theological principles that underlie God's relationship with Israel and, where appropriate, re-applying those principles within a church setting.

Vlach is critical of those, whom he describes as supersessionist, using this kind of fulfillment language.[17] He argues that, whatever the terminology, the church now claims exclusive title to promises first made to national Israel, and that is a theology of replacement, whatever other name it may be given! However, Vlach overlooks what seems to me to be a vital consideration: were these promises in fact "first made to *national* Israel" and are thus based primarily on national identity, or were they, even in the OT, based instead primarily on a faithful and obedient response to God?

The OT People of God: the Community of the Faithful

Within the OT there appears to be a developing sense that faith, rather than national identity, is the determining factor in the composition of the people of God. From the very beginning, Israel's identity was determined by its relationship with God. The covenant with Abraham, by which God promised that the patriarch would become the father of a great nation, emphasizes

---

Jews—calling for synagogues and religious writings to be burned, houses destroyed and Jews themselves removed from the protection of the law (Martin Luther, *On the Jews and Their Lies*, XI). For further discussion see, e.g., Michael Frassetto, ed., *Christian Attitudes towards the Jews in the Middle Ages: A Casebook* (New York; London: Routledge, 2007).

[17] Vlach, *Has the Church Replaced Israel*, 9–11.

this ongoing relationship with Abraham's descendants: "I will establish my covenant as an everlasting covenant between me and you and your descendants after you, to be your God and the God of your descendants after you" (Gen 17:7). From the first, though, this covenant relationship did not include all of Abraham's offspring, but was limited to his descendants through Isaac and Jacob, and even within that line, descent from Abraham was not the final qualifier: circumcision was also required (Gen 17:9–14). This was the *sign of the covenant* (Gen 17:11): the mark of belonging to the covenant people of God.[18] And anyone who was not circumcised was *cut off from his people* (Gen 17:14);[19] he had broken the covenant, and so could not be regarded as part of the covenant community, whatever his parentage.

We see this continuing emphasis on relationship in God's words to Moses, in what became a covenant formula: "I will take you as my own people, and I will be your God" (Exod 6:7).[20] The Sinaitic covenant, which may be seen as the establishment of Israel as a nation, also emphasizes the importance of obedience, and again, willful disobedience results in transgressors being *cut off from the people*.[21] The book of Deuteronomy further emphasizes the need for each generation both to respond to the demands of the covenant and to teach subsequent generations, so that the relationship with God and the obedience that necessarily accompanies it is maintained. Those assembled on the plains of Moab had not been at Sinai (Horeb), or had been too young, then, to respond to God's requirements; nevertheless, they were urged to remember what had happened there, and in so doing to see themselves as part of the same covenant people.[22] They must then make their own response; as must the generations that follow.[23] Entry into the covenant relationship between God and his people remains, ever, a contemporary issue. The people have a choice:[24] with blessings following obedience (Deut 28:1–14), and curs-

---

[18] See further, e.g., Routledge, *OT Theology*, 167–9 (and bibliography).

[19] For further discussion of this expression, see Robin Routledge, "Prayer, Sacrifice and Forgiveness," *EuroJTh* 18.1 (2009): 17–28 esp. 19; *OT Theology*, 196–7; see also Eryl W. Davies, *Numbers* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Marshall Pickering, 1995), 83–84; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 457–60; Gordon J. Wenham, *Leviticus* (NICOT London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1979), 241–3.

[20] This expression, or variants of it, occur in, e.g., Lev 26:12; Jer 11:4; 24:7; 31:1.33; Ezek 11:20; 34:30; 37:23. For further discussion see Rolf Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (OTS; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998).

[21] See, e.g., Exod 30:33, 38; 31:14; Lev 7:20–21, 25–27; 17:4; 22:3; 23:9; Num 9:13; 15:30–31.

[22] Deut 4:10–14.

[23] Deut 29 refers to the people about to enter into their own covenant relationship with God (vv. 12–13), though the scope is widened to include future generations who also accept its demands (vv. 15, 29).

[24] Deut 30:15–20 sets out the "two ways" that God puts before the people. It has been argued that the historical books Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings interpret

es, including eventual exile from the land, as the result of disobedience (Deut 28:15–68).

Already, then, we see that God's promises to Israel in the OT are not just based upon national identity, but are also conditional upon a right response to him. However, God's unwillingness to reject the people as a whole meant that hope in the OT remained linked with the destiny of the nation. The divine call and promise of blessing related to the nation as a whole, and those who did not respond appropriately were excluded from that blessing by being cut off from the nation. That appears to change, though, in the notion of the Remnant,[25] which finds particular expression in the book of Isaiah. Here, a distinction does seem to be made between the nation as a whole and the faithful minority from within the nation through whom God's purposes will be fulfilled.

The most common Hebrew root used in connection with the idea of "remnant" is *š'r*. Words from this root often refer to those who survive, or remain after, a particular crisis (e.g. 1 Kgs 19:18; 2 Kgs 19:4; Jer 40:11; Ezek 9:8). The most significant crisis in the OT was the Babylonian exile, which was seen as God's judgment on the faithlessness of the nation, and resulted in the people being removed from the land.[26] Against this background, *the* Remnant may be seen as the relatively small number of people who, following the exile, will turn back to God and enjoy the blessings of the age to come. The prophets viewed the exile as a theological necessity: a refining that would purify the nation and from which a renewed, faithful people would emerge. It seems probable that, at first, the prophets saw those who returned to the land after the exile as this faithful Remnant. However, as that community fell back into the same sins as before, it became clear that the trauma of exile had not brought about the necessary renewal;[27] and so the idea of the

---

historical events in the light of these two ways set out in Deuteronomy—highlighting the view that blessing, including victory in the land, follows obedience, and defeat and the eventual destruction of the northern kingdom by the Assyrians and the exile of the southern kingdom in Babylon are the result of disobedience. See further, Routledge, *OT Theology*, 261–3.

[25] For further discussion of the Remnant, see, e.g., Gerhard F. Hasel, *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah* (3d ed.; Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 1980); Routledge, *OT Theology*, 266–7 (and bibliography).

[26] This happened twice: the northern kingdom (Israel) was defeated and taken into exile by Assyria in 722/21 B.C.E.; the southern kingdom (Judah) survived that crisis, but was defeated and exiled in Babylon in 587 B.C.E. When referring to "the exile" it is usually the Babylonian exile that is meant. There are references to a remnant linked with the Assyrian exile (e.g. Isa 17:4–6; cf. Amos 3:11), though future hope for the northern kingdom is tied to the restoration of the whole nation, which seems to be closely associated with the fortunes of the south.

[27] Ezra and Nehemiah seek to address some of the moral and spiritual issues facing the returning exiles; similar issues are addressed in Isa 56–66 and by the prophets Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.

Remnant, together with the promise of restoration, seems to have been pushed into the eschatological future. The Remnant in the OT can be seen to embody the future hope of the nation and its presence points to the fact that God has not abandoned his people. However, this Israel of the future will be defined by its faithfulness to God, not by ethnicity alone.[28]

In this notion of the Remnant we see, then, that those who will finally inherit God's promises make up only a very small proportion of the physical nation of Israel, and thus that ethnicity is not a sufficient condition to be part of this new "Israel." I want to suggest that it is not, either a necessary condition.

The book of Isaiah introduces an additional, significant, element into the idea of the Remnant. The name of the prophet's son, *Shearjashub* ("a remnant will return," Isa 7:3) could be interpreted as a warning, *only* a remnant will return, or as a promise that the coming judgment will not result in total annihilation, and there will be some, albeit only a few, survivors. That same twofold interpretation is given in Isaiah 10:20–23, which points to the near destruction of the nation, though again promises that some will survive. For Isaiah, this distinction is linked to *faith in God* (Isa 10:20 cf. 7:9). It is not the nation as a whole that will enjoy the blessings of salvation, but only those who turn to God and put their trust in him. And Isaiah appears to take this a step further. If the most significant factor in inheriting God's promises is faith, rather than national heritage, might not that open the way for the inclusion of non-Israelites, also on the basis of faith?

There is, and continues to be, debate about whether the book of Isaiah is truly universalistic, and envisions the nations sharing equally with Israel in the blessings of salvation.[29] In my view, though, a good case for that can be made. One significant example might be Isaiah 19:25, which portrays Israel along-

---

[28] Rom 9–11 seems to use this same kind of argument. The presence of a "remnant," in this case those Jews who, like Paul, have become followers of Christ, demonstrates that God has not rejected Israel (Rom 11:1–5), and points to the future hope of ethnic Israelites. However, just as the remnant in Paul's argument are those who have come to faith in Christ, so this remnant embodies the hope that the people as a whole may also come to faith in Christ. The soteriological language does not necessarily imply national restoration, as claimed, for example, by Bloesch ("All Israel will be Saved," 134) and Blaising ("The Future of Israel," 438).

[29] For discussion surrounding this debate see, e.g., Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Second Isaiah—Prophet of Universalism," *JSOT* 41 (1988): 83–103; Michael A. Grisanti, "Israel's Mission to the Nations in Isaiah 40–55: An Update," *MSJ* 9.1 (1991): 39–61; Routledge, *OT Theology*, 330–3; Richard L. Schultz, "Nationalism and Universalism in Isaiah," in *Interpreting Isaiah: Issues and Approaches* (ed. David G. Firth and H. G. M. Williamson; Nottingham: Apollos; Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2009), 122–44; Rikk E. Watts, "Echoes from the Past: Israel's Ancient Traditions and the Destiny of the Nations in Isaiah 40–55," *JSOT* 28.4 (2004): 481–508; D. W. van Winkle, "The Relationship of the Nations to Yahweh and to Israel in Isaiah XL–LV," *VT* 25.5 (1985): 446–58. "Proselytes in Isaiah XL–LV? A Study of Isaiah XLIV 1–5," *VT* 47.3 (1997): 341–59.

side Egypt and Assyria as equal beneficiaries of God's blessing, and applies designations formerly reserved for Israel—"my people," which appears as a key part of the covenant formula, and "the work of my hands," which, elsewhere in the book of Isaiah refers exclusively to Israel (29:23; 60:21; cf. 45:11)—to those two non-Israelite nations. I take Egypt and Assyria here as representatives, both of warring nations who will be united in a common worship of God, and of nations hostile to Israel who will, finally, stand alongside Israel as equal objects of God's grace. This leads to the view that, in the coming era of salvation, the people of God will be made up of Israelites and non-Israelites who stand before God, not by virtue of national heritage but solely on the basis of their faith. Ethnicity is thus no longer a necessary condition; rather, a faithful commitment to God becomes both the necessary and the sufficient condition for inclusion among God's people. John Bright summarizes the significance of the Remnant for the relationship between Israel and the church:

> In the notion of the Remnant … a distinction begins to be drawn between physical Israel and the true Israel, the actual Israel and the ideal Israel. The notion begins to take root in Hebrew theology that actual Israel will not inherit the Kingdom of God—that vision will ever be beyond her. Yet, along with this, there remains the confidence that one day there will emerge a true Israel, disciplined to be obedient to God's will, fit to be the instrument of his purpose. It is an Israel, not of birth, but of individual choice for the calling of God … It is precisely as this new Israel … that the Church understood itself.[30]

Within the book of Isaiah the Remnant is closely associated with two other important elements in Israel's future hope: the Messiah and the restoration of Jerusalem (Zion). Put simply, the Messiah will preside over the future era of salvation, he will reign from a renewed and restored Zion and the Remnant are those who will make up the redeemed community in that coming kingdom. The centrality of Zion here would appear to indicate Israel's prominence in the coming age, however, Zion appears, here, to have a wider significance, as the place where God has established his dwelling place, and therefore the place where he can be found. Isaiah 28:16 refers to God laying in Zion "a tested stone, a precious cornerstone for a sure foundation" and this security is appropriated by faith: "the one who trusts will never be dismayed." This passage is often taken as Messianic, and in the NT both Paul (Rom 9:33) and Peter (1 Pet 2:6) identify the stone with Christ.[31] However, in its original setting, it is more likely that the verse contrasts the security that comes from trusting in God with the false hope advocated by the leaders of Judah referred to in the previous verses (Isa 28:14–15). Those who find ref-

---

[30] John Bright, *The Kingdom of God* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985), 94

[31] The LXX reading, *ho pisteuōn epi autō* ("the one who trusts in *him*") indicates that the verse was given a messianic interpretation within early Jewish tradition.

uge in Zion are those who put their trust in God, and thus Zion becomes a symbol of the security that is to be found in God himself (cf. Ps 46:1).

And Zion's significance is not for the faithful of Israel alone. When he built and dedicated the temple in Jerusalem, Solomon recognized its significance for non-Israelites,[32] who, by looking to the temple and having their prayers answered would also come to know and fear God (1 Kgs 8:41–43). Isaiah 2:2–4 describes the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion. There is no sense here of Israel's political prominence. The nations come, not primarily to acknowledge or to pay homage to a nation, but to receive God's law and to submit to his rule over their affairs. By abandoning their weapons (Isa 2:4), the nations demonstrate willingness to put their trust in God and his judgment, and no longer in their own efforts and resources, and here again we see the relationship between salvation and faith. The reference to God's *law* (*tôrâ*, Isa 2:3) links Zion with Sinai. Just as Israel travelled to Sinai to receive the *tôrâ*, so the nations will come to Zion to receive God's instruction. Similarly, as the elders, who represented Israel, came into God's presence and shared a covenant meal on Sinai (Exod 24:9–11), so God will reveal his glory on Mount Zion (Isa 24:23; cf. 4:5–6), and, there, the nations are invited to share a banquet (Isa 25:6–8). Gordon McConville notes that in this, "Jerusalem succeeds Sinai as the symbol of Israel's status as the special people of God."[33] What is also significant in this is that when transferred to Zion, traditions that had been exclusively related to Israel (such as law and covenant) are now related, too, to the non-Israelite nations.

Another important factor in this discussion is the Servant of the Lord,[34] who appears, particularly, in four passages in Isaiah 40–55 (42:1–9; 49:1–9; 50:4–11; 52:13–53:12) often referred to as "Servant Songs."[35] In the rest of Isaiah 40–55 the term "servant" is generally applied to Israel (e.g. Isa 41:8; 42:19; 43:10; 45:4) and some make the same identification in the Servant Songs. However, whilst other passages suggest that Israel has failed in its servant task (e.g. Isa 42:19–20; 43:8–10), the Servant Songs present one who is the ideal Servant, and so distinct from Israel. There is, though, a relationship between the two. In Isaiah 49:3, this ideal Servant is identified as Israel.

---

[32] The term used to describe "foreigners" here is *nokrî*—and in this context points to those who are "from distant lands" (cf. Deut 29:22) and so not directly associated with Israel. See also note 42, below.

[33] Gordon McConville, "Jerusalem in the Old Testament," in *Jerusalem Past and Present in the Purposes of God* (ed. W. L. Walker; Cambridge: Tyndale House, 1992), 21–51 esp. 25; see also, Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (New Voices in Biblical Studies; Minneapolis: Winston, 1985).

[34] For general discussion of the Servant of the Lord, see Routledge, *OT Theology*, 291–6 (and bibliography).

[35] Duhm, who first drew specific attention to these passages, listed them as Isa 42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12, and there is debate about whether some or all of the additional verses should be included. There may be further references to the Servant in Isa 48:16b; 51:16; 61:1–4.

This, though, does not resolve the matter of identity, because in verses 5–6 the Servant also has a mission *to* Israel. If both references to "Israel" are part of the original text, they must have different (though not unrelated) meanings, and the best explanation is that verse 3 points to the Servant as the embodiment of what Israel was meant to be.[36] God called the people of Israel to be his servant, to bear witness to what he has done among them (e.g. Isa 42:18–19; 43:8), but the nation has failed in that task. Nevertheless, God's purposes are maintained through another Servant, who is all that Israel should be, and through whom Israel will be restored and renewed.[37] Various suggestions have been made as to the Servant's identity. The Servant seems to have a prophetic role (e.g. Isa 49:1–2) and the second and third Servant songs are written in the first person, leading to the conclusion that the Servant may be the prophet himself, though the far-reaching nature of the Servant's ministry makes that unlikely. The Servant is, of course, also linked with Jesus. I have ventured my own suggestion, that the Servant might be a composite figure, including all who help Israel to carry out its own servant calling, including Isaiah; though finding eventual fulfillment in Christ.[38] A vital aspect of Israel's calling in the OT was, as God's witnesses, to reveal his glory to the whole world;[39] and it is not surprising, therefore, that the non-Israelite nations are included within the scope of the renewal brought by the Servant, who will be a *light for the Gentiles* (e.g. Isa 42:6; 49:6).[40] Thus the community that will come

---

[36] See, e.g., Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 383–5; John Goldingay, *Isaiah* (NIBC; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2001), 281–2; John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah 40–66* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 291; Routledge, *OT Theology*, 292.

[37] See further, Robin Routledge, "Is There a Narrative Substructure Underlying the Book of Isaiah," *TynBul 55.2* (2004): 183–204; *OT Theology*, 291–296 (and bibliography).

[38] Routledge, "Narrative Substructure," 204.

[39] See, e.g., Robin Routledge, "Mission and Covenant in the Old Testament" in *Bible and Mission: A Conversation Between Biblical Studies and Missiology* (ed. Rollin G. Grams, I. H. Marshall, Peter F. Penner and Robin Routledge; Schwarzenfeld: Neufeld Verlag, 2008), 8–41; *OT Theology*, 319–33; Richard Bauckham, *The Bible and Mission: Christian Witness in a Postmodern World* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2004); Christopher J. H. Wright, *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2006). Some see mission as secondary in the OT, and achieved, primarily, through incorporation into Israel. I have argued, instead, that whilst Israel has a prominent place in God's purposes for the world, God's commitment to the world, as evident in creation and in the covenant with Noah (Gen 9:9–17) precedes his commitment to Israel, and that Israel was called primarily to demonstrate in their life together as the people of God, the relationship that God had always intended for all nations; see Routledge, "Mission and Covenant."

[40] The significance of this and the (possibly) parallel expression, "covenant to the people," has been debated. Whilst a nationalistic interpretation is not impossible, it is more natural, and more in keeping with its Isaianic usage, to see "light" in terms of enlightenment and salvation (cf. 9:2; 42:16; 45:7)—which is here extended to the

into being through the ministry of the Servant is one that is made up of all peoples.

In Isaiah 56–66 the nations again have prominence. Some have suggested that these chapters have a chiastic or concentric structure, which begins and ends with references to foreign nations (56:1–8; 66:18–23).[41] Foreigners, whose involvement in the religious life of the nation had previously been limited,[42] will be included on the basis of their faithful obedience, represented by keeping the Sabbath and holding fast to the covenant (56:6). And towards the end of the book we see God's glory being proclaimed among the nations (66:19): probably by the survivors of Israel.[43] This suggests full inclusion of the nations in the worship of Yahweh,[44] maybe even to the extent of serving as priests (56:6; 66:19).[45]

---

non-Israelite nations. See, e.g., Brueggemann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 44, 112; John Goldingay, *Isaiah 40–55: A Literary-Theological Commentary* (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 164–5; 377; *Isaiah*, 241–2, 283; Hanson, *Isaiah 40–66*, 46–47; Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66*, 117–9, 293–4; Schultz, "Nationalism and Universalism," 136.

[41] See, e.g., Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66*, 461–465; cf. Goldingay, *Isaiah*, 373; Paul D. Hanson, *Isaiah 40–66* (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 1995), 196. Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 301.

[42] The Hebrew noun used in Isa 56:3 for "foreigner" is ***nēkār*** (the related adjective is ***nokrî***). This group is specifically excluded from celebrating the Passover in Exod 12:43. However, Ruth, who is also described as ***nokrî***, does appear to be incorporated into the national life of Israel. And in his prayer at the dedication of the temple, Solomon envisages ***nokrî*** calling to Israel's God (1 Kgs 8:41–43). This suggests that the ***nēkār*** who binds himself the Yahweh may have a status that is similar to that of a ***gēr***—a resident alien (see the discussion below). The reference to holding fast to the covenant points to an existing (if precarious) relationship. See, e.g., A. H. Konkel, "***nēkār***," *NIDOTTE* 1:108–9; D. Lang, "***nkr***," *TDOT* 9:423–31.

[43] The Hebrew noun here is ***pĕlêṭâ***, which refers to those who escape. It is not the usual term for "remnant" (***šĕ'ār***), though the terms appear to be closely related, and occur together, in parallel, in, e.g., Isa 10:20; 37:31–32; cf. Gen 45:7; Ezra 9:14. If these are the Gentile survivors of a wider judgment on the nations (see, e.g., Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66* [OTL; London: SCM, 1969], 425) it is difficult to see to whom they would be sent. The idea, though, that this refers to the survivors of Israel being sent to make God's glory known to the nations is consistent with the narrative substructure of Isaiah; see Routledge, "Narrative Substructure." See also, Walter Brueggemann, *Isaiah 40–66* (WBC; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 258; Goldingay, *Isaiah*, 373; Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66*, 688–689; Schultz, "Nationalism and Universalism in Isaiah," 130.

[44] Commenting on Isa 56:6–8, Brueggemann suggests that "foreigners are inducted into the full life of the worshiping community, participating in both prayer and sacrifice" (*Isaiah 40–66*, 172); Watts makes a similar observation: "this suggests that there will no longer be a distinction between the natural born and the proselyte" (*New Exodus*, 321); see, also, e.g., Childs, *Isaiah*, 458–9; Hanson, *Isaiah 40–66*, 194–5 Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–55*, 459–61; Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 314. Goldingay maintains that "the community continues to be ethnically based. A confessing community has not replaced it" (*Isaiah*, 317); though the unqualified acceptance of foreigners based

Inclusion of non-Israelites within the worshipping community is not new. Although not accorded full rights alongside native-born Israelites, a foreign resident, *gēr*,[46] who committed himself to the religious life of the nation, including circumcision, was able to take part in, for example, the celebration of the Passover, and was treated in the same way as a native-born Israelite (Exod 12:19, 48–49; Num 9:14)—even being described as part of the "community of Israel" (Exod 12:19). And those who sinned, willfully, were, again like native-born Israelites, "cut off from the people" (Num 15:30; cf. Lev 17:10; 20:1–3; Num 19:10b–13). If, as I have argued elsewhere, to be "cut off from the people" refers to being put outside the protection of the covenant this suggests that the *gēr* in Israel might be included in the covenant relationship between God and his people. In these earlier cases, this would generally be by incorporation into the physical nation of Israel;[47] and that idea may still be present within the complex universalism of the Book of Isaiah, though there is also the sense in which this gives way to the nations being brought into relationship with God as entities in their own right. That distinction is important in the discussion of the relationship between God and the non-Israelite nations. For the purpose of this argument, however, it does not need to be pressed. The Remnant, which constitutes the people of God in the era of salvation, is made up of the faithful of Israel (which may include the *gēr* and other foreigners who have bound themselves to the nation), as well as those from other nations who have, similarly, put their trust in Israel's God. And it is with this ethnically inclusive community of faith that the church identifies itself.

The Church: Continuity with the OT People of God

As we have seen, NT writers use designations originally related to Israel to describe the Church. I have argued that this is not an arbitrary reapplication; rather it is consistent with the development of the nature of God's people through the OT and its continuity with the community of those who put their faith in Christ.

We have noted something of that in relation to the Remnant: the ethnically inclusive community of those who are faithful to God, who will accept and benefit from the reign of the Messiah in the era of salvation. NT writers identify Jesus as the Messiah, and the Church as the faithful community over

---

on their faithfulness together with rejection of natural born Israelites as a result of their unfaithfulness seems to be moving inexorably in that direction.

[45] See, e.g., Brueggemann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 259; Childs, *Isaiah*, 542; Hanson, *Isaiah 40–66*, 195; Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66*, 459–60, 690; Watts, *New Exodus*, 319; Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 426.

[46] See, e.g., D. Kellermann, "*gūr*," *TDOT* 2:439`–449; A. H. Konkel, "*gwr*," *NIDOTTE* 1:836–839;

[47] See, e.g., Charles H. H. Scobie, "Israel and the Nations: An Essay in Biblical Theology," *TynBul* 43.2 (1992): 283–305 esp. 286–7.

which he presides. Jesus is also identified as God's Servant.[48] As we have seen, the Servant both embodies God's people, and is the one through whom God's purposes for his people, made up of Israelites and non-Israelites, are fulfilled. As God's Servant, Jesus, too, embodies all that Israel was meant to be, and is the one through whom the new community of God's people, comprising both Jews and non-Jews who put their trust in him, comes into being.

This is highlighted in the recent emphasis on NT writers' development of the Isaianic second exodus motif. Isaiah 40–55 portrays the return from exile in Babylon as a second and better exodus, which would herald the restoration and renewal of the nation, and the coming of God's kingdom. Although the return did take place, it was not as glorious as anticipated, and Isaiah 56–66 appears to address that disappointment and disillusionment. N. T. Wright and others suggest that this sense of disappointment continued into the first century C.E.[49] Geographically the people were back in their own land, but the great promises of restoration had not yet been fulfilled. Thus there was a sense in which the exile was still continuing. The NT writers set the coming of Jesus, against that background. In his life and ministry he re-enacts the narrative of Israel, in order to bring the history of Israel to a climax, and to end to its long bondage.[50] This he offers through a second exodus, brought about through his death and resurrection.[51] In this, there is a typological correspondence between Jesus and Moses;[52] a correspondence highlighted by Jesus' reference to his own "exodus" in Luke 9:31. This could simply be referring to his coming death. However other allusions to the exodus in Luke's gospel, and particularly the occurrence of this statement in the context of a conversation with Moses, suggests, too, a link with Israel's deliverance from bondage.[53]

---

[48] E.g. Matt 12:18; Luke 2:32; Acts 8:35

[49] N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1992), 268–72, 299–301; see also Richard J. Clifford, "The Exodus in the Christian Bible: The Case For 'Figural' Reading," *Theological Studies* 63 (2002): 345–61 esp. 352–354; David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Biblical Studies Library; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 143–6.

[50] Wright, *People of God*, 401–3.

[51] Wright, *People of God*, 388–9.

[52] As well as direct comparisons (e.g. John 1:17; 3:14; Heb 3:1–6) there are allusions and intertextual links; see, e.g., Peter E. Enns, "Creation and Re-creation: the Interpretation of Psalm 95 in Hebrews 3:1–4:13," *WJT* 55 (1993): 255–80 esp. 270–272; Fred L. Fisher, "The New and Greater Exodus: The Exodus Pattern in the New Testament," *SWJT* 20.1 (1977): 69–79 esp. 75–77; Richard D. Patterson and Michael Travers, "Contours of the Exodus Motif In Jesus' Earthly Ministry," *WTJ* 66 (2004): 25–47 esp. 39–42; Kurt Queller, "'Stretch Out Your Hand!' Echo and Metalepsis in Mark's Sabbath Healing Controversy," *JBL* 129.4 (2010): 737–58.

[53] See Susan R. Garrett, "Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1–24," *CBQ* 52 (1990): 656–80; David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 128–9; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 381–2.

The significance of the new exodus for NT writers is explored in several recent discussions.[54] Rikki Watts explores the significance of the new/second exodus for Mark's gospel. He argues that Mark's introductory sentence (1:1–3 cf. Isa 40:3) sets out the conceptual framework of the book.[55] He, too, notes the sense of disappointment that followed the return from exile,[56] and the hope of a new exodus, whose fulfillment is inaugurated through Christ's ministry.[57] David Pao looks at the new exodus, particularly in relation to Acts. Like Watts he notes the significance of the quotation from Isaiah 40:3–5 (Luke 3:4–6), describing it as the "hermeneutical lens"[58] for Luke's writings. His discussion has implications for identity of the Church: God's continuing purposes for his people, being worked out through the book of Acts, include Jews and Gentiles, and thus the Christian community as a whole may be properly construed as "the true people of God."[59]

This new exodus, enacted through Christ, is also related to the work of the Spirit. In Isaiah 63:7–14 God's leading of his people through the desert is closely associated with presence and activity the Spirit (cf. Neh 9:20).[60] Keesmaat sees an intertextual link between this and the reference to being "led by the Spirit" in Romans 8:14.[61] And argues that there are further echoes

---

[54] E.g. Andrew C. Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study of the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John* (WUNT 2/158; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Garrett, "Exodus;" Sylvia C. Keesmat, *Paul and His Story: (Re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition* (JSNTSup 181; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Dave Mathewson, "New Exodus as a Background for 'the Sea was no More' in Revelation 21:1c," *TrinJ* 24NS (2003): 243–58; Rodrigo J. Morales, *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel: New Exodus and New Creation Motifs in Galatians* (WUNT 2/282; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Pao, *Acts*; Patterson and Travers, "Contours;" Watts, *New Exodus*; William J. Webb, *Returning Home: New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1* (JSNTSup 85; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993); William N. Wilder, *Echoes of the Exodus Narrative in the Context and Background of Galatians 5:18* (SBL; New York: Peter Lang, 2001).

[55] Watts, *New Exodus*, 370.

[56] Watts, *New Exodus*, 67, 73, 104.

[57] Watts, *New Exodus*, 383.

[58] Pao, *Acts*, 37, 45.

[59] Pao, *Acts*, 5, 65, 83, 249.

[60] According to Sklba, Isa 63:11–14 and Neh 9:20 are post-exilic retellings of the exodus story, giving prominence to the Spirit, who will also take an active role in Israel's restoration; see Richard J. Sklba, "'Until the Spirit from on High Is Poured out on Us' (Isa 32:15): Reflections on the Role of the Spirit in the Exile," *CBQ* 46 (1984): 1–17 esp. 13. Paul appears to do something similar in 2 Cor 3:16–18, where he links the "Lord" in the exodus narrative (v. 16 cf. Exod 34:4) with the activity of the "Spirit;" see, e.g., Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997), 199–202; C. K. Barrett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Blacks NT Commentary, 2d ed.; London: A. & C. Black, 1973), 122–3.

[61] Sylvia C. Keesmat, "Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8.14–30," *JSNT* 54 (1994): 29–56 esp. 40. The Greek verb, *agō*, occurs in

of exodus language in the designation "sons of God;"[62] and in the reference to God's "firstborn"[63] which, in Romans 8:29 refers to Jesus. Keesmaat also notes allusions to the exodus in the contrast between "sonship" and slavery, in Galatians 4–5.[64] Morales, too, notes the contrast between slavery, as a result of being under the curse of the law, and sonship, through the Spirit. The possible link with Isaiah 63:14 suggests that Paul saw this restoration in terms of a new exodus.[65] Like Keesmaat, he notes, further, the link between being "led by the Spirit" (this time in Gal 5:18) and Isaiah 63:14, and, following Wilder, points, too, to Psalm 143:10, which may also include exodus typology.[66]

The exodus is a paradigm for redemption is evident in both testaments. Through the exodus God demonstrated his commitment to his people and his power to act on their behalf. Following the Babylonian exile, God promised a new exodus: a new act of redemption that would also bring about a new creation of Israel and of the whole created order. According to the NT writers, that promise has been fulfilled in Christ, the new Moses, who leads his people, now made up of Jews and Gentiles, out of slavery and death and into new life as the children of God, and into the blessings of a new age.

This discussion thus points to continuity between the Old and New Testament people of God—with the latter viewed as *fulfilling* rather than *replacing* the former. The community of faith to which the OT points, is not *replaced by* the Church, it *is* the Church, where the Church is rightly understood, not institutionally, but as the ethnically inclusive people of God.

Conclusion

This remains a sensitive area of discussion and commentators are understandably, and probably rightly, cautious about using language that might in any way suggest replacement when talking about the relationship between the church and Israel. Equally, though, they should not tie themselves in semantic knots trying to avoid terms that others might choose to construe pejoratively. There is nothing intrinsically anti-Semitic in the insistence that the hope of salvation for all human beings, including Jews, lies only through faith in Jesus Christ. And, notwithstanding the tragic record of the church over the

---

Isa 63:14 (LXX) and Rom 8:14 (and Gal 5:18). The link is even closer in the LXX which refers to the Spirit giving "guidance" (MT: "rest"). For textual discussion see, e.g., Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66*, 609.

[62] Keesmaat, "Exodus," 38–39.

[63] Ibid. 40–41.

[64] Sylvia C. Keesmaat, "Paul and His Story: Exodus and Tradition in Galatians," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 300–33.

[65] Morales, *Spirit*, 127–9, 149.

[66] Ibid. 146–151; see also Wilder, *Echoes*.

years, nor is there anything intrinsically anti-Semitic in the view that the Christian community, which was, in the first instance, predominantly Jewish, and which should continue to be ethnically inclusive, fulfills the hope of the people of God in the OT.

This fulfillment view is, in my view, consistent both with the developing understanding in the OT of the people of God as a community of faith, and with the NT portrayal of the Church as continuous with that community of faith. Certainly, there are implications for the way we interpret the OT in general, and in particular passages that point to the physical restoration and exaltation of Israel, and this needs further consideration. However it does provide a legitimate basis on which OT passages that relate to Israel's calling, relationship with God, purpose, and future hope, may be re-applied directly to Christian believers who, through Christ, are the embodiment of the OT people of God.