<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

From Eloquence to Evading Responsibility : The Rhetorical Functions of Quotations in Paul's Argumentation

Kujanpää, Katja

2017

Kujanpää, K 2017, ' From Eloquence to Evading Responsibility : The Rhetorical Functions of Quotations in Paul's Argumentation ', Journal of Biblical Literature 185-202 . <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1361.2017.173011>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/299335>

<https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1361.2017.173011>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Katja Kujanpää
University of Helsinki
Finland
katja.kujanpaa@helsinki.fi

This is a post-print version of an article published in the Journal of Biblical Literature 136, 2017, pp. 185–202. There are minor differences between this version and the published one. Please consult the published article for page numbers and for citations.

From Eloquence to Evading Responsibility:

The Rhetorical Functions of Quotations in Paul's Argumentation

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to highlight the variety of functions that quotations perform in Paul's argumentation in light of two modern theories on quoting. First, psycholinguists Herbert Clark and Richard Gerrig's Demonstration Theory describes various functions a quotation may perform in a discourse. Second, the Proteus Principle of Meir Sternberg sheds light on the process of recontextualizing quotations, which serves as a starting point for analyzing Paul's strategies in integrating quotations into his own argumentation. Both theories can be illustrated by textual examples from Rom 9–11, and they bring conceptual clarity to recent debates about Paul's use of Scripture. The final section addresses questions that arise when modern theories are applied to ancient texts and discusses the relevance of such approaches for the study of Paul's argumentation.

1. Introduction

Removing all scriptural quotations in Rom 10 would shorten the chapter by one third. It is an example of a passage in which quotations are an integral part of Paul's argumentation. This essay addresses the following questions: What functions do the quotations have in the argumentation? How are they related to each other and to the parts Paul formulated? Does their original literary context still "echo" through them?

Some scholars label Paul's quotation practice "proof-texting,"¹ a term that raises objections among others and leads to apologetic assertions of Paul's serious theological wrestling with the scriptures. Both this kind of labeling and apologetic approaches aimed at justifying Paul's use of scriptures tend to apply a binary framework that obscures the wide variety of argumentative functions of quotations. The aim in this article is to shed light on these various functions by introducing two modern theories on quoting and thereby examining the argumentative roles of quotations beyond

¹ For example, see Ed P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 21–22, 53 n. 25; Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, WUNT 29 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 68–9. For a slightly different use of the concept of a proof-text, see Shiu-Lun Shum, *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans. A Comparative Study of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran Sectarian Texts*, WUNT II 156 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 243 n. 195.

the category of proof.² These approaches also contribute to recent debates related to Paul's use of scriptures by bringing conceptual clarity into the discussion.

First, psycholinguists Herbert Clark and Richard Gerrig's Demonstration Theory describes various functions a quotation may perform.³ Applied to Paul's argumentation, the theory serves to highlight the multifaceted rhetorical effects of his scriptural quotations. Second, Meir Sternberg, a literary critic, examined the recontextualization process of a quotation.⁴ Given that there is always a transformation in meaning when a quotation is taken from its original context and inserted into a new one, Sternberg refers to the phenomenon as the "Proteus Principle" after the shape-changing sea-god of Greek mythology.⁵ This theory functions as a starting point for analyzing Paul's strategies in integrating quotations from different sources into his own argumentation. As I will show, he creates unity between the quotations and the rest of the discourse by actively framing them with elements that influence their interpretation. Both theories will be illustrated by means of textual examples from Rom 9–11, in which quotations are frequent and form an integral part of the argumentation.⁶ The final part of the article addresses the questions that arise when modern theories are applied to ancient texts and discusses the relevance of the approaches for the study of Paul's argumentation.

This article concentrates on "direct" or "explicit" quotations. A scriptural reference is defined as a quotation if it has 1) an introduction formula, or 2) an established formula used for textual interpretation (cf. τοῦτ' ἔστιν in Rom 10:6), or 3) a clear syntactical or stylistic tension with the surrounding text (like an abrupt change of personal pronouns or verb forms), or 4) significant verbal correspondence with a certain scriptural passage. The last criterion is disputed among scholars and open to various interpretations. More important than having a certain amount of words quoted in

² Why not start with ancient quotation theory instead? Unfortunately, the ancient rhetoric offers few guidelines on the matter. Aristotle remarks on the usefulness of appealing to "ancient witnesses" in court rhetoric, meaning "the poets and all other notable persons whose judgments are known to all" (Aristotle, *Rhet.* I:15 [Roberts]). Referring to maxims, that is, general sayings usually related to proper conduct, he observes that their use "is appropriate only to elderly men, and in handling subjects in which the speaker is experienced" (Aristotle, *Rhet.* II:21 [Roberts]). According to Quintilian, quoting "the happy sayings of the various authors" is especially useful in court: "For phrases which have not been coined merely to suit the circumstances of the lawsuit of the moment carry greater weight and often win greater praise than if they were our own" (Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* II.7.4 [Butler, LCL]). In addition, quoting poets shows the learning of the speakers and enhances the eloquence of the speech, which gives pleasure to the audience (*Inst. Orat.* I.8.10–12). Apart from these remarks, there are no well-known principles that could be applied to Paul's use of quotations. See also Dennis L. Stamps, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 27–30.

³ Herbert Clark and Richard Gerrig, "Quotations as Demonstrations," *Language* 66 (1990).

⁴ Meir Sternberg, "Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse," *Poetics Today* 3 (1982).

⁵ I am indebted to Christopher D. Stanley's article "Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method," 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), 44–58. Stanley presents several modern theories on quoting (including those of Clark and Gerrig and Sternberg), and discusses their relevance to biblical studies. He broadens the scope of theories further in his monograph *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 22–37. However, Stanley does not systematically apply these theories to the study of concrete passages, or even illustrate them with textual examples.

⁶ The field of quotation studies is fragmentary, for quotations are studied in different disciplines without a common theoretical framework. I concentrate on Clark and Gerrig's and Sternberg's theories in this article, because they can be sensibly applied to research on written texts, and they offer concrete tools for that. For other approaches to quotations, see Stanley, *Arguing*, 22–37.

a chain are the frequency of words and forms. However, all the examples used in this article already fulfill at least one of the first three criteria.

2. Quotations as Demonstrations

2.1 Demonstration Theory

Herbert Clark and Richard Gerrig's Demonstration Theory explains why direct quotations are used in a discourse.⁷ Although some features of the theory apply only to spoken communication, many of the key observations can also be applied to written texts. According to Clark and Gerrig, direct quotations are used for stylistic and rhetorical reasons when the person doing the quoting wishes to show what the original communication situation was like. Quotations do not describe the situation, but "demonstrate" it from a certain point of view.⁸ Thus, "quotations are intended to give the audience an experience of what it would be like in certain respects to experience the original event."⁹ However, a quotation is not intended to relay all aspects of the original event, but the speakers quoting choose what to include and what to leave out according to what they wish to "demonstrate" with the quotation.¹⁰

Clark and Gerrig divide the different functions of quotations into two main categories, "detachment" and "direct experience." When speakers indicate that they are quoting they distance themselves from the contents of the quotation. This is useful if they need to relay someone's utterance word-for-word (such as in a law-court), if they do not wish to take responsibility for the utterance, or if they wish to strengthen their rapport with the audience by quoting from a source that unites them with its members. "Direct experience" means that quotations enable the addressees to become engrossed in an event and even to re-experience it vividly. Quotations invite the audience to experience the situation from a certain perspective according to who is speaking. Part of the direct experience is that quotations in spoken discourse help to "demonstrate" elements of the communication event that would be difficult to describe, such as the tone of voice or an emotion.¹¹ In the following I elaborate on three functions defined by Clark and Gerrig that seem to be most applicable for examining Paul's quotations: dissociation of responsibility, lending vividness, and increasing solidarity.

2.2 Dissociation of Responsibility

According to Clark and Gerrig, a quotation can be used "to convey information implicitly that it might be more awkward to express explicitly."¹² Quotations enable authors to create distance between themselves and the quotation so that they cannot be held responsible for it. Clark and Gerrig call this function "dissociation of responsibility."

Paul resorts to quotations for this purpose repeatedly in Rom 9–11, especially when making far-reaching theological claims about the intentions and purposes behind divine action. Formulating

⁷ Clark and Gerrig, "Quotations," 764–805. The theory is also adopted by Elizabeth Wade, see Elizabeth Wade and Herbert Clark, "Reproduction and Demonstration in Quotations," *Journal of Memory and Language* 32 (1993): 805–19.

⁸ Clark and Gerrig, "Quotations," 764–66, 769–74; Wade and Clark, "Reproduction," 807–8.

⁹ Wade and Clark, "Reproduction," 808.

¹⁰ Clark and Gerrig, "Quotations," 774–5.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 792–4.

¹² *Ibid.*, 792, citing Ronald K. S. Macaulay, "Polyphonic Monologues: Quoted Direct Speech in Oral Narratives," *International Pragmatics Association Papers in Pragmatics* 1 (1987): 2.

statements like these in their own words would make authors easy targets of criticism. After all, who are they to analyze divine purposes and to explain God's reasons? However, when a statement is expressed through a quotation, the responsibility shifts to the cited text. Paul appears to make some of his most audacious claims through quotations, which can be an effective rhetorical strategy. When he gives the impression of positioning himself in the background and letting the quotations speak for themselves the reader¹³ disinclined to agree with the argumentation is faced not with Paul's authority but with that of scriptures.

The quotation from Deut 32:21 in Rom 10:19 is an example of this kind of dissociation of responsibility: "But I ask, did Israel not understand? First Moses says, 'I will make you¹⁴ jealous (παραζηλώσω) of a non-nation, with a nation lacking understanding I will make you angry.'"¹⁵ The quotation derives from the Song of Moses, in which Moses foretells the unfaithfulness of the people and describes its consequences. In the original context of the verse, God is provoked into jealous anger by the idolatrous behavior of Israel and, in turn, provokes jealous anger in Israel by allowing a hostile nation to harass them. Although this is a prophecy of doom for Israel, ultimately the goal of the provocation is to make the people turn back to their God (Deut 32:39).¹⁶ Both the immediate context of the quotation in Romans and its original context in Deuteronomy indicate that "you" refers to Israel. In contrast, the "non-nation" that lacks understanding is given a new interpretation by Paul so that it no longer refers to hostile neighbors but to Gentiles who have been called by God.¹⁷ Therefore, in Romans the quotation suggests that God has turned to Gentiles in order to provoke jealousy in Israel. At this stage of the argument it appears that provoking jealousy in Israel is God's reaction and solution in a situation in which the "disobedient and contrary people" (Rom 10:21) rejects the gospel. Paul returns to this jealousy motif in 11:11–14, where he gives it a positive interpretation.

Paul does not express the idea that God intentionally provokes jealousy in Israel by using Gentiles in his own words, but rather allows the quotation to convey it. However, by using introduction formulae and placing the quotation in a certain context he ensures that the quotation is read in this way. Consequently, the reference to God's purposes and the roles of Israel and Gentiles as part of them that could raise objections appears not to be Paul's own invention but a scriptural prophecy. The potential offense lies in the sacred writing.¹⁸

¹³ The expressions "audience" and "readers" are generally used interchangeably in this article. In practice, of course, most of the audience of Romans were "hearers" of the letter that was read aloud. Here, "reader" does not refer to how a member of the audience becomes acquainted with the letter.

¹⁴ Paul changes the personal pronouns of Deut 32:21 from the third (αὐτούς) to the second person plural (ὕμῃς). The substitution can be traced to Paul, for it finds no support in the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint, or in the Masoretic text, targums, Vulgate or Peshitta. Nor is there any need to speculate with reference to extant textual traditions, for in its original context (Deut 32:20–27) the third person plural is used consistently and is totally unproblematic. In Romans, however, the second person plural is used as a rhetorical device that highlights the quotation by distinguishing it from the preceding discourse, thus making it more impressive. Cf. 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), 143; Ross J. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*, NTS 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 190.

¹⁵ The translations of biblical texts are my own.

¹⁶ For the background and dynamics of "jealousy," see Richard H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11*, WUNT II 63 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).

¹⁷ Cf. 9:25–26 in which Gentiles are referred to as "Not My People" (οὐ λαός μου).

¹⁸ That was Paul to some extent aware of the controversial nature of such a scheme is suggested by the careful and considerate manner he discusses the interdependence of Gentiles and Israel in chapter 11 (11:11, 15, 28–32).

2.3 Vividness and Drama

Ancient rhetoricians were conscious that quotations brought vividness and variety into a speech—a device to be used at the right time, in the right place and by the right speakers.¹⁹ Clark and Gerrig analyze this effect more closely, suggesting that the audience may become engrossed in an event through a quotation: “When we hear an event quoted, it is as if we directly experience the depicted aspects of the original event.”²⁰ The addressees enter the scene from which the quotation derives. However, in oral communication the speakers quoting can never reproduce all the aspects of the original event, and rather select the aspects they wish to highlight. Thus they have the power to decide which elements to include in their “demonstration” and which to leave out.²¹ In the case of written texts, the authors quoting make similar choices when they delineate a certain passage and detach it from its original context. Many aspects of the original passages are not transferred to the new environment of the quoted words. The selective character of quoting is clearly visible in Paul’s writing: apparently he did not consider it necessary to quote a sentence as a whole, frequently condensing it and sometimes even omitting words from the middle.²²

The function of adding vividness and drama to the argument is especially relevant to the study of quotations in Rom 9–11, in a remarkable number of which God speaks in the first person singular. These quotations bring liveliness to the argumentation, for instead of speaking of God, they allow God to speak for himself. For example, in Rom 9:17 Paul quotes Exod 9:16: “For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, ‘For this very purpose I have raised you up, that I might show in you my power and that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth.’” Interestingly, although the introduction formula presents “the Scripture” as the speaker, it is obvious that the one who has raised Pharaoh up and whose name shall be proclaimed is not Scripture but God. This phenomenon will be discussed in detail below.²³ God, speaking in the first person singular, addresses his words to Pharaoh and declares his motives and plans. The dialogical element that is built into the quotation invites the audience of Romans to follow the confrontation between God and hardened Pharaoh. It enables the audience to enter the scene, experience the situation and “hear” God’s own voice. Instead of quoting, Paul could have paraphrased the passage: “For the Scripture says that Pharaoh was raised because of God’s very purpose to show his power in him, and to make God’s name proclaimed in all the earth.” However, Paul would have lost the drama and intensity inherent in the quotation. Moreover, quoting God speaking in the first person singular is an appropriate rhetorical device in Rom 9, where Paul consistently emphasizes the sovereignty of divine action. Allowing God to speak directly serves this emphasis because such quotations highlight God’s active agency.

2.4 Increasing Solidarity

Quotations can be used to strengthen rapport with the audience. Quoting from a source that unites the audience and the author confirms their common bond and renders the audience more favorable towards the author. This effect is widely recognized in New Testament studies: when Paul is addressing a Roman audience he has never met, it is natural that he appeals to a common body of texts. However, as quotations can “demonstrate” only some aspects of the original event (or in the

¹⁹ See above footnote 2.

²⁰ Clark and Gerrig, “Quotations,” 793. See also Wade and Clark, “Reproduction,” 808.

²¹ Clark and Gerrig, “Quotations,” 774–75.

²² On this phenomenon, see Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*, BHT 69 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1986), 115–32.

²³ See below 4.1.

case of written texts, they convey only some aspects of the original literary context), the audience commonly needs background information to interpret them in the intended way. This, in fact, enhances the rhetorical effect of strengthening the rapport, as Clark and Gerrig aptly explain: “When speakers demonstrate only a snippet of an event, they tacitly assume that their addressees share the right background to interpret it in the same way they do. In essence, they are asserting, ‘I am demonstrating something we both can interpret correctly,’ and that implies solidarity.”²⁴

Rom 9:7 is an example of a quotation that requires prior scriptural knowledge from the audience, for Paul does not provide many interpretative clues: “And not all are children because they are Abraham’s offspring, but ‘In Isaac shall offspring be named for you’ [Gen 21:12].” That the latter half of the verse is a quotation from an external source is something the audience can deduce from the abrupt change in person (“for you”): someone is clearly being addressed. In this case only very basic prior knowledge is needed. The audience is expected to know that Isaac is Abraham’s son and thus one of the children mentioned in the sentence that precedes the quotation. In addition, they have to realize that the speaker here is God, giving a promise to Abraham, for without this understanding Paul’s argument would be unintelligible. Referring to a shared tradition without the need to articulate this information reminds the audience that they are insiders together with the author. They share a common narrative that Paul can cite elliptically while trusting that the audience can follow him.

What Clark and Gerrig do not discuss is the common-sense observation that if a quotation is too elliptic, obscure, or from an unknown source, the rapport between the audience and the person quoting will hardly be strengthened. The example from Rom 9:7 requires knowledge only of the basic features of a patriarchal narrative. However, the extent of scriptural knowledge Paul presupposes from his audience in Romans in general is debated. In maximalist terms, Paul is inviting his readers to make connections between different scriptural passages and to listen to subtle intertextual echoes from texts that he does not cite, but which are situated in the original literary context of the quotations or have thematic or verbal links to them.²⁵ In this case he would assume that his readers have high scriptural competence. On the other hand, it is possible to outline the minimum amount of scriptural knowledge the audience needs to be able to follow the argumentation. For example, although there are nine quotations in Rom 9:6–29, the argumentation is completely accessible to an audience whose members are aware that Isaac was not Abraham’s only son, that Jacob and Esau were twins, that Pharaoh was hardened and that Sodom and Gomorrah should be associated with destruction.²⁶ This does not imply that Paul pictured all of his audience as having only modest scriptural competence, nor that readers with modest competence necessarily represented Paul’s ideal audience. It only demonstrates that, although Paul quotes scriptures constantly, he ensures that his argument is also intelligible to readers with fairly modest scriptural literacy.²⁷ The focus in the following section is on how Paul accomplishes this by giving his audience interpretative clues that help them to read the recontextualized quotations as he intended them to be read.

²⁴ Clark and Gerrig, “Quotations,” 793.

²⁵ For examples, see footnote 46.

²⁶ See also Stanley, *Arguing*, 145–70 and especially 172–3, where he traces the reading experience of three hypothetical reader groups and estimates their capabilities of following Paul’s line of thought.

²⁷ Compare this with Stanley’s more straightforward suggestion that “Paul constructed his biblical arguments for an ‘implied audience’ that was incapable of consulting the original context of most of his biblical references.” (Christopher D. Stanley, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters,” in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley [Atlanta: SBL, 2008], 155. See also Stanley, *Arguing*, 174–6)

3 From One “Network of Relations” to Another: Framing the Quotation

3.1 Inevitable Change

Meir Sternberg examines the effect that recontextualization has on a quotation when it is detached from its original context and inserted into a new one.²⁸ Sternberg argues that a shift in meaning is *inevitable* in the recontextualization process because a quotation always belongs to “a network of relations.” The quoted passage has a frame that encloses and regulates it. When it is extracted from the framing elements that influence its interpretation and inserted into a new frame with different regulating elements there is bound to be a change in the meaning of the quotation.²⁹

3.2 Changing the “Network of Relations”

Verse Rom 10:6 in which Paul quotes Deut 30:12 serves to illustrate what Sternberg means by “a network of relations.” In its immediate original context the question of going up to heaven is framed by the idea of observing the commandment (Table 1).

Table 1. Deut 30:11–14

For this commandment that I command you today is not immoderate nor is it far away from you. It is not above in the sky,	Context of observing the commandment (bold)
so that one should say,	Introduction
<i>‘Who will go up to heaven</i> and get it for us. And after hearing it we shall do it. ’ (Deut 30:11–12) ... The word is very near to you, in your mouth and in your heart and in your hands, to do it. ” (Deut 30:14)	<i>The passage quoted in Rom 10:6 (italics)</i>

Paul detaches certain words (in italics) from this network of relations and inserts them into a new one in which they are framed with completely different elements (Table 2).

Table 2. Rom 10:5–6

For Moses writes concerning the righteousness that comes from the law, that “the person who does these things will live by them.” [Lev.18:5]	Previous sentence: introduces the principle of righteousness from the law
But (δὲ)	Contrast
the Righteousness from Faith speaks in this way, “Do not say in your heart, [Deut. 8:17/9:4]:	Introduction formula
<i>‘Who will go up to heaven?’</i> ” [Deut 30:12]	The quoted words
That is,	Interpretation formula

²⁸ Sternberg, “Proteus,” 107–56.

²⁹ Ibid., 108, 131, 152.

to bring Christ down. ³⁰	Paul's interpretation
-------------------------------------	-----------------------

I will leave aside a number of interesting hermeneutical questions related to this quotation and concentrate on examining the framing elements. This example is exceptionally rich in such elements. The unique introduction formula presents the personified Righteousness from Faith as the speaker of the quotation. In this context, the particle *δέ* implies a contrast with the previous verse 10:5 that presents the dynamics of the “righteousness from the law” (also using a quotation),³¹ which Paul now contrasts with the dynamics of the “righteousness from faith.” The quotation from Deut 30:12 is followed by an interpretation formula *τοῦτ' ἔστιν*, an expression used in both Jewish and Greco-Roman literature to begin an exegetical interpretation.³² The table shows only the most immediate framing elements, but the network of relations extends deeper. For example, verse 10:6 has verbal links to other parts of Rom 9–11, and in some sense the whole letter is part of the frame of the quotation. What the frame completely lacks is the commandment and its observance. Paul frames the quoted passage so that the idea of observing the divine commandment, a distinctive feature of the frame in Deut 30, is in no way transferred to Romans. In contrast, the new frame implies that the personified “Righteousness from Faith” introduces a principle that differs from law observance.

The influence of the “network of relations” on quotations is further exemplified in Rom 10:18, where Paul quotes from Ps 18:5 LXX. The words he quotes are in italics:

The heavens tell of the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims his handiwork. Day to day declares the word and night to night proclaims knowledge. There are no speeches nor words the articulations of which are not heard. *To all the earth went their sound, and to the ends of the world their words.* In the sun he set his dwelling place. (18:2–5 LXX [19:1–4 MT])

In the psalm, the third person plural of the words Paul quotes refers to day and night, and possibly also to the heavens and the firmament. However, in Paul's argumentation the quotation is related to the question of whether everybody has been able to hear the gospel. In the new frame the third person plural appears to refer to the preachers of the good news:

As it is written: “How beautiful are the feet of **those who preach** the good news!” [Isa 52:7] But not all have obeyed the gospel. For Isaiah says, “Lord, who has believed our message?” [Isa 53:1] So the faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes through the word of Christ. But I ask, have they not heard? Indeed they have! “*To all*

³⁰ ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει· μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν.

³¹ The particle could only signify a change of speaker, as Richard B. Hays suggests in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 208 n. 84. Likewise Wagner, *Heralds*, 161 n. 132. However, the context of verses 10:4–8 and the way Paul modifies the quotation from Deuteronomy strongly suggest that he intended to create a contrast between the two principles of righteousness, cf. Koch, *Die Schrift*, 130–31; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, WBC 38 (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 601; Wolfgang Reinbold, “Das Ziel des Gesetzes nach Röm 10,4–13,” in *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Standorte - Grenzen - Beziehungen*, ed. Lutz Doering et al., FRLANT 226 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 301; Friedrich Avemarie, “Israels rätselhafter Ungehorsam: Römer 10 als Anatomie eines von Gott provozierten Unglaubens,” in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the interpretation of Romans 9–11*, ed. Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner, WUNT 257 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 313–4.

³² Koch, *Die Schrift*, 28 n. 23.

the earth went **their** sound, and to the ends of the world **their** words.” [Ps 18:5] (Rom 10:15b–18)

Paul does not change the wording of the quotation but renders it *verbatim*. Neither does he formulate an introduction in which to claim explicitly that the psalmist has prophesied the extent of the preaching of the gospel. However, the recontextualization of the psalm’s words into a new network of relations changes their meaning completely. In Sternberg’s words, “to quote is to mediate, to mediate is to frame and to frame is to interfere and exploit.”³³

4. Paul’s Tools for Recontextualization: the Framing Elements

If Paul’s scriptural quotations are detached from their new context in Romans and inspected without any framing whatsoever, they appear ambiguous, and occasionally their relevance to Paul’s argumentation is far from obvious. However, Paul actively creates connections between the quotations and his own formulations. When he integrates a scriptural passage into his argumentation he frames it with elements that create consistency and make the quotation fit into its new context.

4.1 Introduction Formula: What, from Where, to Whom?

Of the framing elements Paul uses the introduction formula is of greatest significance, and precedes most of his quotations. Occasionally he uses established, formulaic expressions (“as it is written”),³⁴ but more often he tailors the introductions to his argumentative needs. Introduction formulae offer the audience additional information in specifying the content, speaker, addressee or location of the quotation. Most of them feature conjunctions (γάρ, ὡς, καθὼς, δέ) that indicate how the quotation is related to Paul’s own words or other quotations, offering confirmation or indicating a change of topic or speaker, for example.

The introduction formula in Rom 11:2 contains an exceptional number of elements that guide the interpretation of the quotation: “Or do you not know what the Scripture says in Elijah [narratives], how it appeals to God against Israel?” (ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ἐν Ἠλίου τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ;) At its core is a typical formulaic introduction, “The Scripture says” (λέγει ἡ γραφή),³⁵ but the other parts are carefully crafted by Paul. The introduction begins with a rhetorical question that is clearly related to Paul’s claim that God has not abandoned his people (Rom 11:1): “Or do you not know. . .” This beginning anticipates proof or reasoning of some kind. It is characteristic of Paul to use a rhetorical question to advance the argument, but including it in the introduction formula is exceptional. He also specifies the location of the quotation: it is to be found in the Elijah narratives.³⁶ The rest of the introduction indicates to whom the words are directed and what they concern: they are addressed to God and contain an accusation “against Israel.”

The subject of the pleading in this introduction formula is not Elijah but the Scripture. However, in the following quotation it is Elijah who speaks about his experiences in the first person singular (“I

³³ Sternberg, “Proteus,” 108.

³⁴ Paul uses the expression “as it is written” (καθὼς γέγραπται) 18 times in his undisputed letters. The expression is rare in non-Jewish literature, but it is common usage in Jewish (see 2 Kings 14:6, for example). The equivalent phrase in the Qumran scrolls is באשר כתוב (see Koch, *Die Schrift*, 25, 29).

³⁵ Paul uses the expression λέγει ἡ γραφή also in Rom 4:3; 9:17; 10:11; 11:2; Gal 4:30.

³⁶ Similarly Koch 1986, 27 n. 17. Paul usually mentions the name of the alleged author, not the “location” of the quotation, but this introduction formula has parallels in Rom 9:25 (ἐν τῷ Ὡσηῒ) and 1 Cor 9:9 (ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ). Cf. also Mark 12:26 and Luke 20:37.

alone am left”) not the Scripture. Paul obviously expects his readers to identify this speaker with Elijah, although he crafts the introduction to make the Scripture appeal to God against Israel. This inconsistency should not be attributed to careless formulation. On the contrary, it is a recurrent feature of Paul’s introduction formulae.³⁷ As the following examples show, it is characteristic of him to make the Scripture or the assumed author of the writing (such as David) the subject of the introduction formula, although it is unequivocal that the actual speaker in the quotation is someone else, usually God: “First Moses says, *‘I will make you jealous of a non-nation, with a nation lacking understanding I will make you angry’* [Deut 32:21].” (Rom 10:19) “And Isaiah is bold and says, *‘I have been found by those who did seek me, I have become visible to those who did not ask for me’* [Isa 65:1].” (Rom 10:20) In these quotations the person speaking in the first person singular is God both in the original context and in Romans, not Moses or Isaiah. Another illuminating parallel with the curious introduction formula in Rom 11:2 is that in Rom 9:17: “For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, *‘For this very purpose I have raised you up, that I might show my power in you and that my name might be proclaimed on all the earth’* [Exod 9:16].” As already observed above, despite Paul’s way of formulating this introduction, it is God and not the Scripture that brought Pharaoh to power. Therefore, the grammatical subject of Paul’s introduction formulae does not always indicate who the actual speaker of the words is. Readers have to deduce who is speaking, but in most cases the new context of the quotations in Romans makes it fairly obvious.

Paul may have two reasons for formulating introductions in this manner. First, he appears to have systematically avoided writing “God says” when referring to quotations.³⁸ Second, introductions such as this underline the authority of the scriptural witness. Moses, David and Isaiah are all authoritative witnesses for Paul’s arguments. In a similar way, the Scripture is also a witness, although less well specified. In this light the introduction formula in 11:2 is completely understandable: Paul deliberately crafts the introduction to make the Scripture his witness that appeals to God against Israel. From a rhetorical perspective the sentence becomes more dramatic when the Scripture utters the accusation, but the theological consequences were probably even more decisive. It is apparently important for Paul that Israel’s own Scripture testifies against it. He interprets Scripture’s accusations against Israel as prophecies of Israel’s disobedience in reluctance to embrace the gospel, as is repeatedly implied in Rom 9–11 (Rom 9:33; 10:18, 19, 21; 11:8–10). On the other hand, Paul is likewise certain that Israel’s future salvation is firmly founded in Scripture (cf. Rom. 11:25–26).

Hence, in 11:2 Paul carefully crafts a detailed introduction around a short formulaic core, every part of which has a role to play. On the one hand it helps the readers to connect the quotation to a certain narrative in explicitly mentioning Elijah, and on the other hand it connects the quotation to the recurring theme of the Scripture’s testimony against Israel. Paul’s introduction formulae inform

³⁷ Most translators and commentators do not take into account the fact that this inconsistency is characteristic of Paul, which is why they try to fix it in Rom 11:2. Cf. NRSV: “Do you not know what the scripture says of Elijah, how *he* pleads with God against Israel?” Lutherbibel 1912: “Oder wisset ihr nicht, was die Schrift sagt von Elia, wie *er* tritt vor Gott wider Israel und spricht:” Edition de Genève 1979: “Ne savez-vous pas ce que l’Ecriture rapporte d’Elie, comment *il* adresse à Dieu cette plainte contre Israël.”

³⁸ In Romans, Paul never explicitly states in his introduction formulae that God is the speaker of the quoted words, although it is obvious in most cases. However, in Rom 9:15 and 9:25 the subject has to be “the Lord,” but even then readers have to deduce this from the preceding verses. On this curious characteristic of Paul’s introduction formulae, see Hans Hübner, *Gottes Ich und Israel: Zum Schriftgebrauch des Paulus in Römer 9–11*, FRLANT 136 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 42–43; Koch, *Die Schrift*, 31–32.

the audience how a quotation should be approached and read. Through them he actively and deliberately guides the interpretation process of his audience.

4.2 Summarizations and Conclusions

An integral part of the frame of some quotations consists of Paul's summarizations, interpretations and conclusions. However, most quotations lack such explanatory remarks. Quotations are seldom an object of exegesis in the argumentation of Romans, in the sense that Paul would pause to interpret them (as in Rom 10:6–10), but rather tend to function as independent arguments or as confirmation of Paul's claims that he generally does not explain. Occasionally, however, he summarizes in his own words what he intends the quotation to communicate, or draws a conclusion based on it. In Rom 9:15–16, for example, he apparently felt the need to articulate in his own voice the message and relevance of the quoted passage: "For he says to Moses, 'I will have mercy on whom I have mercy and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion' [Exod 33:19]. Therefore (ἀρα οὖν), it depends not on the one willing or the one running but on God who shows mercy." (Rom 9:15–16) Paul uses the expression ἀρα οὖν to introduce his conclusion from the quotation. Willing and running both signify human exertion, which is contrasted here with God's mercy.³⁹ However, the quotation in itself does not draw such a contrast between human action and divine mercy, the focus being solely on God's sovereignty. In his conclusion Paul integrates the quotation into the juxtaposition of human achievements and God's sovereign calling that is at the core of Rom 9. In this case it is not necessary for readers to consult the original literary context and transfer into Romans the meaning the words have in Exodus, for Paul himself provides the interpretative framework in which the quotation should be read.

4.3 Catchwords

The frame of a quotation may also contain catchwords that have a pivotal role in the argumentation and create verbal links between passages. Creating catchword connections has been described as a typical rabbinic method,⁴⁰ but the phenomenon is also well-attested in non-Jewish literature.⁴¹ Paul uses catchwords to strengthen the cohesion between the quotation and other parts of the argumentation.

The verb "to call" (καλέω), for example, functions as a catchword in Rom 9. In Rom 9:25–26 Paul introduces a quotation that is a combination of Hos 2:23 and 1:10, two verses that play with the prophetic names of Hosea's children: "I will call (καλέσω) 'Not My People' 'My People' and 'Not Beloved' 'My Beloved' [Hos 2:23]. And it will be that wherever they are called (κληθήσονται) 'Not My People,' there they will be called (κληθήσονται) 'sons of the living God' [Hos. 1:10]."⁴² The two parts of the combined quotation share the name "Not My People" and the verb call. Calling also

³⁹ Dunn, *Romans*, 553; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 582.

⁴⁰ See, for example, Edward E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays*, WUNT 18 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1978), 214–216; William R. Stegner, "Romans 9:6–29—a Midrash," *JSNT* 22 (1984): 40; Jewett, *Romans*, 571.

⁴¹ John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress 1987), 48, 268, 282. On catchwords in general, see Stephen J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma: Polebridge 1993), 99–102.

⁴² In verse 9:26, the witnesses for the wording of Romans are divided. Although the majority reading of N-A²⁸ follows the Septuagint (οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς), there are good reasons to assume that οὗ ἐὰν κληθήσονται (P⁴⁶ F G ar b d* sy^p) represents the original Pauline formulation, which is why I follow it in my translation; see Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 174; Wagner, *Heralds*, 84–85. However, the variant makes little difference to my analysis in this article (although it further underlines the importance of the verb καλέω in chapter 9).

links the quotation with Paul's own formulation in the previous verse (9:24): "us whom he also *called* (ἐκάλεσεν), not from among Jews only but also from among Gentiles." Calling is also an essential motif at the earlier stages of the argumentation in Rom 9:7 ("In Isaac shall offspring be named [κληθήσεται] for you") and 9:12 ("not because of works but because of him who calls [ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος]"). Thus the catchword καλέω enhances the coherence of chapter 9, for the repetition of the verb connects different passages and leads the reader to interpret them in light of one another. The quotations become more firmly rooted in their new surroundings and can therefore function as integral parts of the argumentation.

5. The Relevance of Quotation Theory for Pauline Studies

After applying Clark and Gerrig's Demonstration Theory and Sternberg's Proteus Principle to quotations in Rom 9–11, it is time to assess what they can contribute to Pauline studies. However, first it is necessary to raise an essential question concerning the Demonstration Theory: can a theory based on modern communication be applied to ancient texts? As I see it, doing so is based on the observation that certain features of communication appear to be relatively timeless. Classical rhetorical devices that were systematically analyzed in ancient treatises on rhetoric are successfully applied to modern advertising and political rhetoric. Conversely, techniques of using quotations that are found effective today may also have been effective in antiquity. Studying the functions of quotations in the New Testament should not, however, be limited only to categories deriving from recent quotation theory, for it is possible that an ancient author also used quotations for purposes that have not been identified in research on modern communication.

What makes Clark and Gerrig's Demonstration Theory relevant for the study of Paul is that it offers new tools with which to analyze the functions of quotations beyond the limited concept of "proof-texting." Although quotations certainly often serve as proof in Paul's argumentation, confirming and supporting his own statements by showing that they are in accordance with scriptures, this is only one of the numerous argumentative functions they perform. A more comprehensive tool-kit makes it possible to articulate the effects of Paul's quotations in more nuanced ways. Different functions of quotations are, obviously, not mutually exclusive, but they do overlap, and one quotation may fulfill several functions that work on different levels: rhetorical effect, stylistic matters, the structuring of the argument, or the relationship with the audience, for example. When the more subtle effects of quotations are analyzed, questions concerning intentionality arise. To what extent did Paul deliberately hope to create a certain rhetorical effect with a quotation? The question is more acute with respect to some functions analyzed in this paper than others. It is well imaginable that Paul intentionally used a quotation in place of his own statement when discussing a delicate matter, thus shifting the responsibility to the quoted text (10:19–21, for example). However, did Paul intend the rhetorical effect that is created by the repeated use of quotations in which God speaks in the first person singular? It goes without saying that he would hardly have explicated the reasons for his abundant use of quotations in the same way as they have been analyzed in this article. However, this does not mean that he was not on some level conscious that the practice was appropriate and advantageous for his argument. It is valuable to make the rhetorical effects of quotations visible even in those cases in which the question to what extent Paul deliberately attempted to create the effects cannot be answered.

The question of intentionality also arises when Paul's techniques of recontextualizing quotations are examined. For example, a recent debate circled around the question whether Paul "respected" the original context of his quotations—a discussion characterized by disputes about what "respect"

and “original context” essentially mean.⁴³ The concepts of “network of relations” and “framing” in Sternberg’s Proteus Principle may offer a viewpoint on the debate. Sternberg concludes: “However accurate the wording of the quotation and however pure the quoter’s motives, tearing a piece of discourse from its original habitat and reconstructing it within a new network of relations cannot but interfere with its effect.”⁴⁴ Therefore, even if Paul did not intend it, he in any case interfered with the “meaning” of a quotation just by framing it with different elements. The interesting question is to what extent did he *intentionally* detach the quotation from its original network of relations and to what extent did he aim at preserving continuity with the original frame?

This question relates to another recent debate among scholars studying Paul’s use of scriptures. In Sternberg’s terminology, which network of relations is decisive in terms of understanding the quotation as part of Paul’s argumentation: the original context or the new frame of the quotation in Paul’s letter?⁴⁵ Did Paul intend his audience to interpret the quotation on the basis of its original literary context or with the help of the interpretive hints he offers? Scholars such as Richard B. Hays and Ross Wagner often appear to assume that the original setting of the quotation “echoes” through the quoted words so that the audience hears much more than only the words that Paul quotes. They argue that this also was Paul’s intention: he built his argumentation so that the wider passage from which the quotation was taken would shed light on it.⁴⁶ In Romans there are passages in which this might indeed, at least to some extent, be the case. For example, knowledge of the plot and inherent logic of the Deut 28–32 would help the audience to understand how God turns away from his people in order to make them return to him again (cf. Rom 10:19). On the other hand, there are numerous examples of Paul systematically ignoring important aspects of the original literary context of the quotation (cf. Rom 10:18). In such cases he frames the quotation with elements that suggest the new interpretation. In general, Paul appears to take great care in framing quotations: he crafts an individual introduction formula for a significant number of his quotations, integrates them into their new surroundings with catchwords, and makes his own summarizations or conclusions about their relevance to the matter at hand. In addition, he modifies the wording of approximately every second quotation, mainly to make them more compatible with his argument.⁴⁷ Together the repeated modification of the wording and the careful framing suggest that rather than preserving continuity

⁴³ The 2012 article collection from The Society of Biblical Literature’s Paul and Scripture Seminar devotes three articles to these questions, see Steve Moyise, “Does Paul Respect the Context of His Quotations?,” 97–114 (see also his response to Kim: 131–9); Mitchell Kim, “Respect for Context and the Authorial Intention: Setting the Epistemological Bar,” 115–29 in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*, ed. Christopher D. Stanley (Atlanta: SBL, 2012).

⁴⁴ Sternberg, “Proteus,” 145.

⁴⁵ Cf. Moyise’s analysis of recent discussion: Steve Moyise, *Paul and Scripture* (London: SPCK, 2010), 111–25.

⁴⁶ For example, see Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 22–23, 36, 177; Wagner, *Heralds*, 62–68.

⁴⁷ Suggesting that Paul modified the wording of his quotations necessitates careful text-critical analysis that aims at reconstructing the wording Paul knew and used (or sometimes perhaps wordings, see Jonathan D. H. Norton, *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus and the Yahad*, LNTS 430 [New York: T&T Clark, 2011], 55–6). Although even the best reconstructions are probabilities rather than certainties, when all preserved text-critical material on the one hand and the function and context of the quotation on the other hand are taken into account, it is possible to trace certain deviances from the Septuagint to Paul’s own redactional activity; cf. Florian Wilk, “Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text,” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, SCS 53 (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 263–4. Koch’s and Stanley’s comprehensive studies on all quotations in undisputed Pauline letters indicate that deviations from the preserved readings of the source text should primarily not be explained with the assumption that Paul was quoting from memory and may not have got the wording quite right. Often it is obvious that the deviating wording is connected to the way Paul uses the quotation. The emerging overview is widely accepted among scholars: Paul regularly changed the wording of the quotations in order to make them more compatible with his argumentation (Koch, *Die Schrift*, 186–90, Wagner, *Heralds*, 14). On the amount of changes, see Koch, *Die Schrift*, 186, Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 348–9.

with the original literary context, Paul frequently disentangles the quotation from it and creates a new framework for its interpretation. Consequently, examining the original literary context is not automatically the key to understanding Paul's intention in quoting scriptures.

In conclusion, Clark and Gerrig's Demonstration Theory and Sternberg's Proteus Principle both open important perspectives on the process of quoting while approaching it from different angles. The Demonstration Theory provides concepts for analyzing the diverse functions of quotations; Sternberg's Proteus Principle for examining the recontextualization process. The contributions of the theories are connected to two perspectives that deserve somewhat more attention among those studying Paul's use of scriptures. The first one is the variety of functions quotations perform and of rhetorical effects they bring about in Paul's argumentation. The second concerns Paul's techniques in framing quotations. Tracing intertextual links between Paul's letters and the original literary context of quotations means concentrating on what he left unsaid. In contrast, the framing elements are actively and deliberately created by Paul and therefore more likely to reveal how he intended the quotation to be read.⁴⁸ Directing more attention to these two matters deepens our understanding of Paul's quoting practice, rhetoric, and argumentation.

Bibliography

Aristotle. *The Works of Aristotle*. Translated by W. R. Roberts et al. 12 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908–1952.

Avemarie, Friedrich. "Israels rätselhafter Ungehorsam: Römer 10 als Anatomie eines von Gott provozierten Unglaubens," Pages 299–320 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Bell, Richard H. *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11*. WUNT II 63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.

Clark, Herbert and Richard Gerrig. "Quotations as Demonstrations." *Language* 66 (1990): 764–805.

Dunn, James D.G. *Romans 9–16*. WBC 38. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.

Ellis, Edward E. *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays*. WUNT 18. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1978.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hübner, Hans. *Gottes Ich und Israel: Zum Schriftgebrauch des Paulus in Römer 9–11*. FRLANT 136. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary of the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

⁴⁸ For this point cf. Stanley, *Arguing*, 175.

Kim, Mitchell. "Respect for Context and the Authorial Intention: Setting the Epistemological Bar," Pages 115–29 in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*. Edited by Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: SBL, 2012.

Kloppenber, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Koch, Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHT 69. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1986.

Macaulay, Ronald K. S. "Polyphonic Monologues: Quoted Direct Speech in Oral Narratives." *International Pragmatics Association Papers in Pragmatics* 1 (1987): 1–34.

Moyise, Steve. *Paul and Scripture*. London: SPCK, 2010.

---. "Does Paul Respect the Context of His Quotations?," Pages 97–114 in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*. Edited by Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: SBL, 2012.

Norton, Jonathan D. H. *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus and the Yahad*. LNTS 430. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

Patterson, Stephen J. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. Sonoma: Polebridge 1993.

Quintilian, ed. *The Institutio Oratoria*. Vol. 1. of *The Institutio Oratoria*. London: Heinemann New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1920–1922.

Reinbold, Wolfgang. "Das Ziel des Gesetzes nach Röm 10,4–13," Pages 297–312 in *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Standorte - Grenzen - Beziehungen*. Edited by Lutz Doering et al., FRLANT 226. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.

Räsänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. WUNT 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.

Sanders, Ed P. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Shum, Shiu-Lun. *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans. A Comparative Study of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran Sectarian Texts*. WUNT II 156. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Stamps, Dennis L. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal," Pages 9–37 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture. Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

---. "Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method," Pages 44–58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel. Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

---. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

---. "Paul's 'Use' of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters," Pages 125–55 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: SBL, 2008.

Stegner, William R. "Romans 9:6–29—a Midrash." *JSNT* 22 (1984): 37–52.

Sternberg, Meir. "Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse." *Poetics Today* 3 (1982): 107–56.

Wade, Elizabeth and Herbert Clark. "Reproduction and Demonstration in Quotations." *Journal of Memory and Language* 32 (1993): 805–19.

Wagner, Ross J. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*. NTS 101. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Wilk, Florian. "Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text," Pages 253–271 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. SCS 53. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.

Zuntz, Günther. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.