

- Hope for the Jews II
- Espérance pour les Israélites
- Hoffnung für die Juden

Sylvain Romerowski, Saints, France

This is the continuation of the essay that began in EuroJTh 6.1. The summaries of the whole essay are given here again, as they were in that issue. In Part II, the author concludes his survey of the promises to Israel in the Old Testament; and in Part III he takes the argument into the Book of Romans.

RÉSUMÉ

La première partie de cet article traite du rôle d'Israël dans l'histoire de la rédemption. Israël a été choisi en vue de la bénédiction de toutes les nations. A cause de ses désobéissances, ce peuple a dû subir le jugement qui a pris la forme d'une destruction des deux royaumes israélites, et de l'exil. Les prophètes de l'AT ont promis de la part de Dieu un salut qui devait comporter deux aspects correspondant à deux étapes distinctes: le retour de l'exil et la conclusion d'une nouvelle alliance qui lui apporterait le pardon de ses fautes et une transformation intérieure. Ce n'est pas tout Israël qui devait bénéficier de ce salut, mais seulement un reste d'Israélites convertis. Dieu opèrerait un tri au sein de son peuple pour en éliminer les rebelles. Par contre, des gens des nations se tourneraient vers lui, et il les incorporerait au peuple de Dieu: ainsi, ceux-ci bénéficieraient des promesses faites à Israël.

Lorsque Jean Baptiste annonce un baptême d'Esprit et de feu, il le présente comme l'oeuvre du Messie par laquelle il va opérer ce tri au sein du peuple d'Israël. Par conséquent, depuis la Pentecôte, le peuple de Dieu est Israël, dont les Juifs incrédules ont été retranchés, et dans lequel les non-Juifs qui croient en Jésus-Christ ont été incorporés.

La deuxième partie est consacrée à la question du rôle du pays d'Israël dans l'histoire du salut. Elle présente la thèse selon laquelle ce pays a joué un rôle semblable à celui du peuple: de même qu'Israël a été choisi en vue de la bénédiction de toutes les nations, son pays a été choisi en vue de la bénédiction de la terre entière. Car d'après les prophètes (et le NT reprend cette ligne de pensée), le pays du peuple de Dieu devait être agrandi, jusqu'à s'étendre à la terre entière. Par conséquent, ce n'est pas par la possession d'un pays particulier que s'accomplissent les prophéties de l'AT, car le territoire qui revient à Israël ne se limite pas au pays de Canaan. Le rôle du pays d'Israël dans l'histoire du salut, et plus particulièrement de Jérusalem, s'est achevé lorsque les événements du salut se sont produits en ce lieu. L'espérance des croyants Israélites aujourd'hui, qu'ils partagent avec les croyants d'origine non-juive, est celle de régner avec Christ sur la terre entière renouvelée.

La troisième partie aborde le sujet de l'espérance pour les Israélites à partir de l'épître aux Romains. L'ensemble du NT, et Paul en particulier, enseignent que les Israélites incroyants ne font plus partie du véritable Israël, le peuple de Dieu. L'auteur étudie le chapitre 11 de l'épître aux Romains, qui a pour but de répondre à la question de savoir si Dieu a rejeté son peuple. Aux yeux de l'auteur, la réponse de Paul comporte trois éléments: 1. Dieu n'a pas rejeté son peuple car il s'est conservé un reste d'Israélites pour les sauver. Dieu a seulement purifié son peuple en retranchant les Israélites incroyants. 2. La porte demeurerait ouverte au temps de

Paul (et l'est encore actuellement) pour les Israélites inconvertis: s'ils se tournent vers Christ avec foi, ils peuvent encore être sauvés et être réintégrés dans le peuple de Dieu. 3. Un jour, 'tout Israël sera sauvé'. Par là, il faut comprendre que Dieu va faire quelque chose de spécial pour le peuple d'Israël à la fin de l'ère présente: les Israélites qui seront alors en vie se tourneront vers Christ en tant que peuple et recevront le salut. Dieu agira de la sorte, non pas parce

que les Israélites inconvertis auraient conservé un droit quelconque, mais en vertu de sa grâce envers un peuple qui a perdu tout droit à un quelconque privilège.

Dans la dernière partie, l'auteur répond à ceux qui pensent que l'on ne devrait plus annoncer l'Evangile aux Juifs et affirme que cette activité demeure une obligation pour l'Eglise aujourd'hui.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der erste Teil dieses Artikels behandelt die Rolle Israels in der Heilsgeschichte. Israel ist im Hinblick auf die Segnung aller Nationen auserwählt worden. Aufgrund seines Ungehorsams mußte das Volk das Gericht erdulden, das in der Vernichtung der beiden israelitischen Königreiche sowie im Exil bestand. Die Propheten des AT haben im Auftrag Gottes eine Rettung verheißen, die zwei Aspekte, mit zwei verschiedenen Etappen korrespondierend, aufweisen sollte: die Rückkehr aus dem Exil und den Schluß eines neuen Bundes, der den Israeliten die Vergebung ihrer Schuld und eine innerliche Umwandlung bringen werde. Doch nicht ganz Israel sollte von diesem Heil profitieren, sondern nur ein Rest bekehrter Israeliten. Gott wird im Innersten seines Volkes eine Auswahl vornehmen, um die Rebellen unter ihnen auszulöschen. Demgegenüber werden sich Leute aus den Nationen zu ihm wenden, und er wird sie dem Volk Gottes einverleiben, so daß erstere von den Verheißungen, die an Israel ergangen sind, profitieren werden.

Als Johannes der Täufer eine Taufe des Geistes und des Feuers ankündigte, präsentierte er sie als Werk des Messias, wodurch dieser die Auswahl im Innersten seines Volkes Israel vornehmen wird. Deshalb ist das Volk Gottes seit Pfingsten ein Israel, aus dem die ungläubigen Juden herausgeschnitten und in das die

Nichtjuden, die an Jesus Christus glauben, einverleibt worden sind.

Der zweite Teil ist der Frage gewidmet, welche Rolle das Land Israels in der Heilsgeschichte spielt. Er unterbreitet die These, daß das Land eine ähnliche Rolle spielt wie das Volk: wie Israel im Hinblick auf die Segnung aller Nationen erwählt worden ist, so ist auch sein Land im Hinblick auf die Segnung der ganzen Erde erwählt worden. Denn nach den Propheten (und das NT nimmt diesen Gedankengang auf) sollte das Land des Volkes Gottes vergrößert werden, bis es sich über die gesamte Erde erstreckt. Aus diesem Grund bedeutet die Inbesitznahme eines bestimmten Landes nicht die Erfüllung der alttestamentlichen Weissagungen, denn das Gebiet, das Israel zurückerhalten soll, ist nicht auf das Land Kanaan begrenzt. Die Rolle des Landes Israels, und vor allem Jerusalems, in der Heilsgeschichte ist vollendet, sobald sich die Heilsgeschehnisse an diesem Ort vollzogen haben. Die heutige Hoffnung der gläubigen Israeliten, die sie mit den Gläubigen nicht-jüdischen Ursprungs teilen, besteht darin, daß sie mit Christus über die gesamte erneuerte Erde herrschen werden.

Der dritte Teil erörtert das Thema der den Israeliten sich bietenden Hoffnung ausgehend vom Römerbrief. Die Gesamtheit des NT, und vor allem Paulus, lehren, daß die ungläubigen Israeliten keinen Anteil mehr am wahren Israel, dem Volk Gottes, haben.

Der Autor untersucht das 11. Kapitel des Römerbriefes, das eine Antwort auf die Frage geben will, ob Gott sein Volk verstoßen hat. Aus der Sicht des Autors enthält die Antwort des Paulus drei Elemente: 1.) Gott hat sein Volk nicht verworfen, da er sich einen Rest der Israeliten erhält, um sie zu retten. Gott hat sein Volk lediglich gereinigt, indem er die ungläubigen Israeliten herausgeschnitten hat. 2.) Die Tür blieb zur Zeit des Paulus für die unbekehrten Israeliten offen (und ist es auch noch heute): wenn sie im Glauben zu Christus umkehren, können sie noch gerettet und wieder in das Volk Gottes integriert werden. 3.) Eines Tages "wird ganz Israel gerettet werden". In diesem

Zusammenhang gilt es zu verstehen, daß Gott am Ende der gegenwärtigen Ära etwas besonderes für das Volk Israel tun wird: die Israeliten, die dann noch am Leben sein werden, werden sich als Volk zu Christus wenden und das Heil empfangen. Gott wird auf diese Weise handeln, doch nicht, weil die unbekehrten Israeliten irgendein Anrecht darauf hätten, sondern aufgrund seiner Gnade einem Volk gegenüber, das jegliches Recht auf jedwede Begünstigung verloren hat.

Im letzten Teil antwortet der Autor denen, die meinen, daß man den Juden das Evangelium nicht mehr verkünden solle, und bekräftigt, daß diese Tätigkeit ein Auftrag der heutigen Kirche bleibt.

II. Hope for the Jews with regard to the land of Israel or the land of Israel in salvation history

Our thesis regarding the promised land is that it played a role parallel to that of the people of Israel. Just as Israel was chosen with a view to the blessing of all nations, the land was chosen in view of the blessing of the whole earth.

According to the message of the OT prophets, the enlargement of the people of God to include people from all nations was to be accompanied by an extension of Israel's territory. The eschatological territory promised to Israel in the prophetic corpus of the OT was not limited to that comprised within the borders defined by the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 15), that which had been under the rule of Solomon. It extends far beyond. For instance, it is said it would include the land of Edom (Ob 19,21), the territory of Moab and Ammon (Zep 2.9) which Israel was forbidden to conquer by the old covenant law (Dt 2.9,19). Zechariah even declared that God's people would occupy Lebanon and that they would not have enough space with it (10.10).

As we have shown elsewhere,¹ in the second part of the book of Obadiah, which is eschatological (Ob 15–21), Edom functions as a type of all the nations (this is

indicated by vv. 15f), as is the case in other prophetic oracles (Am 9.12; Is 34; 63.1–6; Eze 36.5). Therefore, to say that Israel will possess the territory of Edom (Ob 19,21; cf. Am 9.12) amounts to saying that Israel will possess the whole earth. This is explicitly affirmed in Psalm 2.8.

This view of things is found in the NT also. Paul interprets the Abrahamic promise as the promise of the *inheritance of the world*, and not merely of a country (Ro 4.13). The OT promises of long life and happiness in the land of Israel are restated in the NT as promises of long life and happiness upon the earth (Eph 6.3 quoting Ex 20.12; Mt 5.4 quoting Ps 37.11).

We therefore conclude that, in the old covenant, the promised land functioned as a sign that the earth as a whole belongs to the Lord and that He would entrust the whole earth to his people. The land of Israel was like the firstfruits of the whole earth which the people of God was to inherit. In this way, the earth would become full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea (Is 11.9).

We have seen that the new people of God was founded with Israel's remnant as its kernel. Likewise, it was from Jerusalem and from the land of Judah that the territory of God's people was to be extended (Ob 19–21). Salvation is from

the Jews (Jn 4.22) and it was accomplished in Jerusalem. At the cross mounted immediately outside the gates of Jerusalem, the whole earth, and perhaps the whole cosmos, was reconciled with God in Christ (Col 1.20) in order to share in the redemption of God's children (Rom 8.18–23). Luke draws attention to the following facts: the salvation events took place in Jerusalem (Lk 24.18), the new people of God was constituted in Jerusalem by the gift of Spirit baptism (Ac 1.4,8) and salvation was then to be propagated from there to all the earth (Ac 1.8).

Therefore, once salvation has been accomplished in Jerusalem, the time has come when worship of the Father is no longer confined to the Jerusalem Temple (Jn 4.21–23), for wherever upon earth two or three gather in Jesus' name, he is in the midst of them, in parallel fashion to God's presence in the old covenant sanctuary.

What then does this theology of the land mean in terms of hope for the Jews in our time? And what is the significance of the return of Jews to the land of Israel in our century from that perspective? Many believe this contemporary event to be a fulfilment of OT prophecies.

In order to assess this last claim adequately, extensive exegesis of many passages in the OT prophets would be necessary. This cannot be done here. We will limit ourselves to proposing three conclusions that we have reached on the basis of such exegetical work.

1. The OT prophets do speak of a return of Israelites to the promised land. But this is the return of the Jewish exiles from Babylonia. It took place from 538 B.C and on to the following century. But concerning what has happened in our own century, we find no trace in the message of the prophets.

Yet, in the books of Isaiah and Micah, the return from the Babylonian exile is presented as a type of another return. This means that there will be another return for the Jews, which is compared to their return from Babylonia. This new return is also depicted as a new Exodus: God will grant a deliverance which is described in

language that recalls the deliverance from slavery in Egypt (Is 4.5–6; 10.26; 11.10–16; 12.2 = Ex 15.2; Mic 7.15–20). Soon it becomes clear, however, that this new return and this new Exodus are of a different kind from the first ones. For the enemy of his people whom God will then conquer, as he conquered the Egyptians in the past, is sin: *sin will be hurled into the depth of the sea* as the Egyptians had been overflowed by the Red Sea (Mic 7.15 and 17–18). Likewise, the return will be a return to the Lord (Is 10.20–22): the Lord is now, as it were, the promised land to which the new Exodus leads. There is much more to be said about these themes, but we will only add two more comments here.

First, the new Exodus will be led by Immanuel, the messianic son of David and second, Isaiah foretold that Gentiles would participate in it with the remnant of Israel (11.10–11).

Hence the new exodus corresponds to the second aspect of salvation. The return from Babylonia is presented as a figure of this new exodus; and it functions as a prelude to the new exodus.

All this is figurative and typological language, but it can be easily misunderstood. As a matter of fact, it has been misapplied in interpretations which insisted on a literal eschatological return of Israel into his land. This leads us to our second proposition.

2. The OT prophets extensively used figurative language which has often been misapplied. Let us give here one more example.

Isaiah often depicts a transformation of the desert into fruitful orchards (32.15–17; 35.6f; 43.19; 44.3f; 49.9f; 51.3). This language has been deemed fulfilled in the Israeli realizations in the Negev from 1948 on, through an efficient irrigation system bringing down the water from the Jordan. We ourselves, while visiting an uncle living in a kibbutz in the Negev, south of Beersheba, have seen these wonderful orchards in the midst of the desert, and we can bear witness to this stupendous achievement of the Israelis. But the question remains: has this anything to do with the above Isaianic passages?

The prophet himself gives us clues to his meaning. As we attempt to understand these texts aright, we must also keep in mind that they are parallel passages and therefore ought to be interpreted together, each in the light of the others.

In Is 32, the Holy Spirit is compared to rain which is poured from on high to water a desert and fertilize it (v. 15). What kind of fruit is then produced in the desert? It is justice, righteousness and peace (vv. 16f). We cannot but remember the song of Isaiah 5 at this point. There, Israel was compared to a vine which did not produce the fruits expected by the Lord, justice and righteousness (Is 5.1–7). In ch. 32, the desert is likewise a metaphor for Israel's failure to produce righteousness. But Israel will be transformed by the Spirit in order to produce these fruits that the Lord requires from him.

Similarly, in Is 44.3, the first half verse is in figurative language and is paralleled by the second half verse, in more literal language. The second is explanatory of the other. The prophet speaks of a pouring of water on a thirsty land. Then he explains the water as an image of the Spirit and the thirsty land as an image of the offspring of Israel.

In 51.3, the desert will be changed into a garden, but again, the fruits that will grow there are not ordinary fruits but joy and gladness.

Is 40.3–4 is another text to be mentioned in this connection. For the voice calling to prepare the way for the Lord in the desert, to raise up every valley and make low every mountain, is identified in the NT as that of John the Baptist (Mt 3.3; Lk 3.4). John called the people to conversion in preparation for the coming of the Lord Christ. Hence the desert stands once again for Israel, who should set aside his pride (mountains are often symbols of pride in the prophets' writings) and fill in what is missing in his life (the image of filling in the ruts) by conversion.

The desert imagery is only one of many examples of figurative language which has at times been misapplied to contemporary events. It could be shown, as we have done for this example, that most

frequently, if not always, the prophets give similar clues to orient our interpretation of their imagery that has been ignored when such language has been applied to contemporary events.

We have to recognize metaphorical language for what it is.

3. What about the promises of material blessing and prosperity which pervade the eschatological message of the prophets? Should we expect a literal fulfilment for national Israel, or should we spiritualize them and apply them to the Church? Neither of these solutions are satisfactory in our eyes.

These promises are part of the promises of eschatological salvation addressed to Israel. But as we have seen, this salvation is intended only for a remnant of Israel, and some Gentiles were to be joined to Israel and thereby benefit from the same blessings. The land of the people of God was to extend far beyond its original borders to encompass the whole earth. Therefore, we cannot limit the import of these promises of material blessing and prosperity to national Israel, nor to the land of Canaan.

Yet, though the prophets make abundant use of figurative language and we have to read them accordingly, spiritualization constitutes another category of interpretation and is unwarranted in our eyes. (Spiritualization differs from taking a given unit of language as figurative, in that it works on the principle that salvation and blessings have no material significance, and it operates somewhat arbitrarily insofar as it does not rely on interpretative clues in the texts themselves). For there are no indications in the texts that the above mentioned promises are anything else than promises of material blessing.

In our view, these blessings will benefit the new covenant people of God and will be fulfilled on the new earth described by Isaiah (Is 65.17ff), depicted again in the book of Revelation (chs 21–22) and presented by Paul as our earth redeemed (Rom 8.18–25).

We conclude, then, that we are not warranted by Scripture in formulating

hope for the Jews today in terms of the possession of one particular land. Or, rather, we do not think that the territory to be allotted to Israel should be restricted to the land of Canaan. The role of the land of Israel, and more particularly of Jerusalem, in redemptive history was brought to completion when the events of salvation took place there. Also, the land of Israel had a typological significance under the old covenant; the type will be fulfilled in the reality of the earth redeemed by Christ and made new. The hope Jewish believers have today, and which they share with Gentile believers, is that of reigning with Christ upon the earth renewed, the whole earth.

III. Hope for the Jews according to Romans

The eleventh chapter of Romans has a significant bearing upon the question of hope for the Jews today. Yet before we turn to that question, we have to consider how Paul views the status of unbelieving Jews in the epistle as a whole.

1. The status of unbelieving Jews in Romans

In Rom 2.28–29, Paul writes: ‘A man is not a Jew if he is only circumcised outwardly, nor is circumcision merely outward or physical. No, a man is a Jew if he is one inwardly...’ Of course, the first man spoken of is physically speaking a Jew, he is physically circumcised, and he belongs to national Israel. But he is not a Jew in another sense: he is no longer within God’s people, the new people formed from Pentecost on. For circumcision was a sign of the covenant and of belonging to God’s people. But heart circumcision (an image used in Deuteronomy and then by Jeremiah) is the true circumcision according to Paul, the circumcision that makes one a member of the new covenant, and part of the true people of God.

According to Rom 4.12, Abraham is not the father of all Jews, but only of some of them, i.e. those who have faith in Christ.

What Paul refers to here as the offspring of Abraham is obviously not Abraham’s descendants in a biological sense. To be the offspring of Abraham here means to be a member of the people which God purposed to create for himself through Abraham (*God’s children*, v. 8), the people who would receive the promise made to Abraham (the promise of the world, v. 13). Again, unbelieving Jews are considered as excluded from this entity.

In Rom 9.6, Paul makes a distinction within Israel: ‘Not all who are descended from Israel are Israel.’ And not all descendants of Abraham are to be considered as part of his offspring, or as God’s children (v. 7). In other words, Israel as the people of God is not coextensive with Abraham’s descendants, nor with national Israel. Just as Ishmael and Esau, though they were among Abraham’s descendants, are not to be counted as part of God’s people, not all Israelites are to be counted as members of God’s people.

The image of the olive tree explains why this is so. The olive tree represents the people of God, just like the vine in the OT (Is 5; Eze 15; Ps 80). Unbelieving Jews once were branches of the olive tree: they once were members of the people of God, i.e. under the old covenant. But as we have seen above, when Jesus came and administered to the people a baptism in Spirit and fire, a sorting out of the Israelites took place. The unbelieving Jews are therefore now represented as branches that have been cut off from the olive tree. They have been severed from the people of God. They have been *rejected* and placed outside of it (11.15). Only Jews who have put their trust in Christ remain part of the people of God; they are represented by the natural branches remaining on the tree (11.27). These form what Paul called in 9.27, using Isaianic language, the remnant of Israel.²

The words the prophet Hosea addressed to Northern Israelites at the eve of the fall of Samaria also apply to unbelieving Jews: ‘You are not my people and I am not your God’ (Hos 1.9).

The fact that unbelieving Jews now stand outside of God’s people, and there-

fore do not share in salvation, is what causes Paul great sorrow and unceasing anguish in his heart (9.2). This very fact makes him wish he would be accursed for the sake of the Israelites (9.3). The apostle is not coldly asserting theological truths, or building an argument for mere intellectual delight, without any sensitivity. He is suffering from what he is teaching about the Jews. Nothing less than the fact that unbelieving Jews have been excluded from God's people and are therefore in great danger of eternal death (cf. 10.1) can explain such a deep torment as Paul is expressing. We should beware lest we be entrapped by misplaced culpability or sentimentality and thus be led to tone down or even relinquish this fact. The apostle both expressed great concern and love for the Jews and asserted this drastic fact at the same time! Unless we take this reality into account, we will misunderstand what Paul has to say about what hope there is for the Jews today.

2. Hope for the Jews according to Romans 11

The eleventh chapter of Romans opens with the question: 'Did God reject his people?' This question arises against the background of the matter dealt with in the previous two chapters: the fact that most Jews rejected the Gospel. Paul has explained it in two complementary ways. First, the rejection of the Gospel by a majority of Jews took place because God so willed it (9.6–29). For God only elected some of the Jews to be part of true Israel, of his people, and to receive salvation, just as he only chose Jacob and not Esau to be part of the old covenant people. Therefore, the unbelief of a large part of the Jewish nation does not cancel God's purpose but rather carries it out.

Secondly, as always in Scripture, and especially in the Pauline writings, human responsibility is affirmed on the background of absolute divine sovereignty. Thus Paul points out that if some Israelites do not presently benefit from salvation, it is not without their being responsible for it. For they have attempted to obtain justification on the

basis of law observance instead of receiving it by faith (9.30–10.13). And ignorance of the Gospel on their part cannot be brought as an excuse for this attitude because they heard it and rejected it in disobedience (10.14–21).

If then God did not elect all Jews unto salvation, does it follow that he rejected his people? Or if Jews wilfully rejected the Gospel, is there any place left for the Jews in the plan of God? Since most Jews did not acknowledge their Messiah, is there any hope left for them?

To the first question, Paul answers negatively, and, according to our understanding of Romans 11, presents three reasons to justify this response:

i. In the present, there are Jews who are still members of his people and who benefit from salvation (11.1–10).

ii. Also in the present, the door remains open for Jews to receive salvation and be reincorporated into God's people (11.11–24).

iii. In the future, 'all Israel will be saved' (11.25–32).

i. The first point does not present any real exegetical difficulty for the issues we are dealing with. Paul draws the attention to the fact that, though God hardened a majority of Israelites who have not obtained salvation, he preserved a remnant of elect Israelites, of whom he himself is one. And thanks to God, the present writer could say the same as Paul in that respect, as well as many of his brothers and sisters '*kata sarka*' today.

God did not reject his people. He only purified it by taking off from it the unbelieving Jews. He rejected these individuals (11.15), but not his people as such.

ii. Difficulties begin with verses 11–12 and 15. In v. 11, Paul says that many Jews *stumbled*: they did not respond to the Gospel by faith in Christ and thereby failed to receive salvation. But Paul denies that this situation is definitive: They did not fall beyond recovery. What we think he has in mind is that it remains possible for them to come to Christ in faith and receive salvation.

Then Paul adds a comment on the stumbling of these Israelites: God used it

in order to bring salvation to the Gentiles. In that connection, we may think of the experience of the apostle as related in the book of Acts: very often, it is the rejection of the Gospel by the Jews which led Paul to address the pagan world with the Gospel (Acts 13.45–48; 18.6; 28.24–28).

At the end of the verse Paul brings in the idea that this salvation of the Gentiles may serve in turn to bring Israelites to salvation: seeing Gentiles saved, Jews may be stimulated to desire the same salvation.

In v. 12 Paul imagines what will or would be the conversion of Israelites. If a transgression on their part (their rejection of the Gospel) brought such a positive effect as the salvation of Gentiles, how much more a positive attitude on their part will or would bring a positive effect.

Several uncertainties confront us here as to what Paul exactly means. For one thing, what is the meaning of the Greek word *plerôma*? We mention three possibilities: 1. 'The fulfilling of God's will';³ 2. The participation of all the Israelites in salvation (the large majority of exegetes); 3. The full number of Israelites who must be saved, i.e. the full number of the Jewish elect (so apparently H. Ridderbos).

For another thing, if one adopts option 2 for *plerôma*, is the verse to be understood as affirmative or, as conditional (so Leon Morris)? In other words, is Paul saying: 'it will be great when such an event happens' or: 'it would be great if such an event were to happen'?

In vv. 13–15, Paul insists on what he has just said in vv. 11–12. He also adds a thought concerning his own apostolic ministry. Since the Jews may be stimulated to desire salvation when they see Gentiles obtaining it, Paul hopes that his Gospel ministry to the Gentiles may indirectly contribute to the salvation of some Jews. Seeing Gentiles saved through his ministry, some Jews might also be converted.

In verse 15, he repeats what he said in v. 12. God *rejected* Jews out from his people as a sanction of their unbelief and this proved an occasion for Gentiles to receive his favor. But Paul envisions again that Jews will or might be accepted

again by God and says that this would be a resurrection from the dead.

For most exegetes, this last affirmation is about an eschatological event: the conversion of the Jewish people as a whole. This fits in with option 2. for *plerôma* in v. 12, understood as an affirmation. In their eyes, vv. 12 and 15 say the same thing as v. 26.

The mention of a resurrection from the dead is then understood by some in a figurative sense, to convey the idea of a formidable event and of passing from spiritual death to spiritual life. But for F. F. Bruce and C. E. B. Cranfield,⁴ Paul is referring to the bodily resurrection, meaning that the conversion of the Jewish people as a whole will take place right before and will lead on to physical resurrection.

However, there are two objections to this interpretation. First, it gives to the word *plerôma* a different meaning from the one it usually receives in v. 25. There, Paul speaks of the coming in (into the people of God) of the *plerôma* of the Gentiles. He certainly does not mean that all the Gentiles will be saved. It is therefore largely agreed that Paul refers to the full number of the Gentiles who must come in, i.e. the full number of the Gentile elect. Are we warranted in ascribing a different meaning to the word *plerôma* when it is used about the Jews? This seems very dubious. On the contrary, the use of *plerôma* in v. 25 lends strong support to option 3. in v. 12: the full number of the Jewish elect.

Secondly, the immediate context of vv. 12 and 15 does not support the majority interpretation. For as we have seen, Paul expresses the desire that his ministry may contribute to the salvation of some Jews. This strongly suggests that what he has in mind in vv. 12 and 15 is not an event of the end time, but the conversion of Jews through his own ministry and during the whole missionary era.

Therefore, we believe that in vv. 12 and 15, Paul points out how great it is when Jews turn to Christ in faith – it is like a resurrection (in a figurative or spiritual sense) – and how wonderful it will be

when all the Jews who must do so all along missionary history will have come to Christ for salvation!

Further on, within the presentation of the image of the olive tree, Paul elaborates on this idea (vv. 23–24). It is because of their unbelief that Jews are like branches cut off from the tree. But if they do not persist in this unbelief, they will be grafted in again on the tree, for God is able to do so. And he will be even more willing to graft in natural branches than he has been to graft in the foreign branches, i.e. the Gentile believers.

Therefore, the possibility remains open, in the time of Paul, and still in our own time, for Jews to come in faith to Christ and be incorporated again in God's people. They have stumbled, but their fall is neither irremediable, nor necessarily definitive.

iii. From v. 25 on, Paul goes a step further. Not only does the door remain open for the Jews, but says Paul, one day, this possibility will become actuality: 'all Israel will be saved.'

It is an understatement to say that the interpretation of this assertion is disputed! Who is 'all Israel'? That is the question.

1. Calvin considers 'all Israel' to stand for all the elect, Jews and Gentiles. Accordingly, Paul would be saying that when all the Gentile elect are saved, the full number of Israel will be complete.

We mention this interpretation first to set it aside immediately. For it is difficult to ascribe to 'Israel' in v. 26 a different meaning from what is its obvious sense in the preceding verse. In v. 25 'Israel' refers to national Israel, that which has been hardened in part. Furthermore, the whole chapter uses the term 'Israel' in the national sense, and in contrast with the Gentiles. It would be very confusing if Paul suddenly used 'Israel' in a different way from that of all the rest of the chapter, without giving the least indication of it. It is very difficult to believe he did so.

2. According to the vast majority of exegetes, Paul is saying that the hardening of Israel is not only partial (since there is a remnant left even in Paul's time) but

that it will be limited in time. It will last only until the Gentile elect have come to salvation. Then, at the end of the missionary era, the Jewish people of that time will be saved as a whole, i.e. the last generation living right before Christ's return. In this view, 'all Israel' is however not to be understood as all individual Jews with no exception, but as the great majority of them. *Sanhedrin* 10.1 is a text sometimes alluded to in that regard for it says that 'all Israel will have a share in the world to come' and is followed by a list of exceptions (according to C. E. B. Cranfield). Paul would be thus predicting a national revival of the Jewish people to take place right before the return of Christ.

3. H. N. Ridderbos's view has been followed by a number of Reformed theologians.⁵ He thinks that 'all Israel' refers to all Israelites who receive the Gospel and are converted all along Church history, and even to all the Israelites from of old who have turned to God in repentance. He considers the *mystery* of v. 25 to lie in the fact that Israel will not be saved without the Gentiles. Then he takes *houtôs* at the opening of v. 26 as meaning 'in this way'. Paul would then be saying that Jews can only be saved as Gentiles come in. Israel can be saved only in this way, and not without the Gentiles. Yet, as for now, one does not see Israel as a people to be saved: we only see a few individual Jews that are converted in the midst of an unbelieving people. But then 'all Israel will be saved', and this means that Israel will be manifested in his unity as the eschatological people mentioned by the prophets who was to benefit from the promises of salvation.

Ridderbos thereby understands vv. 25–26 as saying the same thing as he and the present writer found vv. 12 and 15 to be saying. His arguments are as follows:

a. There can be found no other mention of a general conversion of Israel in the rest of the NT. It is very dubious that Paul would have revealed such an event in five words with no other explanation.

b. Paul previously spoke of the conversion of Israelites in his time, and that of some only (vv. 12, 15).

c. In v. 31, the apostle says that it is *now* that the Jews receive mercy.

d. That all Israel be saved in the sense of interpretation 2. is contradictory with what Paul said in ch. 9: a mere remnant of Israel is to be saved, and this not on a national basis.

We do not find these arguments conclusive:

d. does not prove Ridderbos's point. For if the last generation of Israelites is saved as a whole, the remnant principle of chapter 9 still functions during the whole history that precedes.

c. The second *nun* ('now') of v. 31 is weakly attested in the Greek manuscripts. And even if it is retained, it can be understood more loosely than Ridderbos does.

b. does not stand if one distinguishes between Paul's time, of which he speaks in vv. 12 and 15, and the end time which could be the concern of v. 25.

a. may not be entirely true. When the apostles asked about the time when the kingdom would be restored to Israel, Jesus did not reply that such an event would not happen. He merely said it did not belong to them to know the date (Acts 1.6–7). This strongly suggests that the kingdom will one day be restored to Israel, that is that Israel as a people will enter the kingdom which has been taken away from him because of his unbelief (Mt 21.43). The Lk 21.24 passage might be another text saying the same thing.

Furthermore there are some objections to Ridderbos's view and solution 2. is not without support.

a. Ridderbos's interpretation does not do full justice to our text. His idea that v. 26 speaks of the eschatological manifestation of Israel in its unity as a saved community falls short of the content of Paul's words: 'all Israel will be saved'.

b. The *heôs* of v. 25 followed by the *houtôs* of v. 26 tends to indicate temporal succession: the salvation of 'all Israel' will follow that of the Gentiles. Therefore, the salvation of all Israel cannot be identified with the salvation of Jews who are converted all along the missionary era.

c. The word *pas* 'all' in v. 26 seems to

build an opposition with *apo merous* 'in part' of v. 25. But then, Israel has to be taken as national Israel in both cases.

d. It is the Israel that is now hardened that will be saved, not the mere remnant. This receives confirmation from v. 28: it is the Jews who have refused the Gospel and are therefore enemies as far as the Gospel is concerned whom God loves. Paul seems to be saying that despite the unbelief of Israel, God will accomplish something special for this people for the sake of his ancestors.

For these reasons, we prefer solution 2. for vv. 25–26.

This interpretation has been said to be illogical. If Israel no longer is the people of God, there appears to be no reason why God should reserve special treatment for it. There is no reason why Israel should obtain a particular destiny. But this is exactly what Paul says: God saves by grace, and not according to logic. It is when Israel has been bound over to disobedience (v. 32), it is when Israel has lost all rights, all titles to any privilege or special favor that God saves them as a people and grants them special favour. It is when there is no reason left for God to reserve special treatment for Israel that he does something special for Israel, something he will not do for any other nation. This is what grace is.

The way in which God deals with Israel demonstrates that Israel does not deserve anything more than the other nations, and that if it is saved, it is as much by grace as the Gentiles. For God saves those who have no title to salvation, both the Gentiles and then the Jews once they have lost all rights to any privilege.

Verses 28–29 call for further comment: 'As far as the Gospel is concerned, they are enemies on your account.' This assertion again sets the Jewish unbelievers in opposition to the people of God. The word 'enemies' puts them in the shoes of the *goyim* of the OT. But as far as election is concerned, they are loved on account of the patriarchs, for God's gifts and his call are irrevocable.' God does not forget that Israel served his purposes in the history of redemption. He does not forget having

concluded the Sinaitic covenant with them. Of course, the covenant treaty contained provisions for sanctions, blessings and curses. All that we Jews deserve on the basis of that covenant are the curses. Yet, God in his mercy decided that the blessings would nevertheless be fulfilled for Israel because of the historical role he had called him to play. This is the reason why 'all Israel will be saved' one day.

Such an event presupposes that there will be a massive conversion of Jews to Christ in the end time. For Christ is the only way to salvation, even for Jews. They will be saved by faith. What will happen then is a kind of mass revival of this people.

Gentile believers may have a significant role to play in such a revival, in bringing the Gospel to the Jews. In this way, the Jews will obtain mercy as a result of God's mercy to the Gentile believers (v. 31).

IV. Evangelism and the Jews

1. Should we preach the Gospel to the Jews?⁶

Nowadays, more and more voices are speaking out, condemning evangelism to the Jews on the part of the Church, or 'proselytism' as it is sometimes called in a disparaging way. Some of the most recent *Statements of the World Council of Churches and Its Members* have tended to take this direction.⁷ This is not surprising since in recent years the ecumenical movement has been increasingly manifesting an attitude of acceptance of non-Christian religions as other valid ways to God. Even in evangelical circles, voices have been raised to preclude Jewish evangelism. Motivations for such attitudes are diverse.

i. Soteriological universalism leaves no sense to evangelise the Jews, nor indeed any others.

ii. Jewish universalism is also encountered, i.e. the view according to which the Pauline statement that *all Israel will be saved* would mean the salvation of all Jews of all times. This view is sometimes argued as a consequence of the election of

the Jews and of their descent from Abraham (Ro 11.28).

iii. Some believe the Jewish people to be the suffering Servant of the Lord in the book of Isaiah, and that his sufferings in the course of history have atoning value.

iv. It is sometimes claimed that the Church has lost all right to trying to bring the Jews to embrace her faith, because of her attitude towards the Jews in history.

v. Some evangelicals believe that the fulfilment of Ro 11.26 is imminent. They conclude from this that there is no point in proclaiming the Gospel to the Jews since God is now going to draw them all to Christ himself. Rather, the Church would better prepare herself to welcome the Jews in her midst.

Point v. can be answered easily. Even if we grant that in Rom 11.26 Paul foretells a revival of the Jewish people as a whole in the end time, Jesus said we cannot know when this will happen (Ac 1.6). Hence we must reject this claim to knowledge that such an event is imminent. Furthermore, Paul may suggest that the Jews will turn to Christ upon the proclaiming of the Gospel to them by Gentile believers (Ro 11.31). Consequently, the perspective that *all Israel will be saved* should rather encourage us to Jewish evangelism.

Answering argument iii. would require detailed exegesis. We can only bring in a few thoughts here. The Servant of the Lord is called Israel in a polemical way: he is presented as the true Israel, in contrast to the people who is proud of calling himself Israel but does not live up to the vocation this entails (Is 48.1). Therefore the Servant cannot be the people of Israel. For this reason, some identify him with the remnant of Israel, or an elite of righteous Israelites. But the Servant accomplishes his redemptive work on behalf of the remnant of Israel (Is 49.5); hence he must be distinct from such an entity. Furthermore, if there was any elite of righteous men, the prophet must have been part of it. But in ch. 6, Isaiah had confessed his impurity. This shows that in his eyes the best of the Israelites were in need of the justifying work of the Lord's

Servant who was to die as a guilt offering for the sins of his people (Is 53). No elite of Israel could effect such atoning work. As a matter of fact, the idea that Israel's suffering, or that of some Israelites, might have atoning value is totally foreign to the rest of Scripture.

Against Jewish universalism, we have already pointed out that Paul considers Jewish unbelievers as being outside Abraham's true offspring which is heir of the promise of salvation and that the feelings he expresses in Rom 9.1–3 make no sense if all the Jews will finally be saved. His prayer in Rom 10.1 also implies that not all of them are saved.

Israel's election does not mean unconditional salvation for all Jews. On the contrary, as far as the Gospel is concerned, they are enemies (Rom 11.28a). As a matter of fact, this election entails accrued responsibility and more severe judgment if this responsibility is not met (Amos 3.2). In Paul's mind, the salvation of the last generation of Israelites is linked with Israel's election, but this says nothing concerning the previous generations.

Jesus did not say anything different in addressing Jewish people. In his eyes, Jewish unbelievers are not true children of Abraham (8.39) but rather children of the devil (8.44), a stern warning indeed. Their being biologically issued from Abraham is no guarantee of salvation. Life for the Jews only comes through Christ (Jn 5.39f). Hence Jews do not have eternal life if they reject him (Jn 6.53). To disbelieve Christ amounts to disbelieving God (Jn 5.37f) and also Moses, with the result that one is standing condemned by Moses' writings (Jn 5.45–47). If Jews do not acknowledge that Jesus is 'I am', i.e. Yahweh, they will die in their sins (Jn 8.21–24).

Having pointed out that his Jewish hearers have rejected their Messiah, Peter proclaims that there is salvation in no one else (Ac 4.11–12). The implication is obvious: rejecting Jesus Christ excludes Jews from salvation.

According to the Epistle to the Hebrews, rejection of the Gospel prevents one from entering God's redemptive rest

(Heb 3–4) and exposes one to a fiercer judgment than was the case with violation of the old covenant (Heb 2.1–4). See also the warning in Heb 10.29.

Turning again to Romans, we must recall that the first three chapters of this epistle are intended to demonstrate that Jews and Gentiles are on the same footing concerning salvation: Jews and Gentiles alike are in a state of sin and stand condemned for their sins (Rom 3.9,19f); Jews and Gentiles alike can only be justified through faith in Jesus Christ and on the basis of his atoning death (3.21–26).

If we insist so much on all these Scripture references, it is not to denigrate our kinsmen '*kata sarka*', but to expose the monstrous fallacy of the idea that the Church should refrain from Gospel proclamation to the Jews. Refraining from proclaiming the Gospel to the Jews is the worst thing one can do to them today. This is the real anti-Jewish attitude!

For the Gospel is for the Jews (Rom 1.16). It was designed to be preached first to the Jews (Ac 1.8). The apostles, and even Paul, though he was the apostle to the Gentiles, obeyed this command of Christ as we learn from the book of Acts (and Gal 2.9). They are for us examples to be imitated in this very activity. Preaching the Gospel to the Jews is not a matter of a right that the Church might have lost; it is an obligation laid upon her by the urgency of the Jews' need of salvation. It is a matter of life and death.

Of course, since apostolic times, there has been much suffering caused to the Jews by a so called Christian world, all kinds of vexations and discriminations, the Inquisition, the pogroms, the *shoah*, and so on. These are undeniable facts. Does it lend any validity to argument iv? Let it be permitted to us to answer by a more personal word.

My father's father was arrested with other Jews in Paris, in the Spring of 1941, and taken to the camp in Drancy. In 1942, he was part of the fourth convoy of Jews leaving France. The destination was Auschwitz. My mother's parents had come to Paris from Salonica, Greece, in the 1920s with many relatives. Of this

numerous family, only my grand parents and a few relatives escaped the events of World War II and lived beyond 1945; the rest of the family was taken to concentration camps. One of my mother's sisters was arrested by the Gestapo and taken to Auschwitz in the last year of the war; she passed close to death, but was able to come back to France a year or so later. Her husband is from Poland. He managed to survive by fleeing to Russia and hiding himself there for five years. He remembers that when he was a boy in Poland, Jews were chased by people holding crosses in their hands. My mother and brother are believers. To my aunt and uncle, our being Christians is a betrayal of our people, and amounts to making common cause with the oppressors.

Now, what if the persons who shared the Gospel with my mother had thought they did not have the right to do so because of what her family had suffered? I might not be writing these lines today. The three of us might be heading on to die in our sins. Would not that be worse than all the atrocities committed during world war II?

In conversation with my aunt a little bit of Church history has proved helpful. It showed that the Church of Jesus Christ must not be confused with Christendom, nor with whatever bears the name of 'Church'. The true Church of Jesus Christ is made up of the followers of Christ. When Jesus died on the cross, he prayed for the forgiveness of the Jews who had condemned him (Lk 23.34). A true disciple of Jesus Christ cannot have a different attitude towards the Jews. Jesus himself said: 'Not everyone who says to me, "Lord, lord," will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven... Then I will tell them plainly, "I never knew you. Away from me, you evildoers!"' (Mt 7.21,23). True disciples of Christ are to be recognized by their fruits (Mt 7.16,20). Jesus does not have to be judged in terms of everything that has been done in his name or by people calling themselves Christians.

In fact, the true Church has often been persecuted by the same so-called

Christians who persecuted the Jews. There were also disciples of Christ who publicly protested against the treatment reserved to the Jews. I presently have on my desk copies of letters, written in 1941 and 1942 and addressed to the highest authorities in France by Marc Boegner, then President of the French Protestant Federation, and expressing disapproval, in the name of the Protestant Churches, of decisions and actions of the government against the Jews. We know of Christians who have risked their lives to save Jews, to hide them and help them in various ways.

Jews are able to understand these things. They already know some of these facts. As a matter of fact, the number of Jewish believers today may be proportionately higher than believers coming from any other race or religion.

We are not ashamed of the Gospel. Because it is not the Gospel which produced such poisonous fruits as discriminations, the Inquisition, pogroms, the shoah or the like.

Of course, the Gospel remains a stumbling block to many Jews, and sometimes this is so because of the confusion between Christendom and the true Church of Jesus Christ. But the Gospel has always been a stumbling block for numerous Jews, and would be so even if the crimes we know had not been perpetrated (1 Cor 1.22-25). And we fear the Gospel has now become a stumbling block for some who claim the name Christian for themselves! For what they are preaching simply is 'another gospel', which is really no gospel at all (cf. Gal 1.6-7).

We certainly must be cautious in the way we present the Gospel to the Jews, and do it out of love and with love. But Jews need to call upon the Lord all the more because of what they have suffered all through history. And how will they call upon him unless the Gospel is preached to them (Rom 10.17)?

The Church of Jesus Christ is indebted to the Jews because she has received from them the oracles of God, and the Messiah, and because salvation is from the Jews. Bringing the hope of the Gospel to the

Jews out of love and in love is what the Church of Jesus Christ owes them.

2. In what sense is the Gospel for the Jew first?

In Rom 1.16, Paul wrote that 'the Gospel is the power of God for the salvation of everyone who believes, for the Jew first as well as for the Gentile.' We must first note that Paul affirms equality between Jews and Gentiles (*te kai*, 'as well as'). The same Gospel saves Jews and Gentiles in the same way (by faith) with no difference on these points.

However, there is at the same time a certain priority of the Jews. Of what priority is the apostle speaking here?

Some believe on the basis of this text that we are bound still today to preach the Gospel in priority to the Jews. What this means in practice is problematic. For all Churches around the world are not surrounded by Jews in all areas upon earth. And where there are Jews, should we assume that we first have to tell the Gospel to all of them before we ever turn to non-Jewish people?

In our own opinion, Paul has a different kind of priority in mind, a historical priority. In history, the Gospel had to be preached first, and at the beginning almost exclusively, to the Jewish people. This was during the intermediate period when the old covenant was being superseded by the new covenant. For it took a certain time in history to establish the new covenant and to pass from the old to the new.

Thus we hear Jesus say that he had been sent merely to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and he in turn committed to his disciples a mission exclusively directed to Israelites during his earthly ministry (Mt 10.6; 15.24. Also see Act 3.26).

At Pentecost, the Gospel is proclaimed to the Jews who have come to Jerusalem for the festival. And the book of Acts makes it clear that the Gospel was preached to the Samaritans only later, and to the Gentiles even later yet.

When Paul begins missionary work on a new field, he always goes to the Jews

first, following a principle delineated in Acts 13.46. Often, his turning to the Gentiles comes upon the refusal of his message by the Jews. In Rome Paul follows the same practice (Acts 28.28).

The destruction of the temple in AD 70 marks the end of the intermediate period we are speaking about. The Jews are expelled from Palestine (with still later developments following the Bar Kochba revolt). These events manifest the rejection by God of unbelieving Israelites as his people. The end of the temple cultus also signifies the termination of the old covenant. In a sense, God was thereby ratifying the rejection of the Messiah by Israel as a people.

Up to that time, the Gospel had been presented to the Jews first. But finally it appeared that Israel as a whole had rejected it. This took a certain time, the time necessary for the Gospel to be brought to the Jews in the diverse areas of the empire.

The account of Acts 28 is a climax in the Lukan story. The rejection of Jesus Christ by a majority of Jewish religious authorities in Rome epitomizes the refusal of the Gospel by the majority of the Jews, all along his missionary journeys, and gives it global significance. What Paul says in Acts 28.25–28 looks like a definitive conclusion concerning Israel as a whole, the conclusion drawn from a long story culminating in the Roman episode.

Once this global rejection of the Messiah by Israel as a people becomes evident, what Jesus had foretold in Mt 21.42–43, with its concrete manifestation in the destruction of the second temple, comes about. This brought to an end the Jewish priority in the Gospel. This priority was historical, and designed for the period necessary for the rejection of Christ by the Jewish people as a whole, and as a people, to become manifest.

This significance of the AD 70 events as a judgment upon Israel as a people for his rejection of the Messiah appears in Jesus' parable of the wedding banquet (Mt 22.7). It may also be alluded to in a comparable way in 1 Thess 2.16. Paul does not make clear what he has in mind

when saying *the wrath of God has come upon the Jews at last* and it is a controversial matter. He seems to be referring to a precise event in history and in our view, an allusion to the destruction of the temple then to come in AD 70 is the most probable. The context would make it the sanction for the Jewish opposition to Jesus and his apostles (vv. 15–16). We may compare the Thessalonian passage with Lk 21.20–24 where a similar terminology is used: Jesus speaks of wrath against the Jewish people in a predictive description of the events of AD 70.

Conclusion

There is hope today for the Jews because God sent the Messiah promised by the Jewish prophets, so that any Jew can receive through faith forgiveness for his sins on the basis of the expiatory death of the Messiah, and be renewed by the Holy Spirit.

There is hope because, even though many Israelites rejected their Messiah, the door of the kingdom of the Son of David remains open for them to enter, and many Jews will enter in our own time, as many have done so in the past two millennia, and even many more will enter in the end time.

There is hope, for God will send again the Messiah whom he has appointed for them and there will be times of refreshing for the Jews who will have turned to him in faith. And they will inherit the world as was promised to Abraham, and reign with the Messiah, and with people from all nations, upon the earth renewed.

Because of this hope, there is a pressing

and urgent need laid upon us to proclaim the Gospel to the Jews. There may not be agreement concerning everything that has been said in this paper. But this at least is an essential point about which there should not be any doubt in the minds of us all!

- 1 See *Les livres de Joël et d'Abdias* (*Commentaire Evangélique de la Bible*), Vaux-sur-Seine, Edifac, 1989, 269f, 290ff.
- 2 We think Jn 15.1–6 has the same import: Jesus is the true vine in the sense of the true Israel, just as the Isaianic Servant of the Lord was called 'Israel'. The branches that do not bear fruit and are cut off to be burned in the fire (vv. 2,6) represent the unbelieving Israelites. This is also to be compared with the effect of Spirit and fire baptism (Lk 3.9). As Jesus said elsewhere, the kingdom of God was to be taken away from them and be given to a nation that would produce the fruits of it (Mt 21.43).
- 3 Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988, *ad loc.*
- 4 F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Romans* (*Tyndale*), Grand Rapids, Eerdmans; C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans (ICC)*, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1990, vol 2, *ad loc.*
- 5 We depend here on R. B. Gaffin, 'Professor Ridderbos on Romans 11.25–32 (An informal translation of Herman Ridderbos, 'Israel in het Nieuwe Testament, in het bijzonder volgens Rom 9–11,' *Israel* (den Haag: van Keulen, 1955), pp. 57–64)', unpublished mimeographed paper.
- 6 On this topic, see J. Guggenheim, 'Faut-il encore annoncer l'Evangile au peuple juif', *Ichthus* 70 (1977), 20–26.
- 7 *The Theology of the Churches and the Jewish People, Statements of the World Council of Churches and its Member Churches*, Geneva, WCC Publications, 1988.

Bioethics: A Primer for Christians

Gilbert Meilaender

Bioethics is a subject which every one will need to face at some stage of his or her life. It is, therefore, of upmost importance that we understand the issues and their implications in how we live our lives.

In this non-technical introduction to the subject Dr Gilbert Meilaender provides a framework for Christians to think through the issues.

0-85364-793-3 / pb / 144pp / 198 x 130mm / £5.99



PATERNOSTER PRESS PO Box 300 Carlisle Cumbria CA3 0QS UK