

Seton Hall University

eRepository @ Seton Hall

Selected Works of John M. Oesterreicher

The Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies

1963

Israel's Misstep and Her Rise

John M. Oesterreicher

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/oesterreicher>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Catholic Studies Commons](#), and the [Jewish Studies Commons](#)

ISRAEL'S MISSTEP AND HER RISE

The Dialectic of God's Saving Design in Romans 9-11

JOHN M. OESTERREICHER - Newark

The topic I have chosen needs no defense. In days past, it deeply engaged the Apostle; it is always present to the mind of the Church, and it will be, I am sure, of ever-growing significance to the ecumenical movement of today. My subtitle, however, may appear daring. Am I like an eccentric coachman who harnesses a fast runner and a drayhorse to the same cart, hoping that somehow the wagon will benefit by the different qualities of both? I trust not. Indeed, I cherish the uncompromising words of St. Ambrose: "Non in dialectica complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum: 'Regnum enim Dei in simplicitate fidei est, non in contentione sermonis' (1 Cor 4,20)"⁽¹⁾. Neither by learned talk nor human busyness was man saved, but by the power of divine love: the passion and death of God's only-begotten Son. As the fruit of divine freedom, redemption can never be the result of a dialectical process, be it philosophical or historical, be it Socratic or Aristotelian, Hegelian or Marxist.

Still, when St. Paul proclaims the mysteriousness of God's design in words like these: "God has shut up all in unbelief, that He may have mercy upon all" (11,32), what other term is there to characterize this staggering truth than dialectic? In this passionate sentence there beats a heart that rejoices in the God of Israel who baffles the "logician" but, in spite of His incomprehensibility, transports the believer. God making Jews and Gentiles the prisoners of their disobedience in order to prepare their freedom — this is a dialectic supreme, indeed, unique.

I

The very beginning of chapter 9 confronts us with a typical Pauline tension that many commentators find perplexing. Dodd, for instance, considers chapters 9-11 a sermon on the Jewish question which, if this irony

⁽¹⁾ St. AMBROSE, *De fide ad Gratianum*, I, v, 42 (PL, 16: 559).

be allowed, St. Paul filed away in a desk drawer for occasional use. When he inserted it in the Epistle to the Romans, he did his work so poorly that his so-called sermon "starts abruptly, with no connection with what has preceded" (1).

Undoubtedly, there is a sudden, unexpected switch from the last verse of chapter 8 the first of chapter 9, from the hymn of victory to the cry of anguish. In Maier's words: "Es ist, als ob der Apostel auf einmal aus seligen Himmelshöhen in den finstersten, trostlosesten Abgrund stürzte" (2) The "as if" in this image of the Apostle's sudden plunge "from the blissful heights of heaven into an abyss dark and devoid of all consolation" is important. For there is no real change of mood. Dialectically, the two emotions, the Apostle's boundless confidence and his deep sorrow, are one; they are held together by the same love, indeed, they spring from the same passion, a passion not unlike that of his Master who thought nothing of "emptying Himself" of His divine glory to become a slave for our sake (Phil 2,5-7). St. Paul's desire to be an outcast from Christ for the sake of those of his brethren who are divorced from the same Christ is no relapse into Jewish narrowness or national sensibility, as some would have it (3). The Apostle's deepest bond to his people is not blood but providence; it is more than biological, it is salvific, "heilsgeschichtlich". The only triumph he seeks is God's.

Far be it from me to deny St. Paul's intimate sense of solidarity with his kinsmen who do not believe in Christ. Yet I cannot agree with Michel that in Romans 9,1-5, St. Paul "redet als Jude über Gottes Handeln an Israel" (author's italics) (4). Here as elsewhere St. Paul speaks not as a "Jew" but as an apostle whose love is not bounded, whose love encompasses the Church and Israel. Both his kinsmen *κατὰ πνεῦμα* and those *κατὰ σάρκα* he calls "brethren", though evidently not in the same sense; still, it would be quite inadequate to say that the latter are his natural and the former his supernatural brethren. For his affection, anguish, and care are of the order of grace. Not as a "Jew", then, but as an apostle does he speak of what is generally called Israel's privileges or, in Prümm's beautiful phrase, "die gottverbrieften Adelsrechte des einzigartigen Volkes" (5).

(1) C. H. DODD, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London, 1960), pp. 163-164. For a view contrary to Dodd's, see Joseph HUBY, S. J., and Stanislas LYONNET, S. J., *Saint Paul Epître aux Romains* (Paris, 1957), p. 322.

(2) Friedrich Wilhelm MAIER, *Israel in der Heilsgeschichte nach Römer 9-11* (Münster, 1929), p. 6.

(3) See, for instance, DODD, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

(4) Otto MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen, 1957), p. 192.

(5) Karl PRÜMM, *Die Botschaft des Römerbriefes* (Freiburg, 1960), p. 139.

I fear "privileges" or "prerogatives" can be misleading terms; indeed, they have, so it seems to me, led some exegetes to alter the meaning of the passage. Nygren, for instance, asks: "Why does Paul set forth all these advantages of Israel?" only to answer: "To make the mystery of the rejection of Israel truly great and inconceivable" (1). Great and inconceivable as the disbelief of many in Israel is to St. Paul, our three chapters were not written to proclaim "Israel's rejection". Again, Cerfaux holds that these privileges belong, not to the Israel of history but to "God's Israel", that is, the "ideal" people fulfilling God's plan (2). But in Romans 9,3-4 the Apostle's concern is obviously not with an ideal people but with the people around him; he gives the title "Israelites" not to the holy remnant that believes but to those of his kinsmen who are blind to the wonder of Christ. He speaks of the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the promises, the worship and the law, not as marvels that graced his people in the past but as marvels still present. Theirs they are, as *is* "the Christ according to the flesh" (9,5).

The difficulty some interpreters experience in giving such honor to the Israel exiled from Christ disappears if, rather than speaking of Israel's prerogatives, we call the marvels of Jewish history what they are: gifts freely given; manifestations of His saving will granted to the Jews for no merit of their own; favors bestowed on them, not for their own sake but for that of the whole world. Because the marvels of sacred history are all this, they cannot simply disappear. Even in her aloofness from Christ, Israel is still "honored" by them, for they are the honor of God, of the God of Israel whose gracious gifts are irrevocable (11,29) (3).

Yet, such are the surprising ways of the Apostle that no sooner has he bestowed the glorious name "Israelites" on his separated brethren than he goes on to declare: "They are not all Israelites who are sprung from Israel" (9,6) (4). As Lagrange puts it so well, the Hebrew genius discloses meaning by conflicting, antithetical expressions (5). By using side by side expressions that are extreme and absolute, that disregard

(1) Anders NYGREN, *Commentary on Romans* (London, 1958), p. 356.

(2) See Lucien CERFAUX, *La théologie de l'Eglise suivant saint Paul* (Paris, 1948), p. 28.

(3) See MAIER, *op. cit.*, p. 10; also Hans ASMUSSEN, *Der Römerbrief* (Stuttgart, 1952), p. 200.

(4) Cf. P. KERSTJENS, S.C.J., *Les noms « Israel » et « Israelite » dans l'Épître aux Rom. chap. 9-11* (Exercitatio ad licentiam).

(5) See M.-J. LAGRANGE, *L'Évangile de Jésus-Christ* (Paris, 1928), p. 169.

nance and thus lack the shadings the West delights in, the Hebrew mind reveals the reality, complexity, and fullness of the world, even of the world of grace.

St. Paul's attempt to unfold the mysteriousness of God's saving design does not halt at expressing the polarity of Jewish existence: They *are* Israelites; they are *not* Israelites. Many in Israel stumbled, he argues (9,32), still God has not rejected His people (11,1), having preserved Himself a remnant in which grace has free rein and faith full thrust (11,5-6). Again, the stumbling of the many was — *mirabile dictu* — the signal for the awakening of Gentiles, the decrease of the first the wealth of the latter (11,11-12). And as if this were not enough, the small remnant will in the end expand to untold numbers: "All Israel shall be saved" (11,26). There is, then, in the economy of salvation, and hence in our three chapters, a movement running from heights to depths, and to heights again. It is this upward-downward-upward movement that gives redemptive history its dialectical character.

II

Like others before and after him, Luther searched the Epistle to the Romans for an answer to the piercing problem of his life: "Wie kriege ich einen gnädigen Gott?" "How do I find a gracious God?" In Romans 9-11, however, St. Paul is not concerned with the destiny of individuals, their predestination or reprobation, but the fate and salvific function of the two great communities, Israel and the nations. His question is: "How does God's redemptive will accomplish its purpose? How will creation be soaked in His glory?" As he asks this question, he sees that part of Israel which refuses to move with the great messianic current temporarily suspended or inactivated. I repeat, inactivated and not rejected. The Apostle emphatically denies that God has spewn out His own; gladly he declares: "God has not cast off His people whom He foreknew" (11,2). It is his wish to have God's truth acknowledged that makes him so insistent, not some human softness. How foreign softness is to him he proves when he unhesitatingly challenges, indeed, wounds his kinsmen. What could pain them more than a comparison of their present role with those of Esau and Pharaoh, their early foes and hinderers of God's plan (9,6-29)? But if he hurts, it is in order to heal. If he provokes his unbelieving brethren to anger, it is in order to press them toward a new beginning.

When I speak of "wounding" and "provoking" I do not wish to identify myself with those who seem to think that St. Paul's main purpose

in chapters 9 and 10 is to expose the guilt of the people of Israel. As a matter of fact, nowhere in our trilogy is Israel's lack of response to the Christ expressly called guilt. Though St. Paul leaves no doubt that Israel's failure is *her* failure, he shows a restraint not always discerned. Even an expression like "Israel's failure" requires a Pauline qualification. Though the Apostle is saddened that those in Israel who accepted the Good News are but few, *ἡ ἐκλογή*, the chosen part, he is unimpressed by the weight, by the number of those who have remained blind to the messianic Presence, and simply calls them *οἱ λοιποί*, the others, the rest. But what does he have to say about the latter, his "schismatic" kinsmen? To paraphrase his words: They have run against the stumbling block set up by God in Sion and have struck themselves (9,32); their zeal for God is indisputable but it lacks insight (10,2); obtuse to the justice God works in us, they have strained themselves to be just in His eyes through their own efforts (10,3); they have not believed that Jesus is the Risen One, the King of Glory, the Lord (10,9); they have not responded to the Good News and have, in contrast to many of the once heedless pagans, rebuffed God's embrace that is Christ (10,16.20-21); they have been blinded, put to sleep, so that the apostles' message has been no clearer to them than a scroll, sealed or hidden.

There is force in these descriptions; St. Paul himself calls one of them "bold" (10,20). But whatever severity there is in them is of the Old Testament — for they are taken from or based on a psalm and the books of Isaiah and Deuteronomy — a severity that is one of the glories of the Ancient Dispensation. Never before and never after has there been a people in whose midst men, inspired and intrepid, dared castigate the sins of prince, priest, and people alike. If Israel paid little heed to her prophets, none were born, none ever rose elsewhere.

Though the Apostle plainly continues the stern prophetic tradition, he will not speak of Israel's failure without adding a word of mitigation. The prophets, too, were men of compassion; severe *and* mild, they not only accused but also brought God's comfort to their own. Thus St. Paul will not mention the discernment his unbelieving kinsmen so sadly lack without testifying to their zeal for God (10,2-3). He will not declare: "Israel did not obey the gospel". Because love or, if you wish, truth — the two are one — demands of him a more discreet expression, he prefers to say: "Not all have surrendered to the gospel" (10,16). Again, in looking at the many who are severed from communion with the Lord Jesus, he speaks of them as *τινες τῶν κλάδων*, "aliqui ex ramis". Gently he says: "Some of the branches have been broken off" (11,17). This is not mere caution; by faith he sees the "little flock" (Lk 12,32) as a mighty army, the small

remnant as the Israel to whom the wide world has been joined ⁽¹⁾, the few who believe as the core of all mankind redeemed.

Sure of God's saving purpose, St. Paul cannot but speak lovingly. Nowhere is this more manifest than in Romans II,II-12. If anyone had reason to be embittered against his dissident brethren, whom he had previously called "hostile to all men" because they sought to prevent him and his fellow apostles from proclaiming the way of salvation to the Gentiles (I Thess 2,16), it was he. But in writing to the Romans he calls their failure *παράπτωμα*, a "faux pas", a "false step", a "blunder"; *ἔπτασαν*, he adds, "they tripped", "they caught their feet", "they stumbled". There can be no doubt that *πταίω* and *παράπτωμα* frequently express value judgments, that the first may mean "to offend" or "to sin" while the second may go beyond a mere accident to imply a moral fault. But neither can there be doubt that in these two verses their connotation, if not their denotation, is "heils geschichtlich". In drawing attention to the startling fact that for St. Paul Jewish incredulity is a faux pas, Lyonnet adds: "Paul joue sur le sens étymologique du mot" ⁽²⁾.

Those who are inclined to consider "misstep" an understatement that has no other explanation than a momentary weakness of the Apostle, a partiality toward his own flesh and blood, must find even more surprising his positive view of Israel's "No". Many, far too many, have stumbled, yet their stumbling is a means in the hands of God, not an end. Israel's lapse has become an instrument of reconciliation. "Das über Israel hereingebrochene Unheil dient nicht nur dem Heil der Heiden, es soll vor allem dem Heil Israels dienen", writes Maier ⁽³⁾. Compressed into a brief sentence, St. Paul's dialectical argument is that Israel fell in order to rise.

A paradox, an anomaly altogether divine! And corresponding to the boldness of his thesis that Israel's lapse serves the salvation of the Gentiles and leads to her own rising is his boldness of speech. In the three chapters I am considering, there is, I think, no bolder image than the one with which St. Paul wishes to shatter the conceit of Rome's Gentile Christians, who looked upon the unbelieving Israel as a people hopelessly fallen. To remind them that their own calling and their incorporation into the community of the faithful was *παρά φύσιν*, against all nature, against the normal course

⁽¹⁾ See the Second Collect before the blessing of the baptismal font at the Easter Vigil.

⁽²⁾ *Les Epîtres de Saint Paul aux Galates et aux Romains*, trans. S. LYONNET, S. J. (Paris, 1954), p. 110, note d.

⁽³⁾ MAIER, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

of events, that it was an act of divine condescension, he calls them uncultivated branches grafted onto a tree long cared for. This image of a wild shoot grafted onto a noble olive seems to have irritated at least one exegete. "A truly remarkable horticultural experiment!" Dodd exclaims, only to continue: "Paul had the limitations of a town-bred man" ⁽¹⁾. Other exegetes accuse the Apostle of careless style while still others seek to justify his figure of speech by citing an ancient practice which sought to give new life to an old tree by the insertion of a wild sapling ⁽²⁾.

All of these are wrong, his defenders even more than his critics: St. Paul does not allude to the transplantation of a fruit-bearing branch into a piece of wood, sapless and barren, but rather to that of a withered, worthless limb into a rich and living tree. If such a method is unheard-of among men, if it gainsays human experience, this proves our limitations, not St. Paul's. For him, the conversion of Gentiles ahead of "all Israel" is so revolutionary an event, so much a marvel of grace, that he must needs overthrow the rules of nature in order to find a fitting parable for the work of God, who is ever the Saviour, ever the Creator.

III

If God has made fruitful some of the branches that grew in the wilderness, how much more will he those that are from the garden He Himself planted. *Δυνατός ἐστὶν ὁ θεός*, St. Paul exclaims, "potens est Deus iterum inserere illos" (II,23). He who was willing to make mute pagans respond to His Word cannot be less willing to make the people that He had addressed so often and that had, it is true, alternated between response and contradiction but never remained dumb say "Amen", and say it with such vigor that it will reverberate throughout the cosmos. For a moment, however, the road on which God takes the world to its salvation bypasses the majority in Israel in favor of her remnant and generations of Gentiles. For the time being, Israel as a people is outside the Church; still it is not forsaken. God's word endures, His choice stands, His gifts and calling will not be revoked nor will they fail (II,29). With Lagrange we must profess that, in spite of the present disbelief in Jesus as the Christ, "les Juifs sont toujours d'une certaine manière un peuple consacré à Dieu, un peuple dû à Dieu" ⁽³⁾. They remain destined for God, ordained for His

⁽¹⁾ DODD, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

⁽²⁾ See HUBY, *op. cit.*, p. 395, notes 4, 5, 6.

⁽³⁾ M.-J. LAGRANGE, *L'Épître aux Romains* (Paris, 1950), p. 279.

saving purpose. Willing or not, they belong to Him; they cannot cease to be the people of His predilection, for He loves them because He is good and His mercy everlasting (Ps 135 [136]).

What keeps the unsubmitive Israel bound to God is also the biblical principle of solidarity. "If the first handful of dough is holy, so is the whole lump; if the root is holy so are the branches" (11,16). As the first cake from the year's harvest, when offered to God, hallows all the bread in the land, so do the first fruits of Christ's and the apostles' preaching⁽¹⁾ — all born of grace — foreshadow an outpouring of God's grace on the whole people. Again, as a root determines the growth, indeed, the character of a tree, so do the patriarchs, particularly the first of them, give direction to the lives of their descendants. Earlier in the Epistle (4,3-10) St. Paul quotes that weighty sentence: "Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as justice" (Gen 15,6). Here he seems to go further: In the end, Abraham's faith will also profit his sons — such is the faithful and unanimous will of God⁽²⁾.

The holy remnant, a pledge of the salvation of all Israel; Abraham, the recipient of God's promise, himself a promise that the now aloof Israel will in the end turn to Christ — this joyous assurance is the dialectical counterpart to the sorrow with which the Apostle begins chapter 9. At the same time, it is closely linked to the stern words with which he warns Rome's Gentile Christians not to gloat over Israel lapsed, not to attribute to themselves what they owe to God's abundant mercy and to the richness of the olive stem that bears them. Together with his candid confession that by his untiring work among the Gentiles, he ultimately seeks the reconciliation of his own kinsmen (11,13-14), together with his exhortation that those chosen from among the Gentiles remain part of the life-giving tree by clinging to God's goodness (11,17-24), his hopeful vision of Israel's history, which sees patriarch and remnant as tokens of a future of grace for his people (11,16), seems to interrupt the mighty movement that leads from verse 11 to verse 32.

If these passages must be considered parenthetical, then they must be thought of as interludes necessary to heighten rather than lessen the crescendo of chapter 11. They are necessary to strengthen St. Paul's

⁽¹⁾ With Père LYONNET I take ἀπαρχή to refer to the "remnant of grace". See *Les Épîtres de Saint Paul*, p. 111, note c.

⁽²⁾ DODD does less than justice to the communion between Abraham and his people — a figure of the interwovenness of all human existence — when he speaks of it as the "conception of tribal solidarity" and confuses it with heredity and national character (see *op. cit.*, pp. 188-189).

message that without Israel's ingathering the world cannot attain its ultimate perfection, and without accomplishing her salvific instrumentality for the world Israel is hardly more than a shadow, a vestige of herself. So vital is the link between Israel and the world that Maier does not hesitate to call the people of Israel "gleichsam das Α und Ω der ganzen Heilsgeschichte" ⁽¹⁾.

Leaving the parenthetical verses behind, I should like to read St. Paul's εὐαγγέλιον in a translation of my own. As at the Easter vigil the deacon sings, in an ever higher key, "Lumen Christi", so the Apostle goes from joy to joy until he bursts into a jubilant shout: "If their misstep has enriched the world, if their smaller number as enriched the nations, what will their full tale not accomplish" (11,12). He rejoices: "If their exclusion meant a world reconciled [to God], what will their inclusion mean if not life from the dead!" (11,15) ⁽²⁾. Finally, he exclaims: "Lest you trust your own mind [and invent your own solutions of Israel's future], I shall not leave you unaware of this mystery: A part of Israel has become hardened [and this, its insensibility, will last] until the totality of Gentiles has entered. [When this has happened], all Israel will be saved, as is written:

Out of Sion will come the Deliverer
He will banish all godlessness from Jacob.
And this is what I shall do for them:
I shall take away their sins" (11,25-27).

In the first two predictions, St. Paul follows the manner of the ancient rabbis, twice using one of their favorite ways of arguing — the conclusion *a minore ad maius*. In the final prediction, however, he speaks like a prophet, binding into one several Old Testament oracles (Is 59,20-21; 27,9; Jer 31,33-34; Ps 13[14],7). His first two declarations could possibly give the impression that he relies on his own reasoning, but his final utterance leaves no doubt whatever that his hope rests on divine revelation. In all three instances, he speaks as the interpreter of God's eternal counsel.

⁽¹⁾ MAIER, *op. cit.*, p. 123. Need I underline that he speaks of Israel as the Alpha and Omega of the entire *history* of salvation, for the Alpha and Omega of *salvation* is none but Christ?

⁽²⁾ As for the translation of ἥτις and πλήρωμα in verse 12, of ἀπαβολή and πρόσλημις in verse 15, I have greatly benefited from MAIER's discussion of these complex terms. See *op. cit.*, pp. 120-121, 126-127.

IV

This, then, is the working of God's saving design: Though Israel's ingathering shall be God's doing, God's plan for the world will not be accomplished without Israel. In the words of Asmussen: "Israel und sein Schicksal sind ein Mysterium. Worin besteht es? Darin, dass die Wege Gottes nicht ohne Israel vollendet werden" (1). In itself, to be Abraham's offspring is nothing; indeed, it is an evil if a Jew (or for that matter any man) puts his trust in his ancestry rather than in God's mercy. Such is the teaching of the Gospels as it is that of St. Paul (cf. Gal 5,6). Yet it is also his teaching that there is much good in being a Jew, for in looking at a Jew God remembers the words He entrusted to Abraham and his sons (Rom 3,1-2). Again, he writes to the Galatians that whenever there is a new birth "there is neither Jew nor Greek. . . . All are one in Christ Jesus" (3,28). But he reminds the Romans that Jews and Gentiles somehow need one another to become ready for Christ's offer of salvation and that the world needs both, the unity of both, to obtain the fullness of His peace. How could it be otherwise? What love is intent upon giving, only love can receive.

This vision seems to disconcert even a man of Dodd's familiarity with biblical thought. "From our standpoint", he writes, "with a far longer historical retrospect than St. Paul could have dreamt of, the special importance here assigned to the Jews and their conversion in the forecast of mankind appears artificial. It is doubtful whether it is really justified on Paul's own premises". He goes on to say that if the promise means ultimate blessedness for "Israel" then it is *either* the historic Israel that is heir of this promise *or* the New Israel, the Body of Christ in which no people holds a special place. But, he feels, Paul tries to have it both ways. "We can well understand that his emotional interest in his own people, rather than strict logic, has determined his forecast" (2).

In a manner of speaking, Dodd is right. St. Paul loves "both ways", ultimate blessedness for the Israel according to the flesh, not apart from but in and through union with the Israel according to the spirit. Instead of a sad "aut-aut", he preaches the jubilant "et-et" that is the mark of the whole of Catholic doctrine. Yet, is it not shortsighted to think that the progress of time, that more extended historical perspectives can alter theological realities? As for the charge of "emotional interest", I should

(1) ASMUSSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

(2) DODD, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

like to let a Swiss theologian who cannot be accused of bias answer it. "Nicht aus 'warmherzigen Patriotismus' oder gar aus rassischer Treue hält Paulus an seinem Volke fest, sondern einzig, weil Gott es geliebt hat, weil er nicht untreu sein kann gegen seine Geliebten" (1).

Dodd is not the only exegete who feels uneasy about St. Paul's dialectics. To others, too, a promise that Israel as a people will be saved seems to be in conflict with the promises fulfilled in the Church, it seems to impair her unique place, as though abundance of grace could ever be detrimental. Not a few of the early Fathers, inclined as they were to allegorization, understood St. Paul's prophecy "All Israel shall be saved" as referring to the spiritual Israel, and so did some of the reformers. In our own day, Cerfaux thinks it possible that "all Israel" points, not to the empirical people, but to an ideal totality, an ensemble embracing Jews and Gentiles (3).

If I may use resolute language, any interpretation of this kind emasculates St. Paul's message which is that of the majesty of God, of His fearlessness — *sit venia verbo* — of a God unafraid of astounding His critics as well as His followers. In any case, the overwhelming majority of exegetes throughout the ages give to St. Paul's prophecy of Israel's final return its full force. Though on its modalities and consequences, on its manner and immediate fruit we can but conjecture, this uncertainty in no way undoes the certainty of the hope itself. A divine promise, an apostolic legacy, it is part of the Church's unfailing expectation. I am happy, then, to make my own the words of Lyonnet: "De facto conversionis futurae Judaeorum nullum . . . dubium remanere potest" (2).

(1) ERNST GAUGLER, *Der Römerbrief, II. Teil: Kapitel 9-15* (Zürich, 1952), p. 185.

(2) CERFAUX, *op. cit.*, p. 41, note 3.

(3) Stanislaus LYONNET S. J., *Quaestiones in Epistolam ad Romanos*. Series altera (Rome, 1956), p. III.