I. Introduction

The letter to the Romans is the only undisputed Pauline letter addressed to a church that mostly consisted of people whom the apostle neither knew nor converted (Rom 1:10-13; 15:15-16, 22-24). Notwithstanding this unfamiliarity, Paul assumed his audience was familiar with and thus accepted the eschatological triumvirate of the death, resurrection, and enthronement of Jesus at God’s right hand (Rom 8:34). Studies on Paul’s understanding of Jesus’s death and resurrection abound and are too numerous to list. Those devoted to Jesus’s exaltation and Paul’s use of Psalm 110 (the Psalm on which he relies in Rom 8:34) are significantly fewer. Moreover, works on the background for Paul’s portrait of Jesus as an intercessor are even smaller.


Previous attempts to find a context for this portrait of Jesus have proved unsatisfactory. James D.G. Dunn in his masterful 2-volume commentary on Romans answers this query by appealing to Second Temple angelology and Adamic Christology.

The imagery is of heavenly intercession such as was attributed to angels already within Jewish thought . . . We have here therefore another example of earliest Christology taking over various categories used to describe the reality of heaven and focusing them in an exclusive and exhaustive way on Christ . . . Here may be as much an outworking of Paul’s Adam Christology (the last Adam interceding for his race, somewhat like T. Abr. 11). Dunn’s attempted solution of the Enochic tradition and Second Temple theologizing around Adam is tentative at best. Enoch petitioned for angels, as Dunn notes, and Jesus does so for the elect. Major difficulties exist surrounding the dating and Jewishness of the Testament of Abraham that make it problematic for a background for Rom 8:34. Thus Hay, who has published one of the only English monographs devoted to Ps 110:1 in the NT (1973), concludes, “There are no very close parallels in Jewish literature.”

Press, 1963), 88, “Jesus himself quotes Ps. 110, which, as we shall see, became so very important for all early Christian theology that it is cited in the New Testament more often than any other Old Testament passage,” and, 222-23, “Scholars do not usually attribute sufficient importance to the fact that statements about the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God (which were very early included in the creed) formally go back to this psalm [i.e., Ps 110].” F.F. Bruce, Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free (reprint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 118, “Although Paul makes infrequent use of the metaphor ‘the right hand of God’, he takes the oracle of Psalm 110:1 seriously as a messianic testimonium.” Udo Schnelle, Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology (trans. Eugene Boring; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 439, “Paul brings a different perspective to the κύριος title. By speaking of Jesus as ‘Lord,’ believers place themselves under the authority of the exalted Lord, who is present in the life of the church. It is most likely that Ps. 109 LXX (Ps. 110) played a key role in the adoption of the Kyrios title into the developing Christology.” C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology (London: Nesbit, 1952).

5. Dunn, Romans 1-8, 504.

6. E.P. Sanders, “Testament of Abraham,” OTP 1.874-75, 871-902, dates the work to the second century CE. George Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature Between the Maccabees and the Mishnah (2d. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 327, acknowledges that the current text is a Christian one and that dating it is difficult. He suggests a first century CE Egyptian provenance.

7. Hay, Glory at the Right Hand, 131. The closest, according to Hay, is Philo’s allegorical interpretation of Genesis 18 and Abraham’s three visitors. Philo says that one of the visitors is God, another represents government, which is on his left, and the final person is mercy, which is on God’s right (Abr. 124).
In his monograph *The Messiah and the Throne* (2001) devoted to exploring the role of merkabah mysticism in the development of exaltation Christology, Timo Eskola performs eisigesis and reads intercessory rhetoric into the context of Ps 110:4, concluding, “[Jesus] appears to be the new Melchizedek who has a priestly function in the heavenly Temple.” Not only is intercessory language non-existent in Psalm 110 but also Jesus’s petitionary role in Hebrews is linked with his priesthood not his enthronement (Heb 7:25).

Two scholars have suggested that Paul’s portrait of Jesus in the text in question may be better interpreted in light of the Graeco-Roman pagan world. In his commentary on Romans, Jewett entertains the possibility of placing Rom 8:34 into a pagan juridical context. In the process, he refers to a passage from Polybius, one decree from Diocletian, and one papyrus, which he quotes from Moulton’s and Milligan’s majestic *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*. Hay points to an inscription from Commagene in which a king promises to pray for future rulers who will keep in operation the sacred calendar and priests for his cult (*OGIS* 383).

Both of these studies do not develop a theory as to how these references relate to Rom 8:34 and they mentioned them, it seems, only in passing.

The difficulty of previous examinations is the data on which they rely. The purview of Dunn’s and Eskola’s sources were Jewish with some pagan literary texts. The selection of their evidence, therefore, determined the outcome of their studies and left the question as an

---


impasse. Hay’s and Jewett’s attempts are deficient because of their failure to parse out their postulations. Hay’s reference is short and never mentioned again in his book. Jewett never considers the implications of his three references, that they could be part of some larger social convention, or what they meant for Paul’s Roman audience. It is my conviction that the context of Jesus as intercessor in Rom 8:34 lies in both a Jewish text and in the administrative techniques of the Graeco-Roman world, namely the process by which one seeking justice petitions a higher authority. In this paper, I will demonstrate that LXX of Psalm 110 [109] provided Paul with the notion of Jesus as a royal figure present at the eschatological judgment and that Paul’s philological description of Jesus’s activity is indebted to individuals’ petitions to civic officials that are best preserved in documentary papyri. Consequently, this unique portrait of Jesus is the result of Paul reading the Greek Bible in pagan civic and juridical contexts. In the process of arguing this hypothesis, I shall begin with an examination of Psalm 110 in its original context in the Hebrew Bible and its meaning in the LXX. The purpose behind this survey is to demonstrate the significance of the LXX and its portrayal of the Psalmist’s Lord in Paul’s thought in Rom 8:34. I shall then provide the philological connections between Paul’s use of ἐντυγχάνω + ὑπέρ in documentary papyri as juridical rhetoric addressed to a civic official who functions as an intercessor.

Before I begin, I must address three methodological issues. First, I will employ the historical critical method in my exposition of Psalm 110 in its original context, the LXX, and Paul’s letters. Second, while I will discuss a text that Jews and Christians interpreted as

---

1. For the importance in the selection of sources and a scholar’s conclusions, I am indebted to my former professor Giovanni Bazzana, “BASILEIA—The Q Concept of Kingship in Light of Documentary Papyri,” in *Light from the East. Papyrologische Kommentare zum Neuen Testament* (eds. P. Artz-Grabner and C.M. Kreinecker, Philippika; Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 39; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 153, “All attempts to reconstruct the historical figure of Jesus are shaped and guided by a preliminary selection of the sources, with each historian has to carry out before addressing any problem. Hence, since the original background for the phrase βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is almost always sought within a limited set of ‘Jewish’ materials, the very outcome of these searches has specific and constantly recurring characteristics.”
messianic (Psalm 110), my goal is not a history of messianism. Finally, I interpret Paul as: (1) a Second Temple Pharisaic Jew (Phil 3:5; Acts 23:6; 26:5) who accepted Jesus as messiah; (2) a citizen of Rome (Acts 16:37-38; 22:25-27, 29; 23:27) and Tarsus (Acts 22:3); and (3) a missionary to the Gentiles (Rom 11:13; Gal 2:8-9). Consequently, Paul spent his formative years in Judea training as a Pharisee and a great deal of time in the Diaspora. I do not doubt the influences of Second Temple Jewish and Hellenistic-Roman thought in Paul’s theology.

II. Psalm 110 in the Hebrew Bible

My argument for Paul’s understanding of Jesus as intercessor relies on the Greek Psalter and not the Hebrew because the Greek text of Psalm 110 evidences certain ideas and thoughts that are not present in MT and thus probably the Hebrew Vorlage. In order to understand the importance of these changes, we must have a firm grounding in the Psalm’s original context.

Since the pioneering work of Hermann Gunkel, scholars have placed Psalm 110 among the Königspsalmen, which consists of the following Psalms: 2; 18; 20; 21; 45; 72; 89; 101; 110; 132; and 144. Although these may date back to the united kingdom of Israel and Judah, Gunkel was correct to stress that ancient Judahites mediated the text and thus these Psalms can only tell us about the lives of Judean kings, an existence that is starkly contrasted with the records of Samuel and Kings. For example, Psalm 45 was associated with a royal wedding and Psalm 2 was performed at an enthronement festival where ancient Judahites celebrated their king’s exaltation.


and Yahweh reaffirmed his adoption of the monarch (Ps 2:7). Some have criticized these conclusions, but they rest on two strong pieces of evidence: (1) the *Sitze im Leben* of the Psalms themselves and (2) comparative data from other ancient Near Eastern cultures.  

Psalm 110 was probably an oracle pronounced at the annual coronation ceremony of the Davidic king similar to Psalm 2. The psalm’s superscription is probably late, but nevertheless makes explicit what the psalm itself and parallels inculcate, i.e., ties to a Davidic king (Ps 110:1a). The first words spoken are an oracle of Yahweh (יְהוָה נְאֻם) in which he proclaims to the king (who is referred to as the psalmist’s Lord (אדון)): “be enthroned at my right hand until I set your enemies as a footstool for your feet” (ךָלְרַגְלֶי הֲדֹם אוּבְיָה עַד־אָשִׁית לַימִינִי שֵׁב). The psalm does not contain a direct mention of a throne (כִּסֵּא), but philological parallels in the Bible, especially in the Psalms and ancient Near Eastern literature support my translation of the G-stem singular

---


16. Gunkel, *Introduction*, 102. The background of this Psalm is God’s promise to David of a royal line. According to the narrative of Samuel, David desired to build a house for Yahweh (2 Sam 7:2). After initially being told that he could construct a temple for the God of Israel for Yahweh was with David (ךְעי יְהוָה כִּי) (2 Sam 7:3), Nathan received an oracle from God that he would not allow David to build his temple because Yahweh had not dwelled in one since the Israelites came up from Egypt (2 Sam 7:5-11a) (Later, during the postexilic period the Chronicler indicates that it was because David had been a man of war and shed much blood that he was not able to build the temple for God (1 Chr 22:8; 28:3)). Nevertheless, God promised David that he would build him a house, i.e., a royal line (2 Sam 7:11b-14). This lineage includes the establishment of David’s kingdom (2 Sam 7:12, 16) and his throne forever (ךְעֶרֶב) (2 Sam 7:13, 16), and the adoption of David’s offspring. Consequently, Yahweh would become the father of the Davidic king and said monarch would become his son (אֲשֶׁר לְבֵן יִהְיֶה־לִּי וְהוּא לְאָב אֶהְיֶה־לּוֹ אֶנִי בְּשֵׁב וְהוֹכַחְתִּיו בְּהַעֲוֹתוֹ אָדָם בְּנֵי וּבְנִגְעֵי אֲנָשִׁים ט) (2 Sam 7:14).


Translations are mine unless otherwise noted.
imperative ישׁב. Another factor in my translation is the presence of a scepter of the king’s power that Yahweh will send forth (מִצִּיּוֹן יְהוָה יִשְׁלַח מַטֵּה־עֻזְּךָ) (v. 2a) and the footstool (v. 1b), which was common ancient Near Eastern throne furnishing.

Since the Psalms indicate that Yahweh is enthroned on a number of objects such as the heavens, Israel’s praises, and the Ark of the Covenant, where does this session occur, i.e., where is God’s right hand? The king’s exaltation is literal and located in Zion for this is the locale from which Yahweh sends out the king’s scepter (Ps 110:2a). Psalm 110’s rhetoric is unique among the Königpsalmen. Psalm 2:7 expresses the king’s adoption as the son of God,

18. Frank Moore Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 246, concludes of the use of יש in Hebrew poetry, “In early contexts, especially in archaic poetry, derivatives of ysb were used of Yahweh, especially in reference to his enthronement in the sanctuary.” Biblical authors often used a form of יש and כִּסֵּא to indicate that God or a king was reigning: Exod 11:5; 12:29; 1 Kgs 1:13, 17, 20, 24, 27, 30, 35, 46, 48; 2:12, 19; 8:20, 25; 16:11; 22:10, 19; 2 Kgs 10:30; 11:19; 13:13; 15:12; 1 Chr 28:5; 29:23; 2 Chr 6:10, 16; 18:9, 18; 23:20; Isa 6:1; Jer 13:13; 17:25; 22:2, 4, 30; 36:30; Esth 15:6; Ps 122:5; Ps 132:12; Prov 20:8; Job 36:7; Zech 6:13; Isa 16:5.

In referring to the deity and king this way, the ancient Israelites/Judahites used similar concepts as their ancient Near Eastern neighbors. Alison Salvesen, “The Trappings of Royalty in Ancient Hebrew,” in King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar (ed. John Day; JSOT SupSeries 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 132, “The expression ‘sit on the throne; indicating kingship is found widely in Akkadian and Ugaritic as well as Hebrew, so the idea is common to most ancient Near Eastern societies.” And, “The phrase is often metaphorical and was “more or less synonymous with mālak, ‘to reign’, and māsal, ‘to rule.’” For a discussion of the etymology and its relation to the ancient Near East see Salvesen, “Trappings,” 131-36.

19. Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 3, 147, “While it is not explicitly said that this is about sitting on the ‘throne,’ the motif of the footstool of the throne that follows in v. 1e makes this obvious.”

20. Exaltation language of Yahweh is diverse in the Hebrew Bible and he is enthroned on panoply of items. For example, according to Ps 2:4a “the one who is enthroned in the heavens derides” (יִשְׂחָק בַּשָּׁמַיִם) (cf. Ps 123:1). Ps 9:12 proclaims that Yahweh is exalted in Zion (יִשְׂרָאֵל תְּהִלּוֹת יוֹשֵׁב קָדוֹשׁ וְאַתָּה) (cf. Ps. 22:4). The psalmist declares that God is enthroned on the praises of Israel (יִשְׂרָאֵל תְּהִלּוֹת יוֹשֵׁב קָדוֹשׁ וְאַתָּה) (Ps 22:4).Like the ancient Canaanite god Baal, the Lord can also be exalted over the primordial flood (יָשָׁב לַמַּבּוּל) (Ps 29:10). The psalmist also notes that Yahweh is enthroned “on high” (Ps 113:5). Not only is Yahweh exalted in the celestial sphere, but also he is enthroned on the cherubim (Pss 80:2; 99:1; 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 37:16; 1 Chr 13:6). Finally, it is important to note that God could remove his exaltation from a particular place if he wished, according to Ezekiel. The exilic prophet records that God mounted a cherub and left the city of Jerusalem and its temple (Ezek 9:1-3; 1 Kgs 22:19) and the Psalms indicate Yahweh is the only one enthroned in heaven (Pss 9:7; 11:4; 47:9; 93:2; 97:2; 103:19).

21. Aside from Daniel, prophetic visions (Isa 6:1-3; 1 Kgs 22:19) and the Psalms indicate Yahweh is the only one enthroned in heaven (Pss 9:7; 11:4; 47:9; 93:2; 97:2; 103:19).

the king’s throne is actually Yahweh’s,23 and the king participates in his rule,24 which was a common conception of ancient Near Eastern kingship (see image 1).25

God’s promise to deliver the king’s enemies is a central theme to this psalm and one that frames it (Ps 110:1b, 2, 5-6). This assurance is also common among other Kingship Psalms (Ps 2:8-12; 72:9-11; contra Ps 89:43) and royal ideologies of the ancient Near East.26

Psalm 110:3 is fraught with textual and interpretive difficulties.27 The MT is pointed as follows:�יַלְדֻתֶּיָּלֶּךָ מִשְׁחָר בְּהַדְרֵי־קֹדֶשׁ בְּיוֹם נְדָבֹת עַמְּךָ, and the NRSV translates: “Your people will offer themselves willingly on the day you lead your forces on the holy mountains. From the womb of the morning like dew your youth will come to you.” The king’s people are described with the same term used for freewill offerings in the Bible (נְדָבָה), and the idea seems to

23. Cf. 1 Chr 28:5; 29:23; 2 Chr 9:8, where the throne is specifically referred as Yahweh’s. The psalmists were aware that their king ruled only because Yahweh reigned (לְעוֹלָם מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה) (Ps 29:10; 99:1). As a result, the king and God were connected integrally in the Psalms (Ps 2:2: “Yahweh and his anointed וְעַל־מְשִׁיחוֹ עַל־יְהוָה” cf. Pss 20:7; 45:7; 61:7-8).

24. Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 3, 147, Zenger concludes that Ps 110:1 confirms “a real co-enthronement of the addressee, that is, a participation in the exercise of YHWH’s own royal rule.” This portrait is different from Psalm 2 where the king is a “representative” of the deity. Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 3, 148, in Ps 110:1 “YHWH and the king exercise royal rule together.”

That the text speaks to the king in the present tense supports the Psalm’s pre-exilic context. Gunkel, Introduction, 99. Psalm 110 has been assigned various dates, from the pre-exilic monarchy to the time of the Hasmoneans. For a discussion see Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 3, 144-46. Zenger dates the Psalm to postexilic period.

25. Gunkel, Introduction, 99-100; John Walton, Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic 2006), 278, observes the following about the task of an ancient Near Eastern king: “In the ancient world the king stood between the divine and human realms mediating the power of the deity in his city and beyond. He communed with the gods, was privy to their councils, and enjoyed their favor and protection. He was responsible for maintaining justice, for leading in battle, for initiating and accomplishing public building projects from canals to walls to temples, and had ultimate responsibility for the ongoing performance of the cult.” Mowinckel, Psalms, 1.110-16; John Baines, “Ancient Egyptian Kingship: Official Forms, Rhetoric, Context,” in King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar (ed. John Day; JSOT SupSeries 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 17; Lambert, “Kingship,” 55.

26. Mowinckel, Psalms, 1.55.

27. Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 3, 141.
be that they will freely give themselves,\textsuperscript{28} which the NRSV captures. This Psalmist indicates that this occurs on the day of his battle (ךָחֵילֶבְּיוֹם), presumably when the royal figure conquers his enemies (Ps 110:1b, 2, 5-6).\textsuperscript{29} The next half of the verse is the most difficult. The first question that one must answer is with whom does בְּהַדְרֵי־קֹדֶשׁ go? That is, does it refer back to the people or does it point forward to the king? Because the way הָדָר is used in another Kingship Psalm to refer the royal figure (cf. Ps 45:4, 5), I interpret it with the latter. Consequently, the Psalmist is describing the king “in his holy splendor.”\textsuperscript{30} Finally, there is difficulty concerning the pointing of יַלְדֻי. It could be pointed as יְלִדְתִּי and read thus: “I have sired you,”\textsuperscript{31} which is how the translators of the Psalter into Greek rendered it.\textsuperscript{32} This second pointing is the correct one for it reflects the king’s adoption,\textsuperscript{33} which is fitting for an Enthronement Psalm (cf. Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam

\textsuperscript{28} Exod 35:29; 36:3; Lev 7:16; 22:18, 21, 23; etc.

\textsuperscript{29} חֵיל is used for battle in the Hebrew Bible: Exod 14:4, 9; 15:4. Probably looming in the background of the people willingly offering themselves in battle is the notion that the king rules righteously, which was an expectation of Judah’s king and those in the ancient Near East. For more information see Moshe Weinfeld, Social Justice in Ancient Israel and the in the Ancient Near East (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995). The prophetic texts that employ rhetoric about the level of peace and prosperity the restored Davidic king will bring God’s people are best interpreted in light this (Amos 9:11-15; Isa 11:1-10; 16:5; Jer 23:5-6; 33:15-26; Ezek 34:23-24; Zech 12:7-10). Collins, Scepter, 26-46; idem, “The King as Son of God,” in King and Messiah as Son of God (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 11; Lambert, “Kingship,” 55, 69-70; Day, “Canaanite Inheritance,” 87; Gillingham, “Messiah,” 212.

\textsuperscript{30} Contra Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 3, 140, who take it with the former. The LXX translators of the Psalms rendered רָדָא with λαμπρότης.

\textsuperscript{31} For a discussion see Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 3, 142.

\textsuperscript{32} ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἐκσαφροῦ ἐξεγέννησά σε; “From the womb before the morning star, I sired you” (for more on the LXX of Psalms see below)

\textsuperscript{33} Mowinckel, Psalms, 1.53. This does not mean that the king was ontologically the son of Yahweh. There are hints, however, that some in ancient Judah thought of the king as more than human (Ps 45:7). Collins, Scepter, 25-26. Contra Day, “Canaanite Inheritance,” 84; Gillingham, “Messiah,” 217-18, fn. 22; Wilhelm Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar (ed. and enlarged by K. Kautzsch; trans. A.E. Crowley; Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2006 [originally published 1909]), §128d, who adds the preposition ב before מָבית in Ps 45:7. However, מָבית is best taken as a vocative.

Contra Collins, “King,” 22, “the language of sonship does have mythical overtones, and clearly claims for the king a status greater than human.” He overlooks that in Deuteronomy the Israelites are referred to as “sons of the Yahweh your God” (Deut 14:1). And, Collins, Scepter, 26, however, goes too far as he seems to suggest that Ps 45:7 was typical of ancient Judahite thinking: “While the king was not to be confused with the Almighty, he was evidently exalted above the common rank of humanity.” There are only two “clear” passages in the Hebrew Bible
7:11b-14) and an ancient Near Eastern enthronement ceremony.

Finally, Ps 110:4 is evidence of a pre-exilic date when the king performed priestly duties (like many ancient Near Eastern kings).\textsuperscript{34} This does not mean that his main appointment was that of a priest. On the contrary, Rooke has demonstrated that the comparison to Melchizedek in Ps 110:4:

[I]mplies that for the addressee of the psalm, as for Melchizedek, the priesthood is a function of the kingship rather than the ruling power being a function of the priesthood, so that the one to whom the psalm is addressed is first and foremost a king.\textsuperscript{35}

In short, the rhetoric and occasion of the performance of Psalm 110 in ancient Israel is an attempt to have a king similar to what the Deuteronomist purported they would have; a king like all the nations (Deut 17:14; 1 Sam 8:5).

\textit{III. Psalm 110 [LXX 109] in the Septuagint}\textsuperscript{36}

The Judean monarchy fell in 587 BCE with Nebuchadrezzar’s second sack of Jerusalem and capture of Zedekiah (2 Kings 25). With this, the performance of the Kingship Psalms likely ceased. The Hebrew text remained among Judean scribes who ensured its preservation. With the

---


35. Rooke, “Kingship as Priesthood,” 188. For similar comments see Cross, \textit{Canaanite Myth}, 211, n. 60; 265.

36. I use the term Septuagint and abbreviation LXX to refer to any and all Greek translations of the various books that came to be known as Hebrew Bible that occurred from the third century BCE to the second century CE. For more on the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek see Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva, \textit{Invitation to the Septuagint} (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 30-44.
advent of the Hellenistic period and the influence and necessity for Jews to speak, read, and to write Greek, the Hebrew text of the Psalter was translated. This requirement provided opportunities for translators to update their Bible with current theological developments, including eschatological and messianic ones. Consequently, the Greek Psalter provided the notion of a preexistent royal figure who was also a judge for God’s people and against Gentile polities. My objective in this section is not a reconstruction of the Hebrew Vorlage. While I will discuss this at times, my main interest is in the LXX as a historical document and how the translators conceptualized the royal figure of Psalm 110.37 For ease of reference I will refer to Psalm 110 as 109.

Provided the Vorlage of Psalms was similar to the MT, Ps 109:1 is translated straightforwardly.38 Evidence from the biblical MSS among the Dead Sea Scrolls indicates that superscriptions were attached to the Psalms as early as the mid second century BCE.39 As a result, Psalm 109 was associated explicitly to David in the LXX translation of the Psalm’s heading as: Τῷ Δαυίδ ψαλμός. The received text indicates that the translators used κύριος for both Yahweh and the royal figure (Εἴπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου).40 This may have blurred the


39. The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants Volume 3: Psalms-Chronicles (3 vols.; ed. Eugene Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 2013); Martin Abegg Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible (San Francisco: HarperOne, 1999), 505. Although Psalm 110 is unattested among the biblical scrolls, Peter Flint, The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 190-91, 48, concludes that 11QPs likely contained the entirety of the Psalm. This is a case of the preservation of the sources.

40. This is true as long as the LXX that Christian scribes copied looked similar to the ones used by Jews in the Second Temple Period. It is possible that ancient Jewish and even Christian scribes differentiated between the Tetragrammaton and the κύριος title before our earliest copies of the Greek Psalter. George Howard, “The Tetragram and the New Testament,” JBL (1977): 63-83. Contra Hurtado, Lord Jesus Christ, 182-83.
lines between them but this close association of the king and God is not novel in the Hebrew and Greek Psalters (cf. Ps 45:7 [LXX 44:7]). Similarly, the translators rendered 1b: Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐως ἄν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου; “Sit at my right hand until I can make your enemies a footstool for your feet.”41 The reader will notice the change in my translation (“sit”) from the MT (“be enthroned”). As we saw above, the Hebrew Psalter and Bible consistently use יֹשֵׁב in conjunction with כִּסֵּא to refer to a reigning deity or monarch. This frequency led to the creation of a colloquialism in which only the verb יֹשֵׁב sufficed for the concept of enthronement. The Greek Psalms do not witness this consistency,42 and the ancient Near Eastern expression has been lost.

This does not mean that the LXX translators did not have a concept of kingship or that “the LXX translators [of the entirety of the LXX] . . . accepted the political reality of a semi-autonomous Jewish polity.”43 It is true that the translators of the Pentateuch,44 and especially those of Deuteronomy made interesting choices that may suggest some kind of development in

---

41. ἐως ἄν and the subjunctive aorist θῶ in the phrase ἐως ἄν θῶ appears significant initially and seems to place conditionality on the placement of the enemies under the king’s feet. Nonetheless, the Psalms’ translators use ἐως ἄν and the subjunctive for the Hebrew particle עַד with no more conditionality than the Hebrew: Ps 18:38 [LXX 17:38]; Ps 71:18 [LXX 70:18].


their conception of kingship.\textsuperscript{45} However, the Psalter translators always render כְּמֶלֶ and cognates with βασιλεύς and cognates regardless if the referent is Yahweh,\textsuperscript{46} or a Jewish\textsuperscript{47} or pagan king.\textsuperscript{48}  

Psalm 109:2’s statement that Yahweh will send out the Davidide’s powerful scepter from Zion so that the king can reign in the midst of his enemies is rendered straightforwardly in the LXX. The next verse 109:3 contains a significant change that provides a window into the translators’ conception of their messiah. I supply the embedded MT and LXX for comparison:

\textquote[בְּהַחֵילֶךָ] {Your people are a freewill offering on the day of your battle. In holy splendor from the womb of the dawn, I have sired you [and] the dew belongs to you.”}

Provided the translators worked with a Vorlage similar to the MT, changes exist for which there must be an account.\textsuperscript{49} First, they interpreted הָעַמְּ as הָעִמְּ and translated it μετά σοῦ.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{45} For example, the translators of Deuteronomy render consistently כְּ as βασιλεύς when the noun refers to a Gentile king: Deut 1:4 (2x); 2:24, 26, 30; 3:1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 21; 4:46, 47 (2x); 7:8, 24; 11:3; 29:6 (2x); 31:4. When כְּ is used for a Jewish king (Deut 17:14-15; 28:36; 33:5 (only in the LXX in this last reference, for in the MT the text refers to Yahweh)), or Yahweh (Deut 28:26), the term employed is ἀρχων.

\textsuperscript{46} Pss 5:3; 10:16 [LXX 9:37]; 24:7, 8, 9, 10 (2x) [LXX 23:7, 8, 9, 10 (2x)]; 29:10 [LXX 28:10]; 44:5 [LXX 43:5]; 47:3, 7, 8, 9 [LXX 46:3, 7, 8, 9]; LXX 67:13; 68:25 [LXX 67:25]; 74:12 [LXX 73:12]; 84:4 [LXX 83:4]; 93:1 [LXX 92:1]; 95:3, 10 [LXX 94:3, 10]; 97:1 [LXX 96:1]; 98:6 [LXX 97:6]; 99:4 [LXX 98:1, 4]; 145:1 [LXX 144:1]; 146:10 [LXX 145:10]; 149:2.

\textsuperscript{47} Pss 2:6; 18:51 [LXX 17:51]; 20:10 [LXX 19:10]; 21:2, 8 [LXX 20:2, 8]; 33:16 [LXX 32:16]; 45:2, 6, 12, 15, 16 [LXX 44:2, 6, 12, 15, 16]; 48:3 [LXX 47:3]; 61:7 [LXX 60:7]; 63:12 [LXX 62:12]; 72:1 [LXX 71:1]; 89:19 [LXX 88:19]; 144:10 [LXX 143:10].


\textsuperscript{49} Schaper, \textit{Eschatology}, 101-07.
Given that the text from which they worked was un-pointed, the change is understandable. A survey of the Greek Psalter reveals, however, that the translators knew when "עָמָךְ" meant "your people" and "with you" in their Hebrew Vorlage.\textsuperscript{51} Whether or not the alteration was intentional is debatable. Nevertheless, it is evidence that as far as the translators were concerned the Psalm’s focus was on the royal figure and not his people. Second, the translators rendered נְדָבֹת as "ἡ ἀρχὴ,"\textsuperscript{52} which similarly stresses the king and his task. Third, they translated שְׁאֹרִירֵי הָאַל as ἐν τοῖς λαμπρότησιν τῶν ἁγίων. Thus, unlike my interpretation of שְׁאֹרִירֵי הָאַל, the translators thought it referred not to the king but to his people. It is possible that the Hebrew Vorlage contained קְדֹשִׁים, or that the change is deliberate. Given the exegetical tendency of the Psalms’ translators, the latter is most probable. The identity of the holy ones appears unclear initially. Schaper regards it as a reference to God’s people and Collins suggests they are angels.\textsuperscript{53} While either is possible, the reference to their brightness (λαμπρότης) tips the scales in Schaper’s favor, for the term is also used in the θ’ of Dan 12:3 to refer to the elect (καὶ οἱ συνιέντες ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ἡ λαμπρότης τοῦ στερεώματος). Similar statements also occur in I En. 39:7; 104:2; and Matt 13:43, which are all in the context of discussing eschatological “expectation related to divine

\textsuperscript{50} Schaper, \textit{Eschatology}, 101. I am indebted to Prof. Ruth Langer, Professor of Jewish Studies at Boston College and Associate Director of the Center for Christian-Jewish Learning at Boston College, for this observation.


\textsuperscript{52} הַלֵּבָנָן appears thrice in the Greek OT: Deut 16:10; Ps 109:3; Job 30:15, and each time translators used a different Greek term: ἰργοῦ (Deut 16:10), ἦ ἀρχή (Ps 109:3), and ἦ ἐλπίς (Job 30:15). A cognate הַלָּבָן appears 16 times in the MT but is not translated with ἦ ἀρχή in the Greek OT: Exod 35:21, 29; 36:3; Lev 7:16; 22:21, 23; Num 15:3; Deut 23:24; Ezek 46:12 (2x); Hos 14:5; Ps 54:8 [LXX 53:8]; Ezra 1:4; 3:5; 8:28; 2 Chr 35:8.

\textsuperscript{53} Collins, “Messiah,” 58.
judgement and eternal life.”54 The translation, therefore, heightens the Psalm’s eschatological expectation and work of the royal figure, which is related to the vindication of God’s elect at what appears to be a judgment scene.

Fourth, Ps 109:3c provides evidence of the king’s preexistence. The translators rendered מִשְׁחָר (dawn) with ἑωσφόρος, which is used several times in the Greek OT to refer to the planet Venus, i.e., the Morning Star.55 By placing the preposition πρὸ before ἑωσφόρος along with the reference to God’s siring the king (ἐξεγένησά σε), the translators associated the king’s beginning before Venus and thus his priority in creation (cf. 1 En. 48:2-3).56

Like the MT, the Greek of Ps 109:5-6 concludes with God’s promises of being at the king’s right hand and the subjugation of the Gentiles. The LXX accurately renders the MT:

“The Lord is at your right hand. On the day of his wrath he will shatter kings. He will judge the nations. He will fill them with bodies. He will shatter the heads of the land of the many.”57

Schaper notes the Psalm moves from a primeval context to an eschatological event, i.e., the preexistence of the royal figure (v. 3c) to an eschatological judgment scene in which the holy

54. Schaper, Eschatology, 103.

55. LXX 1 Sam 30:17; Job 3:9; 11:17; 38:12; 41:10; Isa 14:12; Jos. Asen. 14:1, 3; 18:7; Philo, Cher. 22; Dec. 54; 2 Pet 1:19.

56. Schaper, Eschatology, 104, “The mention of the saviour’s birth πρὸ ἑωσφόρου can only be understood as a reference to his priority in creation. He was born before the creation of the heavenly bodies, even of Venus, the brightest and most prominent planet (next to the sun and the moon), ‘the bringer of light’ (ἐωσφόρος) in the morning.” Schaper, Eschatology, 104-05, was not the first to notice this. Wilhelm Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter (ed. H. Greßmann; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1926), 264-65 and more recently Collins, “Messiah,” 58, came to the same conclusion.

57. The rendering of the G-stem prefix verb and suffix as futures is faithful to the Hebrew text. The πολλοὶ are frequently enemies of the psalmists: LXX Pss 3:2, 3; 4:7; 54:19; 56:3; 88:51; 118:156, 157.
ones are exonerated (v. 3b; cf. θ’ Dan 12:3) and the nations condemned. Like the MT, the judgment of the Gentile polities frames the Psalm (vv. 2, 6). The future recompense is secure because of Yahweh’s predestination of his agent who will carry out God’s will. Consequently, Schaper refers to this Psalm as a “psalm of messianic judgement.”

Schaper argues that proto Pharisees who lived in Judea in the middle of the second century BCE translated the Psalms into Greek. His hypothesis rests upon translation choices that heighten their eschatology (as has been demonstrated with Psalm 109), which are similar to other second century BCE Judean provenanced works (e.g., I Enoch and Daniel). While Schaper’s conclusion about the provenance of the Greek Psalter is debatable, he is correct about Psalm 109’s heightened eschatology. For my purposes, the translation of this Psalm provides evidence for a preexistent eschatological Davidide who will perform a juridical function for God’s people. It was this figure, not the one of the MT, that Paul assimilated to Jesus in Rom 8:34.

IV. Psalm 110 in Romans 8:34

Chapter 8 of the book of Romans is Paul’s closing arguments the second section in the letter where Paul discusses how those whom God made righteous (5:1) are to live by faith through the Spirit (6:1-8:39; cf. 1:17b). The beginning of the pericope in which 8:34 lies is

58. Schaper, Eschatology, 104, “Ps 109 LXX obviously provides a context that relates primaeval (πρὸ ἐωσφόρου ἐξεγέρνησά σε) to future events (ῥάβδον δυνάμεως σου ἐξαποστέλει κύριος ἐκ Σιων), thereby qualifying the ἡμέρα τῆς δυνάμεως σου. On this day, the saviour’s potential might (cp. v.1) will finally be actualized (cp. v. 2: ἐξαποστέλει), and he will exercise his powers in communion with the saints in their heavenly splendor.”


61. Schaper, Eschatology; Jobes and Silva, Invitation 96.

8:12, which is the conclusion to Paul’s argument about believers’ relationship to the Torah (7:1-8:11). According to 8:3-4, with the Spirit of God the elect can now fulfill the Torah’s ordinance (δικαίωμα) (8:3-4), which makes them children of God. Consequently, they should comport themselves as such (8:12-16), for they are also heirs with Christ (8:17a). This latter notion heightens the eschatological tone of the passage and comes with the caveat that being such means suffering with Christ.

This mentioning of suffering prompts Paul to launch into a rationalization for it in the present time (τοῦ νῦν καρποῦ) (8:18a). Hardships, he says, must be kept in view of the coming glory to be revealed (τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς) (8:18b), presumably at the day of God’s wrath (2:3b, 5-10; 12:19). Believers are equipped to handle adversity through the help of the first fruit of the Spirit that also intercedes for them (8:26-27). The eschatological dimension of the passage is once again emphasized as Paul notes that suffering lasts until the redemption of the saints’ bodies (8:23), which is near (13:11; 16:20). The Romans must sustain themselves by hope (8:24) and endurance (8:25) until that day and understand that even their suffering works for the good (8:28), one Paul’s favorite ethical terms.

---

63. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 480, notes this as well.

64. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 462-64; Fitmyer, *Romans*, 497. 502. This glorification (8:17b) is contingent upon (εἰπερ, ἵνα) suffering (Cf. Rom 8:9; BDF § 454; BDAG, 279; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 456; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 502), which Paul stresses with the attachment of the preposition σύν onto the verbs συμπάσχει and συνδοξάζω.

65. Paul also notes that creation endures a similar suffering (8:19-22).


Although the insertion of ὁ θεός after the verb and as its subject is attested in P46, A, and B, the diversity of MSS that do not contain it supports its omission: K, C, D, F, G, etc. For a discussion see Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001), 428.

Πάντα is only attested in P46. Because a diversity of early MSS support πάντα and the fact that Paul uses it (8:32) and the plural neuter demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα within the same thought in 8:31, πάντα is the better reading. For an in-depth discussion of the textual difficulties and translation possibilities of Rom 8:28 see Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.425-29.

67. Rom 2:10; 12:2, 9; 13:3; 15:2; 16:19; 2 Cor 5:10; Gal 6:10; 1 Thess 5:15; Phlm 14.
Following Paul’s précis of election with a stress on the “already” of deliverance (8:29-30), Paul launches into a courtroom scene with God as judge and Jesus as believers’ advocate (8:31-39). This scene most likely takes place at the final judgment. The purpose is to convince the Romans that nothing can separate them from God. In the process, Paul asks a series of questions related to the possibility of charges against them. To all of these he provides an answer related to what God has done in Heilsgeschichte. It is in answer to the question who is the one who condemns that Paul says, “Christ Jesus is the one who died, but more than that he was raised, and who is at God’s right hand and who petitions on our behalf” (8:34).

As noted in the introduction, scholars have vainly looked for a background to Jesus as intercessor in Jewish literary texts. One text, however, that has escaped notice is the LXX Psalm 109. This neglect is fascinating when one considers the consensus that Paul is relying on LXX Ps 109:1 in Rom 8:34. Almost twenty-five years ago, Richard Hays alerted scholars to the fact

68. Notice the litany of aorist verbs in vv. 29-30: προέγνω, προώρισεν, προώρισεν, ἐκάλεσεν, ἐκάλεσεν, ἔδικαιωσεν, ἔδικαιωσεν, κἀκεῖθεν ἔδικαιωσεν.

69. Cranfield, Romans, 1.404, 438; Dunn, Romans 1-8, 510; Fitzmyer, Romans, 532-33; Gourges, A la Droite de Dieu, 52; Hay, Glory at the Right Hand, 59.

70. Hay, Glory at the Right Hand, 59.

71. Dunn, Romans 1-8, 497. Fitzmyer, Romans, 529.

72. Who will accuse God’s elect? (v. 33); Who is the one who condemns? (v. 34); and What will separate us from Christ’s love? (v. 35)?

73. If God is for us, who can be against us? (v. 31); Who did not spare his own son but handed him over for us all, how will he not bestow on us all things with him? (v. 32); God is the one who rightwising (for explanation see below) (v. 33); Christ Jesus is the one who died and more than that was raised and who is at God’s right hand and who petitions on our behalf (v. 34).

74. It is of no consequence that Paul does not quote verbatim the LXX of Ps 110:1. The LXX reads: ἐκ δεξιῶν μου. Paul, however, says: ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ. There are three options for why Paul’s quotation is different: (1) Paul is quoting from memory; (2) his Greek OT was different than the LXX; and (3) Paul altered the text to fit his need.

that the LXX played an important role in the formation of Paul’s arguments. In the process, Hays demonstrated:

The vocabulary and cadences of Scripture—particularly of the LXX—are imprinted deeply on Paul’s mind, and the great stories of Israel continue to serve for him as a fund of symbols and metaphors that condition his perception of the world, of God’s promised deliverance of his people, and of his own identity and calling. His faith, in short, is one whose articulation is inevitably intertextual in character, and Israel’s Scripture is the ‘determinate subtext that plays a constitutive role’ in shaping his literary production.76

It is my conviction that Paul’s conception of Jesus as an intercessor is taken from the LXX Psalm 109 and is the result of Paul the Pharisee’s attempt to interpret the Bible as accurately as he can (ἀκριβής) (Acts 26:5) and to allow the “symbols and metaphors” of the LXX to condition his understanding of the Christ event in the past, present, and future.

To begin, the superscription of LXX Ps 109:1a connects the Psalm to David. Speculations and theologizing around an eschatological Davidide is an established fact in the Second Temple Period among Pharisees, Christians, and the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls.77 Similarly in Romans Paul connects Jesus’s messiahship to the man after God’s own heart at the opening and arguably most important part of his letter (Rom 1:3-4; cf. Rom 9:5; 15:8). In the process, Paul alludes to another Kingship Psalm, Ps 2:7. As we have seen, the Greek translation of Psalm 110 provides the portrait of an eschatological Davidide who is God’s instrument of judgment and whose rule (ἡ ἀρχή) will cause the elect to shine (ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησιν τῶν ἀγίων) on the day of his power (ἐν ἡμέρα τῆς δυνάμεώς σου) (LXX 109:3). Above, I also noted the parallels with θ’ Dan 12:3; 1 En. 39:7; 104:2; and Matt 13:43, all of

---

LXX in the development of Paul’s theology: “The presuppositions of Paul’s thoughts of God are to be found in the piety of the Septuagint.”


77. Collins, *Scepter*. 
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which are in the context of eschatological judgment.\textsuperscript{78} Scholars are in agreement that Rom 8:31-39 is a juridical scene that takes place at the eschaton.\textsuperscript{79} Notwithstanding, Richard Hays has argued that the LXX Isa 50:8 is what Paul has in mind in Rom 8:34 (ὅτι ἐγγίζει ὁ δικαιώσας με-τίς ὁ κρινόμενός μοι).\textsuperscript{80} While I do not doubt that Paul may have this text in mind as well, the LXX Isa 50:8 does not provide an eschatological verdict \textit{for the elect} like the LXX Ps 109:3 does. It seems more likely that the text that Paul alluded to in Rom 8:34a, the context of which provides for an eschatological vindication of the saints through a messiah is the passage he has in mind in 8:34b. In sum, Paul’s use of Ps 110:1 in Rom 8:34a is not a proof text for Jesus’s exaltation. Rather, like a Pharisee who was trained to read the Bible accurately Paul parsed out the Psalm and developed the notion of Jesus’s eschatological intercession from it (LXX Ps 109:3).

\textit{V. Technical Intercessory Rhetoric in Juridical Contexts from Documentary Papyri\textsuperscript{81}}

While the LXX Psalm 109 inspired the notion of Jesus as intercessor in the eschatological courtroom, the rhetoric that Paul used to describe Jesus’s work is drawn from his pagan Umwelt. Requests for intercession were common in the Graeco-Roman world.\textsuperscript{82} The \textit{modus operandi} of petitions typically followed this pattern: when an individual was wronged or felt that they were

\textsuperscript{78} Schaper, \textit{Eschatology}, 103.

\textsuperscript{79} Dunn, \textit{Romans 1-8}, 510; Fitzmyer, \textit{Romans}, 532-33; Gourges, \textit{A la Droite de Dieu}, 52; Hay, \textit{Glory at the Right Hand}, 59. It is noteworthy that like LXX Ps 109:5-6, the body of Paul’s letter ends with a reference to the ruling the nations in which Paul quotes a litany of scriptures among which is Isa 11:10, a text that was interpreted messianically in the Second Temple period. For the messianic interpretation of Isaiah 11 see Collins, \textit{Scepter}, 60-62, 68, 73, 99-100, 121.

\textsuperscript{80} Richard B. Hays, \textit{The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 35, misses the point when he suggests that in Rom 8:33-34 Paul is referring to Isa 50:8: “Here the echo is very loud indeed; only the most stubborn or tone-deaf reader would deny its presence in Paul’s text.”

\textsuperscript{81} All documentary papyri and translations are from the Duke Papyrological Database at papyri.info.

(ἀδικεῖω), they appealed to a higher power such as a deity or a civic official, which includes an emperor or a king for justice (δικαίος). Implicit in this system was the cultural understanding that the one who was solicited was in a higher position on the social ladder and able to render help to the solicitor. The Greek term most often used to describe this process was ἔντευξις, and the act of petitioning itself was its verbal cognate ἔντυγχάνω.

An abundance of these terms appear in documentary papyri from Egypt and are classified as petitions. The process of composing a petition went as follows. The wronged or purportedly wronged individual:

wanting to write the petition could presumably have gone in person to a scribe and given an oral account of the dispute. The scribe (or a group of scribes acting collaboratively) would have then reduced the complaint to writing, putting it into what was regarded to be the proper form for this type of document.

Said individual then “signed” his or her name in the document’s subscription, or, if they were illiterate (as most people were) a stock phrase existed indicating their inability to read or write.

This process explains why although diverse in length and quality petitionary papyri follow a

83. Kelly, Petitions, 38, rightly cautions against believing everything one reads in petitions: “The people responsible for the creation of petitions had every reason either to tell outright lies, or to manipulate reality to get the better of the opponents with whom they were disputing.” See Roger Bagnall, Egypt in Late Antiquity (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 9, for similar comments.

84. ἔντευξις was often employed in literary texts, including Jewish ones as well as the NT: Josephus, Ant. 15.79; 16.58, 258, 301; 1 En. 99:3; 103:14; T.Adam 2:72; Ep. Ar. 252; 1 Tim 2:1; 4:1.

85. Kelly, Petitions, 41.

86. Kelly, Petitions, 44.

87. Kelly, Petitions, 42.

88. Kelly, Petitions, 42.
pattern similar to the one noted above and evince philological conventions such as ἐντυγχάνω + κατά when a person petitioned against another, 89 and ἐντυγχάνω + ὑπὲρ when an individual interceded for another, 90 which is the way Paul used it twice in Romans: 8:26, 34. It is important to note that the prepositions were not necessary for only the verb was used sometimes, 91 and the participal form of ἐντυγχάνω came to mean a petitioner. 92 In short, this philological consistency is the result of a scribal culture with its own “stock phrases and topos.” 93 Thus Adolf Deissmann correctly noted long ago, “The Papyri show that in Egypt [ἐντυγχάνω] has been long familiar in technical language.” 94 It is this technical, juridical parlance that explains Paul’s rhetoric and his understanding of Jesus’ role in Rom 8:34. A few examples will suffice.

First, suppliants often petitioned deities. An obscure and poorly composed ostracon dated between 1-200 CE appears to function as an oracle that asks for the intercession of the Lord Athena on behalf of Claudius Silbanos and his brothers.

Κλαύδιος Σιλβανὸς καὶ
οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τῇ κυράι Αθη-
ναί κατὰ Λογγίνου Μάρκου.
Λογγίνου, οὗ καὶ πολλά
σοι κατ’ αὐτοῦ ἐντυγχάνο-
μεν, ἐπελθόντι ἡμῶν
τῷ ζῆν μηδὲν ἀδική-
σασί πισχοῖ(ζ) οὕσι, μηδὲν
γὰρ ἔχον κέρδος πρὸς τὸ(δ)
πράγμα πονηρῶς προσ-
ἐρχετ(αι), παρακαλοῦ(μ) ἐκδική(σαι),

89. 1 Macc 8:32; 10:61, 63; 11:25; 2 Macc 4:36.
90. Plutarch, Cato the Minor 49; Philo, Mut. 129.
91. P.Oxy 54.3758 (325 CE); 73.4961) (223 CE).
92. BGU 7.1563=OGIS 669 (68 CE) P.Oxy 61.4115 (third century CE), 4116 (late third/early fourth century CE); 74.5001 (first/second century CE).
καὶ γὰρ τὸι Ἀμωνι ἐνετύχ(εν)

Claudius Silbanos and his brothers. To the Lord Athena against Longius son of Markus.
Concerning Longius about whom we are petitioning many things against him to you (σοι
cατ’ αὐτοῦ ἐντυγχάνομεν). He came against our life, although we did not wrong him for
we are poor. For although he has no profit, he came to this evil deed (¿?). We exhort [you]
to avenge us. For also he has petitioned Amon (SB 18.13931). 95

The suppliants believe Longius has wronged them in some way maybe with violence. They make
it clear that they are innocent and their wish appears to be for justice, although it has gone
unspoken, and that the Lord Athena will intercede for them against Longius. This situation is
made direr by the fact that Claudius Silbanos and his brothers are aware that Longius has also
petitioned another deity Amon, presumably on his behalf.

Second and at the same time more prevalent in documentary papyri are petitions to civic
officials. Two examples will suffice. A papyrus dated between Feb 25-March 26, 162 CE
contains a petition from a certain Ptolemaios of the Arsinoite nome that is a composite document
consisting of four texts, only three of which I will discuss. The first text is a missive written to
Harpokration who was the strategos of Themistes in which Ptolemaios appends a letter of
petition addressed to the epistrategos Vedius Faustus and Faustus’s subsequent subscription and
judgment about unscrupulous tax collectors who were extorting Ptolemaios and demanding that
he pay a poll tax for his son who is no longer under his care. This second text is a copy of said
letter to Vedius Faustus. Within this letter, Ptolemaios says he went to Alexandria to file the
complaint but was unable because he could not to find Vedius Faustus. Consequently, he
submitted it to Herennius Philotas, which is the third text.

95. Cf. Wis 8:21
γιατί ένθεταζε πρὸς τὸ ἀπαρενόχλητον με γενέσθαι. ἔστι δὲ· Ὠνηὴρ Φαῦστος τῷ κρατίστῳ ἐπιστρῆτο (ατήγῳ)

παρὰ Πτολεμαίου [Δ]ιοδόρου τοῦ καὶ Διοσκόρου τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου νομοῦ. κατελθὼν εἰς Αλεξάνδρειαν ὡς μέλ-


cατὰ τὸ παρὸν μὴ εὑρόν σε ἄνετεινα τὸ

[κ]ρατίστῳ δικαιοδότῃ [Ἐρεν]νῖῳ Φ[ιλότα καὶ] ἀνέπεμψε μὲ ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δέομαι ὑποτάξας

tὸ βιβλίδιον τυχεῖν τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ βοηθείας

[i]ν’ ὁ βεβοηθημένος[,]. διευθύνει. ἔστι δὲ· Ἐρεννίῳ Φιλότα τῷ κρατίστῳ δικαιοδότῃ

παρὰ Πτολεμαίου Διοδόρου
tοῦ καὶ Διοσκόρου τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀ[ρσινοίτου] νομου. πάσης βίας ἐκκοπείσης ἐπὶ τῆς

tοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἡγεμόνος ἐπαρ-

 chíεις καὶ τῆς σῆς [δικαίοδοσίας . . . τος ἐντυγχάνω ἀδικοῦμενος καὶ βιαζόμενος. τὸ δὲ

πράγμα τοιοῦτον·

To Harpokration, strategos of the Themistes and Polemon divisions of the Arsinoite nome, from Ptolemaios, son of Diodoros alias Dioskoros, of the village of Theadelphia. I have appended a copy of the petition that I submitted to the most excellent epistrategos, Vedius Faustus, and of his sacred subscription which I received for transmission to you, and of the prefect’s judgment that I obtained concerning a like matter, so that I may be free of harassment. The copy follows: “To Vedius Faustus, the most excellent epistrategos, from Ptolemaios, son of Diodoros alias Dioskoros, a resident of the Arsinoite nome. Having gone down to Alexandria with the intention of submitting to you, my lord, a petition in which my request is set out, and not having found you at the moment, I submitted it to the most excellent iuridicus, Herennius Philotas, and he referred me to you, and having appended the petition, I beg to obtain your assistance (τυχεῖν τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ βοηθείας), so that I may be helped. Farewell. The petition follows: ‘To Herennius Philotas, the most excellent iuridicus, from Ptolemaios, son of Diodoros alias Dioskoros, a resident of the Arsinoite nome. Since all violence has been eradicated under the rule of the most illustrious prefect and your administration of justice . . . I petition you because I am an object of injustice and violence (ἐντυγχάνω ἀδικοῦμενος καὶ βιαζόμενος). . . (SB 14.12087; APIS Translation).

As a result of these actions against him, Ptolemaios goes on to say that he fled to Vedius Faustus to obtain justice (ὅθεν ἐπὶ σὲ κατέφυγον ὅπως [τ]ύχω τῶν δικαί[ω]ν).

There are several things of note. First, Ptolemaios had some difficulty with filing his petition. The papyrus indicates that he attempted to register it with Vedius Faustus but was prohibited by the latter’s absence (the reason goes unstated). Second, Ptolemaios underwent this process because he was wronged and sought justification (δικαίος). An integral connection, therefore, exists between the process of intercession (ἐντυγχάνος) and the desired outcome.
Finally, it was commonplace to address the intercessors with honorary titles or superlatives that implied the supplicant’s subordinated relationship to him.

The second example of a petition to a civic official is another poorly written papyrus dated 198 CE that is a request from Gemellus aka Horion to the epistrategos Calpurnius Concessus because of a tax collector’s extortion of Horion and his mother.

To his excellency Calpurnius Concessus, epistrategos, from Gemellus also called Horion, son of Gaius Apolinarius, Antinoite. Of the petition which I submitted to the most illustrious prefect, Aemilius Saturninus, (2nd hand) and (3rd hand) of the sacred subscription which I obtained from him, I have appended a copy. I request, if it seem good to your Fortune, that you write to the centurion stationed in the Arsinoite nome to send the defendant for your examination and that you hear my complaint against him, in order that I may obtain justice (τόχω τῶν δικαίων). It is as follows: To Quintus Aemilius Saturninus, prefect of Egypt, from Gemellus also called Horion, son of Gaius Apolinarius,

96. It is common knowledge that justice is a key term for Paul’s letter to the Romans: δίκαιος: 1:17; 2:13; 3:10, 26; 5:7, 19; 7:12.
δικαιοσύνη: 1:17; 3:5, 21, 22, 25, 26; 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11 (2x), 13, 22; 5:17, 21; 6:13, 16, 18, 19, 20; 8:10; 9:30 (3x), 31; 10:3 (3 or 2x, textual variant), 4, 5, 6, 10; 14:17
δικαίωμα: 1:32; 2:26; 5:16, 18; 8:4
δικαίω: 2:13; 3:4, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5, 5:1, 9; 6:7; 8:30 (2x), 33.
The notion that civic officials are responsible for justice is an idea old as the ancient Near East and prevalent in Paul’s letter to the Romans (13:1-7).
Antinoite, and however I am styled. I appeal, my lord, against Kastor (ἐντυγχάνω, κύριε, κατὰ Κάστορος), tax collector’s assistant of the village of Karanis in the division of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome. This person, who held me in contempt because of my infirmity for I have only one eye and I do not see with it although it appears to have sight, so that I am utterly worthless in both victimized me, having first publicly abused me and my mother, after maltreating her with numerous blows and demolishing all four doors of mine with an ax so that our entire house is wide open and accessible to every malefactor (P.Mich 6.425; APIS Translation).

Once again, the pattern emerges that the suppliant has been wronged and the purpose of his petition is justice (δικαίος). Horion’s subordinate position is also evident in the honorary terms he uses vis-à-vis the intercessor.

Finally, Hellenistic kings and the Roman Senate and were commonly petitioned. One example of each will suffice. Concerning Hellenistic kings, a well-written petition dated 245-44 BCE addressed to the King Ptolemy III Euergetes I97 from a certain Antipatros who lived in Philadelphia indicates that his wife Simon borrowed money from a man named Nikon. The rate was extortionary. For reasons unrelated to the loan, Antipatros absconded with his wife and son to Hermopolis where he opened a shop. The Shylock lured Antipatros away with the promise of only paying the principle amount with no interest. Once Antipatros left, Nikon sailed to Hermopolis and by threatening Simon he lured her and her son away, and they sailed to Herakleopolis where he imprisoned them separately. Simon escaped and made it back to her husband and is the one who presumably related the experience to Antipatros. As a result, they demand reparations.

To King Ptolemy greeting from Antipatros, resident of Philadelphia. I am being wronged by Nikon. For having loaned seventy silver drachmas to my wife Simon at an interest rate of six drachmas per mina each month and having totaled (the interest) with the principal he drew up a contract of loan with her for 115 drachmas in which I myself was entered as security. After I had gone away from Philadelphia because I was being falsely accused by Artemidoros, agent of Apollonios, the dioecetes, and had opened a shop in Upper Hermopolis, Nikon wrote a letter to Philadelphia to a certain Menestratos who belongs to our family in which he includes the statement, made upon royal oath, that he will draw up an agreement with us for the principal by itself, namely, the seventy drachmas. When Menestratos wrote me at Hermopolis to come to Philadelphia and I sailed down there, Nikon sailed up to Hermopolis and said that he would hand my wife over to the praktor in the matter of the loan unless she followed him of her own accord. Simon, impelled by fear, sailed down with Nikon together with her boy, and Nikon led them to Herakleopolis and shut them up with certain persons, apart from each other. Then Simon escaped and came away; but the boy he holds in detention even now. And when we demand that he give him back, sometimes he acknowledges that he has seized him as pledge for the debt and is still holding him, sometimes he denies it. I beg you therefore, O King, to send my petition to the chremalistai, and if I prove that the allegations set forth in the petition are true, I beg that Nikon may meet with fitting punishment both in the matter of the interest which he has contracted for contrary to the ordinance and because by his own authority he has placed in detention and holds (the boy), a free person; and I beg that the boy be
restored to me in order that I, having fled to you for help, O King, may meet with justice. Farewell.

Similar to the above petitions, the suppliant indicates that Nikon has been wronged him (ἀδικοῦμαί). The mistreatment is twofold: usury and kidnapping. Consequently, Antipatros asks King Ptolemy for justice, which means the punishment of Nikon for both crimes. 98

With regard to the Roman Senate as intercessors, a fantastic example exists in a piece of Second Temple Jewish literature, 1 Maccabees. 99 First Maccabees 8 contains a supposed letter from the Roman Senate to King Demetrius in which the Romans tell the Seleucids:

καὶ περὶ τὸν κακῶν, ὅν ὁ βασιλεὺς Δημήτριος συντελεῖται εἰς αὐτούς, ἐγράψαμεν αὐτῷ λέγοντες Διὰ τί ἐβάρνας τὸν ζυγὸν σου ἐπὶ τοὺς φίλους σου· οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ διὰ τὴν κρίσιν καὶ πολεμήσαμεν σε διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ διὰ τῆς ξηρᾶς.

Concerning the evils that King Demetrius did to them [i.e., the Jews], we wrote to him saying: “Why have you made your yoke heavy on our friends and allies the Jews? If therefore they petition against you again (ἐὰν οὖν ἔτι ἐντυγχανον κατὰ σοῦ), we will render judgment in their favor and we will war with you on sea and dry land (1 Macc 8:31-32).

Within the context of 1 Maccabees 8, King Demetrius was attempting to exercise hegemony over the Jews. The Maccabees sent an embassy to Rome to petition for their help in their quest for freedom. The letter indicates that if Demetrius mistreats the Jews anymore and they appeal to the

---

98. In the first century BCE, King Antiochus of the Roman client kingdom Commagene constructed a massive group of cult statutes (ἀγάλματα) of Persian and Greek gods and himself and placed them on a 2,150 m high mountain. Antiochus also commissioned a long inscription detailing his holy law of prescriptions for a cultic calendar and officials (OGIS 383). At the law’s conclusion, Antiochus offers advice to future rulers and kings of his land: “[I]n the future whatever king or dynast takes over this rule, provided that he guards this law and our honors, let him have the mercy of the daemons and all the gods issuing from my prayer” (ὅστις τε ἄν βασιλεύς ἢ δυνάστης ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ ταύτην ἄρχῃ παραλάβῃ, νόμον τοῦτον καὶ τιμᾶς ἡμετέρας διαφυλάσσων καὶ παρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς εὐχῆς ἱλεως δαιμόνια καὶ θεοὺς πάντας ἔχετο) (OGIS 383.229-35). Although the key terms for intercession are absent, the king’s warning, which is meant to instill fear in possible offenders, rests on the assumption the king will be able to intercede for good or evil for future rulers.

99. The majority of the thirteen occurrences of ἐντυγχάνω in the LXX are in the Maccabean literature and refer to petitions to the Maccabees, the Romans, or other Hellenistic kings: 1 Macc 8:32; 10:61, 63, 64; 11:25; 2 Macc 2:25; 4:36; 6:12; 15:39; 3 Macc 6:37; Wis 8:21; 16:28; Dan 6:13.
Romans, the Romans will come and aid them. This literary work incorporates the same juridical
cant that we saw in documentary papyri. In short, the Romans will justify the Jews.

V. Conclusion

I began by illustrating the necessity of this study from the failure of previous ones to
supply an adequate background for Jesus’s intercession in Rom 8:34. I showed that the LXX
Psalm 109 differs from the Hebrew in that it presents a heightened eschatological tone with a
Davidide as God’s instrument of judgment. From there, I demonstrated that Paul relies on these
notions from it for his courtroom scene and the vindication of the elect in Rom 8:31-39. I also
noted that Paul’s language is indebted to his pagan milieu and is best understood in the context
of a civic official who intercedes for someone who desired justice. Consequently, Paul’s Umwelt
influenced not only his exegesis of the “sacred writings” (Rom 1:2) but also his Christology.100

The notion that Paul is indebted to juridical argot for Jesus as an intercessor for the elect
fits well with the overall rhetorical thrust of Romans 1-8 and something with which Paul’s
Roman audience would have been aware. As noted above, Rom 1:16-17 is the letter’s theme and
Paul’s quotation of Hab 2:4 in 1:17b—the just one shall live from faith—forms the outline of at
least chapters 1-11: (1) how one becomes just (1:18-5:21); (2) how one should live (6:1-8:39);
and (3) what from faith means (9:1-11:36).101 The first subsection (1:18-3:20) within the first
part of Romans presents the sinfulness of all humanity (esp. 3:10-20). First and foremost, Paul
indicts Gentiles with a laundry list of sins (1:18-32). Paul preambles this list with a reference to
the Gentiles’ wronging of God: “For God’s wrath is being revealed from heaven on every
ungodliness and unrighteous (ἀδικία) of humans who suppress the truth in their unrighteousness

100. This is something Deissmann, Paul, 177, noted long ago: “Paul was fond of legal metaphors” from the
Graeco-Roman world.
101. Disagreement arises over whether or not the theme continues on in chapters 12-16, see footnote 62.
(ἀδικία) (1:18). Towards the conclusion of his argument, Paul begins a catalogue of the nations’ sins with the notion that they are filled with all unrighteousness (πάση ἀδικίᾳ) (1:29). Paul also charges that Jews have failed to keep the law and they boast about their possession of it. The consequence of which is that they too have wronged God (2:1-3:9).102 Paul refers to this injustice twice as ἀδικία in 2:5 and 3:5. Consequently, God is the one who has been offended. As we have seen, ἀδικία and cognates as well as δικαίος and cognates are integrally connected to the terms ἐντυγχάνω in petitions in documentary papyri. Paul’s Roman audience would have been aware of the context in which these words were used.

God, being God, does not have a superior. Thus there is no one but him to adjudicate and punish these crimes. His disciple has already begun among the Gentiles with the revelation of his anger (1:18) and his turning them over to their desires (παραδίδωμι) (1:24, 26, 28), and will be completed at the eschaton against all humanity, including Jew and Gentile (2:5, 8; 5:9; 13). God has given a way of escape for the elect, however, for God offers his own righteousness through faith in Jesus Christ (3:21, 21-26) by the handing over of Jesus (παραδίδωμι) (8:32) in the place of the elect. It is no coincidence that Paul’s last use of παραδίδωμι in Romans appears in the courtroom scene of 8:31-39. Because of this gift of Jesus, God’s rightwising103 of the saints (5:1), and Jesus’s intercession on their behalf (8:34b), the elect can be confident that God will not bring a charge of wrongdoing against them at the judgment. Paul’s parlance, therefore, reassures the in cultural terms familiar to them.

102. Contrary to the newer readings of Romans such as by Stanley Stowers, A Rereading of Romans (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), I agree with Fitzmyer, Romans, 297, and Dunn, Romans 1–8, 89-90, that Paul addresses a Jewish interlocutor in Romans 2.

103. No English verb exists to exemplify its connection to righteousness, which is evident in the Greek δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, δικαίωμα, and δικαιώ. Consequently, I have chosen to use a Middle English term “rightwise.”
From this study, I offer five conclusions. First, Paul’s description of Jesus as intercessor is drawn from his civic context and from technical juridical terminology. Consequently, I have made a case for the use of other materials, namely documentary papyri, in the quest to better understand Paul’s theology. Second, Jesus as a civic intercessor indicates that Paul used his environment to shape his theology and specifically his Christology. As a result, we should view the Roman Empire, its complicated administrative apparatus, and all its accouterments as a source of inspiration, not contestation. Third, Paul’s portrait of Jesus as an intercessor would have been surprising to his Roman audience. According to the above survey, finding a civic official to intercede was not always easy and the majority of petitions in documentary papyri are from an individual who was seeking some sort of restitution himself or herself. In the case of Rom 8:34b, Paul says that Jesus, who has God’s ear at his right hand and enough clout to plead for them, acts of his own accord to intercede on behalf of the elect. This would have surprised Paul’s Roman audience. Fourth, because of this unrequested intercession, Paul simultaneously provides a role model for the Romans. Jesus who is exalted to God’s right hand and possesses the second highest social position in the cosmos is the perfect civic official committed to justice and altruism. Finally, Rom 8:34b reinforces the hierarchy and universalism of Heilsgeschichte. God abides at the top of the pyramid and the one to whom Jesus intercedes. The saints regardless of their ethnicity are the ones who count on Jesus’s intercession. These hierarchical notions that are embedded in the Graeco-Roman juridical system pave the way Paul’s discussion of inter-

ekklēśia dynamics in Romans 12-14.
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*VII. Images*
Figure 1 Pharaoh Horemheb seated at the right of Horus. Photo take from http://www.globalegyptianmuseum.org/images/KhM/_250/8301.jpg. Keel, Symbolism, 263, fig. 353. The object is located at the Kunst Historisches Museum in Vien.