

resulting salvation of Israel brings the end.<sup>35</sup> This would be to reverse "to the Jew first" with a vengeance. So far from Israel's salvation bringing greater blessing to the Gentiles, the full salvation of the Gentiles would bring the salvation of Israel. It is to Käsemann's credit that he sees that this would be a reversal of the rabbinic, and indeed Old Testament, view. Murray firmly contends for the Pauline formula: Israel's fall -- Gentile blessing; Israel's conversion -- vastly greater Gentile blessing. He appears to have come to the view of Iain Murray (*The Puritan Hope*) and the Puritan conception of a "time of Zion's glory," yet future, but before the Parousia.<sup>36</sup>

It is my present contention that the sequence which Iain and John Murray have elaborated is partially correct, but that the *fourth* stage of the historical sequence intimated by Paul in Rom 11:12 properly belongs *after* the Parousia, and is therefore a clear prediction of a millennial period in the consummation of the world's history. This perspective in Romans exactly answers the deepest longings of Israel and seems to be in full harmony with the Old Testament. Hans Schoeps quotes Martin Buber:

We know... that world history is not yet broken down to the very ground, that the world is not yet redeemed. We feel the unredeemed state of the world ... For us the redemption of the world is indissolubly one with the consummation of the creation ... with the realized Kingdom of God ....<sup>37</sup>

The traditional handling of Rom 11:15 is the crux of the problem. The ἀποβολή αὐτῶν (*apobole auton*) of 11:15a is invariably read as an objective genitive, declaring God's rejection of Israel in response to their stumbling. 11:15a is thus antithetically paralleled to 11:12a. Paul is thus made to contradict himself, apparently negating the vehement declaration at the beginning of the chapter that God has not cast away His people. To avoid the obvious absurdity, commentators say that God's rejection of Israel is only *temporary* and *partial*. A fatal error is thus introduced into Pauline thought. The principle on which Paul is building is that the root sanctifies the branches; that the firstfruits sanctifies the whole loaf, just as a believing spouse sanctifies an unbelieving spouse and children (I Cor 7:14). There is no partial and temporary rejection of the *people*. Some branches are broken off; the time of breaking off will end, but the root perdures, the *people* is not cast away! Paul speaks of himself out of the election of grace and points to a sovereign and unconditional election of some Israelites, in among whom Gentile branches are grafted. That Paul intends to continue the Old Testament use of "people" as a perduring ethnic entity is made clear in Rom 15, where the Gentiles rejoice with His people!

The results of the bizarre misreading of the genitive of 11:15 are thus apparent. Why have commentators not felt the need to read the genitive as a *subjective* genitive? Thus 11:15 would be synonymously or synthetically parallel with 11:12 instead of antithetically parallel, and 11:15 would be harmonious with the entire Old Testament representation, to say nothing of Paul's perspective in the immediate context. Suppose that the rejection is on Israel's part, that what Paul has in mind is Israel's (the greater part's) rejection of her Messiah, in spite of His yearning over Jerusalem (Matt 23:37. 38). Her rejection of Christ brings about the cross, the