

# Exiting Israel: The Exodus Narrative in Early Christian Worldview & Identity

Alex Macdonald, BA (Macquarie)



Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Research  
Department of Ancient History, Faculty of Arts  
Macquarie University, Sydney

October 2016



# Declaration

I, Alex Macdonald, certify that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AM', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Date: 10 October 2016



# Summary

Early Christianity was profoundly shaped by its Jewish heritage. In order to understand the emergence of Christianity, we must consider the role of Jewish stories, texts, and ideas upon the worldviews and identities of the New Testament authors. Few narratives were so significant for Jewish self-understanding as the exodus story. Building on the allusive and narrative approaches proposed by scholars like Richard Hays and Tom Wright, this thesis investigates the role of the exodus story in shaping the worldviews and identities put forth the New Testament epistles (specifically 1 Corinthians, Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, 1 Peter, and Hebrews). Though the influence of the exodus differs somewhat across each of these texts, all draw on this potent Jewish metanarrative to frame the outlook and self-understanding of the church – they are an exodus people. Furthermore, we may observe that the way these Christians engaged with the exodus story was not entirely novel or different to the ways that the exodus featured in their Jewish background. This Jewish story served to distinguish Christianity from national Israel, while still promoting substantially Jewish worldviews and identities.





# Contents

Abbreviations .....	xi
Acknowledgements .....	xiii
Disclaimer .....	xv
Introduction .....	1
Part 1. Reading Narrative Worlds .....	5
1. Worldview, Story, & Identity .....	7
2. Learning to Read: Textuality & Allusion .....	13
3. Tacit Tales: Narrative Approaches .....	25
Part 2. Exodus: History & Hope .....	31
4. Exploring Exodus .....	33
5. A Prophetic Paradigm .....	49
6. Leaving Egypt Again .....	61
Part 3. Exiting Israel .....	77
7. New Testament & New Exodus .....	79
8. The Wilderness at Corinth .....	81
9. Sons & Heirs in Rome .....	87
10. Redemption Realised in Ephesus .....	97
11. Elect Exiles in Roman Asia .....	105
12. The End of the Exodus in Hebrews .....	115
Conclusion: The Exodus from Israel .....	121
Bibliography .....	128
Ancient Texts: Editions & Translations .....	129
Modern Scholarship .....	131



# Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow the SBL Handbook of Style, second edition, with the following additions.

## **General Abbreviations:**

DH	Documentary Hypothesis
INE	Isaianic New Exodus

## **Journals & Publications**

COQG	Christian Origins and the Question of God
JESOT	Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament
JHis	Jewish History
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
PilNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
QMHSS	Quantitative Methods in the Humanities and Social Sciences



# Acknowledgements

Scholars tend to treat Paul as a lone operator, despite his frequent suggestions that such was not the case. He rarely travelled or wrote alone, and I suspect that his co-workers deserve more recognition than they are sometimes given. This work bears only my name, but credit is certainly due to others as well. I would like to thank some of those who have invested in me and my research.

First, thanks are due to several within the Department of Ancient History at Macquarie University. Dr. Chris Forbes has played a crucial role. His teaching laid the groundwork for this study, and his supervision and eye for detail have vastly improved the quality of my work. Drs. Malcolm Choat and Rachel Yuen-Collingridge have also earned my gratitude for the teaching and opportunities they have provided along the way.

Many outside the institution have also been vital to the success of this project. It seems right to begin with Dan Anderson, for it was in conversation with him that this project began to take shape. His mentorship and example have meant more than he knows, both for my scholarship and for my outlook. Perhaps the largest burden of my study has fallen on my closest family and friends. Thank you to Katie, Em, Red, Lach, and my parents David and Meredith. You have tolerated my fervour and my frustrations, picked up my slack, and sometimes even helped with proofreading! Your support has made a world of difference.

Coming away from this study, I have renewed appreciation for the exodus story. More importantly, I come away with an attitude of praise and thanksgiving to the god who identified himself by it. The Lord is my strength and my song, and he has become my salvation.



# Disclaimer

On 15 August 2016, the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. released a statement concerning plagiarism in three of its commentaries. Three commentaries by Peter T. O'Brien were retracted, on the grounds that they featured plagiarised material. The works in question are the 2010 PilNTC commentary on Hebrews, the 1999 PilNTC commentary on Ephesians, and a 1991 NIGTC commentary on Philippians. O'Brien accepted the charge of plagiarism, saying that it was the unintentional result of poor work practices.

This announcement came fairly late in the process of researching and writing the present thesis. Two of the affected commentaries (Ephesians and Hebrews) had already been used and cited in producing this work. I have decided not to excise all reference to these works. The issue at hand is one of inadequate acknowledgement of sources. Surely, the solution is not to propagate the problem by refusing to cite O'Brien for his influence on the present study. Nonetheless, the reader should keep the plagiarism case and the publisher's statement in mind as they read.

The full statement from Eerdmans (including comments from O'Brien) may be found on the Eerdmans blog.

<http://www.eerdmans.com/Pages/Item/59043/Commentary-Statement.aspx>





# Introduction

“The Biblical story of the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt is THE story, the story of stories, arguably the greatest, in any event the most consequential story ever told – though perhaps not literally experienced – in human history.”<sup>1</sup> So writes Jan Assman, who sees in the exodus the origins of monotheism.<sup>2</sup> Much about Assmann’s work might be debated, but it is beyond question that the exodus is of monumental significance in ancient Judaism and the subsequent history of Judaism, Christianity, and the world.<sup>3</sup> This is an important story to study, not least for its influence upon the early Christian movement. Christianity began in the first century AD when a group of Jews took a messianic message from the Jewish heartland to the Roman world at large. We will understand early Christians best if we understand them in this ancient Jewish context. Therein lies the importance of the exodus. To understand Christianity in context, we must consider Christian engagement with the traditions and paradigms of ancient Judaism. That is a mammoth task, but this thesis will taste just a sliver of that vast pie, with one of Israel’s crucial metanarratives.<sup>4</sup> How did the exodus story shape the worldviews and identities of earliest Christianity?

---

<sup>1</sup> Assmann 2015, “Exodus and Memory”, in T. E. Levy, T. Schneider & W. H.C. Propp (eds.), *Israel’s Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*, QMHSS, Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, pp. 3-16, at p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> In this study, upper case *Exodus* will refer to the biblical book while lower case *exodus* will refer to the story or event more generally. There are occasional exceptions in the case where we cite directly from a scholar who uses *Exodus* for the story or event – as with Assmann above.

<sup>3</sup> As Eugene Merrill notes, the exodus has been recognised by Judaism both ancient and modern to be the “greatest, most theologically significant event in all its 4,000 year history.” Merrill 2014, “The Meaning and Significance of the Exodus Event”, in R. M. Fox (ed.), *Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, pp. 1-17, at p. 1. For just a few of the many statements in this vein, see the following: Piper 1957; Routledge 2014, p. 187; Michael A. Fishbane 1979, *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*, Schocken Books, New York, p. 121; Nadav Na’aman 2011, “The Exodus Story: Between Historical Memory and Historiographical Composition”, *JANER*, vol. 11, pp. 39-69, at p. 39; Thomas Römer 2015, “The Revelation of the Divine Name to Moses and the Construction of a Memory About the Origins of the Encounter Between Yhwh and Israel”, in Levy et al. (eds.) pp. 305-315, at p. 305; Ron Hendel 2001, “The Exodus in Biblical Memory”, *JBL*, vol. 120, no. 4, pp. 601-622, at p. 601; James Constantine Hanges 2012, *Paul: Founder of Churches*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, p. 115.

<sup>4</sup> Here and throughout, “metanarrative” is meant not to invoke the technical definition of Lyotard, but rather a broader sense akin to “master narrative” or “governing narrative” such as we find in the work of scholars like Tom Wright.

## *Introduction*

In order to properly address the issue, this project features three parts. The first contains chapters on theory and method. In the first chapter, we will consider the significance of stories for shaping identity and worldview. The following chapter will consider the theory and practice of reading texts in context, proposing a method for identifying and studying allusions. This section concludes with an introduction to the narrative approach, which has sought to understand the role of narrative in Pauline (and sometimes Petrine) text and theology.

Part 2 addresses the exodus in Jewish tradition. It is difficult to clearly define the exodus. As we shall see, this story is inextricably linked with those of Abraham, the wilderness, conquest, and beyond. We will generally take the exodus story to include everything between slavery in Egypt and the entry into the promised land – essentially the era of Moses. Due to its limited length, however, this study cannot focus on the wilderness traditions as much as the story from Egypt to Sinai. That is the story of the book of Exodus. Part 2 opens with a review of major traditions and themes in Exodus. We then consider the role of the exodus in other Jewish texts, especially as a paradigm for prophetic hope. Chapter 6 surveys a few important Jewish traditions from the Second Temple period, asking how the exodus informed the outlook of their authors. The texts in question are Ezra-Nehemiah, the Letter of Aristeas, the Qumran scrolls, the Wisdom of Solomon, Philo, and Josephus.

With the Jewish backdrop in place, we turn in part 3 to the New Testament. It is impossible to consider all the relevant material in a project this size. Given the length of the gospels and the apocalyptic complexity of Revelation, as well as our methodological roots in Pauline studies (see part 1), we have chosen to focus on epistolary material. To provide some breadth we thus consider texts from three strands of early Christianity. After an introduction to studies of NT exodus typology, part 3 is comprised of chapters studying the significance of exodus paradigms for 1 Corinthians, Romans (and Galatians), Ephesians, 1 Peter, and Hebrews. These texts in particular are chosen because they represent a sample of work from different authors to different audiences, and because (as just mentioned) the methodological framework of narrative and allusion has already shown promise with regard to these texts.

This study seeks to understand the significance and role of the exodus across several strands of NT Christianity, and how this positioned Christianity in its Jewish context. It

will argue that the worldview- and identity-shaping significance of the exodus story was present throughout second-temple and Hellenistic Jewish literature, though it was re-formulated to make sense of new situations and to articulate different variations of Jewish self-understanding and outlook. It will argue that this is also true for several strands of first-century Christianity. The authors of the New Testament (Jews writing to mixed Jew and Gentile audiences) engaged with the exodus as they sought to connect a new mode of being Jewish with the story and identity of Israel. In different ways for different authors, the exodus provided a framework for early Christians to understand their departure from traditional aspects of Jewish belief and praxis. As the title suggests, it might be possible to conceive of this as early Christians “exiting Israel” – they are leaving behind the direct equivalence between national Israel and the people of God by positing a new exodus which marks a new people of God which is not totally coextensive with national Israel.<sup>5</sup> In some sense, the early Christians saw themselves departing from traditional modes of being Jewish, and embracing new – though still thoroughly Jewish – exodus-informed worldviews and identities.

---

<sup>5</sup> This should not be taken too far – the title is not constitutive of the whole argument and its nuances. We must await the argument and its conclusion to evaluate its significance.



Part 1.

Reading Narrative Worlds



# 1. Worldview, Story, & Identity

To understand the earliest Christians is to understand them in their situation. It requires that we study their worldviews and identities in relation to those in their background. Before we can attempt this, we must consider what is meant by these terms, and how to go about it.

The term *worldview* is a calque for the German word *weltanschauung*, first found in Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Judgment*.<sup>1</sup> Kant and the idealists used the term without providing definitions, but in relation to the role of the mind in structuring reality.<sup>2</sup> The first systematic treatment of worldview was that of Dilthey. He argued that one's concept of reality was tied not just to intellect but to the whole of life, the interaction of psychology and experience.<sup>3</sup> Supposing that the character of human experience was universal, he claimed that differences in worldview emerged from differences in temperament, character, and setting.<sup>4</sup>

Nietzsche proposed people are constrained by their contextual horizons. According to this perspectivist approach, worldview is a subjective artefact of situation.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, Wittgenstein theorised worldviews as discursive constructs mediating all knowledge and interaction.<sup>6</sup> Heidegger supposed that worldview was governed by experience and

---

<sup>1</sup> The term appears only once in Kant, with no discussion or definition. Kant 1987 [1790], Kant 1987 [1790], *Critique of Judgment*, W. S. Pluhar (trans.), Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis, pp. 111-112; Ernst Conradie 2014, "Views on Worldviews: An Overview of the Use of the Term, Worldview, in Selected Theological Discourses", *Scriptura*, vol. 113, no. 1, pp. 1-12, at p. 1; Naugle 1998, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Those who followed directly on from Kant cannot be considered here. The most comprehensive treatment of the history of worldview theory (including the German idealists) is offered by David Naugle. Naugle 1998, esp. pp. 37-141.

<sup>3</sup> Sire 2004, *Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept*, IVP Academic, Downers Grove, pp. 25-26, 39; Naugle 1998 pp. 95-96, 100-101, 103.

<sup>4</sup> Sire 2004, pp. 25-26; Naugle 1998, pp. 95-96, 100-101.

<sup>5</sup> Karilemla 2015, "Heidegger's Contrasting Notion of Worldview in the Early, Middle, and Later Writings", *The Humanistic Psychological*, vol. 43, pp. 250-266, esp. p. 251; Sire 2004, pp. 28, 39; Naugle 1998, p. 558.

<sup>6</sup> Sire 2004, pp. 29-30, 39; cf. Taylor 2007, *A Secular Age*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, p. 575; Foucault also rates a mention. Like Wittgenstein, he was influenced by the linguistic turn and took a discursive approach. He discusses "epistemes" as pre-theoretical frames for knowledge, but these are slightly distinguished from worldviews in that they are not held to explain reality at large. His discussion of epistemes and worldview is connected to a broader notion of the linguistic and discursive

sense-data.<sup>7</sup> These schemes differ substantially, but they agree that worldviews are totalising frameworks and not objectively verifiable: critical distance is impossible.

Wishing to preserve the possibility of objective knowledge, Wittgenstein and Heidegger suggest that philosophies (not worldviews) are the road to true insight.<sup>8</sup> Philosophy here refers to consciously formulated systems of reasoning, as opposed to pre-theoretical frameworks which render experience intelligible (worldview).<sup>9</sup> The claim that philosophy is independent of worldview is special pleading, and inconsistent with the broader schemes of Wittgenstein and Heidegger.<sup>10</sup> Theorists from Peter L Berger and Thomas Luckmann to Charles Taylor would suggest that knowledge rendering life intelligible requires some pre-theoretical framework or *symbolic universe* to put everything in place.<sup>11</sup> David K. Naugle convincingly concludes that worldview – the taken-for-granted frame rendering experience sensible and mediating representation and interpretation – precedes philosophy.<sup>12</sup> This stance is affirmed by James W. Sire, Albert M. Wolters, and N. T. Wright.<sup>13</sup>

---

entrapment of humans inside schemes of knowledge, language, and power. These, he says, have to do with politics of privilege, not with objective knowledge of reality. Sire 2004, pp. 31, 39; Naugle 1998, pp. 255-256, 259-261.

<sup>7</sup> Karilemla 2015, pp. 252-254, 256.

<sup>8</sup> Naugle 1998, pp. 560-561; Karilemla 2015, pp. 254, 260-261.

<sup>9</sup> This is the historically-maintained difference between *weltanschauung* and *wissenschaft*, a difference noted, for example, in Heidegger. This is discussed substantially in Naugle 1998, pp. 556-570 and Wolters 1989 (upon which Naugle bases his approach).

<sup>10</sup> Karilemla 2015, pp. 262-263; Naugle 1998, p. 567.

<sup>11</sup> Taylor 2007, p. 13; Berger & Luckmann 1966, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Doubleday, New York, pp. 97-98; cf. Sire 2004, pp. 108-110.

<sup>12</sup> Naugle affirms this position after detailed discussion of the relationship between philosophy and worldview in accordance with the 5 options put forth at Wolters 1989, p. 16. Naugle lists a string of those whose company he joins in adopting that position: this is “an Augustinian point of view, [which] also finds expression in a diverse group of intellectual companions including Hegel, Dilthey, Jaspers, Mannheim, Jung, the neo-Calvinists, and a number of the American evangelicals.” Naugle David K. Naugle 1998, *A History and Theory of the Concept of ‘Weltanschauung’ (Worldview)*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Arlington, p. 554, 566. For this perspective, see also Sire 2004, pp. 108, 112; Albert M. Wolters 1989, “On the Idea of Worldview and its Relation to Philosophy”, in P. A. Marshall, S. Griffioen & R. Mouw (eds.), *Stained Glass: Worldviews and Social Science*, University Press of America, Lanham, pp. 14-25, at p. 20-22; cf. Diederik Aerts et al. 1994, *World Views: From Fragmentation to Integration*, VUB Press, Brussels, p. 9; Conradie 2014, p. 11; Taylor 2007, p. 13.

<sup>13</sup> Sire 2004, pp. 8, 112; *id.* 2009, *The Universe Next Door: A Basic Worldview Catalogue*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, pp. 16, 18, 20; Wolters 1989, pp. 16, 10-22; Wright 1992, *The New Testament and the*



There are different approaches to worldview analysis, but key theorists agree that *questions* and *stories* can aid in reconstructing worldviews. Asking questions about ontology and epistemology, for example, generates propositional expression of the key tenets of a worldview.<sup>14</sup> Answers about origins, nature, purpose, and destiny – ideas of *being* and *becoming* – imply stories about humanity and the world.<sup>15</sup> Worldviews will be formed and expressed through stories, metanarratives configuring experience and belief.<sup>16</sup>

The inseparability of worldview and story reflects the importance of narrative in human experience.<sup>17</sup> Making sense of lived experience means configuring experience into coherent narrative.<sup>18</sup> It seems that narrative structures the way human brains organize memory.<sup>19</sup> The ability to formulate narratives is a significant stage in childhood cognitive development, and the inability to do so (following neurological damage) can have drastic consequences for psychology and self-understanding.<sup>20</sup> Given this dependence on narrative, it is no surprise that story is also involved with identity.

---

*People of God*, COQG, vol. 1, SPCK, London, esp. pp. 32, 36; *id.* 2013, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, COQG, vol. 4, SPCK, London, p. 28; cf. Conradie 2014, p. 11; Though it sometimes seems to express a similar position, the stance of Aerts et al. is somewhat different. Though worldview is still seen as the integrative framework by which the world is made intelligible, it is understood in a less foundational and more derivative sense – it is closer to “philosophy” than other worldview definitions discussed already. Aerts et al. 1994, pp. 9-11.

<sup>14</sup> Naugle 1998, p. 5; Wright 1992, pp. 122-126; Aerts et al. 1994, p.13; James H. Olthius 1989, “On Worldviews”, in Marshall et al. (eds.), pp. 26-40, at pp. 27, 29. A helpful discussion of worldview questions may be found in Sire 2004, especially, pp. 94-97.

<sup>15</sup> Aerts et al. 1994, p. 9.

<sup>16</sup> Sire 2004, p. 97; Sire 2009, p. 21; Wright 1992, pp. 37-38; Naugle 1998, pp. 553-554; Taylor 2007, pp. 575, 715-717.

<sup>17</sup> Green 2007, p. 198.

<sup>18</sup> Taylor 2007, p. 715; Ricoeur 1991, esp. p. 22; Kay Young & Jeffery L. Saver 2001, “The Neurology of Narrative”, *Substance*, vol. 30, no. 1/2, pp. 72-84, esp. p. 72; cf. Berger & Luckmann 1966, pp. 28, 92-93, Phillip L. Hammack 2008, “Narrative and the Cultural Psychology of Identity”, *Personality and Social Psychology Review OnlineFirst*, doi:10.1177/1088868308316892, at p. 11.

<sup>19</sup> Young & Saver 2001, p. 74; Jerome Bruner 1997, “A Narrative Model of Self-Construction”, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 818, no. 1, pp. 145-161, at p. 21; It is important to note that Bruner, a psychologist, stresses that his work is more consolidatory than innovative. He notes that the significance of narrative was well-established in the field, even when he wrote in 1991. Bruner 1991, pp. 5-6

<sup>20</sup> Young & Saver 2001, esp. pp. 75-80; Marie A. Stadler & Gay Cuming Ward 2005, “Supporting the Narrative Development of Young Children”, *Early Childhood Education Journal*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 73-80, at p. 73; Stephanie M. Curenton 2011, “Understanding the Landscapes of Stories: The Association Between

Alasdair MacIntyre raises this idea when discussing agency. He says acts are only cogent with reference to the agent's multi-layered intentionality: a man swings his hammer to drive a nail, to secure a beam, to build a house, to shelter his family. Acts have a historic and teleological, narrative quality, so life is a narrative history of action and intention.<sup>21</sup> The result is a narrative concept of self: I am the one for whom this narrative is true.<sup>22</sup>

Paul Ricoeur also discussed narrative identity. He said life is like literature: to be an intelligible whole it must have a plot, not merely a list of events.<sup>23</sup> The quest for intelligible life is the quest for narrative, coordinating multiplicity (experiences) into unity. By configuring a story and locating oneself therein (*emplotment*), identity is constructed.<sup>24</sup>

Individuals emplot themselves in layers of story, including stories appropriated from context or culture.<sup>25</sup> At the deepest level, they locate themselves in broad stories about the world at large – worldview narratives.<sup>26</sup> A worldview is a “story-shaped conception

---

Preschoolers' Narrative Production Skills and Cognitive Abilities”, *Early Child Development and Care*, vol. 181, no. 6, pp. 791-808, at p. 793, 802.

<sup>21</sup> Alasdair MacIntyre 1985 [1981], *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Duckworth, London, pp. 207-208, 210, 212, 215-216.

<sup>22</sup> MacIntyre 1985 [1981], pp. 217-218.

<sup>23</sup> Ricoeur 1991, “Life in Quest of Narrative”, in D. Wood (ed.), *On Paul Ricoeur: Narrative and Interpretation*, Routledge, London, pp. 20-33, esp. pp. 20-22, 27-28; Margaret R. Somers 1994, “The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach”, *Theory and Society*, vol. 23, pp. 605-649.

<sup>24</sup> Ricoeur 1991, pp. 22-24, 29-33; Somers 1994, p. 618; The concept of narrative identity, derived largely from MacIntyre and Ricoeur (and also Taylor, to some extent), has been widely employed. Though there has been some challenge to this paradigm, it has largely been defended and extended. Dan P. McAdams & Kate C. McLean 2013, “Narrative Identity”, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 233-238, esp. p. 233; John J. Davenport 2012, *Narrative Identity, Autonomy, and Mortality: From Frankfurt and MacIntyre to Kierkegaard*, Routledge, New York, at pp. 3, 42; Taylor 2007, pp. 716-717; Hammack 2008, p. 10; Andrew D. Brown 2006, “A Narrative Approach to Collective Identities”, *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 731-753 at pp. 732-733.

<sup>25</sup> This is also a way in which collective identity can be achieved: a group is unified by a narrative they have in common. This argument (or something much like it, in slightly different terms) is made by a variety of scholars coming from different fields and perspectives. Hammack 2008, pp. 3, 12, 15; MacIntyre 1985 [1981], p. 221; Ricoeur 1991, pp. 32-33; Brown 2006, p. 733.

<sup>26</sup> Ricoeur is speaking of identity, but he notes this reality in relation to fiction. In reading fiction, one must imaginatively enter into a story or stories that are not our own. In doing so, we enter into a *fictive universe*. If we were to accept a narrative as true and locate ourselves within it, our worldview would align with the fictive universe. This is one way in which stories may shape worldview convictions. Though not cast in terms of worldview, the link between narrative and the construction of plausible worlds has been recently applied to historical study in Sarah Iles Johnston's treatment of Greek mythology. Therein, she argues that “Good narratives...can be powerful stuff” – that narratives were a major force in constructing the Greek

of the universe,” and worldview narratives “are ultimately determinative for understanding the meaning of the cosmos.”<sup>27</sup> Finally, in the words of Sire, worldviews are concerned with “seeing one’s own life as part of a master story, a metanarrative.”<sup>28</sup>

The aim of this study is to understand early Christian worldviews and identities. Accordingly, we ought to pay attention to early Christian metanarratives, and their relation to Jewish metanarratives. Our next two chapters discuss the theory and practice of reading for Jewish narratives (like the exodus) in Christian texts.

---

mythic and ritual world. Johnstone 2015, “Narrating Myths: Story and Belief in Ancient Greece”, *Arethusa*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 173-218, esp. pp. 191, 195-196, 201.

<sup>27</sup> Naugle 1998, pp. 554, 568.

<sup>28</sup> Sire 2004, p. 97.



## 2. Learning to Read: Textuality & Allusion

Reading for New Testament worldviews is a literary task. We look to texts to see how Christian outlook was shaped by Jewish heritage. This chapter is dedicated to the theoretical and practical concerns involved in this task.

Hermeneutics is a complex field, especially since postmodernity and the linguistic turn. Biblical positivism (the notion that when we read scripture, we are simply and directly accessing information present in a text) has been challenged by the notion that knowledge is objective and uninvolved, and the claim that meaning is indeterminate – the author *is* in some sense dead, and readers may do as they will.<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, speech-act philosophy has powerfully critiqued this hermeneutic of suspicion. Despite the indeterminacy of language, communication is still possible.<sup>2</sup> If we can understand the discursive context of an author, we can understand authorial meaning.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The positivistic approach emerged out of the Reformation and its concern for literal reading. For more on positivism, see Kevin J Vanhoozer 2009, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*, anniversary ed., Landmarks in Christian Scholarship, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, pp. 47-48; Wright 1992, pp. 32-33; The claims about the arbitrary nature of language depends on Saussurean linguistics, supposing that linguistic signs have no inherent relationship to their object, and thus the meaning of a sign is in its relationship to other signifiers, the distinction between fluid or arbitrary categories. Vanhoozer 2009, pp. 61-63; This is what we might call a “hermeneutic of suspicion,” and is most famously associated with figures like Stanley Fish, Richard Rorty, and Jacques Derrida. Vanhoozer interestingly notes that the death of the author and subsequent indeterminacy in literary meaning is the arrival in literary theory of Nietzsche’s declaration that God is dead. Vanhoozer 2009, pp. 30, 48, 50, 56, 69; Jacques Derrida & John D. Caputo 1997, *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida*, Fordham University Press, New York, p. 31; John R. Searle 1994, “Literary Theory and Its Discontents”, *New Literary History*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 637-667, at p. 657; Fish 1999, pp. 51-52.

<sup>2</sup> Searle 1994, pp. 642, 647; Fish 1999, pp. 46, 52; Wright puts it nicely when he says “When we read words, whether they were written yesterday or two thousand years ago, the normal charitable assumption is that the words were written by writers who were doing their best to say, more or less, what they meant.” Wright 2013, p. 53.

<sup>3</sup> This itself is not disputed by theorists like Fish or Derrida: they merely suggest that we are stuck within our own language and communities, we cannot share enough with an author or text to understand intention. Fish 1999, pp. 41, 51-52, 74; Vanhoozer 2009, pp. 211-212, 217-218; Derrida 2007 [1982], “Signature Event Context”, in B. Stocker (ed.), *Jacques Derrida: Basic Writings*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 105-34, at pp. 119-121; In a roundtable discussion at Villanova University in 1994, Derrida (despite his disagreements with Searle) notes that speaking involves an implicit call to faith: it asks the hearer to believe. This discursive covenant may not be so far from the notion of the speech act after all. Derrida & Caputo 1997, p. 23.

We stand on the middle ground of *critical realism*.<sup>4</sup> We recognise the challenges of worldview and language, yet affirm the possibility of seeing authorial meaning – if only through the glass and darkly.<sup>5</sup> Miscommunication is possible but not inevitable, for epistemological difficulty is not ontological impossibility.<sup>6</sup> Our challenge is to read texts in context, paying close attention to the way authors engage with their cultural encyclopaedia.<sup>7</sup>

Understanding NT texts in context is not a novel aim, but there has been a recent surge of interest in early Christian engagement with Jewish tradition.<sup>8</sup> The result is a booming sub-discipline dubbed *biblical intertextuality*, *inner-biblical exegesis*, or *OT/NT* (the study of the Old Testament in the New Testament).<sup>9</sup>

Intertextuality was introduced to Pauline studies by Richard B. Hays in 1989.<sup>10</sup> The term became “trendy,” but the new terminology has seldom brought new methods or

---

<sup>4</sup> Though numerous scholars advocate critical realism for biblical studies, the discussion put forward by Wright in *The New Testament and the People of God* is the most helpful I have found, featuring a good balance of sophistication and accessibility. Wright 1992, esp. pp. 61-69.

<sup>5</sup> Vanhoozer 2009, p. 139.

<sup>6</sup> Searle 1994, p. 660; Vanhoozer 2009, p. 77.

<sup>7</sup> The notion of cultural encyclopaedia comes from Umberto Eco. He stresses that texts, like signs, are infinitely interpretable (rather like Derrida), but then suggests that “what I have to do is to look for possible contexts capable of making the initial expression intelligible and reasonable.” This does place a burden on the reader, but the assumption is that a reader, should he manage to approximate the discursive context of the author, may accurately determine the intended sense. Umberto Eco 1981, “The Theory of Signs and the Role of the Reader”, *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 35-45, esp. p. 45; cf. Leroy A. Huizenga 2015, “The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory”, *JSNT*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 17-35, at p. 28. Likewise, Steve Moyise asserts that to understand a text it *must* be understood with reference to the textual matrix whence it emerged. Moyise 2009, “Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament”, in R. B. Hays, L. A. Huizenger & S. A. Alkier (eds.), *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, Baylor University Press, Waco, pp. 23-32, at p. 23.

<sup>8</sup> Though it has not always been adequately recognised, the fact that the earliest Christians were Jews steeped in the traditions and texts of Judaism is uncontroversial.

<sup>9</sup> For a more detailed discussion of OT/NT see the September 2015 issue of *JSNT*, a special edition dedicated to the topic. Also in 2015, Samuel Emadi published an article in *Currents in Biblical Research* which summarises and compares the intertextual approaches of several important scholars: Samuel Emadi 2015, “Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading”, *CurBR*, vol. 2015, no. 1, pp. 8-23. Though it deals only with Old Testament scholarship the most comprehensive survey of “intertextuality” in biblical studies is Geoffrey D. Miller 2010, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research”, *CurBR*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 283-309.

<sup>10</sup> Richard B. Hays 1989, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, Yale, New Haven.

approaches – it risks being an empty label.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, many biblical scholars would reject its postmodern connotations.<sup>12</sup> Since we are concerned with history and production (not indeterminacy and dialogic) we will avoid the term.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Ellen Van Wolde 1989, “Trendy Intertextuality”, in S. Draisma (ed.), *Essays in honour of Bas van Iersel*, Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok, Kampen, pp. 43-49, esp. p. 43; Richard B. Hays 2009, “Foreword to the English Edition”, in Hays et al. (eds.), pp. xi-xv, at p. xii-xiii; The inventor of *intertextuality* (Julia Kristeva) herself protested that the term was misapplied when used to refer simply to the study of sources, not her rather more radical postmodern proposals. Kristeva 1984 [1974], *Revolution in Poetic Language*, M. Waller (trans.), Columbia University Press, New York pp. 59-60; As Huizenga notes, there is an irony here: the author of the subversive theory of indeterminate and unlimited meaning is protesting that the readers have misunderstood, have used it incorrectly! Huizenga 2015, p. 25; Irony aside, it is clear that there are contradictory uses which have created some frustration and misunderstanding. Miller’s 2010 essay on the concept of intertextuality in Old Testament scholarship is perhaps the best treatment of this phenomenon: he outlines two major divergent approaches (synchronic and diachronic), and then shows the vast range of disagreements between and within these approaches, the terminology, definitions, methods and conclusions associated with a large range of studies of intertextuality. He rightly concludes that we will benefit from using different terminology. Miller 2010, esp. pp. 284, 303-305.

<sup>12</sup> David I. Yoon 2012, “The Ideological Inception of Intertextuality and its Dissonance in Current Biblical Studies”, *CurBR*, pp. 58-76, at p. 67; Lyn Nixon 2015, *New Testament Quotation at the Reader-Author Intersection: Evoking Story for Transformation*, Doctoral Dissertation, Middlesex University/London School of Theology, pp. 1, 9; Joseph R. Kelly 2014, *Intertextuality & Allusion in the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, Doctoral Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, p. 57; Michael Schneider 2009, “How Does God Act? Intertextual Readings of 1 Corinthians 10”, in Hays et al. (eds.) pp. 35-52, at p. 46; Emadi 2015, p. 10; cf. Estes 2014, p. 37 In reality, it is more than a theory of text: it is a “postmodern ontology.” Yoon 2013, p. 63; Huizenga 2015, p. 25; A production-oriented approach does require that we understand words, phrases and texts in the contextual matrix of the author, but we approach this with a diachronic and author-oriented approach, rather than a properly “intertextual” approach. Florian Wilk 2009, “Paul as User, Interpreter, and Reader of the Book of Isaiah”, in Hays et al. (eds.), pp. 83-100, esp. p. 99.

<sup>13</sup> A similar stance has been promulgated by Miller, David Carr, Richard Hays, and Stanley E. Porter. It is interesting to note that Hays – the one who introduced the terminology – has questioned its validity in biblical scholarship! Hays 2009 [Foreword], pp. xiii, 25-29; Though *Echoes* did have some leaning toward reader-response theories in its theoretical frame, the actual exegesis was largely production-oriented. David Carr 2012, “The Many Uses of Intertextuality in Biblical Studies: Actual and Potential”, in M. Nissinen (ed.) *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, VTSup, vol. 148, Brill, Leiden, p. 531; Hays 2009 [Foreword], pp. xiii, 25-29; Miller 2010, p. 305; Porter 2008, “Allusions and Echoes”, in Porter & Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*, SBL SymS, no. 50, Brill, Leiden, pp. 29-40, at p. 37; Schneider 2009, pp. 45-46; There are some scholars advocating for a fuller sense of intertextuality in biblical studies. Again, Miller 2010 is the best survey considering some of these approaches. Among New Testament scholars, the most articulate and robust theoretical justification of this position comes from Alkier, who articulates a semiotic theory whereby the fullest meaning can be achieved in a community of readers with different ways to construe a sign. This theory, favoured by Hays and Huizenga, has more to do with hermeneutics and application than with understanding authorial intention. Huizenga 2015, pp. 29; Stefan Alkier 2009, “New Testament Studies on the Basis of Categorical Semiotics”, Hays et al. (eds.), pp. 223-248, esp. pp. 224, 227-228, 237-238.

*Inner-biblical exegesis* and *OT/NT* are also imperfect labels.<sup>14</sup> It is hard to speak of *the* Old Testament when there were numerous variant versions.<sup>15</sup> Many of the books of the OT existed in some variant form.<sup>16</sup> The MT may not have been the singular text of Judaism before the first century.<sup>17</sup> Complete LXX collections were probably rare, and there is a complex textual history behind LXX texts.<sup>18</sup> Though psalms were popular at Qumran, none of the Qumran scrolls matches the canonical book of Psalms.<sup>19</sup> Some non-

---

<sup>14</sup> This *critique* also applies to *canonical criticism* (largely associated with Brevard S. Childs) but that particular epithet has not been so prominent in recent discussion. Nevada Levi DeLapp 2014, "Ezekiel as Moses – Israel as Pharaoh: Reverberations of the Exodus Narrative in Ezekiel", in Fox (ed.), pp. 51-73, at p. 52, cf. Hays 2009 [*Foreword*], pp. xiii; Carr 2012, p. 511.

<sup>15</sup> Before the discovery of the Qumran caves and the complex source criticism that has taken place since, it was thought that there were only three options, each of which was relatively stable: The Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch. Qumran has drastically altered the state of scholarship, but a full recognition of the complexity and plurality is not always mentioned. Timothy H. Lim 2015, "Qumran Scholarship and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament", *JSNT*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 68-80, esp. p. 69; Eugene Ulrich identifies numerous examples: 4QpaleoExod, 4QExodu-Lev, 4QNum seem to agree with other sources against the MT, while 4QKgs agrees with the MT against the LXX. Ulrich's book is devoted to discussion of such examples. Ulrich 2015, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, VTSup, The Text of the Bible at Qumran, vol. 169, Brill, Leiden, pp. 9, 34-37, 71-72 etc.

<sup>16</sup> Ulrich 2015, p. 9; Perhaps the En-Gedi scroll which was digitally unwrapped in recent weeks will give further information on this matter. It is the earliest known scroll wherein the text (in this case, Leviticus) never deviates from the medieval MT. W. Brent Seales et al. "From Damage to Discovery via Virtual Unwrapping: Reading the Scroll from En-Gedi", *Science Advances*, vol. 2, no. 9, e1601247, accessed September 27, 2016, <<http://advances.sciencemag.org/content/advances/2/9/e1601247.full.pdf>>.

<sup>17</sup> Ulrich 2015, pp. 10, 20; Ulrich id: 4QpaleoExod, 4QExodu-Lev, 4QNum seem to agree with other sources against the MT, while 4QKgs agrees with the MT against the LXX. Most of this substantial book is devoted to complex source-critical discussions of this sort, revealing the complexity of the textual situation of second-temple Judaism. Ulrich 2015, pp. 9, 34-37, 71-72 etc.

<sup>18</sup> Claude Cox 2014, "Some Things that Biblical Scholars Should Know about the Septuagint", *ResQ Quarterly*, vol. 56, pp. 85-98, at pp. 88-89; Lim 2015, p. 71; Susan E. Docherty 2015, "Do You Understand What You Are Reading?" (Acts 8.30): Current Trends and Future Perspectives in the Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New", *JSNT*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp.112-125, at p. 116; Gert J. Steyn argues that Paul used something very like the LXX. This conclusion is based on a survey of the citations of the minor prophets in Romans 9-11. Though *most* of these citations show some difference to the known text forms, Steyn puts these differences down to Pauline emphasis or adaptation. If Steyn's treatment of these citations is correct, however, we can merely conclude that Paul cited a Greek version very like the LXX when composing Romans 9-11. The problem still stands: though NT authors generally follow the LXX, the textual history and variant forms are enough to leave us with some uncertainty. Steyn 2015, "Observations on the Text Form of the Minor Prophets Quotations in Romans 9-11", *JSNT*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 49-67, esp. p. 64.

<sup>19</sup> They were arranged differently, found in different collections, and had non-canonical psalms interspersed with the canonical. Eva Mroczek 2015, "The Hegemony of the Biblical in the Study of Second Temple Literature", *Journal of Ancient Judaism*, vol. 6, pp. 2-35, esp. pp. 8-11, 16; As short units not embedded in narrative and with liturgical use, the psalms may have been particularly susceptible to rearrangement. Even so, the point still stands: we must be alert for anachronism.



canonical books were more popular than some canonical books at Qumran.<sup>20</sup>

Importantly for this study, the book of Exodus was very popular at Qumran, and this interest or popularity is seen throughout Jewish literature (as will be outlined in part 2).

This complexity also forces us to question literary paradigms. Jewish tradition was often a matter of orality and memory.<sup>21</sup> There was a literary subculture, but it this seems to have operated in concert with orality.<sup>22</sup> Scribes made adaptations by memory and traditions were cross-pollinated.<sup>23</sup> Variants emerged from error and creativity.<sup>24</sup> Models that merely account for finite literary sources (like the JEDP Documentary Hypothesis) are not always adequate.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Ulrich 2015, p. 27; Mroczek 2015, p. 13.

<sup>21</sup> David Carr 2010, "Torah on the Heart: Jewish Textuality Within Its Ancient Near Eastern Context", *Oral Tradition*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 17-40, at pp. 19, 23; 2012, p. 530; Kathy Ehrensperger 2008, "Paul and the Authority of Scripture", in Porter & Stanley (eds.), pp. 291-320, at p. 308.

<sup>22</sup> Porter 2008, "Paul and His Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel", in Porter & Stanley (eds.), pp. 97-124, at pp. 106-108.

<sup>23</sup> Ehrensperger 2008, pp. 305-308; New Testament authors themselves are not free from this; they would have often relied upon their own memory for allusion and citation, not necessarily having access to many scrolls at once. Even if they did, it is not so easy to locate particular moments in a scroll, especially if citing multiple texts. Writers may have sometimes worked from scrolls, sometimes from anthologies, and sometimes from memory. The community itself may have constituted something of a mental library. We would do well to remember the neat formulation of Ed Sanders: "[Paul] carried the Bible safely tucked away in his head, where it belongs." E. P. Sanders 2008, "Did Paul's Theology Develop?", in J. R. Wagner, C. K. Rowe & A. K. Grieb (eds.), *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays in Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 325-350, at p. 347; Porter 2008 [Paul], esp. p. 122; Carr 2010, pp. 31-32.

<sup>24</sup> Allen notes that there is a trend towards attributing "non-standard" (for want of a better term) citations down to some non-extant variant text, rather than assuming that the author has taken liberties with the text. Allen 2015, pp. 9-10.

<sup>25</sup> Carr 2010, pp. 33; The Documentary Hypothesis has lost prominence and popularity among recent years, with many preferring a supplementary or fragmentary explanation instead. Further discussion of this may be found at Joel S. Baden 2012, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*, AYBRL, Yale University Press, New Haven (defending a version of the DH); Joseph Lam 2013, "The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis (Book Review)", *JNES*, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 306-309 (reviewing Baden), Kelly 2014, pp. 25-30 (concerning the decline in popularity), Merrill 2012, "Deuteronomy and de Wette: A Fresh Look at a Fallacious Premise", *JESOT*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 25-42 (critiquing basic tenets of the DH – note especially p. 27, fn. 5), and Konrad Schmid 2011, "Has European Pentateuchal Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status", in Dozeman, Schmid, & Schwartz (eds.), *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, Forschungen zum Alten Testament, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, pp. 17-30. See also Carol Meyers 2005, *Exodus*, NCBC, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 16-18, and various brief reflections on this situation in Levy et al. (eds.). See Christoph Berner 2015, "The Exodus Narrative Between History and Literary Fiction: The Portrayal of the Egyptian Burden as a Test Case", in Levy et al. (eds.) pp. 285-292, at pp. 286-287; Römer 2015, pp. 307-308; Schmid 2015, "Distinguishing the World of

All this complexity and indeterminacy should be kept in mind as we turn again to Richard Hays, with the purpose of evaluating and improving his method of analysis. Hays argued that Paul's engagement with Jewish tradition was not just proof-texting. Drawing on John Hollander's work on Milton, Hays proposed that allusions may operate by *metalepsis*; they create a link between texts, allowing the referent *and its context* to shape meaning in the referring text.<sup>26</sup>

Hays's approach has been hugely influential, but it has its flaws.<sup>27</sup> His terminology of *echoes* is ambiguous, referring to both subtle intentional allusions and unconscious or coincidental agreement.<sup>28</sup> These can be difficult to distinguish, but they are nonetheless different.<sup>29</sup> Taking texts as communicative acts, we must count as allusion only that which the author intended. Unconscious or coincidental agreement sits outside authorial

---

the Exodus Narrative from the World of Its Narrators: The Question of the Priestly Exodus Account in Its Historical Setting", in Levy et al. (eds.) pp. 331-346, at p. 332.

<sup>26</sup> Hays 1989, pp. 19-21; This concept is taken from Hollander's discussion of the poetics of allusion in Milton. Hollander 1981, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

<sup>27</sup> Christopher D. Stanley 2008, "Paul's "Use" of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters", in Porter & Stanley (eds.), pp. 125-156, at p. 128; Though this was a turning point for scholarship, we should recognise that Hays was by no means the first to consider that the context of a referent was important to referential meaning. This notion was characteristic of C.H. Dodd in a previous generation – another scholar with a huge influence over the field of OT/NT. Cf. Allen 2015, p.7; Both Stanley and Moyise point out that not everyone agrees that New Testament citations or allusions are metaleptic. Though not always called by this name, the notion (that an allusion may invoke a context, and the correspondence of referencing and referenced contexts may create the meaning) is practiced broadly. Yet Wilk raises a helpful corollary: metalepsis need not be occurring in every instance, and it can be difficult to determine what the author's intention or logic is. We must evaluate on a case-by-case basis, neither assuming nor discounting metaleptic functions. The criteria of plausibility and satisfaction (below) will help in this process. If (as Stanley suggests) this is ultimately a point for axiom, then I must confess to affirming the axiom: allusions do often import and rely on context. Moyise 2008, "Quotations", in Porter & Stanley (eds.), pp. 15-28, at pp. 27-28; Stanley 2008, p. 130; Bradley R. Trick 2007, "Death, Covenants, and the Proof of Resurrection in Mark 12:18-27", *NovT*, vol. 49, fasc. 3, pp. 232-256, esp. p. 251; Wright 2003, "The Resurrection of the Son of God", *COQG*, vol. 3, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, pp. 427-428; Wright 1999, "New Exodus, New Inheritance: The Narrative Substructure of Romans 3-8", in S. K. Soderlund & N. T. Wright (eds.), *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honour of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 26-35, repr. in N. T. Wright, 2013, "Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978-2013", Fortress Press, Minneapolis, pp. 160-168, esp. pp. 30-31; Wilk 2009, p. 87.

<sup>28</sup> Hays also allows for the possibility that echoes could exist in the mind of the reader, not in the mind of the author or in the text! Hays 1989, pp. 25-29.

<sup>29</sup> Though various scholars have explained their use of the term "echo", not all have. The result is that the confusion produced by problematic terminology – *intertextuality*, *inner-biblical exegesis*, *canonical criticism* – is multiplied. Porter 2008 [*Allusions*], p. 29; Kelly 2014, pp. 86-90.

agency, outside the communicative act.<sup>30</sup> This study uses *allusion* to mean *intentional* reference, whether direct citation or something subtle and indirect.<sup>31</sup> Importantly, an allusion need not refer specifically to a single literary text. Authors may allude to tropes, characters, stories and other extratextual referents.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> This harkens back to the brief mention of speech-act philosophy, and to the notion of agency raised in the previous chapter: an act cannot be understood apart from the multivalent intentionality of an agent. Likewise, a communicative act is not mere causation – the nature of the act is directly tied to the purpose of the agent.

<sup>31</sup> Seeking a technical definition, Kelly engages with the theories of Gian Biagio Conte, Ziva Ben-Porat and Joseph Pucci. He ultimately affirms the approach Ben-Porat, which requires that the reader must “complete” an allusion or else the allusion, by definition, does not exist. Christopher A. Beetham likewise subscribes to Ben-Porat, and says that an allusion does not exist unless it is. Perhaps more useful is W. T. Irwin’s step away from “internalist” perspectives (like that of Ben-Porat) towards an “intentionalist” model. By this scheme, an allusion is not fully realised if it is not recognised, but the allusion nonetheless depends on the intention of the author rather than the competencies of the reader. Kelly 2014, p. 131, 134, 141, 149; Christopher A. Beetham, 2008, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, Brill, Leiden 2008, pp. 17-19; Irwin 2001, “What is an Allusion?”, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 287-297, esp. pp. 290, 293, 295 cf. Robert S. Kawashima, 2007, “Comparative Literature and Biblical Studies: The Case of Allusion”, *Proof*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 324-344, esp. p. 333.

<sup>32</sup> Reading Emadi’s 2015 article, we get the impression that Beetham operates on an unrealistically restrictive concept of allusion. Emadi seems to have slightly misunderstood Beetham, presumably due to Beetham’s assertion that *literary* allusion may only involve two texts. Beetham, in fact, recognises that authors may allude to events, people, traditions, or things– not just simple literary texts. When discussing an exodus *echo* in Colossians 1:12-14, Beetham is able to say “Paul is not echoing any *specific* text, but evoking a whole OT theme or tradition, the foundational event of Israelite history.” Beetham 2008, pp. 18, 81; Emadi 2015, p. 288; Irwin 2001, p. 288; Porter 2008 [*Allusions*], p. 30; Keesmaat 1994 “Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14-30”, *JSNT*, vol. 54, pp. 29-56, at p. 33; Paul Foster 2015, “Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament”, *JSNT*, pp. 96-111, esp. pp. 98-99; Foster is right to warn here that while the Jewish scriptures were the dominant textual influence, we may misunderstand authors if we do not allow for multicultural influence.

Hays proposed seven criteria for detecting allusions.<sup>33</sup> Whether they are accepted, modified, or rejected outright, these criteria have set the agenda for subsequent scholarship.<sup>34</sup> Accordingly, it makes sense to outline them here.<sup>35</sup>

Availability	Authors cannot allude to texts they do not know. <sup>36</sup> If an author is unlikely to know a text, allusion is unlikely.
Volume	Volume concerns how loud or overt an echo is. <sup>37</sup> Having left <i>echoes</i> behind, we will use the non-auditory term <i>strength</i> . We will benefit from specifying several specific sub-criteria under this rubric: lexical agreement, formal/structural agreement, and conceptual agreement. <sup>38</sup> In addition, the rarity or distinctiveness of these agreements comes into play. <sup>39</sup> Finally, strength also considers

<sup>33</sup> Huizenga 2015, p. 22.

<sup>34</sup> Stanley 2008, p.126; Among those who use or condone Hays's seven criteria are Keesmaat, Huizenga, Kelly, Guthrie, & Leithart. G. K. Beale and Dale C. Allison proceed with some modifications, yet accept most of the criteria. Michael B. Thompson and Christopher Beetham produce substantially modified lists of criteria. Foster finds the criteria too subjective, but he offers no alternative method or scheme. Porter criticises several of the criteria as vague, redundant and irrelevant. Emadi 2015; Huizenga 2015, p.22; Keesmaat 1994, esp. p. 34-35; Guthrie 2007; G. K. Beale, 2012, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, pp. 32-34; Thompson 1991, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13*, JSNTSup, no. 59, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield; Beetham 2010, esp. pp. 28-40; Porter 2008 [*Allusions*], pp. 38-39; David A. Shaw 2013, "Converted Imaginations? The Reception of Richard Hays's Intertextual Method", *CurBR*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 234-245, esp. pp. 236-239; Foster 2015, pp. 107-109.

<sup>35</sup> For Hays's own discussions of the criteria see Hays 1989, pp. 29-32 and especially Hays 2005, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 34-45

<sup>36</sup> Porter 2008 [*Allusions*], p. 35.

<sup>37</sup> In using the auditory metaphor of "echo", Hays follows Hollander. Porter contends that to speak of "volume" is inappropriate, as it defines a metaphor with a metaphor. On the contrary, if we accept the auditory metaphor then "volume" is participating in the same metaphorical framework, and seems to me a fitting way to describe the degree to which "the echo presses itself upon the reader." Hays 2005, p. 35; cf. Porter 2008 [*Allusions*], p. 38.

<sup>38</sup> The particular criteria put forward here are informed by the alternative criteria proposed by Beetham and Thompson in particular. Emadi 2015, pp. 11-13, 17; Shaw 2013, p. 236; Beetham 2010, pp. 28-40; Thompson 1991, pp. 30-37.

<sup>39</sup> The notion of distinctiveness is raised by Hays, but he does not make it a separate criterion. Hays 2005, p. 36. This is also the concept behind Benjamin D. Sommer's warning that correspondence between (prophetic) passages must also be considered against the background of near-eastern tradition: when two texts both use vocabulary common in the cultural situation (for example, Isaiah and Jeremiah agreeing on words and concepts which are common in Mesopotamian traditions), we are hard pressed to establish a specific textual relationship. Sommer 1998, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*, Stanford, Stanford, pp. 33-34.

	<i>tradition indicators</i> ; formulae or phrases that suggest tradition is being invoked.
Recurrence	If an author has a demonstrable proclivity for alluding to a particular referent, further allusions to that target are likely. <sup>40</sup> Nonetheless, this is a matter of plausibility rather than positive evidence in specific cases. <sup>41</sup>
Thematic Coherence	A proposed allusion is more likely if it supports the contextual argument. This criterion is not so different from satisfaction (the final criterion). <sup>42</sup>
Historical Plausibility	This criterion suggests that authors would not make allusions that audiences could not understand. Yet some in the churches are likely to have understood, and Paul clearly expected some degree of scriptural literacy and mutual teaching. <sup>43</sup> In any case, reception does not govern authorial intent.

---

<sup>40</sup> Sommer 1998, p. 35.

<sup>41</sup> Porter notes this shortcoming, but seems to have misunderstood Hays. Porter 2008 [Allusions], p. 38; Shaw 2013, p. 239.

<sup>42</sup> Hays recognises the similarity between thematic coherence and satisfaction. He proposes that satisfaction considers the whole Pauline discussion, not just the specific context. This seems to me to be a difficult line to draw, and we are better seeing thematic coherence as an implicit factor in satisfaction. Hays 2005, p.44.

<sup>43</sup> Some scholars (notably Stanley) have argued that Paul was deluded if he expected any substantial portion of his audiences to understand scriptural allusions. Yet Dunn says “we can assume that Paul was aware of his audience’s ‘horizon of expectation’.” Despite low literacy rates, there would be *some* among the audience who would recognise and understand scriptural allusions. There were literate Jews in early Christian communities, and they were still influenced by the synagogues: Bruce N. Fisk 2008, “Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge among the Christians of Rome”, in Porter & Stanley (eds.), pp. 157-188, esp. p. 185; Additionally, Paul had co-workers and colleagues spread throughout the Mediterranean world. Presumably Paul’s couriers had some role in explaining his letters. Paul expected mutual instruction to be taking place, and expects his churches to be “fully conversant with the OT.” Douglas J. Moo 1996, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, p. 233. We should focus primarily on the text and author, not the audience. Stanley 2008, pp. 122, 132-133, 139, 144-145; James D. G. Dunn 2002, “The Narrative Approach to Paul: Whose Story?”, in Longenecker (ed.) *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp. 217-230, at p. 223. For a direct response to Stanley on the competence of Paul’s readers, see Brian J. Abasciano 2007, “Diamonds in the Rough: A Reply to Christopher Stanley concerning the Reader Competency of Paul’s Original Audiences”, *NovT*, vol. 49, fasc. 2, pp. 153-183..

History of Interpretation	Since the church fathers were temporally and culturally proximate to the NT authors, we should take their verdict seriously. <sup>44</sup> Again, however, reception does not govern intention. <sup>45</sup>
Satisfaction	Satisfaction concerns explanatory power. <sup>46</sup> If the text (its language, themes, development and so on) make more sense <i>with</i> the proposed allusion than <i>without</i> , the allusion is likely.

Even with these criteria, studying allusions is an art rather than a science.<sup>47</sup> We should not expect objectivity in matters of poetics. Nonetheless, a good set of criteria may guide discussion and aid consistency. Accounting for the comments made above, we will proceed with the following scheme, modified from that of Hays:

Strength	Lexical Agreement
	Conceptual Agreement
	Formal Agreement
	Tradition Indication <sup>48</sup>
	Distinctiveness
Plausibility	Availability
	Recurrence
	Reception
Satisfaction	

<sup>44</sup> This sensitivity of the early church to allusion is highlighted by Huizenga and Allison, among others. Huizenga 2015, p. 18; Emadi 2015, p. 15; Allison 2005, p. 115.

<sup>45</sup> We should not be surprised to find that Christians from the second century and beyond missed some of the allusions made by New Testament authors. The cultural difference between Paul (a zealous Jew educated in Jerusalem before it fell in 70AD) and the important figures of early Christianity (the apostolic fathers, apologists, and so on) was substantial.

<sup>46</sup> The essence of this criterion is summed up in that old adage that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Hays 1989, p.

<sup>47</sup> Huizenga 2015, p. 22; Emadi 2015, pp. 14, 20; Hays 2005, p. 30; Allison 2005, p. 16; Emadi says that Beetham is the exception, favouring a “mechanical” approach. As already noted, however, Emadi seems to have misunderstood Beetham’s attitude. Emadi 2015, p. 17; Foster’s critique of the poetic mode of allusive detection verges on polemic, suggesting that the echo/allusion approach is prone to becoming nothing more than “a pietistic quest” for extra meaning. Foster 2015, p. 107.

<sup>48</sup> Tradition indication could perhaps also fit under the rubric of plausibility – an introductory formula would certainly make an allusion very plausible. I have placed it under strength because tradition indication constitutes positive evidence for an allusion, not general evidence that allusion is possible.

The final step before we can turn to the texts themselves is a discussion of the *narrative approach* to the New Testament.





### 3. Tacit Tales: Narrative Approaches

We have established the significance of narrative for worldview and identity, but we are yet to consider its role for studying NT epistles. This chapter serves as an introduction to the *narrative approach* to Paul (and Peter), considering how our concern for worldview and identity narratives connects to our goal of contextualised reading.<sup>1</sup>

Scholars have long recognised narrative elements in Paul's thought. Figures like Bultmann, Schweitzer and Käsemann saw implicit narratives in Paul, but considered them relatively unimportant.<sup>2</sup> Cullman proposed that Paul oriented his thought in relation to a story of divine activity, Dodd's *substructure* of the early *kerygma* resembled a plot summary, and Via asserted (but did not justify) that Paul's letters had narrative structure.<sup>3</sup>

The first theoretically sophisticated treatment of Pauline substructural narrative was Hays 1983, which drew on the work of Paul Ricoeur, Northrop Frye, and Robert Funk.<sup>4</sup> Ricoeur and Frye argued that a series of events only becomes a story when configured according to some logic or principle. This *configurational element* of a story may be present even where there is no sequential narration. Funk said that *reflective discourse* like a letter may be predicated on *foundational discourse* like a narrative, which creates a discursive world. Hays proposed that a narrative may shape a text and be implied therein, without ever being recounted. Using the *actantial model* of by A. J. Greimas to detect narratives in Galatians 3-4, he concluded that these chapters were governed by the story of Jesus as a *narrative substructure*.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Helpful introductions to the narrative approach can be found in Bruce W. Longenecker 2002, "Narrative Interest in the Study of Paul: Retrospective and Prospective", in B. W. Longenecker (ed), pp. 3-18, and in Joseph 2013, esp. pp. 33-40.

<sup>2</sup> Richard B. Hays 2002 [1983], *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., The Biblical Resource Series, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 34-52, 58-60, esp. pp. 43, 48.

<sup>3</sup> Hays 2002 [1983], pp. 52-53, 55, 61-62, 64-70, esp. p. 67

<sup>4</sup> Hays 2002 [1983], pp. 21-29.

<sup>5</sup> Hays 2002 [1983], esp. pp. 82-93.

Norman R. Petersen proposed a similar notion in 1985.<sup>6</sup> He argued that the writing of a letter is understood by author and recipients as an event within an ongoing story. Taking Philemon as his example, he proposed that a letter implies a narrative world, but the *poetic sequence* (the order the events appear in the letter) need not match the *referential sequence* of the story itself.<sup>7</sup>

In 1992 Wright argued that stories were fundamental to Jewish self-understanding, and that Jewish stories reformulated around Christ were central to Christian worldviews.<sup>8</sup> Despite some negative reactions, Wright has maintained this narrative emphasis – much of his monumental *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* was spent discussing Pauline metanarratives.<sup>9</sup> Central to Wright's approach is his argument that Second Temple Jews, including Paul, believed that the exile never truly ended. They located themselves in an unfinished story, awaited the realisation of divine purpose.<sup>10</sup> Wright also argues that Jewish narratives like the exodus story were used paradigmatically, re-configured to understand later experience. Like a wheel leaving tracks in the snow, Israel's story was always moving forward by repeating the same pattern.<sup>11</sup> Evaluating Wright's work in

---

<sup>6</sup> Petersen 1985, *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia. Wesley A. Kort, who wrote in 1988, should also be acknowledged here. Though he does not focus on Paul, and does not offer much detailed exegesis, his treatment resembles Hays in some ways. Kort uses the actantial method, but appears more comfortable than Hays in accepting structuralist ideas. Kort is not discussed above because he did not engage with Hays or Petersen, and his work has had minimal impact on subsequent scholarship. Kort 1988, *Story, Text, and Scripture: Literary Interests in Biblical Narrative*, Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park.

<sup>7</sup> Petersen 1985, esp. pp. 7-8, 15, 28, 48, 60.

<sup>8</sup> Wright 1992, p.79.

<sup>9</sup> Note Wright 2013, p. 456, where Wright mentions the friendly critique of O'Donovan. O'Donovan implies that Wright is trying to find story everywhere, and wonders whether this emphasis really makes any difference. Wright's response is to persevere with the approach, attempting to provide more clarity and insight.

<sup>10</sup> Wright was not the first to propose this notion. The classic arguing the point is Odil Hannes Steck 1967, *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn. There is some resistance, but many now accept this hypothesis to be broadly true. Wright 2013, pp. 139-160; Wright 1992, p. 299; cf. Steck 1967; Thiessen 2007, pp. 353-354; White 2016, p. 193.

<sup>11</sup> Wright 2012, "Israel's Scriptures in Paul's Narrative Theology", *Theology*, vol. 115, no. 5, pp. 323-329, repr. in N. T. Wright, 2013, "Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978-2013", Fortress Press, Minneapolis, pp.546-553, at. p. 235; Though his broader argument about the structure of myth is rather different, Frye makes a similar point about the repetition of the exodus pattern. Frye 1987 [1982], "Exodus, the Definitive Deliverance", in H. Bloom (ed.), *Exodus*, Chelsea House Publishers, New York, pp. 73-81, and p. 75.

2016, Joel R. White wrote that Wright's narrative approach was convincing and helpful, though his actantial graphs (resembling those of Hays) were unhelpful.<sup>12</sup>

In 1994, Ben Witherington III wrote *Paul's Narrative Thought World*. Skimming over theoretical matters, he discussed how four different stories – those of God, Israel, Jesus, and Paul – figured across Paul's outlook. Witherington recognises the importance of story for worldview, but his terms are sometimes imprecise.<sup>13</sup> James D. G. Dunn followed and expanded Witherington's approach, considering also a fifth category: the stories of early believers.<sup>14</sup>

In 2002, the second edition of Hays's book on Galatians was published. In a new preface, Hays wrote that he stood by his central argument, despite the book's shortcomings. He rightly noted that it failed to consider Jewish narratives and that his section on narrative syntax was superfluous.<sup>15</sup>

The same year also brought a collaborative volume dedicated to the narrative approach. *Narrative Dynamics in Paul*, edited by Bruce W. Longenecker, discussed the role of Dunn's five stories in Romans and Galatians.<sup>16</sup> Two chapters were dedicated to each story; an argument and a response.<sup>17</sup> Francis Watson and Dunn then offered some final reflections.<sup>18</sup>

Though most contributors affirmed the validity of narrative emphasis, there were points of contention. The strict application of the 5-way scheme was criticised by several

---

<sup>12</sup> Joel R. White 2016, "N. T. Wright's Narrative Approach", C. Heilig et al. (eds.), pp. 181-206, esp. pp. 189, 195, 202.

<sup>13</sup> Witherington 1994, *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, esp. pp. 5-6 n. 7.

<sup>14</sup> Dunn's own formulation is "the stories of those who had believed before him and those who came to form the churches founded by them." Dunn 1998, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, at pp. 114-115.

<sup>15</sup> Hays 2002 [1983], pp. xxiii, xxvii, xxxv-xxxvii.

<sup>16</sup> Bruce W. Longenecker (ed.) 2002, *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.

<sup>17</sup> These five scholars were Edward Adams (Creation), Bruce W. Longenecker (Israel), Douglas A. Campbell (Jesus), John M. G. Barclay (Paul), and Andrew T. Lincoln (Predecessors and Inheritors). The responses were put forth by R. Barry Matlock, Morna D. Hooker, Graham Stanton, David Horrell, and I. Howard Marshall, in that order.

<sup>18</sup> Watson 2002, "Is There a Story in These Texts?", in Longenecker (ed.), pp. 231-240; Dunn 2002.

contributors (including Dunn) – it unrealistically isolates stories and leads to unconvincing conclusions.<sup>19</sup> As Dunn notes, narratives are complex and interrelated.<sup>20</sup> Scholars also disagreed about the importance of technical narrative theory. Edward Adams employed actantial graphs, while both Dunn and R. Barry Matlock opposed them.<sup>21</sup> Adams also outlined a technical definition of narrative, while Douglas Campbell said such definitions have no impact.<sup>22</sup>

This volume highlights that there is no consensus about the role of particular narratives in particular texts. In being preoccupied with narrative, there is a danger of seeing stories that were never there.<sup>23</sup> Yet the opposite is also true: “narrative myopia” may also cause misunderstanding.<sup>24</sup>

Narrative approaches have also been brought to 1 Peter. The first clear instance was M. Eugene Boring’s 1999 commentary, wherein he spoke of the narrative world implied by 1 Peter.<sup>25</sup> In 2006 J. De Waal Dryden discussed narrative and worldview when considering Petrine paraenesis.<sup>26</sup> 2007 saw two important narrative studies. One was

---

<sup>19</sup> Morna D. Hooker, in responding to Longenecker on the story of Israel, suggests that the factors Longenecker considers irreconcilable are quite easily reconciled if we allow the story of Jesus and the story of Israel to operate in parallel here. Longenecker’s project design did not allow for this; an arbitrary distinction has led to misleading conclusions. Morna D. Hooker 2002, “‘Heirs of Abraham’: The Gentiles’ Role in Israel’s Story: A Response to Bruce W. Longenecker”, in Longenecker (ed.), pp. 85-96 esp. pp. 86, 96; cf. Longenecker 2002, “Sharing in Their Spiritual Blessings? The Stories of Israel in Galatians and Romans”, in Longenecker (ed.), pp. 58-84.

<sup>20</sup> Dunn 2002, pp. 222-223.

<sup>21</sup> Edward Adams 2002, “Paul’s Story of God and Creation: The Story of How God Fulfills His Purposes in Creation”, in Longenecker (ed.) 2002, pp. 19-43, at pp. 31-32; Dunn 2002, pp. 218-219, 221; Matlock 2002, “The Arrow and the Web: Critical Reflections on a Narrative Approach to Paul”, in Longenecker (ed.), pp. 44-57, at pp. 45, 47; cf. White 2016, pp. 188-190.

<sup>22</sup> Adams 2002, p. 20; Campbell 2002, “The Story of Jesus on Romans and Galatians”, in Longenecker (ed.), pp. 97-124, at p. 99.

<sup>23</sup> Dunn 2002, p. 219; While Hays prefers to speak of narratives “beneath” the text, we are treating “beneath” and “behind” as roughly synonymous. Both are spatial approximations to suggest a narrative more primary or fundamental than the reflective discourse which is the letter, a narrative which is nonetheless present in some sense in the text (by way of allusion). Hays 2002 [1983], p. 206.

<sup>24</sup> This term is used by Campbell (2002, p. 113) to mean a short-sighted approach which will not consider any narrative influence beyond the surface of a text.

<sup>25</sup> Boring 1999, *1 Peter*, ANTC, Abingdon Press, Nashville, esp. pp. 183-201.

<sup>26</sup> J. De Waal Dryden 2006, *Theology and Ethics in 1 Peter: Paraenetic Strategies for Christian Character Formation*, WUNT 2/209, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, esp. pp. 68-69.

Joel B. Green's commentary which supposed that Jewish narratives shaped 1 Peter much as Wright and Hays argued they shaped Paul.<sup>27</sup> The other was a chapter by Boring again, where he revisited the notion of narrative world, arguing that the Paul/Hays/Wright metanarrative was *not* operative in 1 Peter.<sup>28</sup> In 2013, Abson Prédessin Joseph used a formalist paradigm to argue that there was a narrative pattern (of election, suffering, endurance, and vindication) sitting behind much of 1 Peter.<sup>29</sup> Later that year, Benjamin Sargent proposed that a narrative of discontinuity between Israel and church was the narrative substructure of the epistle.<sup>30</sup>

The purpose of this survey has been merely to show that narrative approaches are well-established in the field. Here we have not room for full defence of a particular approach, but it is important to briefly identify the assumptions and attitudes taken up throughout the rest of this thesis.

First, we affirm that narratives *can* sit behind non-narrative texts.<sup>31</sup> Hays's basic theory is convincing, and it might be possible to see in a text traces of narratives informing it. This can sometimes grant us access to the worldview narratives of early Christianity; we are all shaped by and emplotted in narrative, so all our communication and production bears some imprint of worldview and identity narratives.

Second, stories manifest themselves in letters in various ways. The exodus may serve as nothing more than an example, or else it may be essential to the structure of an argument. It may function as a paradigm at the level of worldview, identity or theology,

---

<sup>27</sup> Joel B. Green 2007, *1 Peter*, The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids. Green speaks about narrative constantly, but a few such passages may be found at pp. 46, 107, 265-269, 282.

<sup>28</sup> Boring's approach brings to mind that of Petersen. Boring 2007, "Narrative Dynamics in 1 Peter: The Function of Narrative World", in R. L. Webb & B. Bauman-Martin (eds.), *Reading First Peter with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of First Peter*, LNTS, no. 364, T&T Clark, London, esp. pp. 15-16, 19, 22, 27. Comparing Boring to Petersen and Green to Wright should not be taken too far; Wright also draws fairly heavily on Petersen, and their work is not incompatible.

<sup>29</sup> Joseph 2013, *A Narratological Reading of 1 Peter*, LNTS, no. 440, T&T Clark, London, esp. pp. 41-43.

<sup>30</sup> Sargent 2013, "The Narrative Substructure of 1 Peter", *ExpTim*, vol. 124, no. 10, pp. 485-490. Sargent's argument is quite similar to Hays's proposal that Paul has an *ecclesiocentric hermeneutic*. Such a position certainly touches on worldview metanarratives, but has less to do with substructure of texts. See Hays 1989, pp. 98, 103-104, 117.

without necessarily being retold in the text. Finally, it could be significant for its place in the story of Israel, a past episode in the continuing story. Since this study focuses on the exodus, identity, and worldview, we will consider whether and how the exodus features as a paradigmatic metanarrative in Christian texts and outlook.

Third, we must beware the dangers of narrative approaches. We must remember that the exodus is not isolated from the larger story of Israel, and that other tales are also significant. The possibility of false positives is real, as are the risks of oversimplifying or universalising narratives. We will not delve into technical (e.g. structuralist) schemes of narrative, for these are controversial and will make little practical difference.

The narrative approach is more of a narrative *focus*. The scholars considered above do not all agree on their paradigms or methods. They merely agree that we should consider narrative in studying the New Testament epistles. Having accepted the importance of narrative *and* the Jewish background, we may proceed to consider the role of one central Jewish narrative: the exodus.

## Part 2.

### Exodus: History & Hope





## 4. Exploring Exodus

Before considering the influence of the exodus on the early Christians, we must familiarise ourselves with the story. Many texts written before the emergence of Christianity deal with the exodus in a variety of ways, and some of these will be considered in subsequent chapters. Here we will focus only on the book of Exodus, the “standard” version in the Second Temple period.<sup>1</sup> Had we more time, we would look beyond the story of Exodus into that of Numbers and beyond, for we cannot isolate the wilderness or the entry to the land from the exodus. Nonetheless, a brief survey of Exodus will give us a good sense of some of the important terms and concepts associated with the exodus, and the role it played in Jewish tradition.<sup>2</sup>

Exodus 1:7 states that Israel was fruitful (פָּרָה), increased greatly (רָבָה), and multiplied (רָבַח) so the land was filled (מָלָא). These words bear connotations of creation and human flourishing, appearing also in Genesis 1 and directly after the flood.<sup>3</sup> They also recall the promise of Genesis 17:20.<sup>4</sup> Such agreement also occurs in the LXX, as 1:7 contains ἀύξάνω (*grow*) and πληθύνω (*multiply*), σφόδρα (*very*) and γῆ (*land, earth*), also found in

---

<sup>1</sup> By this we mean that the book of Exodus was considered authoritative scripture by Jews in the first century and earlier – it is not relevant because it is in the modern canon, but because the book that has found its way into the canon was considered authoritative in antiquity. The book of Exodus is frequently cited directly, and Philo and Josephus considered it the official version even though they propounded some different traditions. Philo *Moses* 1.4; Josephus *Ant.* Preface 2; 4.4.48; Though there are differences between the SP, LXX, and MT, these are minor enough that they are unquestionably different editions of the same text.

<sup>2</sup> As we consider Exodus, we should keep in mind what kind of task we are engaging in. In the words of Terence E. Fretheim, we are doing “literary criticism rather than literary history.” Fretheim is concerned not with how the text came to be as it is, but with the meaning of “the text as we now have it.” In the present study we are interested in the text as it was known to the first century rather than the present day, but this amounts to roughly the same thing. We will not speak much of redaction and tradition history. Terence E. Fretheim 1991, *Exodus*, IBC, John Knox Press, Louisville, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Gen 1:20-22, 28; 9:1, 7; Wright 2013, pp. 785-786.

<sup>4</sup> Gen 17:20 and Exod 1:7 agree on the terms פָּרָה, רָבָה, and מָלָא (*very*). See also Gen 48:4.

Genesis creation and covenant contexts.<sup>5</sup> Israel flourishes in accordance with God's creational and covenantal purposes.<sup>6</sup>

Egypt opposes that purpose by enslaving Israel.<sup>7</sup> The five Hebrew terms used in 1:13-14 for this slavery are from the root עבד, which can denote various kinds of service.<sup>8</sup> The story and the LXX translations, however, leave no doubt that slavery is in mind.<sup>9</sup>

Chapter 2 recounts Moses's life before his commissioning. Levite ancestry hints at a priestly role, his name ("drawn from water") prefigures the sea crossing and his "ark" on the Nile suggests a typological connection with Noah.<sup>10</sup> By killing an Egyptian slave-master, Moses identifies with Israel.<sup>11</sup> Intervening with quarrelling Hebrews, he is rejected and accused of murderous intent – a motif that will recur in the desert.<sup>12</sup> Delivering Ruel's daughters he is labelled an Egyptian.<sup>13</sup> After marrying Zipporah he names his son Gershom, resonating with his time in Midian and Israel's Egyptian

---

<sup>5</sup> LXX Gen 1:20-22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7; 17:20; 47:27. This last reference describes the flourishing of Israel in Egypt under Joseph. There is strong lexical agreement with Exod 1:7 in the Greek, but the correspondence is slightly less in the Hebrew.

<sup>6</sup> Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 25-26; Meyers 2005, p. 33.

<sup>7</sup> Though it is right to speak of Egypt opposing the divine agenda, it is perhaps overly dramatic to say that Pharaoh is "a symbol for the anticreation forces of death." Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 27.

<sup>8</sup> Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 30; Meyers 2005, p. 35.

<sup>9</sup> The Greek translations of these עבד words are κατεδυνάστευω, κατοδυνάω, βία, καταδουλόω, and "τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς σκληροῖς" – oppression, affliction, violence, enslavement, and cruel labour. Throughout Exodus, עבד appears some 97 times describing both service of Egypt and service of God. Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 30.

<sup>10</sup> Exod 2:1-9; The basket in which Moses is set upon the Nile is called an *ark* (תבה), a label only used in the Tanakh here in Exodus, and in speaking of Noah's ark at various points through Gen 6-9. Moses and Noah are both rescued from water in an ark, and commissioned to serve God and his creational purposes. Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 38; Meyers 2005, p. 43.

<sup>11</sup> Exod 2:11-12; We read that Moses *struck* the Egyptian. The words for striking here are נכח and πατάσσω, which are used elsewhere in Exodus to describe God striking Egypt. This could be a subtle prefiguration of the story to come, or else it may merely be the use of an appropriate generic term. Meyers 2005, p. 44.

<sup>12</sup> Exod 2:14; cf. Exod 4:10-12; 16:3; 17:3.

<sup>13</sup> Exod 2:19; The word *deliverance* (נצח) used here for Moses saving Ruel's daughters is also used of God saving Israel in 3:8, 18:4, 18:8-9, but it is generic enough that this may not be particularly significant. The other term used here is עזר (*help*) and so far as I can tell that term was never used of the exodus. The fact that Moses waters the flocks of Ruel's daughters may also be a prefiguration of the wilderness journey, where the metaphorical flock of Israel is watered God (through Moses). Meyers 2005, p. 45.

sojourn.<sup>14</sup> In these stories, Moses appears as an intervenor with liminal identity, identified with and rejected by both Egypt and Israel.<sup>15</sup>

In 2:23-25 we encounter God. Israel groans (לַנֶּגֶן, καταστενάζω) and cries (לַעֲנָה, ἀναβοάω). God hears (שָׁמַע, εἰσακούω), remembers (זָכַר, μνησκόμαι) the covenant, and knows.<sup>16</sup> The stage is set for God to act.<sup>17</sup>

God reveals his intentions at the burning bush in 3:1-4:17.<sup>18</sup> He will deliver the Israelites, and commissions Moses to lead them out.<sup>19</sup> He reveals his name (YHWH) and outlines a plan wherein Pharaoh will be struck with YHWH's mighty hand, and Israel will plunder Egypt.<sup>20</sup> Despite his objections, Moses embarks for Egypt with Aaron to speak for him.<sup>21</sup>

Several important ideas appear in the bush epiphany. First, Israel is called YHWH's firstborn, his son.<sup>22</sup> Second, twice we read that the result of the exodus is Israel serving YHWH: it is a transfer from one service to another.<sup>23</sup> Third, the exodus is a mechanism to bring Israel into the promised land, fulfilling the Abrahamic promise.<sup>24</sup> Finally, this

<sup>14</sup> Exod 2:21-22; The name Gershom is explained with the phrase "I have been a sojourner in a foreign land." This is a valid description of Moses both in Egypt and in Midian, so the exact intent of the original author is not entirely clear.

<sup>15</sup> Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 41-45.

<sup>16</sup> The sense of this knowing is ambiguous, due to the absence of a Hebrew object. The Greek translation makes this a passive phrase; he became known to them (ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς). A very similar phrase occurs in 3:7, where the knowing is knowledge of Israel's suffering.

<sup>17</sup> Fretheim rightly notes that the sense of the hearing, remembering, seeing, and knowing is more active than might be immediately obvious. They signify that God is attending to Israel's plight, and thus we are left with a sense of anticipation regarding how he will act. Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 48-49.

<sup>18</sup> It is interesting to note that this iconic moment may be an adumbration or prefiguration of what is to come. Later Moses will hear God speak from the fire on Sinai. Now Moses is at Horeb (later called Sinai), and hears God speak out of a flaming bush – a rare word for bush which assonates with Sinai (שִׁינַי). Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 55; Meyers 2005, p. 52.

<sup>19</sup> Deliver: נָצַח, ἐξαίρέω; Bring/lead out: נִצַּח, ἐχάγω; Plunder: נָצַח, σκυλεύω.

<sup>20</sup> With a mighty hand: בְּיָד חֲזָקָה, μετὰ χειρὸς κραταιᾶς; Strike: נָכָה, πατάσσω.

<sup>21</sup> I have chosen not to discuss the enigmatic episode in which Zipporah saves Moses's life by circumcising her son. This is a bizarre incident, and one which seems to have little significance for the overall flow and meaning of Exodus.

<sup>22</sup> Exod 4:22-23; Firstborn son: בְּכֹרִית, υἱὸς πρωτότοκος.

<sup>23</sup> Exod 3:12; 4:23; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 1, 20.

<sup>24</sup> Exod 6:4, 8; Wright 2013, pp. 788-790.

section concerns divine revelation. God reveals himself more fully than ever before by declaring his name: אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי ("I am who I am") or *Εγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν* ("I am the one who is").<sup>25</sup> This is more than just a statement of self-existence: it is a refusal to be constrained by a name, signalling that God must be known by his works.<sup>26</sup> The revelatory theme also involves the signs (from אֹת, *σημεῖον*) and wonders (from מִפֶּת, *τέρας*) performed before Moses, Israel, and Pharaoh for the purpose of divine authentication.<sup>27</sup>

When Moses and Aaron go to Egypt, Israel believes and worships.<sup>28</sup> Divine identity is central again, as Pharaoh refuses to obey YHWH whom he does not know, and YHWH is called the god of Israel and of the Hebrews.<sup>29</sup> The theme of service appears here too; YHWH and Pharaoh are competing for Israel's service.<sup>30</sup>

Exodus 5:22-7:13 resembles Exodus 3-4. Israel's groaning, God's attention and promise, and Moses's commissioning are all mentioned. The SP includes an extra verse, outlining Israel's preference for serving Egypt over dying in the desert.<sup>31</sup> YHWH says "I will take you as my own people, and I will be your God," recalling the promise of Genesis 17:7-8.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> The revelation of the divine name is significant due to the weight that names carried in Israelite tradition. We have already seen several names which contribute to the characterisation or understanding of a character: Moses, Gershom, and Ruel (meaning "friend of god"). For a helpful discussion of the divine name in its cultural context, see Meyers 2005, pp. 57-59.

<sup>26</sup> Brevard S Childs 2004 [1974], *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*, OTL, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, p. 76; This is especially significant if we translate the Hebrew as "I am what I will be." This would suggest that God is defining himself by the forthcoming story. The Greek translator has not sought to reproduce that possibility. Instead, the Greek focuses on the notion of existence. Fretheim phrases the significance of this name well: "The name shapes Israel's story, and the story gives greater texture to the name." Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 64-65, cf. p. 86.

<sup>27</sup> Exod 4:4-9, 30. Moses's staff becomes a snake, his hand becomes leprous, and water poured on the ground turning to blood. Interestingly, Exod 4-5 do not describe Moses performing those signs before Pharaoh. The relationship of the third sign to the bloodied Nile in 7:14-24 is an intriguing issue to consider, but this study cannot pursue avenues such as this. We are concerned not with the textual history but with the book as it was known to the early Christians.

<sup>28</sup> Exod 4:31.

<sup>29</sup> Exod 5:1-3.

<sup>30</sup> Pharaoh uses words derived from עָבַד in Exod 5:9, 5:11, 5:15, 5:16 (twice), 5:18, and 5:21. This comes just after God laid claim to the service of Israel in 4:23. At this point Pharaoh appears to be winning the contest for Israel's service, for the Israelites reject Moses and Aaron, and turn to Pharaoh for relief from their load. Exod 5:15-21; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 83.

<sup>31</sup> SP Exod 6:9a.

<sup>32</sup> Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 93-94.

Revelation is again important: YHWH states his name, explaining that the exodus will cause both Israel and Egypt to recognise him.<sup>33</sup> Pharaoh's heart is hardened so signs and wonders will multiply, demonstrating YHWH's power.<sup>34</sup>

Signs and wonders are indeed multiplied. Pharaoh is unmoved when Aaron's staff becomes a snake.<sup>35</sup> Accordingly, ten disastrous signs strike Egypt: blood in the Nile, frogs, gnats, flies, pestilence on livestock, boils, hail, locusts, darkness, and the death of the firstborn.<sup>36</sup> Several proposals have been put forward to explain the form of the signs

---

<sup>33</sup> Exod 6:7, cf. 6:6, 8, 29; 7:5.

<sup>34</sup> Exod 7:3.

<sup>35</sup> Aaron's staff becomes a serpent and swallows the imitation serpents made by Egyptian magicians, proving the superiority of God over the powers of Egypt. The word בלע (swallow, καταπίνω) is in Exodus only here and at 15:12. The word תנין (serpent, δράκων) often denotes a chaos monster or water dragon. For this see MT Isa 27:1; 51:9; Jer 51:34; Ezek 29:3; 32:2; Pss 74:13; 148:7; Job 7:12, and LXX Esth 10:7; 11:6; Pss 73:13; 103:26; 148:7; Job 7:12; 40:25; Amos 9:3; Mic 1:8; Is 27:1; Jer 28:34; Ezek 29:3; 32:2 (occurrences referring to ordinary snakes not included). In Ezekiel 29 and 32, that term is used when speaking of an Egyptian Pharaoh. In Jeremiah 51, Nebuchadnezzar is described like a dragon who swallowed his enemy. The sea crossing is sometimes pitched as victory over a chaos monster, as in Isa 51:9 and perhaps Pss 89, 77, and 104. The sea swallowing the army could be seen as תנין swallowing תנין, so when תנין swallows תנין in Pharaoh's court, this could be a prefiguration of the Red Sea event and a statement of the defeat of chaos. Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 113-114; Meyers 2005, p. 81; Prefiguration or not, Pharaoh is obstinate so YHWH will enact judgements.

<sup>36</sup> These signs and wonders are never called "ten plagues" in the Tanakh. Instead they are called *signs* and *wonders*. The noun *plague* (מגפה) only appears at 9:14 and 12:13, though its verbal root appears at 8:2, 12:23 and 12:27. Meyers 2005, pp. 76-77; The number 10 is also not totally straightforward. Here they appear in 3 sets of 3, prompting Meyers to speak instead of "nine calamities" rather than 10 plagues. It is actually fairly rare for Jewish texts to report 10 disasters. Though some assert that Pss 78 and 105 both list a set of seven disasters, that is not beyond doubt – there are a few different ways we might count each, especially given the differences between Ps 78 and LXX Ps 77. For discussion of the number of plagues in the psalms, the creational connotations in Exodus and Psalms, and the relationship of the Psalms to Exodus, see the following: Samuel E. Loewenstamm 1971, "The Number of Plagues in Psalm 105", *Bib*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 34-38, esp. p. 37; W. Dennis Tucker Jr. 2005, "Revisiting the Plagues in Psalm CV", *VT*, vol. 55, fasc. 3, pp. 401-411, esp. pp. 402-405; Jeffery M. Leonard 2008, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case", *JBL*, vol. 127, no. 2, pp. 241-265, esp. pp. 251-253; The lists of signs and wonders given by Ezekiel the Tragedian (132-147), Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.* 10), 4Q422 (3.5-12), Josephus (*Ant.* 2.14), Philo (*Moses* 1.96-146), Artapanus (27-37) and Jubilees (48) all differ somewhat in their lists or recounts, sometimes describing different phenomena or else featuring a different number or sequence.

narrative.<sup>37</sup> There seems to be a general intensification of signs, and the first nine are structured in triads according to the kind of warning given before each sign:<sup>38</sup>

	Triad 1	Triad 2	Triad 3
Warning (outside in the morning)	Blood	Flies	Hail
Warning (at the palace)	Frogs	Pestilence	Locusts
No warning	Gnats	Boils	Darkness

Additionally, the disasters may constitute chaos or creational undoing: the elements revolt against Egypt, which returns to a state of pre-creation darkness.<sup>39</sup> Ziony Zevit and Dale C. Allison highlight parallels with the Hebrew creation story: “gatherings of waters,” gnats and humans made from dust, darkness and light, and so on.<sup>40</sup> The case is plausible but not conclusive (especially not in the LXX).<sup>41</sup> Jewish tradition does link disobedience with creational degeneration, and Pharaoh is opposed to the flourishing of Israel.<sup>42</sup> It

---

<sup>37</sup> As we might expect, there is substantial discussion about the tradition history of the signs and wonders narrative. When we say that there have been numerous explanations for the form of the narrative, however, we are speaking not of those historical matters but of the matter of final literary composition - the structure or arrangement of the plagues in Exodus 7-12. For discussion of various proposals see Zevit 1976, “The Priestly Redaction and Interpretation of the Plague Narrative in Exodus”, *JQR*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 193-211, esp. pp. 193-196, and also Meyers 2005, pp. 78-79 and Zevit 1990, “Three Ways to Look at the Ten Plagues”, *Biblical Review*, June 1990, pp. 16-42.

<sup>38</sup> Meyers 2005, pp. 77-78; Archie C. C. Lee 1990. “The Context and Function of the Plagues Tradition in Psalm 78”, *JSOT*, vol. 48, pp. 83-89, at pp. 83-84; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 106; The escalation of intensity is not pure and simple. The early signs (blood, frogs, gnats, flies) have only short-term impact, while the latter (storms and locusts destroying crops, and the death of the firstborn) were longer-term disasters. Yet the darkness lasts only three days, and that is right toward the end of the sequence. The final disaster is certainly the most devastating. The increasing potency of these disasters can also be seen with reference to the Egyptian magicians. They can match the first two signs, but we read in Exod 3:18 that they could not copy Aaron in making gnats. In 9:11, the magicians are indisposed because they too are afflicted with sores. The Samaritan Pentateuch does not have the same triadic structure. Instead, it has extra passages (SP Exod 7:18a-g; 29a-e; 8:19a-g; 9:5a-f, 19a-l; 10:2a-f; 11:4a-c) containing warnings where there are not in the MT.

<sup>39</sup> Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 108-110.

<sup>40</sup> They see parallels between Exod 7:19 and Gen 1:10, Exod 8:3 and Gen 1:20, Exod 8:16-19 and Gen 2:7, Exod 9:1-7 and Gen 1:25, Exod 10:15 and Gen 1:11, Exod 10:22-23 and Gen 1:2-4, and Exod 12:29 and Gen 1:24-26. Zevit 1976, pp. 199-211; Dale C. Allison 2005, *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, pp. 204-205.

<sup>41</sup> That the parallels are more compelling in the Hebrew in the Greek could mean that the author or editor of Exodus sought to bring creation to mind, but the LXX translator some centuries later did not detect or reproduce the allusion.

<sup>42</sup> This notion goes hand-in hand with the frequent connection between Israel’s faithfulness and the flourishing of land or creation. Meyers 2005, p. 54; Fretheim 1991, “The Plagues as Ecological Signs of

makes sense for Egypt to experience creational disintegration, but the positive evidence is not strong enough to be sure.<sup>43</sup>

The revelation theme is prominent through the signs and wonders. The magicians recognise the finger of God.<sup>44</sup> Several times we read that events take place so Pharaoh will recognise YHWH, his rule, and his election of Israel.<sup>45</sup> Together, the signs are to make YHWH known.<sup>46</sup> YHWH's superiority is underscored by the suggestion that he judges Egypt's gods.<sup>47</sup>

The death of the firstborn introduces the Passover and departure from Egypt.<sup>48</sup> The first Passover set Israel apart, and subsequent Passovers continued to mark Israel's boundaries: every Israelite (and nobody else) must observe it.<sup>49</sup> Israelite identity was thus bound up with exodus recollection.

At this point, it is worth noting the terminology used to describe the departure. The Hebrew term in 11:1-13:6 is נִצַּח, a common and generic word.<sup>50</sup> The LXX translates it

---

Historical Disaster", *JBL*, vol. 110, no. 3, pp. 385-396, esp. pp. 385, 396; The prime example of the link between degeneration and disobedience is Genesis 3. There the rebellion of humanity is met with a curse on land and childbearing: the creational purpose of humanity (to multiply and subdue the earth) is made difficult and painful. Genesis 6-9 describes the return of watery chaos in response to the evil of humanity. For other examples see Lev 26; Deut 28:15-24; Isa 5:1-10, Jer 22:6; 26:9; Hos 4:1-3. As Keesmaat says, "Throughout the Old Testament there is an explicit link between the freedom and obedience of Israel and the fruitfulness of the land." Keesmaat 1994, p. 43.

<sup>43</sup> There was a later tradition linking the signs with creational themes. This is seen in *Wisdom of Solomon*, especially at Wis 19:18-21 where creation is described as changing its nature in order to harm the unrighteous and serve the righteous. This is not quite the same as creation being undone, but it does show that there was a link between creation and the signs and wonders in Egypt for at least some later Jews. See also Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 106, 110.

<sup>44</sup> Exod 3:19.

<sup>45</sup> Exod 7:17; 8:10; 8:22; 9:14; 9:29; 10:2.

<sup>46</sup> Hendel 2001, p. 609; In addition to revealing YHWH, the signs achieve a reversal of fortune. Israel was afflicted, and cried out. Now Egypt has been struck, and they also cry out. Previously, suffering Israel sought mercy from Pharaoh and told Moses to leave them. Now, Egypt appeals to Pharaoh to let Israel go with Moses. Egypt oppressed God's firstborn son, and he has slaughtered theirs in line with Exodus 4:22-23.

<sup>47</sup> Exod 12:12.

<sup>48</sup> Exod 12:31-13:16.

<sup>49</sup> Exod. 12:43-49; Routledge 2014, p. 192.

<sup>50</sup> It appears more than 1000 times in the MT with reference to a wide range of things, from a river flowing out of Eden (Gen 2:10) to David and Jonathon going into the fields (1 Sam 20:11), and God coming out of his domain to judge the world (Mic 1:3).

with derivatives of several common terms: ἐξέρχομαι or ἐκπορεύομαι for coming or going out, and ἐξάγω for being led out.<sup>51</sup> The notion of being sent away is found several times, with πλῖ and ἐξαποστέλλω – again, fairly generic.<sup>52</sup> Egypt is described as a “house of slavery,” derived from עֶבֶר.<sup>53</sup> Numerous times this section draws on the “mighty hand” language of 3:19 and 6:1.<sup>54</sup> The final disaster is described as YHWH *striking* Egypt and the firstborn, recalling Exod 3:20.

After the Passover, Israel is led to the sea.<sup>55</sup> Pharaoh’s heart is hardened and his army pursues, causing Israel to grumble and despair. The fiery column leading Israel moves behind them, and Moses stretches his hand over the sea. Overnight an easterly wind divides the sea, and Israel traverses dry land between watery walls – a phenomenon with strong creational overtones.<sup>56</sup> When the Egyptians follow, their chariots are bogged and they are terrified, before Moses extends his hand and the returning sea consumes them.

---

<sup>51</sup>Forms of ἐξέρχομαι describe the exodus at Exod 12:31, 41; 13:3; 16:1; 23:15; 34:18. Forms of ἐκπορεύομαι describe the exodus at Exod 13:4, 8; 14:8; 40:15. Forms of ἐξάγω are most common, in Exod 3:8, 10, 11, 12; 6:6, 26, 27; 7:4, 5; 12:17, 42, 51; 13:3, 9, 14, 16; 14:11; 16:3, 6, 32; 18:1; 20:2; 29:46; 32:1, 7, 11, 23; 33:1. Some of these refer to Moses leading Israel out of Egypt, but more commonly the exodus is described as God leading his people out. It is no surprise that the book of Exodus was known as *Εξαγωγή* (as in Philo *Migration* 14) or that the theatrical adaptation of the exodus by Ezekiel the tragedian went by the same name.

<sup>52</sup> Exod. 11:1, 10; 13:15, 17, cf. 6:13; 7:2, 14, 16; 8:4, 16, and so on. There are 880 instances of πλῖ in the MT, and 268 instances of ἐξαποστέλλω in the LXX.

<sup>53</sup> מִבֵּית עֶבְרִים, ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας; Exod 13:3, 14; 20:2.

<sup>54</sup> The various instances of mighty hand have slightly different forms, but always derived from קוֹחַ and יָד, or χείρ and κραταιός. Exod 3:19; 6:1; 13:3, 9, 14, 16; 32:11.

<sup>55</sup> Exod 13:17-14:4.

<sup>56</sup> God restrains the water to bring forth land, as he did in Genesis 1. Gen 1:9-10 and Exod 14 both feature the words for sea (יָם, θάλασσα), waters (מַיִם, ὕδωρ), and dry land (יַבֵּשׁ, ξηρός). The notion of a new creation makes sense if the disasters in Egypt were creational degeneration, but as before the parallels here are not strong enough to be certain as to the intention of the author. The interpretation of יָם סוּף not as “Red Sea” or “Reed Sea,” but as “Sea of End” – the sea marking the edge of creation – would support this idea of creation and uncreation at the sea. Batto 2015, esp. pp. 188-189; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 153; This argument rests on the fact that סוּף can mean both “end” and “weed” or “reed.” The ambiguity in the name does not allow us to say whether there was creational symbolism here. On the other hand, the Wisdom of Solomon (Wis 19.6-7) does associate the crossing of the sea with new creation. Peter E. Enns 1997, *Exodus Retold: Ancient Exegesis of the Departure from Egypt in Wis 10:15-21 and 19:1-9*, HSM, no. 57, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, at pp. 112-117.



Revelation is, again, a major theme here. Pharaoh is hardened that YHWH may get glory and recognition.<sup>57</sup> The fleeing Egyptians declare that YHWH fights for Israel.<sup>58</sup> Israel recognises YHWH's power in praise.<sup>59</sup> This section also highlights that God was present with Israel, visibly leading them.<sup>60</sup> The words for leading are *לָקַח*, *ωδηγέω*, and *ἡγέομαι*.<sup>61</sup> We also encounter service terminology and *עָבַד*, translated with forms of *ἐκπορεύομαι* and *ἐξάγω*.<sup>62</sup>

Israel responds to its deliverance with the Song of the Sea.<sup>63</sup> Therein the exodus is used to characterise YHWH as a warrior, achieving salvation by his wonders, defeating the Egyptians. Israel is also defined by the exodus here; those whom YHWH led (*לָקַח*, *ωδηγέω*), redeemed (*לָצַד*, *λυτρόω*), and purchased (*לָקַח*, *κτάομαι*).<sup>64</sup> Creational overtones appear here as we read of the depths (*תְּהוֹת*, as in Gen. 1:2) solidifying and covering the Egyptians, and God's *רוּחַ* (spirit, wind; *πνεῦμα*) blows water over land.<sup>65</sup> The cowering of nations before Israel connects the exodus with the conquest, but the song also depicts the mountain of God as the destination of the exodus. The goal of the exodus is the land *and* a sanctuary.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Exod 14:4.

<sup>58</sup> Exod 14:25.

<sup>59</sup> Exod 15:1-21.

<sup>60</sup> There is ambiguity here with reference to the leading of Israel. Exod 14:2 mentions Moses leading Israel, and in 14:19-20 it is a messenger (not YHWH) in the guiding pillar.

<sup>61</sup> In Exod. 13:17 and 13:21 we have *לָקַח*. The LXX translates *ωδηγέω* at 13:17. The sense of leading is lost in 13:21, but that verse also has a form of *ἡγέομαι* (lead) in place of the Hebrew idiom describing YHWH's *going before* Israel.

<sup>62</sup> Exod. 14:8, 11.

<sup>63</sup> The Song of the Sea is particularly significant because it is the most cited passage in all of scripture. Ron Hendel 2015, "The Exodus as Cultural Memory: Egyptian Bondage and the Song of the Sea", in Levy et al. (eds.), pp. 65-79, at p. 71.

<sup>64</sup> Exod 15:13, 16.

<sup>65</sup> Exod 15:5, 8; The presence of creational imagery here also serves to give more support to our suspicions of creational allusion in earlier chapters.

<sup>66</sup> Exod 15:13-17.

From the sea, Israel is led to Sinai.<sup>67</sup> This journey showcases Israel's fickleness and YHWH's provision. Israel grumbles, so YHWH sweetens the spring at Marah and promises to preserve them from affliction if they are obedient.<sup>68</sup> They grumble again, and YHWH provides quail and manna to make himself known. Immediately they defy his command and violate the Sabbath. They quarrel and test God again, criticising Moses and questioning God's presence. Nonetheless, God grants them victory over Amalek and brings them to Sinai.

Exodus 19-40 takes place at Sinai. The first two chapters of this section introduce the covenant in a context of exodus recollection. The covenantal promise is introduced with an exodus recount, wherein God has brought Israel *to himself* to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, in covenant relationship with him.<sup>69</sup> This covenant relationship is formalised with the law and ratified with the sprinkling of blood.<sup>70</sup> The Decalogue opens with YHWH identifying himself as the God of the exodus: "I am YHWH who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the land of slavery."<sup>71</sup> In the subsequent laws, moral conduct toward foreigners is grounded in the exodus experience.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> The emphasis is on Israel being led, not merely Israel travelling. Childs 2004 [1974], p. 284; This journey occupies Exod 15:22 to 19:1, but the narrative includes an explanation of manna, several points of grumbling and provision, a battle with the Amalekites, a visit from Jethro, and the institution of a council of elders to help Moses judge the people.

<sup>68</sup> This promise at Exod 15:26 specifically notes that if they are obedient they will not be struck with the afflictions that God brought on the Egyptians. The signs and wonders are thus framed as retribution for disobedience, not meted out on those who follow divine instruction.

<sup>69</sup> Exod 19:4-6; Childs 2004 [1974], pp. 366-367; Kingdom of priests: מַמְלֶכֶת כֹּהֲנִים, βασιλειον ιεράτευμα; Holy nation גֵּי קֳדוֹשׁ, ἕθνος ἅγιον.

<sup>70</sup> Exod 24, esp. vv. 7-8; we should also note that the appearance of God to Israel at Sinai is another note to the tune of divine revelation.

<sup>71</sup> Exod 20:2; Everything in the law and covenant in the following chapters is predicated upon this action of God in the exodus. Meyers 2005, p. 145; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 210, 224; The most famous difference between the SP and the MT comes in the Decalogue, as SP Exod 20:14a-h outlines a command regarding a sanctuary at Mt Gerizim. This discrepancy is no mere technicality. It serves as a point of justification for two divergent approaches to worship and obedience, that of the Samaritans and that of the Jews. Despite this difference, they both preserve the same introduction identifying God as the god of the exodus.

<sup>72</sup> Exod 22:20; 23:9; To mistreat the stranger would be "a disavowal of their own past." Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 205, 247.

There is disagreement about the structure of the rest of exodus. Though it may not be convincing at every point, the chiasm put forward by Barry G. Webb is helpful here:<sup>73</sup>

A: 25:1-9 Presence foreshadowed  
B: 25:10-31:11 Tabernacle instructions  
C: 31:12-17 Sabbath instruction  
D: 31:18 Tablets  
X: 32:1-33:23 Golden calf  
D': 34:1-35 Tablets  
C': 35:1-3 Sabbath exhortation  
B': 35:4-40:33 Tabernacle  
A': 40:34-38 Presence

This highlights that Exodus 25-40 focuses on tabernacle and covenant, centred around the apostasy that threatens the divine covenant and presence.<sup>74</sup> After the covenant ratification in Exodus 24, YHWH declares his intention to dwell with Israel.<sup>75</sup> The locus and symbol of his presence is the tabernacle (מִשְׁכָּן, σκηνης). The tabernacle is the subject of much of the rest of Exodus, and reinforces the creational motifs of the book.<sup>76</sup> In the

---

<sup>73</sup> Adapted from Webb 2008. "Heaven on Earth: The Significance of the Tabernacle in its Literary and Theological Context", in B. S. Rosner & R. Williamson (eds.), *Exploring Exodus: Literary, Theological and Contemporary Approaches*, Apollos, Nottingham, pp. 154-176, esp. pp. 155-157; C is little more than a passing reference, and perhaps should not be considered a unit on its own. C' does speak of the Sabbath, but not exclusively. X is difficult to classify as one unit because of the range of things taking place therein. Nonetheless, this shape still highlights the emphases of Exod 25-40 better than some of the alternatives, like Fretheim's broadly true but simplistic suggestion that Exod 19-40 alternates between story and law. Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], pp. 201-202; The proposal of Peter J. Kearney is less helpful in detecting the specific emphasis on tabernacle or presence, but it broadly corresponds to that of Webb, describing Exod 25-40 as a story of creation, fall, and redemption. Kearney 1977, "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25-40", *ZAW*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 375-387 esp. p. 384.

<sup>74</sup> Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 263; Webb claims that the establishment of the tabernacle after the golden calf incident constitutes the success of "true religion" over "false religion" or "man-made religion," and shows that the covenant has survived Israel's disobedience. These claims may be true, but they do not adequately grapple with the disastrous gravity of Israel's apostasy and its potential consequences. It seems odd for Webb to pull punches at this point, for he himself has identified the golden calf incident as the heart of the chiasm. Webb 2008, p. 157.

<sup>75</sup> Exod 25:8.

<sup>76</sup> The term מִשְׁכָּן (*tabernacle*) first appears in Exod 25:9. We also see the tabernacle referred to as *tent of meeting*, *tent*, or *sanctuary*, but none of these are so common as *tabernacle*. Meyers 2005, pp. 219-220.

Near East, there was a link between temple and creation.<sup>77</sup> Eden is portrayed as a kind of sanctuary, and Solomon's temple featured creational symbolism.<sup>78</sup> The sanctuary menorah has creational overtones, with its seven golden lamps and foliage design. It may even be a symbolic representation of the tree of life.<sup>79</sup> By the first century there was a tradition of seeing creational symbolism in the tabernacle and priestly garments.<sup>80</sup> All this suggests that the presence of God with Israel is associated with creational perfection or restoration.

That suggestion is corroborated in the way the tabernacle instructions and construction are recounted. Exodus 25-31 features seven instances of the phrase "YHWH said to Moses" introducing divine speech: six regarding the sanctuary, and one regarding the Sabbath. This *could* reflect a creational pattern.<sup>81</sup> Such a pattern is clearer in the construction narrative. Moses's observation and approval of each element hearkens back to God's observation and approval of creation in Genesis 1.<sup>82</sup> More than that, eight times we are told that Moses obeyed divine command – one introductory statement and seven specific instances.<sup>83</sup> The tabernacle is erected on the first day of the year, a day for

---

<sup>77</sup> G.K. Beale & A. M. McDonough 2007, "Revelation", in G. K. Beale & D. A. Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, pp. 1081-1161, at p. 1155; Gordon J. Wenham 1994, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story", in R. S. Hess & D. T. Tsumura (eds.), *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, Indiana, pp. 399-404; John H. Walton 2015, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2-3 and the Human Origins Debate*, IVP Academic, Downers Grove, pp. 117-118.

<sup>78</sup> Walton 2015, p. 117; 1 Kgs 6; 7:13-51.

<sup>79</sup> Wenham 1994, p. 401; Meyers 2005, pp. 232-235.

<sup>80</sup> Beale & McDonough 2007, p. 1155; This can be seen in Josephus *Ant.* 3.123, 179-187; *J.W.* 5.212-213 and Philo *Moses* 2.71-135; *Prelim. Studies* 117. Unsurprisingly, Philo is partial to a symbolic interpretation. He not only outlines the way that the tabernacle and vestments reflect the cosmos and the elements, he also reveals that there are others with symbolic interpretations slightly different to his own. Consider *Moses* 2.98 where he shares that some understand the seraphim in the tabernacle to represent two hemispheres of heaven and earth while he himself understands them as allegories for the creative and royal aspects of God. Similarly, Philo explains in *Moses* 2.122-4 that the emeralds on the mantle represent the hemispheres of the heavens, not the sun and moon as some suppose.

<sup>81</sup> Exod 25:1; 30:11, 17, 22, 34; 31:1, 12; Kearney 1977; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 70; Meyers 2005, p. 224; Though this does seem reminiscent of creation, the parallels are not so tight as some might suppose. The phrase "YHWH said to Moses" appears some 53 times in Exodus!

<sup>82</sup> Exod 39:43; cf. Gen 1:22, 28; 2:3; Meyers 2005, p. 282; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 271.

<sup>83</sup> Exod 40:16, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 32; Meyers 2005, p. 282.

celebrating creation.<sup>84</sup> The tabernacle links divine presence with creation and its restoration.<sup>85</sup>

In the middle of these chapters on covenant and tabernacle comes the golden calf incident. Israel asks Aaron for gods, and he fashions the calf.<sup>86</sup> Whether this depicts YHWH or credits some other god for the exodus, it violates one of the first two commandments.<sup>87</sup> The covenant is broken, YHWH is wrathful, Moses smashes the tablets, and Israel is punished with affliction.<sup>88</sup> Having destroyed the calf and rallied the Levites to their slaughter of 3000 men, Moses intercedes with YHWH. YHWH stays outside the camp and proposes to make Moses (not Israel!) a great nation, suggesting that by discarding the covenant, the people have removed themselves from the fulfilment of Abraham's promises.<sup>89</sup> Moses highlights, however, that the exodus bound YHWH's name to Israel. YHWH agrees to send Israel to the promised land, but intends not to accompany them.<sup>90</sup> Moses pleads that he not give them the land unless comes with them: his presence is central to the success of the exodus!<sup>91</sup>

The situation hangs in the balance until YHWH re-establishes covenant relationship with Israel. He reveals himself, letting Moses see his passing glory and goodness, and announcing his name to Israel: "YHWH, YHWH, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children and the children's children,

---

<sup>84</sup> Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p 269; Meyers 2005, p. 282.

<sup>85</sup> Kearney 1977, pp. 381, 385.

<sup>86</sup> Exod 32:1-6.

<sup>87</sup> The first commandment is to have no other gods, and the second is to make and worship no image, meaning a physical representation such as would usually be placed in a temple. Even if this is meant as a depiction of YHWH (as might be implied in Exod 32:4-5), it is in violation of the second commandment.

<sup>88</sup> This is striking in light of 15:26, where YHWH promised *not* to afflict them if they were obedient to his instruction. They have not been obedient, so they suffer as disobedient Egypt did.

<sup>89</sup> Exod 32:11-15; Israel has jeopardised its status as God's people, and this can be seen in the subtle use of pronouns in chapter 32. In Exod 32:7 God calls them "your people, whom you brought up out of the land of Egypt", thus tying them to Moses rather than himself. Two verses later, and then again in verse 31, Israel is not "my people" but "this people." Childs 2004 [1974], p. 564.

<sup>90</sup> Exod 33:1-6; This suggestion is recognised as *נָזַל* – *disastrous* (ESV) or *troubling* (NET) in Exod 33:4.

<sup>91</sup> Exod 33:15.

to the third and the fourth generation.”<sup>92</sup> A new covenant is established with an emphasis on the Patriarchal promises, and Israel is to remember the exodus with the Festival of Unleavened Bread.<sup>93</sup> YHWH again resolves to dwell in the midst of Israel. The construction of the tabernacle is described, and Exodus finishes as God takes up residence.<sup>94</sup>

This brief sketch is far from exhaustive, and the exodus story continues in the wilderness. Nonetheless, we have seen some important ideas and functions of exodus tradition. The identity and revelation of YHWH are constantly revisited, and he is defined by his revelation and actions in the exodus. The exodus is a movement from Egypt and slavery to the promised land, to the sanctuary, and to service and covenant with YHWH himself. Along the way we encounter signs and wonders, divine victory, Passover, and much more besides. The story characterises Israel’s God and justifies its institutions (Passover, law, and sanctuary), and links deliverance to creational restoration and the realisation of divine purpose for creation and humanity.<sup>95</sup> It also defines Israel as an exodus people.<sup>96</sup> With the story and these basic conclusions in mind, we may turn to our other sources recognising that the exodus story did indeed function to frame Israelite identity and worldview.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Exod 34:6-9; This citation is adapted from the NET Bible, which begins with “The LORD, the LORD” rather than “YHWH, YHWH.”

<sup>93</sup> Exod 34:20-27.

<sup>94</sup> Exod 40:34-38.

<sup>95</sup> Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p 13, 15; Fretheim 1991, “The Reclamation of Creation Redemption and Law in Exodus”, *Int*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 354-365, esp. pp. 358-359; Though Fretheim picks up a valid point, his incessant emphasis on creation may underestimate the significance of the Abrahamic promise in shaping the exodus. For this see also Wright 2013, p. 788 and following.

<sup>96</sup> There is a sense in which Israel were already God’s people, since the Abrahamic covenant and the previous deeds of God set that family apart. In that sense Fretheim is right to say that “Peoplehood is the presupposition of these events, not the result.” On the other hand, the exodus story is the story of God making a *nation* of Israel. A family entered Egypt, and a nation came out. Childs 2004 [1974], pp. 14-15; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 22.

<sup>97</sup> Meyers 2005, p. 33; Fretheim does not speak of worldview, but he does recognise that “The event so captured the imagination of Israel that it not only served to illuminate Israel’s most basic identity but also functioned as a prism for interpreting all of Israel’s subsequent history.” Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p 10; Fretheim also helpfully characterises some of the functions of the exodus story as *constitutive* (defining the people of God), *descriptive* (characterising what it means to be the people of God), and *paradigmatic* (a model for how to live as God’s people). These are all valid, but we should note that in later texts the *paradigmatic* function was not just about how to live, but also about paradigms for hope and salvation. In

---

addition, there is a function which we might call *definitive*, whereby the exodus is used to define or characterise God. For this, see the beginning of the next chapter.





## 5. A Prophetic Paradigm

The exodus was among the most important stories in ancient Judaism, with influence stretching well beyond the book of Exodus.<sup>1</sup> We are seeking to locate early Christianity against this whole background, not just the story as it appears in Exodus. This chapter will outline the significance and function of the exodus in some other texts and contexts, with a particular focus on its role as a paradigm in prophetic discourse.

First, we should note that the exodus story was immensely popular and influential across all strands of Israelite tradition.<sup>2</sup> It fills one of the five foundational books of Judaism, and on a broader definition we might say that Numbers and Deuteronomy also concern the exodus. The departure from Egypt is certainly mentioned frequently through the Pentateuch.<sup>3</sup> Most texts in the MT make some reference to the exodus, and some like Psalms, Jeremiah, and Isaiah use it extensively.<sup>4</sup> Several of the LXX Apocrypha engage with the exodus.<sup>5</sup> There are exodus narratives in Jubilees, Biblical Antiquities, and 1 Enoch, and several other intertestamental works make reference to the story.<sup>6</sup> Exodus manuscripts were among the most common found at Qumran, and other texts utilising the exodus were also found there.<sup>7</sup> Josephus narrates the story in his *Jewish*

---

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, many are willing to say it is the singular most important story for all of Judaism, or even (for Assman) for all of history. Hendel 2001, p. 601; Robin E. Nixon 1963, *The Exodus in the New Testament*, Tyndale Press, London, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Hendel 2001, p. 601; Na'aman 2011, p. 39; Nixon 1963, pp. 6-10.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Lev 11:45; 19:34; 22:33; 26:13; Num 1:1; 3:13; 9:1; 11:20; 14:22; 20:15; 26:4; Deut 1:30; 4:20; 4:37; 6:12; 7:18; 9:26; 11:3; 16:3; 24:22; 29:2 and many more.

<sup>4</sup> The books with no apparent reference to the exodus are Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Job, Lamentations, MT Esther, Jonah, Obadiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, and perhaps Habakkuk and Song of Songs.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Jdt 5:10-14; 1 Macc 4:8-11; 3 Macc 2:6-8; 6:4; Wis 10:15-11:19; 16:1-19:22; Bar 1:19-20; and Add Esth 13:16; If we exclude 16:15-16 as later interpolation, Sirach does not engage directly with the exodus per se, but there are references to Moses and Aaron, and the wrath and wonders of God in the wilderness. Sirach 44:23-45:19.

<sup>6</sup> *Jub.* 47-50; *L.A.B.* 9-19; *1 En.* 89.14-40; *Apoc. Zeph.* 6.10; *Jan. Jam.*; *T. Mos.* 3.10-13; Some of these texts are difficult to date, so it is possible that *L.A.B.* and *Apoc. Zeph.* were written after the emergence of Christianity. Nonetheless, they still testify to the popularity of the story in ancient Judaism. The exodus engagement of *Let. Aris.* will be considered shortly.

<sup>7</sup> The significance of the exodus at Qumran is disputed. It is true that compared to Genesis and the Daniel and Enoch literature seem to have produced more exegetical and interpretative activity at Qumran than Exodus did. See Moshe J. Bernstein 2013, *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, vol. 1, STDJ, vol. 107,

*Antiquities*, and responds to several alternate narratives in *Against Apion*. Philo's *Life of Moses* recounts the story at length, and exodus traditions appear in more than half his extant works.<sup>8</sup> The significance of the exodus story is also attested in fragments by a few other writers; Aristobulus translated Exodus, Artapanus recounted the story, and Ezekiel the Tragedian adapted it for the stage.<sup>9</sup>

How was the exodus story actually used in all these sources? That is a huge question, but we can note here just a few trends relevant to our study. God is often defined or characterised by the exodus – the *definitive* function.<sup>10</sup> It is also common for the exodus to serve a *constitutive* purpose, marking Israel as the nation who came out of Egypt.<sup>11</sup> It serves frequently as foundation narrative explaining not only origin of national Israel,

---

Brill, Leiden, p. 22; Bernstein goes too far, however, in suggesting that the exodus was not significant at Qumran or in Second Temple Judaism more broadly. Fragments of 18 different Exodus manuscripts have been found (1Q2; 2Q2-4; 4Q1; 11; 13-22; 7Q1), one of which (7Q1) is in Greek. In addition to the paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus 4Q422 (which Bernstein considers the only interpretative work on Exodus) we should note 4Q127 (a Greek paraphrase), 4Q225 and 4Q226 (Hebrew paraphrases) and numerous rewritten Pentateuch documents which draw on Exodus (4Q37; 174; 158; 364-366). In addition, both 1 Enoch and Jubilees, texts which retell the exodus, were present at Qumran too. As James L. Kugel has said, re-telling scripture was one of the dominant and preferred modes of interpretation in the second temple period, so we should not overstate the lack of Exodus interpretation at Qumran; Kugel 2012, *The Beginnings of Biblical Interpretation*, In M. Henze (ed.), *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 3-26, at p. 11. The significance of the book of Exodus is also seen in the fact that numerous verses from Exodus appear on phylacteries or mezuzah (4Q128-130; 132-136; 140; 144-145; 149; 155; 8Q3). In addition to all this, there are texts which draw on exodus and new exodus concepts, like those discussed in the next chapter, or else the Temple Scroll (which framed either as the speech of Moses or a new Moses, and defines God by the exodus in 54.16-17) or 4Q392 (which draws on Exod 7 and 15 in speaking of God as creator). Wold 2009, esp. p. 282.

<sup>8</sup> For more detail on Philo and Josephus, see chapter 6.

<sup>9</sup> Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 13.12; Artap. frag. 3.27; The whole of the “Exagoge” by Ezekiel the Tragedian was dedicated to the exodus story. It is also worth mentioning Demetrius the Chronographer whose fragments 2-5 interact with exodus and Moses traditions, and Eupolemus, whose fragments 1 and 2.34 do likewise.

<sup>10</sup> There are too many examples to list here, but consider the following: Exod 20:2; Deut 5:6; 6:12; Josh 24:17; Judg 2:12; 6:8; 1 Sam 12:6; 1 Kgs 9:9; Dan 9:15; Ps 81:10; Isa 63:11-13; Hos 13:4.

<sup>11</sup> Again the relevant passages are many, but a few may be listed here: Exod 15:13; Num 22:5, 11; 26:4; 2 Sam 7:23; 1 Kgs 8:53; 1 Chr 17:20-22; Add Esth 13:16; Ezek 20:5-6; Hos 11:1; The term “constitutive” is used by Fretheim in proposing that Exodus was crucial in shaping Israel’s identity, but he is concerned only with the book of Exodus, whereas we use it with reference to other texts and traditions. Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 207; Hendel 2001, p. 621; Routledge 2014, p. 188.

but also the beginnings of the temple system, law, festivals, and so on.<sup>12</sup> Sometimes the exodus serves to justify observances and moral attitudes.<sup>13</sup>

It is worth noting that while traditions about the exodus multiplied and developed, many of the same themes persisted. Texts revisiting the exodus frequently affirm the link between exodus and adoption, covenant, and Abrahamic fulfilment.<sup>14</sup> When God's people were troubled and longed for rescue, they often recalled the exodus as an archetypal act of divine salvation.<sup>15</sup> As they hoped for land, prosperity, and relationship with God, the exodus was a fitting model for the realisation of their hope, the ultimate fulfilment of creational purposes and covenantal promises.<sup>16</sup> It is not surprising that Jewish texts take the exodus as a paradigm for future salvation or restoration – the

---

<sup>12</sup> This was seen to some extent in the previous chapter. Note also that the Decalogue in Deuteronomy is also grounded in the exodus (Deut. 5:6), and the covenant between Israel and God is understood to have originated in the exodus (1 Kgs 8:9, 53; Neh 9:14; Mal 4:4, among many other references to the law of Moses). The Feast of Unleavened Bread and the Festival of Booths are both grounded in the exodus story and mandated throughout the scriptures (Ex 12:17; Lev 23:6, 42; Deut 16:16; 2 Chr 8:13; Ezra 6:22; Neh 8:14-17). The temple is clearly framed as a replacement for the tabernacle (2 Sam 7:1-17; 1 Kgs 8:1-21), and the same laws and practices articulated in Exodus with regard to tabernacle administration were applied to the temple.

<sup>13</sup> Exod 22:20; 23:9; Lev 25:42; Deut 5:15; 7:18; 9:6; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18, 22; Mal 4:4; The failure of Israel to follow the law or please God is linked to forgetting the exodus: Pss 78:42; 106:7, 21. Routledge 2014, p. 195.

<sup>14</sup> Exod 4:22-23; 6:8; 13:5; 33:1; Lev 26:45; Num 32:11; Deut 6:10-12; 26:5-9; 29:25; Judg 2:1; 1 Sam 12:8; 1 Kgs 8:9, 21; Jer 11:4-5; 31:32; 32:21-22; 34:13; Hos 11:1; Hag 2:5; Paul Trebilco 1997, "Jewish Backgrounds", in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 359-388, at p. 360.

<sup>15</sup> This will shortly be seen with reference to passages in the prophetic literature of the Old Testament. In addition to the passages discussed below, see the following: 1 Sam 4:7; Pss 68:7-10; 77:14-20; 80:8-9; 106:7-12; 135:8-12; 136:10-15; Mic 6:4. Often these texts mention events other than the exodus (especially the conquest, which might be considered part of the same story), but the exodus is nonetheless framed as the most decisive act of divine salvation in Israel's past.

<sup>16</sup> Something like this point is recognised by Hanges, who writes that "...the Exodus tradition narrates a singular event - the primary symbol of national identity - and therefore, except as a metaphor in similar dire straits where the nation must again be delivered from destruction, unrepeatable." The story may be used to re-frame Israel, but not so easily as a foundation narrative for some non-Israelite nation. Hanges 2012, p. 115; Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 19.

*paradigmatic function*.<sup>17</sup> This is seen in several places, but most substantially in the prophetic literature.<sup>18</sup>

New exodus hope is found most famously in Isaiah.<sup>19</sup> The first clear example comes in Isa10:24-26. Israel is told not to fear Assyria, even though Assyria will rise against Israel like Egypt did. God will strike Assyria; he will use his staff to raise the sea as he did in Egypt, and Israel will be freed from the Assyrian yoke. Assyria is like Egypt, so future restoration will be a repeat of the exodus.

The new exodus theme reappears in the following chapters.<sup>20</sup> Chapter 11 outlines the restoration and regathering of God's people, and their victory over the nations. In 11:15-16 we read that the Lord will destroy or divide the Egyptian sea, and dry the river with wind so the remnant may walk across.<sup>21</sup> The MT says that there will be a road leading

---

<sup>17</sup> Note that this is not the same as what Fretheim means by the *paradigmatic* sense of the exodus. For Fretheim, Exodus provides a paradigm for life – God's people ought to imitate exodus Israel. I am speaking less of a model for everyday life and more of a scaffold for a worldview or expectation. Fretheim 1991 [*Exodus*], p. 207.

<sup>18</sup> The prophetic paradigm is the focus of the rest of the chapter. If there was more space at our disposal, it would be interesting to consider how the exodus served as a paradigm in other literature. The crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 3-4), for example, is clearly paradigmatically or typologically related to the Red Sea event. Similarly, the story of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11-12) seems to have a paradigmatic connection to the exodus story and the figure of Moses. These and other instances must be overlooked in the interest of brevity. There is much to commend the work of Fishbane dealing with a few of those instances, as well as the prophetic new exodus paradigm ("the paradigm of historical renewal") in his 1979 chapter on exodus intertextuality. Fishbane 1979, pp. 121-140; Though we are focusing on the prophets, the first place (canonically speaking) in which a new exodus paradigm appears is probably in Deuteronomy, both in chapter 18 with the prediction of a prophet like Moses, and in chapter 30 with a prediction of captivity and return from captivity to the land. Merrill 2014, p. 14.

<sup>19</sup> For discussion of the INE concept and texts see especially Bernhard W. Anderson 1976, "Exodus and Covenant in Second Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition", in F. Moore Cross, W. E. Lemke & P. D. Miller (eds.), *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, Doubleday, Garden City, pp. 339-360; *id.* 1962 "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah", in B. W. Anderson & W. J. Harrelson (eds.), *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honour of James Muilenburg*, Harper, New York, pp. 177-195; Rikk E Watts 1990, "Consolation or Confrontation: Isaiah 40-55 and the Delay of the New Exodus", *TynBul*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 31-59. Though he does not go into the details of specific treatments, Smith has traced the surge of "new exodus" interest in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to the earlier work establishing the presence of new exodus motifs in Isaiah. Smith 2016, esp. pp. 207-210.

<sup>20</sup> William J. Dumbrell 1985, "The Purpose of the Book of Isaiah", *TynBul*, vol. 36, pp. 111-128, at p. 114.

<sup>21</sup> There is some disagreement about the etymology of *הררם* in Isa 11:15. The usual reading sees this word being taken from the root *הרם*, meaning something like "devote to destruction." NETS translates "divide" on the understanding that there is a homonymic root *הרם*, which specifically means "divide." Either way, this is a fairly clear exodus allusion. The river mentioned here is the Euphrates, which would need to be crossed if Israel were to return to its land from Assyria.

out of Assyria as there was coming out of Egypt. The LXX says likewise, but states that the road leads out from Egypt!<sup>22</sup> Israel's worshipful response includes a restatement of the opening of the Song of the Sea.<sup>23</sup>

Isaiah 35 is another new exodus passage.<sup>24</sup> Israel is not to fear, for YHWH will save his people with vengeance.<sup>25</sup> The ransomed and redeemed will sing as they walk along a safe road to Zion.<sup>26</sup> Streams will emerge in the desert, the wilderness will flourish, and the people will see God's glory.<sup>27</sup> Conceptually, this passage agrees strongly with Isaiah 11 and other INE passages. The terms used for the ransomed and redeemed (לָקַח, אָמַץ; λυτρόω) are common exodus vocabulary, though none are exclusive to exodus contexts.<sup>28</sup> When used pertaining to national deliverance from a foreign oppressor (as opposed to personal redemption or literal manumission), these terms firmly suggest an exodus allusion. Since deliverance has already been pitched as a new exodus on a wilderness road, there is a good case for plausibility.<sup>29</sup> We can confidently call this a new exodus passage.

The new exodus theme is most prominent in Isaiah 40-55.<sup>30</sup> Deutero-Isaiah is characterised by its message of hope after the emphasis on judgement in preceding chapters. This hope is introduced when God declares comfort to his people in 40:1.

---

<sup>22</sup> In other words, Assyrian control is equivalent to Egyptian oppression, and the rescue from it is a new exodus. The road described here features again in 19:23-25. There it is Assyria walking the road to Egypt, where they and the Egyptians will worship. Israel, Egypt, and Assyria will all be known as God's people. Fishbane 1979, p. 129.

<sup>23</sup> Isaiah 12:2 is drawn from of Exodus 15:2 – "YHWH is my strength and my song."

<sup>24</sup> Watts considers this the most important INE passage in the first half of Isaiah.

<sup>25</sup> Isa 35:4.

<sup>26</sup> Isa 35:8-10.

<sup>27</sup> Isa 35:1-2, 6-7.

<sup>28</sup> The most generic of these is לָקַח, which occurs in 83 verses of the MT, and refers to the exodus or a new exodus less than 10 times. The other Hebrew term, אָמַץ, is used in 48 verses, referring to the exodus or new exodus in just over a quarter (13) of these instances. Of 94 LXX verses employing λυτρόω, about 24 of these have the exodus or new exodus in mind. Using the main text of the Rahlfs/Hanhart LXX this would be 24/95, for he includes λυτρόω in Jer 15:20 where the Gottingen edition does not). This count includes new exodus passages like Isaiah 35, and different scholars may come to slightly different numbers.

<sup>29</sup> Specifically, this draws on the criterion of recurrence.

<sup>30</sup> The presence of this motif in second Isaiah is well established, and some consider it the most important feature throughout these chapters. As Piper said almost 60 years ago, here "the new Exodus is painted in glowing colours." Piper 1957, p. 3; Watts 1990, pp. 32-33, 35; Anderson 1962, p. 181.

Following the declaration of comfort, we read that the desert will be levelled into a road for God to traverse.<sup>31</sup> His glory will appear, all will see his salvation, and he will be seen on Zion.<sup>32</sup> The strength and arm of God are mentioned, and shepherding imagery is used to describe his leading of his people.<sup>33</sup> These are all exodus-related themes, though here it is God (not Israel) walking the desert road.<sup>34</sup>

The next clear exodus allusion comes in Isaiah 43.<sup>35</sup> We read that God redeemed Israel, called them his own, and will be with them as they pass through water and fire.<sup>36</sup> God's presence with his people passing through waters recalls the exodus story.<sup>37</sup> Later in the chapter the people are called sons and daughters of God, and also his servants.<sup>38</sup> God is

---

<sup>31</sup> Isa 40:3-4.

<sup>32</sup> Isa 40:5.

<sup>33</sup> Isa 40:11.

<sup>34</sup> Dumbrell 1985, p. 124.

<sup>35</sup> There are possibly some allusions in chapter 41 and 42, though they are less clear. In Isa 41:14 God calls himself redeemer (לֹקֵחַ, *lytroyμένος*), and 41:18 describes streams in the desert as part of a broader picture of the flourishing of the wilderness, which will lead (in 41:20) to all seeing and knowing that YHWH had done this. In Isa 42:13 we see YHWH described as a warrior, possibly drawing on Exodus 15. In the subsequent verses it says he will dry up vegetation and water, but this may relate more to a combat motif or a curse on the land than an exodus tradition. He will lead the blind in a way they do not know. There are motifs here that could reflect exodus traditions, but they are not so strong or distinct as to warrant confident conclusions.

<sup>36</sup> The fire and flame here are somewhat enigmatic. God being with his people and leading them through water is strongly reminiscent of the exodus, but does the reference to fire invalidate that connection, in favour of a general sense of protection in any situation? All things considered, probably not. First, and most importantly, there is other exodus terminology in the immediate context. The latter part of the chapter would still resemble a new exodus text even if this early section was not. Additionally, there are several ways the exodus could align with the notion of passing through fire. First, there was a tradition in antiquity (known from Artap. f327.37) that claimed that the pillar of fire descended upon the Egyptians before the waters of the Red Sea closed in, such that the Egyptians were destroyed by both fire and water, Israel were not. There was also a tradition that the disasters sent on Egypt included simultaneous rain and fire, for Wis 16:16-19 describes how it was that they could cooperate. Whether either of these traditions was in circulation before Isaiah, however, is questionable. Psalm 66 (LXX Ps 65) describes how God caused his people to suffer with various images, noting how they passed through both fire and water and were brought out into a place of abundance. This is most likely an exodus reference, and if that is the case then we have a parallel for Isaiah connecting fire with an exodus tradition. Finally, we should note that fire was a common metaphor for *testing*. Since Egypt is described as a furnace (Deut 4:20; Jer 11:4) and the wilderness as a time of testing (Deut 8:2; 13:3; Pss 66:10; 81:7), there could be a general link between the exodus and the fire metaphor.

<sup>37</sup> The criterion of reception reinforces the conclusion that this is an exodus allusion, for the Isaiah Targum connects Isaiah 43:2 to the exodus, and the Isaiah Peshitta may do so as well. Elwyn R. Rowlands 1959, "The Targum and the Peshitta Version of the Book of Isaiah", *VT*, vol. 9, fasc. 2, pp. 178-191, p. 186.

<sup>38</sup> Isa 43:6-7, 10.

identified as the one who redeems, the holy one of Israel.<sup>39</sup> He is the one who provides a way in the sea, who quenched out horses and chariots – an allusion to the Red Sea event.<sup>40</sup> Yet Israel is not to focus on former things, for God will do something new. He will make a way in the wilderness and slake the thirst of those chosen to praise him.<sup>41</sup>

From chapter 48 the INE appears more frequently. The terms used for departure and redemption in 48:20 are generic, but consistent with an exodus allusion.<sup>42</sup> A connection to the exodus story is confirmed in 48:21, with reference to the rock dispensing water in the desert. In chapter 49 we find themes of covenant and service, and prisoners are told to come out to be fed and guided along the desert road.<sup>43</sup> The exodus seems to be in mind when the return from exile is described in these chapters.<sup>44</sup>

Chapters 50 and 51 also have exodus motifs. In 50:2-3 God declares his power to save his people and bring them out. He will dry up sea and rivers, and clothe the heavens with darkness. These references could reflect creation rather than exodus imagery, but we should not separate these things too far. The next chapter recalls the exodus, describing the drying of the sea as the piercing of the dragon and the cutting of Rahab so the redeemed might pass over.<sup>45</sup> Exodus and the Near Eastern combat motif are merged here, so such might also be the case in chapter 50. Though 51:9-10 recalls the original exodus, it goes on to predict that the redeemed will return to Zion singing.<sup>46</sup> These chapters employ an exodus paradigm for victory, redemption, and new creation.<sup>47</sup>

Isaiah 52 also features a new exodus concept. Verse 4 mentions the Egyptian sojourn and Assyrian oppression, implying that these were analogous to the exile. God declares

---

<sup>39</sup> Isa 43:14.

<sup>40</sup> Isa 43:16-17.

<sup>41</sup> Isa 43:18-21.

<sup>42</sup> Depart: *אצ*, *ἐξέρχομαι*; Redeem: *לצ*; *רִבּוּמִי*.

<sup>43</sup> Isa 49:8-12.

<sup>44</sup> Dumbrell 1985, p. 125.

<sup>45</sup> Isa 51:9-10.

<sup>46</sup> Isa 51:11; Fishbane 1979, p. 135.

<sup>47</sup> Anderson 1962, pp. 184-185.

that he will make his name known, and mentions redemption.<sup>48</sup> In 52:11-12 the people are told they will go out with purity but without haste, for God is before them and behind them.<sup>49</sup> The return from exile will be a new exodus, less hurried and fearful than the first.<sup>50</sup>

The INE also appears in Isaiah 56-66, though not as extensively as in 40-55.<sup>51</sup> Isaiah 55 predicts that Israel will go out (from Babylon) in joy, led forth in peace. Chapter 58 recalls the wilderness provision in claiming that God will satisfy his people. Some might question the validity of identifying these minor agreements as allusions, but there is no doubt about 63-64. Chapter 63 characterises God by recounting the exodus. The prophet asks where is the one who brought them out of the sea, shepherded the flock, put his holy spirit in them, divided waters to make himself an everlasting name, and lead Israel through the depths.<sup>52</sup> In asking where that saviour is, the prophet implies a need for another exodus-like event.<sup>53</sup> Chapter 64 also expresses a desire for restoration. God is father and redeemer, and the people of his heritage long for his presence and the declaration of his name.<sup>54</sup>

Jeremiah also features paradigmatic use of the exodus.<sup>55</sup> Numerous times Judah's plight is compared to that of exodus-wilderness Israel, but the first hint of new exodus hope comes in 16:14-15. An event is predicted which will supersede the exodus as the

---

<sup>48</sup> Isa 52:6, 9.

<sup>49</sup> The word for haste, *חֲזָזָה*, is found only three times in the MT, and both of the other instances (Exod 12:11; Deut 16:3) refer to the departure from Egypt in the exodus.

<sup>50</sup> Dumbrell also sees takes new exodus concept to inform the events described in Isa 53. Dumbrell 1985, p. 126.

<sup>51</sup> For a discussion of the relationship of the INE concept in Isa 40-55 to that in 56-66 see Watts 1990. Watts argues that second Isaiah paints a picture of a new exodus that did not fulfil eschatological expectation due to the unfaithfulness of Israel. In third Isaiah, however, the new exodus hope is articulated again – the consolation of Israel has been postponed, not cancelled. Watts 1990, esp. pp. 57.

<sup>52</sup> Isa 63:9-14.

<sup>53</sup> Fishbane 1979, pp. 139-140.

<sup>54</sup> Isa 64:2, 8.

<sup>55</sup> In addition, (and perhaps in contrast) to the notion explored here that Jeremiah sees the return from exile as a new exodus, it is worth noting that Jer 40-43 seems to describe the exile as a reversal of the exodus from which there is no return. Gary Yates 2006, "New Exodus and No Exodus in Jeremiah 26-45: Promise and Warning to the Exiles in Babylon", *TynBul*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 1-22, esp. pp. 7-9, 21.



definitive act of God, and bring Israel back to the land.<sup>56</sup> There will be a new salvation to replace the exodus in fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise. A similar concept appears in 23:7.

Salvific hope also appears in exodus terms in chapter 31.<sup>57</sup> There we read of God saving and redeeming a people, leading them on a straight path by brooks of water.<sup>58</sup> God is father, Israel his firstborn son, and shepherding imagery features here as well. Just as Israel received a covenant at Sinai, so they will receive a new covenant at Zion.<sup>59</sup> The law will be within the people and on their hearts, and all will know God. He will be their god and they his people. This collocation of redemption, leading, sonship, covenant, law, and the mountain of God strongly suggests an exodus paradigm.

Finally, Jeremiah 50 describes a new exodus. Israel will go out from Babylon, fleeing and escaping to Zion.<sup>60</sup> Their captors refuse (לֹא) to let them go (לָקוּ), but Israel is saved by God as a redeemer.<sup>61</sup> The only other places these words appear together are the passages in Exodus where Pharaoh refuses to release Israel.<sup>62</sup>

Throughout Ezekiel, the prophet is depicted as a new Moses.<sup>63</sup> He sees God's glory, and ascends the mountain for a vision about the sanctuary.<sup>64</sup> He intercedes for the people, opposes idolatry, meets with elders, and delivers law directly from God – the only character apart from Moses to do so in the Tanakh!<sup>65</sup> Yet the exodus story itself (not just Moses typology) has an important presence in Ezekiel.

---

<sup>56</sup> Fishbane 1979, p. 130.

<sup>57</sup> LXX chapter 38; Yates 2006, pp. 4-7.

<sup>58</sup> Jer 31:9-11.

<sup>59</sup> Jer 31:31-33.

<sup>60</sup> Jer 50:28.

<sup>61</sup> Jer 50:33-34.

<sup>62</sup> Exod 4:23; 7:14; 8:2; 9:2; 10:3-4.

<sup>63</sup> DeLapp 2014, pp. 56-59; Rebecca G. S. Idestrom 2009, "Echoes of the Book of Exodus in Ezekiel", *JSOT*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 489-510, esp. pp. 492-496; Allison 1993, pp. 50-53.

<sup>64</sup> Ezek 1:28; 8:4; 9:3; 10:4; 11:22-23; 40-48.

<sup>65</sup> Ezek 9:8; 40-48; Others like Ezra have a lawgiving role by reading the law before the people, and the other prophets are certainly understood to be speaking the words of God. Yet only Moses and Ezekiel deliver divine legislation they received directly from God himself. DeLapp 2014, p. 58.

Ezekiel 20 frames hope with a new exodus paradigm.<sup>66</sup> The first half of the chapter recounts the original exodus, mentioning election, covenant, God leading Israel for the sake of his name, and Israel's sin. From 20:33, Ezekiel looks to the future. God will regather the people and enter into judgement with them as he did with Israel in Egypt's wilderness, and then he will establish a covenant. Rebels will be purged, while the faithful will enter the land to know and serve God on his mountain. Since there is an explicit analogy to the exodus and the promise comes directly after an exodus recount, we are justified in seeing this as a prophetic new exodus.<sup>67</sup>

The promise and vision of renewal in Ezekiel 36-37 are also informed by an exodus framework.<sup>68</sup> There is an emphasis on the land, the fulfilment of the land promise and the proper flourishing of creation.<sup>69</sup> God acts for the sake of his name (as he did after the golden calf incident) so the nations will recognise him. The "recognition formula" (*they will know the I am YHWH*) is prominent in Ezekiel, and recalls the exodus.<sup>70</sup> The land will be restored, Israel will be multiplied, and they will be brought up from the grave.<sup>71</sup> The result will be a reconstituted nation, a new spirit in the hearts of Israel, a new covenant, obedience, and a new sanctuary.<sup>72</sup> This is reinforced with the "great reprise of the climax of Exodus" in the vision of the temple in Ezekiel 48.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Though not discussed above as an example of new exodus hope, the events of Ezekiel 8-12 are significantly shaped by the exodus. There we read of idolatry in the temple, which causes God to depart – the disaster avoided in the golden calf incident has come to pass, and the exodus is reversed. We then read a vision with parallels to the Passover and the Levite purge of Israel: a messenger marks the forehead of all those who lament the city's idolatry, and other messengers go through the city killing those who have not been set apart by a mark. DeLapp 2014, p. 71; Idestrom 2009, pp. 499-500.

<sup>67</sup> These parallels show a particularly close relationship to Exod 6. Idestrom 2009, p. 501; Fishbane 1979, pp. 131-132.

<sup>68</sup> Idestrom 2009, p. 502.

<sup>69</sup> Ezek 36:8-12, 24, 28, 35-36; 37:21, 26; This emphasis on land and flourishing (including human multiplication) recalls the purpose and flourishing of humanity in creation and Exodus.

<sup>70</sup> Ezek 36:20-23; DeLapp 2014, pp. 60-67; Idestrom 2009, pp. 496-498; The recognition formula ("you/they will know that I am YHWH") occurs a staggering 72 times in Ezekiel! It also appears 9 times in Exodus, twice each in 1 Kings, Isaiah, and Joel, and once each in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.

<sup>71</sup> Ezek 36:10, 37; 37:1-13, 26.

<sup>72</sup> Ezek 37:14, 21-22; 26-28; This emphasis on divine presence is the focus of the end of Ezekiel (chapters 40-48) just as it was the focus of the end of Exodus. Idestrom 2009, p. 509.

<sup>73</sup> Wright 2013, p. 105.

Among the minor prophets, Micah and Hosea articulate a new exodus hope.<sup>74</sup> Micah 7 describes how God will shepherd his flock and demonstrate wonders as he did when he brought Israel from Egypt.<sup>75</sup> In Hosea 2, God declares that he will lead his bride Israel into the wilderness. There she will listen to him, as she did in the exodus era.<sup>76</sup> They who were “not my people” will become God’s people, as in the exodus.<sup>77</sup> In chapter 11, God describes Israel as a child he called out of Egypt, and promises they will not end up in Egypt again.<sup>78</sup> After speaking of the return, God refers to the exodus and promises to make his people live in tents as they did in the wilderness.<sup>79</sup> For Hosea, the exodus was a type for future salvation.<sup>80</sup>

Since the exodus story informed Jewish understanding of the character of God, salvation, the origins of Israel, and the fulfilment of Abrahamic promise, it was a suitable paradigm for hope when Israel was troubled or displaced – for example, during the exile. In other words, the exodus had some significant role in controlling the categories for the Israelite outlook on history and hope. It was a paradigmatic metanarrative.<sup>81</sup> The exile was considered another Egyptian sojourn, so another exodus was necessary.<sup>82</sup> Accordingly,

---

<sup>74</sup> Hosea refers to the exodus often enough and in such a way that Yair Hoffman concludes that “Hosea regarded the exodus as the most important event in the history of the covenant between Yahweh and his people.” Importantly, Hoffman also notes that Hosea considered the exodus a “constitutive” event for Israel. Hoffman 1989, “A North Israelite Typological Myth and Judean Historical Tradition: the Exodus in Hosea and Amos”, *VT*, vol. 39, fasc. 2, pp. 169-182, at p. 170, 172.

<sup>75</sup> Mic 7:14-17, esp. v. 15; Fishbane 1979, p. 126.

<sup>76</sup> Hos 2:14-15; Fishbane 1979, p. 125.

<sup>77</sup> Hos 2:23; Hoffman 1989, p. 173.

<sup>78</sup> Hos 11:1, 5; Note that in 11:1 Israel is called both child and son in the Hebrew (נֶכֶד and בֶּן respectively), but the Greek uses νήπιος and τέκνον (the latter in the plural form τέκνα), both of which refer children generally rather than sons specifically.

<sup>79</sup> Hos 12:9; More precisely, they will dwell in tents “as in the days of meeting.” The ESV takes this to be a reference to a gathering of Israel in festival, while NETS prefers a more general phrase akin to similar formulations in 2:5, 17, 9:9, and 10:9 – “as in the days of old.”

<sup>80</sup> Hoffman 1989, pp. 171-172; Hosea also describes unfaithfulness and exile as a return to Egypt. Hos 8:13; 9:3; 11:5.

<sup>81</sup> Hanges 2012, p. 115; Fishbane goes so far as to say that the exodus was “the temporal-historical paradigm in whose image all future restorations of the nation are to be manifest.” Fishbane 1979, p. 121; Frye 1987 [1982], pp. 73-75; Keesmaat 1999, *Paul and his Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*, JSNTSup, no. 181, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, pp. 24, 35; Matthews 2015, p. 420.

<sup>82</sup> Wright 2013, pp. 150; Anderson 1962, p. 190; Merrill 2014, p. 15; We should note that the constant remembrance of the exodus and observation of exodus-related festivals would have served to encourage Israel in their belief that God would act in that manner again. Trebilco 1997, p. 368.

we see a new exodus hope, even a new exodus eschatology, in the prophetic writings. The new exodus would reconstitute the people of God, establish a covenant, restore creation, and fulfil the promises of old.<sup>83</sup> With this in mind, we turn to consider the ways that various strands of Judaism interacted with the exodus story as a paradigm for salvation, worldview, or identity.

---

<sup>83</sup> Anderson 1962, pp. 184-185; Merrill 2014, p. 15-17; Wright 2013, p. 679.

## 6. Leaving Egypt Again

The previous chapter explored the significance of the exodus in the scriptures of ancient Judaism, especially as a paradigm for hope. But what became of that new exodus hope? Was it realised, or abandoned, or did people go on hoping? This chapter briefly addresses some of the ways the exodus paradigm shaped identity and worldview for various Second Temple Jews. We will consider Ezra-Nehemiah, the Letter of Aristeas, Qumran, the Wisdom of Solomon, Philo, and Josephus.

Ezra and Nehemiah tell the story of the return from exile and the reconstruction of Jerusalem. By now it should come as no surprise that they draw on the exodus story to do so. First, consider Ezra.<sup>1</sup> Therein the people of Israel are brought up from foreign captivity, taking gold and silver given by their captors and returning to Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> They observe a Passover and Feast of Booths, and commit themselves to a covenant with God. The nation is thus re-established.<sup>3</sup> Ezra is an Aaronide scribe who meets with the foreign king before leading Israel on their journey.<sup>4</sup> He draws Israel back to the law, leads the priests, and sets magistrates over Israel.<sup>5</sup> These elements are strongly reminiscent of the exodus, though we should note that the king of Persia responds much more positively than the Pharaoh of the exodus. Yet the prophetic paradigm did *not* prepare us for Israel's disobedience. Israel (including its priests) turns away from the law and its distinct identity by intermarrying with the nations.<sup>6</sup> Though Ezra ends on a hopeful note of repentance, the new exodus was not entirely successful: the people are not totally

---

<sup>1</sup> For discussion of the new exodus in Ezra-Nehemiah see Joshua E. Williams 2014, "Promise and Failure: second Exodus in Ezra-Nehemiah", in R. M. Fox (ed.), pp. 74-93, esp. pp. 84-86.

<sup>2</sup> Ezra 1:3-11; 7:9-16; 9:8-9; The word עבדות (slavery) found in 9:9 is from the root עבד, and appears only twice in the MT. The other occurrence is in Neh 9:17, where it refers to the slavery in Egypt. This is too indirect to make a confident connection, but it hints that the captivity in exile was conceptually equivalent to captivity in Egypt. The LXX translates both terms with δουλεία, which is often (in roughly a third of its occurrences) an exodus term – see discussion on Romans 6-8 in chapter 9 below.

<sup>3</sup> Ezra 3:4; 6:19-22.

<sup>4</sup> Ezra 7:5-7.

<sup>5</sup> Ezra 6:18; 7:25; 10:3, 16.

<sup>6</sup> Ezra 9:4; 10:2, 10, 17, 18, 44.

obedient, the sanctuary is underwhelming, and there is no suggestion that God takes up residence in the temple.<sup>7</sup>

Nehemiah is much the same. The exodus theme is introduced when Nehemiah prays in 1:5-11. He mentions Moses and redemption by God's great power and mighty hand – terms recalling the exodus.<sup>8</sup> He asks God to remember his promises, bringing Exodus 2:24 and 6:5 to mind. He then seeks the approval of the king to return to Jerusalem.<sup>9</sup> The exiles return and Ezra reads the law before the people, who did not know it.<sup>10</sup> They observe the Feast of Booths and make a covenant to obey God's law and be his people.<sup>11</sup> As with Ezra, there are elements detracting from the success of this exodus movement. Again there is no mention of God's presence. Nepotism and impiety are practiced by the priests, and the Levites and singers have returned to their fields because the people have neglected to provide for them.<sup>12</sup> Work is taking place on the Sabbath, and some (including a priest) have married foreigners.<sup>13</sup> Crucially, 9:36-37 says that despite their return, the people are still slaves. This same idea appears in Ezra 9:8-9.<sup>14</sup>

At first glance, Ezra and Nehemiah seem to narrate the fulfilment of the prophetic new exodus hope. On closer examination, it is not so simple.<sup>15</sup> Both see a new exodus as the way to restored Israel, but both depict a new exodus that is incomplete at best –

---

<sup>7</sup> Ezra 3:12; Webb claims that the typology of the perfect sanctuary implied by the tabernacle is never realised. Webb 2008, p. 168.

<sup>8</sup> There is no explicit reference to Egypt or the wilderness here, but to refer to God's mighty hand strongly recalls the exodus. The words *קַיִם* (mighty) and *יָד* (hand) appear next to one another some 32 times in the MT, but in 13 of these verses the hand belongs to someone other than God. Of the remaining 19 verses, 15 refer to the exodus and 3 come in new exodus contexts. It is thus highly likely that Nehemiah refers to the exodus in particular.

<sup>9</sup> Neh 2:5-8.

<sup>10</sup> Neh 8:1-8; Ehrensperger rightly notes that this is a re-enactment of the reception of scripture at Sinai, and serves to affirm the significance of the scriptures for the life of Israel. Ehrensperger 20008, pp. 305-306

<sup>11</sup> Neh 9:1-5; 10:29.

<sup>12</sup> Neh 13:4-11.

<sup>13</sup> Neh 13:15-30.

<sup>14</sup> Williams 2014, p. 92.

<sup>15</sup> Even granting that Ezra and Nehemiah draw on a new exodus pattern, it should be noted that this does not necessarily mean they were working off the back of a pre-existing prophetic tradition – it may be independent, based on the fact that the exodus story was a fitting parallel for the return.

covenant, promise, and restoration are not properly realised. This story hints at a metanarrative where Israel is still, in some sense, in exile.<sup>16</sup> This leaves open the possibility that some Jews still awaited a new exodus.

The Letter of Aristeas also draws on an exodus paradigm. Written in Alexandria in the second century BC, it purports to be a letter from Aristeas, an ambassador sent to Jerusalem by Ptolemy II Philadelphus.<sup>17</sup> The embassy sought a manuscript and scholars to produce a translation of the Torah for the Alexandrian library.<sup>18</sup> The letter essentially tells us the story of the commissioning and production of the LXX.<sup>19</sup>

The narrative of LXX origins is modelled on Exodus and Ezra-Nehemiah.<sup>20</sup> This begins with an emphasis on the liberation of Jewish slaves.<sup>21</sup> Given his pro-Ptolemaic stance and the fact that other texts put a positive spin on Jewish experience under Ptolemy I Soter, it is odd that Aristeas should stress the misery of the slaves.<sup>22</sup> Why mention them at all? It seems that Aristeas is “riffing” on the exodus.<sup>23</sup> Aristeas, a royal official, approaches the king and requests the release of the Jews. Ptolemy grants the request, mirroring Nehemiah and Artaxerxes more than Moses and Pharaoh.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Wright 2013, pp.139-140, 161, 679; Williams 2014, pp. 92-93; D. A. Carson 2007, “1 Peter”, in Beale & Carson (eds.) pp. 1015-1045, at p. 1021; Hindy Najman notes that this notion from Ezra-Nehemiah (that the exile was not fully over) can be seen in the Qumran corpus (e.g. 4Q179, 4Q501, 1QPHab). Hindy Najman 2006, “Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism”, *DSD*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 99-113, at pp. 103-105.

<sup>17</sup> The dating of this letter is not absolutely certain, but the period between 150 and 100 BC is the most likely and most widely accepted date. McKechnie 2008, p. 235.

<sup>18</sup> *Let. Aris.* 9-12.

<sup>19</sup> This is the Septuagint in its strict sense, the five books of the Torah ostensibly translated by the 70 (or 72) scholars from Jerusalem. Cox 2014, p. 86.

<sup>20</sup> Benjamin G. Wright III 2015, *The Letter of Aristeas*, CEJL, De Gruyter, Berlin, p. 58.

<sup>21</sup> *Let. Aris.* 4-5, 12-13, 14-17, 20-24, 33.

<sup>22</sup> Sylvie Honigman 2003, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*, Routledge, London, p. 55. Ps. Hec. in Josephus *C. Ap.* 1.186-189 describes Ptolemy I Soter as a paragon of kindness and humanity, such that the Jews chose to follow him to a better life in Egypt.

<sup>23</sup> Honigman 2003, p. 56; McKechnie 2008, p. 246; As Honigman states, employing a familiar paradigm or scaffold for telling a new story will mean that the meanings or connotations of the original story – in this case the creation of an identity and the authority of the law – will transfer in some sense across to the new story, even if the original scaffolding story is not explicitly interpreted or invoked. Honigman 2003, p. 77.

<sup>24</sup> *Let. Aris.* 15-20; cf. Neh 2:1-8.

The inclusion of edicts and the sending of a letter to Jerusalem *might* be an imitation of Ezra-Nehemiah, but the account of the gifts given to the Jews is certainly dependent on Exodus.<sup>25</sup> The most substantial gift was a gold table for the temple, clearly modelled on the table in Exodus 25.<sup>26</sup> The priestly garments in Aristeas also accord with the Exodus instructions.<sup>27</sup> Some of the corresponding terms are found nowhere else in the LXX except describing the table and vestments in Exodus.<sup>28</sup>

Another parallel comes with the selection of 72 translators.<sup>29</sup> Noah Hacham thinks this number parallels the 70 elders of Israel plus the prophets Eldad and Medad.<sup>30</sup> Paul McKechnie thinks it recalls the 70 plus Nadab and Abihu.<sup>31</sup> Alternatively, perhaps the 72 corresponds to 70 elders plus Moses and Aaron. Such proposals are too speculative to be convincing. It seems most likely that Aristeas has simply changed 70 to 72, allowing equal representation from all twelve tribes.<sup>32</sup> Regardless of the details, the selecting of authoritative elders brings the exodus to mind.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> *Let. Aris.* 33, 42-43, 57-82; McKechnie 2008, p. 240; These gifts were mostly fairly standard articles for a temple. Some of the items described (*φιάλη, κρατήρ, τράπεζα*) have lexical parallels in the LXX and specifically in Exodus, but are too generic or indistinct to justify any claims of literary relationship.

<sup>26</sup> *Let. Aris.* 57-82; This table is described in considerable detail, and its dimensions and material (pure gold, as opposed to gold plating in the MT) match those given in LXX Exod 25:22-29. Describing the finery elements of the table in *Let. Aris.* 58, several terms are used which confirm the reference: *στεφάνη* (*rim*), *κυμάτιον*, (*moulding*), and *αλαιστιαῖος* (*handspan*; this term is found in the Gottingen LXX and the NETS at Exod 25:23, but not in the Rahlfs/Hanhart LXX). Wright 2015, p.57.

<sup>27</sup> Wright 2015, p. 57; *Let. Aris.* 96-98; *χιτών* (*tunic*; LXX Exod 28:4; 35-36; 29:5, 8; 35:18; 36:35); *ποδήρης* (*robe*; LXX Exod 25:6; 28:4, 27; 29:5; 35:8); *κώδων* (*bell*; LXX Exod 28:29-30; 36:33-34); *διυφαίνω* (*interweave*; LXX Exod 36:31); *συσφίγω* (*fasten*; LXX Exod 36:29); *κίδαρις* (*turban*; LXX Exod 28:4, 35-36; 29:9; 36:36); Note that these references follow the Gottingen/NETS divisions rather than the Rahlfs/Hanhart divisions.

<sup>28</sup> *κυμάτιον, αλαιστιαῖος, διυφαίνω.*

<sup>29</sup> *Let. Aris.* 39, 46.

<sup>30</sup> Hacham 2005, "The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?", *JSJ*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 1-20, at p. 3 esp. fn. 6; cf. Num 11:26.

<sup>31</sup> Paul McKechnie 2008, "Ptolemy Philadelphus: A New Moses", in P. Guillaume (ed.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, Brill, Boston, pp. 233-246, at p. 242; cf. Exod 24:1, 9.

<sup>32</sup> That is to say, 72 is divisible by 12 while 70 is not. Honigman 2003, pp. 57-59; Both McKechnie and Hacham see the significance of 72 for allowing representation of all the tribes, but seek (unnecessarily, in my view) to give extra reasons for the number.

<sup>33</sup> Exod 24:1, 9; Num 11:16, 24-25; cf. Ezek 8:11; Wright 2015, p. 58.



Aristeas, Exodus, and Ezra-Nehemiah all stress the giving and receiving of the law.<sup>34</sup> The people are gathered, the law is proclaimed, and the people accept it.<sup>35</sup> In Exodus and Ezra-Nehemiah, this was linked with establishing the identity and nationhood of Israel. This is also the case in Aristeas, but here it affirms cosmopolitan Hellenistic Judaism.<sup>36</sup> The law is no longer exclusive to Palestinian Judaism.

The exodus could be problematic for the Alexandrian Jew. If leaving Egypt (and not returning) was central to Jewish identity, what did it mean to be a Jew in Egypt?<sup>37</sup> Aristeas faces this challenge by authorising the Greek Torah and rehabilitating Egypt as a valid locale for Jewish residence.<sup>38</sup> The oppressor Pharaoh is replaced with the benefactor Ptolemy Philadelphus, and masters are compensated rather than plundered when the slaves leave.<sup>39</sup> The authority and goodwill of Jerusalem is acknowledged, and the law is acclaimed by Jew and Gentile alike.<sup>40</sup> The exodus paradigm is applied to tell a “non-exodus” story; one need not leave Egypt, for it is possible to be a Greek-speaking Jew in Egypt.<sup>41</sup>

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls was a landmark in the study of ancient Judaism. At the same time, reconstructing the history of the site and community of the scrolls is not entirely straightforward.<sup>42</sup> Despite these complexities and the diversity of the material,

---

<sup>34</sup> Benjamin G. Wright III affirms that something like Mosaic legislation occurs, but then insists that there is no equivalent to Sinai lawgiving in the Letter of Aristeas. It seems more reasonable to conclude that the reading and defence of the law is in fact parallel to Sinai. Wright 2015, pp. 58-59.

<sup>35</sup> *Let. Aris.* 308-310; cf. Exod 24:3-7; Neh 8:1-8; Honigman 2003, p. 59.

<sup>36</sup> Wright 2015, pp. 56-58.

<sup>37</sup> McKechnie 2008, p.236; Hacham 2005, p. 14.

<sup>38</sup> Hacham 2005, pp. 10, 14-16; Honigman 2003, p. 53.

<sup>39</sup> *Let. Aris.* 22; Honigman 2003, p. 56.

<sup>40</sup> *Let. Aris.* 39-51; 308-310; Hacham 2005, pp. 2, 9.

<sup>41</sup> Honigman 2003, p. 56; Hacham 2005, p.8; Wright 2015, p. 56.

<sup>42</sup> Wright 1992, p. 203; See Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg Jr., & Edward M. Cook 2005, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, HarperOne, New York, pp. 14-35 for a discussion of some of the issues, including criticism of the Standard Model. As Wright says, however, the exact identity of the Qumran community and their relationship to the site makes little difference here. Even if the community had no Essene connection and the scrolls were not written at Qumran, they still reflect the interests of a desert sectarian group prior to the Jewish revolt. Wright 1992, p, 204.

it is clear that the exodus story was well-known at Qumran.<sup>43</sup> As noted earlier, Exodus was common at Qumran, and numerous other texts engaging with the exodus were also found there. Though the details differ across texts, the people expected some form of divine or messianic intervention to judge the enemy and vindicate the righteous.<sup>44</sup> The prophetic books of the Tanakh were known, so prophetic hope (including new exodus hope) was potentially a factor in Qumran eschatologies.<sup>45</sup> This community left Jerusalem for the desert, apparently due to fallout with temple authorities. They lived in the wilderness, valuing holiness and the Mosaic law, and apparently thinking the exile was not over.<sup>46</sup> This state of affairs could plausibly be influenced by an exodus-wilderness paradigm.<sup>47</sup>

Several texts offer some corroboration for that suggestion. Consider 4Q161, a fragmentary commentary on Isaiah. Commenting on Isa 10:24-27, the writer cites Ezekiel 20.<sup>48</sup> One new exodus passage is interpreted by citation of another, suggesting that a new exodus hope was known to the writer. 4Q462 describes exile as Israel being “given to Egypt a second time.”<sup>49</sup> In *The Words of the Luminaries* the exodus is revisited in prayer, providing a paradigm for forgiveness. Hope is associated with the exodus covenant. YHWH’s name will dwell in Jerusalem, which is equated with Zion, temple, and

---

<sup>43</sup> This claim must be balanced with an acknowledgement that other areas of tradition (Danielic or Enochic literature, for example) receive more attention in the Qumran scrolls than interpretation of Exodus does. As discussed in the previous chapter, however, this does not mean the exodus (or the book of Exodus) was unimportant at Qumran. Exodus is among the most common texts found there, and there are numerous other texts which revisit exodus material. See footnote 28 in chapter 5 for more detail.

<sup>44</sup> Philip R. Davies 1985, “Eschatology at Qumran”, *JBL*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 39-55, at pp. 39-42, 49-55; Wright 1992, pp. 208-209.

<sup>45</sup> Note particularly 4Q176, a compilation of passages of comfort or consolation to God’s people. The preserved material is mostly excerpts from Isaiah, and includes several new exodus passages (Isa 43, 49, 51, 52).

<sup>46</sup> Najman 2006, pp. 103; Wright 1992, p. 206; Leonhard Goppelt 1993 [1978], *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, F. Hahn (ed.), J. E. Alsup (trans.), Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 69-70; Alison Schofield 2008, “The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls”, in K. Pomykala (ed.), *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 37-55, at p. 42.

<sup>47</sup> Wright 1992, p. 206.

<sup>48</sup> 4Q161 2.8-15.

<sup>49</sup> 4Q462 13; Wold 2009, pp. 285-289.

tabernacle.<sup>50</sup> In 4Q511, manna is explained as a metaphor for divine compassion. That scroll also mentions a highway, inheritance, service, and walking in God's glory.<sup>51</sup> Hymn 12 of the Thanksgiving Scroll speaks of the soul being redeemed by the hand of the almighty, and mentions service and statutes, and the shining of the writer's face. This could be using the exodus as a paradigm for individual spiritual salvation.<sup>52</sup> 4Q175 reflects on Deut 5 and Deut 18, outlining an expectation for another prophet like Moses.<sup>53</sup> Finally, 1QS says that by devoting themselves to law, those at Qumran will prepare the way for the Lord, fulfilling Isaiah 40.<sup>54</sup> Since that scroll resembles a membership charter, it seems likely that preparation for the Isaianic theophany was fairly central to the Qumran project. As Benjamin G. Wold has argued, the Dead Sea Scrolls hint that Egypt and exile were ideologically merged, linking future return with new exodus hope.<sup>55</sup> There is good reason to say that a new exodus framework informed hope and identity for at least some at Qumran.<sup>56</sup>

The Wisdom of Solomon engages substantially with exodus tradition. After declaring the necessity of wisdom, the author goes on in chapter 10 to briefly recount the deeds of personified Wisdom in Israel's past. This recount ends with the exodus-wilderness story in 10:15-11:4. Wisdom was the protagonist of the exile who entered God's servant (Moses), performed signs and wonders, led Israel through the sea, and provided in the wilderness.

Exodus traditions dominate much of the rest of the text, but after 11:4 the engagement is more discursive than narrative.<sup>57</sup> Consider Wisdom 11:4-9:

---

<sup>50</sup> 4Q504 2.7-13; 3.5-7, 9-12; 4.2-4, 12; Wold 2009, pp. 292; Schofield 2008, p. 44.

<sup>51</sup> 4Q511 f.2 1.5-10; f.10 8-10.

<sup>52</sup> 1QHa 10.33-11.5.

<sup>53</sup> 4Q175 1.1-8.

<sup>54</sup> 1QS 8.12-16; 9.17-21; cf. 1QS 8.5 where the community is described as a temple. Watts 2000 [1997], p. 247; Goppelt 1993 [1978], p. 105; Schofield 2008, pp. 45-47.

<sup>55</sup> Wold 2009, "Revelation's Plague Septets: New Exodus and Exile", in G. C. Martínez (ed.), *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, STDJ, vol. 85, Brill, Leiden, pp. 279-298, esp. p. 297.

<sup>56</sup> Schofield 2008, p. 53; Piper 1957, pp. 5-6.

<sup>57</sup> The exodus is the focus of Wisdom 10:15-11:16 and then 16:1-19:22.

<sup>4</sup>They thirsted and called upon you, and water was given them out of flinty rock...<sup>5</sup>For through the very things by which their enemies were punished, they themselves were benefited in their need. <sup>6</sup>Instead of the perennial spring of a river, stirred up with defiled blood <sup>7</sup>in rebuke for the decree to kill the infants, you unexpectedly gave them abundant water, <sup>8</sup>having shown by their thirst at that time how you punished their opponents. <sup>9</sup>For when they were tested, although they were being disciplined in mercy, they learned how the impious, being judged in anger, were tormented.<sup>58</sup>

Egypt drowned infants in the Nile, and God retaliates in kind by filling the Nile with blood. The same medium (water) benefits the righteous and punishes the enemy. This strikes a contrast between the righteous and the unrighteous, a contrast also present in the discussion of suffering: Egypt and Israel thirsted, but Israel's suffering was brief and didactic.<sup>59</sup> These are general wisdom principles, and they appear throughout the rest of Wisdom.<sup>60</sup>

Regarding retribution, we read in 11:16 that Egypt was plagued by irrational creatures because of their animal worship, "in order that they might learn that a person is punished by the very things by which a person sins."<sup>61</sup> The association between animal plagues and animal worship occurs also at 16:1. Egypt is enslaved by darkness because they enslaved Israel.<sup>62</sup> The death of Egypt's children and the destruction at the Red Sea were retribution for the Egyptian infanticide.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Wis 11:4-9 NETS.

<sup>59</sup> This is described in 11:10 as like a warning from a father not (as was the case for Egypt's suffering) a sentence from a king.

<sup>60</sup> That is to say they are similar to the kinds of general principles we would expect in wisdom literature like Proverbs add Ecclesiastes, or passages like Psalm 1. Wisdom in general is particularly similar to Proverbs 9, where we also encounter personified lady Wisdom.

<sup>61</sup> For discussion of this theme of retaliation see Samuel Cheon 1997, *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation*, JSPSup, no. 23, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, pp. 116-118.

<sup>62</sup> Wis 17:2.

<sup>63</sup> Wis 18:5-6.

The contrast between God's people and the impious is a recurring motif in Wisdom.<sup>64</sup> The righteous spoil the unrighteous.<sup>65</sup> Insects killed the Egyptians, but even serpents could not kill the Israelites.<sup>66</sup> Wisdom 16:24 says that "creation strains itself for punishment against the unrighteous and relaxes in kindness against those who trust in you."<sup>67</sup> While lawless people were terrified by darkness, God's holy ones had light.<sup>68</sup> The impious were struck with wrath, but the destroyer withdrew from Israel.<sup>69</sup> The praise of Israel is juxtaposed with the Egyptian cry of lament.<sup>70</sup>

Israel's thirst was framed as educative disciplining (*παιδεύω*). Likewise, their hunger and the plague of snakes in the desert were both framed as didactic.<sup>71</sup> The former taught them of God's judgement on the unrighteous. The latter was a warning and lesson about the power of God's word.<sup>72</sup>

In all this, Wisdom uses the exodus to communicate general or universal wisdom principles.<sup>73</sup> Punishment befits sin, creation works for the righteous, wickedness condemns itself – these are true for the audience, not just the exodus generation.<sup>74</sup> Furthermore, the specific details of the original exodus are excised. Moses, Aaron and Pharaoh are never named.<sup>75</sup> We read of God's children, holy ones, the righteous, a holy people, a blameless nation – but not "Israel." The enemy, lawless, people, and the impious appear instead of "Egypt." The exodus has been generalised, such that its broad

---

<sup>64</sup> Cheon 1997, p. 112; Outside of the exodus material we can see this at Wis 3:1-10; 5:1-6, 14-15.

<sup>65</sup> Wis 10:20.

<sup>66</sup> Wis 16:9-10.

<sup>67</sup> Wis 16:24 NETS.

<sup>68</sup> Wis 17:2-18:4, esp. 17:2, 18:1, 3-4; Not only was Israel able to see when Egypt was struck by darkness, but they also had the pillar of fire and the "incorruptible light of the law" (Wis 18:4 NETS).

<sup>69</sup> Wis 18:25.

<sup>70</sup> Wis 18:9-10.

<sup>71</sup> Wis 16:3-4, 6, 11-13.

<sup>72</sup> Additionally, the way in which Aaron's piety turns back the desert plague of death in 18:5-25 seems to account for suffering as a tool to teach the people about the power of a pious priesthood.

<sup>73</sup> Cheon 1997, p. 113.

<sup>74</sup> Wis 11:16; 16:8, 12, 24; 17:1, 11; These are all stated in the present tense, as generally applicable principles or beliefs, rather than just historically specific explanations.

<sup>75</sup> Cheon 1997, pp. 32, 110.

strokes remain directly relevant to God's people.<sup>76</sup> The significance is more on universal righteousness than literal, physical departure from Israel.<sup>77</sup>

Barclay argues against the idea of universalisation or generalisation. He says that "the specificity of reference is inescapable," contending that we are dealing instead with an explanation of God's rationale in the exodus in terms of moral rather than ethnic categories.<sup>78</sup> This is not entirely convincing, but it ultimately makes little difference.<sup>79</sup> The story would not be told if there were no sense of analogy between the righteous in the exodus and the readers of Wisdom.<sup>80</sup> Even on Barclay's account, the story still serves to establish that God saves not *just* according to ethnicity, but instead vindicates the righteous and judges the impious.<sup>81</sup> The exodus story, re-framed in terms of wisdom and righteousness (as opposed to nation and location) promotes a worldview wherein one may live and suffer righteously as an Alexandrian Jew.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Cheon 1997, pp. 110-113; Enns 1997, pp. 147-148.

<sup>77</sup> We should not take this to mean that the literal exodus was entirely insignificant (as at Cheon 1997, p. 110). On the contrary, it was quite possible for Philo to affirm the importance of the literal exodus and yet understand its primary application to be paradigmatic or allegorical. For this, see the discussion of Philo below. The generalisation of the exodus to serve paradigmatically rather than just historically is pushed to an extreme in Wisdom (and Philo), but this is a similar phenomenon to what we saw in the prophets. Hoffman notes that Hosea does not focus on the specifics of the exodus narrative (the disasters on Egypt, the crossing of the sea), because the paradigmatic or typological application of the exodus requires it to be generalised rather than firmly particularised. Hoffman 1989, pp 175-176.

<sup>78</sup> Barclay 2015 *Paul and the Gift*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, p. 204; In this he follows Jonathan A. Linebaugh, but overstates Linebaugh's conclusion that the paradigmatic reading is "only half right." There is a universal paradigm, applicable in every age but *not* applicable to every nation. Linebaugh 2013, *God, Grace, and Righteousness in Wisdom of Solomon and Paul's Letter to the Romans: Texts in Conversation*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 78-79.

<sup>79</sup> We must wonder whether this can really account for the absence of the names not only of Israel and Egypt, but also of Moses, Aaron, and Pharaoh. Why not say that the piety of Aaron ended the attack of snakes, or that Wisdom entered into Moses? The idea that Wisdom is present in every generation, and the consistent articulation of universal and timeless wisdom principles suggest that the exodus story at least has implications for every age – it is the main story being used to frame the moral universe, the worldview, of the Wisdom of Solomon.

<sup>80</sup> Wisdom is certainly not articulating a specific new exodus paradigm after the manner of Isaiah or Nehemiah, but to insist that this is told *only* as an explanation of the exodus story and not on the basis of some paradigm or analogy is out of line with the purpose of Wisdom. Enns 1997, p. 140

<sup>81</sup> Linebaugh is probably right in saying that Wisdom does not allow anyone outside of the Jewish nation to be righteous, but nonetheless the emphasis shifts such that it is by being a righteous Jew as opposed to a Jew who physically departed Egypt, that one pleases God. Linebaugh 2013, pp. 78-79

<sup>82</sup> Cheon 1997, p 147; Enns 1997, p. 147

Philo also wrote from Alexandria, during the first half of the first century. More than half of his extant works interact with the exodus traditions. The most sustained and the most straightforward use of the exodus in Philo comes in his *Life of Moses*. The first volume of that work is a recount of Moses's life, and thus of the exodus. Though he generally agrees with the exodus account, there are numerous points of difference. For example, he emphasises Moses's benefaction in Egypt, and omits the Passover and Sinai!<sup>83</sup> The second book explores the various roles and traits of Moses: king, philosopher, lawgiver, priest, and prophet. Moses is framed as the ideal ruler and the ideal Jew.<sup>84</sup> The exodus story is used to introduce the audience to Jewish tradition and values. There is much in the way of interesting tradition in *Moses*, but our present task requires us to focus elsewhere in Philo's work.

In the rest of his works (including *Questions and Answers on Exodus*), Philo takes a very different approach. Picking up specific phrases or details, he frequently expounds deeper allegorical or symbolic meanings to exodus traditions. Leaving leaven out of Passover bread symbolises the abandonment of self-inflating pride.<sup>85</sup> Moses meets God outside the camp because the soul must leave the body to commune with God.<sup>86</sup> Levites slaughtering sinners in Exodus 32 is allegory for the soul purging itself from contact with the impure.<sup>87</sup> Many more examples could be furnished, for Philo constantly allegorises details in accordance with his Platonic outlook.

---

<sup>83</sup> It is not clear exactly what kind of payoff Philo seeks by emphasizing the benefits Moses brought to Egypt. It could be to ease the tension felt by Jews living in Egypt, by showing a significant precedent. Alternatively (and perhaps more probably, given the likely non-Jewish audience), he may be seeking to legitimize the presence of Jews to the Egyptian reader, by painting the lawgiver of the Jews as benefactor of Egypt. It is also possible that Philo does not have matters of identity and legitimacy in mind – he may be merely asserting the greatness of Moses. Though this undoubtedly has implications for Jewish self-understanding, such matters may not be in mind.

<sup>84</sup> Louis H. Feldman 2007, *Philo's Portrayal of Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.

2007, pp. 3, 12.

<sup>85</sup> Philo *QE* 1.4; Alternatively, at *QE* 2.14 Philo proposes that leaven symbolises sensuality.

<sup>86</sup> Philo *Worse* 159-162; cf. *Drunkenness* 95-96; *Alleg. Interp.* 2.54-55.

<sup>87</sup> Philo *Drunkenness* 67.

Unsurprisingly, Philo sees a deeper meaning behind the exodus as a whole, the movement from slavery into the land. Though he called Egypt his fatherland, Philo depicted it very negatively indeed.<sup>88</sup> Egyptians, he says, are prone to envy and sedition, and they prefer body over soul, earth over heaven.<sup>89</sup> Egypt serves as a symbol for the body and passions.<sup>90</sup> Consequently, Philo construes the exodus a symbolic departure from passion into virtue, from body to soul. God saves those who groan at their “Egyptian” temperament, and the Passover celebrates departing from slavery under indulgence.<sup>91</sup> The horse and rider cast into the sea represents the defeat of the mind riding on the passions.<sup>92</sup> Israel’s desire to return to Egypt represents the temptation to relapse into sin, and the golden calf incident is pitched a return from soul to body.<sup>93</sup> The promised land, on the other hand, was a symbol of purity and prudence.<sup>94</sup> Philo’s broad allegorical take on the exodus is shown in his comments on the naming of the book of Exodus:

“Right well then, did the Sacred Guide inscribe one entire sacred book of the Lawgiving “Exagoge” or “Leading out,” ...he contemplates the task of taking out all the population of the soul right away from Egypt, the body...”<sup>95</sup>

Though Philo thought the literal exodus significant for Israel’s history, he frequently applies the story to his own age as allegory for the migration of the soul. Those beloved by God are defined a spiritual exodus, wherever they happen to live.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Philo *Flaccus* 46-49.

<sup>89</sup> Philo *Flight* 180; *Flaccus* 17, 29.

<sup>90</sup> René Bloch 2015, “Leaving Home: Philo of Alexandria on the Exodus”, in Levy et al. (eds), pp. 357-364, at pp. 360-361; In addition to those passages cited below, relevant examples can also be found in the following passages: Philo *Worse* 93; *Alleg. Interp.* 3.37-39; *Migration* 77-78; *Confusion* 75-82.

<sup>91</sup> Philo *Worse* 93-95.

<sup>92</sup> Philo *Drunkenness* 111; *Alleg. Interp.* 2.102; cf. *Confusion* 70; *Agriculture* 79-81 .

<sup>93</sup> Philo *Prelim. Studies* 164; *Posterity* 155-157; *Drunkenness* 124.

<sup>94</sup> *Alleg. Interp.* 1.77-78.

<sup>95</sup> Philo *Migration* 14 (Colson & Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>96</sup> Bloch 2015, p. 360-361.



Finally, we turn to Josephus. Having defected during the Jewish revolt, Josephus wrote from Rome as a client of the Imperial family. Three of his works engage with exodus material. The earliest of those is *Jewish War*. In the preface, he states that he will *not* discuss the ancient history of the Jews: their origin and exodus, wilderness journey, conquest, and exile.<sup>97</sup> Though he avoids these stories, he nonetheless signals that these are the crucial nodes of Israel's national history. Later he recounts a speech he supposedly delivered urging his countrymen not to resist Rome.<sup>98</sup> Citing the exodus and other examples, he claims that if God wished to defeat Rome he could do so without Israel's help. He sees exodus as an archetypal act of salvation, but he does not actually expect an exodus repeat – he expects the empire to maintain control in Israel.

Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* does what *Jewish War* did not, retelling the story of Israel. His exodus narrative is (like Philo's) similar to the biblical version, but with various differences in emphasis and detail.<sup>99</sup> That Josephus sees fit to revisit the story in such detail says something of its importance, and he reproduces biblical stories and details that affirm its significance for understanding Israel and its deity.

The treatise *Against Apion* provides more clarity regarding the significance of the exodus for Josephus. Therein he discusses alternate versions of the exodus story. He seeks to defend Jews against those who claim they are a young nation with a history of misanthropy, descended from Egyptian lepers – claims made by Manetho, Chaeremon, Lysimachus, and Apion.<sup>100</sup> Josephus responds by highlighting inconsistencies and errors in their accounts. He argues that a leper leading lepers would not create the purity laws, that Amenophis is a purely fictional Pharaoh, that Manetho contradicts himself with different stories, and so on.<sup>101</sup> Josephus does, however, accept the broad thesis of

---

<sup>97</sup> Josephus *J.W.* 1 preface 6.

<sup>98</sup> Josephus *J.W.* 5.9.4.

<sup>99</sup> Like Philo, Josephus spends more time on Moses's deeds and benefaction in Egypt than the biblical account does. One interesting difference in emphasis between Exodus and Josephus's *Antiquities* is that Josephus pitches the exodus as a return to land previously inhabited by Abraham, not an entry into land he was promised. Josephus *Ant.* 2.12.1.

<sup>100</sup> Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.14, 25, 26, 32, 34; 2.2.

<sup>101</sup> Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.27-31, 33, 35; 2.2.

Manetho that the Jews descended from the Hyksos who once ruled Egypt.<sup>102</sup> That accords with Josephus's aim of defending the antiquity and non-Egyptian origins of the Jews.<sup>103</sup>

The details here are less important than the fact of the dialogue itself. It is clear that the Jews were not alone in revisiting the exodus story, and Josephus understands the alternate versions to be malicious attempts to cast aspersions against the Jews.<sup>104</sup> This reveals that the exodus was contested ground that Josephus considered crucial for Jewish origins and self-understanding. To undermine Jewish identity and legitimacy, undermine the exodus. To affirm Jewish antiquity and nationhood, defend the exodus. The Jews for Josephus are an exodus people who did not originate in Egypt, but who departed from there under Moses.

In this chapter we have seen that the exodus story was used as a paradigm for Jewish self-understanding, in a variety of ways. Ezra-Nehemiah depicted an incomplete new exodus, such that hope for a new exodus would have endured.<sup>105</sup> The Letter of Aristeas retold the story to validate Alexandrian Judaism without needing a literal exodus. The prophetic new exodus hope seems to have influenced at least some at Qumran. Wisdom puts forth a generalised exodus paradigm applicable in every age, where the literal exodus is less important. Philo understands the exodus to have a deeper meaning about the migration of the soul: he is concerned with a true, spiritual exodus. Finally, Josephus defends Jewish integrity and antiquity by defending the exodus. Each of these texts is

---

<sup>102</sup> Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.16.

<sup>103</sup> Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.25; 2.41.

<sup>104</sup> Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.25; Such was Josephus's claim, but the situation may have been more complex. Lysimachus is not entirely negative toward the Jews. The stories Josephus responds to may not have originated just with the authors he refutes; we don't know what kind of tradition history sat behind them, whether multiple stories were conflated, and whether some of these traditions about Egyptian origin actually started with Jews seeking to validate their place in Egypt. That is the claim made by Erich S. Gruen, and effectively refuted by Louis H. Feldman. It can be difficult to evaluate the different ways that Jews used the exodus, and how this interacted with non-Jewish accounts. Nonetheless, the use of the story by various people in various ways to frame or attack Jewish identity and status is worth noting even if we cannot reconstruct the exact details. Gruen 1998, "The Use and Abuse of the Exodus Story", *JHis*, vol. 12, no.1, pp. 93-122, esp. p. 98; Feldman 1998, "Responses: Did the Jews Reshape the Tale of the Exodus?", *JHis*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 123-127.

<sup>105</sup> Wright 2013, p. 679.

different, but all testify to the significance of the exodus for Jewish self-understanding. God's people are exodus people.



## Part 3.

### Exiting Israel



## 7. New Testament & New Exodus

Christianity emerged from a Jewish context, as a messianic movement centred on a Palestinian Jew. It is thus not surprising that the literature of early Christianity is profoundly shaped by the traditions of Israel. So how did the exodus influence early Christianity? One need not look far to find citations of Exodus or explicit reference to the story. As we might expect, many scholars have studied most of these passages, drawing conclusions about the exodus in the New Testament.

The role of the exodus in the New Testament has garnered considerable interest since the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the 1950s, Harald Sahlin wrote about Paul's new exodus concept, Jacob Enz and Jindřich Manék did the same for John and Luke respectively, and Otto Piper discussed the way the exodus was used by Jesus and the NT authors.<sup>1</sup> In the first half of the 1960's came Robin E. Nixon on NT exodus typology, Robert Houston Smith on exodus typology in John, and Balentine on Jesus's death as a new exodus.<sup>2</sup> Scholarship has not slowed down, and the place of the exodus in the NT has been the subject of many studies since.<sup>3</sup> These studies include Fred L. Fisher on the shape of Christian salvation, J. S. Casey on Revelation, Paul E. Deterding on 1 Peter, Rikk E. Watts and David W. Pao on the Isaianic new exodus in Mark and Luke-Acts respectively, Dale Allison on Moses typology in Matthew, Sylvia C. Keesmaat on Romans

---

<sup>1</sup> Sahlin 1953, "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St Paul", in A. Fridrichsen (ed.), *The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology*, Dacre, London, pp. 81-95; Enz 1957, "The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John", *JBL*, vol. 76, no. 3, pp. 208-215; Mánek 1957, "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke", *NovT*, vol. 2, fasc. 1, pp. 8-23; Piper 1957, "Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament", *Int*, vol. 11, pp. 3-22; Sahlin's article was published in German in *Judaica* vol. 7 in 1951, before its English publication in 1953.

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of all these studies, see Smith's 2016 article. Some of the early studies (especially Piper 1957) have much to commend them and draw similar conclusions to the present study, but they usually feature breadth rather than depth, and do not adequately consider the Jewish background. Though Piper (Piper 1957, p. 6) recognises the importance of the Jewish use of exodus traditions, he dedicated very little time to actually discussing the matter.

<sup>3</sup> Not all of them will feature in our study – some because they are too broad, others because they are outside our focus, and still others because they have little to contribute. Daniel Lynwood Smith 2016, "The uses of 'New Exodus' in New Testament Scholarship: Preparing a Way through the Wilderness", *CurBR*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 207-243.

and Galatians, Richard J. Clifford on “figural reading” and many more besides.<sup>4</sup> The term “new exodus” is so common that in 2016, Daniel Lynwood Smith warned that it risks becoming an empty buzzword.<sup>5</sup>

Despite all this scholarship on the exodus in the NT, there is no good synthesis or comparison of the exodus influence across different NT texts in comparison with the Jewish background.<sup>6</sup> This study cannot achieve that goal entirely, but we may attempt a step in the right direction. We will consider several NT texts *not* all by the same author, and bring them into contact with Jewish new exodus concepts and texts. In the interest of brevity, only a few passages can be considered. Since the approach we are using has been developed for Pauline studies, that is the most obvious place to begin. First, we will consider the exodus-wilderness theme in 1 Corinthians 10, before turning to Romans and (briefly) Galatians, Ephesians, 1 Peter, and Hebrews.<sup>7</sup> These passages are chosen in light of existing scholarship discussing narrative and exodus influence therein. The size, genre, and complexity of the gospels, Acts, and Revelation render them more difficult to incorporate into this study. Accordingly, they will not be considered.

---

<sup>4</sup> We will encounter more studies like these in the coming chapters. Fisher 1977, “The New and Greater Exodus: The Exodus Pattern in the New Testament”, *SwJT*, vol. 20, pp. 69-79; Casey 1987, “The Exodus Theme in the Book of Revelation against the Background of the New Testament”, in B. van Iersel & A. Weiler (eds.), *Exodus: A Lasting Paradigm*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, pp. 34-43; Deterding 1981, “Exodus Motifs in First Peter”, *Concordia Journal*, vol. 7, pp. 58-65; Rikk E Watts 2000 [1997], *Isaiah’s New Exodus in Mark*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids; Pao 2002 [2000]; Allison 2005 *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids; Keesmaat 1994; Keesmaat 1999; Clifford 2002, “The Exodus in the Christian Bible: The Case for “Figural” Reading”, *TS*, no. 63, pp. 345-361. Note that these are only the studies specifically focused on the role of the exodus in the NT. There are many more that we could note for exodus typology in the Jewish scriptures, including some already used in this study: Anderson 1962; Anderson 1976; Cheon 1997; Enns 1997; DeLapp 2014; Enns 1997; Idestrom 2009; Williams 2014.

<sup>5</sup> Smith’s chief concern is that “new exodus” applies to different concepts or schemes with different foci and scope. He suggests, along with Rodrigo J. Morales, that we may be better speaking of *a* new exodus than *the* new exodus. Smith 2016, pp. 235-236; Morales 2010, *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel: New Exodus and New Creation Motifs in Galatians*, WUNT 2/282, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, p. 14.

<sup>6</sup> The closest scholars have come to such a feat may be Wright’s body of work (which sets up Christ as the fulfilment of new exodus hope for those still in exile, as at Wright 2013, pp. 139-160) and B. J. Oropeza’s 2002 discussion of the influence of Isaiah on Paul, which also makes note of exodus patterns elsewhere in the NT. B. J. Oropeza 2002, “Echoes of Isaiah in the Rhetoric of Paul: New Exodus, Wisdom, and the Humility of the Cross in Utopian-Apocalyptic Expectations”, in D.F. Watson (ed.), *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*, SBL SymS, no. 14, Society for Biblical Literature, Atlanta. Both of these scholars, however, are focused especially on Paul.

<sup>7</sup> In doing so, we will unfortunately bypass the intriguing use of exodus traditions in 2 Corinthians 3, and many other passages besides.



## 8. The Wilderness at Corinth

We begin our discussion of Paul with 1 Corinthians 10. Therein we find Paul's most obvious and sustained use of the exodus-wilderness story. This is a passage wherein the exodus-wilderness story functions paradigmatically.

There is no doubt about the allusion in 1 Corinthians 10, for Paul explicitly refers to the fathers passing through the sea with Moses.<sup>1</sup> He describes the wilderness as a period of rebellion, drawing on the book of Numbers. He refers to Israel's destruction (Num 14:16), and sexual immorality (Num 25:1-9).<sup>2</sup> The snakes Paul mentions are those from Numbers 21:5-6, though *πειρασμός* could refer to trials in general.<sup>3</sup> Grumbling (*γογγύζω*) occurs in several exodus-wilderness passages, so there may not be a specific occasion in mind.<sup>4</sup> Spiritual food and drink recall manna, quail, and water provided in the wilderness. Paul picks up a pre-existing interpretive tradition in mentioning that the rock *followed* Israel.<sup>5</sup> In the context of wilderness allusions, *ἐπιθυμέω* (crave) must be evoking Numbers 11, where the story of Israel craving meat and facing punishment is framed in an *inclusio* with *ἐπιθυμία* in 11:4 and 11:34.<sup>6</sup>

The only direct scriptural quotation comes at 10:7:

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor 10:1-5.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor 10:5, 8.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor 10:9; Forms of *πειράζω* are found in Exodus 17 and LXX Psalms 77, 94, and 105, referring to Israel testing God in the wilderness.

<sup>4</sup> Exod 17:3; Num 11:1; 14:27, 29:41; 17:5; Roy E. Ciampa & Brian S. Rosner 2010, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PilNTC, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, p. 463.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor 10:4; Enns 1996, "The 'Moveable Well' in 1 Cor 10:4: An Extrabiblical Tradition in an Apostolic Text", *BBR*, vol. 6, pp. 23-38; As shall be seen shortly, Paul is drawing on Deut 32 in 1 Cor 10. In Deut 32, God is referred to as a rock numerous times – in verses 4, 13, 15, 18, 30, and 31. In the LXX, God is *not* called a rock in these verses, but it seems most likely that Paul knew the Hebrew version and is associating Christ with God. Alternatively, there are other passages that might permit an association between god and the wilderness rock (LXX Pss 77 or 94, or Isa 44:8). If Paul is drawing on any of these, he is equating Jesus with God, and thus making a very high christological statement. Matthew Thiessen 2013, "'The Rock was Christ': The Fluidity of Christ's Body in 1 Corinthians 10:4", *JSNT*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 103-126, esp. pp. 108, 110-111, 113, 120; cf. Hays 1989, p. 94.

<sup>6</sup> Ciampa & Rosner 2010, pp. 454-455.

Do not be idolaters as some of them were; as it is written, “The people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play.”<sup>7</sup>

This is Exodus 32:6, from the golden calf story. Numbers 11 (already invoked with *ἐπιθυμία*) is recalled again, for the narrative in Numbers 11 is framed by the words *καθίζω* (sit down) and *ἀνίστημι* (rise up).<sup>8</sup> Paul epitomises that wilderness story with a citation about idolatrous feasting.<sup>9</sup> This is his only direct citation, and it forms the structural core of 10:6-11: it is central to his argument.<sup>10</sup> Of many texts about idolatry he might have chosen, Paul selected one which characterises Israel’s idolatry as a matter of eating and drinking, of idolatrous feasting.<sup>11</sup>

Paul is urging his audience to avoid such idolatry. All the Israelites came through the sea in an initiatory (baptismal) rite, and all received divine provision, but most still engaged in idolatry and were judged.<sup>12</sup> The issue is not just idolatry generally, but idol feasts specifically. This makes good sense in the context of 1 Corinthians. Prior to this passage Paul has said that Christians *may* eat meat sacrificed to idols but they should exercise restraint for the sake of others, and that a lack of self-discipline can lead to idolatry.<sup>13</sup> In chapter 10 he urges them to avoid idolatrous feasting, for their baptism and spiritual

---

<sup>7</sup> 1 Cor 10:7 NET.

<sup>8</sup> LXX Num 11:4, 32; Gary D. Collier 1994, “‘That We Might Not Crave Evil’ The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians 10:1-13”, *JSNT*, vol. 55, pp. 55-75, at p. 65.

<sup>9</sup> Collier 1994, p. 65; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 456.

<sup>10</sup> Wayne A. Meeks 1982, “‘And Rose Up to Play’: Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22”, *JSNT*, vol. 16, pp. 64-78, at p. 69; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 455; These verses have a chiasmic structure, with the citation at the centre. Collier 1994, pp. 60-63; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 452.

<sup>11</sup> Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 457; Gordon D. Fee 1987, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, p. 454; It may also be that Paul associates this idolatrous feasting with sexual immorality, the “play” of Israel could be read with sexual overtones (as it was in some Rabbinic sources). It *could* be that Paul’s two major concerns in 1 Corinthians – idolatry and sexual immorality – are both present in orgiastic cult feasts in Corinth. This is all possible, but the argument in favor of this reading (put forward by scholars like Witherington and Fee) is not decisive. Witherington III 1994, *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, p. 221; Fee 1987, pp. 454-455; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 459.

<sup>12</sup> The contrast between *all* and *some* is strong in the original grammar. Verses 1-4 feature 5 parallel clauses about what was experienced by *all* Israel. Verses 6-10 then feature 5 parallel clauses about how *some* sinned. Meeks 1982, p. 65.

<sup>13</sup> 1 Cor 8:7-13; 9:3-7; 9:24-27; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 443.

food (the Lord's Supper) does not render them immune to idolatry and apostasy.<sup>14</sup> They must not repeat Israel's mistake.

The exodus idolatry theme continues in 10:14-22.<sup>15</sup> This passage has more direct scriptural allusions. Compare 10:20a with Deuteronomy 32:17a (again concerning wilderness Israel):

...what they sacrifice they offer to demons and not to God.

...ἃ θύουσιν, δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ [θύουσιν].

They sacrificed to demons and not to God.

ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ,

The inflected forms are not exactly the same, but lexical agreement and sequence clearly mark an allusion.<sup>16</sup> Two verses later, Paul speaks of provoking the Lord to jealousy.<sup>17</sup> Both times the LXX mentions the Lord being provoked to jealousy, it refers to the wilderness era.<sup>18</sup> One of those is Deuteronomy 32, confirming that Paul has that passage about wilderness idolatry in mind. The Corinthians, like the Israelites, risk provoking the Lord by idolatrous participation with demons.

Paul argues from the premise that sacrificial meals involve spiritual participation. Such was the case in the Israelite cult, in Gentile sacrifices, and in the Lord's Supper.<sup>19</sup> If these are all equivalent sacrificial participatory meals, then the Lord's Supper must bear sacrificial connotations. We get the same impression when Paul refers to the Lord's Supper as "the Lord's table," a scriptural term for the Israelite altar of sacrifice.<sup>20</sup> Since Paul calls Christ a Passover lamb in chapter 5, it makes good sense to conclude that Paul

---

<sup>14</sup> Witherington 1994 [*Conflict*], p. 220; Oropeza 1999, "Apostasy in the Wilderness: Paul's Message to the Corinthians in a State of Eschatological Liminality", *JSNT*, vol. 22, no. 75, pp. 69-86, p. 82.

<sup>15</sup> Paul links this passage with the one before with "*Διόπερ*" (*therefore*), showing that he is still concerned with the same main issue. Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 470; Hays 2005, p. 10.

<sup>16</sup> Thiessen 2013, p. 105.

<sup>17</sup> 1 Cor 10:22.

<sup>18</sup> The verb here is *παραζηλοῦμεν*, found in the LXX at Deut 32:21 and Ps 77:58. The latter of these could also be in mind, as it also refers to God as the rock and redeemer, and describes how the fathers went through the sea, were led by a cloud, and received manna from God.

<sup>19</sup> 1 Cor 10:16, 18, 20.

<sup>20</sup> Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 482; cf. LXX Mal 1:12; Ezek 41:22, Isa 65:11.

sees the Lord's Supper as a new Passover, another meal involving spiritual participation.<sup>21</sup> Its participants partake in the sacrifice of Christ, so they cannot then partake in idol feasts – they cannot participate with both demonic and divine.<sup>22</sup>

Paul has advanced two lines of argument. First, baptism and provision do not prevent “post-redemption apostasy.”<sup>23</sup> Second, the Lord's Supper is a new Passover and an exclusive spiritual participation. Both arguments assert that in their eating and drinking, the Corinthians are flirting with idolatry, and risk the same fate as the wilderness generation. All of this argumentation rests on an analogy between the church and exodus-wilderness Israel.<sup>24</sup> But what is the substance of that relationship or analogy?

The relationship of the church to Israel is first depicted as one of continuity. Paul assumes that his Gentile audience will know Jewish scripture, and consider it relevant. More, he calls the wilderness generation “our fathers,” including the Corinthians in the story and identity of Israel.<sup>25</sup>

There is also a paradigmatic or typological relationship. Verse 6 states that these things took place as *τύποι*. Likewise, in verse 11 these things are said to have occurred *τυπικῶς*, for the instruction of those upon whom the end of the ages has come. These are often translated as “examples” – the church must learn from Israel's (bad) example.<sup>26</sup> But this is more than exemplification. Both Israel and the church experience baptism, spiritual sustenance, participation in a Passover, and the risk of negating all this with idolatry. Exodus, Passover, and provision defined God's people, just as baptism, and the Lord's

---

<sup>21</sup> 1 Cor 5:7; Wright 2013, p. 428. This notion is also present in 1 Corinthians 11:23-36, a section which recalls the Last Supper. The accounts of the Last Supper in the gospels also depict Jesus using the Passover to introduce his own sacrificial death. Matthew Myer Boulton 2013, “Supersession or Subsession? Exodus Typology, the Christian Eucharist and the Jewish Passover Meal”, *SJT*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 18-29, at pp. 25-28; Routledge 2014, p. 193; Cf. Holland 2011, p. 89.

<sup>22</sup> 1 Cor 10:21.

<sup>23</sup> Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 456; Wright 2013, p. 421.

<sup>24</sup> Hays 1989, pp. 100-101.

<sup>25</sup> 1 Cor 10:1; Wright 2013, pp. 421, 503.

<sup>26</sup> The NET, NIV, ESV, NRSV, NASB, HCSB, WEB and various other translations consider *example* the best gloss. The NLT, RSV, and CEV opt for *warning*. The Wycliffe and Douay-Rheims translations prefer *figure*. Only a few prefer *type* – Young's Literal Translation, the Darby Bible Translation, and the Jubilee 2000 translation.

Supper defined them in the later epoch. The exodus-wilderness paradigm is applied typologically to understand the identity and situation of the church.<sup>27</sup> Paul wants to effect a “conversion of the imagination” by promoting the exodus as a paradigm for Christian worldview and identity.<sup>28</sup> The Corinthians are to see themselves as a new Israel, seeking to live faithfully in the wilderness.<sup>29</sup> This new Israel is redeemed in Christ, and stands in contrast to Israel *κατὰ σάρκα* who participated in the altar.<sup>30</sup>

Though never stated outright, it seems most likely that Paul implies that a new exodus has taken place. Paul is focused on the wilderness, and never speaks of slavery or Egypt. Christian salvation is assumed, and not explicitly included in the “metaphysical conceit.”<sup>31</sup> Paul is focused on the church, and reads the exodus-wilderness story in a way that reflects this concern; an “ecclesiocentric hermeneutic.”<sup>32</sup> At the same time, baptism and Lord’s Supper were inextricably bound up with Christian salvation just as the Red Sea and Passover were bound up in the exodus. If Paul thinks their post-redemption situations are analogous, then some degree of analogy between exodus and Christian

---

<sup>27</sup> Wright 2013, p. 661; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 443; Hays 2005, pp. 10, 12; Nixon 1963, p. 23; Piper 1957, p. 10; There is some dispute as to whether this should be called typology. Critics like Steven DiMattei argue that the theoretical construct and vocabulary of typology was not yet developed, so Paul’s use of *τύποι* and *τυπικῶς* cannot have a typological sense. There is a risk that later notions of typology may be anachronistically imposed by this terminology. Yet most scholars who speak of Paul using *typology* do so in such a way that they would fit within DiMattei’s description of the lexical range of the relevant terminology in the first century. Paul may be something of an innovator (or at least our earliest record of a developing sense of the term), but that in itself is no proof against this reading. The *practice* of typological or paradigmatic readings of scripture was certainly known before Paul. The decisive evidence must be that of Romans 5. There, Adam is a *τύπος* for Jesus. Paul clearly means to say that Adam was a type, paradigm, or prefiguration of Christ. To say that he is merely a bad example does not do justice to the logic of Romans whereby Adam and Jesus are representative heads of the old and the new humanity respectively. There are instances where “example” may be appropriate (e.g. Phil 3:17 and 1 Thess 1:7) but perhaps “form” or “model” captures the sense of *τύπος* better in those instances too. Technical notions of type and antitype may not have been formulated (and scholars like Hays recognise that), but Paul’s use of the language of *types* is closer to that sense than it is to just exemplification. For more detail on this debate nuance, see DiMattei 2008, “Biblical Narratives”, in Porter & Stanley (eds.), pp. 59-96; cf. Hays 1989, pp. 95-102; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, pp. 453-454; Piper 1957, p. 10.

<sup>28</sup> Hays 2005, pp. 5-6, 10.

<sup>29</sup> Wright 2013, p. 668.

<sup>30</sup> 1 Cor 10:18; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 477; As Hays notes, Paul speaks in 1 Cor 12:1-2 of a time “when you were Gentiles,” implying that is no longer the case. The church is true Israel (though Hays objects to that term), and Israel “according to the flesh” is not. Hays 1989, p. 96.

<sup>31</sup> Hays 1989, pp. 92-93.

<sup>32</sup> Hays 1989, p. 86; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 443.

salvation is implied.<sup>33</sup> Whether a new exodus framework applies to Pauline soteriology will be considered in the coming chapters.

Finally, how does this relate to the eschatology of Paul, and of the prophets? Paul believed himself to be in an overlap of ages.<sup>34</sup> The age to come had been inaugurated in Christ, but the present age endured until his return. This scheme fits exceedingly well with an exodus paradigm, wherein the exodus is only complete when the Abrahamic promises are fulfilled and YHWH dwells with Israel in the land. Paul describes the church as living in the wilderness; they look back on redemption in Christ, and forward to ultimate restoration and salvation. They exist in an interim of partially-realised salvation. When Paul describes them as those upon whom the end of the ages has come, he invokes a sense of eschatology.<sup>35</sup> Could it be that Paul's two-stage eschatology is a new exodus eschatology? Is Paul describing the realisation of the prophetic new exodus hope? This passage hints in that direction.<sup>36</sup> We must keep these questions fresh in our minds as we turn to other passages in Paul and beyond.

---

<sup>33</sup> Piper 1957, p. 11.

<sup>34</sup> This can be seen everywhere throughout Paul's letters. Paul understands the *present* age to be evil, or under the control of evil (1 Cor 2:6, 3:18, 2 Cor 4:4, Gal 1:4) and looks forward to future eschatological events (Rom 8:18-25; 1 Thess 5:1-6 etc.), yet he also speaks as if salvation has taken place (2 Cor 5:17; 1 Cor 6:11; Col 3:1; Gal 2:20; Eph 2:4-10 etc.), and describes his own time as the eschatological age and an age of transition or overlap (Rom 8:21-22; 1 Cor 10:11; Phil 1:3-6 etc.) the birth pangs have begun! We shall see this notion in more detail as we explore Romans 8 and Ephesians 1-2 in the next 2 chapters.

<sup>35</sup> 1 Cor 10:11; Ciampa & Rosner 2010, p. 465.

<sup>36</sup> Oropeza thinks so, and says that the church is in a state of "eschatological liminality", on the "now" journey to the "not yet" kingdom. Oropeza 1999, p. 82; Piper 1957, p. 11.

## 9. Sons & Heirs in Rome

Leaving behind the overt allusions of in 1 Corinthians 10, we look to the book of Romans. We will focus primarily on Romans 8, a theologically charged passage widely recognised to be one of Paul's most carefully composed passages. To begin, let us turn to Romans 8:14-17. If there is allusion here it is not so overt as that in 1 Corinthians 10. We will need to employ our criteria.

Paul says at Romans 8:14 that the Romans are led by God's spirit. Earlier chapters noted the notion of leading in Exodus and Isaiah, and some consider forms of ἄγω to be technical exodus vocabulary from the LXX.<sup>1</sup> Derivatives of ἄγω are prevalent in exodus contexts, but they are also frequent in other situations: ἄγω is far too common to sustain the claim. Since it is leading *by God's spirit*, however, we may entertain the thought of an allusion to Isaiah 63:14 – “A spirit came down from the lord and guided (ὠδήγησεν) them.”<sup>2</sup> Thus you led (ἡγάγες) your people.” Isaiah is revisiting the exodus in order to frame new exodus hope. Romans 8 and Isaiah 63 both speak of glory, spirit, and God as father.<sup>3</sup> Paul certainly knew Isaiah, quoting it nineteen times in Romans alone.<sup>4</sup> On these grounds, an allusion is very plausible.<sup>5</sup> Strength and satisfaction are harder to ascertain, so we cannot make a firm conclusion.

---

<sup>1</sup> Keesmaat 1994 cites de la Potterie who makes that claim, but Keesmaat herself softens the force of the claim by saying leading words occur “most prominently” in exodus or new exodus contexts. This is still something of an overstatement – the words are simply too generic and used too widely to sustain such an assertion. It is fair to say that when leading appears alongside sonship there is a good case that we might be dealing with an exodus concept. Keesmaat 1994, pp. 38, 40; cf. Keesmaat 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Keesmaat 1994.

<sup>3</sup> Rom 8:15, 17; Isa 63:10-11, 14-16.

<sup>4</sup> Hays 2005, p. 39.

<sup>5</sup> That is, the criteria of availability and recurrence support the overall criterion of plausibility. NA<sup>28</sup> identifies one allusion to Isa. 63:10 in Eph. 4:30, but no other references to that chapter in the Pauline literature. From the surrounding chapters, Isa. 64:3 (LXX) is evoked in 1 Cor. 2:9, and Isa 65 numerous times (Rom. 10:20-21; 1 Cor. 2:9; 10:21; 15:58; Phil. 2:16).

Those led by the spirit are sons of God.<sup>6</sup> They are his children, have a spirit of adoption (as opposed to slavery), and call him father.<sup>7</sup> The association of fatherhood, childhood, and leading brings Deuteronomy 32 to mind.<sup>8</sup> Deuteronomy 32 is clearly significant to Paul, for he cites it in Romans 10 and 15, and connected it to the wilderness in 1 Corinthians 10.<sup>9</sup> There is conceptual and lexical correspondence, but quite low distinctiveness. As with Isaiah 63, we cannot be sure.

Romans 8:22-23 mentions groaning. Groaning (*στενάζω, στεναγμός*) is usually found when Israel is oppressed, as in the beginning of Exodus.<sup>10</sup> Exodus 2-4 and Romans 8 both feature groaning, leading, and adoption/sonship.<sup>11</sup> Christ as firstborn in Romans 8 may reflect Israel as firstborn in Exodus 4:4. Again, these parallels are not strong or distinctive enough to say Paul is alluding to that particular passage.<sup>12</sup>

An allusion to LXX Jeremiah 38 has also been suggested.<sup>13</sup> There we find the firstborn, leading, fatherhood, and groaning.<sup>14</sup> Conceptual agreement is strong and there are several lexical parallels, but Paul is generally more likely to cite Deuteronomy or Isaiah than Jeremiah.

No one passage clearly sits behind Romans 8. There are, however, striking similarities to several different new exodus passages. This collection of ideas and themes would make sense if Paul had the exodus (but perhaps not a specific text) in mind.<sup>15</sup> This suggestion

---

<sup>6</sup> Rom 8:14; sons: *υἱοί*.

<sup>7</sup> Rom 8:15-16; children: *τέκνα*; adoption: *υἰοθεσία* (here as genitive form *υἰοθεσίας*); slavery *δουλεία* (here *δουλείας*).

<sup>8</sup> Deut 32:5-66, 12, 19-20; Keesmaat 1999, p. 60; Keesmaat 1994, p. 39.

<sup>9</sup> Rom 10:19; 15:10; 1 Cor 10:20-22.

<sup>10</sup> Exod 2:23, 6:5.

<sup>11</sup> Exod 2:23-24; 3:8, 10-12, 17; 4:22-23; Rom 8:14-16; 22-23; Scott contends that *υἰοθεσία* means adoption, not just sonship. Scott 1992, p. 267.

<sup>12</sup> These terms are spread across 3 chapters of Exodus. There is clearly some conceptual agreement between Romans and the story of Exodus, but there can be no firm case for direct dependence when the terms in Exodus are not all found in close proximity.

<sup>13</sup> Keesmaat 1994, pp. 40-41.

<sup>14</sup> LXX Jer 38:8-9, 19.

<sup>15</sup> Wright 2013, p. 659.



is reinforced by the presence of further exodus motifs. As children, the Romans are *κληρονόμοι*, inheritors.<sup>16</sup> Inheritance vocabulary is strongly associated with the promised land in the LXX.<sup>17</sup> Leading and inheritance appear together in exodus contexts like LXX Psalm 104 and Exodus 15:17. Paul asserts that the Romans do *not* have a spirit of slavery, and that creation is enslaved to ruin. As creation groans for liberation, the Romans groan for *redemption* (*ἀπολύτρωσις*). The lone occurrence of *ἀπολύτρωσις* in the LXX is not exodus-related, but variations on the root (*λυτρόω*) commonly denote exodus redemption.<sup>18</sup> The term for slavery is *δουλεία*, the standard word for Israel's Egyptian bondage through most of the LXX.<sup>19</sup>

Many terms and concepts in Romans 8 suggest an exodus allusion, but a few possible exceptions must be considered. The origin of Paul's slavery concept in Romans is debated.<sup>20</sup> Some consider it informed by Israel's story, especially the exodus. Others associate it with Graeco-Roman chattel slavery. In Romans 6:18, 6:22, 8:1 and 8:21, Paul's word for *liberation* from slavery is *ἐλευθερόω*. This word appears at only three places in the LXX, none of which concern the exodus.<sup>21</sup> Though it would not be the most obvious exodus word to use, the lexical range of the word (which addresses liberation of

---

<sup>16</sup> Rom 8:17.

<sup>17</sup> Wright 1999, p. 30; Wright 2013, p. 730; Exod 6:8; 15:17; 23:30; Lev 20:24; Num 13:3; 33:15; 34:2; 36:2; Deut 1:21, 38; 3:20; 4:14, 26; 6:1; 9:4, 23; 11:8-11; 23:20; Josh 21:43; 23:5; 1 Chr 28:8; Jdt 5:15; Tob 4:12; Pss 36; 104:44; Amos 2:10; Isa 34:17; 60:21 etc.

<sup>18</sup> Dan 4:34; Wright 2013, p. 845; For a brief discussion of the significance of *λυτρόω* as exodus terminology, see chapter 5 footnote 28.

<sup>19</sup> This association has been overstated: Keesmaat follows Noth in suggesting that almost half of the occurrences of *δουλεία* in the LXX refer to the exodus. By my count, it is closer to a third: 16 of 45 instances of *δουλεία* refer to the exodus, though a couple more may be indirect references. This, however, is still a sizeable proportion, and enough that we should always consider the possible exodus overtones – especially when speaking of corporate slavery, and a movement from slavery to sonship. We should also recognise that the LXX Pentateuch does not merely translate *עַבְדּוּת* to *δουλεία* in every instance, especially in the Pentateuch. Keesmaat 1994, p. 43; Keesmaat 1999, pp. 66-67; John K. Goodrich 2013, "From Slaves of Sin to Slaves of God: Reconsidering the Origin of Paul's Slavery Metaphor in Romans 6", *BBR*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 509-530, esp. pp. 521-522, 524.

<sup>20</sup> See Goodrich 2013 for a helpful discussion of the hypotheses of Greco-Roman origin, Jewish origin, and (as Goodrich rightly proposes) combined influence of both backgrounds. Goodrich 2013, esp. pp. 519-520, 530.

<sup>21</sup> 2 Mac 1:27; 2:22; Prov 25:1; The same root also provides us with *ἐλεύθερος*, used to refer to free people, sometimes in contexts of manumission. In one instance (1 Macc 10:33) it refers to the liberation of a group of slaves. We should be wary about isolating the concept of individual slavery and corporate slavery too far: in Leviticus and Exodus the corporate slavery is invoked to justify conduct regarding individual slaves, and the various terms and concepts of slavery were blended in their metaphorical use in the Hellenistic era. Goodrich 2013, pp. 519, 530.

diaspora slaves and a city in 2 Maccabees 1:27 and 2:22 respectively) makes it a viable term for describing the exodus. Importantly, Josephus *does* describe the exodus with the noun *ἐλεύθερος*.<sup>22</sup> Paul's use of *ἐλευθερόω* neither proves nor disproves an exodus allusion.<sup>23</sup>

In chapter 6, Paul's slave discourse concerns allegiance and service rather than ownership.<sup>24</sup> Baptism and salvation move people from *δουλεία* under Sin to *δουλεία* under Righteousness, under God.<sup>25</sup> LXX Exodus never describes Israel's service of *God* as *δουλεία*, but it certainly featured the notion of transferred service: the exodus was a movement from serving Pharaoh to serving God.<sup>26</sup> Other texts *do* use *δοῦλος* language of Israel serving God, sometimes in exodus contexts.<sup>27</sup> Even were this not the case, and allowing that Graeco-Roman slavery may have shaped Paul's concepts, we must remember the simple reality that slavery had powerful ideological connotations in Jewish exodus tradition. As Wright notes, "in Judaism in general any story about slaves

---

<sup>22</sup> Josephus *Ant.* 2.16.4; 3.10.5; 4.2.4.

<sup>23</sup> Goodrich argues that the language of *ἐλευθερόω* cannot be drawn from an exodus background, but we cannot exclude conceptual overlap or a use by Paul that resembles that of Josephus. Goodrich 2013, pp. 524-525.

<sup>24</sup> Moo 1996, p. 400; Goodrich 2013, pp. 516-518; Goodrich discusses this matter while considering the work of Byron and Holland. Holland 2010, pp. 74-77.

<sup>25</sup> Sin here is capitalised because Paul has personified it as an agent. Rom 6:16-19, 22; Though *δουλεία* was commonly used in the LXX for the Egyptian slavery, it is relatively rare in the Pentateuch – it seems that the early translators did not consider *δουλεία* to have the same semantic range as *עַבְדּוּת*, and did not think *δουλεία* always a fitting translation. This probably suggests a concern that Greek categories of slavery would not provide the right sense or emphasis. Over time, other translators were apparently less concerned with this discrepancy, or perhaps did not see a discrepancy at all. We can allow that Greco-Roman slavery institutions and concepts would have shaped Paul to some degree, and perhaps affected his understanding of the exodus. This is nothing more than a recognition that Judaism (especially diaspora Judaism) was substantially Hellenised, not sealed off from its world. Accepting some Greco-Roman influence does not render invalid the conclusion that Paul is evoking the exodus.

<sup>26</sup> Goodrich 2013, p. 516; This notion was certainly present in the Hebrew text, and it is likely that Paul knew the Hebrew even if he worked directly from Greek texts. Holland may not be correct that *δοῦλος* language is exactly equivalent to *עַבְדּוּת*, but this does not mean that it can never be used to describe the same movement or concept.

<sup>27</sup> LXX Pss 104:6, 25; 134:14; Isa 56:6; 63:17; 65:19; Dan 9:15; cf. Deut 32:36; Neh 1:6; 2 Mac 7:6; There are many more examples of Israel being called God's slaves – these are only those which come in exodus and new exodus contexts.

and how they come to be free must be seen at once as an allusion to the events of the Exodus.”<sup>28</sup> To speak of the liberation of God’s people is to evoke an exodus concept.<sup>29</sup>

Paul’s notion of adoption also has disputed origins. The concept of sonship was prominent in Exodus, but *υιοθεσία* never appears in the LXX. This term would have been more familiar to Rome with reference to a Greco-Roman institution of adoption. Since the work of James M. Scott in 1992, however, it is widely recognised that the sonship or adoption described here is conceptually grounded in the sonship of Israel, and especially in the exodus.<sup>30</sup>

Romans 8 features an impressive array of exodus material. There is a contrast between slavery and sonship, and mention of groaning, redemption, leading, inheritance, and creational restoration.<sup>31</sup> There is no strong agreement with a particular passage, but there are numerous conceptual and lexical parallels with the exodus in general – some more decisive than others.<sup>32</sup> The presence of all these images is best explained by the hypothesis that Paul’s outlook is shaped by the exodus paradigm.

Wright goes further, arguing that the exodus has an important role in Romans at large: Romans 3-8 rests on an exodus paradigm.<sup>33</sup> In Romans 6, Paul speaks of baptism as union with the death and life of Christ, and thus as the mechanism by which slaves are liberated from sin.<sup>34</sup> As Wright notes, this resembles the link between baptism and exodus in 1 Corinthians.<sup>35</sup> In Romans 7 we find a discussion of the law, and this is

---

<sup>28</sup> Wright 1999, p. 162; This is something of an overstatement; there evidently *is* some doubt, or else there would be no debate about the origin of the slave metaphor in Romans. Nonetheless, the point still stands; we cannot isolate Paul from his Jewish context or heritage, in which there was a strong tradition of appropriating the exodus paradigm.

<sup>29</sup> Wright is perhaps the most ardent defender of a link between baptism and exodus in Romans 6, but he was not the first to suggest it. Nixon 1963, p. 24; Sahlin 1953, pp. 87, 90-91.

<sup>30</sup> Scott 1992, *Adoption as Sons of God*, WUNT 2/48, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, esp. pp. 269; Keesmaat 1999, p. 163; cf. Morales 2010, pp. 116-117.

<sup>31</sup> We have not discussed creational restoration here, but this is a theme both in Exodus and in the new exodus passages in Isaiah.

<sup>32</sup> I have not mentioned tradition indication here. This is because there is none, but also because this criterion works only positively; the lack of tradition indication is not evidence against an allusion, so nothing needs to be made of its absence.

<sup>33</sup> Wright 1999; Wright 2013, p. 659.

<sup>34</sup> Rom 6:3-4, 10-11, 16-18; Wright 2013, pp. 422-423.

<sup>35</sup> Wright 1999, p. 29; Sahlin 1953, pp. 89-91.

followed by the emphasis in Romans 8 on leading and inheritance, and the ambiguity of the present age. Paul starts with the notion of being redeemed (through water) from slavery, before moving on to address law, and then sonship and inheritance. This looks like an exodus sequence.<sup>36</sup> But what of chapters 3-5?

Tom Holland does not argue for a narrative substructure, but he sees in chapter 3 (verses 21-26) a reference to the Passover. This is largely due to the word *πάρεσις*.<sup>37</sup> Though this *could* describe God “passing over” Israel in Egypt, nowhere in the Second Temple literature was it used that way.<sup>38</sup> Another line of argument says that the sacrificial imagery of this section is tied to the Passover. There is a reference to the propitiatory, the *ἱλαστήριον*, which would have more obvious connection to atonement sacrifices than to the Passover.<sup>39</sup> At the same time, we also encounter *ἀπολύτρωσις* (*redemption*). There is some scriptural precedent for a Passover with atoning sacrifices, in Ezekiel 45.<sup>40</sup> We also know that Paul considered Jesus a Passover lamb, whose death had atoning significance.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, this passage of Romans speaks of righteousness and redemption, and the only LXX verse featuring both of these terms is Exodus 15:13.<sup>42</sup> This does not amount to certainty, but it is feasible that Paul could have had exodus and Passover in mind when writing Rom 3:21-26.

Romans 4 is about the fulfilment of Abrahamic promises in Christ. Since the exodus was firmly associated with Abrahamic fulfilment, to speak of Abrahamic fulfilment may imply a new exodus in Christ. Paul’s reliance on Genesis 15 (which predicts the exodus)

---

<sup>36</sup> Wright 1999, p. 27.

<sup>37</sup> This appears in the accusative form *πάρεσιν* in 3:25.

<sup>38</sup> The word, or at least the related term *παρίημι*, is found in the LXX numerous times, and very often in Greek texts (including those of Josephus and Philo). I have not found any occasion on which any writer uses it to refer to the Passover.

<sup>39</sup> E.g. Lev 16:15; Tom Holland 2011, *Romans: The Divine Marriage: A Biblical Theological Commentary*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene 2011, p. 85; Moo 1996, p. 232; It may be that the literal “mercy seat” or propitiatory is in mind, but Moo rightly argues that we must not forget the broader signification of propitiation in this language – “sacrifice of atonement” is a good translation. Moo 1996, pp. 231-236.

<sup>40</sup> Ezek 45:21-25; Holland 2011, pp. 86-87.

<sup>41</sup> See ch. 8, fn. 20 above. Cf. 1 Cor 5:7; 10:26-21; 11:23-26; Holland 2011, p. 89; Boulton 2013, pp. 25-29.

<sup>42</sup> *λυτρώω; δικαιοσύνη*.

hints in that direction.<sup>43</sup> Chapter 5 is the “the bridge between the promise...and the fulfilment” in chapters 6-8, chapter 5 itself has only indirect exodus connections at best.<sup>44</sup>

The exodus connections in Romans 9 are more compelling.<sup>45</sup> This chapter opens with Paul’s wish to exchange his salvation for that of his kinsmen, mirroring Moses in Exodus 32:31-34.<sup>46</sup> Then comes a list of Israel’s privileges: adoption, glory, covenant, law, worship, and promises.<sup>47</sup> The fathers and Christ are *Israel’s* fathers and *Israel’s* Christ, yet not all descended from Abraham qualify as the true Israel.<sup>48</sup> These ideas were central to Jewish identity, and several relate to the exodus. Importantly, Paul has just applied these same blessings to the church (in his new exodus framework), signifying that they are realised not in Israel *κατὰ σάρκα*, but in the new Israel in Christ.<sup>49</sup>

More ought to be said, but we must sum up the argument and draw some conclusions. The exodus might be present in chapter 3. Chapter 4 paves the way for a new exodus in Christ. Chapters 6-8 provide an exposition of this new exodus, before chapter 9 confirms the church as a new Israel. Yet what do these allusions actually reveal?

First, they confirm that Paul saw Christian salvation as a new exodus that fulfils God’s promises. Christian baptism, salvation, redemption operated rather like the first exodus, creating a community. There is no clear dependence on specific prophetic texts, but there are hints (spirit, new creation, restored sonship, and his general dependence on Isaiah) that Paul may be influenced by prophetic exodus eschatology.

Second, the exodus locates the Romans in Paul’s eschatological schema. They are children led by the spirit and awaiting their inheritance.<sup>50</sup> They are God’s people in the

---

<sup>43</sup> Rom 4:6, 13, 16, 18; cf. Gen 15:13-14; Wright 1999, pp. 30-31.

<sup>44</sup> Wright 1999, pp. 31, 33-34.

<sup>45</sup> The most overt reference to Exodus tradition in Rom 9 is the reference to God hardening Pharaoh in Rom 9:14-18. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of the present study to cover that material as well.

<sup>46</sup> Rom 9:3.

<sup>47</sup> Rom 9:4-8; Note especially that *υιοθεσία* is used with clear reference to the sonship of Israel.

<sup>48</sup> Rom 9:4-8; Witherington 1994, pp. 57, 60.

<sup>49</sup> Rom 8:9-39; 9:3.

<sup>50</sup> Wright 2013, p. 659.

wilderness between ages.<sup>51</sup> Paul expects the exodus paradigm to influence Christian identity and worldview.

Third, the new exodus distinguishes the church from Israel. Paul claims the promises and their exodus-shaped fulfilment for those in Christ, not ethnic Israel. This is most evident in the discussion of law in 7:1-8:11. The law appears at the place we would expect in the new exodus sequence, but its significance is reversed. Law is not a constitutive covenant marker accompanying redemption: it is itself an oppressor. The new exodus is an exodus *from* the law.

Though we cannot dedicate a full chapter to Galatians, we should briefly note several ways in which it resembles Romans with regard to exodus influence. Galatians 4 is a good place to begin. In verse 5 we read that God's son was sent to redeem and adopt those under law.<sup>52</sup> The adopted have the spirit of the son and cry to God as father. They are now heirs, not slaves.<sup>53</sup> This scheme aligns well with that in Romans, where Christians are people of a new exodus, a new exodus *from* the law. The eschatological sense appears when Paul states that all this happened at the fullness of time.<sup>54</sup>

The new exodus framework is found elsewhere in Galatians, too.<sup>55</sup> In 5:1 Paul urges his audience not to return to slavery.<sup>56</sup> He goes on to stress that the Galatians are free, but this freedom is for love and service. Paul associates baptism with a movement from imprisonment under law to sonship in 3:23-29.<sup>57</sup> In 3:13 he says the Galatians were redeemed from the law's curse by Christ. Interestingly, chapter 3 stresses that the law did not fulfil the Abrahamic promise; that promise has not been replaced, annulled, or

---

<sup>51</sup> Wright 2013, p. 477.

<sup>52</sup> The word for redeem here is not *λυτρόω* but a form of *ἐξαγοράζω*, which does not have such strong exodus connotations. Nonetheless, we are still speaking of a transfer from slavery to sonship and inheritance.

<sup>53</sup> In Gal 3:23-25, Paul *does* draw on Graeco-Roman slavery practices in speaking of the law as a *παιδαγωγός* for God's people. Nonetheless, there is a good case (again on the basis of Scott's work) that slavery in Galatians still intends to evoke the exodus.

<sup>54</sup> Gal 4:4; For detailed discussion of the slavery and adoption here see Scott 1992, esp. pp. 149-155

<sup>55</sup> Wright 2013, p. 424.

<sup>56</sup> Wright highlights that this is a charge to not return to Egypt. Wright 2013, p. 719.

<sup>57</sup> Wright 2013, p. 1070.

fulfilled until Christ.<sup>58</sup> The exodus did not achieve fulfilment of the promise, and a new exodus from exile was required.<sup>59</sup>

In Romans, Paul portrayed Christian salvation as a new exodus. The promises and privileges of the exodus are realised not in national Israel, but in those liberated by Christ. A similar situation can be seen in Galatians. At this point, it may be possible to draw conclusions about how Paul's worldview was influenced by the exodus story. The purpose of this study, however, is to synthesise a variety of Pauline and non-Pauline material in comparison with Jewish texts. To that end, we continue to another letter.

---

<sup>58</sup> Gal 3:15-19.

<sup>59</sup> Wright 2013, p. 1140.





## 10. Redemption Realised in Ephesus

The next text we will consider is Ephesians. Though some avoid Ephesians due to its disputed authorship, there is no reason why we should do so. If Paul wrote Ephesians – and I think that most likely – it can help us evaluate Paul’s thought across different times and situations. If not by Paul, it will reveal the influence of the exodus on some of Paul’s followers.

Scholars of typology in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century (like Nixon and Piper) generally overlooked Ephesians, but most commentators now recognise exodus elements therein.<sup>1</sup> Some go further, arguing that the exodus had a substantial role in shaping Ephesians, especially the first two chapters. Wright has made that point on several occasions, but only briefly and without showing much working.<sup>2</sup> By contrast, Richard M. Cozart’s monograph on the subject is technical but not always convincing.<sup>3</sup> His emphasis on eschatological triumph is helpful, but sometimes his reconstruction rests on loose connections that cannot bear the weight he requires of them.<sup>4</sup> Between Wright and Cozart sits David Starling, whose piece is shorter and simpler than Cozart but more technical than Wright’s.<sup>5</sup> Nonetheless, some of his claims require more nuance than he provides.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Frank Thielman and P. T. O’Brien, for example, both recognise exodus elements but do not articulate any extended notion of exodus as a metanarrative. Thielman 2010, *Ephesians*, BECNT, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, p. 59; O’Brien 1999, pp. 102, 105.

<sup>2</sup> Wright 2003, pp. 236; Wright 2013, p. 730.

<sup>3</sup> Cozart 2013, *This Present Triumph: An Investigation into the Significance of the Promise of a New Exodus of Israel in the Letter to the Ephesians*, WEST Theological Monograph Series, vol. 5, Wipf & Stock, Eugene

<sup>4</sup> Examples of Cozart’s overreach can be seen in and around Cozart 2013, loc. 1181, 1264, 1861, 3455, 3503, 3694. At times his scholarship is not particularly careful. An example can be seen at when he explains that there are substantial differences between the works of Ezekiel the Tragedian and Ezekiel the Dramatist. In fact, there can be no difference, for they are one and the same. He is dependent here upon Grabbe, who once calls Ezekiel a Dramatist and once calls him a Tragedian. Even in Grabbe, however, it is clear that these terms refer to the same author. Cozart has made a factually false claim due to a misreading of a secondary source and a failure to check what he thought it was saying against other scholarship, ancient evidence, or even the pages that he cites from Grabbe! Cozart 2013, loc. 1302; Grabbe 2000, pp. 55, 77.

<sup>5</sup> Starling 2014, “Ephesians and the Hermeneutics of the New Exodus”, in Fox (ed.), pp. 139-159; This essay was modified from part of his earlier work on Paul and the concept of exile.

<sup>6</sup> For example, his argument could be strengthened by more detailed lexical analysis of the exodus terminology in chapter 1 (p. 142), clearer articulation of the new exodus sense of prophetic passages

Following the lead of those studies, this chapter evaluates the significance of the exodus for Ephesians.

Ephesians 1:3-14 features a *berakah* listing blessings received in Christ. God has blessed, chosen, predestined and lavished his grace upon the church. They possess redemption and an inheritance. In 1:20-2:7, we read that Christ is established as ruler over all, and that the church has been raised with him and seated in the heavenlies. These things are *already* achieved or possessed. Despite this present emphasis, there is also clear expectation for the future. The spirit is a deposit until the inheritance is redeemed, and there is mention of “the age to come.”<sup>7</sup> We read of a “plan for the fullness of time,” but it is not entirely clear whether it has yet been realised.<sup>8</sup> Ephesians 1-2 outlines an inaugurated eschatology, though there is a greater emphasis upon the *already* than the *not yet*.<sup>9</sup>

Earlier we asked whether Paul’s inaugurated eschatology was tied to an exodus paradigm of Christian salvation. To answer that same question for Ephesians, we can begin by bringing our criteria of allusiveness to the *berakah* in chapter 1. In the absence of an obvious allusion to a particular text, we will look for terms and concepts that align with the exodus matrix.

First, consider ἐξελέξατο (from ἐκλέγομαι, *elect*) in 1:4. This term is not exclusive to exodus contexts, but on several occasions it does denote the election of Israel in the exodus.<sup>10</sup> Peter T. O’Brien considers the exodus important background at this point. Alone, however, this link is not decisive.<sup>11</sup>

In 1:11 and 1:14 we encounter the language of inheritance, used in the LXX to describe the promised land and the fulfilment of Abrahamic promise. In 1:14 this clearly refers to

---

invoked in chapter 2 (p. 144), and more substantial argumentation to establish the connection between the divine warrior imagery in Isaiah and Exodus (pp. 148-149).

<sup>7</sup> Eph 1:14, 21.

<sup>8</sup> Eph 1:10; Wright links this “fullness of time” with the fullness of time in Gal 4:4.

<sup>9</sup> Cozart 2013, loc. 3288; Thielman 2010, p. 109; O’Brien 1999, pp. 105, 114-115, 169.

<sup>10</sup> Num 16:5; Deut 4:37; 7:7; Ps 134:4 (LXX); cf. Isa 43:20.

<sup>11</sup> O’Brien 1999, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, PilNTC, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 99-102.

the inheritance of God's people, and thus bears the connotations of Abrahamic fulfilment and the end of the exodus.<sup>12</sup> O'Brien proposes that verse 11 describes the church being taken as God's inheritance (as in Deuteronomy 32) since the verb *ἐκληρώθημεν* is passive.<sup>13</sup> This is possible, but not certain.<sup>14</sup> In any case, Deuteronomy 32 is linked with new exodus concepts in 1 Corinthians 10 and Romans 8, and Israel was sometimes described as God's inheritance in exodus contexts.<sup>15</sup> To speak of election and inheritance brings to mind Abraham and especially (given the corporate sense of election and inheritance) the exodus.

We have previously noted that *υἱοθεσίαν* (present at 1:5) elsewhere derives from Israel's exodus sonship.<sup>16</sup> Apart from this reference in Ephesians, the NT features *υἱοθεσίαν* only at Galatians 4:5 and Romans 8:15, 8:23, and 9:4 – all passages with exodus background.<sup>17</sup> This term alone is highly suggestive, for it seems to have linked Israel's sonship, eschatology, and new exodus in Pauline thought.<sup>18</sup>

In 1:7 we encounter a form of *ἀπολύτρωσις*. The word was discussed regarding Romans 8:23. It has no exodus application in the LXX, but it is etymologically related to exodus terminology.<sup>19</sup> Commentators generally agree that there are exodus resonances here.<sup>20</sup>

Beyond the points of lexical agreement, there is also broader conceptual agreement. In this passage we find election to holiness, adoption, redemption, forgiveness, manifestation of God's will, and inheritance. These are exodus themes in proper new exodus sequence. Though forgiveness is not an element we have yet discussed, there are

---

<sup>12</sup> This notion was discussed in the previous chapter. O'Brien 1999, p. 121; Starling 2014, p. 139

<sup>13</sup> O'Brien 1999, p. 115

<sup>14</sup> Thielman 2010, p. 73

<sup>15</sup> Deut 32:9; 4:20; 9:29; Ps 105:40 (LXX); 1 Kgs 8:53; Isa 63:17; See also MT Exod 34:9 for the notion of Israel as God's inheritance in the exodus.

<sup>16</sup> See discussion of Rom 8:15 (and 8:23 and 9:4) in the previous chapter. Thielman 2010, p. 52

<sup>17</sup> For this see chapter 9 above, especially pp. 91-94.

<sup>18</sup> Thielman 2010, p. 52

<sup>19</sup> See chapter 5, footnote 28. Cf. Wright 2013, p. 845

<sup>20</sup> Thielman 2010, pp. 58-59; O'Brien 1999, pp. 105-106; Starling 2014, p. 142

hints of this theme in Exodus, and it is found in prophetic new exodus passages.<sup>21</sup> This coalition of exodus themes and terms, all in exodus sequence, amounts to a fairly strong case for allusion.

Unlike Ephesians 1, chapter 2 does draw on specific texts. The chapter as a whole evokes the breathtaking eschatological vision of Ezekiel 36-37. Ezekiel 36 repeatedly states that exiled Israelites live *among the nations*, and stresses Israel's disobedience.<sup>22</sup> God promises to his people, cleanse them from sin, restore them, and multiply them in the land.<sup>23</sup> He will make a new covenant of peace, and put a new spirit and heart in them that they may obey it.<sup>24</sup> Like the exodus events, all this happens that God might be recognised.<sup>25</sup> The hope outlined in Ezekiel 36 is then illustrated in chapter 37. Scattered bones are brought back together, and the dead come alive – a symbol for the re-creation of Israel.<sup>26</sup> Two sticks are joined together, representing the union of two nations into one.<sup>27</sup> The chapter ends with a promise of a Davidic ruler, possession of the land, a covenant of peace, God's presence in a new sanctuary, and the nations recognising the Lord.<sup>28</sup>

The parallels in Ephesians 2 are striking.<sup>29</sup> The Ephesians were dead, and living sinfully among the sons of disobedience, but God made them alive.<sup>30</sup> Lexically speaking, there are a few points of agreement: *νεκροὺς* links with *νεκροὺς*; *συνεζωοποίησεν* with forms of

---

<sup>21</sup> Exod 32:32; 34:7; Neh 9:17; Jer 31:34 (38:34 LXX); Ezek 16:63; 36:25; cf. LXX Ps 129 Starling 2014, p. 143

<sup>22</sup> In Ezek 36:19-23, this notion of Israel being in or among the nations appears six times. Starling 2014, p. 145.

<sup>23</sup> Ezek 36:8, 10-11, 24-29, 33.

<sup>24</sup> Ezek 36:26-27.

<sup>25</sup> Ezek 36:11, 23, 37; 37:13-14, 28; Cozart 2013, loc. 12558.

<sup>26</sup> Ezek 37:1-14.

<sup>27</sup> Ezek 37:19-23.

<sup>28</sup> Ezek 37:24-28.

<sup>29</sup> This correspondence is the theme of Suh's 2006 doctoral dissertation. Robert H. S. Suh, 2006, *One New Humanity in Christ: The use of Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2*, Doctoral Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; Cozart 2014, loc. 4142; Starling 2014, p. 145.

<sup>30</sup> Eph 2:2-3, 5; The sons of disobedience among whom the Ephesians once lived (Eph 2:2-3) are to be identified with *τὰ ἔθνη* of Eph 4:17. Starling 2014, p. 145.

ζάω; ἀμαρτίαις with ἡμάρτοσαν.<sup>31</sup> The Gentiles were far away but now they have been brought near, they are no longer strangers to the promises and covenant of Israel.<sup>32</sup> Christ has brought peace, making two into one.<sup>33</sup> The gathering of Israel and unification with Judah has been recast (or fulfilled) as the gathering of the Gentiles and their unification with the Jews!<sup>34</sup> There are several mentions of the spirit, and Ephesians 2 ends with God dwelling in a new sanctuary, that of the believers being built up on Christ.<sup>35</sup>

There is one final lexical tie between this new temple and Ezekiel 37. In the valley, each bone is described approaching its joint, ἀρμονίαν.<sup>36</sup> This word is found only twice in the LXX. The noun is never in the LXX, but a verbalised form with a favourite Pauline prefix (συναρμολογουμένη) is found just twice, at Eph 2:21 and 4:16.<sup>37</sup> In 4:16 the church is described as a body, building itself up and held *together* by joints. Ephesians 2 and 4 both employ bodily image for the church, and both use this modified Ezekiel 37 word to describe the building of the church. The hope for national restoration that was illustrated in Ezekiel 37 has found its fulfilment in the church. The body built from scattered parts is a new Israel in Christ.<sup>38</sup>

The focus on return from exile is also seen in Ephesians 2:17. That verse says that Christ “preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near.” This is a composite citation of Isaiah 52:7 and 57:19.<sup>39</sup> In 57:19, Isaiah describes peace for exiled

---

<sup>31</sup> Ezek 37:9 & Eph 2:1, 5; Ezek 37:3, 6, 9-10, 14 & Eph 2:5; Ezek 37:23 & Eph 2:1; None of these are particularly distinct as lexical references, but they show close conceptual agreement. Though *συνεζωοποίησεν* looks rather different to the forms of ζάω found in Ezek 37, this form is what we might expect if Paul (or some other Pauline writer) started with ζάω, verbalised it (with ποιέω), and added a favourite preposition (σύν) as a prefix. Suh 2006, pp. 55-62, 83.

<sup>32</sup> Eph 2:12-13; Though there is some agreement with the gathering notion of Ezekiel 37-37 here, there is a closer correspondence to the gathering described in Isaiah, as we will shortly see.

<sup>33</sup> Eph 2:15-16.

<sup>34</sup> Cozart 2013, p. 4142.

<sup>35</sup> Eph 2:18-21; Suh 2006, pp. 77-78.

<sup>36</sup> Ezek 37:7.

<sup>37</sup> This is a very similar situation to *συνεζωοποίησεν* in Eph 2:5 – see footnote 28 above. Suh 2006, pp. 63-64.

<sup>38</sup> Suh 2006, p. 133, 146.

<sup>39</sup> Starling 2014, pp. 146-147; Thielman 2010, p. 158.

Israel, and 52:7 mentions the *preaching* of peace. The post-exilic peace foretold by Isaiah (and Ezekiel, see Ezek 37:26) is now realised in Christ. Given that both Isaiah 52 and Ezekiel 36-37 are new exodus passages, and Ephesians 1 drew on a new exodus paradigm, we are amply justified in taking this as another statement of new exodus fulfilment.<sup>40</sup>

Since the exodus was a powerful identity narrative for Israel, it is not surprising to find it present when Jews explored or articulated matters of identity. Just as the exodus framed identity, so a new exodus on different terms might serve to frame a new identity.<sup>41</sup> That is what we find when Ephesians 1 and 2 are considered together. Chapter 1 recounts a new exodus (election, sonship, redemption, forgiveness, inheritance) and stresses the victory of Christ. Chapter 2 then explores the implications of that new exodus: those in Christ are eschatological Israel. As in Exodus, the result is God's presence in the sanctuary among his people.<sup>42</sup> The worldview and identity promoted in Ephesians 1-2 are grounded in a new exodus narrative, wherein prophetic hope is realised in Christ.<sup>43</sup>

This new exodus framework illuminates other passages in Ephesians as well. LXX Psalm 67 recounts Israel's exodus and exile, before depicting God as divine warrior and redeemer in a new exodus. That psalm is cited in Ephesians 4:8, applying the exodus warrior/redeemer paradigm to Christ. Ephesians 6:2-3 invokes Exodus 20:12, the command for children to be obedient and so enjoy long life in the land. Ephesians has already said that the law has been abolished, so it is odd to have now applied to Gentiles!<sup>44</sup> This makes most sense not just as a general, usually-true principal, but as part of the exodus typology wherein the promises given to Israel find their fulfilment in the church.<sup>45</sup> In 6:10-20 Christians are instructed to don the armour of God; the armour

---

<sup>40</sup> Cozart asserts that though Ezekiel is important, Isaiah is the dominant influence on Ephesians 2. In making this claim, however, Cozart provides very little justification. This may be a point at which Cozart's interest in the *Isaianic* new exodus is distorting his interpretation. Cozart 2013, loc. 3431-3435.

<sup>41</sup> Suh 2006, p. 46; Routledge 2014, p. 193.

<sup>42</sup> Starling 2014, p. 146.

<sup>43</sup> Wright 2003, p. 239; Starling 2014, pp. 147.

<sup>44</sup> Eph 2:15; Starling 2014, p. 156.

<sup>45</sup> Starling 2014, pp. 156-158; c. O'Brien 1999, p. 444 and Thielman 2010, pp. 400-401.

of the divine warrior and his messiah in Isaiah.<sup>46</sup> This may bear connotations of new exodus triumph, for divine warrior images are prominent in Isaiah and especially in Exodus 15.<sup>47</sup>

We have seen strong agreement with the matrix of new exodus ideas and terms, especially with Ezekiel and Isaiah. Now we must briefly consider plausibility and satisfaction. Exodus, Isaiah, and Ezekiel were certainly available in Greek in the first century, and use thereof recurs throughout Paul and other Christian authors. The citations of Exodus, LXX Psalm 68 and Isaiah 52 amount to a more general recurrence of exodus texts in Ephesians. There is no evidence that the early audiences received Ephesians as a new exodus text, but reception is not decisive and we cannot know how the earliest recipients read it. Whether this reading is *satisfying* depends entirely on whether it makes sense of the elements and argument of Ephesians. We have proposed above that this is the case, especially in chapters 1-2.

We may conclude that Ephesians casts Christian salvation as an exodus-shaped fulfilment of Jewish eschatological hope. Its author understood the church to be a new people created through a new exodus in Christ – their identity was shaped by the prophetic fulfilment in Christ.<sup>48</sup> Not only does the exodus structure the development of Ephesians 1-2, it seems to sit deep in the worldview of the writer.

---

<sup>46</sup> Isa 11:5; 59:17; 52:7.

<sup>47</sup> Exod 15, esp. vv. 3, 6; Starling 2014, pp. 148-149; There is also a possible link of divine warrior imagery with the conquest narrative, which can certainly be construed as part of the exodus story.

<sup>48</sup> Suh 2006, p. 46.





## 11. Elect Exiles in Roman Asia

Of the general epistles, 1 Peter is most suited to our study. It features many allusions and citations, and it has been subject to narrative approaches. It is similar and different enough to make for fruitful comparison with Paul. As in previous chapters, our task is not to explain every element of 1 Peter, but to evaluate the role of the exodus for the text and its author.<sup>1</sup>

The first to address metanarrative in 1 Peter was M. Eugene Boring. In 1999 and 2007, he argued that Peter's theology is framed in a narrative world.<sup>2</sup> This world can supposedly be reconstructed by arranging the events Peter mentions (like the flood and the Parousia) into chronological sequence.<sup>3</sup> Green's approach is similar, but addresses worldview and identity.<sup>4</sup> He argues that Peter frames Christian identity through emplotment in a scriptural story of six parts: primordial time, ignorance, Jesus's revelation, liberation, alien living, and Jesus's final revelation.<sup>5</sup> Dryden also speaks of worldview and identity, positing a narrative substructure.<sup>6</sup> Peter is melding the grand story together with the story of his audience.<sup>7</sup> Joseph similarly proposes that listing events does not explain a story. Instead, he considers *fabula*, the story behind the story.

---

<sup>1</sup> There is no real need here to discuss the authorship of 1 Peter, for even if the writer had no association with the apostle, they still offer us a perspective from someone other than Paul. I will call the author Peter, for the sake of simplicity. For what it's worth, I do not think the case against Petrine authorship is so strong as many suppose. I see no chronological or theological problems locating the composition of the letter in Rome before the death of Peter. The strongest argument against Petrine authorship must be the language, for very few Galilean fishermen would have had known Greek well enough to write 1 Peter. Yet it would not be surprising for Peter to speak Greek, and he most likely did not physically pen the letters himself. We must allow for the influence of scribes or co-workers in shaping the letters, and recognise that the Greek does show traces of Semitic influence that accord with authorship by someone who spoke Greek as a second language. The claim of the letter to be written by Peter has been accepted since antiquity, and I am not compelled to reject it now. Jobs 2005, pp. 14-19.

<sup>2</sup> Boring 1999, p. 45; Boring 2007, esp. pp. 24, 27.

<sup>3</sup> Boring 2007, pp. 23-24; He claims that 1 Peter refers to some 264 events in the course of the letter! Boring 2007, p. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Joel B. Green 2006, "Narrating the Gospel in 1 and 2 Peter", *Int*, vol. 60, pp. 262-277, at p. 266; Green 2007, pp. 15, 46.

<sup>5</sup> Green 2007, pp. 200-201.

<sup>6</sup> Dryden 2006, pp. 66, 80.

<sup>7</sup> Dryden 2006, p. 68.

According to Joseph, the substructure of 1 Peter is a *fabula* of election, suffering, faithfulness, and vindication – a *fabula* common to Jesus, Israel, and the church.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, Patrick T. Egan proposes that an Isaianic paradigm of suffering and glory governs 1 Peter.<sup>9</sup> Against these readings, Sargent argues for a simple narrative of discontinuity which privileges the church over Israel.<sup>10</sup>

Despite their differences, these scholars agree on the significance of implied narrative, and the importance of Jewish scripture, for understanding 1 Peter.<sup>11</sup> Our concern is the relationship of exodus tradition to Peter's narratives. We turn, then, to 1 Peter 1:1-2:10. It is there that Peter lays the foundations of identity and theology for the rest of the letter.<sup>12</sup>

Peter's address identifies his audience as "elect exiles of the dispersion."<sup>13</sup> Though *παρεπίδημος* (exile) never refers to the exile or Egyptian sojourn in the LXX, there is some conceptual alignment with those situations.<sup>14</sup> The epistle also ends with a reference to Rome as Babylon, and there are a couple more instances of exile throughout.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, the indebtedness of this opening Jewish tradition is reinforced when Peter mentions election.<sup>16</sup> Karen H. Jobes makes a compelling case that

---

<sup>8</sup> Joseph 2013, p. 50.

<sup>9</sup> Egan 2011, *"This Word is the Gospel Preached to You": Ecclesiology and the Isaianic Narrative in 1 Peter*, doctoral dissertation, University of St Andrews, esp. pp. 44, 46-49.

<sup>10</sup> Sargent 2013, esp. pp. 488-489.

<sup>11</sup> Though he does not speak of worldview or metanarrative and his commentary is very brief, Paul Barnett also warrants mention here for his notion that "Peter sees the 'story' of Israel being spiritually repeated in the experience of Christian believers." Paul W. Barnett 2006, *Living Hope: Reading 1 Peter Today*, Aquila Press, Sydney, p. 138, cf. pp. 139-144.

<sup>12</sup> Goppelt 1993 [1978], p. 20; Dryden 2006, pp. 68-69.

<sup>13</sup> 1 Pet 1:1.

<sup>14</sup> Goppelt and Joseph both make a thematic connection to Israel in Egypt. A connection to the exile fits more directly, but we should not forget the conceptual overlap between these categories in Jewish thought. Goppelt 1993 [1978], p. 19; Joseph 2013, p. 59, 95; Jobes 2005, p. 44.

<sup>15</sup> 1 Pet 1:17, 2:11; 5:13; Green 2007, p. 34; Paul Achtemeier 1996, *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*, Hermeneia, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, p. 70; Jobes 2005, p. 14.

<sup>16</sup> Green 2007, p. 17; Through the rest of the epistle it is almost axiomatic that those chosen by God are strangers to those around them.

Peter's audience were Jewish Christians literally displaced from Rome under Claudius.<sup>17</sup> If she is correct, the language of exile is used to reconcile their socio-political situation with their election. Even if she is wrong, the exile metaphor still characterises the situation of Christians in a hostile environment in Roman Asia.<sup>18</sup>

The next verse features an Exodus allusion. Peter's audience are those sanctified "εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ."<sup>19</sup> The function of the Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is disputed. A telic objective genitive makes sense regarding obedience, but not the sprinkling of blood – what would it mean to be sanctified *for* the sprinkling of blood *to* Jesus?<sup>20</sup> It is implausible to suppose that the genitive could be objective for obedience but possessive regarding the blood.<sup>21</sup> Taking both as possessive with causal force would make for easy translation, but most scholars reject that εἰς can be causative.<sup>22</sup> Recognising that blood-sprinkling and obedience were key elements in the covenant ratification in Exodus 24:3-8, it is best to see this as an allusive hendiadys about covenant formation.<sup>23</sup> This allows a telic possessive genitive; sanctification for covenant obedience. The exodus *story* is not necessarily invoked, but Exodus and covenant are invoked.<sup>24</sup>

Peter supposes that through Jesus's resurrection, the Father has given Christians new birth into an imperishable inheritance.<sup>25</sup> Since the language of inheritance was associated with Israel's possession of the promised land, this should be seen as a

---

<sup>17</sup> Jobes 2005, *1 Peter*, BECNT, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, pp. 28-41; Carson 2007, p. 1016.

<sup>18</sup> Green 2007, p. 16; Goppelt 1993 [1978], pp. 67-68; Jobes 2005, p. 62

<sup>19</sup> Translated in the NET as "for obedience and for sprinkling with Jesus Christ's blood." 1Pet 1:2

<sup>20</sup> Carson 2007, p. 1016

<sup>21</sup> Carson 2007, p. 1016

<sup>22</sup> This proposal was first made in F. H. Agnew 1983, "1 Peter 1:2 – An Alternative Translation", *CBQ*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 68-73. Both Green and Joseph find it compelling. Most, however, are not convinced, and Achtemeier went so far as to call this notion a "grammatical monstrosity." Achtemeier 1996, pp. 87-88; Carson 2007, p. 1016; Jobes 2005, pp. 75-76, c. Agnew 1983, esp. pp. 69-70; Green 2007, p. 20; Joseph 2013, p. 60

<sup>23</sup> Carson 2007, p. 1017

<sup>24</sup> Achtemeier 1996, pp. 89-90; Jobes 2005, p. 71; Nixon 1963, p. 27

<sup>25</sup> 1 Pet 1:4

comparative claim: the Christian inheritance, unlike Israel's, is failproof.<sup>26</sup> After past rebirth and present protection, they await this inheritance in the future (in the last time; ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ).<sup>27</sup> This is an inaugurated eschatology, and Peter's era is one of trials (πειρασμός), testing (δοκιμάζω), and rejoicing.<sup>28</sup> Both δοκιμάζω and πειρασμός are used in exodus-wilderness contexts.<sup>29</sup> In Wis 11:9-10, both terms are used to describe God testing Israel.<sup>30</sup> The collection of terms and concepts here has parallels in Sirach 2:1-6 and Wisdom 3:4-9, but in neither case is an allusion sure.<sup>31</sup>

The nature of the Christian era is also addressed in 1:10-12. Commentators agree that this passage is essential for understanding Peter's metanarrative of history.<sup>32</sup> He claims that the prophets spoke for the sake of the church, predicting the suffering and glory of Christ. The church is the locus of scriptural fulfilment.<sup>33</sup> Peter expects his audience to understand themselves and the scriptures according to a narrative of fulfilment in Christ.

Peter instructs the churches to "gird the loins of your minds."<sup>34</sup> To gird one's loins was to tuck up garments in preparation for action or activity. Though not certain, this *might*

---

<sup>26</sup> At the same time, speaking of inheritance capitalises on that association in a typological manner, suggesting that the hope anticipated by Christians. Dryden 2006, p.p. 71-72; Achtemeier 2006, p. 96

<sup>27</sup> 1 Pet 1:5; Dryden 2006, p. 72.

<sup>28</sup> 1 Pet 1:6-7; Dryden 2006, p. 73; Deterding 1981, p. 60.

<sup>29</sup> For God testing Israel, see Exod 16:4; 20:2; Deut 13:3; Pss (LXX) 67:31; 80:8. For Israel testing God, see Exod 17:2; Num 14:22; Deut 6:16; Pss (LXX) 77:41, 56; 94:8. For the disasters on Egypt as trials, see Deut 7:19; 29:3; 3 Mac 2:6. There are also a few points at which Egypt is associated with a furnace, perhaps connoting refining (Deut 4:20; 1 Kgs 8:51; Jer 11:4). Deterding 1981, p. 63.

<sup>30</sup> LXX Psalm 94:8 also has both these terms together in a wilderness passage, but it describes Israel testing God. It is accordingly unlikely to be the target of an allusion in 1 Peter. At the same time, we cannot exclude the possibility that there was a general association of these terms with the wilderness, and Peter refers to the events in general rather than a specific text.

<sup>31</sup> Peter H. Davids notes both these passages (though he specifically points to Wis 3:5-6), and Jobes favours the similarities to Sirach. In Sir 2:1-6 we see forms of πειρασμός, πῦρ, δοκιμάζω, χρυσός, πιστεύω and ἐλπίζω. In Wis 3:4-9 we see forms of ἐλπίς, ὀλίγος, πειράζω, χρυσός, δοκιμάζω, and πιστός. Jobes 2005, p. 95; Davids 1990, *The First Epistle of Peter*, NICNT, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 57-58.

<sup>32</sup> Egan 2011, p. 34.

<sup>33</sup> Importantly, just as the church is the locus of scriptural fulfilment, scripture is the locus of Christian identity. Achtemeier 1996, pp. 70-71.

<sup>34</sup> 1 Pet 1:13; Modern translations usually paraphrase this instruction into idiomatic English. The NETS, for example, translates "get your minds ready for action."

be an allusion to the Passover, the most iconic instance of this practice in Jewish tradition.<sup>35</sup> As Israel prepared for the exodus, Christians prepare for future grace.<sup>36</sup>

Focusing on the future, they are not to follow their former ignorance and passions.<sup>37</sup> The word passions, *ἐπιθυμία*, often refers to Israel's cravings in the wilderness (as in 1 Corinthians), but we cannot know if that was on Peter's mind.<sup>38</sup> What we *can* deduce is that ignorance and passion were associated with the ways inherited from their fathers. Now that they call on God as father, they are to live as obedient children.<sup>39</sup> Identity and ethical conduct here rest on an implicit notion of adoption – a concept important in other exodus contexts.<sup>40</sup>

Adoption hints at an exodus paradigm, but redemption makes it clear. Peter uses a form of *λυτρόω*, and most conclude that he alludes to the exodus.<sup>41</sup> There is strong conceptual agreement with Isaiah 52, the promise that Israel will be redeemed *not with silver*.<sup>42</sup> The church is redeemed not with silver or gold, but with Jesus's precious blood.<sup>43</sup> Jesus was like an unblemished lamb, and the sacrifice of such a lamb to achieve redemption and adoption makes most sense as a Passover allusion.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Exod 12:11; Deterding 1981, p. 62; Joseph 2013, p. 81; Jobes 2005, p.111.

<sup>36</sup> We say *might* because it is simply not possible to know how much baggage came with the phrase. Jesus used the term in Luke 12:35, but there is a good case that Luke also draws heavily on exodus concepts. For this see David W. Pao 2002 [2000], *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, Biblical Studies Library, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids. Granted that it may be nothing more than common idiom for preparation (Achteimer 1996, p. 118), we should nonetheless be cognizant of a context full of allusions to Jewish traditions, including exodus and Passover traditions. Green 2007, p. 43; Jobes 2005, p. 111.

<sup>37</sup> 1 Pet 1:14.

<sup>38</sup> Num 11:4, 34; 33:16, Deut 9:22; Pss 77:29; 105:14; Wis 16:2, 21; 19:11; Jer 2:24; it is interesting to note that some among these (notably Ps 77:29 and Wis 16:2, 21) do not case the desire of Israel as sinful. Nonetheless, through the LXX (and broader Greco Roman moral discourse) there is generally a negative sense to *ἐπιθυμία*. Green 2007, p. 38.

<sup>39</sup> 1 Pet 1:14.

<sup>40</sup> Jobes 2005, p. 115.

<sup>41</sup> Deterding 1981, p. 59; Green 2007, pp. 40-41; Carson 2007, p. 1019; Jobes 2005, p. 117; Davids 1990, p. 71; Barnett 2006, p. 139.

<sup>42</sup> Isa 52:3; “οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε”; Green 2007, p. 41; Jobes 2005, p. 117.

<sup>43</sup> 1 Pet 1:18-19; “οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε”; Egan 2011, p. 62.

<sup>44</sup> Goppelt 1993 [1978], p 116; Green 2007, p. 41; Deterding 1981, p. 58; Barnett 2006, p. 1; Davids 1990, p. 72. Once again we should recall the way that other Christian traditions merged Passover and atonement concepts in the death of Christ.

As a result of salvation, the church is to be holy. This charge is justified by reproducing Leviticus 19:2 – “You shall be holy, for I am holy.”<sup>45</sup> This is holiness grounded in covenant relationship.<sup>46</sup> Peter implies some analogy between Israel’s post-exodus covenant and vocation, and the covenant and vocation of the church.<sup>47</sup>

Having established that the inheritance is imperishable and redemption is not bought by perishable things, Peter claims in 1:23-25 that rebirth is of imperishable seed.<sup>48</sup> He grounds that claim by quoting Isaiah 40:6-8. This brings to mind the broader context of Isaiah 40, which emphasises God’s power in salvation and judgement, comforting Israel with a new exodus hope.<sup>49</sup> Since God’s declarations are eternal, restoration is guaranteed to win out against exile. This citation makes good sense in writing to Christians suffering in Asia: they are reassured that human opposition is temporary, but their salvation cannot fail.<sup>50</sup> Accordingly, this salvation is to undergird their living, motivating them to holiness. The message governing this confidence and conduct is the message of Isaiah 40: a new exodus and theophany in Christ.<sup>51</sup>

In 2:4-10, Peter continues to establish a framework to underpin his paraenesis. Here Jesus is a spiritual stone, and Christians are spiritual stones being built into a spiritual house and holy priesthood. This house refers not just to a household (though that idea may be implied) but to a temple: stones built together make a building, not a family.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> 1 Pet 1:16; The phrase cited corresponds exactly to that in Lev 19:2. There are three other places where a very similar formulations are found, but with slight variation from the phrasing in Lev 19 and 1 Pet 1 (Lev 11:44; 20:7-8; 20:26). Carson 2007, p. 1017; The exact form here is from the holiness code, rather than from a Passover context (like 11:44). This could mean that Peter does *not* have Passover imagery in mind, but it may also mean that Peter was citing from memory, or that he considered these phrases interchangeable. In any case, the giving of the law was narratively associated with the exodus and its covenant, so this is no proof that the exodus is not in mind. Egan 2011, p. 60.

<sup>46</sup> Green 2007, p. 44.

<sup>47</sup> Green 2007, p. 34.

<sup>48</sup> 1 Pet 1:4, 18, 23; Egan suggests that this might be an example of *gezera shawa* (see footnote 54 below), concerning the words *φθαρτός* and *ἀφθαρτός*. Egan 2011, p. 71.

<sup>49</sup> Jobes 2005, p. 127.

<sup>50</sup> Jobes 2005, p. 129.

<sup>51</sup> Carson 2007, p. 1021.

<sup>52</sup> Goppelt 1993 [1978], p.141; cf. 1 Pet 4:17; The notion that this refers to a household rather than a temple is most famously associated with John H. Elliott, but it has been more recently defended by Dryden. Elliott

This language of constructing a house was used of the temple in the LXX, and the mention of priesthood and sacrifice makes good sense in a temple context.<sup>53</sup> Peter casts the church as the eschatological temple. If we accept that Peter is engaging with the exodus movement from slavery to sanctuary, this eschatological temple might be akin to the sanctuary at the end of the exodus.<sup>54</sup>

Through 2:6-8, Peter continues on the lithic theme. He cites three passages with the word *λίθος*, interpreting the stone to refer prophetically to Christ.<sup>55</sup> Isaiah 28:16 emphasises the election of the stone and the vindication of those trusting in him. LXX Psalm 117:22 says that the rejected stone has become the cornerstone.<sup>56</sup> Isaiah 8:14 adds that the stone causes stumbling. Peter's Christocentric hermeneutic here has ecclesiological implications, for the church is the temple built on that stone, awaiting vindication.<sup>57</sup>

These ecclesiological reflections bring us to the final verses of Peter's identity discourse. He alludes yet again to Jewish scripture in 2:9-10.<sup>58</sup>

---

1981, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, esp. pp. 168-169, 220-234; Dryden 2006, p. 122.

<sup>53</sup> We should allow for double meaning with this language. Consider Eph 2:19-22 where Christians are included in the household of God, but also constitute a temple where he comes to live.

<sup>54</sup> Jobes 2005, p. 148; Egan 2011, p. 80; Barnett 2006, p. 1.

<sup>55</sup> This is a good example of the Jewish interpretive technique *gezera shawa*, where passages are linked or listed according to a shared word. The three passages cited are Isaiah 28:16, Psalm 117:22, and Isaiah 8:14. Egan 2011, p. 71.

<sup>56</sup> It is worth noting that Psalm 118 (according to the MT numbering) was one of those sung at the Passover, so it may be that it came to have connotations of exodus recollection and hope. Jobes 2005, p. 153.

<sup>57</sup> Green 2007, p. 55.

<sup>58</sup> These LXX citations are all reproduced from Rahlfs/Hanhart.

But you are a chosen race (γένος ἐκλεκτόν),	<b>Isa 43:20</b> ...τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν...
a royal priesthood (βασιλείον ιεράτευμα), a holy nation (ἔθνος ἅγιον),	<b>Exod 19:6</b> ...βασιλείον ιεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον...
a people for his own possession (λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν), that you may proclaim the excellencies (τὰς ἀρετὰς) of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.	<b>Isa 43:21</b> ...λαὸν μου, ὃν περιεποιήσαμην τὰς ἀρετὰς...
Once you were not a people (οὐ λαός), but now you are God's people (λαὸς θεοῦ); once you had not received mercy (οἱ οὐκ ἡλεημένοι), but now you have received mercy (ἐλεηθέντες).	<b>Hos 2:25 (LXX)<sup>59</sup></b> ἐλεήσω τὴν Οὐκ-ἡλεημένην καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ-λαῶ-μου Λαὸς μου εἰ σύ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρεῖ Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἰ σύ

Some of these allusions scarcely need further justification, but a few points are noteworthy.<sup>60</sup> Exodus 19:6 is one of only two LXX verses featuring *ιεράτευμα*.<sup>61</sup> It is also one of just two places where Israel is called a holy nation.<sup>62</sup> Isaiah 43 is one of two places

---

<sup>59</sup> In the MT and NETS this verse is Hosea 2:23.

<sup>60</sup> Only the important points are mentioned above. These allusions receive support from lexical, formal, and conceptual agreement, distinctiveness, availability, and recurrence. The result is a strong, plausible, satisfying case for these allusions. The criterion of reception is interesting here, for it is not always easy to tell whether a patristic text cites Exodus or 1 Peter. For example, *Biblia Patristica* understands chapter 41 of the 43<sup>rd</sup> *Oration* of Gregory Nazianzus to be citing 1 Peter 2:9, but since it speaks of the exodus we must wonder whether it is actually taken directly from Exodus 19. Elsewhere, Gregory does cite 1 Peter 2:9 in describing the church. Gregory *Orations* 12.4; 42.9; Presumably patristic figures such as this would not have been ignorant of the direct citation, but it is difficult to find instances where the allusion is directly acknowledged.

<sup>61</sup> The other is 2 Mac 2:17. The Rahlfs/Hanhart LXX also features this word in its longer version of Exod 23:22, but the Gottingen edition does not.

<sup>62</sup> The other is Wisdom 17:2. It is more common for Israel to be called a holy *people* than holy *nation*. Egan 2011, p. 85.



where *γένος* and *ἐκλεκτός* appear together, and the only place where *περιποιέω* and *λαός* together describe God's people.<sup>63</sup> Both Exodus 19 and Isaiah 43 were passages with implications for self-understanding, and both are related to exodus traditions.<sup>64</sup> Peter is applying the post-exodus priestly role and identity of Israel to the church; they are defined by a covenant role typologically related to that of exodus Israel.<sup>65</sup>

The case for Hosea is less decisive, lacking distinctiveness and recurrence. Nevertheless, we know that Peter saw the church as the locus of prophetic fulfilment. 1 Peter 2:10 has broad lexical and conceptual agreement with Hosea 2, and most verses since 2:3 have contained an allusion. It is likely that this is an allusion, and this is particularly significant given that Hosea 2 is another new exodus text.<sup>66</sup>

This brings us to the end of the material we will address in 1 Peter. It is time, then, to make a few conclusions. It is important to make note of Peter's eschatological narrative, his use of exodus traditions, and the relationship of exodus and exile.

Peter understands Christ and the church as the fulfilment of Israel's prophetic hope. This is overt in 1:10-12 and implied elsewhere, and it is tied up with inaugurated eschatology. The end of times has come, but Christians await salvation in the last time. Jewish concepts of exodus and exile are central to that eschatology. Peter draws on numerous exodus or new exodus passages to frame salvation and identity; Exodus 19 and 24, Isaiah 40, 43, and 52, and Hosea 2. He also speaks of election, adoption, redemption, holiness, covenant, inheritance, priestly vocation, and the eschatological temple. Peter's concept of Christian identity and ethics draws heavily on the narrative of Israel, but especially on the exodus story.<sup>67</sup> Christians are framed as people of a new exodus but it may be wrong to call them a new Israel, for Peter never really elaborates on the relationship of Israel to the church.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> See also Add Esth 16:21.

<sup>64</sup> See discussion of these texts in chapter 5. Green 2007, p. 62; Goppelt 1993 [1978], p.148

<sup>65</sup> Jobes 2005, pp. 159-160; Green 2007, p. 63

<sup>66</sup> Green 2007, p. 63; Egan 2011, p. 87; Achtemeier 1996, p. 70

<sup>67</sup> Barnett 2006, p. 1; Dryden 2006, p. 68; Green 2007, pp. 46, 194, 219

<sup>68</sup> Egan 2007, p. 88; For example, Green's statement that Peter is "working to collapse the self-evident historical distinctives between Israel of old and these communities of Jesus-followers in the service of a

On the other hand, it is not the case that new exodus was *the* defining concept or story for Peter. The ambiguous period of inaugurated eschatology is not described as wilderness wanderings, but exile – the very thing a new exodus was meant to end. The exilic theme opens and closes the book, and appears amid exodus motifs in 1:17, and directly after the new exodus identity of 2:9-10. Though the *already* is described in exodus terms, the allusion to Isaiah 40 and the allusion to girding loins both use exodus concepts to describe the *not yet* as well.<sup>69</sup> Rather than applying an exodus paradigm tightly and systematically, Peter has merged exodus and exile to make sense of the ambiguous situation of the elect in Roman Asia.

---

theological unity that conjoins old and new” is probably claiming more than can be properly justified from the text. Green 2007, p. 202; Achtemeier 1996, pp. 70; Sargent 2013, p. 488; Nixon 1963, p. 28.

<sup>69</sup> Deterding 1981, p. 64; This ambiguity may also be seen in the citation of LXX Psalm 33. The reborn believers are to crave spiritual milk. Those who grow up into salvation are those who have tasted that the Lord is good. In the psalm, the psalmist urges his audience to seek God, to taste and see that he is good. This is linked to his own experience whereby he was saved from sojourning (*παροιμία*). He finishes on the idea that God will redeem his slaves, those who hope in him. The psalm thus depicts the past salvation of the author and the future redemption of his audience. The ideas of hope, sojourning, and redemption are all present in 1 Peter 1:13-21, but they are spread apart in the psalm. If the psalm does sit behind 1 Peter, then it is not clear exactly how its chronology informs that of 1 Peter. In 1 Peter the sojourning is present and the redemption is past, while the psalm takes salvation from sojourning to have happened in the past, and depicts redemption in the future.

## 12. The End of the Exodus in Hebrews<sup>1</sup>

Our final text is the letter to the Hebrews. Hebrews was traditionally associated with Paul, but its authorship is unknown. Though it has similarities to Pauline and Petrine material and Stephen's speech in Acts 7, it constitutes another strand of early Christianity.<sup>2</sup> As such, it makes for productive comparison with Paul and Peter.

Hebrews constantly engages with Jewish scripture, featuring everything from passing allusions to extended exegesis.<sup>3</sup> Important Jewish concepts such as atonement, covenant, Abrahamic promise, and inheritance are found throughout.<sup>4</sup> There are relatively few citations of Exodus, but the exodus story itself has profoundly shaped the worldview and self-understanding found in Hebrews.<sup>5</sup> This chapter seeks to explain and justify that claim by briefly studying Hebrews 3-12. At the outset, it is important to acknowledge that the hypothesis argued below is largely dependent on that of Matthew Thiessen.<sup>6</sup>

The first clear example of exodus engagement comes in Hebrews 3:1-6, with a comparison of Jesus and Moses. Hebrews reports that Moses was faithful in all God's house (*οἶκος*). This draws on Numbers 12:7 where God affirms Moses's faithfulness as

---

<sup>1</sup> This title is modified slightly from Matthew Thiessen 2007, "Hebrews and the End of the Exodus", *NovT*, vol. 49, pp. 353-369." My own understanding of the role of the exodus in Hebrews is largely shaped by his hypotheses. See also Thiessen 2009, "Hebrews 12.5-13, the Wilderness Period, and Israel's Discipline", *NTS*, no. 55, pp. 366-379.

<sup>2</sup> O'Brien 2010, *The Letter to the Hebrews*, PilNTC, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 41-43.

<sup>3</sup> This ranges from the series of citations (from Ps 2:7, 2 Sam 7:4, Deut 32:43, Ps 104:4, Ps 45:6-7, Isa 61:1-3, Ps 102:25-27, and Ps 110:1) in chapter 1 to the longer quotation of Jeremiah (LXX 38:31-34) in Heb 8:8-12, to broad allusions to characters in chapter 11 or appropriation of language from Isaiah 35:3 in Heb 12:12.

<sup>4</sup> Atonement/sacrifice: Heb 5:1-3; 7:27; 8:3; 9:9, 23, 26; 10:1-11, 26; 13:1; Covenant: Heb 7:22; 8:6-10, 13; 9:1, 4, 15, 818-20; 10:16, 29; 12:24, 13:20; Abraham/Promise: Heb 6:12-17; 7:6; 8:6; 9:15; 10:23; 10:36; 11:8-9, 13, 17, 39; Inheriting/inheritance: Heb 1:4, 14; 6:12, 17; 9:15; 11:8; 12:17.

<sup>5</sup> The book of Exodus is cited directly at Heb 8:5 (Exod 25:40), Heb 9:20 (Exod 24:8) and Heb 12:20 (Exod 19:12-13). Radu Gheorghita 2014, "περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου . . . ἐμνημόνευσεν, "He Spoke about the Exodus": Echoes of Exodus in Hebrews", in Fox (ed.), pp. 160-186, esp. pp. 160-161.

<sup>6</sup> Thiessen 2007.

people oppose him.<sup>7</sup> While Moses was a servant within the house, Jesus is builder of and son over the house.<sup>8</sup> Though this passage mentions construction, its emphasis on servanthood and sonship, and the context of Num 12:7, suggest that *οἶκος* here means household more than temple.<sup>9</sup> The church is God's household.<sup>10</sup>

Though 3:1-6 involves some basic notion of Jewish and Christian identity, the second half of the chapter is more important for our purposes. Hebrews cites LXX Psalm 94, which recalls Massah and Meribah and the disobedience of Israel in Numbers 14.<sup>11</sup> Distrusting God, the wilderness generation was told "they will never enter my rest."<sup>12</sup> Hebrews understands this to refer not just to that generation, but to Israel ever since. The psalmist (ostensibly David) urges his contemporaries to faithfulness, that they may enter God's rest.<sup>13</sup> Such was only possible, says Hebrews, if the rest had not already been realised.<sup>14</sup> Even in the promised land during the united monarchy, Israel had not entered God's rest. The application of the psalm and the wilderness type in Hebrews implies, by the same logic, that the rest had still not been entered by the first century CE.<sup>15</sup> The exodus movement was *still* incomplete, and the promises to Abraham were yet

---

<sup>7</sup> O'Brien 2010, pp. 131, 142.

<sup>8</sup> Heb 3:2-6.

<sup>9</sup> It is possible, however, that there is some degree of double-exposure or overlapping of concepts here. To speak of the house of God is suggestive of the temple. In Heb 10:21 we read that Jesus is high priest over the house of God, in a section discussing sacrifice and the holy place.

<sup>10</sup> Heb 3:6.

<sup>11</sup> Heb 3:11; LXX Ps 94:11; Num 14:30; Hebrews 3 uses the terms *παραπικρασμῶ* and *πειρασμοῦ* which are the same terms used in the LXX, but only *one* of these (*πειρασμοῦ*) is used in LXX Exod 17:7. We must remember, however, that the Psalm itself was translated from Hebrew, and the original Hebrew psalm reflects the Hebrew terminology of Exodus – both Exod 17:7 and Ps 95:8 in the MT feature the words *מִרְיָבָה* and *מִסָּה*. Accordingly, it seems that the translator who produced LXX Ps 94 and the translator who produced LXX Exod 17:7 used different terms (*παραπικρασμῶ* and *λοιδόρησις*) to translate *מִרְיָבָה*.

<sup>12</sup> Ps 95:11 (LXX 94:11); cf. Num 14:20-38, esp. 22-23, 30, 37.

<sup>13</sup> Heb 3:7-8; cf. LXX Ps 94:7-9.

<sup>14</sup> Heb 4:8.

<sup>15</sup> Thiessen 2007, p. 358; Harold W. Attridge 1980, "'Let Us Strive to Enter That Rest': The Logic of Hebrews 4:1-11", *HTR*, vol. 73, no. 1-2, pp. 279-288, at p. 280; O'Brien 2010, p. 148.

to be fulfilled.<sup>16</sup> The church is in the same situation as wilderness Israel (indeed, as Jews rather than Gentiles they *are* wilderness Israel), poised finally to enter God's rest.<sup>17</sup>

Joshua took Israel into the promised land, but according to Hebrews he did not give the people rest.<sup>18</sup> Consequently, rest cannot be exactly synonymous with the promised land. The word used here for rest is *κατάπαυσις*, which connotes *a resting place*.<sup>19</sup> In 4:3-4 and 4:9 we discover more about the nature of that rest. It is *σαββατισμός*, Sabbath rest, the rest of God after the completion of creation.<sup>20</sup> Sabbath was concerned not just with cessation, but also with creational perfection, divine presence, and praise.<sup>21</sup> Given that Sabbath, exodus, Psalm 95, and Abrahamic promise are all associated with creation (and often divine presence), it makes sense to posit that the end of the exodus has not been reached unless Israel is resting in God's presence in perfected creation.<sup>22</sup> That is not the case, so Israel is still in the wilderness. The church is to locate itself within that exodus narrative.

The consistent emphasis of Hebrews 5-10 is the superiority of the new covenant in Christ.<sup>23</sup> Jesus is a perfect sacrifice whose blood seals a new covenant, and he is a high priest who ministers in the presence of God in the true sanctuary. Levitical priesthood, animal sacrifices, and the tabernacle were inadequate imitations of the reality of

---

<sup>16</sup> O'Brien 2010, pp. 159-160, 168.

<sup>17</sup> Enns 1993, "Creation and Re-Creation: psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1-4:13", *WTJ*, vol. 55, pp. 255-280, esp. pp. 256, 273; O'Brien 2010, pp. 145, 161.

<sup>18</sup> Thiessen 2007, p. 355; cf. Josh 21:43-45.

<sup>19</sup> O'Brien 2010, pp. 164, 170; This term is the term used in LXX Ps 94:11, and appears here at Heb 3:11, 18; 4:1, 3 (twice), 5, and 10. For the notion of rest as *resting place* see also: Deut 12:9; Jdt 9:8; Ps 131:14; cf. Is 66:1.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Gen 2:2; O'Brien 2010, p. 146; Thiessen 2007, p. 359; The word *σαββατισμός* is only used once here, in 4:9.

<sup>21</sup> O'Brien 2010, pp. 167, 171; It is interesting to note also that in Exod 20:8-11, the Decalogue justifies the Sabbath with reference to creation. In the Deuteronomy Decalogue, the Sabbath is justified with reference to the exodus (Deut 5:12-15). This could reinforce the connection between Sabbath, creation, and exodus.

<sup>22</sup> Enns 1993, p. 279; For discussion of the creation and exodus themes in the psalm, see Enns 1993, esp. pp. 259-261.

<sup>23</sup> O'Brien 2010, p. 304; This is not to say that there is nothing else in these chapters. The main exception is the digression in 5:11-6:20. This is clearly a digression. Heb 6:20 repeats the claim of 5:10 that Jesus is a high priest after the order of Melchizedek, as if getting the discussion back to the point from which the digression began.

Christ.<sup>24</sup> It is important to note that Hebrews discusses the tabernacle, not the temple. At Sinai Moses saw a *τύπος* of the tabernacle, which is interpreted here not as a blueprint but an archetype: the true heavenly sanctuary.<sup>25</sup> That reveals that in Hebrews's discussion of covenant, the exodus is still in mind.<sup>26</sup> We find further confirmation of this when Hebrews cites Exod 24:8 (about covenant blood) and speaks of redemption (*λύτρωσις*, *ἀπολύτρωσις*) into an inheritance (*κληρονομία*).<sup>27</sup> The new covenant is cast as the fulfilment of Jeremiah 31:31-34, a new exodus passage discussed earlier in this study.<sup>28</sup> Hebrews pitches Christian salvation as a replacement of the exodus covenant with a new covenant that will achieve the Abrahamic promise. God will be their god, and they will be his people.<sup>29</sup>

The list of faithful Israelites in Hebrews 11 is doubly significant for our investigation. These characters all exhibited faith, "an assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen."<sup>30</sup> Included in this catalogue are several events concerning Moses and Israel in the exodus: they crossed the sea *by faith*.<sup>31</sup> This is a positive example of the principle demonstrated negatively in chapter 4. Unbelief prevented Israel entering the land, but as faith allowed them to cross the sea. It may be implied that Egypt could not

---

<sup>24</sup> For a simple table outlining the comparisons drawn through this section of Hebrews see Peter Gräbe 2008, "The New Covenant and Christian Identity in Hebrews", in R. Bauckham et al. (eds.), *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*, LNTS, no. 387, T&T Clark, London, pp. 118-127, at pp. 124-125. In Hebrews, see especially 7:22-28; 8:5-13; 9:11-22; 10:11-18.

<sup>25</sup> Heb 8:5; cf. 9:11, 24; This idea of the heavenly sanctuary of which the tabernacle is only a copy is also known from Philo, as in *Moses* 2.74. Hays 2009, "'Here We Have No Lasting City': New Covenantalism in Hebrews", in Bauckham et al. (eds.), pp. 151-173, at p. 159.

<sup>26</sup> O'Brien 2010, p. 307.

<sup>27</sup> Heb 9:12, 15; O'Brien notes that this language is common exodus terminology, and notes that the exodus story is still in mind in the discussion of the tabernacle. Strangely, however, he makes no positive claim that an exodus concept is involved with redemption and inheritance here. O'Brien 2010, p. 322.

<sup>28</sup> See page 57 above. It is also interesting to note that Jeremiah predicts not the abandonment of the law, but its transformation and internalisation. It was the sacrificial law that was inadequate, and in fulfilling the sacrificial law Christ has made observance of these elements unnecessary. It may be that Hebrews intends to say nothing about the rest of law (that is, the law concerning things other than sacrifice and priesthood), and is making no claim about its abrogation or annulment. Barry C. Joslin 2008, "Hebrews 7-10 and the Transformation of the Law", in Bauckham et al. (eds.), pp. 100-117, esp. pp. 102-105, 114; Hays 2009 [*No Lasting City*]p. 162.

<sup>29</sup> O'Brien 2010, pp. 298-301.

<sup>30</sup> Heb 11:1.

<sup>31</sup> Heb 11:23-29.

follow Israel through the sea because they did not have the same faithful orientation to God as Israel did.<sup>32</sup>

Additionally, this list confirms that Israel was still in the wilderness. All these Israelites faithfully endured, never receiving what was promised.<sup>33</sup> The inheritance of Israel was never realised, and it is only now, because of Christ, that rest, inheritance, and promises can be realised.<sup>34</sup> As before, the church is Israel in the wilderness on the cusp of their inheritance.

Hebrews 12 also draws on this continuing exodus scheme. It calls Jesus *ἀρχηγός*, a term applied to Joshua in the wilderness.<sup>35</sup> Citing proverbs 3:11-12, Hebrews urges its audience to endure suffering as *παιδεία* (*discipline or training*).<sup>36</sup> This reflects Deuteronomy 8:5, where the wilderness is a period of *παιδεία*, God disciplining his son.<sup>37</sup> The suffering of the church is likewise wilderness discipline for God's children. The exhortation to endurance also draws on Isaiah 35:3 (about strengthening hands and knees) and perhaps Isaiah 40:3 (about straight paths) – both new exodus passages.<sup>38</sup>

Finally, a comparison is made between the church and Israel at Sinai.<sup>39</sup> Christians have not come in terror (as Israel did) to an untouchable mountain with fire, darkness, storm,

---

<sup>32</sup> Heb 11:29; O'Brien 2010, p. 436.

<sup>33</sup> Hays 2009, p. 163; Thiessen 2007, pp. 363, 366; This point is slightly enigmatic. At 6:15 we read that Abraham "obtained the promise," and 11:33 notes that there are more people who might be mentioned who "obtained promises." Whatever this means, it must be held in line with the assertion of 11:39 that "all these...did not receive what was promised."

<sup>34</sup> Thiessen 2007, pp. 360, 369; Gheorghita 2014, pp. 185-186; The Joshua typology is particularly intriguing when we consider that Joshua and Jesus are both called the same name - *Ἰησοῦς*.

<sup>35</sup> The scouts named in Num 13:1-16 are called (collectively) *ἀρχηγοὶ*. This is the only time Joshua is given that title. We should note that it is *not* a word with totally positive associations: it is used of numerous people in the wilderness narrative, but they are not all faithful like Joshua. See Num 16:1-3; 25:1-5; cf. Thiessen 2007, p. 366.

<sup>36</sup> Heb 12:5-11, esp. pp. 5-6.

<sup>37</sup> Thiessen 2009, p. 369.

<sup>38</sup> Heb 12:12 reads "*Διὸ τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε*" (NA28) in comparison to Isa 35:3 with "*ἰσχύσατε, χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα*" (Rahlfs/Hanhart); Heb 12:13 reads "*...τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιεῖτε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν...*" (NA28) while Isa 40:3 says "*...Ετοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου...*" (Rahlfs/Hanhart). The former instance is clearly an allusion, but the latter is much less convincing.

<sup>39</sup> This is arguably the climax of Hebrews – the end of the exodus, the realization of the promises of old. O'Brien 2010, p. 477; Nixon 1953, p. 27.

and trumpet sound.<sup>40</sup> Instead, they have come to Zion, the city of God.<sup>41</sup> “Once more” God will shake earth (and heavens), implying an analogy as well as difference between old and new.<sup>42</sup> In this new covenant associated with Zion, the exodus can be finally complete.

It is fair to say that the exodus is a dominant narrative throughout Hebrews.<sup>43</sup> Though numerous texts are invoked for various reasons, the identity of the church is framed in terms of an ongoing exodus and a wilderness typology.<sup>44</sup> The new covenant administered by Jesus means that the promises to Israel are finally fulfilled in the church. Though there is an element of replacement theology in Hebrews, the continuity is just as striking.<sup>45</sup> Here a community of Jews is told that at long last, the destiny of their people is realised when Christ brings about the end of the exodus. The exodus frames their identity.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Heb 12:18-21.

<sup>41</sup> Heb 12:22-24.

<sup>42</sup> Heb 12:26-27.

<sup>43</sup> As Gheorghita says, the influence of the exodus on Hebrews amounts to “not a whisper, but a reverberating thunder.” Gheorghita 2014, p. 186.

<sup>44</sup> Thiessen 2007, pp. 354-355; Hays 2009, p. 166.

<sup>45</sup> Hays 2009, pp. 154, 166.

<sup>46</sup> Hays 2009 p. 155.



# Conclusion: The Exodus from Israel

What role did the exodus story have in first-century Christianity? It is time to answer that question. First, we must address the limitations of the study. Then we may review our material and draw conclusions about the exodus in early Christianity and its Jewish context.

The shortcomings of this study largely relate to its limited size. Despite considering several strands of tradition, we have had to exclude vast swathes of relevant material. Ideally we would include texts like the gospels, Acts, 2 Corinthians, Jude, and Revelation, and also texts without obvious exodus engagement.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, there is relevant material throughout Jewish tradition, from the Pentateuch to Psalms, to the Rabbis. Our narrow sample may not be representative of Christianity or Judaism, and it is unlikely that the “standard” first-century Jew (were there such a thing) would agree wholeheartedly with a Roman defector or the Christians and Alexandrians studied above.<sup>2</sup>

Defining the exodus is also problematic. The exodus could refer to just the moment of departure, or it may stretch to Sinai, the Jordan, or the conquest. Further discussion of this matter and greater attention to the wilderness narratives would allow further insight. By focusing only on the exodus, we risk inadvertently implying that other stories (like the Fall or the Akedah) had no bearing upon Christianity.<sup>3</sup>

Finally, we would benefit from further engagement with modern scholarship. We have not had space here to consider the criticism and alternate paradigms of scholars such as

---

<sup>1</sup> Since we are focused on the epistles, it would be particularly interesting to introduce the Johanne epistles, which have no obvious reference to the exodus or any exodus paradigm.

<sup>2</sup> It *might* be that Rabbinic material contains traces of the attitudes of common Judaism in the first century, but if it is possible to reconstruct the role of the exodus in first-century worldview and identity from these later Rabbinic sources, it is certainly not possible to do so in a study of this scope and scale.

<sup>3</sup> In addition, it is not the case that the Greco-Roman context had no bearing on Christianity. Properly, we ought to consider the role of non-Judaic traditions on early Christianity, but such was well beyond the capacity of this study.

## Conclusion

Watson and Barclay. With these limitations in mind, we must revisit our sources and draw some conclusions.<sup>4</sup>

Our treatment of Christian texts began with Paul. The letters considered were fairly consistent in framing the identity and location of their readers in exodus paradigms. 1 Corinthians drew on Numbers and Deuteronomy, typologically equating the church with wilderness Israel. Christians were to be self-disciplined, avoiding idolatry. Romans described a new exodus liberating Christians from sin and law. They were adopted and redeemed, led by the Spirit, and awaiting inheritance and restoration that resembles the prophetic hope. The privileges and promises of Israel were transferred to the church. Galatians also describes a move from slavery to sonship, a new exodus necessary because the exodus covenant did not fulfil the Abrahamic promise. Christians must not return to slavery. Ephesians delivered a new exodus *berakah* before drawing on Isaiah and Ezekiel to suggest that the return from exile was realised in the church. The church is God's people, built into a temple where he dwells.

All these texts understand the world and the church through an exodus lens, and suggest that Paul's eschatology may be structured on an exodus story. There is continuity *and* discontinuity with Israel; the Gentile church is descended from the fathers and the promises have not been abandoned, but they are fulfilled in the church (not national Israel). Christians are redeemed and adopted children, being fed and led in the wilderness. They are to live faithfully approaching their inheritance. Paul's worldview was profoundly shaped by an exodus paradigm.<sup>5</sup>

Hebrews is remarkably similar in some respects. It too locates the church in the wilderness on the verge of inheritance (which is not just inhabitation of the land). Where Paul posits a new exodus as the end of exile, however, Hebrews describes the end of the original exodus. Israel never entered God's rest, for the law, covenant, and tabernacle were inadequate. With Christ's sacrifice and ministry in the archetypal

---

<sup>4</sup> Details and references for most of the following material can be found in earlier chapters. We will only provide references here when drawing on ideas or sources that were not explicitly cited in earlier argumentation.

<sup>5</sup> Wright 2013, p. 543; Nixon 1963, p. 24.

sanctuary, the new covenant foreseen by Jeremiah was established. There is no clear distinction between national Israel and the church in Hebrews: there is a greater sense of continuity.

Discontinuity is more prominent in 1 Peter. The prophets spoke of Christ and the church, not Israel. Nevertheless, Peter constantly frames the church with Jewish concepts. His emphases on covenant and trials in the wilderness resemble ideas in Hebrews. In the way it employs new exodus prophecy, frames salvation as a new exodus, and mentions *ἐπιθυμία*, 1 Peter resembles Paul. Peter's scheme does not map as neatly onto an exodus paradigm as Paul or Hebrews; Christians are simultaneously exiles and wilderness pilgrims.

There are certainly differences between them, but all of these strands rely on the exodus in understanding Christian salvation, status, vocation, and hope. All define the church by an exodus paradigm wherein the Abrahamic promises are realised in Christ.<sup>6</sup> It is interesting to note the way these sources speak of God's house. In 1 Peter this metaphor was primarily temple imagery, perhaps with household overtones. In Hebrews it was primarily household language, though there was construction imagery and Jesus was called priest over the house. In Ephesians, both senses are present: the church is God's household, stones built into a temple for his presence. It may be that the language had double significance for all these Christians.

How do these Christian notions fit in their textual and cultural world? We must now briefly revisit the Jewish texts, noting just a few points of correspondence.

The prophets influenced all our Christian texts. Hebrews recalled Jeremiah, Peter invoked Isaiah and Hosea, and Paul (especially in Ephesians) drew on prophets and Deuteronomy. Only Paul describes the new exodus as return from exile. This aligns Paul with the worldview of the prophets and Ezra-Nehemiah, with the key distinction that he described a *successful* (if not yet complete) new exodus.

Aristeas used the exodus paradigm to validate a cosmopolitan Judaism less bound to temple, land, and political freedom. This is an intriguing precursor to the Christian

---

<sup>6</sup> Piper 1957, p. 13.

## *Conclusion*

exodus wherein location, race, and politics are relatively unimportant. Aristeeas authorised Alexandrian Judaism by reconciling Ptolemaic Egypt with Jerusalem, the tribes, and the temple. It affirmed the importance of the law by making it accessible. This stands against the Christian exodus, which does not promote Jewish authorities and leaves Torah behind!

Qumran material implies a new exodus paradigm. The faithful depart from the unrighteous, devoting themselves to the law in the desert, anticipating a day when God will fulfil his promises and end the exile. As in Paul and Hebrews, an exodus-wilderness typology frames the present experience and hope of God's people. A fundamental difference is that Qumran advocates resolute Torah observance. Qumranites sought by their emigration to provoke eschatological events, whereas the Christians describe a spiritual exodus; they are exodus people even as they are scattered.<sup>7</sup> Several specific traditions in our Christian texts have parallels at Qumran. An intriguing example is the possible dependence of 1 Peter 2 on Community Rule 8 – both call their communities a temple, and cite Isa 28:16.<sup>8</sup> Perhaps the new exodus notion of church as sanctuary comes from Qumran.

Wisdom used the exodus as a paradigm for every age, not for a specific eschatological event. The exodus is bound less to location and nation and more to wisdom and righteousness. The strongest Christian parallels may be in Hebrews, for it also reads the exodus as a story about faith, and speaks of Israel's faith through the generations. The themes of testing and endurance in the wilderness are found throughout Jewish literature, but the use of exodus-wilderness paradigms to explain hardship among God's people is found in Wisdom, 1 Peter, and Hebrews. Despite generalising the exodus, Wisdom still spoke positively of the law, and probably did not consider it possible for those outside ethnic Israel to be righteous as Paul did.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> This observation was made by Goppelt specifically about 1 Peter, but a similar thing rings true for the other sources considered here as well. Goppelt 1993 [1978], pp. 154-157.

<sup>8</sup> 1QS 8.4-8; Cf. 2 Pet 2:5-6.

<sup>9</sup> Hebrews and Peter almost certainly agree with Paul, but at least one and perhaps both of those texts have Jewish Christian audiences, and do not directly address the status of Gentiles. For promotion of the law in Wisdom, see Wis 18.4.

Philo's paradigmatic exodus is slightly different to that in Wisdom. It focuses more on the departure of the individual soul from body and passion. Those souls which have thus departed are beloved to God. Paul's distinction between spirit and flesh is not a simple Platonic dualism, but the concept of liberation from sin and passion into righteousness is not so far from Philo's scheme.<sup>10</sup> Philo also has a suggestion similar to that in Hebrews, that the tabernacle was an imitation of a heavenly archetype.<sup>11</sup> Though he reads it creatively at times, Philo still considers the law important for God's people.<sup>12</sup>

Josephus does not allegorise or generalise the exodus for his own situation. He stresses the importance of the original exodus for Jewish nationhood and identity. He is important here mostly as a foil: numerous Christians and Jews repurposed the exodus, but some did not.<sup>13</sup>

The goal of this study has been to better understand early Christian worldviews and identities by considering the exodus as a paradigmatic metanarrative. We have sought to understand the significance and role of the exodus across several strands of NT Christianity, and how this positioned Christianity in its Jewish context.

The exodus played an important role framing Christian worldview and identity across all three Christian traditions considered here. This crucial Jewish metanarrative was not left by the wayside, but nor could the literal sense of the original exodus be the final word on Christian identity. Instead, all these Christian texts sought to understand the new revelation, covenant, and redemption with scaffolding provided by the exodus story. This is not to say that they did so in the same way. While there are certainly

---

<sup>10</sup> This is a matter worthy of further investigation, and well beyond the scope of the present work.

<sup>11</sup> Philo *Moses* 2.74.

<sup>12</sup> Philo's recount of the exodus and his allegorical readings already discussed assume that the Torah had meaning for his contemporaries, and show his interest in explaining it. Also note that his 4 volumes of *Spec. Laws* reveal his interest in the law. Furthermore, there are passages affirming the importance and permanence of the law. For just a few examples see *QE* 1.41 and *Moses* 2.12-14. For further discussion of Philo and the law, see Najman 2003, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSup, vol. 77, Brill, Leiden, pp. 70-106, esp. pp. 73-74, 80-81.

<sup>13</sup> Interestingly, Josephus's defence of the exodus did not compel him to reject foreign rule or remain in the land.

## *Conclusion*

common elements, the exodus-shaped worldview in each strand is different from the others and manifests itself in different textual features.

We should not overlook the differences between this Christian mode of Judaism and what came before. Peter and Paul make a clear distinction between national Israel at large and the people of the new exodus. All the Jewish texts considered above affirmed the importance of the law, but our Christian sources do not. Indeed, Paul describes salvation as an exodus from the law. Finally, this new exodus is inseparably bound to Jesus – the Christians (most of whom were Jews!) supposed that in Christ and his church, God's purposes were finally achieved. This was certainly a departure from a particular kind of Judaism, an exodus from national Israel and some of its concerns. It may be too strong to say that Jewish Christians "exited" Israel, but there was certainly a departure from some of its nationalistic tenets.

Nevertheless, Christians were not the first to reformulate the exodus for new identities and worldviews. The practice was, in fact, well-established prior to the emergence of Christianity.<sup>14</sup> It was a thoroughly Jewish thing to do.<sup>15</sup> Numerous elements of the Christian exodus typologies and non-literal readings have heritage (or parallels) in earlier Jewish appropriation.<sup>16</sup> These Jewish Christian authors followed a Jewish practice of reformulating this Jewish story to describe the realisation of Jewish hope. On this basis, we may confidently say that the worldviews and identities of these early Christians, though each strand was different, were Jewish worldviews and identities.

---

<sup>14</sup> Though he focuses on the book of Exodus specifically, considers interpretation rather than worldview or identity, and fails to deliver on his own assertion, the importance of comparing Jewish and Christian exodus engagement was noted well by Piper: "an investigation of Exodus in the New Testament can not completely ignore the use made of that book in the rest of the Old Testament and in Judaism. The possibility that the Primitive Church followed Jewish patterns of interpretation cannot be excluded altogether." Piper 1957, p. 6.

<sup>15</sup> Though non-Jewish writers challenged the exodus story (as seen in our brief discussion of Josephus), they apparently did so in order to challenge the claims that Jews made on the basis of the story. The paradigmatic appropriations of the story were all from a Jewish perspective.

<sup>16</sup> Piper says that Paul is "worlds apart from the literalism of the Jewish theologians." Piper 1957, p. 10; Indeed, Paul is far from the literalism of Ezra-Nehemiah and Qumran, but to speak of "the Jewish theologians" as literalists defies Piper's own warning about treating Judaism as homogenous, and does not do justice to the evidence considered above. Piper 1957, p. 6.



## Bibliography



## Ancient Texts: Editions & Translations<sup>1</sup>

*Biblia Hebraica with Westminster Hebrew Morph 4*, Accordance Bible Software 11<sup>2</sup>.

*The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, M. O. Wise, M. G. Abegg Jr. & E. M. Cook (trans.) 2005, HarperOne, New York.

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orations*, in P. Schaff & H Wace (eds.) *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 2, P. Schaff & H Wace (eds.) 1886–1889, repr. 1994, vol. 7, Hendrickson, Peabody, Massachusetts.

*The Holy Bible, English Standard Version*, 2001, Crossway Bibles, Good News Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois.

*The Israelite Samaritan Version of the Torah: First English translation Compared with the Masoretic Version*, B. Tsadeka, & S. Sullivan 2013, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

*Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28<sup>th</sup> Revised Edition, B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, B. M., Metzger, (eds.) 2012, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart.

Philo, F. H. Colson & G.H. Whitaker (trans.) 1929-19, 10 vols, Loeb Classical Library, no. 261, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Philo, R. Marcus (trans.), *Supplement 2: Questions on Exodus*, Loeb Classical Library, no. 401, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

*The New English Translation Bible*, 2005, Biblical Studies Press, L.L.C.

*A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*, A. Pietersma & B. G. Wright (eds.) 2007, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

*The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, The*, J. H. Charlesworth (ed.) 1983, 2 vols, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, Massachusetts.

*Septuaginta: Editio altera*, Rahlfs, A. (ed.) 1935, Hanhart, R. (rev.) 2006, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart .

---

<sup>1</sup> I have not cited in full every bible translation consulted in the course of this research or mentioned in the study. Instead, I have listed those upon which I relied fairly heavily.

<sup>2</sup> This edition conforms to the text of Codex Leningradensis.



## Modern Scholarship

- Abasciano, B. J. 2007, "Diamonds in the Rough: A Reply to Christopher Stanley concerning the Reader Competency of Paul's Original Audiences", *NovT*, vol. 49, fasc. 2, pp. 153-183.
- Achtemeier, P. J. 1996, *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*, Hermeneia, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Adams, E. 2002, "Paul's Story of God and Creation: The Story of How God Fulfills His Purposes in Creation", in B. W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp. 19-43.
- Aerts, D., Apostel, L., De Moor, B., Hellemans, S., Maex, E., Van Belle, H., Van der Veken, J. 1994, *World Views: From Fragmentation to Integration*, VUB Press, Brussels.
- Agnew, F. H. 1983, "1 Peter 1:2 – An Alternative Translation", *CBQ*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 68-73.
- Alkier, S. 2009, "New Testament Studies on the Basis of Categorical Semiotics", in R. B. Hays, S. Alkier & L. A. Huizenga (eds.), *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, Baylor University Press, Waco, pp. 223-248.
- Allison, D. C. 2005, *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids.
- Allison, D. C. 1993, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Anderson, B. W. 1976, "Exodus and Covenant in Second Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition", in F. Moore Cross, W. E. Lemke & P. D. Miller (eds.), *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, Doubleday, Garden City, pp. 339-360.
- Anderson, B. W. 1962, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah", in B. W. Anderson & W. J. Harrelson (eds.), *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honour of James Muilenburg*, Harper, New York, pp. 177-195.
- Assmann, J. 2015, "Exodus and Memory", in T. E. Levy, T. Schneider & W. H.C. Propp (eds.), *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*, QMHSS, Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, pp. 3-16.
- Attridge, H. W. 1980, "'Let Us Strive to Enter That Rest': The Logic of Hebrews 4:1-11", *HTR*, vol. 73, no. 1-2, pp. 279-288.
- Baden, J. S. 2012, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*, AYBRL, Yale University Press, New Haven.

## Bibliography

- Barclay, J. M. G. 2015, *Paul and the Gift*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Barnett, P. W. 2006, *Living Hope: Reading 1 Peter Today*, Aquila Press, Sydney.
- Beale, G. K. 2012, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids.
- Beale, G. K. & McDonough, S. M. 2007, "Revelation", in G. K. Beale & D. A. Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, pp. 1081-1161.
- Beetham, C. A. 2008, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, Brill, Leiden.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. 1966, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Doubleday, New York.
- Berner, C. 2015, "The Exodus Narrative Between History and Literary Fiction: The Portrayal of the Egyptian Burden as a Test Case", in T. E. Levy, T. Schneider & W. H.C. Propp (eds.), *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*, QMHSS, Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, pp. 285-292.
- Bernstein, M. J. 2013, *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, vol. 1, STDJ, vol. 107, Brill, Leiden.
- Bloch, R. 2015, "Leaving Home: Philo of Alexandria on the Exodus", in T. E. Levy, T. Schneider & W. H.C. Propp (eds.), *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*, QMHSS, Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, pp. 357-364.
- Boring, M. E. 2007, "Narrative Dynamics in 1 Peter: The Function of Narrative World", in R. L. Webb & B. Bauman-Martin (eds.), *Reading First Peter with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of First Peter*, LNTS, no. 364, T&T Clark, London.
- Boring, M. E. 1999, *1 Peter*, ANTC, Abingdon Press, Nashville.
- Boulton, M. M. 2013, "Supersession or Subsession? Exodus Typology, the Christian Eucharist and the Jewish Passover Meal", *SJT*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 18-29.
- Brown, A. D. 2006, "A Narrative Approach to Collective Identities", *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 731-753.
- Bruner, J. 1997, "A Narrative Model of Self-Construction", *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 818, no. 1, pp. 145-161.
- Campbell, D. A. 2002, "The Story of Jesus on Romans and Galatians", in B. W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp. 97-124.

- Carr, D. 2012, "The Many Uses of Intertextuality in Biblical Studies: Actual and Potential", in M. Nissinen (ed.) *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, VTSup, vol. 148, Brill, Leiden.
- Carr, D. 2010, "Torah on the Heart: Jewish Textuality Within Its Ancient Near Eastern Context", *Oral Tradition*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 17-40.
- Carson, D. A. 2007, "1 Peter", in G. K. Beale & D. A. Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, pp. 1015-1045.
- Casey, J. S. 1987, "The Exodus Theme in the Book of Revelation against the Background of the New Testament", in B. van Iersel & A. Weiler (eds.), *Exodus: A Lasting Paradigm*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, pp. 34-43.
- Cheon, S. 1997, *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation*, JSPSup, no. 23, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Childs, B. S. 2004 [1974], *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*, OTL, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.
- Ciampa, R. E. & Rosner, B. S. 2010, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PiNNTC, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Clifford, R. J. 2002, "The Exodus in the Christian Bible: The Case for 'Figural' Reading", *TS*, no. 63, pp. 345-361.
- Collier, G. D. 1994, "'That We Might Not Crave Evil' The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians 10:1-13", *JSNT*, vol. 55, pp. 55-75.
- Conradie, E. 2014, "Views on Worldviews: An Overview of the Use of the Term, Worldview, in Selected Theological Discourses", *Scriptura*, vol. 113, no. 1, pp. 1-12.
- Cox, C. 2014, "Some Things that Biblical Scholars Should Know about the Septuagint", *ResQ Quarterly*, vol. 56, pp. 85-98.
- Cozart, R. M. 2013, *This Present Triumph: An Investigation into the Significance of the Promise of a New Exodus of Israel in the Letter to the Ephesians*, WEST Theological Monograph Series, vol. 5, Wipf & Stock, Eugene.
- Curenton, S. M. 2011, "Understanding the Landscapes of Stories: The Association Between Preschoolers' Narrative Production Skills and Cognitive Abilities", *Early Child Development and Care*, vol. 181, no. 6, pp. 791-808.
- Davenport, J. J. 2012, *Narrative Identity, Autonomy, and Mortality: From Frankfurt and MacIntyre to Kierkegaard*, Routledge, New York.
- Davids, P. H. 1990, *The First Epistle of Peter*, NICNT, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Davies, P. R. 1985, "Eschatology at Qumran", *JBL*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 39-55.

## Bibliography

- DeLapp, N. L. 2014, "Ezekiel as Moses – Israel as Pharaoh: Reverberations of the Exodus Narrative in Ezekiel", in R. M. Fox (ed.), *Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, pp. 51-73.
- Derrida, J. 2007 [1982], "Signature Event Context", in B. Stocker (ed.), *Jacques Derrida: Basic Writings*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 105-34.
- Derrida, J & Caputo, J. D. 1997, *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida*, Fordham University Press, New York.
- Deterding, P. E. 1981, "Exodus Motifs in First Peter", *Concordia Journal*, vol. 7, pp. 58-65.
- DiMattei, S. 2008, "Biblical Narratives", in S. E. Porter & C. D. Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBL SymS, no. 50, Brill, Leiden, pp. 59-96.
- Docherty, S. 2015, "'Do You Understand What You Are Reading?' (Acts 8.30): Current Trends and Future Perspectives in the Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New", *JSNT*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp.112-125.
- Dryden, J. D. W. 2006, *Theology and Ethics in 1 Peter: Paraenetic Strategies for Christian Character Formation*, WUNT 2/209, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Dumbrell, W. J. 1985, "The Purpose of the Book of Isaiah", *TynBul*, vol. 36, pp. 111-128.
- Dunn, J. D. G. 2002, "The Narrative Approach to Paul: Whose Story?", in B. W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp. 217-230.
- Dunn, J. D. G. 1998, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Eco, U. 1981, "The Theory of Signs and the Role of the Reader", *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 35-45.
- Egan, P. T. 2011, *"This Word is the Gospel Preached to You": Ecclesiology and the Isaianic Narrative in 1 Peter*, doctoral dissertation, University of St Andrews.
- Ehrensperger, K. 2008, "Paul and the Authority of Scripture", in S. E. Porter & C. D. Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBL SymS, no. 50, Brill, Leiden, pp. 291-320.
- Elliott, J. H. 1981, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Emadi, S. 2015, "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading", *CurBR*, vol. 2015, no. 1, pp. 8-23.
- Enns, P. E. 1997, *Exodus Retold: Ancient Exegesis of the Departure from Egypt in Wis 10:15-21 and 19:1-9*, HSM, no. 57, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia.

- Enns, P. E. 1996, "The "Moveable Well" in 1 Cor 10:4: An Extrabiblical Tradition in an Apostolic Text", *BBR*, vol. 6, pp. 23-38.
- Enns, P. E. 1993, "Creation and Re-Creation: psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1-4:13", *WTJ*, vol. 55, pp. 255-280.
- Enz, J. J. 1957, "The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John", *JBL*, vol. 76, no. 3, pp. 208-215.
- Fee, G. D. 1987, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Feldman, L. H. 2007, *Philo's Portrayal of Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.
- Feldman, L. H. 1998, "Responses: Did the Jews Reshape the Tale of the Exodus?", *JHis*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 123-127.
- Fishbane, M. A. 1979, *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*, Schocken Books, New York.
- Fisher, F. L. 1977, "The New and Greater Exodus: The Exodus Pattern in the New Testament", *SwJT*, vol. 20, pp. 69-79.
- Fisk, B. N. 2008, "Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge among the Christians of Rome", in S. E. Porter & C. D. Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBL SymS, no. 50, Brill, Leiden, pp. 157-188.
- Foster, P. 2015, "Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament", *JSNT*, pp. 96-111.
- Fretheim, T.E. 1991, *Exodus*, IBC, John Knox Press, Louisville.
- Fretheim, T. E. 1991, "The Plagues as Ecological Signs of Historical Disaster", *JBL*, vol. 110, no. 3, pp. 385-396.
- Fretheim, T. E. 1991, "The Reclamation of Creation Redemption and Law in Exodus", *Int*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 354-365.
- Frye, N. 1987 [1982], "Exodus, the Definitive Deliverance", in H. Bloom (ed.), *Exodus*, Chelsea House Publishers, New York, pp. 73-81.
- Gheorghita, R. 2014, "περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου . . . ἐμνημόνευσεν, "He Spoke about the Exodus": Echoes of Exodus in Hebrews", in R. M. Fox (ed.), *Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, pp. 160-186.
- Goodrich, J. K. 2013, "From Slaves of Sin to Slaves of God: Reconsidering the Origin of Paul's Slavery Metaphor in Romans 6", *BBR*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 509-530.

## Bibliography

- Goppelt, L. 1993 [1978], *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, F. Hahn (ed.), J. E. Alsup (trans.), Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Gräbe, P. 2008, "The New Covenant and Christian Identity in Hebrews", in R. Bauckham, D. Driver, T. Hart & N. MacDonald (eds.), *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*, LNTS, no. 387, T&T Clark, London, pp. 118-127 .
- Green, J. B. 2007, *1 Peter*, The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Green, J. B. 2006, "Narrating the Gospel in 1 and 2 Peter", *Int*, vol. 60, pp. 262-277.
- Gruen, E. S. 1998, "The Use and Abuse of the Exodus Story", *JHis*, vol. 12, no.1, pp. 93-122.
- Hacham, N. 2005, "The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?", *JSJ*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 1-20.
- Hammack, P. L. 2008, "Narrative and the Cultural Psychology of Identity", *Personality and Social Psychology Review OnlineFirst*, doi:10.1177/1088868308316892.
- Hanges, J. C. 2012, *Paul: Founder of Churches*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Hays, R. B. 2009, "'Here We Have No Lasting City': New Covenantalism in Hebrews", in R. Bauckham, D. R. Driver, T. A. Hart & N. MacDonald (eds.), *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 151-173.
- Hays, R. B. 2009, "Foreword to the English Edition", in R. B. Hays, S. Alkier & L. A. Huizenga (eds.), *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, Baylor University Press, Waco, pp. xi-xv.
- Hays, R. B. 2005, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Hays, R. B. 2002 [1983], *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., The Biblical Resource Series, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Hays, R. B. 1989, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, Yale, New Haven.
- Hendel, R. 2015, "The Exodus as Cultural Memory: Egyptian Bondage and the Song of the Sea", in T. E. Levy, T. Schneider & W. H.C. Propp (eds.), *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*, QMHSS, Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, pp. 65-79.
- Hendel, R. 2001, "The Exodus in Biblical Memory", *JBL*, vol. 120, no. 4, pp. 601-622.
- Hoffman, Y. 1989, "A North Israelite Typological Myth and Judean Historical Tradition: the Exodus in Hosea and Amos", *VT*, vol. 39, fasc. 2, pp. 169-182.



- Holland, T. 2011, *Romans: The Divine Marriage: A Biblical Theological Commentary*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene.
- Hollander, J. 1981, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Honigman, S. 2003, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*, Routledge, London.
- Hooker, M. D. 2002, "'Heirs of Abraham': The Gentiles' Role in Israel's Story: A Response to Bruce W. Longenecker", in B. W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp. 85-96.
- Huizenga, L. A. 2015, "The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory", *JSNT*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 17-35.
- Idestrom, R. G. S. 2009. "Echoes of the Book of Exodus in Ezekiel", *JSOT*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 489-510.
- Irwin, W. T. 2001, "What is an Allusion?", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 287-297.
- Jobes, K. H. 2005, *1 Peter*, BECNT, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids.
- Johnstone, S. I. 2015, "Narrating Myths: Story and Belief in Ancient Greece", *Arethusa*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 173-218.
- Joseph, A. P. 2013, *A Narratological Reading of 1 Peter*, LNTS, no. 440, T&T Clark, London.
- Joslin, B. C. 2008, "Hebrews 7-10 and the Transformation of the Law", in R. Bauckham, D. Driver, T. Hart & N. MacDonald (eds.), *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*, LNTS, no. 387, T&T Clark, London, pp. 100-117.
- Kant, I. 1987 [1790], *Critique of Judgment*, W. S. Pluhar (trans.), Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis.
- Karilemla, 2015, "Heidegger's Contrasting Notion of Worldview in the Early, Middle, and Later Writings", *The Humanistic Psychological*, vol. 43, pp. 250-266.
- Kawashima, R. S. 2007, "Comparative Literature and Biblical Studies: The Case of Allusion", *Proof*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 324-344.
- Kearney, P. J. 1977, "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25-40", *ZAW*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 375-387.
- Keesmaat, S. C. 1999, *Paul and his Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*, JSNTSup, no. 181, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.

## Bibliography

- Keesmaat, S. C. 1994, "Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14-30", *JSNT*, vol. 54, pp. 29-56.
- Kelly, J. R. 2014, *Intertextuality & Allusion in the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, Doctoral Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Kort, W. A. 1988, *Story, Text, and Scripture: Literary Interests in Biblical Narrative*, Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park.
- Kristeva, J. 1984 [1974], *Revolution in Poetic Language*, M. Waller (trans.), Columbia University Press, New York.
- Kugel, J. L. 2012, "The Beginnings of Biblical Interpretation", In M. Henze (ed.), *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 3 -26.
- Lam, J. 2013, "The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis (Book Review)", *JNES*, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 306-309.
- Lee, A. C. C. 1990. "The Context and Function of the Plagues Tradition in Psalm 78", *JSOT*, vol. 48, pp. 83-89.
- Leonard, J. M. 2008, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case", *JBL*, vol. 127, no. 2, pp. 241-265.
- Lim, T. H. 2015, "Qumran Scholarship and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament", *JSNT*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 68-80.
- Linebaugh, J. A. 2013, *God, Grace, and Righteousness in Wisdom of Solomon and Paul's Letter to the Romans: Texts in Conversation*, Brill, Leiden.
- Longenecker, B. W. 2002, "Narrative Interest in the Study of Paul: Retrospective and Prospective", in B. W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp. 3-18.
- Longenecker, B. W. 2002, "Sharing in Their Spiritual Blessings? The Stories of Israel in Galatians and Romans", in B. W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp. 58-84.
- Loewenstamm, S. E. 1971, "The Number of Plagues in Psalm 105", *Bib*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 34-38.
- MacIntyre, A. 1985 [1981], *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Duckworth, London.
- Mánek, J. 1957, "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke", *NovT*, vol. 2, fasc. 1, pp. 8-23.
- Matlock, R. B. 2002, "The Arrow and the Web: Critical Reflections on a Narrative Approach to Paul", in B. W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp.44-57.

- McAdams, D. P. & McLean, K. C. 2013, "Narrative Identity", *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 233-238.
- McKechnie, P. 2008, "Ptolemy Philadelphus: A New Moses", in P. Guillaume (ed.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, Brill, Boston, pp. 233-246.
- Meeks, W. A. 1982, "'And Rose Up to Play': Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22", *JSNT*, vol. 16, pp. 64-78.
- Merrill, E. H. 2014, "The Meaning and Significance of the Exodus Event", in R. M. Fox (ed.), *Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, pp. 1-17.
- Merrill, E. H. 2012, "Deuteronomy and de Wette: A Fresh Look at a Fallacious Premise", *JESOT*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 25-42.
- Meyers, C. 2005, *Exodus*, NCBC, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Miller, G. D. 2010, "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research", *CurBR*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 283-309.
- Moo, D. J. 1996, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Morales, R. J. 2010, *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel: New Exodus and New Creation Motifs in Galatians*, WUNT 2/282, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Moyise, S. 2009, "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament", in R. B. Hays, S. Alkier, & L. A. Huizenga (eds.), *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, Baylor University Press, Waco, pp. 23-32.
- Moyise, S. 2008, "Quotations", in S. E. Porter & C. D. Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBL SymS, no. 50, Brill, Leiden, pp. 15-28.
- Mroczek, E. 2015, "The Hegemony of the Biblical in the Study of Second Temple Literature", *Journal of Ancient Judaism*, vol. 6, pp. 2-35.
- Na'aman, N. 2011, "The Exodus Story: Between Historical Memory and Historiographical Composition", *JANER*, vol. 11, pp. 39-69.
- Najman, H. 2006, "Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism", *DSD*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 99-113.
- Najman, H. 2003, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSup, vol. 77, Brill, Leiden.
- Naugle, D. K. 1998, *A History and Theory of the Concept of 'Weltanschauung' (Worldview)*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Arlington.
- Nixon, L. 2015, *New Testament Quotation at the Reader-Author Intersection: Evoking Story for Transformation*, Doctoral Dissertation, Middlesex University/London School of Theology.

## Bibliography

- Nixon, R. E. 1963, *The Exodus in the New Testament*, Tyndale Press, London.
- O'Brien, P. T. 2010, *The Letter to the Hebrews*, PilNTC, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- O'Brien, P. T. 1999, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, PilNTC, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Olthius, J. H. 1989, "On Worldviews", in P. A. Marshall, S. Griffioen & R. Mouw (eds.), *Stained Glass: Worldviews and Social Science*, University Press of America, Lanham, pp. 26-40.
- Oropeza, B. J. 2002, "Echoes of Isaiah in the Rhetoric of Paul: New Exodus, Wisdom, and the Humility of the Cross in Utopian-Apocalyptic Expectations", in D.F. Watson (ed.), *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*, SBL SymS, no. 14, Society for Biblical Literature, Atlanta.
- Oropeza, B. J. 1999, "Apostasy in the Wilderness: Paul's Message to the Corinthians in a State of Eschatological Liminality", *JSNT*, vol. 22, no. 75, pp. 69-86.
- Pao, D. W. 2002 [2000], *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, Biblical Studies Library, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids.
- Petersen, N. R. 1985, *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Piper, O. 1957, "Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament", *Int*, vol. 11, pp. 3-22.
- Porter, S. E. 2008, "Allusions and Echoes", in S. E. Porter & C. D. Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBL SymS, no. 50, Brill, Leiden, pp. 29-40.
- Porter, S. E. 2008, "Paul and His Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel", in S. E. Porter & C. D. Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBL SymS, no. 50, Brill, Leiden, pp. 97-124.
- Ricoeur, P. 1991, "Life in Quest of Narrative", in D. Wood (ed.), *On Paul Ricoeur: Narrative and Interpretation*, Routledge, London, pp. 20-33.
- Römer, T. 2015, "The Revelation of the Divine Name to Moses and the Construction of a Memory About the Origins of the Encounter Between Yhwh and Israel", in T. E. Levy, T. Schneider & W. H.C. Propp (eds.), *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*, QMHSS, Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, pp. 305-315.
- Rowlands, E. R. 1959, "The Targum and the Peshitta Version of the Book of Isaiah", *VT*, vol. 9, fasc. 2, pp. 178-191.
- Sahlin, H. 1953, "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St Paul", in A. Fridrichsen (ed.), *The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology*, Dacre, London, pp. 81-95.

- Sanders, E. P. 2008, "Did Paul's Theology Develop?", in J. R. Wagner, C. K. Rowe & A. K. Grieb (eds.), *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays in Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 325-350.
- Sargent, B. 2013, "The Narrative Substructure of 1 Peter", *ExpTim*, vol. 124, no. 10, pp. 485-490.
- Schmid, K. 2015, "Distinguishing the World of the Exodus Narrative from the World of Its Narrators: The Question of the Priestly Exodus Account in Its Historical Setting", in T. E. Levy, T. Schneider & W. H.C. Propp (eds.), *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*, QMHSS, Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, pp. 331-346.
- Schmid, K. 2011, "Has European Pentateuchal Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status", in Dozeman, Schmid, & Schwartz (eds.), *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, Forschungen zum Alten Testament, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, pp. 17-30.
- Schneider, M. 2009, "How Does God Act? Intertextual Readings of 1 Corinthians 10", in R. B. Hays, S. Alkier, & L. A. Huizenga (eds.), *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, Baylor University Press, Waco, pp. 35-52.
- Schofield, A. 2008, "The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in K. Pomykala (ed.), *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 37-55.
- Scott, J. M. 1992, *Adoption as Sons of God*, WUNT 2/48, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Seales, W. B., Parker, C. S., Segal, M., Tov, E., Shor, P. & Porath, Y. 2016, "From Damage to Discovery via Virtual Unwrapping: Reading the Scroll from En-Gedi", *Science Advances*, vol. 2, no. 9, e1601247, accessed September 27, 2016, <<http://advances.sciencemag.org/content/advances/2/9/e1601247.full.pdf>>.
- Searle, J. R. 1994, "Literary Theory and Its Discontents", *New Literary History*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 637-667.
- Shaw, D. A. 2013, "Converted Imaginations? The Reception of Richard Hays's Intertextual Method", *CurBR*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 234-245.
- Sire, J. W. 2009, *The Universe Next Door: A Basic Worldview Catalogue*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove.
- Sire, J. W. 2004, *Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept*, IVP Academic, Downers Grove.
- Smith, D. L. 2016, "The uses of 'New Exodus' in New Testament Scholarship: Preparing a Way through the Wilderness", *CurBR*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 207-243.

## Bibliography

- Somers, M. R. 1994, "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach", *Theory and Society*, vol. 23, pp. 605-649.
- Sommer, B. D. 1998, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*, Stanford, Stanford
- Stadler, M. A. & Ward, G. C. 2005, "Supporting the Narrative Development of Young Children", *Early Childhood Education Journal*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 73-80.
- Stanley, C. D. 2008, "Paul's "Use" of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters", in S. E. Porter & C. D. Stanley (eds.), *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBL SymS, no. 50, Brill, Leiden, pp. 125-156.
- Starling, D. 2014, "Ephesians and the Hermeneutics of the New Exodus", in R. M. Fox (ed.), *Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, pp. 139-159.
- Steck, O. H. 1967, *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Steyn, G. J. 2015, "Observations on the Text Form of the Minor Prophets Quotations in Romans 9-11", *JSNT*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 49-67.
- Suh, R. H. S. 2006, *One New Humanity in Christ: The use of Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2*, Doctoral Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Taylor, C. 2007, *A Secular Age*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Thielman, F. 2010, *Ephesians*, BECNT, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids.
- Thiessen, M. 2013, "'The Rock was Christ': The Fluidity of Christ's Body in 1 Corinthians 10:4", *JSNT*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 103-126.
- Thiessen, M. 2009, "Hebrews 12.5-13, the Wilderness Period, and Israel's Discipline", *NTS*, no. 55, pp. 366-379.
- Thiessen, M. 2007, "Hebrews and the End of the Exodus", *NovT*, vol. 49, pp. 353-369.
- Thompson, M. B. 1991, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13*, JSNTSup, no. 59, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Trebilco, P. 1997, "Jewish Backgrounds", in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 359-388.
- Trick, B. R. 2007, "Death, Covenants, and the Proof of Resurrection in Mark 12:18-27", *NovT*, vol. 49, fasc. 3, pp. 232-256.

- Tucker, W. D. Jr. 2005, "Revisiting the Plagues in Psalm CV", *VT*, vol. 55, fasc. 3, pp. 401-411.
- Ulrich, E. 2015, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, VTSup, The Text of the Bible at Qumran, vol. 169, Brill, Leiden.
- Van Wolde, E. 1989, "Trendy Intertextuality", in S. Draisma (ed.), *Essays in honour of Bas van Iersel*, Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok, Kampen, pp. 43-49.
- Vanhoozer, K. J. 2009, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*, anniversary ed., Landmarks in Christian Scholarship, Zondervan, Grand Rapids.
- Walton, J. H. 2015, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2-3 and the Human Origins Debate*, IVP Academic, Downers Grove.
- Watson, F. 2002, "Is There a Story in These Texts?", in B. W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, pp. 231-240.
- Watts, R. E. 2000 [1997], *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids.
- Watts, R. E. 1990, "Consolation or Confrontation: Isaiah 40-55 and the Delay of the New Exodus", *TynBul*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 31-59.
- Webb, B. G. 2008. "Heaven on Earth: The Significance of the Tabernacle in its Literary and Theological Context", in B. S. Rosner & R. Williamson (eds.), *Exploring Exodus: Literary, Theological and Contemporary Approaches*, Apollos, Nottingham, pp. 154-176.
- Wenham, G. J. 1994, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story", in R. S. Hess & D. T. Tsumura (eds.), *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, Indiana, pp. 399-404.
- White, J. R. 2016, "N. T. Wright's Narrative Approach", in C. Heilig, J. T. Hewitt, & M. F. Bird (eds.), *God and the Faithfulness of Paul: A Critical Examination of the Pauline Theology of N.T. Wright*, WUNT 2/413, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, pp. 181-206.
- Wilk, F. 2009, "Paul as User, Interpreter, and Reader of the Book of Isaiah", in R. B. Hays, S. Alkier, & L. A. Huizenga (eds.), *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, Baylor University Press, Waco, pp. 83-100.
- Williams, J. E. 2014, "Promise and Failure: second Exodus in Ezra-Nehemiah", in R. M. Fox (ed.), *Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, pp. 74-93.
- Wise, M. O., Abegg Jr., M. G., & Cook, E. M. 2005, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, HarperOne, New York.

## Bibliography

- Witherington III, B. 1994, *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Witherington III, B. 1994, *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.
- Wold, B. G. 2009, "Revelation's Plague Septets: New Exodus and Exile", in G. C. Martínez (ed.), *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, STDJ, vol. 85, Brill, Leiden, pp. 279-298.
- Wolters, A. M. 1989, "On the Idea of Worldview and its Relation to Philosophy", in P. A. Marshall, S. Griffioen & R. Mouw (eds.), *Stained Glass: Worldviews and Social Science*, University Press of America, Lanham, pp. 14-25.
- Wright III, B. G. 2015, *The Letter of Aristeeas*, CEJL, De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Wright, N. T. 2013, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, COQG, vol. 4, SPCK, London.
- Wright, N. T. 2012, "Israel's Scriptures in Paul's Narrative Theology", *Theology*, vol. 115, no. 5, pp. 323-329, repr. in N. T. Wright, 2013, "Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978-2013", Fortress Press, Minneapolis, pp. 546-553.
- Wright, N. T. 2003, "The Resurrection of the Son of God", COQG, vol. 3, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Wright, N. T. 1999, "New Exodus, New Inheritance: The Narrative Substructure of Romans 3-8", in S. K. Soderlund & N. T. Wright (eds.), *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honour of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, pp. 26-35, repr. in N. T. Wright, 2013, "Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978-2013", Fortress Press, Minneapolis, pp. 160-168.
- Wright, N. T. 1992, *The New Testament and the People of God*, COQG, vol. 1, SPCK, London.
- Yates, G. 2006, "New Exodus and No Exodus in Jeremiah 26-45: Promise and Warning to the Exiles in Babylon", *TynBul*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 1-22.
- Yoon, D. I. 2012, "The Ideological Inception of Intertextuality and its Dissonance in Current Biblical Studies", *CurBR*, pp. 58-76.
- Young, K. & Saver, J. L. 2001, "The Neurology of Narrative", *Substance*, vol. 30, no. 1/2, pp. 72-84.
- Zevit, Z. 1990, "Three Ways to Look at the Ten Plagues", *Biblical Review*, June 1990, pp. 16-42.
- Zevit, Z. 1976, "The Priestly Redaction and Interpretation of the Plague Narrative in Exodus", *JQR*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 193-211.



