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Interpreting what texts mean is a great intellectual challenge whether one is a biblical scholar who seeks to understand the truth in the scriptures or a Supreme Court justice who seeks guidance from the constitution in adjudicating legal disputes.

Raymond W. Gibbs Jr.

Humans love stories. A good yarn can keep someone seated, turning page after page, without becoming restless. The exodus event does that for me. I am fascinated by the way it is reactualized and recontextualized in subsequent biblical books. Throughout the Old Testament, there are reminiscences of the exodus event again and again. The lexical, conceptual, and influential allusions to this founding event of the ancient Hebrew nation resonate throughout the Bible: in the Psalms, Prophets, and the postexilic literature. Yet the ripples do not stop in the Hebrew Bible. The New Testament literature appeals to the exodus event as well. Of the numerous references in the New Testament to the Old Testament, the exodus event comes in a noble third, trailing behind only the prophet Isaiah and the Psalms in number of citations.¹ It serves as the organizing paradigm for several of the Gospels and influences the book of Acts. Paul’s two most doctrinal letters, Romans and Galatians, lean heavily on the exodus for their theology. The apostle Peter puts an ecclesiastical spin on the exodus, and Revelation ties all the

threads together in John’s tapestry of consummation. I have set on climbing a big wall of narration. In short, I want to relate the greatest story ever told.

The biblical writers’ use of the exodus event is no mere repetition, no base recapitulation. Rather, it is taken up, transformed, “eschatologized,” and ultimately repackaged into a tapestry that mesmerizes readers and draws them into the drama of salvation. No biblical reader can walk away from the performance unchanged. To trace the allusions throughout this corpus of biblical literature is not only an exercise in curiosity and aesthetic entertainment. Consider the following questions: Why would Paul refer to the exodus event as “under the cloud”? Why would Peter address his church in language evocative of Israelite identity? Why would the prophets invoke the ancient creation combat motif to express theology if they were committed monotheists? What is the purpose of the “way of the Lord” language in Isaiah 40:1-11, arguably one of the most influential passages at Qumran and elsewhere in the Second Temple period? Why would Jesus himself, at the transfiguration, discourse with Elijah and Moses about his own exodon? What, we may ask, is the purpose of these allusions? Are they poetic influence, metaphor, citation, or something altogether different? My goal throughout this book is to help readers grow in their “allusion competence,” especially in their ability to recognize scriptural allusions to the exodus motif.

The exodus event is what Walter Brueggemann calls “the Exodus grammar of Yahweh.” He comments, “The Exodus recital, either as a simple declarative sentence enacting Israel’s primal theological grammar or a fuller narrative, becomes paradigmatic for Israel’s testimony about Yahweh. It becomes, moreover, an interpretive lens to guide, inform, and discipline Israel’s utterances about many aspects of its life.”

This book is about the continuing thread of the exodus motif in the Old Testament and New Testament. Students, pastors, and biblical scholars will come to appreciate how interconnected the Scriptures are.

---

and how a biblical motif works through allusion and transformation of that motif. From the perspective of the Hebrews, a more important topic than the exodus motif could hardly be chosen. Martin Noth considered the Hebrew exodus from Egypt to be a primary confession or article of faith (Urbekenntnis).³

What is the exodus motif? The following pages will demonstrate that the exodus motif is a much bigger concept than merely the liberation of the Hebrews from the oppressive iron furnace of the Egyptians. It is about God’s crafting a people for himself by bringing them to the very abode of his presence at Mount Sinai. Yet there is more. Just as there was an anticipated goal at the beginning of creation in the Garden of Eden, so also there is an anticipated goal for Israel. The deliverance from Egypt did not stop at Sinai, where God meets with his people. The deliverance was intended to include the Promised Land. In the immediate context of the Hebrew Bible, this means the land of Canaan. However, the final goal of the exodus deliverance and salvation itself includes something greater than the Promised Land. It is nothing less than the grandest gift imaginable: heaven itself, which I will refer to as “the world-to-come” in this book.⁴ Mishnaic Hebrew came to express the world in the future as ʿālām habāʾ (world-to-come). This Hebrew construction is often used to contrast “world” in an eschatological context with the present world (ʿālām hazzeh). This is where the exodus motif finds its fulfillment, in the world-to-come (cf. Rev 21:3).⁵

⁴The word heaven has a wide application in the Scriptures. First, it is a real place, since the Nicene Creed says that Christ “came down from heaven.” In Scripture it sometimes means the atmospheric heavens or the stellar heavens where astral bodies reside. There are also the “third heavens,” where God resides and the glorified body of Christ now reigns. Then there is the sublime use of the word by which Christians are described as being already introduced into a realm by virtue of their regeneration and union with Christ. In the English language, the word is used for the domain of space travelers as well as the domain of God, where he assembles those whom he saves. See the terse summary of Charles Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950), 113-16. Also see the fine summary in Xavier Léon-Dufour, *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, updated 2nd ed., trans. P. Joseph Cahill and E. M. Stewart (Boston: St. Paul, 1967), 229-32.
⁵This language will be used throughout the book for the goal of the exodus motif (and new exodus as well).
In introducing the importance of this pervasive theme, I hope that readers will be swept up into this grand story of redemption. As has been suggested,

No other OT motif is as crucial to understand. No other event is so basic to the fabric of both Testaments. Our concepts of deliverance and atonement, of God dwelling with his people, of God taking a people for himself and so forth have their roots in this complex of events. And precisely because it so permeates the Bible, the interpretation of the exodus and its motif usage are a challenge.\(^6\)

Undoubtedly, the exodus motif is one of the most important themes in the Bible to interpret.\(^7\) Understanding the use of this motif in Scripture is vital to reading our Bible and hearing its message. As Geerhardus Vos declared years ago, “The exodus from Egypt is the Old Testament Redemption.”\(^8\)

I am not saying the exodus motif is the central theme in Scripture.\(^9\) Nevertheless, it is a significant organizing theme. The hazard of choosing one major organizing theme of biblical theology is that reductionism often follows close behind.\(^10\) Moreover, in our postmodern context, an attitude of suspicion exists toward any grand story or meta-narrative (grand récit). This is primarily the result of a Lyotard’s critique of modern, Western epistemology.\(^11\) Therefore, writing a biblical theology (even one limited to tracing a motif) runs the risk of marginalizing certain voices within the scriptural material.\(^12\) Any attempt at


\(^9\) Claiming central dogmas has caused trouble for biblical theologians in the past; nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the exodus motif is a central narrative since it is the paradigmatic salvation event in the OT and very influential for how the NT authors describe salvation.


\(^12\) See Craig G. Bartholomew and Michael W. Goheen, “Story and Biblical Theology,” in Bartholomew et al., Out of Egypt, 144-71.
biblical theology must avoid flattening out all biblical genres or ignoring other motifs and themes.\textsuperscript{13} And while the current cultural climate is not conducive to telling the grand story of the exodus motif in all its dimensions, I am convinced that I must try for at least the following reason.

The exodus motif is one important way that the Bible tells us about Christ—not only about his person, but also about what he has accomplished in his work. The centrality of Scripture is Christ, and this book will take pains to demonstrate this hermeneutical principle as we trace the exodus motif through redemptive history as revealed in the Old Testament and New Testament.\textsuperscript{14} The exodus motif offers a way of explaining God’s grand narrative—or meganarrative—of redemption for sullied, sinful men, women, and children. In some cultural contexts, it might prove difficult to understand and see this as a grand narrative, since it might be construed as the master story of one’s adversary.\textsuperscript{15} Nevertheless, the exodus motif is the Bible’s grand narrative, and it is one of the best stories because it encompasses all the major aspects of God’s work of salvation through Christ: redemption from sin, suffering, and the tyranny of the devil (the exodus from Egypt and Pharaoh); bringing us into the very presence of God (represented at Sinai); wilderness wanderings (pilgrimage toward a special place); and possession of the land of Canaan (ultimately symbolizing entitlement to the world-to-come; cf. Heb 4) in order to be a unified, holy people in a place where they might worship God perpetually. Such is the

\textsuperscript{13}Möller, “Nature and Genre,” 59.


\textsuperscript{15}Consider, e.g., the testimony of Richard B. Hays in his recent book \textit{Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness} (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014), xiv-xv. The most frequent question he received from the audience during the presentation of his lectures in Cambridge was whether his argument “might impact conversations between Christians and Jews. Does a theological affirmation of the christological exegesis of Israel’s Scriptures de facto invalidate Judaism and generate a hostile supersessionist understanding of the relationship between Israel and the church? The question is both important and complicated.” Hays’s response is that Christian figural readings do not annihilate the significance of the Hebrew Scriptures; rather, they “affirm its reality.”
meganarrative of redemption with all its major theological themes: redemption and forgiveness, presence with God, which entails union and communion with God, sanctification through the pilgrim way, holy community in the kingdom of God, and positive righteousness won by the Savior qualifying one who believes for entitlement to the world-to-come. Nothing is more needed today than studies of Scripture that help us bridge the gulf that has been created in paradigms of salvation. Let me explain.

I was stunned by the paradigm shift that had occurred in the academy when I emerged from the Semitics library at the Catholic University of America as a newly minted PhD in 2000–2001, ready to begin my academic career. Forensic metaphors for salvation were being replaced by metaphors of participation. This could be traced to the more distant influence of Albert Schweitzer and in more recent decades to the influence of E. P. Sanders on Pauline theology. Sanders’s emphasis on participation in Christ vis-à-vis juridical concepts of salvation is evident in Paul and Palestinian Judaism, where he argues that “the main theme of Paul’s theology is found in participationist language rather than on juridical conceptions of atonement.”17 The influence coming in the wake of these works has been felt far and wide.18

Sanders, it is true, may be credited with chastening the academy for its caricatures of Judaism and changing the paradigm for New Testament studies.19 Additionally, he pioneered the “new perspectives” on Paul, giving birth to trends that are far from waning.20 Sanders has been called

---

17Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 552.
19He particularly helped focus attention away from merely Greco-Roman backgrounds and onto Jewish works as a background for understanding New Testament writings. See, e.g., the introduction of R. Michael Fox in Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014), xi.
the “godfather if not the grandfather” of the new perspective on Paul.21 The category of participation in Christ has become a central topic in discussions of Paul’s theology of grace.22

My own project attempts to bridge a huge gulf that has been created between participationist and forensic descriptions of salvation.23 Both elements must be included in any description of the plan of salvation presented in the Bible.24 Union and communion, participation and relationship with God—this is a vitally important category when talking about the salvation of sinners. Even so, one cannot pit this against judicial and legal categories.25 Just as a marriage between a man and a woman is one of the most powerful biblical metaphors for God’s relationship to his blood-bought people, so too we cannot eviscerate the forensic element out of this image or it will lose its power. That institution has a legal basis. Indeed, the relationship between God and Israel is also portrayed in terms of a marriage bond, and that relationship comes with demands.26 The Old Testament is largely unique in this regard compared to world religions and even Islam since it focuses on a

---

23 For bibliographical references, see Michael J. Gorman, Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul’s Narrative Theology (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 3n6.
24 Consider Gorman, Inhabiting the Cruciform God, who goes all in on the participationist side and encourages a greater appreciation for theosis. More precisely, he tries to bridge the gap between those who emphasize the juridical model and those who emphasize the participationist model by suggesting instead that Paul has one soteriological model: justification by co-crucifixion (which he labels JCC). Or, for a more mitigated position, but one that still makes unconditional promise the foundation of covenant theology and downplays the forensic foundation of salvation, see Scott W. Hahn, Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God’s Saving Promises, Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).
relationship with one transcendent, personal God who loves someone that has not loved him first.\textsuperscript{27}

I did not set out in this project to prove this claim. Rather, I was merely developing an elective course at the institution where I teach. Nevertheless, the more I observed the biblical data as it unfolded, the more I began to realize that I had stumbled into a manner of describing salvation that was inclusive of both the union and communion side of salvation (“participation”) and the forensic basis of salvation. These ways of describing salvation are not exclusive, forcing us to emphasize one or the other. I am referring to the ditch often created by those who emphasize participationist categories (sometimes referred to as “being in Christ” or “union with Christ”) over against juridical categories (i.e., declarative justification of the individual saint) in their presentation of biblical salvation.\textsuperscript{28} In short, both are necessary.

\textit{Biblical Motifs and Intertextuality}

A motif is like a theme, but it accomplishes more. Leland Ryken says it is “a discernible pattern composed of individual units, either in a single work or in literature generally.”\textsuperscript{29} Concurrent with the influence of a literary approach to the Bible, the analysis of motifs has been applied to biblical literature with ever-increasing frequency.

Recent studies in biblical narrative have demonstrated an ancient reader’s difficulty in grasping abstract ideas. In other words, so much of the biblical story and message is not given in bare, abstract propositions. Shemaryahu Talmon says there is a “dearth of systematic presentation of speculative thought [in the Hebrew Bible].”\textsuperscript{30} Generally speaking, truth derived from narrative must be an aggregate of particulars peppered throughout the biblical text. Only after sustained reading of a


\textsuperscript{28}Not all New Testament scholars would equate “union with Christ” with “participation.” So much depends on how one defines terms.

\textsuperscript{29}Leland Ryken, \textit{Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible} (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 361.

biblical story does a reader of the narrative arrive at the point of truth being conveyed.31

Talmon has proposed the following definition for a literary motif as it applies to biblical studies:

A literary motif is a representative complex theme that recurs within the framework of the Hebrew Bible in variable forms and connections. It is rooted in an actual situation of anthropological or historical nature. In its secondary literary setting, the motif gives expression to ideas and experiences inherent in the original situation and is employed by the author to reactualize in his audience the reactions of the participants in that original situation. The motif represents the essential meaning of the situation, not the situation itself. It is not a mere reiteration of the sensations involved, but rather a heightened and intensified representation of them.32

This definition has many salutary features. Motifs, according to Talmon, make a story come alive through resonances. A motif is a bridge-building literary tool for spanning centuries of elapsed time: it can make an ancient text come alive for subsequent hearers.

Talmon is an extremely sensitive reader of the Hebrew text. If he means, as John Wright says, that the “ideas and expressions in the original situation give rise to the symbol, and become a motif,” which is somewhat disassociated from the original situation itself, then I cannot but agree.33 Although Talmon focuses on the fact that biblical narrative is selective in its historiography, I would not draw such a sharp bifurcation between “the essential meaning of the situation” and “the situation itself.” The way to the world-to-come is through the earth. Concrete symbols give way to symbols that embody transcendent truths.

Literary concerns and historicity should not be pitted against each other. This book will help the reader understand the exodus motif in the

31Ibid., 151.
texts of the ancient Hebrews and the texts of early Christians. For example, we will trace the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, the use of mythical concepts in biblical literature, biblical theology, and biblical history. One of the most important things I wish to achieve is to break new ground in one area: how to understand evocation and allusion in biblical literature. Gilbert Highet recognized years ago, in tracking down Greek and Roman influences on Western literature, that this is no simple task:

It is a difficult art, the art of evocative quotation. The theory held by the romantics that all good writing was entirely “original” threw it into disrepute. It has been further discredited by the misapplication of scholarship and the decline in classical knowledge . . . for readers do not like to think that, in order to appreciate poetry, they themselves ought to have read as much as the poet himself. Also, they feel, with justice, that hunting down “allusions” and “imitations” destroys the life of poetry, changing it from a living thing into an artificial tissue of copied colours and stolen patches. Still, it remains true that the reader who knows and can recognize these evocations without trouble gains a richer pleasure and a fuller understanding of the subject than the reader who cannot.34

This is true as well with the study of the Bible, especially the Bible in its original languages: the reader who can recognize evocation will have a better understanding and appreciation of the material. As Benjamin D. Sommer has recently commented, “Indeed, the constant reworking of biblical material is a hallmark of Jewish literature, a hallmark that is already prominent in the Bible itself.”35 The technical term for evocation is *intertextuality*, which is “how the Bible relates to itself in its own system of cross-reference. . . . It has to do with the way in which parts of the Bible and finally the two Testaments relate to one another.”36 In other words, later biblical authors build on, allude to, cite from, and

36Christopher Seitz, *Prophecy and Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 228.
repurpose earlier portions of Scripture.\textsuperscript{37} As we will see in chapter one, biblical scholars often use the term intertextuality in manifold and sometimes confusing ways. This has become such a problem that some have even argued for abandoning the term altogether. I am not in favor of abandoning the term; rather, I think we need a careful analysis of how one should carry out intertextual studies. Early on in this study, we will seek to define our terms closely and carefully. Thus, instead of abandoning the term, I will attempt to revivify what I think is a responsible use of the term vis-à-vis an irresponsible, or at least less rigorous, understanding of intertextuality.

When performing intertextual analysis, some citations and allusions are easy to recognize; however, “recognition of intertextual elements are, in many cases, not conspicuous and are only ascertainable through the performance of an attentive textual analysis,” as Magdolna Orosz correctly recognizes.\textsuperscript{38} Thankfully, now more than ever before, resources are available to help the biblical interpreter identify quotations and allusions in the biblical text. Excellent and reliable lexicons, commentaries, concordances, and monographs identify and discuss allusions. And many of these resources can be loaded on computers, enabling quick searches.\textsuperscript{39}

In this book I will attempt to revivify a responsible use of typology, which has fallen out of favor in the academy. Indeed, typology and intertextuality are not unrelated, nor are they mutually exclusive, despite the fact that mainstream biblical scholars are disinclined to use typological exegesis at present.\textsuperscript{40} In exploring the exodus, we will use typology rather broadly. We will speak of both literary typology (retrojective and forward

\begin{footnotes}
\item[37]See the important article by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” in The Semitic Background of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 3-58. Fitzmyer builds a taxonomy for the way in which Old Testament literature is quoted in Qumran and the New Testament: (A) The Literal or Historical Class (pp. 17-21), (B) The Class of Modernized Texts (pp. 21-33), (C) The Class of Accommodated Texts (pp. 33-45), (D) The Class of Eschatological Texts (pp. 46-52).
\item[38]Magdolna Orosz, “Literary Reading(s) of the Bible: Aspects of a Semiotic Conception of Intertextuality and Intertextual Analysis of Texts,” in Reading the Bible Intertextually, ed. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), 197.
\item[40]As is recognized, for example, by Brueggemann, Theology of the Old Testament, 178.
\end{footnotes}
looking, as will be explained below) and typology in the more common sense found in the history of interpretation: a divinely designated, shadowy type anticipating and looking forward to a fulfillment in the antitype (i.e., the real thing).

In addition to tracing the exodus motif, I am also interested in and concerned about the discipline of biblical theology. The primary purpose of biblical theology is the study of God’s unfolding plan of redemption in Scripture. It has to do with understanding God’s revelation as given in different eras. Such study concerns itself with “three characteristics that are common to every action to which God commits Himself in time,” says Klaas Schilder. He goes on to identify those properties: “(1) Such revelation is always a true one, and (2) Such revelation is never a complete one, and (3) Such revelation is always a growing one.” These principles attend every ongoing revelation of God in Scripture. Following this threefold nature of revelation are certain demands on persons who receive it. This becomes important as we explore the contrasts among varying responses to God’s revelation.

Many biblical theologies are too ambitious. As James Barr comments, to add another book that essays the “grandiose task of verbalizing the theology of the whole” may, by its very ambitions, “invite mockery.” Barr questions whether ambitious Old Testament biblical theologies are the best way to pursue biblical theology. He suggests that the real work of biblical theology lies along more modest lines in the areas of tracing one theme, or investigating one area of Old Testament background or one area of Old Testament tradition.

Outline of the Book

Here is how we will proceed. Chapter one discusses intertextuality and hermeneutics generally. This chapter develops a text theory within a

---


42James Barr, The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 53, 60. See Barr’s insightful comments on pp. 52–61 about the ever-increasing number of large volumes trying to write the theology of the Old Testament.

43Ibid., 53.
philosophy of language that interacts with recent trends. If readers are interested in drilling deeper, they can consult the more detailed account found in the appendix. This is a complex and technical subject, and consequently its technical jargon needs no justification.

Chapter one also looks at allusions. How do they work? How is allusion distinct from related terms? Here the main issue is how the author of the text, the original audience, and the reader are all involved in the process of determining meaning. Is discerning the original author's intention actually possible, and if so, what does this mean? What is the primary and proper horizon from which to commence a study of the meaning of a given text? Is it the horizon of the reader, the audience, the author, or the historical situation of the original audience? In this discussion, we will observe how allusions to the exodus function.

Once these theoretical issues have been discussed, we will be ready to dive into the biblical text in earnest. Chapter two is about the foundations of the exodus motif as they are found in the biblical creation account. The past is prologue here. Thus, we turn to the beginning of the Scriptures to see that creation itself informs the way the story plays out. In creation, the big themes that will provide the backdrop for so much of the rest of the book are put in place: mountain, wilderness, avian (bird) imagery, alienation, and promise. Creation is important for its connection with covenant. Once we see that creation and covenant are connected, we are prepared to see the connections with the exodus. Covenant becomes a structuring device, especially in Genesis but also in Exodus. In my view, covenant is best defined as a legal transaction in

---

44Pace Fitzmyer, *Semitic Background*, 22.
which there are divinely sanctioned commitments.\(^{46}\) This definition is broad enough to encompass a host of biblical covenants. Moreover, it does not prejudice the relational over against the legal. Biblical covenants function as “instruments of the divine government.”\(^{47}\)

Having laid the foundations, we come to the heart of the matter in chapter three: a discussion of the exodus motif as a paradigm. We explore the foundational salvific event of the Old Testament and build a platform for future discussion. The deliverance of God’s people becomes a crucial motif in Scripture from this point forward.

In chapter four we see how the threads of the exodus motif are woven into the pattern and tapestry of the Psalms. We will also see the function of the exodus motif: Israel is called to a new level of understanding in light of God’s faithfulness in the past. We will see not only how biblical themes are interwoven at this point but also how the themes and ideas of the surrounding cultures are strategically employed. God as the divine warrior will now conquer the enemies of his people just as he subdued the ancient and tumultuous waters of chaos.

Chapter five deals with Isaiah’s use of the exodus motif. Something “new” is going to take place, according to the prophets. This has been called the “Isaianic new exodus.” From different vantage points and in various ways, Isaiah teaches us that the foundational salvific event of the exodus is a paradigm for announcing an altogether new event of salvation. What was a mere shadow is going to break on the horizon of the future with a new brilliance. In Isaiah 40–55 we will observe a fusion of a series of creation/redemptive themes in more than a dozen passages.

Next, chapter six handles the exilic and postexilic periods. Here I turn to the two other major prophets, Ezekiel and Jeremiah. The prophets are important for our understanding of how the exodus motif plays out in the New Testament; however, one more link is necessary before we turn to the New Testament’s use of this theme. After the Babylonian exile,


the exodus motif continues to influence the manner in which the biblical authors describe salvation history. Indeed, references to the exodus motif during the postexilic period of redemptive history mark the transition to the New Testament. The “new thing” that the prophets anticipated is realized in the coming of the King, who inaugurates his kingdom. Scholarship has recognized this especially in the use of particular Hebrew phrases and formulas in Ezra–Nehemiah having to do with the exodus and an analysis of the prayers of Nehemiah. Moreover, the exodus pattern becomes the paradigm of the Gospels to describe this new and profound realization.

When we come to the Gospels in chapter seven, we observe the mediatorial role that the ideology of the exodus plays in formulating the message of the arrival of King and kingdom. In this chapter I consider Mark and Matthew. Here the Isaianic new exodus paradigm is evoked to demonstrate that the exodus motif has become “eschatologized.” The exodus has become a future event promised on the basis of God’s past action in delivering his people. In chapter eight I will consider Luke–Acts. Now a reformulation of the exodus event appears along cosmic, earth-shaking lines: the new exodus is a creative event declaring who the true Israel is. Moreover, we begin to see that the foundation story of the exodus is mediated through Isaiah especially, but other Old Testament Scriptures as well.

As one would expect, all this evocation flowing from the exodus could not possibly leave the apostle Paul untouched. Indeed, the influence of the exodus motif on the apostle is pervasive, and we will be selective in what we discuss in chapter nine. As N. T. Wright says, “The theme of ‘new Exodus’ is never far away from the mind of Paul, or indeed of other early Christians.” The exodus motif has been identified by scholars as being pervasive and influential for two of Paul’s

49N. T. Wright, The Paul Debate: Critical Questions for Understanding the Apostle (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015), 38. Indeed, in an earlier work Wright had claimed that this was the narrative that had dominated so much early Christian thought; see Paul and the Faithfulness of God, 1105.
most important and doctrinal books: Galatians and Romans. Chapter nine discusses the influence of the exodus motif on these two books as well as some other references in Pauline literature such as Colossians 1:12-14 and 1 Corinthians 10:1-10.

The apostle Peter also makes prominent use of the exodus motif, especially in 1 Peter 1:1–2:10. Chapter ten interacts with the particular contribution of Petrine texts. These letters contribute to the development of the exodus motif from an ecclesial perspective. In 1 Peter 1–2, Christians are now redeemed by the spotless blood of the Lamb and become the new people of God, the fulfillment of the promise of that royal priesthood. We also begin to see the special function of the exodus motif unfold with new clarity in the these epistles. The people of God are caught up and participate in the new exodus so that they might serve God and one another as a new royal priesthood of God.

Chapter eleven brings us to the end of the biblical corpus with an examination of the exodus motif in Revelation. Here, all the strands come together in the consummation of the ages. Revelation shows similarities to 1 Peter, but John advances on Peter’s argument. Indeed, Christians are seen as the new kingdom of priests, no longer pilgrims in a strange land. The divine warrior themes so common in the exodus motif become prominent once again. The church’s victory is seen as complete; typology throughout Scripture is now fulfilled, and the consummation of the ages has come. The kingdom of Christ and his people has become the kingdom of this world.

Chapter twelve attempts to bring the arguments together under the rubric of biblical theology. Having traced the particulars of Scripture’s use of the exodus motif, we view the whole from the parts. I analyze what contribution our study makes to the discipline of biblical theology.

Should you speed-read this book? Probably not. I recommend reading from beginning to end slowly and carefully in order to discern the flow of the argument. I have deliberately organized it with such a view in mind. Skipping ahead to read the treatment on any particular passage or topic may lead to misunderstanding a part in light of the whole, or vice versa.
The exodus motif is one way the masterful and mysterious plan of God is made plain to those readers of Scripture willing to invest the energy. As Paul E. Deterding has said, “If the church’s proclamation is to be truly apostolic, we must also declare that God’s dealings with Israel in Egypt are not bare, historical facts with no application to ourselves. Rather, we are to proclaim that in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, in our own conversion, and in the immanent consummation, God fulfills His mighty acts of old for us.”50 Understood properly, the story of an ancient nation delivered from captivity, led into the desert, and brought to a new land is full of life-changing news for a modern world.

HERMENEUTICAL FOUNDATIONS

Mi amar le-mi u-matay (“who said unto whom and when”).

Chana Kronfeld

Theory was to be understood (by the Greeks) as itself the highest realization of practice.

Martin Heidegger

There is wide consensus among literary critics that Milton was a precursor to Wordsworth as Shakespeare was to Keats. These literary giants influenced subsequent poets. Can we observe the same kind of literary dynamic happening among biblical authors? For example, is Isaiah influenced by the creation account and the exodus motif when allusions are made in his writings? If so, how? Do the Gospel writers refer to the Prophets when they make allusions to the exodus? If so, how? More important, what does this tell us about how the Hebrew Bible is informing and influencing the narrative of Jesus as the agent of the new exodus? In the introduction we discussed motifs and their use in Scripture, highlighting their references to past events. In this chapter we will look at intertextuality, allusion, and typology.


2However, Milton criticism has been diverted with finding allusions that the writer himself may not have even been aware of. See, e.g., Dale C. Allison Jr., The New Moses: A Matthean Typology (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 22.
Simply stated, intertextuality is the manner in which the various books of the Bible interact. In other words, authors in Scripture often allude to, cite, echo, comment on, and even at times “revise” or “accommodate” other scriptural texts. When studying a passage in the Bible that references another passage, we are given a window into an author’s understanding of the other scriptural texts, especially when metaphors are used. But the reader cannot be left out of the equation when it comes to understanding meaning, especially when it comes to identifying motifs and metaphors. Indeed, in the final analysis, “it is the reader who ‘completes’ the reading and engenders the metaphor’s tenor [i.e., meaning].” My primary goal in this chapter is to provide the reader with a brief introduction to intertextuality. A secondary goal is to look at the literary side of hermeneutics.

Hans-Georg Gadamer is well known in the field of philosophical hermeneutics. One chief concern of Gadamer’s was to develop what he called “effective history,” or Wirkungsgeschichte. This is essentially the historical continuum shared by an interpreter and the phenomena he or she studies, which is ultimately the basis of understanding. Enter the topics of allusion and typology.

Literary theorists suggest all kinds of reasons for the deliberate use of allusion. For example, Benjamin Sommer, an Isaiah scholar, introduces the notion of delight and pleasure. Playfulness may contribute to the use of allusion since we delight in alluding to other authors and we delight as human beings in recognizing allusions. The primary reason Scripture uses allusions, however, has to do with typology. “Allusions commonly merge with typology,” claims Bruce Waltke. He goes on to say, “The Old

---

Testament is full of types of people and historical events, but none surpasses Moses and Israel’s exodus from Egypt.” Although typological interpretation has fallen on hard times in recent decades, it is a method of biblical interpretation with a time-honored pedigree in the church. The topic needs to be revisited in a serious manner, and the concept needs to be retrieved. In the discussion that follows, I will often use the terms figural reading and typology synonymously, although I realize that in much secondary literature distinctions are made between the two.

Finally, I will discuss the controversial concept of the rule of faith, or regula fidei. This hermeneutical principle was commonplace in the biblical interpretation of the early church. Recently, it has regained attention. The payoff is theological since, at its most basic level, the rule of faith is concerned to identify Christ with Yahweh as revealed in the Old Testament Scriptures.

A Brief History of Intertextuality

The term intertextuality was coined by the French literary theorist Julia Kristeva (b. 1941) in her 1969 book Σημειωτική [Sēmeiōtikhē]: Recherches pour une sémanalyse.⁸ Turbulent events in France in May 1968 provoked a crisis in literary criticism in order to attempt to transform society.⁹ Moved by what she perceived as a crisis in meaning within Western literature, Kristeva sought to mediate the ideas of Russian literary thinker Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975) to the Western world.¹⁰ Bakhtin was one

---

¹⁰Some may think that engaging authors such as Kristeva entails taking on the ideological baggage associated with poststructuralist theorists. I disagree since interest in their ideas (e.g., intertextuality and “echo” within literature) does not entail accepting their ideological framework. See the comments of Richard B. Hays, The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 172–74.
of the leading twentieth-century thinkers about the nature of literature and texts.\textsuperscript{11} He had analyzed Dostoyevsky’s novels and come to the conclusion that speaking merely of authorial intent in literature was shortsighted. Every character carries a voice that interacts with many other previous and contemporary voices inside and outside the text.

Consequently, to understand meaning in any given literary text, a reader needs to be aware of the myriad influences, cultural and intertextual, that are represented in the text. Kristeva’s methods were weighted more toward a synchronic than a diachronic approach. Looking at a topic synchronically means considering something across a slice of time, looking at language as a functional whole. In contrast, a diachronic approach is concerned with the text’s history, how it came into its present form through time. Here the aim is to give a historical evaluation of a topic through time. The synchronic approach is usually connected with reader-centered methods, whereas the diachronic approach is customarily joined to an author-centered methodology. This distinction is related to the thinking of the father of modern linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913). (The curious reader can learn more about him by turning to the appendix.)

**Intertextuality and Biblical Studies**

In biblical studies, the work of Michael Fishbane represents a seminal perspective on the field of intertextuality with his focus on the reuse of the Hebrew Bible within the Hebrew Bible itself.\textsuperscript{12} With methodological

---

\textsuperscript{11}See Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist, *Mikhail Bakhtin* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984). For a recent application of Bakhtin to certain aspects of systematic theology, see Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *First Theology: God, Scriptures and Hermeneutics* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), and especially his more recent work, *Remythologizing Theology: Divine Action, Passion, and Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Vanhoozer’s work is creative, deeply informed, and helpful in many respects; however, there are some areas where I demur at his suggestions, e.g., his construals that challenge a classic approach to the impassibility of God.

precision and clarity, Fishbane notes the many ways in which the scribes of the Hebrew Bible commented on the received text (the *traditum*) by incorporating their own exegetical insights into a subsequent product (the *traditio*). He argues that at each stage of the development of the Hebrew Bible, the *traditum* was transformed, revised, and even reinterpreted for subsequent generations.

In New Testament studies, the work of Richard B. Hays on Paul has been groundbreaking with respect to intertextuality. This is especially the case with Hays’s use of *metalepsis*, or *transumption*, a poetic and rhetorical device in which a later author draws on older work in order to suggest a connection or interplay between the two texts. Specifically, *metalepsis* is the use of allusion that “evokes resonances of the earlier text *beyond those explicitly cited*. The result is that the interpretation of a *metalepsis* requires the reader to recover unstated or suppressed correspondences between two texts.” Following Fishbane and Hays, a deluge of papers, articles, and books on intertextuality have flooded the biblical studies guild. Some have suggested jettisoning the term *intertextuality* altogether because of the varied uses of the term. Rather, we must be...
more precise in our use of terms and concepts since failing to recognize intertextual links may result in a loss of meaning and falsely presuming intertextual links may result in a distortion of meaning.17

How are we to define intertextuality? A minimal definition is how “in one artistic text there coexist, more or less visibly, several other texts.”18 Applied to biblical studies, it is the recognition that “the interpretation of the Bible begins with the Bible itself.”19 Here Leland Ryken’s simple definition is helpful: intertextuality is “a situation in which the full meaning of a text depends on its interaction with another text.”20 Even at this point, one must recognize cultural influences on the Scriptures and the reader’s role as well. A definition commended by W. J. C. Weren is perhaps inclusive enough to capture all these factors, since by “intertextuality” he means “research into the relationships between texts and the functions of these relationships.”21 I appreciate the functional definition given by James H. Charlesworth also: “Intertextuality is the attempt to appreciate the meaning of a text by focusing on the text (or texts) within it; that is, quoted in it or echoed in it.”22 Such mental recognition by a reader often depends on what I am calling “allusion competence.”

A character portrayed in a novel may say to a jealous husband, “I will not have you misinterpret my handkerchief!”23 Readers may immediately recognize such an allusion if they are current on their Shakespeare. However, this requires some level of literary competence, which undergirds an allusion competence. The character could have said to her jealous

---

20 Leland Ryken, Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 361.
husband, “I will not have you make me into a Desdemona,” or even more explicitly, “I will not have you make us into Desdemona and Othello from Shakespeare’s play Othello.” The latter examples are much more explicit. Even if readers don’t know the play, they can understand the allusion with a little bit of research.

In other words, in order for readers to recognize allusions, they must be aware of what is being referred to, which is an act of informed intelligence. In the interpretation of Scripture, the reader must keep in mind the human author as well as the divine author. The Old Testament can be used consciously by a New Testament writer, who can be influenced by it unconsciously as well. So what are we doing as students of the Bible when we use an intertextual approach, and how ought we to use the terminology now in vogue?

Reader Oriented or Author Oriented?

The answer to the above question is that both reader and author are important. For the sake of clarity, we should restrict the term intertextuality to the reader-oriented, synchronic approach (although not exclusively). On the other hand, two terms have gained currency for the more author-oriented, diachronic approach: innerbiblical exegesis and innerbiblical allusion. I will adopt the term innerbiblical exegesis for the diachronic approach since my understanding of allusion with regard to the exodus will focus on diachronic concerns. The upshot of this is that when I use intertextuality, I

---

24Ibid., 290.
25Figural (i.e., typological) interpretation will take both the divine authorship and intentions and the human authorship and intentions of the Scriptures seriously. Here Calvin may be our guide. Let it be perfectly clear what I am saying: “It is not possible for Calvin to talk singularly about the human author’s intention: for him this is never separate from the divine Author’s intention,” as Sujin Pak declared recently in “Calvin on the ‘Shared Design’ of the Old and the New Testament Authors: The Case of the Minor Prophets,” WTJ 73 (2011): 257.
28On this, see the extensive discussion in the appendix.
am talking about a literary connection in which one text influences another, and I am less concerned about chronological precedence. When I use the term *innerbiblical exegesis*, I am assuming that one text influenced a subsequent biblical text, even diachronically. In my judgment there can be no ultimate rapprochement between the two approaches (synchronic and diachronic) if they both want to own the term *intertextuality*.29

I am suggesting a theory that takes seriously the text and its original horizon, which includes both human and divine authors, and the process by which readers come to understand the literary and theological meaning of a scriptural text and realize that meaning may be “updated” by the new horizons of subsequent readers. As traditional approaches to philology have emphasized for centuries, readers have an ethical obligation and a responsibility to work hard and earnestly listen to what an author or narrator is saying, and to do justice to those words by not twisting them to fit one’s own interpretation.30

Sometimes determining quotations and allusions depends on an interpreter’s commitment to either the reader or the author.31 My theory of influence and intertextuality does not ignore the historical side of an author or the psychology of the reader, for the two must be wedded for a full understanding of meaning. This approach runs against the grain of much interpretation in literary circles.

---

29This is more restrictive than the recent work, from which I have benefited greatly, by Will Kynes, *My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job’s Dialogue with the Psalms*, BZAW 437 (Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 29. Kynes seeks to use the term more broadly by suggesting “intertextualities in dialogue” (by modifying Ben-Porat and Hays) since he notes that writers often fluctuate between diachronic and synchronic approaches in their analysis of allusions.


In the last half century, this “de-authoring” of texts and concomitant focus on the act of interpretation has “shifted attention to the reader, encouraging the procedures of [synchronic] intertextuality.”\textsuperscript{32} Has this been a good move? Whereas Julia Kristeva opened the gate for this new approach, Roland Barthes (1915–1980), perhaps the most influential among the new literary critics in France in the 1960s, sauntered through it. Barthes states,

Classic criticism has never paid any attention to the reader; for it, the writer is the only person in literature. We are now beginning to let ourselves be fooled no longer by the arrogant antiphrasical [antiphrasis is the rhetorical device that uses a word in an opposite sense to its usual meaning] recriminations of good society in favour of the very thing it sets aside, ignores, smothers, or destroys; we know that to give writing its future, it is necessary to overthrow the myth: the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author.\textsuperscript{33}

Surely, this is a gaffe of immense proportion when it comes to respecting any author, let alone the divine author.\textsuperscript{34} In this system of reference, Sommer suggests, “it is the reader who interprets signs in the text by associating them with related signs in the reader’s own mind.”\textsuperscript{35} As far as literary-critical theories are concerned, some would even say that the poststructuralist reaction to Barthes has led to a radical shift from how the signs of a text work to the “perception of those signs in the mind of the reader.”\textsuperscript{36} In other words, in this approach the meaning is merely generated by the reader.\textsuperscript{37}

By contrast, I am suggesting that human intentionality is accessible, though discovering what that exactly is has many challenges.\textsuperscript{38} Indeed,

\begin{thebibliography}{100}
\bibitem{Sommer} Sommer, \textit{Prophet Reads Scripture}, 7.
\bibitem{Vanhoozer} For helpful criticism of Barthes, see Vanhoozer, \textit{First Theology}, 211-13, 244-45.
\bibitem{Wimsatt} See the famous article on the “intentionalist fallacy” made clear: W. K. Wimsatt Jr. and M. C.
human intentionality is fairly consistent across cultures and artifacts and among individuals in their communication, whether written or otherwise.\(^3^9\) Barthes’s theory, which sought to marginalize or even get rid of the author of a text, suppresses history, biography, and psychology.\(^4^0\) I will not. Truth is at stake.\(^4^1\)

**Determining Literary Connections: Criteria for Establishing Relationship**

Within the context of innerbiblical exegesis and intertextuality, one of the first tasks for the reader of Scripture is to determine whether an actual influence exists between one text and another. Scholars who are concerned to establish and interpret a link have made various proposals for accomplishing this. What criteria should we use to determine the influence of one scriptural text on another?

**Sharing language.** The foremost criterion for establishing a link between texts is *shared lexical features*.\(^4^2\) When dealing with New Testament quotations of Old Testament texts, a debate ensues as to whether the New Testament author interpreted the Old Testament citation or quotation in line with the original Old Testament context.\(^4^3\) An example of

---

\(^3^9\) See the excellent book by Raymond W. Gibbs Jr., *Intentions in the Experience of Meaning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 332-34. Gibbs, a cognitive psychologist, provides a robust defense of intentionalism across cultures in written and oral communication, but he also recognizes that there may be different ways of recognizing intentions among people in different kinds of interpretive activities.

\(^4^0\) Ibid., 252-56.

\(^4^1\) See Ann Jefferson, “Structuralism and Post-structuralism,” in *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*, ed. Ann Jefferson and David Robey, 2nd ed. (London: B.T. Batsford, 1986), 92-121. She comments in relation to Barthes, “Truth is similarly found to have no real status in the literary text. Far from ordering and creating literature from without, Barthes shows truth to be a mirage produced by one of his five codes. By posing an enigma and deferring its solution, the hermeneutic code pulls off a sleight of hand which makes delayed information synonymous with truth. Truth is not something fixed and solid beyond and behind the literary text, and to which the text can be reduced: it is simply what comes last in the text” (110).


this is found in Psalm 68. At the end of the psalm (Ps 68:33-35), the psalmist appeals to the universal rule of God. The tone becomes eschatological and universal. The apostle Paul quotes this psalm in Ephesians 4:7-16. There is significant development from the context of the original psalm but also coherence. Enter the topic of typology.

When Paul quotes Psalm 68, there is typological development and heightening. But another point is significant for the purposes of biblical typology. In Ephesians 4:8, when the apostle says *dio legei*, “therefore it says,” he is citing Scripture in a manner that is not customary for the apostle. Paul is marking by the use of the preposition “therefore” (*dia*, in consequence of this) the inference of what Scripture says in Psalm 68:18. The effect of this is that Paul is essentially claiming, “(Because) to each one of us grace was given . . . therefore, . . . Scripture says, ‘When he ascended on high . . .’” Stephen M. Baugh explains that the apostle is essentially teasing out the meaning of Psalm 68, seeing in that text a preliminary announcement of the gospel (cf. Gal 3:8). For Paul, claims Baugh, the psalm is part of the organic development of how the apostle understands redemptive revelation. “Organic” is merely communicating continuity. Both author and reader are important here for understanding. In Ephesians there must be a merging of horizons. Yes, there is development and it is forward looking; however, the idea culminating in Christ’s distribution of gifts to men (Eph 4:11) was inchoate in Psalm 68, and that is the reason for the psalm being written in a mysterious and preliminary way.

**Sharing content.** Other ways may be established to link texts. Sometimes there is no direct citation or quotation from another passage in Scripture but merely overlap in content without direct citation. An example of this may be seen in 1 Peter, which is treated later in the book.

**Sharing form.** In the instance of authors citing each other explicitly, innerbiblical exegesis is clear. But a similar use of form or even structures

---


45 See ibid. Only in three other places does this occur in Scripture: a composite quote in Eph 5:14, Jas 4:6 (a quote from Proverbs), and Heb 10:5.

46 Baugh’s translation.
can also signal influence. Little research and writing has been developed in this area. Yet in my view similar patterns can provide important clues to influence. Indeed, similar structures between texts may be allusive. Take Isaiah 5 as an example. This chapter’s influence on the vineyard parables in the Gospels is notable, but consider how the form of the passage, a softer and more general pattern, may have influenced them as well. For example, the structure of Matthew 23 seems to have been influenced by the form of Isaiah 5 (notice the “woe” oracles in both passages).

Now that we have seen some criteria for determining links between biblical texts, how are these links used by biblical authors in constructing their texts and furthering their theology?

Interpreting the Connection and Exegetical Function

In what follows, I offer my definitions and criteria for determining allusions. The first area is the most general in literary circles: influence.

**Evocation and influence.** While I am interested in innerbiblical discourse that attempts to make diachronic judgments, to speak of evocation and influence is a better path. Some have gone so far as to say, “Inner-biblical discourse requires that we begin with diachronic observations and judgments.” Influence, moreover, is a term used in literary-critical circles to broadly describe links between various themes in texts. Strictly speaking, influence should refer to relations between mere texts. However, influence studies often comment on shared intellectual backgrounds. In considering the exodus motif, an expanded definition and sense of influence “allows one to shift one’s attention from the transmission of motifs between authors to the transmutation of historically given material.” This associative strategy has had a long history, but in modern literary criticism no one has been more influential than Harold

---

49Clayton and Rothstein, “Figures in the Corpus,” 3.
50Ibid., 6.
Bloom (b. 1930). Bloom’s theory of poetry “remains essentially a theory of literary influence.” Bloom maintains that authors are always engaging their predecessors when they write; indeed, they are under the influence of their predecessors. But Bloom also notes that there is a constant tilt toward originality in literature, an agonizing desire to say something different from those who have gone before us. Because of this, some have suggested that Bloom himself is caught in a “vicious oedipal circle” of his own making, though Bloom thinks this is a caricature of his work and an unfair reading. What, then, is allusion? We now look at precisely how scholars have referred to the various kinds of influence.

**Quotation.** Until recently, quotation has been the primary category recognized and discussed in scriptural intertextuality and innerbiblical studies. The issue is whether a quotation must contain some kind of citation formula (e.g., “it is written”). Stanley E. Porter has offered a critique of the definitions and methodology of scholarship in this area. Since some quotations do not have introductions (e.g., “it is written”), Porter calls quotations without an introduction formula “direct quotations.” However, I will use “quotation” for those marked with some kind of introductory formula.

**Subtle citation.** By contrast, a subtle citation is a quotation that does not have an introductory formula (e.g., “it is written”). This category may encompass a fairly literal citation without an introductory formula or a citation with some alteration of the word order of the cited text but not to the same degree as allusions. Porter uses the term paraphrase to cover this; however, I am trying to keep terms to a minimum. While there has been some discussion in biblical scholarship on this dynamic, especially in Paul, a consensus has not been achieved.
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**Allusion.** An allusion is usually defined as a tacit or indirect reference to another text, although this definition is inadequate. More recently, a semantic and pragmatic approach has been suggested as a better way to understand how allusions function in literature. Allusions are usually more fragmentary or periphrastic than quotations. But defining and describing the semantic meaning of allusions should not be overly formalized. Even so, as Ziva Ben-Porat observed, it is important to distinguish between “allusion in general and literary allusion.” Allusion in general merely makes indirect reference to known facts. Literary allusion, by contrast, is restricted to a “device for simultaneous activation of two texts.” But this might even be a reduction, for literary allusion is not merely a device but, in Viktor Shklovsky’s words, “an essential modality of the language of literature.”

Some would express uncertainty about whether an allusion to an Old Testament text by a subsequent Old Testament narrator or a New Testament writer was intended. Most, however, would maintain the intentional aspects of allusion. As James Chandler puts it, “An allusion is an intentional echo of an earlier text: it not only reminds us; it means to remind us.” Porter defines allusion as “nonformal invocation by an author of a text (or person, event, etc.) that the author could reasonably have been expected to know (for example, the Old Testament in the case
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