proclaimed by Paul and by the church that Ignatius called catholic.

That conviction is made most visible when the four Gospels are studied in the order proposed. All four could agree that the way to know God is by following and so knowing Jesus, and that faith and hope look for vindication in the resurrection of the dead on the last day, when the Son of man shall appear as judge. Meanwhile the three later Gospels expect disciples to participate in what the Spirit or risen Lord already now makes present. If Mark makes that insufficiently clear he at least deserves credit for stimulating such remarkable successors, and for leaving some modern readers with the uneasy suspicion that it is perhaps his God-forsaken and now absent Christ who is, when all is said and done, the secret of God’s rule.  

ABSTRACT

This article calls for consideration of the Cribbs–Shellard hypothesis that the fourth canonical Gospel to be written was Luke’s. The evidence is not decisive and certainty is impossible, but is sufficient to require that the hypothesis be seriously entertained. Looking at the four canonical Gospels in the different light of a new hypothesis about their probable literary relationships proves theologically suggestive for Christian reading of Scripture. Studying the Gospels in the proposed order, and considering how each Evangelist may have responded to his predecessors yield better New Testament theology than the modern tendency to marginalize John. Gospel criticism can thus make surprising new impacts upon Christology.


40. This essay echoes themes addressed by Maurice Wiles in the Festschrift for L.E. Keck (A.J. Malherbe and W.A. Meeks [eds.], The Future of Christology [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993], pp. 229-38) and is dedicated to both these exemplary theologians, teachers and colleagues on their respective seventieth and sixty-fifth birthdays. I am also grateful to colleagues at Oxford, Oberlin, and King’s College, London, and to Professor Moule, for helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

1. Introduction: Tradition and Intertextuality

In a 1975 article Jacob Neusner suggests that the study of religion can be profitably viewed as the study of tradition (Neusner 1975). In this context tradition is understood as that which gives an identity to a group of people, that which explains their past to them and provides a context within which they can think about the present and the future. As such, tradition is not static; it is creative and living. It is selective in that not all inherited in the tradition is passed on (Scholem 1974: 285), yet there is a core to the tradition which is central to any new situation.

Since tradition is a dynamic relationship between the past and the present, it exists in what Neusner calls a creative tension. This tension arises because on the one hand the tradition provides the basis for group identity; the tradition provides a matrix from the past within which people can conceive of their present and future. Yet on the other hand the tradition, as something that is rooted in the past, may not be able to face new realities; it constantly needs to be contemporized and reactualized in order to face new circumstances. In the words of Michael Fishbane, ‘the tradition is both conservative and innovative’ (Fishbane 1977: 286). There is a tension between handing the tradition

1. Knight 1977: 144. Cf. Young 1990a: 80: ““History” is not just “fact”; it is a corporate memory conveying identity, telling where we have come from so that we can know who we are and where we are going’.
on unchanged, which will kill it, and reinterpreting it for the present situation in such a way that it is vivified, yet not fundamentally impaired.²

Tradition, therefore, is in a constant state of transformation. Sometimes this transformation is in response to the mundane cultural changes that occur over the space of time; sometimes it is in response to a major cultural dissonance such as the capture of Jerusalem in the history of Israel. In times of crisis this reinterpretation gains a certain urgency, for at such times the tradition is under threat: if it proves unable to provide meaning in the face of emphatic disjunction it may be abandoned.³ Its only hope for survival lies in its ability to provide a fresh word of hope in a new situation. But whether a culture is in the throes of crisis or not, tradition is constantly readapting itself to reality as time passes.

What I am calling tradition is a dynamic that has been discussed in other contexts in other ways. By some this dynamic has been described in terms of ideology,⁴ by others in terms of world-view or the symbolic world,⁵ by others in terms of story.⁶ I will, in this article, use the term tradition, but I will do so with my ear attuned to the overtones of other terms.

This article is concerned primarily with Israel’s tradition. By and large, the most accessible form in which modern scholars can observe the transformation of Israel’s tradition is through its sacred writings. As Michael Fishbane has shown in his masterful study, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel (see Fishbane 1985: 18), from the time of earliest reflection on the sacred writings of Israel, a certain amount of reinterpretation took place in order to apply the biblical text to the situation of those reflecting on the text. This resulted in a certain method of dealing with the material which incorporated the sacred traditum with the current traditio to form what would be the traditum for succeeding generations (Fishbane 1985). Consequently, what was received in the written tradition was never identical to what was passed on.

This reinterpretation of the scriptural text, which Fishbane calls inner-biblical exegesis, was not limited to the Old Testament canon and the crises faced by those who wrote books such as Deuteronomy and second-Isaiah.⁷ The post-biblical writings of the Pseudepigrapha and Qumran reveal that such reinterpretation continued in the intertestamental period. Indeed, by that time it was accepted that exegesis was necessary in order for the tradition to be authoritative (Fishbane 1977: 297; 1989: 4), and it seems that in the synagogues especially the interpretation of the text became an inseparable part of the text itself (McNamara 1972: 69; Vermes 1975: 68).

I suggest that if we centre Paul in the scenario I have just outlined, if we situate him in the context of those who grapple with their tradition in order to revivify it for a new reality, if we place his interpretation of Scripture in this long tradition of reinterpretation, then his writings gain a coherence and sense which, some have argued, they at present conspicuously lack. The question that lies behind the following analysis is whether it is possible to see Paul as also working within this tradition which is struggling to reinterpret itself in a time of great conflict. Could Paul, in his use of Old Testament traditions, be working within the centuries long practice of reformulating those traditions in such a way that they have continuity and rootedness in the past, yet are revivified for the future? Perhaps this way of stating the question anticipates my conclusions; I can only hope that by the end of this article the reader will think this anticipation justified.

In situating my discussion of Paul in the context of the question of tradition, I have been talking in sociological terms. But, as Jeanrond (1988: xv) has shown, for us theology is enmeshed in texts and hence the only way into the question of tradition is by way of a text—in this case Rom. 8.14-30. Hence the use of ‘intertextual’ in my title.

Intertextuality is a term used by literary theorists in its broadest sense to designate the structural relations among two or more texts (Morgan 1985: 5). Within circles which deal with biblical interpretation the term ‘inner-biblical exegesis’ has been generally used to discuss the relationship between texts, specifically the text of the Old Testament and subsequent reinterpretations of that text. For a number

3. Further on this, see Ludwig 1980: 26.
7. On the reinterpretation of tradition in books written at the time of the exile, see Ackroyd 1977; Zimmerli 1977; Brueggemann 1985; Lohfink 1977.
of reasons, however, the term intertextuality is more fruitful for our discussion here.

In the first place, Paul is not primarily concerned with a straightforward exegesis of the Old Testament text in Rom. 8.14-30. Unlike the authors of the book of Jubilees, the Qumran commentaries, or the Targums, he is not involved in an intentional and explicit systematic retelling of the biblical story or a systematic exegesis of a given text. Paul’s use of the Old Testament tradition in these verses is more implicit: it works on the level of echo or allusion. It should be noted that it is difficult to ascertain in some cases whether Paul’s use of the Old Testament tradition is unintentional (echo) or intentional (allusion). All that can be determined is whether an echo would have made sense to Paul’s readers in their particular cultural context. In contrast to inner-biblical exegesis, which describes an intentional dynamic, intertextuality refers to a dynamic occurring between texts which is not dependent on or limited by intentionality or lack thereof. In this article I will be arguing that some allusions could be seen quite plausibly as intentional and that for others the issue of intentionality is hard to determine. At any rate, the question of whether Paul intended to create a certain intertextual pattern should not limit our discussion of such patterns when they do occur. It may be that Paul’s text carries echoes and meanings which were hidden even from Paul himself (Hayes 1989: 33).

One reason why the question of Paul’s intentional use of previous texts can be an open one for us is the more fluid origin of the notion of intertextuality. It has been noted that texts occur not only in relation to other texts but also in dialogue with other aspects of the cultures in which they occur. Hence an intertextual reference may be to a ritual or a work of art, or indeed to a matrix of ideas which is informed by specific texts, but is not a text in itself. Hayden White refers to such ideas as the archetypal story lines of a culture, while Boyarin discusses them in terms of ‘cultural codes’. The ‘historical, ideological, and social system of a people’ provides a construction with which every text within that culture is in dialogue. But these cultural codes provide not only the dialogic context for a text, they also provide constraints on the text. Boyarin notes that ‘when a historian…reconstructs the past, this is always done in conformity to the plots which the intertext of the culture allows. This is what endows the narrative he or she creates with both plausibility and significance’ (Boyarin 1990: 86; White 1978: 85-88). The writings of Paul also, I suggest, take place within certain ‘cultural codes’ which endow his writings with plausibility. Sometimes these can be traced to specific texts, but more commonly he is drawing on a matrix of ideas which cannot be linked to any specific text but which is shaped and formed by a number of texts (and traditions) within his culture. In this article I will attempt to pinpoint some of the texts which quite possibly constituted this matrix of ideas; texts to which Paul may or may not have been deliberately appealing, but which shed some light on the assumptions of the culture within which Paul was writing.

A number of literary theorists have explored the way in which intertextuality is a dynamic which both ‘disrupts’ and ‘regenerates’ a given textual tradition. Thus intertextuality is a literary discussion of

8. According to Morgan (1985: 5), relations between texts can occur in a number of ways; they may be explicit or implicit, intentional or unintentional. The most explicit of intertextual relations is quotation; the most implicit is allusion or echo.

9. Although the literary theorists who first used this term did indeed assert the unintentional nature of intertextuality alongside the near impossibility of locating the origin of the intertext (eg. Barthes 1981: 39) it is now common to speak in terms of intertextual patterns which are rooted in known texts and which may have been intended by the author of the text. See: Boyarin 1990: 12; Boyarin 1987: 540; Morgan 1985; Gosselin (1978) assumes intentional intertextuality between specific texts throughout her article, as does Perri (1978). It should be noted that the emphasis on the unintentional intertextual nature of texts was important for authors such as Barthes and Kristeva since they were arguing for the intertextual nature of all textual discourse. For such a discussion the unintentional nature of much intertextuality does indeed need to be emphasized.
the very dynamic outlined earlier in relation to tradition; intertextuality is one means by which a tradition is transformed and revivified for a new context and situation. 15 If we are concerned with how Paul struggled with his new context as a Jewish Christian, and if our window into that struggle is a certain text, then intertextuality provides a suitable framework for discussing Paul’s thought.

While the majority of my exegesis deals with intertextual relationships, I will also draw on intratextual connections in my exegesis. That is to say, echoes within the Pauline text itself, places where Paul alludes to something which he himself has already said, will also contribute to my argument.

As is the case with any new methodological undertaking, a few words need to be said about constraints. This matter is especially relevant in an article such as this one, which concerns itself primarily with echo and allusion. There may be little doubt about the source of an explicit quotation, but the intertextual background of an echo is more likely to be open to question. The criteria which provide constraints for my analysis are taken, and in one case expanded, from Richard Hays’s book Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul. They are not all equally relevant for both intentional and unintentional echoes and carry relative weight according to their suitability. They can be outlined briefly as follows:

1. **Availability.** Was the proposed source of echo available to the author and/or original readers? 16
2. **Volume.** To what degree is there explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns? This also involves how distinctive or prominent the precursor text is within Scripture and how much rhetorical weight the echo receives in Paul.
3. **Recurrence.** How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage?
4. **Thematic Coherence.** How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument Paul is developing? Does it clarify or illuminate Paul’s discussion?

5. **Historical Plausibility.** Could Paul have intended the suggested meaning? Could his readers have understood it? Or, leaving the language of intentionality aside, is the suggested meaning plausible in light of ‘the plots which the intertext of the culture allows’ (Boyarin 1990: 86)?

6. **History of Interpretation.** Have other readers, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes? (This criterion, it should be noted, should never be used to exclude readings which commend themselves on other grounds.)

7. **Satisfaction.** Does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse? Does it produce for the reader a satisfying account of the effect of intertextual relation? 17

I will not make explicit my use of these criteria throughout the course of this paper. I will, however, evaluate my conclusions in their light at the end of the exegesis.

At the outset of this article I placed my discussion of intertextuality in the context of tradition. The tradition which I will be alluding to at length is the exodus tradition. A brief description of the importance of the exodus tradition in ancient Israel and second-temple Judaism is therefore in order.

Within Israelite historical consciousness the exodus held a central place. 18 The exodus was recalled as the major formative event in Israelite history. It was seen as the event in which Israel was created; their history as a people was perceived to have begun at the exodus. 19

As a result, the exodus was recalled as that which formed the identity of the Israelite people; they were a people who had once been slaves but had been saved from slavery by the Lord their God.

As the basis of Israelite self-identity, the exodus was also recalled as

---

15. See also Boyarin 1990: 22, 38, 104 where Boyarin suggests that the rabbis created a ‘pervasively intertextual literature’ as part of the appropriation of Scripture for their (disrupted) times; Boyarin 1987: 555; Rusinko 1979: 232.
17. Taken, with an addition to the fifth criteria, from Hays 1989: 29-32.
the paradigm for Israelite social interaction. The laws which outline attitudes towards the sojourner, slaves and the poor all find their basis in the liberating context of the exodus: ‘Love the sojourner, for we were sojourners in the land of Egypt’ (Deut. 10.19); ‘You shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt and the Lord your God redeemed you; therefore I command you today [to free Hebrew slaves in the seventh year]’ (Deut. 15.15).20 The exodus narrative provides a basis for the law; it provides a vision of reality within which the law gains meaning (Sanders 1987: 43).

The exodus narrative was also recalled as that which gave identity to Israel’s God. Israel’s God is a God who hears Israel’s cry and comes to redeem them; a God who acts on behalf of God’s people; a God who provides for the people in the wilderness and provides them with an inheritance; a God who gives them life.

And because Israel knew that God had acted for them in the past, they could be sure that God would act similarly for them in the future. Hence the prophetic books envision God’s restoration of Israel in terms of a new exodus event.21 Israel will once again be gathered from the nations and be led through the wilderness to her inheritance.22 In the words of Michael Fishbane, the exodus informed Israel’s ‘projective imagination’ (Fishbane 1979: 121), their expectation of how God would interact with them in the future. The exodus motif, therefore, was a recollection of the past which guided Israel’s actions in the present and provided hope for their future.

The presence of the exodus motif in intertestamental literature suggests that it was still an important part of Judaism at the turn of the

20. See also Deut. 5.15; 6.20-25; 10.19; 15.15; 16.12, 20; 23.8; 24.18, 22; Lev. 19.34; Exod. 20.2; 22.20; 23.9. See also Stuhlmuller 1970: 60; Sarna 1986: 3; Bauck 1964: 46; Daube 1963: 13, 38; Anderson 1976: 344; Noth 1971: 49; Walser 1985: 53, 101-16. Walzer points out that the exodus event cannot really be liberating unless Israel responds in obedience (pp. 109-16).


22. Deut. 30.4-5; Pss. 30.4; 104.11; 142.2, 10; Isa. 60.21; 63.13, 14; Jer. 38.9; 9; Tob. 13.4, 5; Bar. 5.6; Sir. 36.10; Jub. 17.3; 22.14; 32.19; 1 En. 5.7.
epistle that discusses the righteousness and faithfulness of God in relation to Israel, used a phrase such as ὁ διός γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἔγνωκας, would be have been alluding to a matrix of ideas common in first-century Judaism.

The second image, 'sons of God', is most often interpreted in light of discussions on Christology. As such, the focus is often on the 'individual' as son of God and hence on the question of divine status and relationship to the father. The Old Testament texts which inform such a focus are generally those which point to the king of Israel as Son of God.28

When we tune our ears to hear the first-century overtones of these phrases, however, we discover echoes in these images of a number of Old Testament passages and images. I. de la Poterie has suggested that 'the verb ἔγνωκα (with its compounds ἔγνωκαν and ἔλεγχον) and its synonym δοκήσεως, in the Greek New Testament are derived from technical terms found in Exodus vocabulary' (1976: 221),29 and an examination of the context of these words in the LXX reveals that they do indeed occur most prominently in an exodus context.30 Similarly a careful look at the Old Testament and intertestamental literature reveals that by far the most common image associated with the 'son of God' terminology is Israel as son of God.31

In fact these images occur together in a number of Old Testament passages.32 Most notable of these is Deuteronomy 32 where in the Song of Moses we read of the faithfulness of God towards a people who continue to act perversely towards him. This text is echoed a number of times in Rom. 8.14-17. The people of Israel are characterized as God's children (τέκνα v. 5) and God's sons (υἱοί vv. 19, 20), albeit unfaithful ones. God is Israel's father, who created them (v. 6) and begot them (v. 18). Moreover Israel is a people whom God alone led (ὁγείε) in the exodus (Deut. 32.12) and tenderly cared for in the wilderness. The echoes of Deuteronomy 32 which can be perceived in Romans 8 are abundant.

But these intertextual echoes are not direct; they are not specific quotations of the LXX passages and one might be tempted to suggest that the echo is too faint to be heard, were it not for corroborating intra-textual evidence which we also have; that is to say, other evidence within Paul's writings and within Romans itself show that Paul's thought moved within the framework of Deuteronomy 32. Paul not only uses Deuteronomy 32 in 1 Corinthians 10 (see Hays 1989: 93-94) he also directly quotes parts of Deuteronomy 32 in Romans 10 and 15, quotations which shed some light on our possible echo in Romans 8.

In Romans 8 Paul is taking the characteristics of Israel found in Deuteronomy 32 (and elsewhere) and applying them to the church, the new community in Christ. In doing so he does not just make a typological identification between the two, nor does he reject Israel by transferring their identity to the Christian community. His echo of the sonship language moves in the larger matrix of Deuteronomy 32 as a whole, where Israel is provoked to jealousy by another nation (Deut. 32.21 quoted in Rom. 10.19) and where the nations will join with Israel in praising God (Deut. 32.43 quoted in Rom. 15.10).33 If we allow Paul's intertextual echoes here to move within the larger framework of Deuteronomy 32, we realize how nuanced his application of the tradition of Israel to the church is: the Christian community is identified with the tradition of Israel for the very sake of Israel. Paul's language in these verses anticipates the argument of Romans 9-11.


31. Exod. 4:22; Deut. 32.6, 7, 20, 43; Deut. 14.1; Hos. 2.2 (LXX); 11:1; Isa. 1.2, 4; 43.5-7; 45.11; Jer. 31.9 (LXX 38.9); 31.20 (LXX 38.20); Sir. 36.4; Wis. 9.7; 12.6; 14.3; 16.10; 26; 18.4, 13; 19.6; Pss. Sol. 13.9; 17.27; 18.4; Jub. 1.24, 25; 25, 26: Sanh. Or. 3.702; T. Mos. 10.3. The following passages allude to Yahweh as Israel's father: Jer. 3.4; 3.19; Isa. 63.16; 64.7; Wis. 11.10; 12.6, 21; Deut. 32.6; 7, 18. See Schweizer 1966: 190; TDNT, VIII, 351-52; Wilckens 1980: 156; Moo 1991: 534.

32. De la Poterie (1976: 225-26) discusses the juxtaposition of the image of leading and the image of Israel as 'son' of God in a number of Old Testament passages including Deut. 32, Isa. 63, Jer. 31 [38], and Isa. 63. I will discuss these passages in greater depth below.

33. Further on this see Hays 1989: 163-64.
But these verses do not echo only Deuteronomy 32. This is primarily because Paul is drawing on themes which were central within the symbolic world of ancient and first-century Judaism. Hence, the imagery of leading is central to a number of accounts where God’s faithfulness to Israel in the exodus is recalled—for example, Exod. 15.13; Ps. 104.42, 43. In a number of instances (Pss. 77 and 22 LXX) this language of leading is linked with the language of not being afraid (cf. Rom. 8.15) and being led in hope (cf. Rom. 8.20). I am not suggesting that Paul was consciously echoing all of these passages. Rather, it seems to me that they provide insight into an intertextual matrix of ideas where the leading of God in the exodus is a dominant image.

There are, however, a number of passages which, in addition to Deuteronomy 32, provide a less elusive background to Rom. 8.14, 15 and which may have been equally as prominent as Deuteronomy 32 in Paul’s mind.

The first of these is Isaiah 63. This chapter recalls God’s past mercies and love towards the Israelites, who are God’s children (v. 8). It recalls the exodus event where the Spirit of God came down and led (ἀνέκτησεν) God’s people, where God led the people to make for God’s self a glorious name (v. 14). It ends with a supplication, a cry to God as father for salvation (v. 16). Notable are the explicit images of being led by the Spirit of God, the crying to God as father, which is echoed at the end of Rom. 8.15, and the general context of appeal for help, based on a recollection of past events, most notably the exodus. This latter emphasis becomes central as Romans 8 progresses.

A similarly strong intertextual background for this passage is Jeremiah 38 (31 MT), specifically vv. 8, 9:

> γιὰ τὸ ημὲν ἐυκαμπτόμενον ἐκ τῆς καταδείκνυσθεν ἡμῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐνεργείας τῆς ἱεραρχίας τῆς ἐντολὴς τῆς ἐν ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν προσκυνήσει τῆς ἐν πίστει τῆς ἐν οἰκείωσις τῆς ἐν ἡττήματι τῆς ἐν εἰρήνῃ τῆς ἐν ἱεραρχίᾳ τῆς ἐν ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν προσκυνήσει τῆς ἐν πίστει τῆς ἐν οἰκείωσις τῆς ἐν ἡττήματι.

Behold, I will lead them from the north and will gather them from the ends of the earth in the feast of Passover; you will also give birth to a great company, and they will come back here. With weeping they came out, and with consolation I will lead them up, causing them to dwell by brooks.

34. My thanks to Professor Al Wolters for this translation of φασέω.

This passage not only provides an intertextual matrix for the leading of God’s people and the image of God as father which we have focused on thus far (both in the context of a new Passover), it also provides a verbal link between Ephraim as πρωτότοκος (first-born) and Jesus as πρωτότοκος in Rom. 8.29. This could suggest an identification of Jesus the Christ with Israel.35

The context of these verses from Jeremiah is, of course, the magnificent chapter which culminates in the new covenant. The chapter begins with a new exodus event, moves on to the new covenant, and ends after the dramatic assertion that only if the created order were to disappear, then Israel would cease to exist before God. This passage, therefore, provides a background not only for the motifs which we have discussed thus far, but also provides a context for Paul’s insistence on the faithfulness of God to Israel in Romans 9–11.

In fact, Paul’s emphasis on the renewal of creation furthers on in Romans 8 takes on weighty implications in light of this. Not only, as we shall see below, is Paul concerned with God’s faithfulness to all of creation, but in light of Jeremiah 38, the renewal of creation in Romans 8 is an affirmation of God’s faithfulness to Israel. If we allow the Jeremiah text to speak through our reading of Romans 8, then Paul’s language here takes on a meaning which coheres extremely well with his argument of the letter as a whole.36

It is possible that Paul is echoing themes also found in a number of intertestamental texts—I am thinking specifically of Tob. 13.4, 5 and Bar. 5.6 where, in new exodus accounts of God’s faithfulness to Israel, we read that God leads his people and is a father to them. Moreover, we also find in these passages the themes of witness and glory, also found in Romans 8. I will not follow up these possibilities in any detail here, although they illustrate the juxtaposition of the themes of Romans 8 in writings which informed Paul’s cultural context.

Up to this point my analysis of Paul’s intertextual echoes has neglected one important context of the motif of ‘being led’ found throughout the Old Testament which we first find in Exod. 6.6: Εὑρο

35. See Allison 1987b: 79ff. where the parallels with the exodus in Mt. 1–5 suggest a typological identification of Jesus with Israel (p. 76).

36. That a central concern of Romans is God’s faithfulness to Israel is argued by Hays 1989; Elliott 1990; Wright 1991: 234-35.
kύριος καὶ εξέδω ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς δυναστείας τῶν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ῥύσομαι ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῆς δουλείας... (I am the Lord and I will lead you out of the power of the Egyptians and deliver you from bondage...'). This phrase (with slight variations) becomes the basis for the self-designation of God in passages which describe the exodus event. Hence, at the establishment of the Passover ceremony the Israelites are to tell their sons in chеιρι κρασιαί ἑξέδω ὑμᾶς κύριος ἐκ τῆς δουλείας (By strength of hand the Lord led us out of the land of Egypt out of the house of bondage, Exod. 13.14, cf. v. 3). Similarly the decalogue found in both Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 begins in both instances of this phrase (Exod. 20.2 and Deut. 5.6) and the designations of God throughout Deuteronomy follow this pattern. In Leviticus this phrase is used as a basis for God's future redemption—the fact that God made a covenant with the first generation whom God led out from slavery ensures that God will remember the people in exile (Lev. 26.45). The phrase is used throughout the LXX for Yahweh's great act in the exodus from Egypt. What is striking about this phrase is not only that γάρ verbs are commonly used but that the leading out which occurs is invariably from δουλείας, the very word Paul uses in Rom. 8.15:

οὐκοι, γάρ, πνεύμα ἢθεου ἄνθρωπον
οὐ φύλακεν πνεύμα δουλείας
καὶ εἰς ψώμινο
καὶ ἐλάβεσθε πνεύμα λογίας (Rom. 8.14, 15a)

The use of the phrase πνεύμα δουλείας ('a spirit of bondage') has puzzled commentators, who have variously asserted that it is merely a rhetorical foil to πνεύμα λογίας ('a spirit of sonship') and that it refers to the old religious order and slavery under sin. It seems more likely that in vv. 14 and 15 Paul is echoing one of the Old Testament confessional statements about the nature of God

(cf. Fretheim 1984: 24-29), a statement which characterized God primarily as the one who led the people out of Egypt in the exodus, who freed them from bondage. Almost half of the occurrences of δουλεία in the LXX are in this context (cf. Noth 1971: 47-52). Thus it seems likely that the use of δουλεία by Paul would have suggested this Old Testament refrain.

Again, we cannot ascertain whether this is a direct allusion to a specific text; it is more likely an appeal to the intertextual space on which Paul was drawing. Paul's echo of Scripture in these verses appeals to the most primary confession of who the God of the ancient Israelites was. As such Paul is grounding his line of thought in these verses once more in the confession of God as a God who is faithful and as the one who leads God's people from bondage.

3. Intratextual Echo in Romans 8.14-30

Paul's echo using δουλεία in v. 15 forms the basis for an intratextual echo in v. 21. In that verse creation is described as being set free from its bondage (δουλείας) to decay into the glory of the liberty of the children of God. It is quite probable that Paul is echoing Rom. 8.15 here and that in so doing he is indicating that the action of God in liberating his people (whether in Christ or the exodus) is to be applied to creation. Creation too will move from bondage to liberation. Creation too will experience an exodus event. God is faithful not only to her people, but also to her world.

It seems to me that this echo is quite strong—but in the light of Old Testament material, just how probable is it? Well, the application of bondage language to creation, of course, is not new to Paul. Throughout the Old Testament there is an explicit link between the freedom and obedience of Israel and the fruitfulness of the land. When Israel is

41. This interpretation solves the false dilemma that arises when it is noted that Paul uses slavery language for servitude to sin as well as for servitude to God (cf. Dunn 1988: 452). Paul uses δουλεία only in a negative sense (Rom. 8.15, 21; Gal. 4.24; 5.1) whereas the word δολός is used in a more varied manner. Martin (1990) does not seem to discuss the difference between these terms. The use of δουλεία in contrast with λογία also suggests, contra Sanders 1977: 512, that Paul does have an understanding of sin which is reminiscent of the Israelites' "bondage" under Pharaoh. This also suggests an answer to Rüschmann's query (1987: 233) as to why Paul repeatedly refers to the non-Christian past as 'slavery' and why he sets the contrast between past and present in terms of bondage and freedom.

37. Deut. 5.6; 6.12; 7.8; 8.14; 13.5 (6), 10 (11).
38. Eg. Judgs. 6.8; 1 Kgs 9.9; 2 Esd. 19.17 (Neh. 9.17); Mic. 6.4; Jer. 41.13 (24.13). See Noth 1971: 47-49, who describes this phrase as "a primary confession (Urbeekenness) of Israel" (p. 49). (italics original).
40. Byrne 1979: 99 n. 75; Cramier 1982: 211; Dunn 1988: 452.
in bondage, either to Egypt or disobedience, all aspects of the created order in Israel suffer. Hence the oppression of Israel in Egypt resulted in an oppression of all of creation (see Fretheim 1991a; 1991b: 357).

This continuing relationship between the people of Israel and creation is made explicit in Leviticus and Deuteronomy where the blessings and curses are outlined: if Israel is obedient, the land will be fruitful, if it is disobedient, the land will lose its fertility.42 This emphasis is found also in the prophetic literature where the disobedience and punishment of Israel are linked to the desolation and fruitlessness of the rest of the created order.43

When Paul, therefore, characterizes creation as being in bondage, he is drawing on a theme which has been prominent throughout the Old Testament story. And as the bondage of creation is closely linked to the bondage of the people of God, so the renewal of creation finds its source in the liberation of the people of God. Terence Fretheim, in one of his recent articles, argues that the exodus account makes clear that ‘the deliverance of Israel is ultimately for the sake of the entire creation’ (Fretheim 1991a: 392). Whether Paul would have been sensitive to these nuances in the exodus account is unclear; we can be more certain that he was aware of this emphasis in the prophetic and inter-testamental literature where the renewal of creation is closely linked to the redemption of the people of God.44 In using the language of bondage, therefore, in talking of creation, Paul is evoking a tradition deeply rooted in the intertextual space of his culture.

Note that I am not arguing here that Paul is echoing these Old Testament or intertextual texts. Indeed, none of these texts explicitly states that the land is in bondage. Rather, the echo here is an *intratextual* echo with Rom. 8.15. This echo, however, gains plausibility when placed within the continuing story of Israel and creation as witnessed to in Israel’s writings and outlined above.

42. Deut. 28.1-24; 29.22-29; Lev. 18.24-28.
43. See Gen. 4.11, 12; Isa. 7.23-25; 8.21-22; 9.18-21; 13.9-13; 24.4-6; 32.9-14; 34.8-17; Jer. 4.23-26; Amos 4.7-9; Hos. 4.1-3; Hanson 1985: 198; McDonagh 1990: 12; Bradley 1990: 60; Dymess 1987: 60-61; DeRoche 1981: 400-409. Both DeRoche and Dymess point out that the punishment upon Israel is portrayed as the reversal of creation in a number of passages (Zeph. 1.2-3; Hos. 4.3).
44. E.g. Isa. 11.6-9; Jer. 50.34; Ezek. 34.25-31; Hos. 2.18-23; Zech. 8.12 etc.; later 1 En. 45.4-5; 51.4-5; 2 Bar. 29; 4 Ezra 8.52; Sib. Or. 3.777-96. See Byrne 1979: 105; Moo 1991: 554.

46. Ps. 11.6 (12.5). See also, e.g., Judg. 2.18; Ps. 101.21 (102.20).
47. See references in the above note as well as Job. 3.24; 23.2; 24.12; Pss. 6.7 (9.6); 30.11 (31.10); 37.9, 10 (38.8, 9); 78.11 (79.11); 101.6 (102.5); Isa. 24.7; 30.15 (Greek = 'when you turn from groaning then you shall be saved'); Jer. 51.33 (45.3); Lam. 1.8, 21, 22; Ezek. 21.11, 12 (6, 7); 1 Macc. 1.26; 3 Macc. 1.18.
salvation. Moreover, the imagery of the pain of childbirth had become, in Neil Elliott’s words, ‘the potent and powerful language of theodicy in Jewish apocalyptic literature’ (Elliott 1990: 259 n. 1).

This imagery was associated with the end days, with the coming of God’s kingdom in the new age. By using the image of creation as groaning and suffering the pang of birth, therefore, Paul is not only echoing the language of the curse, he is also echoing language associated with God’s liberation from the oppression of the curse for Israel both in the exodus and in the new age to come. Creation too suffers bondage—but it is bondage from which creation will experience a new birth.

This emphasis shifts in v. 23 where Paul draws a connection from the groaning creation back to the people of God: we also groan (στενάζομεν), says Paul. Again Paul is rooted in the Old Testament tradition: as we have seen, the people of God groan under oppression. But Paul has transformed this tradition, making it wider than the Old Testament texts had intended. Not only the land of Israel, but all of creation, the whole earth is groaning under oppression. And not only the people of Israel, but all those who are in Christ Jesus are groaning under oppression; not just under the oppression of another foreign power, but under the oppression of a worldwide curse, the curse of Adam. The tradition has been transformed so that it is no longer only the tradition of Israel, land and people, but the tradition of the whole cosmos and those in Jesus Christ.

Up until this point Paul’s echo of στεναγμός has been shifting between creation and the people of God. But the echo does not end there, for in v. 26 Paul tells us that the Spirit intercedes with ‘wordless groans’ (στεναγμοί ἀλαλήτους). This echo completes the picture: God too is sharing the groaning of creation and of believers. The irony of this should not be overlooked. It was part of the curse that birth was to be painful; as we noted above, Eve’s groaning and anguish in childbirth were to be increased because of her sin. And now God’s very self is under that curse as well—God is bearing the very curse to which God subjected humankind and creation.

The idea of God bearing the curse for our sin is, of course, central to much christological discussion. This passage suggests, however, that this bearing of our curse was not an event isolated in Jesus on the cross. In the Spirit God continues to bear that curse, God continues to suffer with the people God created.

Through intertextual echo Paul has drawn on the Old Testament tradition of the groaning of the people of God in bondage. But that is not all that he does. He transforms the tradition in such a way that it is no longer only the story of Israel, but the story of the whole people of God in Christ, the story of the whole of creation and the story of God’s very self.

4. Evaluation

I have argued in this article that a number of Paul’s images in these verses echo the exodus event and that by means of such echoes Paul transforms the tradition of which these images are a part. How well does this argument square with the seven criteria outlined at the beginning of this article? I shall briefly evaluate my discussion in light of each of them.

1. Availability. I have suggested that Paul is echoing Deuteronomy 32, Isaiah 63, Jeremiah 38 and Genesis 3 as well as various traditions found in the Psalms and the prophetic literature, primarily Isaiah. Throughout his writings Paul cites texts from all of the above books; moreover, his writings show that he expected that his readers would be familiar with these texts as well (Hays 1990: 30).

2. Volume. That the volume of the echoes found here is quite high is suggested in the juxtaposition of images found both in the Romans passage and in our background passages such as Deuteronomy 32, Jeremiah 38 and Isaiah 63. Moreover, other New Testament writings show evidence of having been steeped in books such as Isaiah (see Chilton 1983), Jeremiah, Deuteronomy and the Psalms. In addition, the motif upon which my argument rests, as I have argued earlier, was prominent in second-temple Judaism and beyond. Within Paul the

49. Elliott also notes the ambiguity of this language.
50. Eg. IQH 3.6–19; cf. 4 Ezra 5:46–55. For a comprehensive analysis of this theme in intertestamental Jewish literature, see Allison 1987a: ch. 2.
51. On the birthpangs of God for a new creation in the Old Testament, see Fretheim 1984: 147.
52. See Fretheim 1984: ch. 7–9 for a powerful depiction of the suffering of God in Old Testament literature.
allusions carry much rhetorical weight, occurring at the centre of Romans 8, the climactic chapter of Romans 3-8.

3. Recurrence. The passages explicitly mentioned (again Deut. 32, Isa. 63, Jer. 38 and Gen. 3) are all, with the exception of Isaiah 63, explicitly mentioned elsewhere in Paul. Deuteronomy, Isaiah and Genesis are three of the four books which Paul quotes most frequently in his letters (the other one is the Psalms—a number of which I have alluded to in this paper). These passages recur often in Paul.53

4. Thematic Coherence. I have argued in the first part of this article that the passages to which Paul alludes provide a basis for his argument in Romans 9-11. Paul's exodus allusions also provide a strong framework for his description of the identity of the believing community especially with regard to their relationship to suffering and future hope.

5. Historical Plausibility. It is quite likely that Paul intended to draw on exodus motifs, as they provide the natural framework in the Old Testament and second-temple Judaism for reflecting on God's saving activity and God's faithfulness to Israel. His readers, Gentile and Jewish Christians who celebrated a meal modelled on the Passover, would quite likely have been acquainted with this formative Israelite story (see Le Déué 1982). In addition, the suggested reading of this passage coheres with the plot of the story of first-century Judaism as found in its texts and as outlined in this paper. The intertext of the culture permits this reading.

6. History of Interpretation. A number of other readers, most notably de la Potterie, have identified an exodus background for at least the imagery of 'being led' found in this passage. The community which reads this passage as part of its Scripture has also drawn attention to the exodus echoes in this passage, most prominently in the common lectionary liturgy. The exodus as the underlying framework for the whole of this passage, however, has not been argued before.

7. Satisfaction. While a more sustained argument would be necessary to establish that Paul's echo of exodus motifs provides a sustained conceit within which the various images in this passage find coherence,54 even within the parameters of this article the allusions to exodus motifs provide a satisfactory account of Paul's images in vv. 14-15 and reveal the wider implications of vv. 20-30. Moreover,

the proposed reading grounds Paul's argument within the history of tradition and provides a plausible context for his discourse.

5. Conclusion: Paul and Tradition in Romans 8.14-30

My analysis of this passage strongly suggests that Paul was echoing specific Old Testament texts as well as drawing on the intertextual space of Judaism in his discussion of God's action in Jesus Christ in Rom. 8.14-30. And, as a result, my analysis suggests a framework for understanding Paul which indicates an answer to the vexing question of how he uses Old Testament texts: rather than sporadically quoting Old Testament texts to bolster up his arguments, Paul is assuming many Old Testament motifs and trajectories which he alludes to and builds upon in the course of his arguments.

In addition, my analysis paints a picture of how Paul grapples with this tradition, a picture which coheres with the scenario I outlined at the start of this article. As mentioned above, Paul in Romans is struggling with the question of God's faithfulness to Israel. And that struggle results in a transformation of tradition similar to those found in Isaiah and Jeremiah, who were struggling with this same question. In Rom. 8.14-30 Paul affirms God's faithfulness to Israel, drawing on the motif central to Israelite consciousness which revealed God's faithfulness to Israel. He is rooted in the past, yet he transforms the tradition in this passage, extending it beyond the land and people of Israel, to all people in Christ Jesus and to the whole of creation. The language formerly applied to God leading Israel is now characteristic of those in Christ led by a suffering spirit; he applies Israel's role of son to Jesus Christ and those in him; and, as I said earlier, he transforms the exodus narrative of bondage-groaning-liberation so that it is no longer only the story of Israel, but the story of the whole people of God, the story of the whole of creation, indeed, nothing less than the story of God's very self.55

54. An argument I am currently developing in my DPhil thesis at Oxford.
55. My thanks to Francis Watson, Ilona Stilwell and Helen Vreugdenhil for commenting on an earlier draft of this article.
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James packs all of its remarks about verbal integrity into two sentences comprising one verse. That verse is 5.12. The fact that 5.12 opens with πρὸ πάντων δὲ (‘above all else’) presents commentators with a problem. If read literally, it states that the admonition in 5.12 is the most important in a series of related items. However, few desire to read the phrase so literally. Davids prefers to take it as calling attention to the admonition which follows, but not in any way which exalts 5.12 above the statements that precede it. Laws suggests that the phrase introduces the whole final section of admonitions as opposed to climaxing anything previous. In this way it signals the close of the letter. Typically, Dibelius despair of finding any

4. Laws’s suggestion that Paul’s use of λοιπὸν in 2 Cor. 13.11 and Phil. 3.1 parallels the use of πρὸ πάντων δὲ here in Jas 5.12 is questionable. First, different words are involved. An example of πρὸ πάντων δὲ used this way would be enlightening. Secondly, 2 Cor. 13.11 is full of other indicators that the letter is closing, like
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