1

Introduction and Method

An Overview of the New Creation Debate in the Hauptbriefe

Prior to 1935, the phrase καινὴ κτίσις in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15 was interpreted within a purely anthropological framework, which is reflected in the English translation "new creature" (e.g., KJV).[1] However, with the arrival of R. Strachan's commentary on 2 Corinthians, what was once an inactive crater suddenly became a bubbling volcano.[2] Rather than understanding this Pauline expression in anthropological terms, Strachan proposed to interpret it through the lens of Jewish apocalyptic literature and opted for the translation "new creation."[3]

Since the publishing of Strachan's commentary, a number of works have been written that attempt to elucidate the meaning of καινὴ κτίσις in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15.[4] These studies generally seek to probe what may

1. Cf. Hubbard, *New Creation*, 2; pace Jackson, *New Creation*, 7–9. Jackson helpfully notes that there were several voices in the early church that interpreted the phrase καινὴ κτίσις along anthropological *and* cosmological lines. Nonetheless, one can reasonably conclude that this phrase has been primarily interpreted anthropologically over the past few centuries.

2. Strachan, *Corinthians*, 113–14.

3. Beginning with the RSV, major English translations of the New Testament [NT] since the publication of Strachan's commentary have translated the phrase καινὴ κτίσις in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15 with the phrase "new creation." Throughout this study, the phrase "new creation" will be used not only as a translation for the expression καινὴ κτίσις in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15, but also as a shorthand way of capturing the various ideas associated with this theological concept.

4. Aside from discussions in commentaries, more specialized studies include: Stuhlmacher, "Erwägungen," 1–35; Hoover, *New Creation*; Mell, *Neue Schöpfung*; Hubbard, *New Creation*; Adams, *Constructing the World*; Aymer, *Paul's Understanding of 'KAINE KTISIS'*; Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes*; Schneider, *KAINH KTISIS*; Schneider,

1

be described as the essential theological nature of Paul's idiom. Over the years, scholars have predominantly understood the expression in three main ways: anthropologically, cosmologically, and ecclesiologically.[5] Most scholars have combined these three interpretations in various ways. Others, however, demonstrate a marked tendency to prioritize one interpretation over the others. Thus, there exists a strong measure of debate concerning how this important phrase should be understood. This lack of consensus may partly reflect the absence of a sustained discussion of new creation in 2 Cor 5 and Gal 6.

Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie, 357–71; Schneider, "Die Idee der Neuschöpfung," 257–70; Gloer, *New Creation*; Jackson, *New Creation*. Romans 8:18–25 is another pertinent text in this debate. See Jackson (*New Creation*, 150–69) for an especially helpful discussion of new creation in Rom 8:18–25. Colossians 1:15–20 is another significant text related to new creation in the Pauline corpus, though it has received scant attention within this larger debate. Space limitations prevent a detailed analysis of these two texts.

5. The anthropological reading of new creation primarily focuses on conversion and the inward/ethical transformation of individual Christ-followers. According to Schnelle (*Anthropologie*, 1), "Die neutestamentliche Anthropologie fragt nach dem Grund, der Ermöglichung, der Struktur und dem Vollzug menschlicher Existenz." This definition provides a suitable basis for considering potential anthropological notions that might be associated with the portrait of new creation in the Pauline corpus. Generally speaking, I will approach this reading of new creation more from the perspective of systematic theology than the social scientific discipline of anthropology.

The cosmological reading of new creation primarily interprets the phrase καινὴ κτίσις as the partial fulfillment of Isaiah's promised "new heavens and new earth." According to Adams ("Graeco-Roman and Ancient Jewish Cosmology," 5), cosmology refers to the attempt "to explain the origin, structure, and destiny of the physical universe." This definition provides a suitable framework for this research project as it orients the discussion and interpretation of the phrase καινὴ κτίσις around the future of the created order.

In terms of the ecclesiological reading of new creation, a close analysis of the literature on this subject suggests the need for greater precision in this area. A significant question that has been featured in this debate concerns whether new creation in Paul encompasses individual Christ-followers or the entire community of believers. While this is an important question, the answer to this question may not sufficiently account for the complexity of Paul's understanding of new creation, particularly in Gal 6:15. Kraus and Jackson rightly note that the corporate element within Paul's understanding of new creation particularly focuses on the identity of the church as composed of Jewish and Gentile Christ-followers (e.g., Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes*, 251–52; Jackson, *New Creation*, 111–13). The distinction between an anthropological and an ecclesiological understanding of new creation thus reaches beyond an individualized versus corporate reading of καινὴ κτίσις. I should point out that Jackson does muddy the water a bit by framing the anthropological reading of new creation within an individualized and corporate framework (e.g., Jackson, *New Creation*, 4). Adams (*Constructing the World*, 227–28, 235) may also fall into the same trap.

Review of Research on New Creation in the Hauptbriefe

This project will interact primarily with major works devoted to investigating the meaning of new creation in the Pauline corpus. Special attention will be devoted to: 1) scholarly studies that argue for a limited conception of new creation; and 2) scholarly studies that have made claims regarding the relationship between the portraits of new creation in the Hauptbriefe and that of Ephesians. I will now briefly discuss the contributions of the major figures within this debate.

The contribution of U. Mell to this debate is representative of a firmly cosmological reading of καινὴ κτίσις in the Hauptbriefe. Mell's understanding of new creation in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15 is weighted heavily by his cosmological reading of the noun κόσμος in Gal 6:14. Yet Mell also places great stress on a history-of-traditions analysis and argues that the Pauline understanding of new creation is derived from apocalyptic Judaism. Mell's *traditionsgeschichtliche* analysis of new creation is problematic on two fronts. First, he engages in a highly selective analysis of Second Temple Jewish texts that overlooks the anthropologically oriented portrait of new creation in such texts as *Joseph and Aseneth*. Second, his attempt to explain the development of the new creation concept (beginning with Isaiah, proceeding through apocalyptic Judaism, and culminating in the Hauptbriefe) not only downplays the complexity (and significance) of new creation in Isaiah and Second Temple Judaism but also the Pauline corpus itself.

Hubbard's contribution to this debate warrants special attention because of his strictly anthropological reading of new creation. While Mell may be rightly chided for a prejudicial selection of texts, Hubbard falls into the identical trap. According to Hubbard, the key to understanding the nature of new creation in the Hauptbriefe lies in the anthropocentric new covenant promises of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, as well as the import of the death-life metaphor for understanding the new creation motif in the Hauptbriefe.[6] While Hubbard judiciously stresses the anthropological nature of new creation in the Hauptbriefe, like Mell he firmly divorces theological categories that Paul in all probability would have never severed.

An exclusively ecclesiological reading of καινὴ κτίσις is associated particularly with Kraus's *Das Volk Gottes: Zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus*. Kraus's central concern in this work is presenting an alternative to the traditional supersessionist approach regarding the place of Jewish identity within the Christian community. According to Kraus, καινὴ κτίσις in both 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15 is best understood as a "Gemeindewirklichkeit"

---

6. Cf. Hubbard, *New Creation*, esp. 91–122.

inaugurated by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.[7] Kraus is to be commended for not only appreciating the ecclesiological nature of new creation in the Hauptbriefe, but also the manner in which this concept implicitly draws upon the eschatological expectations related to the conversion of the nations in such texts as Isa 66:18–24. Nonetheless, Kraus fails to grapple with how Paul's portrait of new creation (and the Isaianic texts that inform his understanding of this theological concept) is related to Scriptures' basic story of redemption and how this question of who constitutes the people of God is related to an *Urzeit-Endzeit* typology.[8] That is, Kraus fails to consider how the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ is related fundamentally to God's plan to put right the crisis depicted in Gen 3.

While the meaning of the phrase καινὴ κτίσις in the Hauptbriefe plays a minor role in his analysis, Adams's *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language*, nonetheless, represents a major peak in this debate. The importance of Adams' contribution is seen primarily in the complex understanding of new creation for which he contends in this monograph. For Adams, new creation in the Hauptbriefe encompasses both anthropology and cosmology, and also looks beyond individual Christ-followers to

---

7. Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes*, 251.

8. Wright (*People of God*, 38–44, 77–80, 215–19, 262–68) provides a helpful explanation of the place of "story" within biblical interpretation, as well as important insights into the fundamental stories of Israel, early Judaism, and early Christianity. For now, one should note that: 1) the creation and fall narratives in Gen 1–2 and Gen 3 respectively, constitute significant points in the biblical plot-line; and 2) the Abrahamic covenant is to be understood as God's remedy for the crisis depicted in Gen 3. The translation of the verb נרך in Gen 12:3 MT aside (note the use of the passive participle ἐνευλογηθήσονται in the LXX, however), it is reasonable to conclude that Gentiles somehow benefit through a positive relationship with Abraham (cf. Gen 17:4; 18:18; Gal 3:8; *1 En.* 10:3, 21). Cf. ibid., 262–63. There is thus a sense in which the identity of God's people plays an important role in Scripture's grand narrative of salvation.

The nomenclature "*Urzeit-Endzeit*" will be used throughout this project to refer to the well-known pattern within Jewish eschatology that suggests the new age will be somehow related to the primordial age of Gen 1–3. Cf. Isa 11:6–9; 51:3; 65:17–25; Ezek 47:1–12; *4 Ezra* 6:13–28; *Sib. Or.* 3:785–95; *2 Bar.* 73:1–7; *1 En.* 24:1—25:7; *L. A. B.* 3:10; Rev 21:1—22:7. This typological pattern was first extensively examined by Gunkel (*Creation*, esp. 231–33). For the sake of clarity, the various ways in which this correlation between the beginning and the end may be construed should be considered. The ways in which the new age might be related to the primordial age include: 1) a complete and precise return to the primordial age; 2) a return to the primordial age that involves a high degree of continuity between the end and the beginning, such that the new age may be understood as something of a reenactment of the primordial age; and 3) a return to the beginning that involves some degree of continuity with the primordial age, yet at the same time making it clear that the end is superior to the beginning. Goppelt (*Typos*, 32–38, 228–29) rightly notes that portraits of the end in Second Temple Judaism and the NT generally follow the third option. Cf. Hanson, *Dawn*, 407.

the entire community of believers. Significantly, Adams does not seem to address the ecclesiological nature of this community.

Jackson's recent monograph, *New Creation in Paul's Letters: A Study of the Historical and Social Setting of a Pauline Concept*, warrants attention because of the complex portrait of new creation advocated in this study. His central thesis is that new creation explicates Paul's "eschatologically infused soteriology which involves the individual, the community and the cosmos and which is inaugurated in the death and resurrection of Christ."[9] Jackson is to be especially commended for appreciating the interrelationship between anthropology and cosmology not only within Paul's thought but also within his Jewish background. His study is also significant because of his contention that Isaiah constitutes the primary background for Paul's understanding of new creation. Despite these strengths, Jackson's analysis does not account sufficiently for the relationship between Paul's understanding of καινὴ κτίσις and an *Urzeit-Endzeit* typology. Jackson's treatment of new creation also does not account for the implications of the temple imagery in 2 Cor 6:16.

The Letter to the Ephesians and the New Creation Debate

While the nature of new creation in the Hauptbriefe has sparked a great deal of interest among scholars, this topic has received relatively little attention in the letter to the Ephesians. Several studies have explored individual passages that comprise the new creation theme in Ephesians.[10] Scholars also have pointed to a variety of similarities between the new creation theme in Ephesians and the Hauptbriefe.[11] Both Hubbard and Jackson have also appealed to the discussion of new creation in Ephesians in support of their divergent readings of new creation in the Hauptbriefe.[12] Nonetheless, to date a full analysis of the precise points of continuity and discontinuity between

---

9. Jackson, *New Creation*, 6.

10. Turner ("Mission," 138–66) is an important exception. Though brief, Turner's essay closely connects new creation with the letter's larger theme of cosmic reconciliation. While his methodology is questionable, McHugh ("Reconsideration," 302–9) extensively discusses Irenaeus' recapitulatory understanding of Eph 1:10. Finally, Miletic (*"One Flesh"*) explores the significance of new creation theology for understanding subordination within the husband-wife relationship.

11. For example, Beale ("Reconciliation," 578–79) notes the presence of allusions to Isaiah's new exodus in 2 Cor 5:17 and Eph 2:13, 17, as well as the close connection between new creation and reconciliation in both texts. Cf. Webb, *Returning Home*, 117–20.

12. Cf. Hubbard, *New Creation*, 7; Jackson, *New Creation*, 184.

the portraits of new creation in the undisputed Pauline epistles and the let-
ter to the Ephesians has yet to be undertaken. Thus, the primary aim of this
study is to explore how strongly aligned the portraits of new creation in the
Hauptbriefe and Eph 1–2 are with one another via an intertextual analysis
of the relevant texts.

In contrast with 2 Cor 5 and Gal 6, there is a more extensive discus-
sion of new creation in the letter to the Ephesians. For now, it is sufficient
to note the entire context of Eph 2:1–22 is set within a new creation frame-
work.[13] Interestingly, new creation theology in Eph 2:11–21 is grounded in
the context of Isaiah's proclamation of a new exodus (cf. Isa 52:7; 57:19;
Eph 2:13, 17). These allusions to Isaianic tradition in Eph 2:13, 17 establish
a significant parallel with new creation in the Hauptbriefe as it is generally
agreed that Isaiah's new exodus forms the backdrop for new creation in 2
Cor 5:17. These preliminary observations regarding new creation in Eph 2
raise the question of this theme's relationship to new creation theology in
the Hauptbriefe.

The extent to which new creation theology in the Pauline tradition
is linked with Isaiah's prophecy indicates that an examination of relevant
Isaianic traditions could bring greater clarity to this debate. Paul's allusion
to Isaianic tradition in 2 Cor 5:17 (τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινά)
has certainly played a role in this discussion.[14] However, the significance of
new creation in the Pauline tradition has yet to be investigated by means of
a full-scale intertextual analysis.[15] Such an investigation would extensively

---

13. It is helpful to comment briefly at this point on several features of Eph 1–2
that will be explored more fully below. First, there is strong evidence to suggest that
new creation in this letter carries anthropological connotations (cf. Eph 2:1–6, 10, 15;
4:24). Second, the emphasis on inaugurated eschatology in Ephesians suggests that
new creation in that text may also carry cosmological overtones (cf. Eph 1:10, 20–23;
2:5–6, 10). Third, the use of temple imagery in Eph 2:19–22 to describe the union of
Jewish and Gentile believers indicates that new creation in Ephesians may also convey
the ecclesiological orientation emphasized by some scholars. Further ecclesiological
overtones pervade Eph 2:11–19 with its discussion of the uniting of Jew and Gentile
through the death of Christ. New creation in this segment of the Pauline tradition thus
does seem to resist the tidy divisions proposed by some scholars.

14. The Isaianic texts that scholars generally attempt to link with 2 Cor 5:17b in-
clude: Isa 42:9 (τὰ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἰδοὺ ἥκασιν καὶ καινὰ ἃ ἐγὼ ἀναγγελω); 43:18–19 (μὴ
μνημονεύετε τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα μὴ συλλογίζεσθε ἰδοὺ ποιῶ καινά); 48:3, 6 (τὰ
πρότερα ἔτι ἀνήγγειλα . . . ἀκουστὰ σοι ἐποίσα τὰ καινά); 65:16–17 (τὴν πρώτην . . .
ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινή . . . τῶν προτέρων). Cf. Stuhlmacher, "Erwägungen," 6; Mell,
Neue Schöpfung, 38–39, 47; Webb, *Returning Home*, 121–28; Jackson, *New Creation*,
119–23; Beale, "Reconciliation," 552–59; Hubbard, *New Creation*, 182; Gignilliat, *Paul*,
97; Hoover, *New Creation*, 169; Schneider, "Die Idee der Neuschöpfung," 265; Wilk,
Jesajabuches, 276–80; Kim, *Origin*, 18.

15. See below, pp. 8–13, for a discussion of intertextuality.

explore the Isaianic texts evoked in 2 Cor 5:17; Eph 2:13, 17 and assess the extent to which Isaiah's prophecy informs the understanding of new creation in the Pauline tradition.[16] Investigating these texts intertextually could be especially advantageous since the relationship between new creation in the Hauptbriefe and Isaianic tradition is, in fact, a major issue within this larger debate.[17]

At this stage, it is also necessary to discuss a helpful methodological tool for evaluating the relationship between new creation in the Hauptbriefe and Ephesians. In his work exploring the correlation between the Qumran *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and *The Celestial Hierarchy* of Dionysius the Areopagite, P. Alexander employs what he has termed a heuristic analysis to address the complexities of the relationship between these two texts.[18] For Alexander, such an analysis involves a comparison and contrast of notions revolving around a theme and generally circumvents issues such as differences in the dating, authorship and provenance of separate literary works. The intent of using this methodological approach within this present analysis is to deal with the deutero-Pauline status of Ephesians in a critical manner.[19] The application of a heuristic analysis to this wider issue will first require that the theological content of new creation in each of these letters be investigated on their own terms, and then the degree of continuity and discontinuity between the texts will be assessed.

Summary of This Investigation

This analysis of new creation will proceed in four major steps. First, I will analyze major texts that form part of Isaiah's new exodus theme with a view toward assessing its precise theological content and determining how this motif might inform the understanding of new creation in the Pauline

16. Jackson (*New Creation*, 17–30) provides one of the more extensive examinations of the relevance of Isaiah for this question, yet his analysis does not engage closely with the Isaianic texts alluded to in Eph 2:13, 17.

17. Of the scholars who have closely investigated new creation in the Hauptbriefe, Jackson most strongly emphasizes the importance of Isaiah. Others stress the new covenant promises of Jeremiah and Ezekiel (particularly Hubbard and Schneider) or the apocalyptic traditions of early Judaism (Mell).

18. Cf. Alexander, *Qumran Songs*.

19. While I personally do not find the arguments against the Pauline authorship of Ephesians strong enough to deny its authenticity, the nature of this project will nonetheless require I take these concerns seriously. I will therefore not refer to Paul as the author of Ephesians and will occasionally use E. Best's designation "AE" (i.e., "author of Ephesians"). See Van Roon (*Ephesians*) and Hoehner (*Ephesians*, 2–61) for helpful defenses of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians.

tradition. A prominent feature of this analysis will be considering the relationship between Isaiah's new exodus and ANE temple-building traditions.[20] Second, I will examine significant traditions related to new creation and restoration in Ezekiel, Jeremiah, *1 Enoch*, and *Jubilees*. Special attention will be given in this chapter to considering the extent to which restoration in Ezekiel and Jeremiah is presented in purely anthropological terms and how Isaiah's "new heavens and new earth" is developed in the Second Temple period. Third, I will consider the descriptions of new creation in Gal 6:11–16 and 2 Cor 5:11–21. The goal of this analysis is to determine how narrowly or broadly Paul conceives new creation in these two passages and the extent to which they are related to an *Urzeit-Endzeit* typology. Finally, I will offer a detailed treatment of Eph 1:9–10 and Eph 1:20—2:22. Once again, the aim of this chapter will be to evaluate the theological scope of new creation in these passages and more closely consider how the portraits of new creation in these two texts are informed by Isaianic traditions.

Intertextuality and the Pauline Tradition

The relationship between the Old Testament [OT] and the documents in the Pauline corpus has been a subject of much scholarly debate. Throughout this discussion, an assortment of issues has come to the forefront.[21] This enquiry found new direction through the influential work of R. Hays. In his monograph, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, Hays investigates the use of Israel's Scriptures in the Pauline corpus by means of the literary phenomenon of intertextuality.[22] According to Hays, intertextuality refers to

20. By ANE temple-building traditions I am referring to texts from the ANE (e.g., *Enuma Elish* 1:37–40, 73–76; 6:1–70) that correlate the creation of the universe with the defeat of a god's enemies and the consequent construction of a temple in that god's honor. Two points of clarification regarding the nature of a temple within the ANE worldview are particularly germane to this discussion. First, a temple was understood as the earthly locus of the divine presence (e.g., Exod 25:8; 29:44–45; 1 Kgs 8:10–13; Ps 25:8 LXX). Second, temples were viewed as a microcosm of heaven and earth (cf. *Enuma Elish* 6:112; Ps 77:69 LXX; 131:8–9, 13–14 LXX; Josephus, *Ant.* 3:123, 179–87; Philo, *Plant.* 1:47–50; Wis 9:8). Cf. Lundquist, "Temple," 205–19. Finally, the designation "LXX" is used throughout this study to refer to the critical text of the Septuagint.

21. See Hays (*Echoes*, 37–52) for further discussion. Watson (*Paul*, 2–5) has also recently demonstrated the fundamentally textual nature of Paul's theology, which is firmly grounded in a careful reading of the OT. Watson (ibid., 2–5) has also advocated the use of a three-way model that intertextually explores Paul's reading of the OT by bringing together the OT, texts from Second Temple Judaism, and the Pauline text itself into a single inquiry.

22. Hays's approach is similar to and in some ways builds on M. Fishbane's work on inner-biblical exegesis in the Old Testament (see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*).

"the imbedding of fragments of an earlier tradition within a later one."[23] An important feature of Hays's approach is his suggestion that the relationship between the Pauline corpus and the OT may be associated profitably with the literary phenomenon known as metalepsis.[24] For the purposes of this study, Hays's approach to intertextuality provides a theoretical framework for recognizing that the presence of an intertextual reference in the Pauline corpus *may* require the reader to examine the precursor text for possible implicit connections between the Pauline text and the OT text. Hays's proposal raises the question of just how closely the portraits of new creation in 2 Corinthians and Ephesians are related to Isaianic tradition.

While Hays's work is indeed a valuable contribution to Pauline studies, it does raise two questions that are particularly relevant to this project. First, what is the role of the reader in the interpretative process? Second, what are suitable criteria for validating proposed allusions to the OT? These issues will be treated in the following analysis.

An issue in Hays's work that has attracted a great deal of subsequent interest is his reader-oriented hermeneutic. This is an important concern given the strong emphasis among some intertextual theorists on freeing a text from the constraints of authorial intention.[25] Admittedly, Hays does not attempt an explicitly post-structural reading of the Pauline epistles. Hays, in fact, notes five possible loci of meaning—the author, original readers, the text, contemporary readers, an interpretative community—and seeks "to hold them all together in creative tension."[26] It is hard to escape the conclusion, however, that Hays places great stress on the interpreter's role in the exegetical process.[27]

It would no doubt be naïve not to recognize the danger of subjectivism that is inherent in reading any text intertextually. At the same time, however, it is also necessary to account for the cognitive distance between Paul and modern exegetes. More specifically, we must not overlook the fact

---

Regarding his specific approach to intertextuality, Hays depends strongly on the work of J. Hollander (cf. Hollander, *Echo*). See Clayton and Rothstein ("Figures," 3–36) for a helpful description of intertextuality.

23. Hays, *Echoes*, 14.

24. Cf. Hays, *Echoes*, 20, 87–88, 155. Hays (ibid., 20) suggests that an instance of metalepsis "functions to suggest to the reader that text B [the later text] should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A [the text that is alluded to], encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed."

25. Cf. Clayton and Rothstein, "Figures," 12, 14–16, 21–26. Others argue that the author's intended meaning does not exhaust a text's full semantic potential. See Vanhoozer (*Meaning*) for a balanced discussion of this issue.

26. Hays, *Echoes*, 26–27.

27. Cf. ibid., 31–33.

that Paul's worldview is drastically different from that of the typical twenty-first-century interpreter. Our ability to interact with the Pauline tradition in an objective manner can be hampered not only by doctrinal biases but also by broader worldview commitments such as scientific rationalism.[28] Even a casual reading of Paul's writings indicates that he was quite willing to engage with the OT in creative and imaginative ways (e.g., 1 Cor 10:3–4). Thus, there is a strong sense in which interpreters must keep their "feet" in both the past and the present. More specifically, while it is necessary to adjudicate any potential intertextual reading according to valid and scientific criteria, one must also be willing to simply "let Paul be Paul."

This now brings us to the matter of suitable criteria for validating potential quotations and allusions to the OT. To engage in an intertextual analysis is admittedly to pursue a somewhat subjective enterprise where plausibility can sometimes be in the eye of the beholder. Hence, there is a need to establish principles that will aid the exegete in assessing the probability that a tradition is being alluded to in a later text.

One of the lasting contributions of Hays's monograph, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, is the seven criteria he proposed to assess the feasibility of a proposed allusion. These seven "tests" (as he refers to them) have frequently been utilized in intertextual investigations of the Pauline corpus. The tests Hays developed are:

1. availability—this test primarily addresses the accessibility of the precursor text;

2. volume—this test assesses the degree of formal correspondence between the precursor text and the later text;

3. recurrence—this test considers the frequency with which the same author evokes the precursor text in other texts;

4. thematic coherence—this test evaluates the degree of conceptual correspondence between the precursor text and the later text;

5. historical plausibility—this test weighs the likelihood that the author would have intended to evoke the precursor text and the likelihood that the original readers would have detected the intertextual reference;

6. history of interpretation—this test attempts to validate a proposed intertextual reference by determining whether other interpreters have previously detected the suggested quotation or allusion;

---

28. Cf. Wagner, *Heralds*, 11–12.

7. satisfaction—according to Hays, this test seeks to determine if "the proposed reading offers a good account of the experience of a contemporary community of competent readers."[29]

While none of these tests are free of difficulties, they have generally been well received within the scholarly community.[30] Nonetheless, a number of them require additional comment and clarification. Hays's seventh test, satisfaction, is especially problematic. Hays himself notes it is challenging to describe this measure without committing the affective fallacy, the misleading notion that a text's meaning is related to its emotional impact on the interpreter.[31] Much of Hays's description of this test seems to overlap with the explanation of his fourth criterion, thematic coherence. That is, both tests seem to assess the "quality" of the reading produced by the proposed allusion.[32] In light of these two factors, this test will not be employed in this analysis.

Hays's historical plausibility test also warrants careful consideration at two points. First, one must recognize that this is not an entirely objective criterion since it requires the interpreter to construct an image of Paul as a writer/theologian.[33] This is not an insurmountable objection, however, since there is a fair amount of primary data present in the Pauline corpus to construct such an image. Second, as noted above, this test also considers the original reader's ability to detect proposed allusions. Hays does allow for the possibility that Paul may have penned statements that were not readily intelligible to his original audience.[34] C. Stanley, however, has extensively argued that many of Paul's allusions, echoes, and implicit quotations would have been overlooked by Paul's original readers.[35] Stanley's work on the literary competence of first-century readers does establish the importance of considering how accessible a potential allusion was to Paul's original readers. However, to adopt his reader-centered approach to this matter unduly limits Paul's creativity as an interpreter of the OT. While a cautious, conservative analysis of the primary data is laudable, in order to understand Paul's use of the OT, one again should seek to "let Paul be Paul" (though this

---

29. Hays, *Echoes*, 31–32.

30. See Berkeley (*Broken Covenant*, 65) and Wagner (*Heralds*, 11–13) for helpful assessments of Hays's criteria for adjudicating allusions.

31. Hays, *Echoes*, 31.

32. Cf. Wagner, *Heralds*, 13.

33. Cf. Berkeley, *Broken Covenant*, 65.

34. Hays, *Echoes*, 30.

35. Cf. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 48.

undoubtedly can be difficult).[36] Finally, as Wagner notes, one has to account for the probability that less competent readers/interpreters of Paul might have received sufficient instruction from other Christ-followers concerning how to understand Paul's use of the OT.[37]

Finally, Hays's suggestion that a text's prominence within Paul's intertextual framework (the recurrence test) can serve as a means of validating proposed allusions also requires a closer look. In particular, one should consider the frequency a given OT text is referenced outside the Pauline corpus. For example, the Watchers tradition (Gen 6:1–4) holds a prominent place within a variety of Second Temple Jewish texts (e.g., *1 En.* 6–16; Philo, *Gig.* 6, 16, 19, 58; 1QS 3–4; *Jub.* 5:1–11). A proposed allusion to Gen 6:1–4 in the Pauline corpus could gain some measure of viability simply on the basis of its importance in early Jewish literature. A text's place within the NT documents outside the Pauline corpus would hold even greater relevance. Hays himself identifies the relevance of C. H. Dodd's analysis of the early church's Bible to this larger discussion.[38] If the early church did assign a great deal of weight to certain texts within the OT, a proposed allusion by Paul to one of these texts would thus gain a strong degree of probability.

In summary, intertextuality provides a useful hermeneutical tool for investigating the new creation motif in the Pauline tradition. Nonetheless, careful use of this interpretative method is necessary because of the subjective nature of this approach to analyzing texts. Where relevant, the following examination of new creation in the Pauline corpus will focus on two forms of intertextual references—quotations and intentional allusions— and will implicitly use six of Hays's tests (availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation) to assess the viability of allusions to the OT.

Conclusion

Despite a long history of association with anthropological renewal, recent interpreters have argued for a much broader understanding of the phrase καινὴ κτίσις in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15. More specifically, a number of

36. Stanley (ibid., 34) himself notes, "The cost of this measure of security [afforded by a reader-centered approach] is the exclusion of a number of passages whose closeness to a particular biblical passage reveals a clear intent to reproduce the wording of that passage within the later Pauline context (e.g., Rom 2:6; 1 Cor 5:13; 15:32; 2 Cor 13:1)."

37. Wagner, *Heralds*, 36–39.

38. Hays, *Echoes*, 201. Cf. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 61–110.

scholars have contended that the traditional reading of new creation in 2 Cor 5:11–21 and Gal 6:11–16 neglects significant cosmological and/or ecclesiological associations within these two texts. At the same time, the traditional account of new creation in these two texts has recently been championed by Hubbard. The nature of new creation in 2 Cor 5:11–21 and Gal 6:11–16 thus remains a matter of serious debate.

The portrait of new creation in Eph 1–2, however, has not received as much scholarly interest as the same material in the Hauptbriefe. Commentators frequently note that Eph 2:1–22 is replete with new creation imagery and concepts. Nonetheless, only a few minor studies have specifically examined the discussion of new creation in this text. A few scholars have also noted a variety of similarities between the conception of new creation in Eph 1–2 and that of the Hauptbriefe. Interestingly, both Hubbard and Jackson appeal to Ephesians in support of their opposing understandings of new creation in the Hauptbriefe. The combination of these factors raises the question of the conceptual relationship between the significance of new creation in these three texts.

In contrast with most investigations of new creation in the Pauline corpus, this inquiry will attempt to give due weight to the allusion to Isaianic tradition in 2 Cor 5:17. While it is often observed that this allusion links new creation in 2 Cor 5:17 with Isaiah's new exodus, a number of interpreters give greater weight to the new covenant traditions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel or Jewish apocalyptic traditions. The intertextual method will be employed throughout this study to determine just how closely new creation in the Pauline tradition is aligned with Isaiah's vision of divine deliverance. The fact that Isaiah's new exodus is also evoked in Eph 2:13, 17 reinforces the viability of the intertextual method for this particular project. In summary, this inquiry will explore the degree of continuity and discontinuity between the depictions of new creation in the Hauptbriefe and the letter to the Ephesians by means of an intertextual analysis.