Appendix 1 A Study of Issues Related do Inner-Biblical and Inter-Biblical Interpretation

Four issues regarding the OT and NT use of the OT are left untreated in chapter one: (1) text or tradition, (2) quoted text-form, (3) intertextuality, and (4) post-biblical interpretation. Since only intertextuality will be examined here, readers are referred to some representative references for further study.[839] Recent trend of both OT and NT studies reveals the extensive use of intertextuality as a mode of understanding when one text is quoted or alluded to in another text. Is intertextuality the same as inner- and inter-biblical interpretation? This question deserves a detailed investigation.

A1.1 A Discussion of Intertextuality: Its relationship with Inner- and Inter-Biblical Interpretation

Confusion may occur when we look at the term 'intertextuality' in relation to inner- and inter-biblical interpretation as scholars begin applying it in biblical interpretation. For instance, Scott L. Harris refers to using "inner-biblical interpretation" to replace Fishbane's "inner-biblical exegesis" in his monograph.[840] Scott's methodology, however, is in the realm of intertextuality even though he seldom uses the term in his text. This is due in part to his methodological argument being based on a great proponent of intertextuality.[841] Though inter- or inner-biblical interpretation and intertextuality are fused in Scott's book, one should discern Scott's use of the term

---

839 For a study of tradition, see R. Gnuse, "Tradition History," in *DBI* 2: 583-88; Douglas Knight, *Rediscovering the Tradition of Israel*, rev. ed., Dissertation Series 9, (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1975); Peter Ackroyd, *Studies in the Religious Tradition of the Old Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1987). From a Jewish perspective, see Géze Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1961). Part 3 of Vermes' book is more focused on biblical traditions. For text-form used in citation, see Max Wilcox, "Text Form," chap. in *It Is Written*, 193-204; Darrell Bock, "Use of the Old Testament in the New," chap. in *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation,* ed. David Dockery, Kenneth Matthews, and Robert Slogan (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman and Holman, 1994), 97-114. Related significantly to text-form is textual criticism; see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1992). For post-biblical interpretation, see C. T. R. Hayward, "Rewritten Bible" in *A Dictionary of Bible Interpretation,* ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden (London: SCM Press, 1990), 595-98; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times" and "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded" chaps. in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus,* ed. Michael Stone, CRINT (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1984), 33-156.

840 Harris, *Proverbs 1-9*, 31. See also his article "'Figure' and 'Riddle'," *BR* 41 (1996): 58-76.

841 In his methodological discussions, Harris cites M. Sternberg and M. Bakhtin. The latter is one of the pioneers of intertextuality. See Harris, *Proverbs 1-9*, 24, 45-52.

intertextuality should not be equated to inner- and inter-interpretation. Therefore, it is appropriate to address the issue here.[842]

Scholars would argue for the presence of intertextuality as a contemporary concept, yet Worton and Still have traced intertextuality as a phenomenon back to several ancient figures (e.g., Plato and Aristotle) and that makes intertextuality "as old as recorded human society."[843] Having anchored its roots in antiquity, scholars then turn to the contemporary proponents of intertextuality. The one who brought this concept to the West is Julia Kristeva, regarded as one of the most important and earliest[844] interpreters of the work of Russian scholar M. Bakhtin.[845] It was 1969 when she introduced the term "intertextualité" for literary debate.[846]

Since then, intertextuality has become popular and heuristic. It has become a "fashionable term, but almost everybody who uses it understands it somewhat differently."[847] The growing trend of the use of intertextuality has prompted *Semeia* to devote an entire issue to exploring this topic.[848]

According to George Aichele and Gary Phillips:

> Intertextuality cuts across different methodological and theoretical borders (including those of formalism, semiotics, discourse analysis, narratology, poststructuralism, deconstruction, and other post-modern approaches), as well as widely varying discipline fields (including literature, film, architecture, ethnography). It would be a mistake, however, to limit intertextuality to the domain of literary relationships.[849]

---

842 Another distinction should be made at this junction. The notion of intertextuality proposed by Kristeva differs somewhat from that of text-linguistics. Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Dressler point out that Kristeva's notion of intertextuality is narrower than that in text-linguistics; likewise, intertextuality is one of the seven standards of textuality. See de Beaugrande and Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics* (London/New York: Longman Group, 1981), 13 (note 15).

843 Michael Worton and Judith Still, "Introduction," chap. in *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*, ed. Michael Worton and Judith Still (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), 2-15.

844 Ibid., 16.

845 Ellen van Wolde delineates the "concept" of intertextuality as first used by a Russian literary critic named Michael Bakhtin in the 1920s. See her "Texts in Dialogue with Texts: Intertextuality in the Ruth and Tamar Narrative." *BibInt* 5 (1997): 1-2. According to G. R. O'Day, however, the title/role of the progenitor of contemporary intertextuality should go back to T. S. Eliot for his 1919 essay. See, O'Day, "Intertextuality," in *DBI* 1: 546-48.

846 Moyise, "Intertextuality," 14. He provides a helpful, up-to-date but short overview (survey) of the subject of intertextuality spanning from Kristeva to recent biblical scholarship.

847 Henrich F. Plett, "Intertextualities," in *Intertextuality*, ed. Plett (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 3.

848 *Semeia: An Experimental Journal for Biblical Criticism* 69/70 (1995). A helpful German work on intertextuality is Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, eds., *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1985).

849 George Aichele and Gary Phillips, "Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis," *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 7.

Therefore, in a broad sense, one should not look at intertextuality merely for its role in interpreting literature but also for its role in "social practice and cultural expression."[850] Its usage in the literary domain in biblical studies, however, is our primary interest.

In literature, Plett has argued that there are three camps leaning toward intertextuality:[851] the progressives, the traditionalists, and a third group, the anti-intertextualists. The progressives are the poststructuralists, deconstructionists, or postmodernists, who fail to provide any system for textual analysis, and who are limited to a few scholars. The traditionalists are mainly conventional literary scholars; they are neither linguists nor semioticians, and they tend to use intertextuality to improve their methodologies. To their credit, they have succeeded in making intertextuality more applicable; unfortunately, due to their narrow methodological focus, they have failed to release the dynamics embedded in intertextuality. The third group is comprised of anti-intertextualists, whose negative attitude toward intertextuality can be expressed in two ways: (1) they accuse progressives of being too subjective and irrational, and therefore unscientific, and (2) they oppose the traditionalists' pragmatic approach. They argue that they themselves have been working with intertextuality all along. In despair, Plett concludes:

> Intertextuality is put through the critical mills, accused of being incomprehensible on the one hand and old wine in the new bottles on the other hand. One opponent asserts that he does not understand anything, the other insists on having known it all the time. So many intertextualists, so many anti-intertextualists - that is the result.[852]

While the status of intertextuality in general is equivocal, its application to biblical studies is confusing. Intertextuality in biblical studies was first introduced in two major works in 1989, as Moyise has observed.[853] Then Moyise delineated the use of this term, which covers a wide range of biblical studies from source criticism, Jewish midrash, typology, Fishbane's "inner biblical exegesis," and the literary critic's "deep intertextuality," to reader-response criticism.[854] Considering the wide range covered by the term "intertextuality," there are several issues at stake here: (1) its

---

850 Ibid.

851 What follows is a summary of Plett, "Intertextuality," 3-5.

852 Ibid., 5.

853 Moyise, "Intertextuality," 14-15. The two major publications are Spike Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings. Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (Kampen: Kok, 1989) and Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*. Hays' book is reviewed with an opportunity for a counter-response in Craig A Evans and James A. Sanders, eds., *Paul and the Scripture of Israel* JSNTSup 83 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

854 Moyise, "Intertextuality," 15. Part of his comments is traced to George W. Buchanan, *Introduction to Intertextuality* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen, 1994).

methodologies, (2) its relationship with other disciplines and (3) its application to biblical interpretation.

A1.2.1 Methodologies Used by Intertextuality

Not much attention has been paid to the methodologies employed by intertextuality. O'Day provides a brief discussion on methodology:[855] it ranges from Freudian psychology as advocated by Bloom[856] and rhetorical criticism in the work of Hollander in terms of echo,[857] to semiotics in Riffaterre[858] and Genette's works.[859] Based on O'Day's discussion, a question is posed: is there a consistent methodology used by intertextuality? The answer is probably not, as observed by Ann Jefferson when she aptly comments:

> The concept of intertextuality has now become thoroughly absorbed into the literary system as a condition of textuality in general. Consequently, this radical re-thinking of the relation between texts and their origins as a re-writing of existing texts *does not yield a particular critical methodology or an identifiable line of theoretical reasoning*.[860]

On a pragmatic level, the methodology of intertextuality is no more than a semantic (inter-)relationship between two texts. For example, Ellen van Wolde, in her study of the Ruth and Tamar narrative texts, discusses intertextuality, but her procedure in studying the relationship of these two texts is no more than noting their "shared semantic features."[861] Therefore, intertextuality, at its worst, could be called methodological anarchy and at its best, could be called another form of literary-semantic analysis.

---

855 We are indebted to what O'Day wrote in his "Intertextuality," in *DBI*, 1: 546-47 (see bibliographical data of the names cited in p. 548).

856 See an assessment of Bloom in Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 16-17.

857 See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 18-21.

858 See Worton and Still, "Introduction," 24-27.

859 See an assessment of Genette in Tryggve Mettinger, "Intertextuality: Allusion and Vertical Context Systems in Some Job Passages," in *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Heather McKay and David Clines, JSOTSup 162 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 261-62.

860 Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., *Encyclopedia Dictionary of Semiotics*, 2d ed. (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994), s.v. "Intertextuality," by Ann Jefferson. (Words in italics ours.)

861 Ellen van Wolde, "Texts in Dialogue," 8. Although van Wolde talks about the role of the narrator and of characters in the Ruth and Tamar narratives, her discussions are mainly based on the similarity of semantic features in these two texts.

A1.2.2 Its Relationship with Other Disciplines

As previously noted by Moyise, intertextuality is a disconcerting concept, its ambivalence extending to relationships with other disciplines. For instance, both Buchanan and Boyarin equate it with midrash,[862] with the latter taking one step further. Initially refusing to define intertextuality, Boyarin puts it in the shadow of canonical approach (as framed by Childs), and reluctantly concedes:

> Were I to attempt to define midrash at this point, it would perhaps be radical intertextual reading of the canon, in which potentially every part refers to and is interpretable by every other part.[863]

Other scholars see intertextuality in light of semiotics.[864] After surveying the current but conflicting notions of intertextuality, Hans-Peter Mai remarks: "All in all, discussions of intertextuality seem to be most comfortably localized within the wide domain of contemporary semiotics. . . ."[865] Plett argues for a three-fold semiotic perspective to analyze intertext: syntactical, pragmatical and semantical; and emphasizes that each perspective cannot be considered in isolation.[866]

Another area that intertextuality seems to overlap with is redaction criticism.[867] Speaking from the NT perspective (especially using Mark 13 as a case study), Willem Vorster contends that there are major differences between redaction criticism (*Redaktionsgeschichte*) and intertextuality.[868] While redaction criticism is primarily an author-centered approach (focusing on the redactor and his activities), intertextuality is reader-oriented (alerting the readers to assign meaning to the text). Furthermore, while redaction criticism is a "form of source-influence study"[869] assuming the existence of an oral and written source or tradition behind the text, intertextuality is a text theory based on a "finished" text in relation to another text. As Vorster surmises, "All texts can be regarded as the rewriting of previous texts, and also

---

862 See Buchanan, *Intertextuality*, 3-5 and Daniel Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1990).

863 Boyarin, *Intertextuality*, 16.

864 To go into detail on semiotics goes beyond our interest. For the best survey of this subject, see Thomas Sebeok, ed., *Encyclopedia Dictionary of Semiotics*, s.v. "Semiotics" by Jerzy Pele.

865 Hans-Peter Mai, "Bypassing Intertextuality: Hermeneutics, Textual Practice, Hypertext," in *Intertextuality*, ed. Heinrich Plett, 32.

866 Plett, "Intertextualities," 6-7.

867 NT scholar Willi Marxsen coined the term redaction criticism. See "Redaction criticism, NT" and "Redaction Criticism, Hebrew Bible" in *IDB* 2: 373-79.

868 Willem Vorster, "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*, 15-26.

869 Ibid., 17.

as reactions to texts."[870] In essence, Vorster's article calls for NT scholarship to replace redaction criticism with intertextuality in their studies. This leads to our next concern.

A1.2.3 Application to Biblical Interpretation

Since Hays and Draisma published their works in 1989,[871] the practice of intertextuality in biblical studies has been growing. Concerning the OT, Danna Fewell edited a collection of works on intertextual studies in the OT in 1992,[872] followed by others.[873] In NT studies, Brawley took the lead in using intertextuality to study Luke-Acts.[874] The application is not limited to the OT and NT, but extends to related field like the OT and Ugarit.[875] Nonetheless, Gary Phillips argues that the application of intertextuality for illuminating various exegetical phenomena, such as textual citation, allusion, allegorical interpretation, typology, rhetorical and discourse structures, narrative structure, reader-response trategies, canonical and extra-canonical formation, and the like, has not been exploited by biblical exegetes in particular, for that matter, by religionists in general.[876]

Another area thought to be profitable for intertextuality is the NT use of the OT, though it is observed that studies regarding the use of the OT in the NT mainly concentrate on how quotations, allusions, and echoes function in light of

---

870 Ibid., 20.

871 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture and Draisma*, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*.

872 Danna N. Fewell, ed., *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster/John Knox, 1992).

873 To name a few works in monograph form: Patricia T. Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, SBLDS 161 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1997). Goerg Steins, *Die 'Bindung Isaaks'* and Jannie Hunter, *Faces of a Lamenting City: The Development and Coherence of the Book of Lamentation* (Berlin: Peter Lang, 1996). Other scholars contribute through articles. For example, Robert Carroll, "Intertextuality and the Book of Jeremiah: Animadversions on Text and Theory," in *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum and David Cline (Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1994), 55-78. Christine Mitchell, "The Dialogism of Chronicles," in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, JSOTSup 263, ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steve L. McKenzie (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 311-26. In the same book, see Noel Bailey, "David and God in 1 Chronicles 21: Edged with Mist," 336-59.

874 Robert L. Brawley, *Text to Text*. Others follow Brawley. For example, Sylvia C. Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*, JSNTSup 181 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Keesmaat openly acknowledges that she is indebted to Hays' work, which provides her a methodological tool in her own study (preface, p. 9).

875 Johannes C. De Moor, ed., *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 1998). The title of the book is, however, misleading because there is only one article pertaining to the OT and Ugarit.

876 Gary A. Phillips, "Sign/Text/Differance: The Contribution of Intertextual Theory to Biblical Criticism" in *Intertextuality*, ed. Plett, 78.

intertextuality.[877] As we have mentioned earlier, there is no consensus regarding their relationships, workable definitions, and methodologies employed to study them.

So far, we have listed some of the issues involving intertextuality. In our opinion, these issues cannot be resolved easily. Nonetheless, we will offer some of our evaluations of intertextuality as follows.

First, there are certain benefits to applying intertextuality to biblical study. Moyise is correct that "a text cannot be studied in isolation. It belongs to a web of texts which are (partially) present whenever it is read or studied."[878] This is especially true of the study of Scripture because the present canon provides a framework or boundary for text comparison.

Second, its strength, however, is also its weakness. Proponents of intertextuality have not sufficiently discussed the criteria to determine the existence of intertextuality between two or more texts. It is conceivable that not every text will have a pre-text, and every text should be read in its own right before comparing it to other texts. It is observed that whether intertextuality exists in two texts depends on an interpreter who detects an existence of quotation, allusion, or echo in a later text. Intertextuality is seen mostly as equivalent to allusion and echo.[879] Nonetheless, the confusing definitions offered for quotation, allusion, and echo – especially the last two – have not helped in the application of intertextuality to biblical studies (see our chapter 1 "How a Text is Quoted").

Third, the historical factor in biblical study is neglected. Viewed mainly as a synchronic approach, intertextuality by and large ignores the historical difference between two texts. Therefore, as Charlesworth proposed, it should be used as a supplementary method to biblical criticism.[880]

---

877 This is a sample of some of the important studies on quotations, allusions, and echoes. On quotation: Plett, "Intertextuality," 8-17. He addresses the issue of quotation in this session as "An Intertextual Case Study: the Quotation." Christopher D. Stanley, "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, JSNTSup 148, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1977), 44-58. In his article, Stanley argues for a rhetoric approach to biblical quotations. On allusions: Mettinger, "Intertextuality," 257-80. Udo J. Hebel, "Towards a Descriptive Poetics of *Allusion*," in *Intertextuality*, ed. Heinrich Plett, 135-64. Lyle Eslinger, "Inner-biblical Exegesis and Inner-biblical allusion: The Question of Category," *VT* 42 (1992): 47-58. On echo: Moyise, "Intertextuality," 18-19, and Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*.

878 Moyise, "Intertextuality," 15-16.

879 Porter, "Use of the Old Testament," 85.

880 James H. Charlesworth, "Intertextuality: Isaiah 40: 3 and the Serek Ha-yahad," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, ed. Craig Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 205.

Fourth, intertextuality has lost its own distinctiveness as a "literary and hermeneutical category"[881] to interpret the Bible. Scholars tend to lump "together a whole variety of approaches and [call] them intertextuality."[882] Is intertextuality a midrash, or a reader-response criticism? The lack of uniformity in its definition and methodology has made intertextuality meaningless and confusing for any practitioner of biblical study.

Finally, as noted earlier, there is no consistent methodology for intertextual studies. That does not mean, however, that we do not have pragmatic procedures for doing intertextuality. Some of those proposed procedures prove to be helpful in an intertextual study of the Scripture. For example, as indicated in van Wolde's article, positively and pragmatically speaking, her "shared semantic features" in intertextual studies would be a welcome procedure for inner- and inter-biblical interpretation.[883]

---

881 Gail R. O'Day "Jeremiah 9: 22-23 and 1 Corinthians 1: 26-31: A Study in Intertextuality," *JBL* 109 (1990): 259.

882 Moyise, "Intertextuality," 16.

883 The step-by-step procedure delineated by van Wolde is as follows: (1) reader awareness of the similarities of the two texts; (2) reader to study the text on its own; (3) to compare the two texts and take inventory of the shared semantic features by noting repetitions of word-level, textual unit and structure, theme and genre, character description or character type, actions or series of actions; (4) to note the narratological representations; and (5) to review other features such as the rhetorical, pragmatic, or communicative. See van Wolde, "Text in Dialogue," 7-8.