[*CR:BS* 8 (2000) 59-90]

INTERTEXTUALITY AND THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES

Patricia Tull

Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary

The Problem of Definitions

The concept of 'intertextuality', as the name implies, concerns interrelationships among texts. Thus far do theorists and practitioners concur, both in the area of biblical studies and in the wider world of literary theory. From this point on, however, the concept of intertextuality represents a battleground of differing emphases and claims, both linguistic and ideological. The most widely made second statement concerning intertextuality is that few agree on how best to understand and use the term:

> Intertextuality today is easily the most catholic of concepts in the realm of literary theory, but also the one most entangled in controversial definitions and contradictory usages (Schulze-Engler 1991: 3).

> The face of 'intertextuality', as a new master term, is less a simple, single, and precise image, a bronze head by Rodin, than something shattered, a portrait bust by an avid exponent of analytic cubism too poor to afford a good chisel (Clayton and Rothstein 1991: 11).

A major reason for the struggle over the term's meaning is that intertextual theory is, in one sense, nothing new or remarkable at all. It draws attention to textual properties that have been recognized since ancient times. Yet postmodern paradigms have introduced fundamental shifts in the ways in which texts and language are understood, and consequently, in the ways in which relationships among texts can be viewed. In struggles over the definitions of intertextuality, certain questions come to the fore:

1. What is a text?
2. How are texts interrelated, and how interrelated are they?
3. Where does meaning/interpretation reside? Who are the agents of meaning?

Differences in approaches to intertextuality can often be described in terms of differences in emphasis surrounding these and related questions. As will be shown below, a variety of approaches find legitimate roots in the historical origins of the discussion of the concept, and practitioners of no one approach can claim exclusive right to the meaning or use of intertextuality.

What Is a Text?

Some intertextualists limit their discussion to specific kinds of written texts, implying, at least, that the issues of intertextuality are only to be found among them. Bloom, for instance, in *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973), limits his discussion to the literary works of great poets, describing his version of intertextual theory as an Oedipal struggle occurring between poets and their precursors, their poet-fathers. According to Abrams's less strict but still limited viewpoint, intertextuality signifies 'the multiple ways in which any one *literary* text is inseparably inter-involved with other texts' (1993: 285; emphasis added). Many who engage in intertextual studies in biblical interpretation share a similar minimalist view of what a text can be, and what kind of intertextual relationships are significant.

Most intertextualists, however, would define the 'text' in 'intertextuality' much more broadly, extending their understanding (at least in theory) beyond literature, beyond the written word, to any sort of communication involving words, whether written or spoken. Beyond that, many would extend their discussion to encompass not only words, but in fact all signs (or 'signifiers') which call for interpretation. In this broader sense, the following would also be texts, since they convey meaning that must be understood culturally and contextually: a pictorial 'no-smoking' sign; a symphony; a gesture; a sacrament; a protocol; a football game—anything interpretable by means of cultural knowledge. Culture itself is viewed as the rich interweaving of myriad strands of text. In that sense, intertextual relationships can roam the gamut of cultural ingredients, moving among and between genres (and becoming, in the terms of some, no longer intertextuality, but intermediality): a gesture can refer to a movie character; a movie can echo a burgeoning

cultural phenomenon; a TV commercial can satirize an urban myth, a football game can adopt the ritualism of a religious sacrament; a critic can verbally interpret a concerto, a sonnet can call to mind a painting, a viewer can interpret an event on the evening news in terms of a recently-heard sermon (see Morgan 1985: 8). Extending even further, some theorists would have difficulty identifying anything at all as *not* being text, since even the individual human consciousness is constructed out of a myriad of strands of intersecting text. Derrida's famous line sums it up: 'There is nothing outside of the text' (Derrida 1976: 158).

Naturally, the more general the definition of text becomes, the more complex the discussion will be, since the variables become boundless and finally impossible to sort or distinguish. Some interpreters ignore the radical dimensions of intertextual theory and attempt to partake of the notion of intertextuality while maintaining a fairly positivistic, modernist view of texts as discrete and unified entities. Theoretical purists, on the other end, tend to assert the impossibility of carrying on any kind of concrete discussion of relationships among texts as separate entities. Still others attempt to steer somewhat of a mediating course. Recognizing that any discussion of textual boundaries or relationships can only be proximate and partial, yet reluctant to renege entirely on the enterprise of interpretation, they still believe there are some things worth saying about individual texts and particular relationships drawn among them, and continue to do so. Culler, whose chapter 'Presupposition and Intertextuality' elegantly sums up the interpretive dilemmas of operating with an enlarged view of intertextuality, states it this way:

> By its very nature, perhaps, the description of intertextuality can only be accomplished by projects that distort and restrict the original theoretical program. But the impossibility of ever mastering and presenting, making present, the intertextuality of a particular text, much less a culture, does not mean that the project can be abandoned in favor of interpretation which applies one text to another in order to produce new readings [à la Bloom] (1981: 118).

'How Are Texts Interrelated, and how Interrelated Are They?'

This question, as well, is answered in a variety of ways, from minimalist to maximalist. According to Bloom, each strong poet is the heir of a single poetic father: a poem echoes, and struggles to overcome, one precursor (1973: 30). But his schema, while neat, is generally not accepted. Other intertextualists, more liberally than Bloom, may view texts as having multiple sources, but limit their field of vision to direct

allusions to discernible sources, deliberately made by the author. For instance, while Rabinowitz recognizes that the term 'intertextuality' encompasses more than literary borrowing, he views the term as 'needlessly broad' for his purpose (1980: 242), which is to catalogue the vocabulary of literary borrowing according to the audience's relationship to a work's precursor text. For Bloom, Rabinowitz, and many others, the concept of 'influence' remains at the forefront, and the actions of later texts are described in relation to precursor texts, whether as 'imitation', 'parody', 'misreading', or 'borrowing'. This group has traditionally described later texts as existing in a position of indebtedness in relation to prior texts: the earlier text 'influences' the later; the later text 'borrows from', 'imitates' or 'draws upon' the earlier.

Radically theoretical intertextualists, on the other end of the scale, for whom 'text' is all-encompassing, view texts as being so thoroughly and deeply interwoven that tracing lines among them becomes as meaningless as distinguishing among water drops in the ocean. Barthes, for instance, is often quoted as saying:

> The intertextual in which every text is held, it itself being the text-between of another text, is not to be confused with some origin of the text: to try to find the 'sources', the 'influences', of a work, is to fall in with the myth of filiation, the citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable, and yet *already read*: they are quotations without inverted commas (1977: 160)

For this reason, many would eschew discussing individual instances of relationships among texts, labeling such discussions as 'banal source-hunting'.

Still others, such as Culler, understand intertextuality to encompass a broad range of possibilities, from the deliberate and more-or-less clearly marked quotations and allusions that traditionalists recognize, to more subtle echoes of texts and 'texts' (that is, texts in both the narrower and broader sense), whether intended by an author or created by a reader, to a text's participation in a range of cultural discourses, genres, languages and gestures (see especially 1981: 103). Similarly, this group recognizes both the impossibility of presenting any comprehensive catalogue of a text's intertextual ties, and the problematic differences between an author's ideal readers, whose mental repertoires of intertexts coincide with the author's own, and real readers, especially readers far removed culturally and temporally. Yet they are not daunted by these problems from at least attempting to discuss a text's responses

to other texts. Resisting the notion of a relationship of indebtedness, intertextualists in this class tend to emphasize the multifaceted dialogical, revisionary, sometimes even polemical relationships in which texts stand over against one another.

Where Does Meaning/Interpretation Reside? Who Are the Agents of Meaning?

Traditionally, authors of texts were given credit for imbuing them with meaning. A reader's job was to follow the pathways created by the author, which if competently navigated would lead to the understanding that the author wanted readers to gain. If a text alluded to another text, a good reader would be able to recognize the allusion and to recreate the author's purpose in using it.

But no actual reader reads exactly the way an author intends. Because no two individuals share the same repertoire of 'texts in the mind', readers miss allusions and echoes intended by authors, and hear unintended echoes and associations. Even the most literate, like-minded reader cannot replicate exactly the nuances of an author's terms, because connotations of words and phrases originate from particular, idiosyncratic, largely unarticulated and even consciously forgotten prior experiences. No matter how much a given reader desires to recreate an author's intent, slippage is simply inevitable. Because of this, theorists have come to recognize the agency of readers in the production of textual meaning.

The distinctiveness of the roles of author and reader becomes more blurred when the 'author as reader' and 'reader as author' are considered: the author as being first a reader of other texts which inform the author's own text; the reader who in the interpretive process inevitably 'writes' a new text unintended by the author.

Radical intertextualists will give credit for meaning to the reader, if to anyone at all. Barthes, for instance, talks of the reader as 'playing the Text' as a musician plays a musical score, noting that much contemporary music calls on the interpreter to be 'in some sort the co-author of the score, completing it rather than giving it "expression". The Text is very much a score of this kind: it asks of the reader a practical collaboration' (1977: 163). But even that idea is suspect to some, since they doubt how much of an agent a person can be, when even individual consciousness is a complex product of intersecting, and inevitably divergent, cultural texts. Because readers and authors as agents of

meaning cannot be pinpointed, the particularity of viewpoints can tend to be obscured. Oddly, theorists propounding along these lines the anonymity of texts and the death of authors nevertheless continue diligently to author texts, and their texts tend to be ponderously overladen with quotations from a certain canon of authors/authorities that are anything but anonymous. Friedman's article (1991), discussed below, articulates some of the ironies created by this viewpoint.

The discussion of agency in intertextual theory is likewise quite important, but quite complex. Historically, the role of readers in the making of meaning has been far too long ignored. The importance of messages proceeding beyond what an author actually meant, or could have meant, has not always been observed, and the role of cultural boundaries in constraining and determining what is possible for both writers and readers to mean has only recently begun to be explored. At the same time, many theorists, especially in America, resist the doctrine of an all-encompassing, anonymous cultural text, on the grounds that it mutes the voices of those who stand in some tension with dominant cultural ideologies, and delegitimizes dialogical interaction:

> The position that the Author is dead, and subjective agency along with him, does not necessarily work for women and prematurely forecloses the question of identity for them When the question of identity—the so-called crisis of the subject—is posed, as it generally is, within a textual model, that question is irreducibly complicated by the historical, political, and figurative body of the woman writer (Miller 1986, 107).

Intertextualities

An amusing character sketch of the differences among intertextualists is offered by Plett in his aptly titled article, 'Intertextualities' (1991). He catalogues, with intentional overstatement, three broad factions, whom he labels 'progressives', 'traditionalists', and 'anti-intertextualists'. According to this schema, progressives are those radical intertextualists who:

> ..do not tire of quoting, paraphrasing and interpreting the writings of Bakhtin, Barthes, Kristeva, Derrida and other authorities' They are comprehensible only to elitist circles which are devoted exclusively to the study of the masters. Although numerically small, this group of French origin has succeeded in spreading its activities internationally and in setting up branches in all the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Regardless of whether they call themselves poststructuralists, deconstructionists, or postmodernists their basic aim is identical to dislodge

> academic teaching from its traditional moorings. But the overthrow of the old orthodoxy, paradoxically not without a logic of its own, has only led to the establishment of a new one (pp. 3-4).

The traditionalists, Plett says, are 'conventional literary scholars':

> Alerted by the public reaction to the work of poststructuralists and deconstructionists, these scholars asked themselves—after a period of cautious hesitation—whether the insights of the intertextuality debate could be applied profitably to their own concerns. Those scholars who are seriously concerned with theoretical advances in their discipline use 'intertextuality' as a general term to improve their methodological and terminological instruments. Thus they have succeeded, at least partly, in making the new approach more applicable. Yet ...systematic interest easily leads to narrow thinking, emphasis on terminology to batteries of scholastic nomenclatures, largely devoid of content (p. 4).

Plett himself, who in this article attempts to catalogue and describe a wide variety of intertextual phenomena, could be found guilty in this respect. His concluding statements, however, could well apply to the field of biblical studies: 'It is even worse when scholars use the term "intertextuality" without having critically examined the concept, only in order to appear up-to-date. "Intertextuality" as a vogue word—that is the negative side of the coin' (p. 4).

Criticizing progressives for reveling in opaque language, and criticizing traditionalists for inadequate understanding of opaque theories, might seem to leave Plett only the third group to praise, the anti-intertextualists. Yet he criticizes them also, for failing to comprehend the progressives, and, over against the traditionalists:

> [never tiring of] emphasizing that they themselves have worked intertextually all along. The change in terminology, it is argued, did not change anything substantially. Quite on the contrary, such a devious labelling only affects a progressiveness which does not actually exist. In this way, intertextuality is put through the critical mills, accused of being incomprehensible on the one hand and old wine in new bottles on the other (pp. 4-5).

Such is the state of things in the field of intertextuality: everyone has an opinion, a claim to stake, a prior understanding to assert vigorously over against all competitors. Yet this situation seems strangely apt for a concept that helps explain why a single word, which has only lived to accumulate meanings for some 30 years, refuses to rest quietly in the dictionary, and instead stirs up vehement linguistic struggle. To under-

stand this struggle better, it helps to examine the term's history in the world of ideas.

Origins of the Concept of Intertextuality

Influence Theory

Though the word 'intertextuality' was introduced only in the late 1960s by Kristeva (see 1980, 1984 [ET]) it does indeed describe a phenomenon that has emerged in a variety of ways since the dawn of language and philosophy. 'There is nothing new under the sun': new creative endeavors do not simply fall from the sky, but rather spring from the reworking of prior material. As Still and Worton have pointed out (1990: 2-5), discussions of some forms of intertextuality can be found at least as far back as Plato and Aristotle.

Cicero and Quintilian emphasized the importance of imitating the speech of others; and throughout the middle ages and even during the Renaissance, writers continued to practice imitation, allusion, and even plagiarism (see Still and Worton 1990: 6-8). But in the mid-eighteenth century, a concern arose that disrupted such free intertextual borrowing, and led to what intertextualists now call 'influence theory'. This was a preoccupation with the notion of originality, a concern reflecting the enlightenment spirit of independence, of distrust for tradition: 'For the authors of *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759) and *An Essay on Original Genius* (1767), Edward Young and William Duff, originality was a key to a work of literature and the only true sign of an author's genius' (Clayton and Rothstein 1991: 5). A cat-and-mouse game ensued: critics began searching literary works for signs of derivation and influence that would enable them to evaluate a writer as weak and lacking in genius; writers themselves fought for their own immortality by seeking innovation.

Because of the pronounced bias toward the 'original', descriptions of the relationships between earlier texts and related later texts tended to locate power and intentionality in the earlier text: X *influenced* Y; that is, X *acted upon* Y; Y *was influenced by* X. Ironically, it has been pointed out, this construction of relationships does justice neither to textual chronology, nor to either text's intentions, nor to any descriptive analysis:

> If one says that X influenced Y it does seem that one is saying that X did something to Y rather than that Y did something to X. But if we think of Y rather than X as the agent, the vocabulary is much richer and more

> attractively diversified, draw on, resort to, avail oneself of, appropriate from, have recourse to, adapt, misunderstand [the author goes on to list 39 more verbs].. To think in terms of influence blunts thought by impoverishing the means of differentiation (Baxandall 1985: 58-59)

As long as the concept of 'influence' reigned, opportunities to examine the many ways in which later texts could and did interact with their predecessors were rendered invisible to the interpretive eye.

In the biblical world, discussions of relationships between texts were similarly conditioned by concern over original genius. The shape of the limitations can be seen both in the ways in which source criticism was carried out and in the ways in which texts that are clearly interrelated were understood. In terms of the first, concern for originality particularly dominated interpretation of the biblical prophets (see Dinter 1997: 385). Romantic notions of the solitary prophets as God's mouthpieces, independent of human tradition and institutions, provided much of the sociological foundation beneath Wellhausen's Documentary Hypothesis, articulated in his 1878 *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*:

> [The prophets] do not preach on set texts, they speak out of the spirit which judges all things and itself is judged of no man. Where do they ever lean on any other authority than the truth of what they say, where do they rest on any other foundation than their own certainty? (1957: 398-99)

Source critics of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries followed Wellhausen's notion, and proceeded diligently to isolate the 'original', textually independent, short oral speeches of the classical prophets from real and supposed accretions of scribes, which the critics thought could be detected by the mere fact that they echoed other texts. Often, repetition of any sort, no matter how insignificant, even repetition internal to the prophetic work itself, was taken as a sign of redactive addition (see Willey 1997: 11-22 for a more detailed description of this movement). Many critics, seeing themselves as 'editors' restoring the prophetic utterance, proceeded to rewrite the prophetic texts, deleting and rearranging to create speeches that matched their expectations of what prophets should be.

Concern for originality also discouraged comparative studies among texts that clearly stand in direct relationship to one another. The language of 'influence' rendered it difficult to say much more about Chronicles than that it was a tendentious rewriting of Samuel–Kings.

Only in recent years have questions emerged regarding the dialogical intentions of Chronicles that can be discerned from its additions to, deletions from, and rewritings of whole sections of the earlier text. Similarly, the notion of 'influence', when applied to the citation of Scripture in the Christian New Testament, obscured both the agency of the early church in adapting the Hebrew Scriptures to unforeseen theological purposes, and the distinctions between the messages of these texts as they were previously understood, and the meanings newly imputed to them.

Bakhtinian Dialogism

Though influence theory is certainly one way, and until recently the predominant way, of viewing relationships among texts, it is not the historical source of intertextual theory. Rather, the term first appeared in the writings of Kristeva, as she mused upon Bakhtin's description of the 'dialogism' of novelistic prose. Addressing the hitherto puzzling question of the stylistic qualities of prose fiction, Bakhtin suggested that what characterizes novelistic prose is its dialogical nature—that is, the propensity of prose fiction to lack a particular unified voice of its own, and rather to mirror, emulate, and even set side by side a variety of kinds of language found in the author's own world. Bakhtin's criticism of the idea of 'stylistics' as a useful category for describing prose fiction has been found to be equally applicable to 'new critical' stylistic studies in literature in general and in biblical studies in particular:

> Stylistics has been completely deaf to dialogue. A literary work has been conceived by stylistics as if it were a hermetic and self-sufficient whole, one whose elements constitute a closed system presuming nothing beyond themselves, no other utterances... From the point of view of stylistics, the artistic work as a whole—whatever that whole might be—is a self-sufficient and closed authorial monologue, one that presumes only passive listeners beyond its own boundaries... Stylistics locks every stylistic phenomenon into the monologic context of a given self-sufficient and hermetic utterance, imprisoning it, as it were, in the dungeon of a single context, it is not able to exchange messages with other utterances, it is not able to realize its own stylistic implications in a relationship with them; it is obliged to exhaust itself in its own single hermetic context (1981: 273-74)

In other words, Bakhtin accuses literary critics of assuming that when readers read, communication proceeds in a simple, direct and uniform line from text to reader. The reader does not protest against or add

insights to the text, no other texts are appealed to by the text or recalled by the reader, and the text itself is the only influence on the reader's interpretation of that text: the text speaks in monologue to the reader. Much of what has been variously called 'rhetorical criticism', 'narrative analysis', and 'synchronic reading' in biblical studies is subject to Bakhtin's critique (for descriptions of rhetorical analysis in the light of intertextual theory, see Tull 1999, 2000).

In contrast to such assumptions, Bakhtin points out that both the creation and the reception of words are conditioned by the presence of competing words already at large in the discursive environment:

> Between the word and its object, between the word and the speaking subject, there exists an elastic environment of other, alien words about the same object, the same theme...
>
> Indeed, any concrete discourse (utterance) finds the object at which it was directed already as it were overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, already enveloped in an obscuring mist—or, on the contrary, by the 'light' of alien words that have already been spoken about it. . The word, directed toward its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group, and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile.
>
> The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance, it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it – it does not approach the object from the sidelines (1981: 276-77)

Creators of new texts, according to Bakhtin, cannot help but enter into intertextual relationships. They may repeat the words of some, repudiate the conceptions of others, twist an old theme into a new form, but no matter what they do, they are shaped by what has already been said, and in their rejoinders they attempt to reshape what will be understood in the future. Dialogism consists not simply of alluding, either covertly or overtly, to some other literary work, but also of echoing, recoiling from, seizing, or reconstituting all manner of language existing in the environment, whether authored or anonymous, spoken or written, specific or general.

Noting another layer of complexity, Bakhtin adds that writers write in the awareness of dialogue with readers, anticipating their responses:

> Every word is directed toward an *answer* and cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that it anticipates.
>
> The word in living conversation is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction Forming itself in an atmosphere of the already spoken the word is at the same time determined by that which has not yet been said but which is needed and in fact anticipated by the answering word. Such is the situation in any living dialogue (1981: 280).

As his baroque but vivid prose shows, Bakhtin's genius lies in his creative teasing out of various dynamics of discourse that were implicit but not necessarily obvious. However, his work is not uniformly consistent or precise. As one of his most prominent interpreters, Todorov, points out (1984: 63-64), Bakhtin sometimes contradicts himself by using a single word to mean several different things. For instance, on the one hand he insists that all texts are necessarily dialogical, and on the other hand he insists that the form of the novel as exemplified by Dostoevsky is dialogical, while poetry, epic and other novels, such as those by Tolstoy, are 'monologic' in form. What he seems to mean is that Dostoevsky's work portrays the variety of voices and stances that operate in dialogue with one another in such a way as to refrain from judging among them in order to present an unambiguous authorial vision, whereas other artistic endeavors do attempt to convey an overriding viewpoint. And yet at the same time, because every text enters a world already overlain with other viewpoints, even a text that is meant to offer a monological viewpoint cannot help but be crisscrossed with competing views itself, and enters into dialogue with other texts as soon as it is read.

Kristevan Intertextuality and the Debate that Ensued

When Kristeva introduced Bakhtin to the Western world (1980), she ascribed to him notions that resembled his, yet differed substantially. While ostensibly presenting Bakhtin, Kristeva subtly employs the work of other French theorists, particularly Derrida and Lacan, to modify his ideas (see Clayton and Rothstein 1991: 17-21 for a full discussion of this aspect of Kristeva's work). Like Bakhtin, she views dialogical relationships as inevitable on account of the very nature of language. Also like him, she sees these relationships as intricately interwoven, insepa-

rable from the very warp and woof of every discourse. But in creating the word 'intertextuality' as a stand-in for Bakhtin's 'dialogism', she introduces more than a synonym. For Bakhtin, each word stands at the intersection of other words but, as Clayton and Rothstein point out, Kristeva parenthetically slips the word 'text', a substitute term, into her reiteration of Bakhtin's ideas: 'Each word (text) is an intersection of word (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read' (Kristeva 1980: 66). She summarizes her paraphrase of Bakhtin's insight: 'Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another' (Kristeva 1980: 66). Thus she textualizes Bakhtin's 'voices', submerging Bakhtin's emphasis on the ties between utterances and their socially distinct settings.

Kristeva particularly differs from Bakhtin in her understanding of authorship. For Bakhtin, the author is a subject responding in a particular social world. Kristeva and the French theorists who follow her, seeing even authorial subjectivity as a myth of originality, view language itself as a mosaic of interrelated, virtually subjectless discourses:

> The writer's interlocutor, then, is the writer himself, but as reader of another text. The one who writes is the same as the one who reads. Since his interlocutor is a text, he himself is no more than a text rereading itself as it rewrites itself (Kristeva 1980: 86-87).

Thus, as soon as the Bakhtin's concept of dialogism was read, it was, as he said, 'already as it were overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, already enveloped in an obscuring mist' (1981: 276), even by his disciples and interpreters. And correspondingly, as soon as the term 'intertextuality' was coined by Kristeva (1980), it too was charged with value and open to dispute. To be philosophically consistent, understandings of intertextuality that partake of Bakhtin's and Kristeva's descriptions would view the dispute that the word itself occasions as a confirmation of the very problematics that intertextual theory describes. But Kristeva did not seem to see it that way. She found it frustrating that her new word began to take on other meanings in other people's work, that it was coming into contact with something that resembled influence theory, and being used by some in what she called the 'banal sense of "study of sources" ' (Kristeva 1984: 59-60). Soon she began to abandon it for other terms, such as 'intersection' and 'transposition'. Yet, as Culler points out (1981: 105-106), it is difficult to describe intertextuality without mentioning concrete cases in which intertextual relationships can be traced. He notes

that in developing her theories, Kristeva herself has 'studied sources' in depth, even to the point of worrying over which of several editions of one text was being invoked by a subsequent author.

Since the individuality and authority of the speaking subject is substantially discounted in a Kristevan universe, one would think it out of bounds to insist on citing Kristeva as the authority controlling use of the terms, and more appropriate to delight in the multitudinous intertextual paths that the notion has taken, as a prime example of the endless, open-ended play of language. However, Kristeva and her apologists have vehemently defended her control over the term and the theory. Thus, they inadvertantly demonstrate Bakhtin's notion of a 'monologic' discourse in a dialogically tension-filled world. Roudiez, in his introduction to Kristeva (1980), defines intertextuality as having been 'originally' introduced by Kristeva, but subsequently used, abused and misunderstood 'on both sides of the Atlantic'. For Roudiez, intertextuality 'has nothing to do with matters of influence by one writer upon another, or with the sources of a literary work; it does, on the other hand, involve the components of a *textual system* such as the novel' (p. 15). As Friedman points out:

> Roudiez's disturbance at the 'abuse' of Kristeva's term—authorized by Kristeva's own disparaging remarks—reflects the wish for intellectual clarity and precision in terminology, but it also engages in a desire to maintain a fixed meaning, a signified, for intertextuality. The concern for the purity of Kristeva's concept—the critique of its 'abuse'—insists upon the operation of influence in the dissemination of her concept in its original form on 'both sides of the Atlantic' Kristeva *authored* the terms, which should be used with the *meaning* she *intended*. I highlight these words.. to emphasize the irony of the discourse of anonymous intertextuality being promoted within the discourse of influence (1991 154).

Dogmatism can appear in any part of the discussion. Jenny protests against dictums such as Roudiez's, but himself limits the definition in the opposite direction: 'Intertextuality in the strict sense is not unrelated to source criticism: it designates not a confused, mysterious accumulation of influences, but the work of transformation and assimilation of various texts that is accomplished by a focal text which keeps control over the meaning' (1980: 39-40). In a more balanced discussion, Culler affirms the merit of both sides of the intertextual debate:

> 'Intertextuality' thus has a double focus. On the one hand, it calls our attention to the importance of prior texts, insisting that the autonomy of texts is a misleading notion and that a work has the meaning it does only because certain things have previously been written. Yet in so far as it focuses on intelligibility, on meaning, 'intertextuality' leads us to consider prior texts as contributions to a code which makes possible the various effects of signification. Intertextuality thus becomes less a name for a work's relation to particular prior texts than a designation of its participation in the discursive space of a culture... The study of intertextuality is thus not the investigation of sources and influences as traditionally conceived; it *casts its net wider* to *include* anonymous discursive practices, codes whose origins are lost, that make possible the signifying practices of later texts (1981: 103, italics added)

In practice, intertextuality is invoked in a wide range of ways, some highly theoretical, others conceptual and programmatic, others pragmatically interpretive. The vast majority of publications explore relationships among identifiable texts, or between a text and elements of its social environment. Because intertextual theory and its vocabulary have been construed so diversely, some discussion of theoretical and methodological assumptions becomes necessary at the outset of most studies.

Intertextuality in Biblical Studies

Studies in intertextuality that involve the Bible are every bit as diverse as those in other fields. It is impossible in this short article to do justice to all that is being written that invokes intertextuality as a rubric, much less to all explorations of intertextual relationships that do not invoke Kristeva's term. However, I will note below some major works, concentrating on studies that represent new paths theoretically or methodologically. Some of these works focus on intertextual relationships within the canon of Hebrew Scripture itself, and others on relationships between parts of that canon and works outside of it, primarily interpretations of Hebrew Scripture in subsequent literature and culture. Since relationships of New Testament writings to Hebrew Scripture inspire an ever-burgeoning library all their own, only a few representative studies will be mentioned.

Intertextual Study within the Hebrew Scriptures

Several edited collections of articles focusing on intertextuality illustrate the wide range of ways the idea is being appropriated among bibli-

cal scholars. For anyone unconcerned to pin intertextuality down to a single definition, a simple perusal of some of these volumes can be fascinating and instructive. Clearly, even when the editors prescribe definitions and boundaries in their introductions, their own contributors continually transgress the rules.

On one end of the range stands a Semeia volume edited by Aichele and Phillips, *Intertextuality and the Bible* (1995). In their introduction, the editors express a Kristevan disdain for all practitioners who do not bow at her temple. Dissidents are 'narrow', 'conservative', 'ideologically contradictory', 'banal', 'thin', 'superficial', 'suspect' and 'traditional.' Proper reflection upon intertextuality as the editors view it is posed as the necessary and sufficient cure for all the ills that the Bible has created, able to undo the Bible's legitimization of 'hatred not only of Jews but of women, gays and lesbians, the poor, and any marginalized other' (p. 13). Those who demur from a Kristevan approach are tempted to suspect that they are not only thereby bad scholars but also politically incorrect and morally insensitive people. Yet the variegated essays within the volume itself display a delightfully flamboyant range of approaches, with some authors praising scholars that the editors have condemned, other authors arguing that no tribute to theory can protect a person from native conservatism, and still others rubbing the most unexpected texts together and watching the sparks fly.

On the other end of the range stand volumes of essays that partake of intertextuality in the sense that it is difficult to do anything at all in biblical scholarship without running into intertextual issues, but whose invoking of intertextuality is limited to occasional use of the word, especially in titles and final paragraphs. For instance, *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, edited by Evans and Talmon (1997), is a large and eclectic compendium of essays by male biblical scholars, ranging in methodology from canonical criticism to philology, in text from Esau to Qumran to James to David Kimchi, and in focus from 'Paul's Understanding of the Textual Contradiction between Habakkuk 2:4 and Leviticus 18:5' to 'On Biblical Theology'. A prestigious list of authors and wide-ranging list of topics make the volume more than worthwhile to peruse, even though, except for a couple of articles, it would be nearly the same book without any reference to intertextuality.

The contrasting of these two collections is not meant to disparage one in relation to the other, nor to suggest in the least that one is 'doing

intertextuality' while the other is not. Rather, it is to note, and to celebrate, just how wide the range of possibilities is, when some continue freely to color within traditional lines and others obey the doctrine of transgression. On the one hand, non-believers are doing naturally what others discover through theory, though some of their practices might be sharpened by self-critical pondering (would a deconstructionist critique of the Bible's fomenting of sexism, à la Aichele and Phillips, have encouraged Evans and Talmon to include one or two women among the 33 contributors?). On the other hand, biblical scholarship has always benefited from the eclecticism of its practitioners, and trying to fit all scholarship into intertextual categories may lead to the missing of some very great insights that proceed from a technically proficient examination of a sliver of text from all angles. Furthermore, while intertextual purists may sometimes, so to speak, take a Concorde through Paris to get from New York to Boston, traditional scholars hop on the old Greyhound bus and get there cheaper and faster. That is to say, what more traditional scholars may lack in literary *chic*, they often more than make up for in efficiency.

An early compendium of articles partaking of intertextual theory that locates itself between these two extremes is Fewell's *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (1992). Here a wide range of understandings of intertextuality is recognized and enjoyed, as a variety of authors make forays into the Bible's intertextual world, some highly interpretive, others more theoretical. Beal's introductory article, 'Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production' (1992), is particularly helpful in addressing the question of the ethics of biblical interpretation. Other edited volumes that explore intertextuality include de Moor's *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (1998) and Draisma's *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (1989).

By far the most monumental single work on intertextual relationships within the Hebrew Scriptures, both in terms of theory and in terms of sheer volume of information, is Fishbane's comprehensive *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (1985). Fishbane studies one certain kind of intertextual relationship: 'inner-biblical exegesis', the readerly interpretation by biblical writers and editors (which he calls *traditio*) of pre-existing biblical texts (*traditum*), which in turn also entered the biblical canon.

Fishbane explains this phenomenon by noting the 'citation-filled life'

of Western religious-cultural society, which is dependent upon 'authoritative views which are studied, reinterpreted, and adapted to ongoing life' (1985: 1). Readers are constituted not simply by the memories passed down to them but also by the texts they read. People oriented to scriptures think, speak and act within the possibilities presented by their texts as they are interpreted by religious tradition. Over time, authoritative texts are called upon to address problems or explore possibilities unforeseen by their creators. New interpretations arise, drawing out of Scripture meanings that earlier generations may not have intended or perceived. The authority for a new interpretation is closely tied to its ability to demonstrate rhetorically that it stands in continuity with the past, that it was in fact present in the text all along, waiting to be revealed.

Fishbane's study is unapologetically diachronic. He notes the addition of scribal notes of all sorts within texts, which clarify, extend or correct. He notes the reinterpretation of texts in other parts of Scripture, such as the commentary on Torah in the prophets, and the retelling of Samuel–Kings in Chronicles. In all instances he traces what kind of interpretive impulse seems to be at work and why, in order to come to understand better the process itself.

Fishbane's later volume of essays, *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics* (1989), creatively explores the hermeneutical significance of this exegetical drive in religious tradition. He calls this a 'process of symbolic immortality', in which 'the umbilical cord of hermeneutics is at once a lifeline to one's matrix in the past and a death-defying act of the imagination in the present' (p. ix). After beginning his discussion with inner-biblical exegesis, he moves beyond the canon to subsequent interpretation that kept the Bible alive for later generations, from rabbinical times to the present. Contemporary readers, Fishbane says, can find the sacrality of the Bible in the ways in which its texts are 'our interior Tower of Babel, filling us with the many voices of the many texts that make us who we are' (pp. 127-28). We become 'a living texture of ideas'.

Dinter's essay 'The Once and Future Text' likewise explores the Bible's nature as a deeply intertextual book, as a basis for a critical, postmodern articulation of its power to communicate with, and to form, the believing community. 'Its own textured and intertextual content is the best spring board for our attempts to understand it afresh' (1997: 385). Like Fishbane, he emphasizes continuity between the interpretive

impulses out of which Scripture developed, the post-biblical religious tradition of interpretation, and the reactualizing work of preaching and worship in contemporary congregations; and he draws implications for what Scripture's authority and 'revelatory' power might mean in a postmodern context.

Similarly, Kort's *'Take, Read': Scripture, Textuality, and Cultural Practice* (1996) examines strategies of reading the Bible as Scripture. Moving from Calvin's doctrine of Scripture and interpretive strategies, through the problematization of Scripture in the modern and postmodern periods, Kort suggests that theorists such as Kristeva point a way toward reading the Bible 'as if it were' Scripture.

What happens when Fishbane's general notions of inner-biblical exegesis inform a sustained examination of a particular text? Two recent and complementary studies of Second Isaiah, Sommer's *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (1998) and Willey's *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (1997) both explore the recollection and reinterpretation of Judah's scripted past in exilic poetry. Sommer's work recognizes intertextuality, but utilizes more traditional influence study as a theoretical base, while my own work (Willey 1997) draws from the dialogical concepts of Bakhtin. Accordingly, Sommer's book concentrates on source texts, systematically exploring Second Isaiah's allusions to Jeremiah, Psalms and laments, and pentateuchal texts. My book concentrates on the voices scripted in Isaiah 49–55, interpreting section by section in relation to the concatenation of 'other words' recollected within Second Isaiah's poetry—as they are known from Lamentations, Jeremiah, Jerusalem psalms and pentateuchal narratives—and the textualization of the symbolic figures Daughter of Zion and the Servant of YHWH. Though our approaches differ methodologically, and we only became aware of each other's work as our own neared completion, we discovered considerable agreement in many of our conclusions, most particularly in the implications of our work for the formation of the book of Isaiah.

A study of 2 Samuel 14, which employs intertextuality in a broader, more inclusive, and less diachronically conditioned sense than any of the foregoing, is Lyke's *King David with the Wise Woman of Tekoa: The Resonance of Tradition in Parabolic Narrative* (1997). Understanding this episode to have evolved in intertextually and culturally conditioned communal shaping, Lyke explores many biblical topoi, both within David's court narrative and outside of it, to account

for the multivalent effects of the woman's words to David and of the narrator's telling of the story. These topoi include not only other episodes closely connected with this one, such as 2 Samuel 12 and 20, but also stories alluded to by the woman, such as Cain and Abel, narrative stagings that others would call 'typescenes' (such as the 'woman with a cause'), and legal material. Such an approach allows him, rather than dating texts, to understand particular themes and movements as pervading the storytelling of Judah, so that, for instance, even a later tale such as Esther can help illuminate the narrative expectations involved in the woman's approach to the king.

Other works offer forays that are by no means exhaustive but rather demonstrate the plenitude of critical possibilities available through asking questions in a particular way. Reed, in *Dialogues of the Word: The Bible as Literature according to Bakhtin* (1993), highlights several ways in which the Bible partakes of Bakhtin's dialogical universe within individual books, across genres and across testaments. An article by Carroll (1994), 'Intertextuality and the Book of Jeremiah: Animadversions on Text and Theory', briefly points toward a multitude of intertextual issues regarding the book, from its complex relationships to the Deuteronomistic History and other prophets, to the complexity of its internal relationships to the great variations between the MT and the LXX. He shows convincingly how very much the production of Jeremiah as the book we now know proceeded from a multitude of tantalizing, yet not clearly traceable, intertextual transactions. There, as in many biblical books in which the notion of authorship is highly complex and problematic, intertextual theory can make room for different kinds of observations about the origins of the book.

Since not even Kristeva owns the patent on the term, claims to intertextuality can be made by anyone. It would take volumes to list (and encyclopedias to describe and evaluate) all that claims to be 'intertextual' in biblical studies. One more book should be mentioned, however, if only because it is often cited by others as a negative example of Kristeva's banal source hunting? Buchanan's *Introduction to Intertextuality* (1994), published by Mellen Press, is an enthusiastic, personalistic and simplistic examination of Scripture's intertextual ties. The flavor of his work can be tasted from the following quotations:

> There is nothing mysterious about intertextual biblical research. Almost anyone can do it. Students can begin in English, German, French, or any other language which has a Bible translation. Initial tools are concor-

> dances and the cross-reference notes given in most Bibles. In Greek and Hebrew there are good computer programs, such as Ibycus, by means of which individual words or groups of words can be discovered for every time they occur, either in the Hebrew Scripture or in the New Testament. Whenever one text is known to have quoted another earlier text, then the researcher studies the earlier text to learn its original meaning and after that, the later text, the midrash . (pp 4-5)
>
> When intertextual scholars completely screen the entire Bible for these relationships we may be able to develop a Hebrew Bible in which all of these relationships are shown in bold-faced print with documentation in the margins the way the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament is designed (p 49).

Every exegetical method has its pedantic adherents, but if the vast number and range of other kinds of intertextual study are any indication, Buchanan's hopes that an army of students with concordances and laptops will produce a Bible with all the dots connected is in no more danger of final realization than the colored-pencil sorting of J, E, P, and D ever was.

Intertextual Study of Post-biblical Interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures

One of the most important burgeoning areas in biblical studies is that of the history of biblical interpretation. Many Christian scholars, having cut our teeth on histories of interpretation that begin and end with modern historical-critical scholarship, are increasingly pondering what else has happened throughout the long and broad history of biblical interpretation that either has been overlooked (and thus is worth reexamination), or has conditioned our judgments in ways of which we are not conscious. As these questions come to the fore, intertextual theory will continue to be an essential tool for studying the complex relationships between biblical text and cultures of interpretation, both Jewish and Christian.

Here, as in many areas, a narrow focus on 'influence studies' hardly does justice to the complexity of hermeneutical construction. A more sophisticated intertextual understanding of the thick social culture in which the exegete lives and works is desirable. It is also, for many times and places in post-biblical history, much more possible than it has been for biblical culture, simply because of our greater access to documents from, and knowledge about, the environments in which such interpretations were developed. Recognition of the ways in which other

'people of the book' have appropriated the Bible, and with what results, can aid us in exercising humility concerning our own methods and knowledge.

In the area of early Jewish biblical interpretation, Boyarin's *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (1990) stands out as an example of fruitful use of Bakhtin's concepts of voices, double-voices and dialogism without heavy reliance on esoteric theoretical discussions. For him the Bible, upon which midrash draws, is anything but a unified, seamless textual fabric. Its many gaps and heterogeneities have inspired layers of interpretation that begin within the canon of Scripture itself, and continue in the making of midrashic interpretations that juxtapose biblical texts with one another, with legends and discussions that further tease out understanding and insight.

Charlesworth (1997) invokes intertextual theory to help understand the use of Isa. 40.3 by the Qumran community in the Serek Ha-Yahad. In this article, he also places his own historical-critical goals in relation to other discussions of intertextuality, particularly those of Kristeva and her followers, and claims the importance of eclecticism for biblical interpretation.

In terms of New Testament appropriations of the Hebrew Scriptures, Hays's *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (1989) and Brawley's *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voice of Scripture in Luke–Acts* (1995) carry out similar programs, using intertextual theory to help clarify the significance of scriptural allusions in Paul and Luke–Acts respectively. While Hays uses Hollander (1981) as his primary theoretical source, Brawley appeals to the baroque 'revisionary ratios' of Bloom (1973).

The work of Hays and Brawley is far more sophisticated than what Kristeva criticized as understanding intertextuality in the 'banal sense of "study of sources" ' (Kristeva 1984: 59-60) and more interesting than studies of the past that seemed satisfied to demonstrate *that* New Testament writers used Scripture extensively, without examining the transformations in their use of Scripture and the rhetorical force of these transformations on readers' understanding of both precursor and echoing texts. Brawley's introduction includes a discussion of diachrony and synchrony that is quite instructive in mediating between the two concepts that others have seen as mutually exclusive:

> Because allusive texts claim for their meaning (synchrony) texts that are temporal antecedents possessing meaning apart from their successors (diachrony), allusions prepetuate a lie against time. Synchrony overtakes diachrony (1995: 7).

By attending to the sometimes subtle changes rung on texts when they are set into new contexts, and the larger patterns of precursor texts that are implicitly called forth in the newer texts, both scholars tease out interpretations that explore beneath the superficialities of similarity. For instance, Hays demonstrates his approach by exploring a subtle echo of Job 13.16 (LXX) in Phil. 1.19. There Paul repeats verbatim a five-word phrase in which Job asserts that 'this will turn out for my deliverance'. During this same speech, Job explicitly depicts himself as a prisoner—as Paul literally is at the time of his writing.

> By echoing Job's words, Paul the prisoner tacitly assumes the role of righteous sufferer, as paradigmatically figured by Job. 'Awaiting trial, he speaks with Job's voice to affirm confidence in the favorable outcome of his afflictions; thereby, he implicitly transfers to himself some of the significations that traditionally cluster about the figure of Job' (Hays 1989: 22).

Similarly, Brawley notes Jesus' appeal to the precedent of David, who ate the bread of the presence when he was being pursued in the wilderness by Saul. Noting that Saul's concern over David resulted from the presence of God's spirit with him, which had left Saul, Brawley points out the parallel context Luke has created by the Pharisees' pursuing Jesus with questions out of consternation arising from God's spirit with him. The notion that Saul and David's story is being reenacted between the Pharisees and Jesus is not announced overtly by Luke, but rather lies suggestively in the background for those who follow Jesus' citation to its source (1995: 13-14).

A more theoretically eclectic study is Eisenbaum's *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (1997), which examines Hebrews 11 as an interpretation of Jewish Scripture that liberally employs both quotation and retelling. Concentrating on a detailed analysis of the text, Eisenbaum makes use of comparative studies, rhetorical theory, speech-act theory, hermeneutics and intertextuality to examine what the author is responding to, and carrying out, in utilizing a Jewish genre (listing the 'heroes of the past') to create a faith heritage with a particularly Christian focus.

Many other studies of New Testament recollections of Scripture, too

numerous to catalog, by means of a sharpened focus on intertexts, have made unexpected discoveries for diverse lines of inquiry, from translation problems, to social settings of early Christian communities, to the complex problem of the interrelationship of pre-texts to one another. For instance, in her 1990 article on Paul's recollection of Jer. 9.22-23 in 1 Cor. 1.26-31, O'Day confirms a retranslation of the Corinthians text that had been suggested on other grounds by Wuellner (1973: 667), a translation that calls into serious question reigning assumptions concerning the social status of the Corinthian community. Krause notes (1997) the complex relationship of disparate texts in Mk 11.1-10, which decenters the unambiguous authority of certain conceptions of messiahship.

As with the Hebrew Scriptures, so in New Testament exegesis of Hebrew Scriptures, edited volumes have proliferated. Again, these employ intertextuality in a variety of ways, from the traditional to the trendy. Several such volumes are noted in the bibliography.

Although the line of inquiry is very new, intertextual theory will increasingly be utilized in the study of the history of reception of Scripture, facilitating the discussion of the interaction of intervening texts and cultural factors in the fortunes of Scripture's interpretation among commentators, theologians, artists and storytellers, and popular culture. At present, intertextual theory is less often explicitly employed to discuss self-consciously religious texts than other cultural artifacts. It is much easier to find studies that are conversant with intertextual theory among discussions of biblical intepretation in Dante, Blake, Toni Morrison and *Star Trek* than among studies of Rashi, Calvin, Barth and the Revised Common Lectionary. Of course, studies of the Bible's interpretive history that do not explicitly partake of intertextual theory abound in religious scholarship, and point the way to greater potential in this area.

Studies of the literary use of biblical material, which do explicitly employ intertextual theory, often offer freshness to biblical understanding both in terms of methodology and in terms of content, since not only the works studied, but oftentimes the scholars studying, come from outside of orthodox canons. Rose's examination of William Blake's biblical consciousness (1988) explores the poet's interpretations of Job, Revelation, and particularly of Paul. Prickett's article (1998) on aspects of Blake's illustration of Jacob's ladder situates Blake's work in relation not only to romanticism but also to major biblical/theological

interpreters such as Swedenborg, Kant and Lowth. McMahon's study of Satan and Narcissus (1991) describes Dante's intertextual reworking of Ovid in terms of Christian Scripture. Astell's *Job, Boethius, and Epic Truth* (1994) comprehensively explores the pairing of the book of Job with Boethius' sixth-century *Consolation of Philosophy*, among writers from Dante and Chaucer to Milton.

Intertextual transumptions of Scripture are of course not confined to literature, whether religious or secular. Lively readings of *Star Trek: The Next Generation* by Graham (1995), and of Arnold Schwarzenegger's *Terminator* films by Boer (1995), demonstrate the offering up of biblical stories and themes for popular consumption, while Pippin (1995) explores the representation of Jezebel in a variety of texts ranging from *The Woman's Bible* to a Bette Davis movie to Tom Robbins's *Skinny Legs and All* to analyses of the term 'jezebel' in white southern culture.

Conclusion

If of the making of many books there is no end, then the potential of making many books that study the studying of books by books is as vast as the universe itself, and only limited by consumer demand. As in every field in which books multiply, some perspectives and some studies will endure while others are forgotten. The ones that will endure are not necessarily the ones that invoke the proper theoretical demigods, though the canon will include some of these. Nor will they be the ones that use a certain methodology or work toward a certain pre-specified interpretive goal. Intertextuality is more an angle of vision on textual production and reception than an exegetical methodology, more an insight than an ideology. But by removing artificially imposed boundaries between texts and texts, between texts and readers, by attending to the dialogical nature of all speech, intertextual theory invites new ventures in cultural and literary perception that will certainly introduce shifts in the ways biblical scholarship is carried out for many years to come.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Studies of Intertextuality Outside of Biblical Literature

Abrams, M.H
1993 'Text and Writing (Écriture)', in Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (Harcourt Brace, 6th edn), 284-86.

Bakhtin, M.M.
1981 *The Dialogic Imagination* (ed M Holquist, Austin, TX. University of Texas Press) [Original publication in Russian, 1975].

Barthes, R
1971 'De l'oeuvre au texte', *Revue d'esthetique* 3 (1971) 225-32
1977 *Image, Music, Text* (trans S Heath; New York Hill and Wang)

Baxandall, M
1985 *Patterns of Intention On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven Yale University Press)

Bloom, H
1973 *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (London, Oxford University Press)

Clayton, J., and E. Rothstein
1991 'Figures in the Corpus Theories of Influence and Intertextuality', in Clayton and Rothstein (eds.) 1991: 3-36

Clayton, J., and E. Rothstein (eds.)
1991 *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Madison, WI University of Wisconsin Press)

Culler, J
1981 *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)

Derrida, J
1976 *Of Grammatology* (trans Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press)

Eliot, T S
1917 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', in Cleanth Brooks *et al.* (eds.), *American Literature: The Makers and the Making*, II (New York: St. Martin's Press) 2828-2839

Emerson, R.W.
1875 'Quotation and Originality', in *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, VIII (Boston: Houghton Mifflin): 177-204

Fleming, M., and R Payne (eds.)
1988 *Criticism, History and Intertextuality* (London: Associated University Presses)

Friedman, S S
1991 'Weavings Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author', in Clayton and Rothstein (eds) 1991 146-80

Frow, J
1990 'Intertextuality and Ontology', in Worton and Still (eds) 1990, 45-55

Harris, W
1992 *Dictionary of Concepts in Literary Criticism and Theory* (New York: Greenwood Press)

Hebel, U.J
1989 *Intertextuality, Allusion, and Quotation: An International Bibliography of Critical Studies* (New York: Greenwood Press) 1-19

Hollander, J.
1981 *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Holthuis, S
1994 'Intertextuality and Meaning Constitution: An Approach to the Comprehension of Intertextual Poetry', in Petofi and Olivi (eds.) 1994: 77-93.

Jenny, L.
1976 'The Strategy of Form', in T. Todorov (ed.), *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader* (trans. R. Carter; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 34-63

Kristeva, J.
1980 *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (ed. L. S. Roudiez; trans. T. Gora, A. Jardine, and L. Roudiez; New York: Columbia University Press).
1984 *Revolution in Poetic Language* (trans. M. Walker; New York: Columbia University Press)

Miller, N.K.
1986 'Changing the Subject: Authorship, Writing, and the Reader', in T. de Lauretis (ed.), *Feminist Studies—Critical Studies* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press): 102-20

Morgan, T
1985 'Is There an Intertext in This Text? Literary and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Intertextuality', *American Journal of Semiotics* 3.4 (1985): 1-40.

Payne, M., and R. Fleming
1988 'Introduction', in R. Fleming and M. Payne (eds.), *Criticism, History and Intertextuality* (London: Associated University Presses): 11-14

Petofi, J.S., and T. Olivi (eds.)
1994 *Approaches to Poetry: Some Aspects of Textuality, Intertextuality and Intermediality* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Plett, H.F.
1991 'Intertextualities', in Plett (ed.) 1991: 3-29.

Plett, H.F. (ed.)
1991 *Intertextuality* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter)

Plottel, J.P.
1978 'Introduction', in J.P. Plottel and H. Charney (eds.), *Intertextuality: New Perspectives in Criticism*, II (New York: New York Literary Forum)

Pfister, M.
1985 'Konzepte der Intertextualität', in U. Broich and M. Pfister (eds.), *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer): 1-30

Rabinowitz, Peter
1980 '"What's Hecuba To Us?". The Audience's Experience of Literary Borrowing', in S. Suleiman and I. Crossman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press): 241-63

Rajan, T.
1991 'Intertextuality and the Subject of Reading/Writing', in Clayton and Rothstein (eds.) 1991: 61-74

Riffaterre, M.
1990 'Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive', in Worton and Still (eds.) 1990: 56-78

Roudiez, L.S.
1980 'Introduction', in Kristeva 1980: 1-22

Schulze-Engler, F.
1998 'Cross-Cultural Criticism and the Limits of Intertextuality', in W. Klooss (ed.), *Across the Lines: Intertextuality and Transcultural Communication in the New Literatures in English* (Readings in the Post/Colonial Literatures in English; Amsterdam: Rodopi): 3-19

Still, J., and M. Worton
1990 'Introduction', in Worton and Still (eds.) 1990: 1-44

Todorov, T.
1984 *Mikhail Bakhtin. The Dialogical Principle* (trans. Wlad Godzich; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)

Worton, M., and J. Still (eds.)
1990 *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Zholkovsky, A.
1994 'To Cross Or Not to Cross: Axmatova's "Sacred Boundary"', in Petofi and Olivi (eds.) 1994: 248-64

Studies of Intertextuality Related to the Hebrew Bible

Aageson, J.W.
1993 *Written Also for our Sake: Paul and the Art of Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press)

Aichele, G., and G.A. Phillips
1995 'Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis', in Aichele and Phillips (eds.) 1995: 7-17

Aichele, G., and G.A. Phillips (eds.)
1995 *Intertextuality and the Bible* (Semeia, 69-70; Atlanta: Scholars Press)

Astell, A.W.
1994 *Job, Boethius, and Epic Truth* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)

Aune, D.E.
1991 'Intertextuality and the Genre of the Apocalypse', in E.H. Lovering (ed.), *SBL 1991 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP, 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press): 142-60.

Beal, T.
1992a 'Glossary', in Fewell (ed.) 1992: 21-24
1992b 'Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production', in Fewell (ed.) 1992: 27-39

Beentjes, P C.
1996 'Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and their Dynamics', in L J. de Regt, *et al.* (eds), *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible* (Assen Van Gorcum): 31 50

Boer, R.
1995 'Christological Slippage in Schwarzenegger's *Terminator*', in Aichele and Phillips (eds) 1995. 165-94.

Boyarin, D
1990 *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington, IN. Indiana University Press)

Brawley, R L.
1995 *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech· Voices of Scripture in Luke–Acts* (Bloomington, IN Indiana University Press).

Brenner, A , and Fontaine, C (eds)
1997 *A Feminist Companion to Reading the Bible: Approaches, Methods and Strategies* (Sheffield Sheffield Academic Press)

Buchanan, G W.
1994 *Introduction to Intertextuality* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press).

Carroll, R.P.
1994 'Intertextuality and the Book of Jeremiah. Animadversions on Text and Theory', in J C Exum and D.J.A Clines (eds), *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible* (Valley Forge, PA Trinity Press International): 55-78

Carson, D.A., and H.G.M Williamson
1988 *It Is Written. Scripture Citing Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Charlesworth, J.
1997 'Isaiah 40:3 and the Serek Ha-Yahad', in Evans and Talmon (eds) 1997· 197-224

Cosslett, T
1997 'Intertextuality in *Oranges are Not the Only Fruit*. The Bible, Malory, and Jane Eyre', in H. Grice and T Woods (eds), *'I'm Telling You Stories' Jeanette Winterson and the Politics of Reading* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B V.) 15-28

Dinter, P E.
1997 'The Once and Future Text', in Evans and Talmon (eds.) 1997 375-92.

Draisma, S. (ed.)
1989 *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (Kampen. Kok)

Eisenbaum, P.
1997 *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (SBLDS, 156, Atlanta Scholars Press).

Eslinger, L.
1992 'Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion. The Question of Category', *VT* 42 (1992)· 47-58

Evans, C A , and J A Sanders (eds.)
1993a *Luke and Scripture· The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke–Acts* (Minneapolis Fortress Press)

1993b *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSOTSup, 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)
1997 *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigation and Proposals* (JSOTSup, 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)
1998 *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition* (JSOTSup, 154; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Evans, C.A., and R. Stegner (eds.)
1994 *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSOTSup, 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Evans, C.A., and S. Talmon (eds.)
1997 *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Leiden: E.J. Brill)

Fewell, D.N. (ed.)
1992 *Reading between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press)

Fishbane, M.
1979 *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts* (New York: Schocken Books).
1980 'Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis', *JBL* 99 (1980): 343-61.
1985 *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
1989 *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Graham, S.
1995 'Intertextual Trekking: Visiting the Iniquity of the Fathers upon the Next Generation', in Aichele and Phillips (eds.) 1995: 195-220.

Handelman, S.
1982 *The Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Theory* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press).

Hays, R.
1989 *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Kimball, C.A.
1994 *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSOTSup, 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Kort, W.
1996 *'Take, Read': Scripture, Textuality, and Cultural Practice* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press).

Krause, D.
1997 'The One Who Comes Unbinding the Blessing of Judah: Mark 11.1-10 as a Midrash on Genesis 49.11, Zechariah 9.9, and Psalm 118:25-26', in Evans and Sanders (eds.) 1997: 141-53.

Kugel, J.
1994 *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Linafelt, T., and T. Beal
1995 'Sifting for Cinders: Leviticus 10:1-15', in Aichele and Phillips (eds.) 1995: 19-32.

Lyke, L.L
1997 *King David and the Wise Woman of Tekoa: The Resonance of Tradition in Parabolic Narrative* (JSOTSup, 255; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Marcus, J
1992 *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press)

McMahon, R.
1991 'Satan as Infernal Narcissus: Interpretative Tradition in the *Commedia*', in M.U. Sowell (ed.), *Dante And Ovid: Essays in Intertextuality* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 82; Binghamton, NY: Center for International Scholarly Exchange, Columbia University): 65-86

Mettinger, T.N.D
1993 'Intertextuality: Allusion and Vertical Context Systems in Some Job Passages', in H. McKay and D.J.A. Clines (eds.), *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday* (JSOTSup, 162; Sheffield: JSOT Press), 257-80.

Moor, J.C. de (ed.)
1998 *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (Leiden: E.J. Brill)

Newsom, C.
1992 'Response to Norman Gottwald, "Social Class and Ideology in Isaiah 40–55: An Eagletonian Reading" ', *Semeia* 59 (1992): 73-78

Nielsen, K.
1990 'Intertextuality and Biblical Scholarship', *SJOT* (1990/2): 88-95

O'Day, G.R.
1990 'Jeremiah 9.22-23 and 1 Corinthians 1.26-31: A Study in Intertextuality', *JBL* 109 (1990): 259-67.

Phillips, G.A.
1995 ' 'What is Written? How are You Reading?" Gospel, Intertextuality and Doing Lukewise: Reading Luke 10:25-42', in Aichele and Phillips (eds.) 1995: 111-48

Phillips, G.A.
1991 'Sign/Text/Différance: The Contribution of Intertextual Theory to Biblical Criticism', in Plett (ed.) 1991: 78-97

Pippin, T.
1995 'Jezebel Re-Vamped', in Aichele and Phillips (eds.) 1995: 221-34.

Prickett, S.
1998 'Jacob's Dream: A Blakean Interpretation of the Bible', in M. Gassenmeier *et al.* (eds.) *British Romantics as Readers: Intertextualities, Maps of Misreading, Reinterpretations* (Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag C. Winter), 99-105

Reed, W.L.
1993 *Dialogues of the Word: The Bible as Literature according to Bakhtin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Rose, E.J.
1988 'Blake's Biblical Consciousness and the Problem of the Interpretation of Text and Design', in Fleming and Payne (eds.) 1988: 113-23

Sommer, B
1996 'Allusions and Illusions: The Unity of the Book of Isaiah in Light of Deutero-Isaiah's Use of Prophetic Tradition', in R. Melugin and M. Sweeney (eds.), *New Visions of Isaiah* (JSOTSup, 214; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 156-86
1998 *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press)

Tull, P.K
1997 [published under author name Willey, P. Tull] *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (SBLDS, 161; Atlanta: Scholars Press)
1999 'Rhetorical Criticism and Intertextuality', in S. McKenzie and S. Haynes (eds.), *To Each its own Meaning* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, rev. edn): 156-80
2000 'The Rhetoric of Recollection', in *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament Congress Volume (16th Congress, 1998)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill): 71-78

Wainwright, E.
1997 'Rachel Weeping for her Children: Intertextuality and the Biblical Testaments—A Feminist Approach', in Brenner and Fontaine (eds.) 1997: 452-69

Watts, R.E.
1997 *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Wellhausen, J.
1957 *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Cleveland, OH: World Publishing [1878])

Wilkinson, N.
1995 '"The Getting of Names": Anti-intertextuality and the Unread Bible in Toni Morrison's *Song of Solomon* and *Beloved*', in Aichele and Phillips (eds.) 1995: 235-46

Willey, P. Tull
1997 [please see reference under Tull, P.K.]

Wolde, E. van
1989 'Trendy Intertextuality?' in Draisma (ed.) 1989: 43-49
1994 *Words Become Worlds: Semantic Studies of Genesis 1–11* (BIS, 6; Leiden: E.J. Brill)
1997 'Intertextuality: Ruth in Dialogue with Tamar', in Brenner and Fontaine (eds.) 1997: 426-51

Wuellner, W.
1973 'The Sociological Implications of I Corinthians 1.26-28 Reconsidered', in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *SE VI* (Berlin: Akademie): 666-72