In recent years a variety of exegetical methods have appeared, emphasizing many forms of literary analysis for biblical texts. In fact, it is well known that some scholars have a growing interest in an approach to the scriptures through the possible connections of the texts, that is to say, connections between early records and later allusions. From this perspective, two known approaches have emerged; these are intertextuality and inner-biblical exegesis. This paper will attempt to review some methodological assumptions of these two approaches.

**IMPORTANCE OF A METHOD**

“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.”

G. Leibniz states, “There is something more important than fine discoveries, it is to know the method by which a thing has been done.” It is of such transcendence that sometimes the methodology of the research and its resultant definition cause scholars to question whether the method has been well defined. Ancient Near Eastern and OT studies are not stranged from that reality.

---

1 I would like to express my great esteem and gratitude to Professor Dr. Merling Alomia. His contributions as pastor, scholar, professor and writer have been most notable, particularly in the Hispanic academic community.


3 In Claude Brezinski, El oficio de investigador (Madrid: S. XXI de España Editores, 1993), 103.
As is well known, method comes from Greek μέθοδος (methodos) and means “according to the path” or “in the path”; in other words, method is the route that we follow in order to achieve an objective.4

From Sitz im Leben to Sitz im Text

In OT studies, we can notice that several methodologies are applied, and these are as diverse as scholars are.5 The interaction with other disciplines has been broadly developed.6 Today we can read a vast number of essays where literary analysis predominates.7 From this perspective scholars often set out a comparison of features with Ancient Near Eastern texts;8 in other instances they approach Hebrew Bible following a narrative,9 semiotic,10 structural,11 metaphorical,12 deconstructive,13 or intertextual analysis.14

---

7A biblical reading that follows these proposals can be found in John H. Guttcent The Bible: A Literary Study (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986); Helmut Utschneider, Arbeitsbuch Literaturwissenschaftliche Bibelauslegung: Eine Methodenlehre zur Exegese des Alten Testaments (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001); John C. Dancy, The Divine Drama: The Old Testament as Literature (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2001); Marshall D. Johnson, Making Sense of the Bible: Literary Type as an Approach to Understanding (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002).
10George Aichele, Sing, Text, Scripture: Literary Interests in Biblical Narrative (Shelfield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
14Not least remarkable are social and cultural studies, Fernando Segovia y Mary Ann...
Coming Back to Early Texts

In recent years, scholarship has exhibited interest in studying biblical texts for possible connections between early texts and later writings. A general review of this approach shows that diverse terminology has been applied to that methodology. It is called: intertextuality, inner-biblical exegesis or allusion, historical tradition, or re-reading, etc. Today intertextual practice has attracted the attention of biblical scholars and acquired a dominant space in biblical studies. It is not only a part of exegetical process but emerges as a methodology in progress in biblical studies. There is no doubt that, of the terminology in question, the most popular is intertextuality.


See Currently publishing: such as Marvin A. Sweeney, *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, FAT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), this work, recently published, is focused on the role of literary form and intertextuality in the study of prophetic and apocalyptic literature; includes studies in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the minor prophets and apocalyptic literature. Also Mark F. Rooker, ed, *Studies in Hebrew Language, Intertextuality, and Theology*, TSR 98 (Lewiston / Queenston / Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2003); D. N. Fewell, ed., *Reading Between Text. Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, LCBI (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992). Further important contributions have been made by following these methods, see e.g. Ph.D. thesis Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, SBLDS 161 (Atlanta, Georgia. Scholar Press, 1997), the study is categorized into intertextuality and was directed by Carol Newsom; Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), this dissertation focuses on allusion and Intra-biblical exegesis and was directed by Michael Fishbane.
The Intertextuality

Although Russian Mikhail Bakhtin has been credited as ideological precursor of the theory, it was Julia Kristeva who brought us the expression at the end of the 1960’s in her *Semiotique*. Kristeva specifies that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. Intertextuality takes place instead of intersubjectivity.” It is clear that her platform is semiotic. In addition it is possible to infer Kristeva’s basic reasoning that all words turn back towards a previous literary corpus; but in contrast to Influence theory—interested in the author—intertextuality focuses on the reader’s view. Thus, several literary studies have been oriented from this perspective, even when critics have warned that the theory is also the one most entangled in controversial definitions and contradictory usages.

On the other hand, in the biblical field, despite some scholarly discussion, there is not a universal definition of the intertextual theory.

---


20Kristeva defines it as the science of Discourses, Semiotics, 22, 25; William W. Young III “Aesthetics and Analysis in the work of Kristeva and Clément” *Cross Currents* 55, no. 2 (2005), 152-3. Despite the semiotics of Kristeva’s emphasis is on the “traces” and “brands” rather than the “signs” Maria Margaroni “The Lost Foundation’: Kristeva’s’ semiotic Chora and Its ambiguous legacy” *Hypatia* 20, no. 1 (2005): 79.

21Kristeva, semiotics, 190; She also refers to this as the maternal body that is in continuous separation, Ewa Ziarek, “At the Limits of Discourse: Heterogeneity, Alterity, and the Maternal Body in Kristeva’s Thought” *Hypatia* 7, no. 2 (1992): 103. For her the text is the basis of ‘soma’, “the signs are those that produce a body,” she says in Perry Meisel, “An Interview with Julia Kristeva” *Partisan Review* 51, no. 1 (1984): 132, cited by Dawne McCance, “L’écriture limite: Kristeva’s Feminist Postmodern Ethics” *Hypatia* 11, no. 2 (1996): 145. We should clarify here that the interest of Kristeva goes beyond linguistics and literary theory, she also advocates for feminism and psychoanalysis; see Julia Kristeva, *Sentido y sinsentido de la revuelta: Literatura y psicoanálisis* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires, 1998).

22Tilottana Rajan thinks Influence theory have been replaced by the intertextuality, “Intertextuality and the subset of Reading/Writing” in *influence and intertextuality in Literary History*, eds. J. Clayton y E. Rothstein (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 61.


The Semeia series on *Intertextuality and the Bible* is only one example of the ideological spectrum of this approach. When the authors of the first article try to define the issue: What is intertextuality? They evade the question. Instead they make an effort to determine the end of intertextuality; “It is as a critical door” they point out “that opens towards several issues such as: ideology, subjectivity, generation of meaning and interpretability.” It is not a question of mere allusion but it deals with transformation.

To P. Tull, intertextuality concerns interrelationships between texts; even though few agree on how best to understand and use the term. She adds: “the concept of intertextuality represents a battleground of differing emphases and claims, both linguistic and ideological;” and their practitioners “explore relationships among identifiable texts, or between a text and elements of its social environment.”

She concludes: “Intertextuality is more an angle of vision on textual production and reception than an exegetical methodology, more an insight than an ideology.” Finally, she says, “intertextual theory invites new ventures in cultural and literary perception that will certainly introduce shifts in the ways biblical scholarship is articulated for many years to come.”

Intertextualist Kirsten Nielsen states, “no text exists independently of every other one.” Each text, he believes, is part of another network from which its meaning is derived. Thus, the meaning of a text cannot be limited to author’s intention, points out Nielsen, a text has potential meanings and it is realized only by the encounter with the reader.

---

27Although they include a definition of the term (p. 300.) In the glossary, this is done on the definition of Kristeva who in the article criticizes George Aichele and Gary A. Phillips, “Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis” in *Intertextuality and the Bible*. Semeia 69/70, eds. George Aichele and Gary A. Phillips (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995), 7.
28Reading the Bible intertextually denotes a deconstructive investigation through the inherent conflicts, tensions and paradoxes in transposition systems and subjectivities in violent juxtaposition. . . what is new and what is old, see Aichele, “Introduction,” 11.
30Tull argues that intertextuality invokes a wide range of procedures, some highly theoretical, others conceptual and pragmatic and still others pragmatically interpreted. Patricia Tull, “Intertextuality and Hebrew Scriptures,” CBR 8 (2000): 73, 83.
Intertextuality: Complex Methodology

Plett has warned: “currently, ‘intertextuality’ is a fashionable term, but almost everybody who uses it understands it somewhat differently.”33 On the other hand, Charlesworth admonishes us that “there are real dangers if intertextuality is not carefully defined and used conservatively.”34

Buchanan in his Introduction to Intertextuality places under intertextuality’s “umbrella” the criticism of forms, Jewish Midrash, typology and inner-biblical exegesis.35 This author may not mention re-reading36 and inner-biblical allusion;37 nonetheless, the latter is actually a redefinition of inner-biblical exegesis.

I do agree with Buchanan; because intertextuality is a vague term.38 Intertextuality, thought of as a method for biblical texts, is an eclectic methodology that brings together a spectrum of approaches focused on the connections of the texts.39

34“It must be employed using criteria and data provided only by the text before our eyes. Otherwise we are in danger of hearing our own echoes and not those we claim to find in a text.” James H. Charlesworth, “Intertextuality: Isa 40:3 and the Serek Ha-Yahad,” in The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders, eds., C. Evans y S. Talmon, (Brill: Leiden/New York/Köl, 1997), 204-05.
36Respected South American scholar José Severino Croatto has focused on this perspective, He argues that “if an author takes an earlier text to which to add another text by his own hand, he necessarily establishes an intertextuality that relates to both, but that is not all; for the former becomes reelevado/rewritten to better express the interpretation that operates with the author who uses it.” Isaias 1-39 in Comentario Bíblico Ecuménico (Buenos Aires: La Aurora, 1989), 14, emphasis added. His second volume is very much dependent on that perspective; La Palabra profética y su relectura hermenéutica, Vol II: 40-55 (Buenos Aires: Editorial Lumen, 1994).
38Noble also agrees that intertextuality is currently used with widely divergent meanings by different scholars depending on their hermeneutical convictions, Paul R. Noble, “Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusion” in VT 52 no. 2 (2002), 219, n. 1.
In fact, it is notable that some scholars relate intertextuality to classical critical models of interpretation. According R. Carroll: “The whole Bible (whichever one is used) is a mosaic of mosaics (a mosaic of Mosaics, also). In classical critical theory about the Bible, the Documentary Hypothesis about the generation of the Pentateuch from four documents (JEDP) is a primitive form of an intertextual account of the writing of the Bible.”

It is now time to proceed to a more accurate approach, that of inner-biblical allusion, review below.

**BRIEF ANALYSIS OF INNER-BIBLICAL EXEGESIS**

As an approach to biblical texts, IBE is older than intertextuality; before Kristeva coined her term, N. Sarna in 1963 suggested the expression IBE. Sarna reminds us that exegetical practice dates from pre-exilic times. In this approach, according Sarna: “the past is drawn upon to give sanction to the present, and the ancient words, precisely because they are invested with authority, are reinterpreted to make them applicable to the contemporary scene.” According to his article it is possible to infer that Sarna supports a diachronic analysis, the authority of the biblical text and, the reinterpretation within a contemporary context. (Here the term diachronic is being used as it has been applied to literary interpretation).

Although Sarna was the precursor of IBE, it is Michael Fishbane who has developed the concepts of his professor. He has written several articles and books with respect to this subject, but the most prominent is *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. In the opinion of some scholars this is the most notable personal contribution that IBE has made to the intertextual field.

---

42I think it would be right to recognize Nahum Sarna as precursor of Inner-Biblical Exegesis (hereafter IBE).
We shall now review its basic assumptions, its conception about revelation and tradition, and the process of interaction with IBE.

**Basic Assumptions of IBE**

From his first contributions about IBE, Fishbane introduces the *columns* that support IBE. They are: revelation and tradition. Fishbane says that there is a predominant authority of revelation over tradition in the diverse genres and expressions of inner-biblical exegesis; it is notable by the striking reuse of old legal texts instead of composing new ones, or the reapplication of earlier oracles instead of their nullification. In his opinion, this makes it evident that “these older deposits of revelation had already achieved an *authoritative status*—thus suggesting a *canonical consciousness* of sorts.”

Then, institutionalized, the old laws retained the aura of the divine origins attributed to them with sufficient intensity as to legitimate and absorb their latter-day reinterpretations, expansions, or transformations. From this perspective, “exegetical tradition extends the authority of older materials.”

In his *Biblical Interpretation*, Fishbane later changes the terminology, so that instead of “revelation” and “tradition,” he speaks of *traditum* and *traditio* respectively. Permit me to explain the dynamics of his theory:

The central task of exegetical tradition is to demonstrate the capacity of Scripture to regulate all areas of life and thought. However, this capacity is not at all manifest or self-evident. As a result, traditional Jewish exegesis first assumes the comprehensive adequacy of Scripture to be an implicit feature of its contents, and then sets its task as one of explication, as one that makes the comprehensive pertinence of Torah explicit and manifest. This fundamental task is achieved either by deriving new teaching from old—through one exegetical technique or another—or by legitimating existing social customs and laws (religious or civil) by means of secondary connection to Scripture. In this way, tradition assumes religious dignity through its exegetical association with revealed Scripture. Thus, “the *traditum* was not

---

47Ibid., 349.
48Ibid., 359. *Author’s italics.*
49Ibid., 351.
50Ibid., 360.
at all monolithic, but rather the complex result of a long and varied process of transmission, or *traditio*.\(^{53}\)

According to Fishbane all interpretation and explanation was done within an authoritative *tradtum* context. Further, each solidification of the *tradtum* was the canon in process of its formation; and each stage of canon-formation was a new achievement in *Gemeindebildung*, in the formation of an integrated book-centered culture. The inner-biblical dynamic of *tradtum-tradtio* is thus culturally constitutive and regenerative in the most profound sense;\(^{54}\) in this, scribal activity played an important role.\(^{55}\)

Recapitulating, IBE as the main exponent defines it is “a vast range of annotations, adaptations and commentaries about early traditions.”\(^{56}\)

**Critics to IBE**

Several criticisms have been made with respect to the proposals of Fishbane.

Firstly, in the opinion of Davies, Fishbane follows some ideas of the historical-critical method,\(^{57}\) in particular with the study of tradition-history. But the notable difference is, that whereas the study of tradition–history moves back from the written sources to the oral traditions that make them up, inner-biblical exegesis starts with the received Scripture and moves forward to the interpretations based on it. In tradition–history, written formulations are the final of many oral stages of *traditio* during which the traditions themselves become authoritative; by contrast, inner-biblical exegesis begins with an authoritative *tradtum*.\(^{58}\) Another point that has been observed is regarding terminology. Great confusion exists as to the definition of *tradtum* and *traditio*. The Latin term *tradtum* means “that which is handed over, surrendered”; the trouble is, so does tradition.\(^{59}\) Incidentally, the English word “tradition”

\(^{53}\)Ibid., 6.  *Tradtum* here equates to the content of the tradition, that is, what he first called revelation, and *traditio* is equivalent to transmission.

\(^{54}\)Ibid., 18.

\(^{55}\)Fishbane points out that “Israelite scribes were also responsible for maintaining, transmitting, and collating literary records.” *Biblical Interpretation*, 27. Scribal practice evokes and marks out in the most historically concrete and literarily discrete manner, the two constituent aspects of tradition: the transmission and reinterpretation of received texts and traditions.


\(^{59}\)Agustín Blanquez Fraile, “tradtum,” “traditio” in *Diccionario Latino-Español* (Barcelona:
can mean in Latin the process of handing over, passing down, etc. It can and does also mean, a “tradition.” As Kugel appropriately says “Fishbane has not been well served by Knight.”\(^60\) I think it is an unnecessary change in the theory of Fishbane.\(^61\) But if we remember his early contributions, *traditum* are early revelations that constitute the background in a tradition, which then achieves an authoritative range. In other words, an old revelation in a generation plus its tradition—the process of interpretation and applying new contexts or exegesis—became an all authoritative, the Sacred Writing. As Fishbane writes: “The Inner-Biblical dynamic of *traditum-traditio* is thus culturally constitutive and regenerative in the most profound sense.”\(^62\)

Another comment by J. Kugel of Harvard University is that Fishbane’s approach has a Protestant orientation. Kugel writes: “the neglect of the topic of Inner-Biblical Exegesis derived from the essentially Protestant orientation of modern biblical studies.”\(^63\) In my point of view, if it is true, it is important for the reader that considers the Bible not only as a literary work. A method that gives value to divine authority on the bible is not only important but also necessary.\(^64\)

**Which of Them is the Best Approach?**

Before we can answer, it is necessary to remember something else. According B. Sommer, who had Fishbane as adviser to his dissertation, there is a notable contrast between intertextuality and IBE or allusion as he calls it. Intertextuality is concerned with the reader or with the text as a thing independent of its author. IBE is concerned with the author, as well as the text and reader. Intertextuality is concerned with the relation among many texts, IBE is diachronic or even historicist. Intertextuality is interested in a very wide range of correspondences among texts. As Ben-Porat has pointed out, the connections do not arise exclusively from an intentional and signaled use of an early text,
such as a citation. Those connections may result from the way that expressions in a given text reflect linguistic, esthetic, cultural, or ideological contexts of the text at hand.\textsuperscript{66} The IBE approaches to texts has a more restricted sense: it looks for specific connections between a limited numbers of texts.

I think if we use intertextuality as methodology, we must state what we understand by intertextuality and what are the implications of our approach. It is not only an issue of terminology but it lets us realize the basic assumptions of this methodology.

Furthermore we have reviewed a second methodology, IBE. And though it seems to be an approach more respectful of biblical texts, we have to be warned about limited usage of the term “exegesis” as Fishbane uses it. For him exegesis refers to any case in which one biblical passage borrows from or is based on another. But scholars on the whole define exegesis as an attempt to analyze, explain, or give meaning to a text.\textsuperscript{67} It is preferable, as has been suggested by Sommer to call the phenomenon IBE and Allusion.\textsuperscript{68}

\textbf{CONCLUSION}

In this short analysis, I have attempted to do a brief review of some assumptions of intertextuality as well as inner-Biblical exegesis (allusion). Both theories evoke the connections from the texts. Though some scholars use the terms in an interchangeable way, it is clear that these theories differ one from another, not only in their origins but also in their assumptions as biblical approaches. The first is an eclectic theory and the second needs a brief redefinition concerning its terminology. To share some basic assumptions of these theories has been the purpose of this paper.

\textsuperscript{66}“The connections may be to the extent that the expressions in a given text reflects linguistic, aesthetic, cultural or ideological text contexts is at hand” Ziva Ben-Porat, "Intertextuality" Ha-Sifrut 34 (1985): 170 [Hebrew], cited by Sommer, Prophet Reads Scripture, 7.
\textsuperscript{67}According to Odil Hannes Steck the work of exegesis is to determine the meaning and intention of the biblical text, Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology, SBLRBS 33 (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar Press, 1995), 3.
\textsuperscript{68}Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 23.