

GOING BEYOND THE GENIALLY OPEN 'CF': INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE TO THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW

Margaret Daly-Denton¹

The title of this article is inspired by a passage from the writings of the literary critic John Hollander. Reflecting on the re-appearance of words and phrases from earlier texts in later texts, he distinguishes between two ways of viewing this — one which studies it for what it can reveal about the author's use of sources, the other which asks what function this might perform or might have performed for the original readers. Hollander notes that, until quite recently, the first of these approaches has tended to predominate in literary criticism to the neglect of the other more reader-oriented approach.

The re-appearance of particular words has long been acknowledged by the apparatus of scholia, although the tendency of annotators, employing the genially open philological 'cf.', has been to shun the caves of ambience and the chambers of meaning.²

Hollander's insight is applicable to the study of the use of the Old Testament in the New.

Our scholarly editions of the New Testament are generous with 'the genially open philological "cf."' However, until the current opening up of biblical studies to insights from contemporary literary theory, the study of traces of the Old Testament in the New tended to confine itself mainly to the questions characteristic of

redaction-critical enquiry. What was the Evangelists' *Porlage*? Is this NT author quoting a known version of scripture accurately? If not, what might the verbal form of a quotation tell us about the author's theology and purpose in writing? This approach is predominantly author-oriented. The approach of which Hollander writes, however, is reader-oriented. Applied to NT studies, it focuses on quite different questions. Acknowledging the value of the findings of redaction criticism, it goes further, asking how traces of the OT would have functioned for the intended receptors of the NT writings? What resonances would particular scripture passages have carried for them? What presuppositions might have underlain their reception of a given passage of scripture? A major influence on the emergence of such questions in biblical studies has been the literary theory of intertextuality.

INTERTEXTUALITY

The theory of intertextuality is founded on the recognition that texts do not exist in isolation. When a quotation from an earlier work is introduced into a later work, it brings in its train manifold resonances of other texts already associated with it. Intertextuality is thus '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.'³ As Roland Barthes explains, 'Any text is an intertext; other texts are present in it, at varying levels, in more or less recognisable forms: the texts of the previous and surrounding culture. Any text is a new tissue of past citations.'⁴ Furthermore, the quoted text is itself transformed by its incorporation into a new

¹ Margaret Daly-Denton lectures in Scripture at the school of Hebrew, Biblical and Theological Studies, Trinity College, Dublin, and at the Milltown Institute of Theology and Philosophy.

² John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981) 88.

³ Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981) 103. For intertextual approaches to the biblical text, see Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford - New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); F. Watson, ed., *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies?* (London: SCM, 1993).

⁴ See 'The Theory of the Text' in Robert Young, ed., *Unying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader* (Boston - London - Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981) 32-45, at 39.

context. The reception of the quotation as part of the later work will therefore depend on factors far more complex than the reader's awareness of the original source. Intertextuality thus involves an exploration of the unconscious presuppositions, the *déjà lu*, which readers bring to a literary work.⁵

The concept of intertextuality thus has to do with the inevitable inter-relatedness of texts. It rests on two basic principles: that no literary work is entirely original and that reception is an integral phase of the literary process. Every text is the product of its author's accumulated experience of other texts. Consciously or unconsciously, writers construct works out of what they themselves have received. Texts are not completed when authors put down their pens — or press the print command on their computers. In fact, the written artefact is not yet, strictly speaking, the text. The work will continue to be modified in the process of reception. Each and every receptor of a literary work will bring a lifetime of accumulated experience of other works to bear on the reading of it. Each receptor will make something different of it. Consequently, every reading of a work involves the production of a unique 'text,' i.e. the work as received by a particular person or group at a particular time, in a particular setting. In this process, author and receptor, each bringing to the work the *déjà lu* of their own experience, collaborate in the production of the text.

It is this focus on the intended readers as receptors which is the major point of contrast between studies of the use of Scripture in the NT which use intertextuality theory and those which use the older more author-oriented approaches. Intertextuality theory encourages us to go beyond 'the genially open "cf."' We can then begin to discover the early Christians as readers of the scriptures of Israel which they believed were 'about Jesus' (see Lk 24:44). We can stand with them, as it were, and hear the resonances which

⁵ The term *déjà lu* refers to what Barthes calls *les citations sans guillemets*. 'The intertext is a general field of anonymous formulae whose origin can scarcely ever be located; of unconscious or automatic quotations, given without quotation marks...' See 'Theory of the Text' (n 4) 39.

particular Scripture passages would have had for them. The notion of intertextuality thus liberates our efforts from confinement to what the author may have intended. It allows us to discover connections between texts that are not necessarily genetic links. Once we acknowledge that reference to earlier texts can be entirely unconscious, the product of a work's 'participation in the discursive space of a culture,'⁶ we can posit connections even between texts that lack common traits at the philological level.

In NT study, a widening of the parameters to the point where there appear to be no clear criteria for identifying intertextual references to scripture has caused a certain unease. The title of an article published in 1989 — 'Trendy Intertextuality?'⁷ — highlighted the wariness that many feel towards what has probably by now become a 'buzz word' among the advocates of the literary approach to biblical studies. Compared with the rigour of the strictly *Redaktionsgeschichte* approach, a methodology based on the principle of intertextuality may seem vague, imprecise and open to the charge of incitement to 'parallelomania.'

In view of this, I would propose a methodology which draws upon intertextuality theory and reception theory (with which intertextuality is inextricably linked). This methodology, as I have developed it so far, has provided a useful framework for my own work on the NT reception of the psalms.⁸ For that reason, the examples which I cite will be principally instances of NT reference to the Psalter. Obviously, there is a wider application.

THREE MODES OF INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE

The guises in which the Scriptures appear in the NT range from actual quotations where the author gives notice that an earlier

⁶ See n 2.

⁷ Ellen van Wolde, 'Trendy Intertextuality' in Spike Draisma (Ed.) *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (Kampen: Kok, 1989) 43-63.

⁸ See Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

source is being used, through allusions where the author refers recognisably to a work known to the ideal audience, to echoes which, to quote John Hollander's explanation, 'constitute a kind of underground cipher message... or perhaps a private melody or undersong hummed during composition' and heard only by a particularly attentive reader.

The three modes of reference to an existing text — quotation, allusion and echo — function on a 'sliding scale' of diminishing intentionality on the part of the author and decreasing visibility on the surface of the text, requiring a correspondingly increasing competence on the part of the reader. Authors quote intentionally, their allusions may plausibly be presumed to be intentional, but they can echo an earlier work quite inadvertently. Quotations, because they are 'sign-posted' in the text by a formula of quotation, are of their nature obvious. Allusions, although more fragmentary and periphrastic, must still be recognisable if they are to perform their function. Echoes, however, are covert, faint, blurred, subliminal, often as small as a single word or as elusive as a particular cadence or turn of phrase. Verbal echoes may consist of as little as one word. Thematic or structural echoes may not even have any actual words in common with the source text. They may be heard when an OT passage can be perceived as generating the sequence of thought in a NT passage or as functioning like a framework. Readers are directed by the author to perceive quotations as such. They are presumed by the author to be able to recognise allusions to material that inhabits the shared 'portable library' or, as the theory of linguistics would have it, the 'presupposition pool' of author and reader.¹⁰ They need a well attuned ear to hear echoes.

⁹ See Hollander (n 2) ix.

¹⁰ See Hollander (n 2) 64. The term 'presupposition pool' is explained with reference to the biblical text in P. Cotterell and M. Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1989) 89-95.

In his descriptions of the elusiveness of echo, Hollander's frequent recourse to imagery from the world of music is most enlightening:

Echoes can be so faint and fragmentary that they seem to enter a poem as tonal quality, or shading of voice, even as harmonic partials, accompanying a fundamental pitch, enter and shape its world of timbre rather than being heard in their own right. ... The reader of texts, in order to overhear echoes must have some kind of access to an earlier voice, and to its cave of resonant signification, analogous to that of the author of the later text. When such access is lost in a community of reading, what may have been an allusion may fade in prominence; and yet a scholarly recovery of the context would restore the allusion, by revealing an intent as well as by showing means.¹¹

Following Hollander's lead, we will now proceed to look at several NT passages which exemplify OT quotation, allusion and echo.

CRITERIA

Obviously, it is important to establish criteria for each category. This is fairly straightforward with regard to quotations. References to Scripture introduced by an introductory formula such as 'This was to fulfil the scripture...' (Jn 19:24) or 'It is written...' (Mt 4:6) or 'Have you not read in the Law...?' (Mt 12:5) are clearly quotations. The writer alerts the reader to their presence in the work.

Generally speaking, allusions manifest substantial repetition of words from the precursor work, although there can often be a strong case for thematic allusion even where there is minimal verbal contact. This means that deciding whether to regard less formal references as allusions or as echoes can be problematic. The distinction between allusion and echo seems to lie somewhere in the realm of authorial intent. If the 'point' of a passage would be

¹¹ Hollander (n 2) 64.

lost, were the reader to miss the reference to scripture, then this is likely to be a case of allusion.

In contrast, a NT passage in which there is an echo of Scripture can be read quite satisfactorily 'at face value.' However, a deeper, more enriching level of meaning opens up for the reader who can hear the scriptural echo. It is not even necessary that the author intended to echo Scripture; the echo could simply be part of the *déjà lu* which the author has brought to bear, even unconsciously, on the writing. The echo may be fleeting, often no more than a single word. Because of this we need certain controls lest we slip into 'parallelomania.' So the echoed text must be reasonably distinctive. The claim that the author is echoing Scripture in a particular passage must be in line with what we know of the conventions for scripture interpretation during the NT period. It must also cohere with the author's general line of argument.¹² Yet, while all these criteria have their place, we have to acknowledge that textual interplay can take place quite unbeknownst to an author. We tend to discern echoes by hunches and intuitions which we then seek to verify by using criteria. However, the nature of echo is such that it defies total control.

For modern readers, it is frequently 'the genially open philological cf.' in the margin or the footnotes which indicates the existence of an echo. Our task, as students of the NT, is to discover the intended audience as readers, who did not have the benefit of *marginalia*, and hear the resonances which a scriptural echo would have created for them. As we have seen, this involves trying to stand alongside them, within what Hollander calls 'the caves of ambience and the chambers of meaning,' i.e., sharing, as far as possible, the presuppositions, the *déjà lu* which they brought to their reception of the work. In this way we may begin to learn what they made of it.

¹² Useful criteria for the testing of echoes are presented by Richard B. Hays in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1989) 28-32.

QUOTATION

While the capacity of allusion and echo to invoke other meanings is obvious, the revisionary power of quotation is not always immediately evident. Yet quotations, even if lexically they appear to be faithful representations of the cited text, are equally accommodations, adaptations, reinterpretations and even distortions of the original voice. The process of quotation is always transformative of what is quoted. Transposition into a new context always generates new signification.

This is certainly the case with the quotation from Ps 118:26 in Jn 12:13 — 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.'¹³ This acclamation of the people as Jesus enters Jerusalem cites the only psalm passage that is found *verbatim* in all four gospels.¹⁴ Focusing on the psalm passage as transposed into the Fourth Gospel context, we can sense that the actual wording would have had particular resonances for Johannine Christians. The quotation contains two expressions, equivalents of which are frequently found in the Fourth Gospel: 'the one who comes' (*ho erchomenos*), and 'in the name of the Lord' (*en onomati kyriou*). Once introduced from the Psalter into their new setting in the Fourth Gospel, these two expressions take on the freight that their verbal and thematic equivalents carry in that setting. This new signification can be inferred from the Gospel itself.

In the Judaism contemporary with the NT, the term *ho erchomenos* was a technical term for the expected deliverer figure /

¹³ Strictly speaking, this does not satisfy our criteria for quotations as it is introduced in direct speech without an introductory formula. However, its narrative setting functions *in lieu* of such a formula and its textual fidelity to its source is beyond question.

¹⁴ In both Mt 21:9 and Mk 11:9 it is quoted as it stands in the LXX. In the Lucan version (Lk 19:38) an interpretive gloss, 'the king,' has been inserted. John leaves the citation intact, but appends the words, '[and] the king of Israel.'

Messiah.¹⁵ Characters in the Fourth Gospel use it to give expression to various expectations concerning 'one who is to come' — John the Baptist (Jn 1:15), the Samaritan woman (4:25), those who eat the bread (6:14), the people of Jerusalem (7:25-31), Martha (11:27). In all of these instances the issue is not just that Jesus is the expected 'one who was to come,' but, more importantly, where he comes from. For Jesus is the one who comes from above (8:23). The expression, *ho erchomenos*, has thus become a Johannine cipher for Jesus' heavenly origins. The phrase 'in the name of the Lord' also takes on the meaning of its equivalents in the Fourth Gospel. For the Fourth Evangelist, Jesus comes in the name of his Father (5:43) and performs works in the name of his Father (10:25) works which manifest that name (17:6). For Johannine believers, therefore, to acclaim Jesus as 'the one who comes in the name of the Lord' is to confess his divine origins and his unique role as emissary of God, as the one who comes 'for judgement' (9:39), 'to be a light for the world' (12:46), 'to bear witness to the truth' (18:37). Even a cursory examination of a Johannine 'scripture' such as this can suggest how radically transformative the process of quotation can be, and the extent to which a precursor text can be modified by its introduction into a new work.

ALLUSION

It was suggested above that an important feature of an allusion is authorial intentionality. Correspondingly, the author assumes that the envisaged readers will be able to recognise the allusion. The Fourth Evangelist alludes to Gen 28:12 when he has Jesus say, '... you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and

¹⁵ Amid the variants in Jewish expectation, it had several different connotations. It carried suggestions of the mysterious figure coming with the clouds of heaven (See Dan 7:13), of the cry which was to greet the sudden coming of the Lord to his Temple (See Mal 3:1), of the promise that the coming one would not delay (Hab 2:3 LXX. See Heb 10:37). In the early episodes of all four gospels, John the Baptist speaks to his followers of Jesus as *ho erchomenos* (Jn 1:15, 27, 30; Mk 1:7-8; Mt 3:11; Lk 3:16. See also Mt 3:11 and 11:3).

descending upon the Son of Man' (Jn 1:51). Clearly the author intends the readers to make the connection with Jacob's dream. Without recognition of the Genesis allusion, they would be at a disadvantage and quite unable to experience the meaning effect of the passage.

The author's intent to refer to Scripture is discerned by means of another distinguishing feature of allusion which we might call volume. An allusion repeats a sufficient volume of words or concepts from the precursor text to be readily recognisable as such. For example, there is an allusion to the thrice repeated refrain of Ps 42-43 in the Marcan and Matthean accounts of the Gethsemane scene (Mk 14:34; Mt 26:38). Most study editions of the NT will use 'the genially open philological cf.' to refer the reader to Ps 42:6.12.¹⁶ The inter-textual links are quite visible on the surface of the text, in that there are verbal contacts between Jesus' words and those of the psalm — the address to 'my soul' and the word for 'sorrowful' (*perilypos*). Going beyond 'the genially open "cf."', however, we find that the verbal links draw attention to a more profound structural connection. As Etienne Trocmé has suggested in his study of the liturgical origin of the Passion Narratives, 'an early church that constantly read the Psalms of David was influenced by some of them in the process of elaboration of a tradition telling the story of the Passion, to the extent of structuring some episodes or enlarging some after models found in the Psalms.'¹⁷ It is precisely in the ternary form of the Gethsemane episode — Jesus returning three times to the disciples — that Trocmé thinks the literary dependence on Ps 41-42 with its thrice-repeated refrain may lie.

¹⁶ That these two psalms form one poem is clear from the refrain they share. Ps (42)43 lacks a title in the Hebrew and some very early Hebrew MSS indicate no break between the two.

¹⁷ Etienne Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy: A Study of the origin of the Passion Narrative in the Four Gospels* (London: SCM, 1983) 59. The most obvious example of this is Jn 19:23-24 where both members of the parallelism in Ps 22:18 are enacted.

There is general consensus that Jn 12:27 is the Johannine equivalent of the synoptic Gethsemane scene.¹⁸ For the Fourth Evangelist, the idea of a Jesus who prays in distress would be incongruous. Nevertheless, the Christian reception of Ps 41-42, as received in the pre-gospel passion tradition, has had repercussions in the Gospel. There is a hint of it in the Fourth Evangelist's description of Jesus as 'troubled in spirit' (Jn 13:21).¹⁹ However, as we allow one allusion to lead us to another, we move into the realm of echo where we are dealing with forms of intertextual reference which are covert, faint, blurred, subliminal, often as minimal as a single word.

ECHO

One such intertextual reference is found in the opening verse of the Johannine Passion Narrative, an echo of 2 Sam 15:23 which produces, for the attentive reader, a distinct recollection of David's departure from the city of Jerusalem with his loyal followers at the time of Absalom's conspiracy: both David and Jesus cross the Kidron valley (*to cheimarros tou Kedron*). Taken at 'face value,' this could be explained (on the analogy of Jn 5:2 or 19:13.20) simply as an aid for readers unfamiliar with the topography of Jerusalem. However, the strong intertextual link with the David story in the passion tradition (as reflected in the synoptics)²⁰ strengthens the case for an echo of 2 Sam 15:23.²¹ At this crucial

¹⁸ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I - XII* (Garden City N. Y.: Doubleday, 1966) 475.

¹⁹ There are also possibly traces of Ps 42: 6, 12 in the distress of Jesus when confronted with the death of Lazarus (Jn 11:33) and in the grief of the disciples at the prospect of Jesus' death (Jn 14:1.27).

²⁰ This is seen most notably in Matthew's detail that Judas went out and hanged himself which serves to cast him in the role of Ahithophel, David's betrayer (Mt 27:3-5; 2 Sam 17:23).

²¹ The textual clarity of the echo is particularly persuasive in that the Evangelist refers to the location as the *cheimarros* of the Kidron, i.e. the winter-flowing stream bed, rather than calling it simply the Kidron. Josephus is

point in John's narrative, the echo has the effect of alerting the reader to other points of similarity between the Johannine 'Hour' and the 'Passion of David.'²² This is important for his argument that in the death and resurrection of Jesus the Christ, the promise to David is fulfilled.

This single echo of 2 Sam 15:23 intones a Davidic 'undersong' which persists throughout the Johannine Passion Narrative. In particular, it influences the reader's reception of the psalm quotations as outpourings of David finding their fulfilment on the lips of Jesus. It also sensitises the reader to other possible echoes of the David narratives in the gospel. For example, Jesus' warning about the branches that do not abide in him withering, being thrown into the fire and burned (Jn 15:6) may, perhaps, echo 2 Sam 23:6 where David is presented as saying —

'But the godless are like thorns that are thrown away
... and they are utterly consumed with fire.'

Whether there is literary dependence here cannot be decided on purely verbal and syntactical grounds. Even if it could, one would still have to ask, 'So what?' Going beyond 'the genially open "cf."', one would wish to know what possible meaning and function such an echo might have for John's intended readers.

Even from this cursory look at the connection between the Johannine Jesus and David it seems evident that the intended readers' recognition of Jesus as the Christ included the perception of his 'David-likeness.'²³ Certainly, in the Johannine view, Judas is to Jesus what Ahithophel was to David.²⁴ Perhaps, then, Johannine

the only other contemporaneous author writing in Greek who mentions the Kidron (*Wars* 5, 70; 252 and *Ant.* 8:17). Jn 18: 1 is the only NT reference to it.

²² See Margaret Daly-Denton, 'Shades of David in the Johannine Portrayal of Jesus' *PJBA* 19 (1996) 9-47.

²³ It also included the recognition of his Moses-like, Elijah-like, Isaac-like, Joseph-like traits, but in view of the author's stated preoccupation in writing (See Jn 20:31) David-likeness would seem to be important.

²⁴ See Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996) 133 - 36.

believers saw themselves as prefigured by those Israelites who recognised that God spoke them through David, 'the man who was raised on high,' whose just judgements dawned on them like a light (see 2 Sam 23:1-7). This posited echo would certainly be in line with the idealised view of David which had developed in Second Temple Judaism. It would also cohere with the Fourth Evangelist's general presentation of Jesus. It is not necessary to claim that the Evangelist intended to echo 2 Sam 23. The echo could be quite unconscious, simply the product of the Evangelist's reading of the David story as scriptural testimony to Jesus (see Jn 5:39).

CONCLUSION

It is precisely this kind of intuitive and imaginative approach to the NT that methodologies using the theory of intertextuality allow. Approaching the NT in this way forces us to ask reader-oriented questions. What function might scriptural quotations, allusions and echoes have performed for the original readers? What resonances might particular scripture passages have carried for them? It also allows us to see ourselves as fellow readers with them and, therefore, as co-producers of the text.

ARISTOTELIAN FRIENDSHIP: EXAMINING A DISPUTED CHARACTERISTIC IN THE LIGHT OF HIS POLITICAL THEORY.

*Phil Huston*¹

Those, then who busy themselves in an exceptional degree with noble actions all men approve and praise; and if *all* were to strive towards what is noble and strain every nerve to do the noblest deeds, everything would be as it should be for the common weal, and every one would secure for himself the goods that are greatest, since virtue is the greatest of goods [1169a11].²

INTRODUCTION.

'The real friend is surely that in which all these so-called friendships terminate.'³ Socrates in the *Lysis* raises the question of what it is that is loved for its own sake and not for the sake of something else. Aristotle is engaged in a similar inquiry in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He is leading his listeners towards that mark, the chief good, which will have a great influence on life as it is the goal of all actions.

Aristotle begins his discussion of the kinds of friendship by suggesting that a clarification of the object of love is necessary [1155b16-17]. There are three objects of love: that which is good, that which is pleasant and that which is useful. As the latter is that through which some good or pleasure is produced, Aristotle claims

¹ Phil Huston lectures in philosophy at the Milltown Institute of Theology and Philosophy.

² Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, in W.D. Ross, trans., *The Works of Aristotle* Vol. IX (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966).

³ Plato, *Lysis*, in M. Pakulak, ed., *Other Selves, Philosophers on Friendship* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1991) 23, 220b.