J. TODD HIBBARD

Intertextuality in Isaiah 24-27

Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe
16

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
2. Reihe

Edited by

Bernd Janowski (Tübingen) · Mark S. Smith (New York)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen)

16

J. Todd Hibbard

Intertextuality in Isaiah 24-27

The Reuse and Evocation of Earlier Texts and Traditions

Mohr Siebeck

TODD HIBBARD, born 1968; studied Theology at Lee University and Biblical Studies at the Universtiy of Notre Dame; 2003 Ph.D.; Assistant Professor of Hebrew Bible at Lee University.

ISBN 3-16-149027-4
ISBN-13 978-3-16-149027-9 978-3-16-157847-2 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019
ISSN 1611-4914 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.ddb.de.*

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Held in Rottenburg.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

The following study is a revised version of a doctoral dissertation submitted to the University of Notre Dame in July 2003 with the title, *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24-27: The Reuse and Evocation of Earlier Texts*. I am grateful to the editors of the series *Forschungen zum Alten Testament*, Prof. Dr Mark S. Smith, Prof. Dr Bernd Janowski and Prof. Dr Hermann Spieckermann, for accepting this work for publication.

Writing a dissertation is a collaborative effort, even if only one person's name is found on the title page. My debt of gratitude extends to several persons, professional and personal. I wish to express my thanks to the faculty and staff at the University of Notre Dame for creating an environment in which undertaking the task of graduate education was so rich and enjoyable. Among those whom I wish to thank, first mention goes to my doctoral supervisor, Prof. Joseph Blenkinsopp, whose assistance, direction, and influence were indispensable. This project could not have been completed without encouragement and critical judgment. Thanks also go to Prof. James VanderKam, Prof. Hugh Page, Jr., and Prof. Hindy Najman, each of whom faithfully and dutifully served as members of my dissertation committee. This study has profited much from their comments and suggestions.

My colleagues in the Department of Theology at my present institution, Lee University, have been enormously supportive. Their encouragement has been professionally and personally invaluable. I would like to thank especially Dr. Emerson Powery, Dr. Michael Fuller, Dr. Brad Frazier, Dr. Dale Coulter, and Mr. Brian Alderman. It is a joy to call you friends as well as colleagues. Among the many excellent students whom I have had the opportunity to teach and interact, I would like to thank my assistant, Jennifer Whitson, whose assistance has proved timely. I would also like to express my gratitude to one of Lee University's most outstanding graduate students, Joshua Clark, whose help with editorial matters and compiling the indexes have made the publication of this book more timely than it would have been otherwise.

Closer to home, I would like to thank my parents, Rev. James and Pat Hibbard, who first opened to me the richness of the scriptures. They have been a constant source of encouragement, support, and motivation. Thanks are also due to my siblings, Amy Harris and Joshua Hibbard, who have al-

ways taken time to listen to the older brother's aspirations and dreams. Thanks also are due to my in-laws, Rev. Frank and Carleen Cox. Their support throughout my graduate education has not gone unnoticed, even when it required making crazy decisions that had potentially disastrous consequences for their daughter. Finally, I am especially grateful for a loving and supportive immediate family who has been willing to sacrifice in more ways than I can count so that I could complete this project, both when it was a dissertation and now as a monograph. My children, Chase and Mackenzie, continue to help me see what is truly important and lasting in life. They remain my greatest sources of inspiration and joy. My greatest debt of gratitude is owed to the love of my life, Danielle, without whom none of this would have been possible. Her love and encouragement continue to overwhelm me. Her support has been more than I deserved at many points along the way, but I am grateful that she chose to travel this road with me. I love her more than words can express. This book is lovingly dedicated to her.

J. Todd Hibbard
Lee University
Easter 2006

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

1. Prolegomena and Method

Isaiah 24-27, the doubly mislabeled 'Isaiah Apocalypse,' presents the biblical interpreter with some of the most severe challenges in the entire book of Isaiah. These chapters resist easy genre[1] and form-critical[2] classification, present a host of seemingly intractable difficulties concerning their date of composition,[3] and withstand attempts to chart convincingly their

---

[1] Detailed discussions about the genre of Isaiah 24-27 may be found in Johannes Lindblom, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse. Jes. 24-27* (Lund: Gleerup, 1938); Georg Fohrer, "Der Aufbau der Apokalypse des Jesajabuchs (Jesaja 24-27)," *CBQ* 25 (1963): 34-45; Helmer Ringgren, "Some Observations on Style and Structure in the Isaiah Apocalypse," *ASTI* 9 (1973): 107-15; William Millar, *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic* (HSM 11; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976).

[2] Nearly every commentator and exegete has discussed form-critical matters; some of the more important discussions include Bernard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* (4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892), 172-94; Rudolf Smend, "Anmerkungen zu Jes. 24-27," *ZAW* 4 (1884): 161-224; Paul Lohmann, "Die selbständigen lyrischen Abschnitte in Jes 24-27," *ZAW* 37 (1917/18): 1-58; Wilhelm Rudolph, *Jesaja 24-27* (BWANT 10; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933); Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. Peter Ackroyd; New York: Harper and Row, 1965), 323-27; William E. March, "A Study of Two Prophetic Compositions in Isaiah 24:1-27:1" (Th.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 1966); Marie-Louise Henry, *Glaubenskrise und Glaubensbewahrung in den Dictungen der Jesaja-apokalypse* (BWANT 86; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1967); Paul Redditt, "Isaiah 24-27: A Form Critical Analysis," (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1972); Dan G. Johnson, *From Chaos to Restoration: An Integrative Reading of Isaiah 24-27* (JSOTSup 61; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988); Marvin Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39* (FOTL XVI; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 311-53, esp. 313-6; Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27: A Commentary* (trans. T. H. Trapp; Continental Commentary; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1997), 447-60; Reinhard Scholl, *Die Elenden in Gottes Thronrat* (BZAW 274; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000).

[3] Again, see any of the commentaries; more important or specialized discussions include Duhm, *Jesaia*, esp. 172-3; A. H. van Zyl, "Isaiah 24-27: Their Date of Origin," in *New Light on Some Old Problems: Papers Read at the 5th Meeting [of the South African Society for the Study of the Old Testament] Held at University of South Africa, Pretoria, 30 January–2 February 1962* (ed. A. H. van Zyl; Potchefstroom: Pro Rege, 1962), 44-57; Eissfeldt, *Old Testament*, 323-25; Otto Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology* (trans. S. Rudman; Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1968), 53-78; Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 13-39* (trans. R.

redactional arrangement.[4] Apart from the fact that they have come down to us as part of the Isaiah tradition, we know virtually nothing about their author(s). They are textually challenging,[5] as a glance at the diversity of the ancient textual witnesses as well as the number of emendations scholars have proposed makes clear. Finally, various ambiguous references to an anonymous city[6] (24:10, 12; 25:2; 26:1, 5; 27:10) occur in every chapter, certainly providing some sort of clue about interpretation; however, it has been understood in several different ways. In short, these chapters are some of the most obscure in the entire book of Isaiah. Nevertheless, nearly every scholar who has studied them has noted at least one common element in these chapters: their intertextual nature.[7] These four chapters re-

---

A. Wilson; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 173-233; Jacques Vermeylen, "La composition littéraire de l'«Apocalypse d'Isaïe» (*Is.*, XXIV-XXVII)," *ETL* 50 (1974): 5-38; idem, *Du Prophète Isaïe à L'Apocalyptique* (vol. 1; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1977), 349-81; Millar, *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic*, 115-20; John H. Hayes and Stuart A. Irvine, *Isaiah, the Eighth Century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1987), 295-320; Johnson, *Chaos*, 17; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 316-24; Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, 460-7.

[4] See most recently the discussion in Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39* (AB 19; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2000), 346-8; cf. also Terence Collins, *The Mantle of Elijah* (The Biblical Seminar 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 37-58; Vermeylen, "La composition," 5-38; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 320-4.

[5] Early important text critical work was performed by Ernst Liebmann, "Der Text zu Jesaia 24-27," *ZAW* 23-25 (1903-5): 209-86; 51-104; 145-71; cf. also G. R. Driver, "Isaiah 1-XXXIX: Textual and Linguistic Problems," *JSS* 13 (1968): 36-57; idem, "Linguistic and Textual Problems: Isaiah I-XXXIX," *JTS* 38 (1937): 36-50; Millar, *Isaiah 24-27*, 23-58.

[6] Otto Ludwig, *Die Stadt in der Jesaja-Apokalypse: Zur Datierung von Jes. 24-27* (Inaugural Dissertation; Bonn: Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1961); Paul Redditt, "Once Again, The City in Isaiah 24-27," *HAR* 10 (1986): 317-35; Mark Biddle, "The City of Chaos and the New Jerusalem: Isaiah 24-27 in Context," *PRS* 22/1 (1995): 5-12.

[7] For example, see T. K. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1895), 147-8; Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, 465-7; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 323-4; idem, "New Gleanings from an Old Vineyard: Isaiah 27 Reconsidered," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (ed. C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 51-66; idem, "Textual Citations in Isaiah 24-27: Toward an Understanding of the Redactional Function of Chapters 24-27 in the Book of Isaiah," *JBL* 107 (1988): 39-52; John Day, "A Case of Inner Scriptural Interptretation: The Dependence of Isaiah xxvi. 13-xxvii. 11 on Hosea xiii. 4-xiv. 10 (Eng. 9) and Its Relevance to Some Theories of the Redaction of the 'Isaiah Apocalypse,'" *JTS* 31 (1980): 309-19; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 347; Scholl, *Die Elenden in Gottes Thronrat*, 20-6; Donald C. Polaski, *Authorizing an End: The Isaiah Apocalypse and Intertextuality* (Biblical Interpretation 50; Leiden: Brill, 2001); idem, "Reflections on a Mosaic Covenant: The Eternal Covenant (Isaiah 24.5) and Intertextuality," *JSOT* 77 (1998): 55-73.

veal an interrelationship with other texts in Isaiah, with other portions of the Hebrew Bible, as well as possible connections with the corpus of Canaanite mythology. This textual interconnectedness, or intertextuality, forms the focus of the present study.

As a field of inquiry, intertextuality has developed in several different directions.[8] Both concept and term have found a home in such diverse areas as structuralist poetics,[9] post-structuralist literary approaches (in their seemingly infinite variety),[10] and New Historicism,[11] among others. Not surprisingly, a wide diversity in the definition of the term "intertextuality" has accompanied this vast usage, with the result that the term has become almost meaningless to some.[12] Without entangling myself in a discussion of these different meanings (which will come later), let me simply state the approach I will adopt here. While recognizing the validity of more theoretical orientations, I operate with a model of intertextuality much more akin to modes of discourse found in traditional biblical scholarship. This

---

[8] On the development and application of intertextuality as an approach within literary and cultural theory, see Graham Allen, *Intertextuality* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000); Thaïs Morgan, "The Space of Intertextuality," in *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction* (ed. P. O'Donnell and R. Con Davis; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 239-79; Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, "Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality," in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (ed. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein; Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 3-36; Barbara Godard, "Intertextuality," in *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms* (gen. ed. Irena R. Makaryk; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 568-71; Wendell V. Harris, "Intertextuality," in *Dictionary of Concepts in Literary Criticism and Theory* (New York: Greenwood, 1992), 175-8.

[9] Michael Riffaterre, *Semiotics of Poetry* (Bloomington, Ind.: University of Indiana Press, 1978); idem, *Text Production* (trans. Terese Lyons; New York: Columbia University Press, 1983); Gérard Genette, *Figures of Literary Discourse* (trans. Alan Sheridan; New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); idem, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky; Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1997).

[10] Here see esp. Roland Barthes, *S/Z* (trans. Richard Howard; New York: Hill and Wang, 1974); idem, *Elements of Semiology* (trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith; London: Jonathan Cape, 1984); Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (trans. T. Gora, A. Jardine and L. S. Roudiez; ed. Leon S. Roudiez; New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

[11] Most notably Dominick LaCapra, *History and Criticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985); idem, *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983); for a recent treatment of Isaiah 24-27 from this perspective see Donald Polaski, *Authorizing an End*, esp. 24-32.

[12] Ironically, the confusion in the term's definition can ultimately be traced to the person who coined it, J. Kristeva. She herself eventually abandoned "intertextuality," preferring instead the term "transposition." Cf. J. Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language* (trans. Margaret Waller; New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 59-60.

study offers an exegesis of Isaiah 24-27 that pays special attention to examples of intertextuality that have played a role in the formation of and discourse in these chapters. Three related questions guide this study: What criteria must be established to determine whether the text under consideration is accurately considered an intertext (methodology)? How should we think about the reappropriation of the earlier text on the literary level (literary function)? What is the exegetical significance of each example of intertextuality; that is, how do individual cases of intertextuality contribute to the meaning of the text within Isaiah 24-27? Other ancillary questions arise during the course of the investigation, but these three questions form the core of the inquiry. I take them as three stages through which the interpreter must proceed in order to gain a proper understanding of the kinds of intertextuality to be uncovered in Isaiah 24-27.

The methodology adopted for the first stage is in some respects the most important issue, since it will dictate, in large part, what I view as a true intertext. Even a brief survey of existing treatments of intertextuality reveals that no firm or certain answer to what forms a true example of intertextuality exists. In fact, for many who operate within this domain, the question itself is misguided, since any text can be placed into conversation with any other text, thereby forming an intertextual relationship. Certain discussions about intertextuality have tended to emphasize the role of the reader and the reader's ideology in the construction of meaning, to advocate a synchronous reading of texts, to eliminate any notion of "author" and authorial intent from the discussion about a text, and to eschew the idea of literary influence. While these characteristics certainly have a place in the discussion about intertextuality, I question their ability to account adequately for the kinds of issues that arise in handling an ancient text within its own context. I am much more interested in the question of how the ancient reader read earlier texts and constructed a textual conversation with that text through the composition of her or his own text. In framing the issue this way, I consciously opt to retain a diachronic arrangement of the texts, however sketchy our knowledge about those matters may be. Additionally, I will not jettison the concept of the author or the author's intention as has become fashionable of late, but will instead attempt to understand what the author(s) was doing in the composition of Isaiah 24-27 *based on the textual evidence.*[13] Obviously, framing the issue like this moves us into a hypothetical realm to a certain degree and mandates that certain safeguards

[13] For a similar position on the issue of the author and intertextuality within biblical studies, see James Nogalski, "Intertextuality and the Twelve," in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts* (ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; JSOTSup 235; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 102-24, esp. 102f.

be constructed, but the degree to which the "reading" advocated here is hypothetical is certainly no less than other more ardently postmodern approaches, and in fact, probably less so.

In this study, I will adopt the following procedure for identifying an intertext: first, some amount of *shared vocabulary* must exist between this text and another. As one would expect, it is impossible to quantify precisely the amount of shared vocabulary necessary before positing an intertextual relationship, but obviously more is better. Additionally, the shared vocabulary should preferably not be language common to the rest of the Hebrew Bible. So, for example, two texts in question both using עצה is probably insufficient evidence for a meaningful intertextual relationship; more evidence is needed. The rarer the language in common between the two texts or the more extensive the verbal overlap, the more probable it is that one is dealing with an actual case of intertextuality. Second, the two texts in question should exhibit some degree of *thematic coherence.* If two texts are both exploring the same concept or problem, the possibility of intertextuality increases since the later text may intentionally choose the previous one as a "conversation partner." The issue is made difficult, however, by the fact that two texts may address a similar theme or topic without using the same vocabulary. In such a case, it is extremely difficult to decide whether or not a true intertextual connection exists since one text may conceivably interact with another without using the same vocabulary. Nevertheless, in this study I have opted for what I regard as the safest possible course, which means that thematic coherence will need to be accompanied by shared vocabulary in order to qualify as an example of intertextuality. This limits the options in certain cases, but it is a necessary limitation in my view. Next, it must be shown that the textual relationship *is meaningful in some way.* That is, it seems pointless to argue for an intertextual relationship based on similar vocabulary or theme if that relationship has no bearing on the meaning of the Isaianic text under consideration. I readily concede that this involves a degree of subjectivity on the part of the exegete; nevertheless, one must ask the question and attempt to answer it. Finally, since I am retaining a diachronic arrangement of the texts under consideration, the intertextuality should be *chronologically possible.* A possible intertext must refer to a text earlier than Isaiah 24-27, otherwise the relationship is not possible in the way I am defining intertextuality.[14]

[14] This last point is important, because many current discussions about intertextuality bring texts from different historical periods into conversation with each other. Part of this effort is to allow later texts to determine (at least partially) the meaning of earlier texts. While this may be illuminating as a playful exercise for modern discourse, it tells us nothing about the ways these texts would have been read in antiquity.

Having identified an intertextual relationship, I turn to the question of which literary categories best describe the situation at hand. At this stage I attempt to understand *on a literary level* how the Isaianic text has engaged the earlier one. A wide spectrum of possibilities exists, ranging from *quotation*[15] on one end to broader, more elusive *thematic* correspondences on the other. In between lies a whole range of possible ways of construing the intertextual alignment, described by Patricia Willey as "the realm of allusion, response, appropriation, recollection, and echo."[16] This question essentially addresses how an author has evoked another text within his or her own composition. Additionally, it provides an index for how informed the author may expect the reader to be, since the reader must be aware of the precursor text in order to appreciate fully the way in which the author has reused it. The more opaque the textual interplay is, the more adept the reader will need to be to understand the reference. For example, a quotation may be more easily spotted by the reader because of the high degree of similarity between the referencing text and its antecedent.[17] When the author chooses merely to echo or allude to an earlier text, however, the degree of difficulty in recognizing the literary interplay increases. Most of the examples adduced for Isaiah 24-27 fall into this middle range of allusion and its various correlates, which suggests that their identification – by ancient and modern readers – may not always be simple and straightforward. Most analyses of this sort involve a certain degree of unavoidable subjectivity on the part of the interpreter, and this is only all too easily ap-

---

[15] For an insightful study of quotation within the prophetic literature and, to a lesser degree, quotation within the larger corpus of ancient Near Eastern literature, see Richard Schultz, *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets* (JSOTSup 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Schultz makes a useful distinction between *verbal parallels* and *verbal dependence*. Quotations form part of the latter category, while the former may be due to any number factors.

[16] Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (SBLDS 161; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 61. Ben Sommer uses three broad categories in his examination of allusion in Second Isaiah: explicit citation, implicit reference and interpolation (*A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66* [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998], 20-22). Cf. the three categories outlined by the French literary critic Gerard Genette (*Palimpsests*, 6-15): *citation*, *allusion*, *plagiat* (plagiarism).

[17] I should stress, however, that identifying a quotation in a biblical text is not as easy as in a modern text. For example, whereas punctuation and/or attribution indicate the presence of quotation in modern Western texts, this is not the case in the biblical text. No such indicators usually exist. Moreover, an author may intentionally change a text in quoting it in order to provide some kind of comment upon it, thereby complicating either the reader's ability to recognize the quotation or the reader's understanding of the purpose of the quotation (on which see my discussion in chapter 2 on Isa 24:18).

parent in trying to decide whether an intertextual connection is an allusion or an echo, for example.

Finally, I explore the effect that the intertextual connection has on the reading of the Isaianic text. The history of scholarship in this area indicates that exegetes have often been content merely to note the textual overlap without inquiring about its purpose. Perhaps it seems axiomatic, but a valid example of intertextuality will have some bearing on the way the texts are to be read, otherwise there would be no point in the evocation of the other text. What possibilities exist? In my view, the textual link may impact the interpretation of either the earlier or later text, or both, so the reader must always bear in mind these multiple interpretive possibilities.[18] The textual overlap may confirm or transform the message of the earlier text in some way. In the latter case, intertextuality may serve to augment the message of the earlier text (cf. Isa 16:1-12; 13-14), subtract from it, reapply it to a new situation (cf. Jer 25:11, 12; Dan 9:2), contradict it (cf. Isaiah 58; Deut 23:1-3), or reconfigure the ideas completely (cf. anonymous city in Isaiah 24-27 vs. historical cities in Isaiah 13-23[19]).[20] In these cases the primary relationship is an exegetical one in which the later text comments on the earlier text in one or another of the preceding ways.

Intertextuality's effect on the alluding text may take several forms. It may be something as simple as conferring a sense of authority on the later text, inasmuch as the association with an earlier authoritative text subtly suggests to the reader that it too is authoritative. More often, however, the allusion is more complex. To take an example that I will consider in more detail in chapter 2, how should the reader evaluate the reference to the ברית עולם in Isa 24:5? Is the use of this technical phrase meant to call to mind similar texts from the Priestly stratum of the Pentateuch (in whatever form it may have existed)? Additionally, might it envision similar uses of this phrase from Ezekiel as well as more generic covenant language connected with Deuteronomy and the Davidic dynasty? Perhaps all of these ideas converge to one degree or another in this one verse in Isaiah 24, resulting in a radical reconfiguring of covenant now expressed in this eschatologically oriented document.[21] If this is the case, then the allusions to these earlier texts are meant to contribute to the reader's understanding of this otherwise oblique reference in Isa 24:5. A similar example may be

---

[18] Sommer argues that the reasons a text may allude to an earlier one include exegesis, influence, revision, polemic, allusion, and echo (*A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 22-30).

[19] Vermeylen, "La composition," 36-38; Biddle, "The City of Chaos and the New Jeruslam: Isaiah 24-27 in Context," 5-12; J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 348.

[20] Michael Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, [Oxford: Clarendon, 1985], 44-279) provides several examples of these types of exegetical relationships.

[21] This is essentially Polaski's argument; cf. *Authorizing an End*, 94-145.

seen in Isa 27:2-6 where the vineyard language and imagery first introduced in Isaiah 5 reappears. A comprehensive taxonomy of the exegetical possibilities is not possible, since they are nearly infinite. Rather, my approach will be to highlight the interpretive function of the textual link in the course of the exegesis that follows.

More directly, this study does not take up intertextuality for its own sake, that is, as simply a creative impulse of an author with no other purpose. Rather, in my judgment, intertextuality functions as part of the wider developmental process of ancient Israel's religious tradition(s). It is one approach to the theological development of religious themes, concepts and ideas, the trajectories of which followed different paths in the Hebrew Scriptures, but which eventuated in the Hebrew canon. Authors both inherit earlier aspects of that tradition and, for a variety of reasons,[22] modify it for those who follow them. By the time Isaiah 24-27 is attached to that tradition (here I am thinking of the Isaianic tradition as well as the larger religious tradition of nascent Judaism whatever its contents at that point), prophecy, or more properly the composition of prophetic texts, has begun to interact with an expanding *written* tradition – prophetic and otherwise – of which it must take account. This writtenness provides the later author with both a formal exemplar as well as a stock of themes, symbols, and ideas from which to draw. That an author would use these in such a way as to cause the reader[23] to recall these earlier compositions is not hard to imagine.[24]

---

[22] On the factors which lead to change in a tradition (religious or otherwise), see the important work of Edward Shils, *Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), esp. 213-61. Shils contends that two types of social actors precipitate change in traditions: endogenous and exogenous. These factors create the patterns of change: at one end of the spectrum, a synthesis between an older and newer tradition may occur such that a completely new tradition emerges unlike either of its parents; at the other extreme, one of the traditions may simply absorb the other with no apparent change in the former. In between these two extremes traditions may evolve through the addition of newer elements to the older pattern as well as through an amalgamation of new and old.

[23] Unfortunately we lack information about who read these texts and the context in which they would have been read and studied. Therefore, in trying to imagine the proper social context for these texts, I assume, for better or worse, a rather small readership for these texts, based primarily on what I take to be the rather low level of literacy among the general populace at this point in Judah's history and a lack of access to these texts. On the latter point, I think it likely that these texts were archived in Jerusalem where only a small cadre of interested people possessing the requisite skills to understand them would have taken notice of their material existence. One of the correlates of this kind of assumption, a proper one in my view, is the ability to surmise more easily that generally most readers would have understood the same set of intertextual allusions. For a recent treatment of the literacy question in ancient Israel and many related issues, see Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word* (LAI; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox,

I should stress that it is not my task here to define a methodology or develop a taxonomy that is applicable to every example of textual reuse in the Hebrew Bible, a kind of *Übermethode,* that transcends the bounds of this project, and I question whether it is practically possible in any non-reductionist way.[25] Undoubtedly, the authors of the biblical texts developed a variety of ways of interacting with earlier texts and traditions over the long course of the development of the biblical traditions and texts. It stands to reason that the approaches and stances toward these texts will differ in various cases, thereby making it nearly impossible to describe the phenomenon comprehensively. Yet while my focus is primarily to understand better the textual interrelationships within Isaiah 24-27, I hope that this will contribute to a greater understanding of intertextuality as a compositional and rhetorical strategy within the larger biblical corpus. To the degree that these chapters represent a later stratum of composition within the Isaianic tradition, they may yield important clues for the way tradents of the biblical traditions in the Second Commonwealth thought about and interacted with their predecessors.[26]

1997). On the matter of archives and their possible existence in Israel, see Philip Davies, *Scribes and Schools* (LAI; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1998).

[24] Wolfgang Lau and Burkhard Zapff have described this interaction and the composition of new prophetic texts as "scribal prophecy" (*schriftgelehrte Prophetie*). I will comment on this idea vis-à-vis Isaiah 24-27 in chapter six. See Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56-66* (BZAW 225; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994) esp. 1-21, and Zapff, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie–Jes 13 und die Komposition des Jesajabuches* (Forschung zur Bibel 74; Würzburg: Echter, 1995).

[25] Obviously, Fishbane's treatment of inner-biblical exegesis (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*) comes the closest to this kind of thing. However, as others have noted, clearly *exegesis* does not and cannot explain all of the varieties of textual relationship in the Hebrew Bible. See, e.g., Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 23-5. Moreover, even within legitimate examples of exegesis, Fishbane's three primary analytical categories – legal, aggadic, and mantological exegesis – may not account for the total range of exegetical activity.

[26] B. Sommer's understanding of these issues from the perspective of Deutero-Isaiah is worth mentioning here: "Deutero-Isaiah's was a peculiar sort of prophetic inspiration. He experienced the presence of the divine voice by ruminating on divine voices from the past. More than his pre-exilic forerunners, Deutero-Isaiah based his prophecies on older texts, recasting their words in order to create new but derivative oracles for his own day" (*A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 152). On the other hand, D. Polaski denies this kind of explanation for the origin of Isaiah 24-27, denying what some think is its exegetical, therefore, dependent status (*Authorizing an End*, 357). Polaski seems to think that a position like Sommer's (or that of David Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* [SBLMS 23; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976]) diminishes the authority and power of the text, a position that simply does not follow from my perspective.

2. Intertextuality: What Is It and Who Does It?

As I stated earlier, this study will adopt an approach to Isaiah 24-27 that falls under the heading of loosely related approaches known as *intertextuality*. The following is an attempt to survey briefly some relevant intertextual studies and theorists in order to nuance more adequately my own appropriation and application of this term as outlined earlier. Recently, textual examinations utilizing the language and procedure of this burgeoning area of literary studies have proliferated, but in so doing the confusion about this term and its appropriate application has only multiplied. In short, intertextuality has come to mean many things to many people, since no authoritative definition for either the term or the approaches to the text that it may represent has been forthcoming. The French literary theorist Julia Kristeva originally coined the term in the late 1960s,[27] a time of transition in Paris from the previously dominant structuralist influence in literary studies to the poststructuralism that still dominates in many ways today.[28] She derived the concept from Mikhail Bakhtin's idea of *dialogism*,[29] broadly understood as give and take – the *play* – between the "text of the sender (subject), the text of the addressee (object), and the text of culture."[30] However, whereas Bakhtin remained committed to the social location of this discourse, and therefore to the historical dimension generally speaking, Kristeva's modification sought to take the text out of the historical realm and into a kind of ahistorical textual space. Unfortunately, Kristeva's use of the term was not always consistent, so what she meant by intertextuality cannot be defined with a great deal of precision. One of her chief concerns was to differentiate between *utterance* and *enunciation*.[31] For her, the former dealt with the act of the text's coming into being, while the latter was more concerned with the actual text itself *independent from the author*. Additionally, she introduced the ideas of the *genotext* and the *phenotext* – the latter being the traditional object of textual analysis, while the former is understood as the part of the text that emanates from the subconscious and serves to disrupt or undercut the phenotext.[32] The phenotext

---

[27] See especially two essays in Kristeva's *Desire in Language*: "The Bounded Text," 36-63; and "Word, Dialogue, Novel," 64-91.

[28] Allen, *Intertextuality*, 30-5.

[29] On which see Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination* (ed. Michael Holquist; trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981).

[30] Timothy K. Beal, "Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production" in *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Danna Nolan Fewell; LCBI; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 29.

[31] Kristeva, "The Bounded Text," 36-7.

[32] Ibid., "Word, Dialogue, Novel," 86-9; see also, Allen, *Intertextuality*, 50-1. One can see here already the seeds of deconstructionism.

Source Index

I. Ancient Near Eastern Sources

II. Old Testament

III. Apocrypha and Qumran

Author Index

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

Edited by Bernd Janowski, Mark S. Smith
and Hermann Spieckermann

Alphabetical Index

For a complete catalogue please write to the publisher
Mohr Siebeck • P.O. Box 2030 • D-72010 Tübingen/Germany
Up-to-date information on the internet at www.mohr.de