CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Rationale for this study: A Peculiarity of Methods For Reading the Abraham Narrative

Any work has to start somewhere, and not everything that is stated can be proved in detail. Thus, this study, too, has its presuppositions. It will take for granted the fact both literarily and historically, that the Pentateuch was originally composed as a single book (cf. Harrison 1969:531-541; esp. 541).[1] It will be assumed that its themes and central ideas were presented by the author/the final composer.[2] In reading the

---

[1] Cf, O. Eissefeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. P. R. Ackroyd (Oxford & Basil: Blackwell, 1974), 156; G. Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. D. E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 103; W. H. Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, trans. M. J. O'Connell (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 43; H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (New York: KTAV, 1968), 215, especially for the earliest references to the Greek Pentateuch. Meanwhile, in his work, T. D. Alexander, *From Paradise to the Promised Land* (Grand Rapids: Paternoster Press & Baker Academic, 2002), 97-100, gives some reasons with various factors why the Pentateuch should be read as a whole:

A. The idea of the promised land, which penetrates from Genesis to Deuteronomy.
B. Thematic relevancies between the five individual books (e.g., the fulfillment of Joseph's will in Gen 50:25 and Exod 13:19; dedication and appointment of priests in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 9; the death of Moses in Num 20:12 and Deut 34.
C. Genesis is clearly integrated into the overall plot. For instance, the Joseph narrative presents a crucial parallel between the patriarchal narratives and their posterities.

In this context, one may affirm the unity of the Pentateuch, though the books consist of very divers components and even superficially give the impression of disunity.

[2] Although the entire Pentateuch is anonymous, larger portions of the legal material (Exod 24:4; 30:11, 17; 33:1, 5; 39:1, 5, 29; Lev 1:1; 4:1; 6:1; Num 4:1; Deut 1:1, 5; 5:1; 31:22, 30; 33:1) in the Pentateuch, the common assumption of post-exilic Judaism (1 Chr 15:15; 22:13; 2 Chr 23:18; 24:6; 25:4; 30:16; 35:12; Ezra 3:2; 7:6; Neh 1:7; 8:1; 13:1; Sir 24:23; also Philo, Josephus, the Mishna and Talmud), even Jesus and his disciples (Matt 8:4; Luke 16:31; 24:27, 44; John 1:17; Acts 3:22), are respectively conclude that it is not irrational to assert that "Moses is the person primarily responsible for the writing of the Pentateuch." See, D. Garrett, *Rethinking Genesis: The Sources and Authorship of the First Book of the Bible* (Ross-shir: Mentor, 2000), 47. In this study, the term 'the author' of the Pentateuch is more properly understood as 'the final composer' as the one who gave the book its final shape with his own compositional strategy, rather than the editor/compiler or the redactor. Noted in J. H. Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zandervan, 1992), 33-35; id., *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zandervan, 1995),

Pentateuch, it is evident that when one views the Genesis narratives to the exclusion of the rest part of the Pentateuch there is appreciable loss of the major theme or sense as well as a susceptibility for missing the details of the book.

With regard to discussion of the disparate nature of the materials that have been used in the Pentateuch (the composition of Genesis in particular) this work does not intend to raise the question of the peculiarity of the literary strata.[3] Rather, the particular focus

---

206-15. This use rests on the observation suggesting the premise that the author is a real person who writes with a certain compositional strategy, bending the different sources (whether oral or literary) for a designed purpose in the text. For convenience, the term 'the author' thus shall generally be referred to as 'the final composer' as well. Thus, these terms will be used together in this study. For further more authorship of Genesis, cf, R. B. Dillard & T. Longman III, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: ZondervanPublishingHouse, 1995), 38-39; R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 497; R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methdological Study* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 221-22; S. Sandmel, "The Haggada Within Scripture," *JBL* 80 (1961): 105-22.

[3] Most studies by modern biblical critics have consistently focused on the various literary strata (fragmentation) reflected in such differences within the Pentateuch, especially the book of Genesis. A common feature of biblical-critical interpretation has been to interpret the contents of the book as a literary composite, which is divided into small sections in isolation from one another. It is, of course, important to discover the anatomy of a text by dissection, but such an approach puts too much emphasis on discovering sources rather than interpreting whole texts. More important, however, is how the component parts relate to each other, namely, what literary relationship exist which were intended by the author/composer. In fact, as R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York & London: Basic Books & Allen & Unwin, 1981), 133-40, illustrated inconsistencies and narrative gaps can be turned into literary virtues easily seen and transcribed by the sensitive reader. M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Bible Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* ISBL (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 365-440, regards the 'gaps' and 'doublets' as important expression of a sophisticated literary technique. Some scholars (e.g., H. C. Brichto, "The Worship of the Golden Calf: A Literary Analysis of a Fable on Idolatry," *HUCA* 54 [1983]: 1-44; B. S. Child, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* OTL [Philadelphia & London: The Westminster Press & SCM, 1974]; R. W. L. Moberly, *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34* JSOTSup 22 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983]) also accept the coexistence of seemingly disparate elements in the text and strive to absorb these elements in the order indicated by the textual organization, even though they represent different methodological standpoints (i.e., different views on the character of the text and the literary processes which shaped them), and refer to different categories of analysis. On their common character as well as the inherent significance of their special and questionable type of approach, cf, M. S. Smith, *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus* JSOTSup 239 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 176-79. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch*, 235, 237-42, on the one hand, seems to equate the impact of the 'controlling genius' with influence upon the textual shape. Cf. D. J. A. Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch* JSOTSup 10 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 17-21. He raises doubts for the existence of parallel J and E sources underlying this section of Genesis as some critics have argued (e.g., G. W. Coats, *From Canaan to Egypt: Structural and Theological Context for the Joseph Story* CBQMS 4 [Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976], H. Donner, *Die literaturische Gestalt des alttestamentlichen Josephgeschichte* [Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1976]; D. B. Redford, *A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph* VTSup 20 [Genesis 37-50] [Leiden: Brill, 1970]. J. Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975], not merely

(or, greatest concern) in this study is about the role that a particular literary unit played in the compositional strategy of the author/the final composer of the Pentateuch as a whole.[4] It is still necessary to understand how these different literary parts are compositionally related to each other.[5] In short, this means that serious reflection on the nature of the textuality of Scripture is needed.[6] Such an interpretive premise implies that this study of Genesis, which has been the eye of a storm of biblical

---

rejects the source analysis of the Abraham narrative, suggested by the Documentary Hypothesis, but offers also an interesting alternative. M. A. Fishbane, "Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle (Gen 25:19-35:22)," *JJS* 26 (1975): 15-38, and J. P. Fokkelmann, *Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), call the accepted source analysis of the Jacob cycle into serious question. Cf. R. Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission of the Pentateuch*, trans. J. J. Scullion (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

[4] In this respect, J. H. Sailhamer, "The Canonical Approach to the Old Testament: Its Effect on Understanding Prophecys *JETS* 30 (1987), 307-15; id., "The Mosaic Law and the Theology of the Pentateuch," *WTJ* 53 (1991): 241-61; id., *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 33-59; *Introduction to Old Testament Theology*, 206-15, maintains that the distinct textuality between texts in the Pentateuch strongly argues the fact that the Pentateuch scrupulously composed with a discernible compositional strategy, which encompasses the entire texts of the Pentateuch. The final shaping of the Pentateuch not merely reveals such a compositional scheme, but indicates of the hermeneutic of the author/the final composer of the Pentateuch, uncovering the central concerns, namely inherent relationship between the past and the future, which could call it an eschatological reading of the historical narratives. The compositional strategy of the Pentateuch presents the final shape of the books:

NARRATIVE	POETRY	EPILOGUE

On the recent works of the integrity of Genesis as a whole under the literary-critical readings, see, B, S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch*; B. T. Dahlberg, "On Recognizing Unity of Genesis," *ThDig* 24 (1976): 360-67; T. E. Fretheim, "The Book of Genesis: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 1, ed. C. Simpson (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 1996; T. W. Mann, "All the Families of the Earth: The Theological Unity of Genesis," *Int* 45 (1991): 341-53.

[5] In connection with the idea, T. D. Alexander, "Genealogies, Seed and the Compositional Unity of Genesis," *TynBul* 44 (1993): 257, trenchantly summarizes as follows:

> Why did the author/editor select and arrange the material to form the present text? What overall intention underlies the final composition of Genesis? In this regard, it is perhaps helpful to compare Genesis to a collage made of different types of materials and colors. Merely to note the origin of the different parts or their particular features is insufficient. We need also to observe the way in which they interrelate and the effect which they produce as a whole.

[6] In fact, on over the last two centuries scholars have been shown their ignorance of the importance of the nature of the textuality of the Bible. They have mostly concentrated on historical concerns, namely the study of nontextual entities – historiography, archaeology, and the nature of historical events. As a result, the recognitional significance of the text as the locus of revelation and the focus of theology were relatively forgotten. Attention must be devoted to answering the questions which can result in a better understanding of texts: What is a text?; How does a text work?

criticism in the twentieth century, should be focused on the need to develop a synthetic (as opposed to analytic) approach towards the text of the book (Anderson 1978:23; Polzin 1975:82-83).[7] This suggests that to fully appreciate the biblical material it is necessarily to emphasize and to seek the final form of the text as a literary product, worthy of attention in its own right (cf. von Rad 1972:440; Whybray 1977:14). This does not, of course, imply that traditional approaches applied to the book of Genesis have no direct bearing on the validity of the results attained by examining these interpretive placements at all, but it surely does imply that, at least, primary weight should be laid on the final form.

In fact, with regard to the Pentateuch, past biblical scholars have generally presented it in a way of both an easily discernible unity and a perceptible lack of uniformity by their neglecting the final form of a literary work in favor of hypothetical reconstructions.[8] Though the bold historical undertaking of the nineteenth century[9]

---

[7] It is the fact that in this period when the source-critical approach was still dominant, attention was concentrated on the historical questions of the text and consequently the importance of the present form of our texts was neglected. Although the advent of form criticism led to more concern with the present text (e.g., G. von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, trans. J. H. Marks & J. Bowden OTL [London: SCM Press, 1972], basically the study was oriented by historical concern [i.e., oral/written tradition or history of the religion of Israel]). Therefore, this has created a climate in which scholars have fortunately advocated the need to develop a synthetic and synchronic approach to the biblical text (cf. R. Alter, "A Literary Approach to the Bible," *Commentary* 60 [1975]: 70-77; id., *The Art of Biblical Narrative*; Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch*; Fishbane, "Composition and Structure," 6-27.

[8] Modern biblical exegesis attempts to determine the meaning of biblical texts by means of both diachronic and synchronic methods. The diachronic methods, such as those of redaction criticism and tradition criticism and the historical-comparative methods, are aimed at an explanation of biblical texts based on the study and reconstruction of oral and written geneses or traditions. The synchronic methods, such as form criticism and literary criticism, seek to provide an explanation of the text on the basis of the study of the genres to which a text belongs and the study of the stylistic and literary composition of the text. The commentary of C. Westermann, *Genesis*, trans. D. E. Green (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987) on the book of Genesis may serve as an example of such modern exegesis. It is generally accepted as a good exegetic study which combines a diachronic – that is traditional critical, and a synchronic – namely form critical approach. In his work, he tries to explain the irregularities and contradictions in the text of Genesis on the basis of various traditions that have preceded the formation of the text. The explanation of what he considers to be irregularities in the text is not based on the text itself, but on the notion that various traditions have supplied the textual elements and as a consequence have determined the meaning of the text.

has made important contributions to our knowledge of the biblical text, it has, however, tended to see the lack of consistency of style, theological emphasis, logical consistency and vocabulary of the Pentateuch as a sign of a lack of unity in the structure and message.[10] It is these textual inconsistencies that have consistently caused scholars to question the unity of the text.

In particular, the application of form criticism (*Formgeschichte*, *Gattungsgeschichte* or *Literaturgeschichte*, lit., a history of [literary] types or "genres" or history of literature)[11] to Genesis has divided and atomized the texts. Hermann Gunkel (1862-1932) who was a pioneer of an important new development in approaching the biblical literature, sought to go beyond the work of earlier source critics by examining the development of the Israelite traditions in their oral stage. He hypothesized that before the present account of Genesis there were numerous independent sagas, which originally circulated in poetic form. He sought thus to rediscover the original setting in life of these material (*Sitz im Leben*), as well as these separate sagas. Gunkel's

---

[9] In this regard, there was an effort to distinguish sources in the Epoic of Gilgamesh in terms of only depend on comparison with other, known, texts (A. Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983): 132-34; cf. J. H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982); W. Moran, "The Gilgamesh Epic: A Masterpiece from Ancient Mesopotamia," *CANE* IV (1995): 2327-336.

[10] In this sense, McEvenue's appraisal of traditional approach is pertinent("Reading Genesis with Faith and Reason," *WW* 14 [1994]: 137-38):

> What is right about historical research is, first, that it is truly attentive to the physical text of the Bible and truly obedient to the data. Second, by searching for the historical contexts of biblical texts, it establishes in advance the existential nature of biblical messages, preserving interpreters from deriving simplistic doctrinal meanings. Third, historical research has won respect by its sheer brilliance – making inferences from what is often inadvertent in the text, detecting specific constraints and focuses in the horizon of the author, speculating about life situations that could evoke a text, relating these to real moments in Israel's history, and so forth.

[11] In fact the term was used first by M Dibelius who is a student of Gunkel in his work, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Eng., From [Oral] Tradition to Gospel [London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, Ltd., 1934]); cf. J. Clarke, "The Flood and the Structure of the Pre-patriarchal History," *ZAW* 83 (1971): 184-211.

judgment, in particular, is that there is a single correct or natural classification for literary texts (cf. Gunkel 1964:vii-xii, 159).[12] He noted that Genesis consists of numerous episodes (the variants types of material), which originally existed as independent oral stories (e.g., legend, concerns the life of a family, and tends to be poetic). Fundamental to his method to Genesis is that these materials appear to have been collected together at the oral state to form a longer narrative comprising various episodes, for example, the story of Abraham[13] and Lot, because he believed that the

---

[12] In his commentary on Genesis, first published in 1901(esp. in an introduction entitled "*Die Sagen der Genesis*") Gunkel divided Genesis into two portions: Genesis 1-11, mythical in nature, and Genesis 12-50, the legends of the patriarchs. Genesis is, thus, for him a folk book, a collection of legends. Consequently, he discussed the question of the nature of the literary materials in Genesis and the materials' relationship to oral tradition in terms of operating two categories: *history* (*Geschichte*) – always transmitted in writing, concerns a political environment, and is prosaic, and *saga* – preceded the writing of history and reflected an earlier stage in the development of a people (cf. H. Genkel, *The Folktale in the Old Testament*, trans. M. D. Rutter [Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1987], 21-27; P. G. Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study* JSOTSup 62 [Sheffield: JSOT Press1988], 24). In particular, he suggested that the episodes in the patriarchal narratives were collected and edited over long period of time. He acknowledged the existence of pre-canonical collections, the J, E, and P strata, and while he considered the editors of these strata to have had an active role in the editing of the text (pp. LXXXff.), he considered their role to be limited essentially to collecting the material, material which they often did not fully understand (p. LXXXV). The earliest written forms may have rearranged and supplemented the materials, but to some extent, they merely reproduced the oral tradition. Thus, his analysis actually tended toward tracing the diverse forms into the recesses of history, and so the emphasis fell not on any unity but on the idea of original diversity. In the perception of Gunkel, Genesis appeared radically splintered. Besides, in his influential work, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 44, Martin Noth, thought that the Pentateuchal traditions, a saga-tradition had received a fixed form in the oral stage. He viewed the tradition "emerged, developed, and was transmitted through the mouths of 'narrators' within the anonymous totality of the tribes and their several clans at those times when they were gathered together, that is, pre-eminently on cultic occasion" (*A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 44). This is a diverse aspect from Gunkel, but he followed Gunkel in the view that the rise of the state fosters the tradition from saga tradition to history. The two scholars are agreed that the traditions of Israel were transmitted orally, especially in the pre-monarchic period, when the traditions began as simple tales, individual episodes, which were subsequently collected and elaborated. Meanwhile, the two scholars, Thompson and Van Seters have reexamined the patriarchal materials and have concluded that very little can be known about the patriarchs and have raised serious doubts about the antiquity of the patriarchal traditions. See, Thompson's archaeological issues concerning the patriarchs (esp. the Nuzi materials as a means of explaining the matriarchal marriage customs), *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narrative: The Quest for the Historical Abraham* BZAW 133 (Berlin: W de Gruyter, 1974) and Van Seters' examination of the non-literary arguments and the literary analysis of the Abraham tradition, and its pre-literary form and its subsequent development (*Abraham in History and Tradition*). Van Seters agrees with previous scholars that the patriarchal tradition is clearly not a unity, because of the presence of doublets and internal inconsistencies within some of the stories. He regarded the repetition of words or phrases as indications of differing sources only when the repetition is awkward and breaks the continuity of thought and action.

[13] For convenience, the names Abraham and Sarah shall be used the familiar longer form of their names

materials in Genesis originated orally. He thus proposed that during the oral stage of transmission some of them were collected together to form larger units. According to his argument, these episodes represented short, separate stories, which are designated their genre, for instance, Sagen (e.g., legends, fables, myths, tales, sing, [heroic] sage, sundry "report").[14] As a result, in Gunkel's opinion, Genesis was composed of short episodes that once circulated orally within an ancient society storytelling initially involved the use of Sagen, short oral account, and only later did this primitive form develop into 'history' (*Gechichte*).[15] An important implication of Gunkel's approach was that he came to view the sources J and E as collections of oral material. Accordingly, it was no longer appropriate to think of Yahwist and Elohist as 'authors'; they were merely collectors, who brought together material that was not entirely homogeneous, while he viewed P as an 'author' who clearly shaped into his own mould any traditional material that he received.[16]

He, and even more, some of adherents (e.g., Algrecht Alt[17], Gerhard von Rad[18], Martin

---

throughout this study in spite of the fact that these are first introduced in Gen 17:5 and 17:15 to replace the earlier designations Abram and Sarai respectively.

[14] This method has been seriously challenged, and the form categories assigned to the individual units have been found to be anachronistic or meaningless (cf. Garrett, *Rethinking Genesis*, 31-46; B. K. Waltke, "Oral Tradition," in *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, ed. W. Kaiser & R. Youngblood [Chicago: Moody, 1986], 17-34; Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch*, 133-219). For a various list of the genres in Genesis, see, G. W. Coats, *Genesis: With an Introduction to Narrative Literature* FOTL 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 317-20.

[15] See, Warner's helpful summary of Gunkel's approach, "Primitive Saga Men," *VT* 2 (1979): 329.

[16] According to some critics, the two major strands (J and P) reflect particular historical situations, most likely the rise of the Davidic-Solomonic in the tenth century and the fall of the state of Judah to the Babylonians in the sixth (cf. R. E. Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronmistic and Priestly Works* [Chico: Scholars Press, 1981] and R. B. Coote & D. R. Ord, *The Bible's First Historian: From Eden to the Court of David with the Yahwist* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989]).

[17] Alt produced influential studies on the religion of the patriarchs as cult founders ("The God of the Fathers," in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1966], 3-77), which is about the evolution of Israelite religion prior to the time of the monarchy, and Israelite law, which is about the two main types of law found in the Pentateuch; casuistic (If a man…) and apodictic (Thou sahlt (not)…). See, for the former, *Der Gott der Väter, Stuttgart*, 1929; reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel I* (München: C H Beck'sche, 1953), 1-78. E. Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in*

Noth[19], The Scandinavian Scholars[20], and Van Seters[21]) who came under the profound

---

the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 54-58, has summed up Alt's views on early Israelite religion. Also, see the latter, *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Recht*, 1934; reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israels I* (München: Beck'sche, 1953); ET in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966). Some critics criticizes both Alt's method and his proposal, Alt's use of historical analogy (reconstruction), that is, the religion of the Nabateans as an alaogue (Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, 158-61) and his inconsistent criteria of a pre-literary tradition (Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*, 36). In fact, there is not objective grounds for the isolation of the El deities from their literary contexts as oral traditions, to say nothing of substantiating the highly complex, multi-layered history of tradition Alt has proposed hypothetically and subjectively.

[18] *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (Stuttgart: W Kohlhammer, 1938); ET, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Ediburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966). In this work, He asserted that J was composed along the lines of an outline of Israel's history contained in early creedal forms, for example, Deut 6:20-24; 26:5b-9; Josh 24:2b-13, used in cultic celebrations. According to him, these had been originally used in cultic worship related to the Festival of Weeks held at Gilgal during the initial period of Israel's settlement in Canaan. However, his thesis faces one major criticism, which concerns the dating of the short historical credos. For his position to be substantiated it is necessary that these credos be dated earlier than J. However, the evidence suggests that on each occasion the credo occurs in passage which are usually dated later than J. It is therefore impossible to demonstrate that J was based upon such creedal confessions. Some critical scholars also hold that it is not possible to determine with certainty the presence of orally transmitted narrative in a written text, that the 'creed' (esp. Deut 26:5b-9) are not necessarily independent of other themes. von Rad's methodological legitimacy that it is possible that pre-history of the text, the tradition can be extract the early Israelites' interpretation of history from the text and used it to develop the theological model of *Heilsgeschichte* (salvation history) has been challenged by them (cf. D. A. Knight, "The Pentateuch," in *The Hebrew Bible and its Modern Interpreters* [Chico: Scholars Press, 1985], 268-72).

[19] *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: W Kohlhammer, 1948); ET *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972). This work describes on the pre-history of the sources J, E and P adopting the tradition or tradition-historical approach, which concerns with outlining the history of the traditions prior to their final redaction. In order to argue von Rad's position Noth employed the five themes as a central of the traditions passed independently for a long process to combine the various traditions contained in J: 1) the guidance out of Egypt, 2) the guidance to the arable land, 3) the promises to the Patriarchs, 4) the guidance in the wilderness, and 5) the revelation at Sinai. Noth holds that the central cult of the amphictyony was the place where the themes were merged (For the critical view on Noth's amphictyony, see Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 332-34. Noth's supposition that he can distinguish earlier from later material in the text on the basis of style and uses the dubious criterion that short and concise narratives are the earliest have critically observed by Knight, "The Pentateuch," 265-68, and Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch*, 187-90, 194-96).

[20] Cf. their skepticism regarding the possibility of recovering a complex oral tradition (see, Whybray *The Making of the Pentateuch*, 202).

[21] Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, 158-61, accepts three major areas of concerns in Olrik's laws: 1) general structural characteristics, 2) internal structural characteristics, and 3) characterization. Developing Olrik's laws and following some criteria, including the notion that the simple forms are the earliest and complex forms are the most recent. A second account may both summarize and add new details, that a story may assume knowledge of an earlier version of the same story (the 'blind motif'), and that verbal similarity indicates literary dependence. Cf. his, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 38. For instance, he holds that Gen 12:10-20 is a primitive folktale piece of oral literature. In addition, he views that Genesis 20 is a literary account dependent on Gen 12:10-20 because of 'blind motifs', and that Genesis 26 is a literary conflation of the previous two accounts (*Abraham in History and Tradition*, 162-63, 167-83). For the different view on Van Seters' own criteria for oral literature and his assertion on oral composition variants, see T. L. Thompson, *The Origin Tradition of*

influence of Gunkel, believed it possible to reconstruct oral antecedents for the written texts present in the Bible on the assumption that such antecedents indicated the stamps of a single genre "purely" and "simply."[22] Due to his brilliant surgical work of Genesis, a number of scholars who fractionalize the book from the angle of academic (or scientific) and critical (e.g., Driver; Eissefeldt; Speiser) methods, have generally treated the book simply as a collection of once independent pericopes.[23] They have fundamentally viewed the interpretive task as both analytic and diachronic [as Anderson (1978:23) pointed out early]. In putting their own interpretive premise in this way, they have reduced texts in Genesis to a group of various documents and/or redactional strands in order to determine the origins of the book.[24] As a result, they have concluded that that nothing much may be gained from an attempt to examine the unity of the book (cf. Mann1991:341-353).[25] It is appear that such a reading of the text

---

Ancient Israel : I. The Literary Formation of Genesis and Exodus 1-23 JSOTSup 55 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 53-55, and Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*, 62-64.

[22] Gunkel's basic position is that in literature there are three aspects - that is, a characteristic content, a definite linguistic form, and life setting (*Sitz im Leben*) – reacting against a purely particularist way of looking at the texts. Yet, the question remains, in literature, do these three aspects strictly cohere with one another as Gunkel suggests? Can a certain idea be expressed in more than one linguistic form and under different external conditions? Is there a clear classification and only one that is appropriate for the biblical text? Gunkel's mistaken belief in the regularity of genres on an oral level produced a special, historical twist in his study. Over the last several decades it has ultimately become apparent that the form criticism, as a tool for reconstructing early forms, has little basis for speculative reconstructions because of its rejection of the simplicity of oral forms.

[23] However, some critics have recently suggested that Genesis is clearly more than a collection of diverse elements (e.g., J. P. Fokkelman, "Genesis," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, eds. R. Alter & F. Kermode [Glasgow & Cambridge: William Collins Sons & Co/Belknap, 1987], 36-55; E. Fox, "Can Genesis Be Read as a Book?" *Semeia* 46 [1989]: 31-40; T. L. Brodie, *Genesis as Dialogue: A Literary, Historical, and Theological Commentary* [Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2001a], 5-25). They argue that, despite its complexity and diversity, Genesis is a single unified text, not a collection of disparate episodes.

[24] In this respect, to give an extreme example, Speiser's, *Genesis*, AB1 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964), 293-94, comments are representative. Some scholars, however, have pointed out the failure of assertions, which seek to dissociate the narrative sections which comprise Genesis; see, Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*; Warner, "Primitive Saga Men," 335, and Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch*, 133-219.

[25] For they basically allege that "Genesis is a rich composite of many different oral traditions, written sources, and editorial hands" so that they "can identify scores of different literary genres deriving from as many sociological settings" as Mann stated. The main reasons for rejecting unity of the book are

of Genesis would seem to have a unique tendency to highlight apparent discrepancies and to attribute repetition to different sources reflecting actual historical events and authorial situations (cf. von Rad 1972:119-121; Speiser 1964:54-56).

This type of exegesis, which not only attempts to explain the unproblematic parts of texts on the basis of their present state but also the ambiguous parts of these texts on the basis of earlier oral and written stages, however, is often unsatisfactory and leaves the need for an approach which takes as its object the text in its final form and in relation to its (intended) functioning with respect to a certain reading public or religious community. Thus, two aspects can be described about the weakness in such a reading:

1. It is the lack of appreciation for their relationship to the many other episodes that comprise the rest of the book (cf, Muilenburg 1969:4; Polzin 1975:82-83).[26]

---

sixfold:

A. Variation in style and language in the description of creation (Gen 1:1-2:4a and 2:4b-24);
B. Variation in the name of God (Gen 1:1-2:4a – "God"; Gen 2:4b-Genesis 3 – "YHWH God"; Gen 4:1-16 – "YHWH");
C. Variation in viewpoint or theology (Gen 1:1-2:4a – God's elevation and distantness; Gen 2:4b-4:16 – God's anthropomorphic);
D. Repetitions and doublets (Gen 45:3-4 – Joseph's revealing his identity; Gen 12:10-20; Genesis 20; Gen 26:1-11 – episodes about an endangered wife);
E. Internal contradictions (Gen 38:25-28, 36 – the description of the passers-by [Ishmaelites/Midianites] in the sale of Joseph); cf. A. F. Campbell & M. A. O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introduction, Annotations* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993), 225;
F. The diversity of stories in content and especially in form: Genesis seems episodic that is like a series of stories or episodes. The stories in Genesis are diverse in content, and even more so in form, because of the dynamics of oral tradition. Genesis therefore can be perceived as a disparate collection of orally transmitted stories (cf. H. Gunkel, *The Stories of Genesis. A translation of the introduction to the third expanded edition [1910] of Gunkel's commentary on Genesis. With an added introduction by the translator, J. J. Scullion* [Vallejo: Bibal, 1994], 63-92.

[26] Eissefeldt in his work, *Die kleinste literarische Einheit in den Erzählungsbüchern des Alten Testaments* Kleine Schriften I (Tübingen, JCB Mohr, 1962), 49, had emphasized the necessity of studying the inter-relationships between text sections in Genesis rather than simply to multiply these sections by repeatedly dividing the text.

2. By concentrating on the genetic development of the text material, there is a tendency to neglect the compositional strategy by an author or a composer.[27]

Happily, in this regards, the final form of the book of Genesis currently receives more attention and the traditional idea of a somewhat haphazard arrangement is being questioned (Adar 1990:9; Baker 1980:197-215; Cassuto 1973:197-215; Dahlberg 1976:360-367, 1982:126-133; Fokkelman 1987:36-55; Fox 1989:31-40; Greenstein 1982:114-125; Sarna 1981:76-82). This paradigmatic shift is due partly to the fact that the gains of atomistic methods like form criticism have begun to diminish. However, on the one hand, it is now appropriate to turn to a kind of historical-critical method that goes more clearly beyond the older orientations, while, on the other, accepting useful insights that have been reached by work within them.[28]

1.1.1. Aim and Objectives

As discerned above, it must be acknowledged that historical-critical approach in exegesis has tended to ignore the question of why Genesis was composed, and why the larger and smaller narrative units in the book should be understood within the compositional strategy of the entire Pentateuch. These questions, indeed, are as

---

[27] As stated earlier in this work the aim of using form criticism is to reconstruct the early *Sitz im Leben* (i.e., 'life setting) of a specific literary unity. When using form critical tools in the analysis of textuality of a passage, however, the aim is always the *Sitz im Text* (i.e., 'text setting'). Thus, D. W. Baker, "Diversity and Unity in the Literary Structure of Genesis," in *Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives*, eds. A. R. Millard & D. J. Wiseman (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 189, asserts that each passage must be seen in its objective *Sitz im Text* before it can be studied in its often more vague and subjective *Sitz im Leben*. Isolating a distinct literary form is of value only to the extent that it elucidates the present text strategy. Cf. M. Kessler, "A Methodological Setting for Rhetorical Criticism," *Semitics* (1974): 22-36. In conjunction with the idea, along with some eclectic methodologies (i.e., intertextuality and the narrative approach), composition criticism as a pivotal method for this study will be discussed in greater detail in the section of the methodological considerations.

[28] On the basic interpretive stance of this work, see n. 27.

important as the issue of how Genesis originated.[29] To be sure, there are good reasons for a historical-critical approach, due to the fact that the Abraham narrative offers several textual tensions and transitions which are likely to be explained from different sources and textual layers. However, as Westermann (1980:57) fittingly observed, "the various types of presentation in the Abraham narrative reveals a surprising organization that cannot simply be written off an accidental," despite his thorough form critical and, a tradition-historical approach of the patriarchal cycles under the rubric of "promises to the fathers." In other words, each section maintains its own integrity in terms of both structural (i.e., consistent and chiastic) and thematic aspects (i.e., the blessing of the descendant and the land). This fact reflects an indication of an architectonic whole, which means that, far form being a mere collection of traditions about Israel's beginning, the book is a text of considerable layering that has been scrupulously knit together with artistic tools of a high caliber.[30] In the sense, John H Sailhamer's language (1992:24-25) is apt:

> To sustain a realistic understanding of the book's unity, an appreciation of the nature of its composition and an understanding of its structure are necessary.[31]

In this regard, one, in this study, may indicate not merely the traditional approach's twist in a total lack of comprehensive planning in the composition of the Pentateuch,

---

[29] Thus, this question is not so much about the parts or various layers of the text, but rather how the parts hold together and provide coherence to the whole. This is to recognize the structure of the composition, "the configuration of its component part," how language and rhetorical devices (like parallelism, repetition and verbal registers) are used to illustrate sequence and movement of the text in the unfolding of its inner development. Cf. J. Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *JBL* 88 (1969): 11.

[30] The consistent overlapping structures, that is, chiasms, spiraling (or tapering) stories, double dramas, and diptychs, are indications in varying ways that the structures of Genesis are complex, but they are so consistent that they are indicate well-wrought unity – complex and sophisticated. See, Brodie, *Genesis as Dialogue: A Literary*, 11-35.

[31] Sailhamer's such an interpretive suggestion will form the background to this work concerning the exegetical analysis of the Abraham narrative.

but also offers a hermeneutical and theological view of the Abraham narrative (Gen 11:27-25:11) in a more balanced reading of the Scripture.[32] For this reason, the center of the claim of this work, which is in some respects the point of disagreement with the traditional approaches that emphasize the division of a text into its constituent parts, basically is the contention that biblical texts should be studied as wholes.[33]

In such a fundamental interpretive premise, the primary emphasis of this study is on reading text as a seamless narrative, which renders the representation of its own world (cf. Barr 1976:1-17; Frye 1981:39-50, 64-65; Wicker 1975).[34] The method employed in the present work, thus, will be to analyze the narrative text in its received form; in other words, no interest will be taken in the source-critical or traditio-critical facets of

---

[32] In fact this work is an exegetical attempt of biblical exegesis in the way of combining exegetical methods into a cluster of methods within a comprehensive exegetical approach in which one method supplements the other and one step serves to verify the findings of the precious one (cf. J. A. Loader, "Gedagtes oor gekontroleerde eksegese," *HTS*[1] 34 [1978]: 1-11).

[33] Yet this work does not agree with some of the more radical proponents of the approach (e.g., D. Robertson, "Literature, the Bible as," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Sup. vol [Nashville: Abingdon, 1976], 548, and M. Weiss, *The Bible from Within: The method of Total Interpretation* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1984], 1-46) that downplay traditional approaches. There is no denial that the text has a prehistory, enquiry into which is legitimate. Nor is it ahistorical, inasmuch as it seeks to establish the meaning of the final form given by the author or composer as an ancient Israelite text. As W. G. Plaut, *The Torah: A Modern Commentary* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congressions, 1981), xxiii, pointed out, what is important to do interpretation of the text is a balanced reading balance. In this sense, Coats, *From Canaan to Egypt*, 59, has suggested that the analytic and synthetic approaches to the biblical material can be integrated in its structure to complement one another in order to arrive at a better understanding of the text, admitting that these two methods are quite distinctive. Cf. B. W. Anderson, "From Analysis to Synthesis: The Interpretation of Genesis 1-11," *JBL* 97 (1978): 38. Coats has recognized the importance of integrating these two methods in terms of "functional unity." By combining these two methods, the structural form of the final (received) text can be used as a useful guide for source analysis. Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, 156-57, also recognized the value of form and structure as a control for source analysis, but he confused this issue by directly equating the concepts of 'form' and 'structure' with 'form-criticism'. In any case, although a thorough examination of this hermeneutical premise that biblical text must be understood overall is part of a theological prolegomena that somewhat lies outside the scope of the present work here, it is accepted as a necessary, basic proposal to clear new ground in defining and in affecting the nature and the task of doing Old Testament theology. Old Testament theology is a restatement and explication of God's revelation, since God has revealed himself in ways that can be observed and restated in more or less precise language. It, in this sense, is a study and presentation of what is revealed in the Old Testament (cf. Sailhamer, *Old Testament Theology*, 16-17).

[34] In other words, it means that the key purpose of this work is to clarify the criteria for claiming that one known text depends on another.

chapter, but in its final canonical form (cf. Clines 1997). The goal is not reconstructing the 'sources' from which the Abraham narrative may have derived but rather the role that these various collections of narrative units play in the overall compositional strategy of the final form of the book of Genesis and the remainder of the Pentateuch. How and why has the author/composer put them where they are within the text? This study is concerned with the question of composition and literary strategy. For this exegetical stance presupposes that Genesis is both a document composed (written) and a unified narrative.

Accordingly, this study proceeds on the hypothesis that the Abraham narrative, in the final form of Genesis, functions as a synthetic interaction between the other texts in Genesis and the rest of the texts in the Pentateuch at semantic, textual and theological levels. The thesis is based on the observation that various elements contained in the narrative interact narratively within the entire structure of the Pentateuch (in some respects despite the diversities with the rest of the Patriarchal narrative) in both its forms and the characters.[35] For this, it is necessary to attempt to describe the semantics of the arrangement of source materials in the book of Genesis at first. The aim of this study, therefore, is to trace the narrative function of the Abraham narrative within the overall compositional strategy of the Pentateuch and the theological perspective of the author/ the final composer.

[35] For a different characteristic of the narratives in Genesis, see, Fox, "Can Genesis Be Read as a Book?," 32-33.

1.1.2. Central Theoretical Argument

This study, in fact, began with an interest in the striking similarities between the Abraham narrative and the remainder accounts in Genesis, (also including the rest of the text of the Pentateuch) in terms of semantic, textual, and theological dimensions, and in the question whether these textual relevancies had anything to say about the composition of the Pentateuch. Since the striking parallelisms[36] (or the abundance of intra- and inter-texts) [inter]textually appear in these narrative parts,[37] it seemed instructive to track them in terms of the compositional strategy for contributing to a better understand its role in Genesis and in the Pentateuch. These remarkable interrelations and cross-references between narratives primarily reflect closed thematic relevancies.

---

[36] In a stricter sense of intertextuality the reader perceives similarities and these function as signs pointing to the intertextual relationship between the texts. In this sense, an inventory of the repetitions that can be made in compared texts might be read as signs, iconic pointers to intertextuality relationships. On the one hand, a text components in a general sense of intertextuality are viewed as in indices as sings that are directly and causally determined by earlier texts. For detailed information, see pp. 26-39.

[37] As above mentioned, the text of the Abraham narrative can be approached as single literary units composed of many smaller units of texts. By interweaving these literary units of text, it is possible to trace a discernible compositional strategy, which reflects the basic hermeneutic of the author/composer of the Pentateuch thematizing his basic message or his theology. This literary strategy can be found at various levels within the pentateuchal narrative. In this regard, Sailhamer, *Old Testament Theology*, 206-15 (cf. S. Schmidt, *Texttheorie, Probleme einer Linguistik der sprachlichen Kommunikation* [Muenchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976], 150) distinguishes three kinds of their own cohesive nature of strategy according to the scale of the literary units in the text, called in-, inner-, inter-, and con-textuality. Sailhamer's in-textuality and con-textuality, broadly speaking, can be categorized into intra-/inter-textuality, therefore two levels of textual relations (and thus two phrases in the analysis of any given text) is acknowledged (cf. J. M Lotman, *Die Struktur literarischer Texte* [übersetzt von Rolf-Dietrich Keil] [München: Wilhelm Fink, 1972], 81-91). These are:

1) Intratextulaity: it implies of *all textual relations within* a given text, which mean that a text consist of different building blocks that contribute separately, but also through their interrelatedness, towards the meaning of the text (cf. Lotman, *Die Struktur literarischer Texte*, 81-91).
2) Intertextuality: it denotes of the relationship between a given text and other, similar, texts. it indicates that no text is an island but belongs to a web or matrix of texts that is expanding with every new utterance. Intertextuality thus is not merely referring to the interconnections among texts, but signifying the shared webs of meaning and association that enable communication between people (cf. P. K. Tull, "Rhetorical Criticism and Intertextuality," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, eds. S. L. McKenzie & S. R. Haynes [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999], 165).

The crucial themes to the composition of the Abraham narrative are the divine promises of posterity (Gen 12:2; 15:4; 17:16; 18:10-15), of land (Gen 12:2, 7; 13:14, 15, 17; 15:7-12; 17;8; 22:17; 24:7), of numerous descendants (Gen 12:1-3; 13:16; 15:5; 16:10; 17:5, 6, 16, 20; 18:18; 21:13, 18) and of blessing (Gen 12:2-3; 17:16, 20; 22:17). Although the basic theme of the narrative, however, is the promise of Abraham's inheritor (Wager 1972:138),[38] the most significant aspect is that the Abraham narrative contains all these thematic elements that the Pentateuch has suggested. Have the themes been randomly combined together? The various themes, which are decisive factors to form the plot underlying the cycle, obviously perform important function in terms of providing striking link between the narratives in Genesis and in the Pentateuch. Thus in its present form the Abraham cycle must be considered an integral part within the larger literary framework of the Pentateuch. The two kinds of hermeneutical methods (i.e., the composition approach and intertextuality), which are employed in this study, will be useful to reflect this proposal to verify that the narrative has the abundance intra and inter-textual interrelatedness.

1.2. Methodological Considerations

Taking the adage 'let the text speak for itself' as its point of departure, this study focuses on the question how narrative units in the Abraham cycle are played by texts in Genesis and in the larger literary units in the Pentateuch.[39] The idea suggests that this

---

[38] Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch*, 48-50, sees the primary theme in Genesis 12-50 is the promises of the prosperity, he regards the thematic elements of the land as a subsidiary one, with the divine relationship.

[39] As stated in the earlier section, this is premised on the striking similarities (i.e. the author's/the composer's intertextuality) between the Abraham narrative and the rest of Genesis, even including the

study seeks primarily to interpret the final form of the text as the locus of revelation, that is, text-oriented[40] (Frei 1974; cf. von Rad[41] 1962).[42] Along the way, this work

---

Pentateuch. Every single word, phrase, and clause comes in to play as part of a larger interconnected whole. Every part is construed in a specific and particular way as a meaningful, integral piece of the text. Thus, text-oriented interpretation focuses on the intertextual relations motivated by the parts of the text in compositional strategies. Meanwhile, the justification for this option fundamentally begins with an acceptance of the notion of the Abraham narrative is an inspired text (2 Tim 3:16). Although biblical scholars from the period before the rise of historical criticism in the eighteenth century, holding belief in the inspiration of Scripture often, unfortunately, went unnoticed or became a foil within the context of what later came to be known as new historical methodology (or criticism), there remains much that must be considered worthwhile theological reflections on the unique problems of the OT. See, H-J. Kraus, *Die Biblische Theologue: Ihre Geschichte und Problematik* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), 93. In this regard, S. Holthaus, *Fundamentalisms in Deutschland, Der Kampf um die Biblel im Protestantisms des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Bonn: Verlag fü Kultur und Wissenschaft, 1993), 140-44, specially describes the views of conservative biblical scholars and theologians. For a further brief, historical survey of the study of OT theology in the eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, see J. H. Hayes & F. Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History and Development* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 2-34, 36-71, 136-42) as well as Kraus, *Die Biblische Theologue*, 17-18.

[40] The text-oriented theory, so-called, as an objective theory of interpretation as opposed to a mimetic or expressive theory appeared in 1940's as a reaction against the extreme cases of the traditional approach (i.e., the historical approach). Text-oriented theory studies every thing but the work of literature itself (cf. J. Barton, "Classifying Biblical Criticism," *JSOT* 29 [1984], 19-35). Here on the account of limited space, the brief description of text-oriented theory will be simplistic with two typical major schools of the theory: *New Criticism* and *Structuralism*. New Criticism may be traced to the work, 'The New Criticism' by John Crowe Ransom in 1941 and faded as the dominant force in literary studies in the late 1950s. It basically views that the author's intention and background are unimportant to the critic who regards the literary text as an artifact or verbal icon because the literary work is self-sufficient. In this sense, the self-sufficiency of the literary text implies the denial of the author. In addition, it demands a close reading of the text (see, M Weiss' work, *The Bible from Within*) in order to analyze the complex interrelationships within the work itself (cf. J. Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996]; Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*; D. M. Gunn, *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation* JSOTSup 6 [Sheffield: JSOT, 1978]; The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story JSOTSup 14 [Sheffield: JSOT, 1980]). Especially, Barton, *Reading the Old Testament*, 140-57 points out a close formal resemblance between B Childs' 'canonical method' and the principle of New Criticism, in terms of his treatment of biblical texts as self-sufficient and as understood within a literary tradition [or canon], even though he distances himself from any literary justification for his approach. Meanwhile, Structuralism as a diverse collection of methods, paradigms and personal preference (cf. V. S. Poythress, "Structuralism and Biblical Studies," *JETS* 21 [1978]: 221) and as general theory about human culture – language, social life, and art is of major importance in contemporary research on the biblical studies than New Criticism. It asserts that meaning is a function of the structure of a cultural system (Barton *Reading the Old Testament*, 112). What lends impetus to develop Structuralism in the area of literary criticism was the desire to be 'scientific' in order to provide literature with a method of analysis that could be demonstrated and repeated (R. C. Culley, "Exploring New Directions," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*, eds. D. A. Knight & G. M. Tucker [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], 174; cf. R. M. Polzin, *Biblical Structuralism: Method and Subjectivity in the Study of Ancient Texts* [Philadelphia & Missoula: Fortress & Scholars Press, 1977], 174). Structuralism, influenced by linguistics, derived its origin from Ferdinand de Saussure's (1857-1913) insight into the nature of the sign in linguistics (or semiotics) in his major work, *Cours de linguistique génerale* (Eng., Course in General Linguistics). He proposed a series of distinctions of the sign nature of language:

- *langue* as 'a system, an institution, a set of interpersonal rules and norms' (J. Culler, *Structuralist Poetics* [Ithaca: Cornel, 1975], 8).

- *parole* as an actual sentences used in writing or speaking.
- *signifier* – the word, or acoustical image.
- *signified* – the concept evoked by the signifier; syntagmatic analysis and paradigmatic analysis.

In this sense, Structuralism may be defined as the extension of the linguistic metaphor to other semiotic system. Literature is considered by structuralists to be a "second-order semiotic system," in that literary texts are constructed from language. Thus, the analogy between linguistics and literature leads to two major insights into the nature of literature: 'literary competence' and 'literature as systemic.'

The conception of literary competence may be traced back to Saussure's foundational distinction between *langue* and *parole* as stated above (Barton, *Reading the Old Testament*, 11-18; Culler, *Structuralist Poetics*, 9). Deep underlying structures may be discerned that cut across literature as a whole. These rules may be described 'literary conventions.' In short, authors (or writers) are not seen as original contributors to their work but as users of previous devices. Their work is a conglomeration of previous works. The meaning of a text resides in the conventional code, which has a public meaning, not in the author's intention or in the reader's preunderstanding (Culler, *Structuralist Poetics*, 9; cf. A. C. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980], 15-17). On the one hand, the notion of literature as systemic is another characteristic feature of structuralism in the name of *binarism*. It suggests that Structuralists look for functional oppositions (i.e., binarism) in whatever material they are studying. Since structuralists view that, like computers, the human brain perceives and processes data according to the principle of binarism (Barton, *Reading the Old Testament*, 111). Structuralism has emphasized prose narrative over against poetry. Structuralist study of plot and character in prose stories has had major impact on the analysis of biblical texts. The representative figures in the survey of structuralist approaches to prose narrative are Propp and Greimas. In, *Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. L. A. Wagner (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968), 21, Propp analyzes the folktale as consisting of two elements.

1. (seven) *roles* (or spheres of actions) – the villain, the donor, the helper, the sought-for person and her father, the dispatcher, the hero, and the false hero.
2. (thirty-one) *functions* as 'an act of a character defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of the action.

Greimas's analysis based on Propp's and influenced by Lévi-Strauss made an actantial model, which biblical scholars have particularly used (cf. E. V. McKnight, The Bible and the Reader: An introduction to literary criticism [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985], 49-58). Meanwhile, Lévi-Strauss described the oppositional character of Propp's 'spheres of action and referred to these spheres as *actants*.

Sender ⇒⇒⇒⇒ Object ⇒⇒⇒⇒ Receiver
⇑
Helper ⇒⇒⇒⇒ Subject ⇒⇒⇒⇒ Opponent

There is a benefit in the fact that these approaches focus on the text than on the author in interpretation. However, it is important to not that there is also danger in moving away from authorial intent. In fact, biblical interpreter do not have to choose between text's meaning and authorial intent. The absolute importance of both should and must be affirmed. All that is need is a more balanced reading of the Bible.

[41] By arguing the impossibility to speak of a historical event behind the biblical narratives, von Rad induces a fundamental reversal of the biblical theologian's attention from the historical focus of biblical theology to the narrative text. It does not mean that he excluded an historical event that served as the historical foundation of Israel's faith. He argued that the historical event is not the event referred to by the text but the actual process of referring by means of the text. In other words, for him a real historical event was the communication situation – that is *Traditionsgeschichte* – the process by which the Old Testament was formed.

[42] The text as a depiction of the event is the source of divine revelation in terms of giving an accurate access to the event. There are three motivations for attempting such a reading.

1. The words of Scripture and the biblical author's (or composer) intended meaning are the first and primary goal. The only way it is possible to access divine revelation now is by interpreting the inspired writers in the text of Scripture. A text is an embodiment of an author's intention, namely a strategy designed to convey the author's intention. In their work, R-A. de

investigates the structural features of linguistic actions of (or between) communication partners in the Abraham narrative with the rest of the Pentateuch (cf. Schmidt 1976:144). This approach offers an interpretation that aims to find (the meaning of) the narrative function of the cycle within the canonical context, and is also theological, i.e., takes into account the fact that the narrative is a coherent whole testifying to the promise of God.[43]

Seen within such a context, two methodological approaches in this study will be offered premise discovering the narrative function of the Abraham cycle. The first, composition approach, provides the compositional tactics mapped out by the author/composer for the recognition of narrative literary context of the Abraham narrative within the macro-structure and the micro-structure[44] of the Pentateuch.

Beaugrande and W. U. Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics* (London: Longman, 1981), 113-38, call this idea "acceptability" which means "intentionality" in texts. It lays emphasis on the reader's own cooperation in receiving a text as a cohesive and coherent unit plays a major role in textuality. The recent text theory regards a text as a system of signs bearing the information in an act of communication. Here the term *information* can be generally understood as any message, which the speaker intends to transmit to the hearer. Seen within such a context a text and its communication situation can be illustrated with the following diagram.

SPEAKER (author) ►►►► SIGN SYSTEM (text) ►►►► HEARER (reader)

2. If we may not be able to reconstruct prehistory for the text we must take seriously the fact that the written text as we have it in its final form is the locus of divine revelation insofar it represents what the author (or composer) intends it to mean (cf. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, trans. D. M. G. Stalker [New York & Edinburgh: Harper & Row & Oliver & Boyd, 1962].
3. The textual meaning is mediated through the verbal meaning of the language of the text (i.e., words as a *reference* to things [*res*]), which functions of the author's intention as it is realized in the rending of a particular text. To understand a text, one must read it.

[43] It is not intend, however, that the hermeneutical attempt employed in this study, however, is to be understood as the only possible way of interpreting texts (esp. Genesis). This is not a case of trading a suit of worn clothes (i.e. historical-critical hermeneutical approach to the Abraham narrative) for new fashionable garments (i.e. intertextuality). In short, this study is merely a forum for intertextual reading of the Abraham narrative.

[44] The 'macro-structure means the smaller literary sections, and the 'micro-structure' denotes the devices used to mark the internal divisions of text and indication of the unity (cf. Kessler, "Rhetorical Criticism," 22-36).

While second, the literary theory of intertextuality asks the right questions to discover textual correlations between the narrative and the rest of text in Genesis and in the Pentateuch.[45] Both methodologies deal with the final form of canonical text, look for harmony rather than diversity, and take seriously the notion that unity in the sum total of the book is possible. These have not been applied to the Abraham narrative in such a blended combination before. Such an understanding might be properly called a reformed-canonical proposal (or approach), which is similar to a ***pre-critical*** reading of the text (cf. Frei 1974:17-50, 90).[46]

1.2.1. Composition Criticism

The method (*Kompositionskritik*[47]) was coined by Ernst Haenchen (1968. *Der Weg*

---

[45] A fuller detailed discussion of the method will be provided in the following section.

[46] The understanding of biblical text reflects an attitude of taking the Bible at face value and reading it as it was originally intended, namely looking within the narrative text for its clues to meaning. Before the rise of historical criticism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Western Christian reading of the Bible was usually strongly realistic. In other words, the Bible was read literally and historically as a true and accurate account of God's acts in real historical events (H. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* [New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1974], 1). For the limited application by Frei on the aim of biblical realism, see Sternberg, *The Poetics of Bible Narrative*, 82. In the precritical view of Scripture, the course of the actual historical events (i.e., the historical events depicted by the biblical narratives [ostensive reference]) is precisely that which is depicted in the biblical narratives and is understood as such by the precritical reader. In short, the precritical reading is to find the meaning of the Bible in the biblical narratives themselves. However, it should be obviously noted here that for special revelation to be real history, there must be a providential link between the narrative text and the event. In this sense, the concept of divine providence is the matting that held together the depiction of events in the biblical narratives and the occurrence of those events in history. Meanwhile, a historical reading of the Bible is one, which looks for meaning beyond the narratives themselves to the events they recorded. Consequently, the focus shifted from the text to the event in terms of attempting to reconstruct historical events (cf. von Rad's argument, 1962). From this view, one can clearly see that there are fundamental differences between the critical and the precritical view of biblical narrative.

[47] Some German critics draw a distinction between 'literary criticism' and '*Kompositionskritik*.' While literary criticism is taken in a narrow sense as the analysis of single, usually brief literary units, Kompositionskritik is defined as the analysis of those larger texts composed of at least two preexisting (whether oral or written) units. In this respect it is likely that the defined 'composition' would occur at any of three stages:

1. At an oral or written state prior to adoption by a writer.

Jesu. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter; cf Moore 1989:4-7) in the 1960s is a hermeneutical attempt to depict how the various pieces fit into the whole (cf. Fohrer 1983:139ff). According to Soulen & Soulen (2001:38) this approach was used as an analytical method, where identifiable sources are present within a composition, to refer to the total effect of the redactional techniques employed by an author to investigate a redacted biblical text. In other words, it is an attempt to explain how partly literary and partly preliterary units were joined together and how the compositor made changes in the pre-existing material, and how and why he added his own. In this sense, it denotes a holistic variation of redaction criticism (*Redacktionskritik*). When composition criticism investigates the redactional treatment of units or compositions and their function in larger works or books, it becomes virtually identical with redaction criticism. However, the composition approach here must be distinguished from redaction criticism, even though the latter may concern itself with the text's final form. For redaction criticism asks after the redactor's purpose in composing the text from the determined extent and nature of the various redactional elements within a text, while the composition approach treats the composition as a whole.[48]

This analysis of a literary composition works on the premise that the text's purpose is reflected in its composition. The idea implies that the author's (or composer's) intended motif and meaning determine the structure and content in the shape of the work (cf. Eissefeldt 1965:156-157; Knierim 1985:395-415). Consequently, it attempts to describe the semantics of the arrangement of various source materials in the biblical

---

2. At the time when the writer joins the units together in the process of composition.
3. When a 'redactor' reworks a text, adding material to a preexisting literary unit.

[48] In New Testament studies, this method has representatively employed by R. F. O'Toole, *The Unity of Like's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984) for the study of Luke-Acts.

text in terms of describing how the various pieces fit into the whole.[49] That is, it is trying to trace the ways the biblical writers organized and fashioned literary units into complete unified literary texts and whole books, as well as to understand the theological characteristics of the smaller and larger compositions and the direction, goal, and tendency of an author/a composer of the whole finished work (Fohrer 1983:142). Thus, it is an approach to trace the literary strategy of text that was employed by an author/composer to interweave these smaller literary parts into a whole throughout the entire work.[50] In this sense, it may be conceded that in the compositional process, the author/composer of Genesis would have used certain existing literary materials (or records) as were generally known, which were of reliable authority in his time, and also interweave them into his narrative conformably with that unity of design which so manifestly pervades the entire work (Jamieson, Fausset &

---

[49] Actually, there is little agreement in the study of Pentateuch regarding the origin and diversity of raw materials, in particular, their hypothetical shape and extent in each book. Currently, however, there is a growing consensus among scholars today on the nature of the material in its present shape and that these five books exhibit a unified structure with a common purpose. In the recent years, the attention of biblical scholarship has focused as much on textual strategies in the Pentateuch as on textual strata, instead of source criticism, which had long been dominated in the study of Genesis (and well as in the Pentateuchal studies). For more information of this notion, see E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* BZAW 189 (Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1990), 1ff; G. Fohrer, *Exegese des Alter Testaments* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1983), 139ff; R. P. Knierm, "Criticism of Literary Features, Form, Tradition and Redaction," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*, eds. Tucker, G & Knight, D (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; Chico, Calif: Scholars, 1985), 123-65.

[50] Composition criticism asks the two basic questions:

1. What are the steps of composition?
2. What is the function of the units within the composition?

It may seek to determine the theological content of the various units (for they can vary greatly) along with perspective and intention. In this respect, Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 34-35, in his work suggests some crucial aspects to trace the compositional strategy of a author:

1. What methods and techniques does an author employ in producing a final text?
2. What large units of text has the author employed to build the final text?
3. What functions do the individual units within the final text play in the light of the completed whole?
4. Does the author give any final touches to the text that determine how the text will be read and received?
5. What is the religious and theological viewpoint of the final text?

Thus, the strategy is the key to grasp a theological denotation of text.

Brown 1945:1:xxxii, xxxv; cf. Harrison 1969:543-553).

R. Alter defines this kind of literary analysis as a study of the "artful use of language … the kind of disciplined attention, in other words, which through a whole spectrum of critical approaches has illuminated, for example, the poetry of Dante, the plays of Shakespeare, the novels of Tolstoy."[51] Such literary interpretations have often been applied to the narratives of Genesis.[52] Exemplary of this has been the early work of J. P. Fokkelman and more recently H. C. White's study in the function of narrative discourse in Genesis.[53]

This work is a hermeneutical enterprise to demonstrate the narrative nature of the Abraham cycle based on the approach of compositional criticism.[54] Employing the interpretive method, this study will attempt to show, that when viewed as a whole, the narrative is a single literary unit composed of many smaller units of episodes which are relating to the larger narrative units – narrative, poetry, and law codes – in the rest of Genesis and the Pentateuch, as explained earlier. In the interweaving of these parts into a whole, a discernible compositional strategy can be traced throughout the whole narrative. Several reflections of a narrative strategy can be traced in relation to the

---

[51] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 12-13.
[52] E.g., K. R. R. Gros Louis, et al., eds., *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narrative*, vol. I (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974), and Gros Louis & Ackerman, eds., ibid., vol. II (Nashville: Abingdon, 1982); R. Alter & F. Kermode, eds., *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987); A. Preminger & E. L. Greenstein, *The Hebrew Bible in Literary Criticism* (New York: Ungar, 1986); D. M. Gunn & D. N. Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
[53] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art in Genesis*; H. C. White, *Narration and Discourse in the Book of Genesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
[54] Obviously, redaction criticism, which considers how an author modified his source(s), proves extremely useful in studying Genesis where we know the sources he used, but it would be much less useful in tracing the compositional strategy of the author of the whole work. The author/composer of Genesis did compose the Abraham narrative, and he wove his ideas throughout the narrative within the whole narrative framework of the book. Therefore, the use of composition approach, which like literary criticism analyses the whole of an author's work, seems often to be the better method.

Abraham narrative in Genesis.[55]

1. **The textual function of the Terah's genealogy (Gen 11:27-32):**

   Terah's genealogy provides four kinds of information to understand the events in the life of Abraham which follow – the relevance of all individuals except "Iscah (Gen 11:29) to understand the events of the following narrative; the infertile of Sarah (Gen 11:30) with connection with the wordplay on Isaac's name (יצחק, he laughs – Gen 17:17; 18:12-13, 15; 19:14; 21:3, 6); the uncompleted journey to Canaan of the Abraham family; and listing only eight names, unlike a customary generations formula of listing tem names in order to anticipate the two sons of Abraham, Ishmael (Gen 16:15) and Isaac (Gen 21:3). From these details, it is apparent that the genealogy functions to provide the reader with the essential background for understanding the events of the narrative to follow.

2. **The narrative placement of the call of Abraham (Gen 12:1-9):**

   The episode is deliberately placed after the dispersion of the nations at Babylon (Gen 11:1-9) within the geographical setting of Ur of the Chaldeans, in order to picture Abraham's call as God's gift of salvation in the midst of judgment.[56]

---

[55] If one looks at these episodes below within the larger scope of the purpose of the Pentateuch, and the pains by the author/composer to construct a whole narrative out of just these smaller units of discourse, much more appears to lie in these passages. For a detained discussion of the reflections of a narrative strategy will be provided in chapter 3.

[56] Thus, the author/composer has arranged the episode of Abraham's call and blessing after an earlier account of a similar gift of salvation in the midst of judgment, the conclusion of the Flood narrative (Gen 8:15-19). In this view, Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 137-39, appropriately argues that by putting Abraham's call in the context of Ur of the Chaldeans the author of Genesis is trying to harmonize with the central view of the prophet in the later prophetic literature (Isa 13:19; 48:14; Jer 24:5; 25:12; 50:1, 8, 35, 45; 51:24, 54; Ezek 1:3; 12;13; 23:15, 23)

3. **The intentional alignment of the Abraham narrative with the reiterate passages regarding the divine blessing (Gen 9:1; 12:1-3; 13:15-16; 15:5, 18; 17:6-8; 18:9-19; 22:17-18; 25:11; 26:2-4; 27:27-29; 49:28; cf. Gen 1:28):**

   The author/composer emphasizes the central theme of Genesis, the promise of the way of life and blessing (Gen 1:28; cf. Gen 2:17 – the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; Gen 7:23 – the ark) though the narratives of Abraham and his posterity who are prefigured as a new beginning in God's plan of blessing.[57]

4. **The positioning of the Lot story (Genesis 13) between these two remarkably similar narratives of Abraham's telling a falsehood on his wife (Gen 12:10-20 and Genesis 20)[58]:**

   The arranging of the account of Lot between the similar story of Abraham's sojourn in Egypt (Gen 12:10-20[59]) and his sojourn in Gerar (Genesis 20) is

---

[57] By putting the reiteration of the blessing after the representative list of 'all humankind' in Genesis 10 and their dispersion as the result of Babylon's rebellion (Gen 11:1-9), the author/composer accentuates the fact that all the families of the earth shall be blessed, revealing the goal of Israel's existence (cf. von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," 66; cf. also n 107). In this context, the identity of the 'seed' of Abraham as a sign of the 'seed who is to come (Gen 49:8-12) will be one of the key themes of the following narratives. Cf. T. W. Mann, *The Book of the Torah: The Narrative Integrity of the Pentateuch* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1988), 29-31.

[58] For the intertextual relationship between two narratives, see, I. N. Rashkow, "Intertextuality, Transference, and the Reader in/of Genesis 12 and 20," in *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. D. N. Fewell (Louisville: Westminster & John Knox Press, 1992), 57-73.

[59] The composition of Gen 12:10-20 has been deliberately patterned to parallel the later account of God's deliverance of Israel from Egypt (Genesis 41-Exodus 12) to prefigure or foreshadow the events. Through such a compositional strategy, the author/composer intends to present the implications of God's past deeds with his chosen people. One might be called this narrative feature '*narrative typology*' which the future events are portrayed or foreshadowed as like the past events (cf. U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part II: From Noah to Abraham. A Commentary on Genesis VI9-XI32 with an appendix: a fragment of part III*, trans. I. Abrahams [Jerusalem: The Magnes Press & The Hebrew University, 1992], 334-44). Such a striking similarity, thus, is a part of a larger typological scheme. From this, Abraham is portrayed as a picture or type of the future of Israel. It is n this sense that

apparently as a kind of inclusio, a reflection of a compositional strategy.[60]

5. **The striking similarities between the introductions to both narratives of Abraham and Isaac (Gen 25:19-26):**

   The author/composer wove these two introductory part of stories as related with several contextual paralleling aspects to provide the essential setting of that four elements – the premature death of Haran (Gen 11:28) and Ishmael (Gen 25:17-18); the two key characters, Nahor (Gen 11:29; 24:15; 24), the grandfather of Rebekah, and Laban (Gen 25:20; 28:2), the father of Jacob, regarding the quest for a bride for Isaac and Jacob; the barrenness of the two women, Sarah (Gen 11:29-30; cf. Gen 15:2-3; 16:1; 17:17; 18:11-12) and Rebekah (Gen 25:20-21); the accompany, conflict[61] and separation,[62] Abraham and Lot (Gen 11:27; 13:7, 9, 11, 14), and Jacob and Esau (Gen 25:22-24; Genesis 25-28; Gen 25:23).

6. **The definite linkages between Lot's separation (Gen 13:7, 9, 11, 14) and**

---

typology is intertextual, because characters and scenes symbolically prefigure later events. For example, according to Rosenberg, "Biblical Narrative," in *Back to the Sources: Reading the Classic Jewish Texts*, ed. B. W. Holtz (New York: Summit, 1984), 51, "the descent of Abraham to Egypt in time of famine and his exit from Egypt with great wealth anticipate the events of the Exodus story." Thus, intertextuality exists on several levels, not only in narratives, which seem repetitive.

[60] For the study of narrative relationship between the episode of Lot's separation from Abraham (Gen 13) and the entire section of the Abraham narrative, and its significance, see L. R. Helyer, "The Separation of Abram and Lot: Its Significance in the Patriarchal Narratives," *JSOT* 26 (1983): 77-88.

[61] The conflict between brothers or within families (Genesis 4; Gen 9:20-27; 13:7-12; 21:9; 25:22; Genesis 29-31; 37-50) is a central motif in Genesis. Chapter 4 that describes the struggle between Cain and Abel has already foreshadowed a whole series of such conflicts within the book. The emphasis on enmity and struggle appears to stem from the first words of judgment in Genesis; namely, God's statement: "I will put enmity between your seed and her seed" (Gen 3:15).

[62] In particular, most importantly in these narratives are the striking verbal parallels between the narrative of the struggle, which arose between Abraham and Lot (Gen 13:6), and Jacob and Esau (Gen 36:7). Such a manner is one of many ways in which the author/composer carefully guides the reader toward the focus of his narrative, in order to reinforce of central theme of Genesis, the fulfillment of the blessing (Gen 1:28). In this regard, the both themes, 'blessing' and 'separation' centrally play to thrive the narrative purpose of the author/composer in Genesis.

the nations' separation at Babylon (Gen 11:1-9) and the judgment of the nations at Sodom (Genesis 19):

One can see a tie between Genesis 13 and Genesis 19 in Gen 13:10, which informs the state of Somdom and Gomorah before the destruction and Gen 13:12-13, which describes Lot's place in Sodom and the wickedness of Sodom's people against God. The linkage between Genesis 13 and the narrative event of the destruction of Babylon can also be detected in the similar description of the traveling in the same geographical direction, the journey eastward (מ קדם[63], Gen 11:1-2; 13:11).

7. **The verbal and thematic connection between God's calling Abraham (Gen 12:1-7) and that of Noah (Gen 8:15-20):**

In both narratives, calling Noah out of the ark and that of Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldeans, we see the remarkable ties. Abraham, like Noah, marks a new beginning as well as a return to God's original plan of blessing "all humankind" (Gen 1:28).

8. **The textual relationship between the birth of Ishmael (Genesis 16) and Hagar and Ishmael sent away (Gen 21:8-21):**

The author/composer's close attention to the textual relationship in the details

[63] Although it is still unclear how the reference to 'east' in Gen 2:8, which seems positive, is to be associated with the references to 'eastward' in the subsequent narratives, which are all to be taken negatively, several references to the notion of 'eastward' in Genesis is by and large connection with judgment and separation from God (e.g., Gen 3:24; 11:2; 13:11). He presents 'eastward' to be the direction of the city of Babylon (Gen 11:2) and the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 13:11) where human beings take in their search for a home. The author/composer is paying close attention to geography in working out his key themes.

of both Genesis 16 and 21 can best be seen by the frequent use of foreshadowing which allows him to draw connection between important narratives. The author/composer uses foreshadowing as a literary technique to develop his central themes in Genesis and he continually draws them to the reader's attention. In this case, the Lord's promise to Hagar (Gen 16:10-12) was recounted in a strikingly similar fashion to the actual fulfillment of the promise (Gen 21:18-21). Thus, the promise foreshadows the fulfillment.

THE PROMISE (16:10-12) ►►►► THE FULFILLMENT (21:18-21)

9. The relations between Genesis 13 and 14:

There appears but little connection between the two chapters on the surface, but in reality, several indications within Genesis 14 suggest that the author/composer intends the narrative to be read closely with Genesis 13. Shortly after reporting on what happened to Lot in the international war of the four kings (Gen 14:1-12), the narrative makes the reader's eye turn to Abraham's geographical situation in Hebron (Gen 14:13; cf. Gen 13:18). The geographical mention of 'Mamre' at the end of the narrative in Gen 14:24 is placed there to remind the reader of the last verse of Genesis 13. In putting these two narratives together in this way the author/composer appears to have deliberately illustrated the promise that, as stated early in Gen 12:3, those who accompany with Abraham (Gen 14:13) will be blessed (Gen 14:24), but those who separate from him (e.g., Lot in Gen 13:12), will be cursed as Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 14:11-12).

10. Several similarities between Abraham (Gen 12:10-20; 20:1-18) and Isaac

(Gen 26:6-11):

It can be argued that there are several textual ties between the events in Genesis 26 and those in the life of Abraham (Gen 12:10-20; 20:1-18). Each of the brief narratives in Genesis 26 portrays Isaac in a situation or circumstance that has a parallel in the life of Abraham. In Genesis 26, the author/composer precisely illustrates how Isaac's entire life was a repetition of that which happened to Abraham. It suggests that not only is the author/composer fully cognizant of the textual affinities, but also appears to use them to emphasize the central theme of divine faithfulness to his promises. From this viewpoint, we gain the following lesson: God's faithfulness in the past can be counted on in the present and the future.[64]

11. **The same covenant of promise to Abraham (Genesis 15) and Jacob (Genesis 28):**

In the two narratives, we find a remarkable similarity of divine confirmation of the promised blessing. The same covenant promises are given to both characters, Abraham and Jacob, in the very similar situation (cf. Gen 15:1, 12; 28:11-12) – the gift of the land, the promise of great posterity,[65] and blessing to all the nations. In a extremely similar fashion, both narratives look forward to the future 'exile' of Abraham's seed and the promise of a 'return.' From this, the promise was that God would not forsake them and would return His people to their land.

---

[64] A detailed investigation of the textual relevancies between the two narratives will be provided in chapter 3.
[65] In fact, the substance of the covenant is the promise of abundant descendants.

12. A thematic interplay between Genesis 17 and 34:

By contrasting the rite of circumcision with the deception of Shechem by Jacob's sons (i.e., Simeon and Levi), one becomes aware of the thematic interplay between two chapters. In Genesis 17 the rite of circumcision, which was originally given a sign of the covenant promise to Abraham to be the father of a multitude of nations (Gen 17:5), has become a sign of the unity of the covenant people and their separation from the rest of the nation. Thus, perversely, Jacob's sons carry out the rite on the Shechemites as a means for the two families to become 'one people' (Gen 34:16).

A further indication of this narrative interrelationship is the wordplay in the two chapters between the word אות [*sign*] (Gen 17:11) and אות [*consent* (of the two families to live as one people)] (Gen 34:15, 22-23). All of this reveals a larger thematic development within the Jacob narratives. The overall and ultimate purpose of these narratives is to show that, in spite of the fact that Jacob and his family's own plans and schemes ran counter to God's own, they could not thwart the eventual success of his intentions.

This fuller understanding of the literary strategies of the Abraham narrative helps the reader not merely to see the pivotal themes in the narrative, but also provides the means for an appreciation of the basic structure of the whole Pentateuch. These textual interrelationships can be understood in terms of both divine causality and divine retribution, both of which can be found in Genesis. To develop these two crucial aspects in Genesis (esp., the Abraham narrative) the author/composer employs three

major narrative techniques: recursion[66], contemporization[67] and foreshadowing[68] (Sailhamer 1993:110-117). It is obvious that an awareness of such narrative techniques enhance one's reading of the narrative placement of the Abraham cycle within the compositional strategies in the Pentateuch. The analysis of the compositional strategy of the narrative can then be executed at various levels[69] with the context of its

---

[66] It is a narrative technique in which the author deliberately shapes narrative events so that key elements of one narrative are repeated in others. An example of recursion in the Abraham narrative can be seen in the way in which the two stories of deceiving of Abimelech by Abraham in Negev (Genesis 20) and Isaac (Gen 26:1-11) in Gerar follow the same pattern and order as the earlier account of Abraham's tricking Pharaoh in Egypt (Gen 12:10-20). For further examples of recursion in Genesis, see the story of the restoration of the land after the great Flood (Gen 7:24-9:17), which follows the account of Creation in Genesis 1 in the respect of pattern and order, and the short narrative of Noah's drunkenness (Gen 9:18-27) which emulates the account of the Fall (Genesis 2-3). The implication of such similarities and recursions in narrative structure is that the narrative world depicted by these narratives also has this same design and purpose.

[67] In this technique, the past is often portrayed in light of events and institutions of the present. The story of Abraham's battle with the four kings from the East (Genesis 14) reflects the same concerns as those of Deut 20:1-15 (the instructions concerning carrying out wars with foreign nations) is a good instance of this narrative trait. As the detail of the narrative show, Abraham's dealing with the kings of the East in the after math of the battle and his response to the king of Sodom matches what would be expected of the Israelites from Deuteronomy 20. The sign given to Cain as divine protection (Gen 4:15-24) represents the provisions for the cities of refuge where there is the rule of law. Further detailed discussion of this issue will be given in chapter 3.

[68] This is a narrative technique in which a narrative recounts an event in such a way as to foreshadow and anticipate. In the note 30, this trait was also designated a narrative typology. This means that the events of the past anticipate the fulfillment of the event in the future. Thus, early things are read as pointers to the last things. However, the technique must be distinguished from recursion in terms of foreshadowing anticipates fulfillment and not mere repetition of the past. By means of foreshadowing, central themes are developed and continually drawn to the reader's attention, with the result that a further sense of purpose is added to the reader's understanding of events. From this point of view the account of Abraham's visit to Egypt (Gen 12:10-20) has been intentionally structured to shadow, or anticipate, the sojourn of the Israelite in Egypt (Genesis 41-Exodus 12).

[69] S. Bar-Efrat, "Some Observations on the Analysis of Structure in Biblical Narrative," *VT* 30 (1980): 157-70, presents four levels of structures:

A. *The verbal level* (based on **words** or **phrases**, e.g., the Creation account in Ge 1, and the narrative of Samson and Delilah in Judg 16:4-31).
B. *The level of narrative technique* (based on **variations** in narrative method – narrator's account as opposed to character's speech [dialogue] in the narrative of David and Achish at Aphek in 1 Sam 29:1-11; **scenic presentation versus summary** in the story of Samuel's birth in 1 Sam 1:1-2:11 and 2 Sam 11:2-27); **narration as against description**; **explanation**; **comment**.
C. *The level of the narrative world* – **characters** (its identity, nature [i.e., characteristics: virtuous versus vicious, hospitable versus inhospitable, loyal versus disloyal, fruitful versus barren] and function [i.e., distinctions: hero and opponent, assistants to either side, instigants, obstacles, pursuer and pursued] in the story); **events** (making up the plot which has a structure).
D. *The level of conceptual content* – the **themes** (defining the central issues of the narrative) and **ideas** (i.e., the meanings and lessons contained in the narrative) of the narrative

textuality (i.e., the cohesive nature of the strategy of the individual literary unit within the narrative).[70]

1.2.2. Intertextuality: A Theoretical Inquiry for Its Meaning and Praxis

All text (i.e., including any system of signs, not simply a literary text) has its own unique peculiarity, which means their inseparability from association with other texts. From this, a text thus is more than the sum of its words. It is designed to maximize its persuasive powers as a signifier to acquire meaning only when compared to a code already known. That is to say, the text assumes a network of anonymous prior texts whose origins and exact forms are, for all practical purposes, unknown or incidental (cf. Barthes 1977:156-161; Kristeva [Fr. 1969]1980:64-70). In this sense, the text has its integrity, sovereignty and individuality. In this broader understanding of text, all communication is seen as inherently 'intertextual,' which means that any act of communication always occurs in the context of other signs. This property of texts is known as 'intertextuality.' It is now a *sine qua non* of biblical scholarship that texts should never be interpreted in isolation.[71] In this section, we thus will discuss of the

---

[70] According to Schmidt, *Texttheorie, Probleme einer Linkguistik der sprachlichen Kommunikation*, 144, textuality as a distinct "illocutionary act" performed by a segment of a text is "structural features of socio-communicative (and thus linguistic) actions of or between communication partner." With regard to textuality in communication, A. B. Du Toit, "Die toekoms van die Skrifgesag in die moderne eksegese: 'n hoofsaaklik Nuwe-Testamentiese perspektief," *NGTT* (1990): 517-18, points out the important fact that "biblical science must not neglect the role of the text as the expression of the communicational meaning of the sender." In this regard it is necessary to uncover the nature of the communication that happens in the biblical texts as such (e.g., the Abraham narrative as the highest and most independent linguistic unit) and to show the underlying order and structure of those texts (cf. de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*; G. Brown & G. Yule, *Discourse Analysis* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983]).

[71] Intertextuality may have become a tool of the self-named 'new literary critics,' but even scholars who do not align themselves with the new literary school noted the importance of quotations and allusions in the biblical text itself and between the Bible and other ancient Near Eastern documents. For the New

nature and the development of intertextuality in current literary theory.

1.2.2.1. Historical survey of intertextuality: Its quickening and dissemination

As some circumspect scholars duly pointed out (cf. Muilenburg 1969:1-18; Robertson 1977:4-5), the birth of interest in intertextuality in biblical studies arose not from a revival of classical rhetoric or interaction with the 'new rhetoric,' but from dissatisfaction with historical-critical approaches of the Bible.[72] Aware of the shortcomings of historical-critical methods, some biblical scholars (e.g., Muilenburg who was a form critic whose perceived as limitation in the practice of form criticism.) have developed an interpretive enterprise alternative. As a result, in biblical studies, earlier biblical methods (esp. the objectivist claims of "Higher Criticism") have been challenged by literary methods, which question its authority to produce the interpretation of a particular text (cf. Boyarin 1990:12; Krause 1992:191).[73] The

---

Literary Criticism, see D. Clines and C. Exum, *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible* JSOTSup 143 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 11-25. Meanwhile, E. J. van Wolde, "Trendy Intertextuality," in Intertextuality in *Biblical Writings: Essays in honour of Bas Van Iersel*, ed. S. Draisma (Kampen: J H Kok, 1989, 43, believes that biblical scholars have produced "a number of biblical studies [that] seem innovative but, in fact, use intertextuality as a modern literary theoretical coat of veneer over the old comparative approach."

[72] As Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," fittingly pointed out, historical critics (esp., form critics) had neglected the texts' own unique qualities, i.e., failed the discernment of "the many and various devices by which the predications are formulated and ordered into a unified whole" (Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 8). In addition, as P. D. Miscall, "Isaiah: New Heavens, New Earth, New Book," in *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville: Westminster & John Knox Press, 1992), 41-42 and "A textual reader, and a texual writer," in *Semeia (Intertextuality and the Bible)*, eds. G. Aichele & G. A. Philips (1995), 6, pointed out formerly, although essentially intertextual in analysis of "textual borrowings," the individual historical-critical methods have inevitably resulted in a "loss of holistic dimensions of the text."

[73] The historicist assumes that a scholar can uncover an author's intentions, the sources of his/her ideas, and responses of contemporary readers. Key terms of this approach are "influence" (in which an earlier text has privileges over a later one for which it acts as a source) and "inspiration" (that conversely regards the later one as an innovative improvement over the previous one). As early as the 1940s, however, René Wellek and Austin Warren questioned the predominance of nineteenth-century influence studies by pointing out a dilemma in the historical investigation of a text: "There are simply no data in literary history which are completely neutral 'fact'" (T. Morgan, "Is there an intertext in the text?:

paradigm thus shift may inevitable (cf. Tull 1999:156-180).

In recent years the idea of intertextuality , as a self-conscious literary-critical approach, emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s and has in significant ways informed the practice of criticism and contemporary understandings of literary history in North America and Europe.[74] Intertextuality generally understood to connote the structural relations between two or more texts, has gained popularity, since the late 1960s, as an

---

Literary and interdisciplinary approaches to Intertextuality," *American Journal of Semiotics* 3 [1985], 1). This shift from historicism with its tracing of literary origins and sources of influence, to intertextuality marked, as Morgan notes, a dramatically different approach to literary studies (cf. M. Landwehr, "Introduction: literature and the visual arts; questions of influence and intertextuality," *CL* 2 [2002]: 2):

> By shifting our attention from the triangle of author/work/tradition to that of text/discourse/culture, intertextuality replaces the evolutionary model of literary history with a structural or synchronic model of literature as a sign system. The most salient effect of this strategic change is to free the literary text from psychological, sociological, and historical determinisms, opening it up to an apparently infinite play of relationships with other texts, or semiosis (Morgan, 1).

In this regard, as R. P. Carroll, "Intertextuality and the Book of Jeremiah: Animadversions on Text and Theory," in *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*, eds. D. J. A. Clines & C. Exum (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 76, notes, more traditional approaches might talk about 'echo', 'influence', 'borrowing', and 'quotation', though, to be fair to the concept of intertextuality. The following list of key concepts, which are interconnected with intertextuality, reveals that intertextual study is a multifaceted and elusive phenomenon indeed: quotation, source, influence, allusion, association, reminiscence, echo and reference. As D. Krause, "A Blessing Cursed: The Prophet's Prayer for Barren Womb and Dry Breasts in Hosea 9," in *Reading Between Texs: Intertextuality and the hebrew bible*, ed D. N. Fewell (Louisville: Westminster & John Knox Press, 1992), 191, mentioned, intertextual reading strategies are often double-edged. It is includes the fact that a particular text is placed in relationship with others to produce a fresh reading. Simultaneously this new reading is often aimed at displacing the text's dominant interpretation according to critical consensus. In connection with this perspective, Miscall, *Isaiah*, 44, insists that the relationship between two texts is equivocal in terms of 'acceptance and rejection,' 'recognition and denial,' 'understanding and misunderstanding,' and 'supporting and undermining.' Thus, he maintains, "to recognize that a text is related to another text is both to affirm and to deny the earlier text."

[74] M. Pfister, "How Postmodern Is Intertextuality?", in *Intertextuality* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 221, draws an important distinction between the deconstructivist theory of intertextuality of European vintage and the practice of intertextuality characteristic of American postmodernism:

> While Bakhtin, Kristeva and the Tel Quel group have evolved their theory of intertextuality in order to deconstruct the bourgeois ideology of the subject and to undermine all traditional certitudes and authorities, the "random cannibalism" (Jameson 1984) of the American postmodernist movement […] no longer threatens any authority; on the contrary, [it] is tolerated or even welcome by those in power, as it helps to take people's minds off those life-endangering facts, which are in the meantime eagerly brought about by them, backstage.

alternative strategy to studying literary texts that would serve as an antidote to historically oriented approaches (Harty 1985:1-13).[75] In late 1960s and early 1970s, intertextuality was associated with an antagonism towards the contemporary hermeneutical struggle, characterized by a crisis of representation, which could no longer guarantee meaning, centrality and reference (cf. Hatina 1999:30-31). Beginning in the late 1970s and early 1980s, biblical scholars have increasingly used the methods of intertextual studies to interpret biblical texts. In the 1980s, intertextuality, in particular, was systematized on the basis of reflection on the demerits of Kristeva's usage of intertextuality (which was thought to be too broad and not a systematized concept; see below).

In his work in 1919, "*Tradition and the Individual Talent*," T S Eliot, the progenitor of contemporary intertextual studies, challenged and reclaimed the conventional assumptions of the backdrop of Romantic theories of poetic inspiration and the genius

---

[75] In fact, the literary theory of intertextuality has been applied recently to Old Testament studies, where it has significantly broadened the horizons of investigation. However, we find a wide range of opinion among scholarship on the point of whether intertextuality as a hermeneutical method can be categorized or not (cf. S. E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scripture of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, eds. C. A. Evans & J. A. Sanders [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997], 84-85). D. C. Polaski, "Reflections on a Mosaic covenant: the eternal covenant (Isaiah 24:5) and intertextuality," *JSOT* 77 (1998): 58, firmly maintained that intertextuality is not so much a methodology as a theoretical term; or, rather, a theoretical term which may give birth to several different methodologies. In the same vein, I. Paul, "The Use of the Old Testament in Revelation 12," in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J L North*, ed. S. Moyise (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 259, also argues, "intertextuality, as an approach, does not provide a method for interpretation, so much as highlighting the importance of considering the relation between the new context and the old in interpreting allusion and citation." D. Clippinger, "Intertextuality," in *Encyclopedia of postmodernism*, eds. V. E. Taylor & C. E. Winguist (London: Routledge, 2001), 190, however, holds a different angle on this. According to him, intertextuality refers to both a 'method' of reading that juxtaposes texts in order to discover points of similarities and differences, as well as the belief that all texts and ideas are part and parcel of a fabric of historical, social, ideological, and textual relations. In this framework, intertextuality can be considered as a 'mind-set' in which a methodology is employed. Articles in Draisma's work, *Intertexuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in honour of Bas van Iersel* (Kampen, J H Kok, 1989) provide examples of a variety of applications of the theory of intertextuality. For the diversity of understanding of intertextuality, see Tuckett's introduction, "Intrroduction," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels, xiii-xxiv*, ed. C. M. Tuckett (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997).

of the poet, which claimed that the poet's originality is an expression of personality. His central thesis was that no poet or artist receives complete meaning in isolation, but must be set "among the dead" (1964:4). By doing so, he replaced the evolutionary model of influence with a model of literary interrelationships, because he conceived of literature as "a system of coequal, copresent texts" that hold "literature as history and literature as system" in balance (Morgan 1989:242). As a result, this emphasis on literature as a system of interrelated texts is his most lasting contribution to intertextual studies.[76] Here we may categorize a wide variety of methodologies employed by scholars in relation to studying intertextual relations in literary texts: philosophy and psychology, rhetorical criticism, and Semiotics.

1. The first category is the theories drew by Bloom (1973, 1975)[77] from modern philosophy and Freudian psychology in order to identify and explain the dynamics and motivations of literary borrowing. His study of "intra-poetic relationships" shares with Eliot similar conceptualizations of influence and the interaction of past and present in literary composition. In his view every reading of a text is a misreading the poetic precursors as a personal space, which is created by a new poet. Bloom depicts this misreading in terms of a Freudian struggle between fathers and sons. His psychological orientation leads him to focus on authorial intention.

[76] Eliot has two distinct observations in his subsequent intertextual studies. His first stream of intertextuality focuses on literary interrelationships and patterns of literary borrowing within literature proper. The other stream broadens the understanding of 'text' to include a variety of linguistic phenomena and thus studies the interrelationship of text and culture.
[77] See, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973) and *A Map of Misreading* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975).

2. A second methodology can be seen in the work of J Hollander (1989)[78], which belongs to the more general category of rhetorical criticism. He identifies allusions to and echoes of earlier poets in the work of their successors and studies the way those textual echoes create new meanings. For Hollander echo is understood as a rhetorical trope that establishes links between texts chronologically removed from one another. Under the general category of rhetorical approaches to intertextuality, one can also place studies that investigate the way various rhetorical figures are used (e.g., citation), the effects produced by literary borrowing, and the reader's experience of literary borrowing.

3. Finally, semiotic is a third methodology used to study intertextuality within literature proper. A semiotic approach basically focuses on text and culture.[79] Semiotics has a broader understanding of text differently from rhetorical and more traditional literary critics. They regard 'text' as a system of signs, not simply a literary text and thus any act of communication intertextually occurs in the context of other signs. Since the diverse approach to text and culture, semiotic approach splits into two divergent philosophical camps: the linguistic theory (R Jacobson) and the structural anthropology (C Lévi-Strauss), and the critical views on the stability of language and literature and the ambiguity and instability of communication (M Bakhtin, J Kristeva, J Culler, and J Derrida).

---

[78] See, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California, 1989).

[79] In the meantime, some semiotics (e.g., M. Riffaterre, *A Semiotics of Poetry* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978]) assume that intertextuality is operative in all literature, for they focus on the act of reading specific literary texts. For a thorough discussion of them, see, T. Morgan, "The Space of Intertextuality," in *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction*, eds. P. O'Donnell & R. C. Davis (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 262-71.

> With these literary critics, intertextuality becomes part of a broader deconstructionalist reading of literature.

Indeed, an understanding of how biblical authors have used certain (oral/written) precursors in creating their works, according to their own compositional strategy, must be considered central to a correct interpretation of their works.[80] Intertextuality employed as a methodological strategy in this study thus is a significant and valuable method for approaching the Abraham narrative. Because this periscope has such a rich and complex web of textual relations with the other biblical texts, an intertextual approach is essential for discerning how it represents the author's unique compositional strategies.[81]

Therefore, in the following subsection, some aspects of intertextuality will primarily be described in its general and specific senses. In this process of debate, one may to stress two things: that text obtains life and vitality because of their connections with other texts with which they share a particular world of meaning, as well as that each text has its own integrity, which must not be lost through any form of comparison.

1.2.2.2. Intertextuality, Its Origin and Variety: 'No Text Is an Island'

Although intertextuality has been presented as an alternative interpretive means in both a literary and hermeneutical category, few studies adequately reflect the complexity of

---

[80] In a sense, as M. A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press & Clarendon, 1985) maintains, the Hebrew Bible is full of examples of creative reinterpretations of earlier material.

[81] Biblical writers often cite passages in other parts of the Bible as they develop their own arguments and rhetoric. This Intertextuality creates a rich and complex web of relationships among biblical texts. Understanding how authors use the cited material is crucial to the interpretation of their work.

the field of intertextuality in literary discussions, relying instead on the reading strategies developed by a single literary critic, such as Julia Kristeva or Harold Bloom, who are much concerned with textuality[82] and intertextuality.[83]

---

[82] Textuality is basically indicated by According to J. Degenaar, "The text is an episode in an all-encompassing textuality," in *Acta Academica Supplementum 1, 3-21*. (Bloemfontain: University of Orange Free State, 1995), 11, textuality refers to the nature of being a text in a textual world in which signs are dynamically interrelated allowing for new connection to be made continually. Thus, a text will be defined as a communicative occurrence. From this textuality is basically indicated by seven standards. (de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Text Linguistics*, 3):

1) First standard of textuality is *cohesion* of grammar and syntax. "The components of the surface text (i.e., the actual words) are mutually connected within a sequence. The surface components depend upon each other according to grammatical forms and conventions, such that cohesion rests upon grammatical dependencies."
2) The second one is *coherence* at the semantic level. "The components of the textual world (i.e., the configuration of concepts, as a configuration of knowledge (cognitive content) and relations, the links between concepts, are mutually accessible and relevant. To put is concretely, the constituent themes of the text thus are meaningfully related so as to produce a thematic net which is woven out of the constituent themes of specific themes in a text.
3) The third standard of textuality is *intention (intentionality)* which concerns "the text producer's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the producers' intention" (e.g., legal texts).
4) Fourth is the standard of *acceptability* which concern "the text receiver's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text having some use or relevance for the receiver to acquire knowledge or provide co-operation in a plan."
5) The fifth standard is *informativity* since a text is not wholly redundant. It concerns "the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown/certain."
6) The sixth standard of textuality is *situalionality* because a text is directed to a situation. Basically it concerns "the factors which makes a text relevant to a situation of occurrence. The interpretation of the text thus is in some measure related to the situation which gave rise to it, namely, precisely depend on its situationality.
7) Finally is the seventh standard, intertextuality, the existence of a body of texts in some sense analogous to the text under consideration. It concerns "the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered text." Cf. A. C. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Bible Reading* (London: HarperCollins, 1992), 80-81.

For this study, the first three of these seven standards have particular importance. They are grammatical and syntactical cohesion, semantic coherence, and intentionality. That is to say, an author produces a communicative text consisting of related strings across which there are certain constants (e.g., proforms having identifiable antecedents) and with the meanings of the strings related so as to produce a topic or theme or thematic net.

[83] Charlesworth in his work, "Intertextuality: Isaiah 40:3 and the Serek Ha-Yahad," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A Sanders* (Leiden & New York: Köln: Brill, 1997), 199-200, presents some critics' works which use quite similar methodologies to intertextuality; J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London & Philadelphia: SCM & Trinity Press International, 1991); J. Licht, *Storytelling in the Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986). Licht argues, "repetitions and repetitive situations can be used to produce various mimetic effects in the narrative convention of the Hebrew Bible" (79); G. Schille, *Früchristliche Hymnen* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965).

The term of intertextuality, like modern literary and cultural theory itself, can be said to have its origins in twentieth-century linguistics, particularly in the seminal work of the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure.[84] This notion, however, also emerges from theories, which are more concerned, than de Saussure seems to be, with the existence of language within specific social situations. The history of the concept of intertextuality begins with the Russian literary theorist (formalist)[85] and philosopher, Mikhail M Bakhtin (1895-1975, writing mostly in the 1920s and 1930s, and died in 1975; cf. Lechte 1994:7-12). He initiated the concept[86] in the process of posing the question of the connection of literary texts with one another and with society. This was in contrast to contemporaries who plunged into the text-immanent approach. He introduced the notion of dialogicity (or dialogičnost), which means that someone who writes is not only led by text-internal considerations, but also enters into dialogue with other texts of the reader and reality. This understanding of dialogicity is to be situated within Bakhtin's general theory of language, in which linguistic expression and context are inextricably interlinked. Bakhtin regards context as a social, communicative situation, which is shared among people, and in which each utterance is in dialogue

---

[84] Saussure's emphasis on the systematic features of language establishes the relational nature of meaning and, thus of texts (see F. de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, ed. C. Bally & A. Sechehaye with the collaboration of A. Riedlinger, trans. And annotated R. Harris [London & Duckworth: BBC Books, 1983]).

[85] It is here necessary to state the divergence between the Russian theoreticians and French theoreticians. The former accentuates the preserving functions of the intertext, while the later views intertextuality as a decentralizing function. However, explicit intertextuality can carry with it both 'disruptive' and 'reconstructive' features. This double movement of disruption and regeneration is precisely its raison d' être of intertextuality. Cf. D. Boyarin, "Old wine in new bottles: intertexuality and Midrash," *PT* 8 (1987), 539-56.

[86] For greater understanding of this concept, several of M. Bakhtin's works, written in English, can be consulted: *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship*, trans. A. Wehrle (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978); *Dialogic Imagination*, trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981a); *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Theory and History of Literature 8, ed., trans. C. Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984); P. Morris, *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Voloshinov* (London: Edward Arnold, 1994).

with previous utterances. This dialogue gives rise to a text that forms a microcosm of polyphony or multivalency and is a reflection of earlier texts and of reality (cf. van Wolde 1997:426-427).

The work of Bakhtin, which influenced the theories of literature and language, is crucial here. In recent years, biblical scholarship has shown a growing interest in Bakhtin's work.[87] His thought was introduced to the West and employed by Julia Kristeva, and developed in theories of French (post) structuralists like Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida, and American postmodernists such as Stanley Fish and Harold Bloom.[88]

In the historical setting, the term, intertextuality as a technical literary term must be restricted to the so-called originators of the term, such as Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes, writing within the Parisian cultural revolution of the 1960s and 70s.[89] In fact,

---

[87] In her work, B. Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction SemeiaSt* 38 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 193-205, provides a list of scholars who employed Bakhtin's theory in their biblical studies. In addition, C. Newsom, "Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth," *JR* 76 (1996a): 292-94, and D. Olson, "Biblical Theology as Provisional Monologization: A Dialogue with Childs, Brueggemann, and Bakhtin," *BibInt* 6 (1998): 171, have made some suggestions of how Bakhtin's dialogical model could be of value for conceiving a biblical theology. In particular, Newsom proposes an important thesis: truth itself is dialogical (or dialogic), and much of the Bible is dialogical in nature. She maintains that the idea of dialogic truth helps to explain some of the most perplexing feature of biblical composition: the book of Job ("Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth," 297-98; *The Book of Job as Polyphonic Text. Paper delivered to the Society for OT Study, Winter meeting, Birmingham, England, January 4*, 1996b) and Genesis 1-11 as well as the patriarchal narratives ("Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth," 298-304, esp. 299).

[88] See, van Wolde's overview of the relation of Bakhtin to the broader field of intertextuality ("Intertextuality: Ruth in Dailogue with Tamar," in *A Feminist Comapnion to Reading the Bible: Approaches, Methods and Strategies*, eds. A. Brenner & C. Fontaine [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997b], 426-51). Meanwhile, Green identifies a number of areas where Bakhtin's thought might be especially valuable in terms of 'questions concerning history and genre' (*Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship*, 60-65).

[89] To put it concretely, Kristeva came to employ the concept of intertextuality in the 1960s in France, at a time of profound social upheaval and change (i.e., the time of political infighting between the French Communist and the Leftist Parties) similar to the way Bakhtin's notion of dialogism arose in the context of the Soviet cultural revolution of the twenties. It was in the setting of the *Tel Quel* circle – a radical socio-literary group that sought revolutionary change in French political and cultural life – that Kristeva coined this term as a means of revolutionizing notions of art, literature, and texts (as a way of writing (*écriture*), and as a productive and subversive process), and subjectivity (T. Moi, *Introduction to The*

it was through her work as a poststructuralist literary critic that Kristeva casually introduced the concept of intertextuality in 1967.[90] The fancy jargon not withstanding, she originally envisioned (and actually innovated) it as a new kind of hermeneutics. She gave a positive evaluation of Bakhtin because, he firstly replaced a static view of the text with a dynamic one (i.e., he did not study a text as something that stood on its own but as something that came about in relation to other texts). Thus, Kristeva, following Bakhtin, expressed the idea that a text stands in dialogue with other texts.[91] As a result, she coined the term 'intertextuality' in order to indicate that a text

---

Kristeva Reader by Julia Kristeva [Columbia: Columbia Unversity Press, 1986], 3-7; Pfister, "How Postmodern Is Intertextuality?," 211). The so-called *Tel Quelians* included Roland Barthes, Michael Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Marcelin Pleynet, Jean Ricardou, Julia Kristeva, and Philippe Sollers, among others, who were active both intellectually theory, the concept of intertextuality was inseparately connected with political idealism. The agenda was nothing less than the subversion of the bourgeois establishment through the empowerment of the reader (or critic) to resist and combat the literary and social tradition at large (H-P, Mai, "Bypassing Intertextuality," in *Intertextuality*, Research in Text Theory 15, ed. Plett [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1991], 41; cf. J. Kristeva, "Semiotics: A Critical Science and /or a Critique of Science," in *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. T. Moi (New York & Oxford: Columbia University Press & Basil Blackwell, 1986a), 75). In the late 1960s and early 70s, intertextuality was particularly associated with an antagonism toward the contemporary hermeneutical struggle, characterized by a crisis of representation which could no longer guarantee meaning, centrality, and reference. Thus, the historical context of Kristeva's work – which is also the social background of intertextuality – is significant for understanding the importance of the systemic and transformative character of intertextuality. From this historical background, one may epitomize the historical characteristic of Kristeva'work by three factors:

1) Her work finds its roots in Russian formalism but is "a kind of poststructuralist *avant la lette*" (Moi, *Kristeva Reader*, 3).
2) A second important factor in her work (and the poststructuralist movement in French) is its revolutionary character.
3) Her historical consciousness is a hallmark of the development of the theory of intertextuality. Thus, intertextuality is not some neutral literary mechanism, but rather, at heart, a means of ideological and cultural expression and of social transformation (G. Aichele & G. A. Philips, "Introduction: exegesis, eisegesis, intergesis," *Semeia* 69 [1995]: 7-18). The transformative role of intertextuality is most visible in the range of post-modern intertextual writers, who presuppose intertextuality as both the form and substance of post-modern writing. Hence, intertextuality is closely aligned with deconstruction in which language serves as the ground of existence and the world emerges as infinite text. Moreover, the poststructuralists' focus on the role of the reader creates immediate discord with the historical critics, who focus on the author and the written text.

[90] See, Kristeva, J. "Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman," *Critique* 33 (1967): 438-465; ET available as "Word, Dialogue and Novel," in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. L. S. Roudiez and trans. T. Gora & A. Jardine & L.S. Roudiez (New York; Columbia University Press, 1980a), 64-91; also in Moi, T. (ed.), *The Kristeva Reader*, 34-61.

[91] Basically, she states that every text is constructed like a mosaic of quotations; every text is an absorption and a transformation of another text.

intersects with other texts.[92] In addition, she attempted combining both Saussurean and Bakhtinian theories of language and literature, producing the first articulation of intertextuality theory in late 1960s (cf. Kristeva 1986).[93] The closest similarity with her concept of intertextuality is suggested by Féral (1980:275):

> From Bakhtin Kristeva borrows the contextualization of any signifying practice … in an historical or social frame. Attempting to replace the static subdivision of texts a model in which the literary structure does not merely exist, but elaborates itself in relationship to another structure, Bakhtin [postulated] that the word was no longer to be considered as a point of fixed meaning, but as a place – a place where various textual surfaces and networks … cross.

In this sense, it is the fact that intertextual relationships in the biblical text had not been recognized before the first work of Kristeva (1980 [Fr. 1969][94]; 1984 [Fr. 1974][95]) in the 1960s.

---

[92] Of Course, some critics even definitely deny any affinity between poststructuralism and Bakhtin's theories (e.g. A. Shukman, "Between Marxism and Formalism: The Stylistics of Mikhail Bakhtin," *Comparative Criticism* [1980], 223). Others merely assert a connection (C. M. Bové, "The Text as Dialogue in Bakhtin and Kristeva," *University of Ottawa Quarterly* [1983], 117-24). However, G. Pechey, "Bakhtin, Marxism, and Post-Structuralism," in *The Politics of Theory: Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature, July 1982*, 234-47, presents a contextual reading of Bakhtin, which helps to clarify his (Bakhtin's) relevance for Kristeva's poststructuralist, intertextual concept.

[93] Her work on Bakhtin occurred during a transitional period in modern literary and cultural theory. This transition is usually described in terms of a move from structuralism to poststructuralism. It is often characterized as one in which assertions of objectivity, scientific rigour, methodological stability and other highly rationalistic sounding terms are replaced by an emphasis on uncertainty, indeterminacy, incommunicability, subjectivity, desire, pleasure and play. G. Allen, *Intertextuality* (London & New York: Routledge, 2000), 217, provides useful information on poststructuralism in the glossary of his work:

> "Poststructuralist theorists argue that Saussurean structuralism did not provide scientific objectivity and methodological stability, but rather demonstrated the unstable nature of language and of meaning. Poststructuralists deny any demands for a scientific study of texts or cultural sign systems, and insist that all texts are polysemous."

In this sense, the concept of intertextuality has been employed initially and vigorously by the critics of poststructuralism critics to disrupt notions of meaning, while structuralism critics adopt the same term to locate and even fix literary meaning, as proof enough of its flexibility as a concept.

[94] See, *Desire in Language*, 66, cf. also 36, 86-87.

[95] See, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, trans. M. Waller (New York: Columbia University Press)

She coined the term to depict Bakhtin's concept of 'dialogic orientation'[96] in her seminal essay (in 1966) explaining his notion of dialogism[97] and carnivalization[98]. She scientifically expanded Bakhtin's notion of dialogism beyond the literary text to encompass all cultural formations (Kristeva 1986b:37). For Kristeva, intertextuality signals foremost, systemic relationships and process "the transposition of one (or

---

[96] 'Dialogic orientation' was Bakhtin's original term for what is now called 'intertextuality' (cf. T. Todorov, *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialgocial Principle*, trans. G. Wlad [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984], 62). Meanwhile, in his earlier work, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, originally published in 1929, Bakhtin argues, "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices is in fact the chief characteristic of Dostoevsky's novels." In his later work, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. C. Emerson & M. Holquist, trans. V. W. McGee. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986) and his essay, *Discourse in the Novel*, in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, eds. C. Emerson & M. Holquist, trans. M. Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981b), 259-422, he develops these ideas into a more comprehensive theory of literature. He further maintains that the notion of dialogue is not only limited to literature but also provides a model for truth and life itself (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 293). Within this theory of dialogue are, in a nutshell, six key points: 'dialogical' (Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 88; *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, 71, 72, 94, 106, 119-20, 124, 162; *The Dialogic Imagination*, 276, 284; cf G. S. Morson & C. Emerson, *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* [Standford: Stanford University Press 1990], 125-26), 'designer' (Bakhtin, *Discourse in the Novel*, 253; *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, 69, 125; Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship*, 33, 62-63; Morson & Emerson *Mikhail Bakhtin*, 232), 'great time' (Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, 4-5, 169-170) 're-accentuation' (Bakhtin, *Discourse in the Novel*, 409-10, 420-22; Morson & Emerson, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, 364-65), 'outsider' (Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, 6-7; Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship*, 41; Morson & Emerson, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, 230, 289), 'unfinalizable' (Bakhtin, *Dialogic Imagination*, 30; *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 166, 293; *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, 136-37; Morson & Emerson, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, 60, 228, 241; cf Olson, "Biblical Theology as Provisional Monologization," 172, 174). In conjunction with Bakhtin's view, Morgan, "Is there an intertext in the text?" 8-13, cites the following – "Each literary or aesthetic text produces a palimpsest, superimposing several other texts which are never completely hidden, but always hinted at." She explains that the literary palimpsest hovers between originality and imitation. Nevertheless, she judges "the idea that the other texts can be seen transparently through the centering text is highly dubious."

[97] The basic idea of Bakhtin's dialogism is that the open-ended, back-and-forth play between the text of the sender (subject), the text of the addressee (object), and the text of culture (cf. T. Beal, "Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production," in *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. D. N. Fewell [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992], 29-30). It is the characteristic epistemological mode of a world dominated by heteroglossia which is the base condition governing the operation of meaning in an utterance. In this sense, Bakhtin "refers to the idea that all utterances respond to previous utterances and are always addressed to other potential speakers, rather than occurring independently or in isolation." "Words always contain a dialogic quality, embodying a dialogue between different meanings and applications." Thus, Bakhtin's dialogism undermines "any argument for final and unquestionable positions, since every position within language is a space of dialogic forces rather than monologic truth (cf. Allen, *Intertexuality*, 211).

[98] The term "relates to Bakhtin's term 'dialogicism', and is opposed to notions of single meaning and unquestionable authority" (cf. Allen, *Intertexuality*, 211).

more) system(s) of sign[99] into another" (cf. 1984:60), "an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point a fixed meaning"[100] (cf. 1980:65; Mai 1991:47). To avoid any confusion with notions of literary borrowing (cf. Miscall 1992:41-43[101]) or poetic influence (cf. Eliot 1964:3-11[102]; Bloom 1973; 1984:3-14[103]), she understood the term intertextuality to describe every discourse, whether written or spoken. Drawing from Bakhtin, she asserts, "Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations;[104] any text is the absorption and transformation[105] of other texts"[106] (Kristeva 1980a:66). In her

---

[99] Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, 28, observes, "whereas the hermeneutical tradition tended to focus on processes of human understanding within life-worlds grounded in historical inter-subjectivity, semiotic approaches tend to focus on processes in which sign-systems become operative as sub-systems grounded in contextualizing frames of intertextuality."

[100] In contrast to the traditional hermeneutics (i.e., a work and author-oriented perspective) that hold literary works are something fit to be respected, something authoritative, she believed that meaning does not exist apart from meaning producers (i.e., readers or recipients).

[101] Cf. Speiser's discussion on borrowing, in Gen 1:1-2:4a, from Mesopotamian models (i.e., the *Enuma Elish*, the Babylonian creation story), and his conclusion of the differences and the critical position in conjunction with an exposition of the unique aspects and tenets of Israelite monotheism which can be forcefully expressed by being contrasted against the Mesopotamian beliefs (*Genesis*, 9-11).

[102] Especially see, Eliot's discussion of the conformity and continuity between the individual poet and precursive tradition ("Tradition and the Individual Talent," in *Selected Essays, 1917-1932* [New York: Harcourt & Brace & Jovanovich, 1964], 5). Also, see D. Penchansky's note on the "exchange of information between separate and seemingly independent texts" in time ("Staying the Night: Intertextuality in Genesis and Judges," in *Reading Between Texts: intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. D. N. Fewell [Louisville: Westminster & John Knox Press, 1992], 77).

[103] Cf. Bloom's psychoanalytic overtone in his theory of reading and writing (i.e., the poetic influence). Especially see, the relationship between Satan and God in Milton's Paradise Lost, and Christian supersessionism.

[104] This is derived from Bakhtin's fundamental idea of a text as multilayered mosaic quotations, forming a dialogical and polyphonous structure.

[105] In this regard, H. F. Plett, "Intertextualities," in *Intertextuality* Research in Text Theory 15, ed. H. F. Plett (Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1991:20-23) presents four transformations of intertextuality – that is, substitution, addition, subtraction, and permutation.

[106] In the poststructuralist's and deconstructionist's view, text is not restricted to written material as an object of textual criticism. It is a productive and subversive process. Kristeva's notion of text stems from her interdisciplinary fusion. She tried to fuse ideas from philosophy (Husserl/Derrida), political science (Marx/Althusser) and psychology (Freud/Lacan) with linguistic-structuralist approaches (Chomsky) and formal logic (cf. M. Adriaens, "Ideology and Literary Production: Kristeva's Poetics," in *Semiotics and Dialectics: Ideology and the Text*, ed. P. Zima [Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1981]); Mai, "Bypassing Intertextuality," 38. While she borrowed from these disciplines, at the same tine, she tried to subvert them. The notion of text is described by Kristeva ("The Bounded Text," in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. L. S. Roudiez [New York & Oxford: Columbia University Press & Basil Blackwell, 1980b], 36) as a "productivity" which means "first, that its relationship to the language in which it is situated is redistributive (destructive – constructive) […]; and second, that it is a permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another."

doctoral dissertation, she describes the term intertextuality as the transposition of one or several sign system(s) into another (Kristeva 1984:59-60). She thus eliminates the notion of authorial intention. For her, a text is permutation of texts,[107] the result of connection with other texts – the anterior literary corpus; it is an absorption of and a reply to another text (cf. Kristeva 1980a:69). With respect to the basic force of intertextuality, the "dialogical space of texts" of Kristeva (1980a:66) dynamites the autonomy and univocality of any particular text. It is for this reason that every text is polyvalent.[108] In this sense, intertextuality is inimical to current historical-critical inquiry. Consequently, Kristeva (1984:59-60) delineates two dimensions of intertextuality: 1) *the inner play* – that is 'the web of relations that produce the structure of the text (or the subject); 2) and *the outer play* – that is, the web of relations linking the text (subject) with other discourse' (1984:59-60).

In order to grasp the notion of intertextuality in a general sense, it is necessary to state the great differences between Bakhtin and Kristeva. Although Kristeva created the term intertextuality under Bakhtin's influence, major differences between them are evident. According to van Wolde (1997:427), Kristeva restricts intertextuality to the relationship between texts. Yet, she also extends the concept of text further and further so that reality also becomes a text. Meanwhile, Bakhtin is concerned with the relationship between text and reality, as well as with the relationship between texts –

---

[107] This idea, along with the concept of repetition, is one of intertextuality's characteristic features. The notion of transformation will be discussed in the next section, which describes intertextuality in a specific sense.

[108] In this, T. R. Hatina, "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is there a relationship?" *BI* 7 (1999): 29, presents three major characteristics of intertextuality in contrast to historical criticism: 1) the ideological context wherein the term was coined; 2) the inherently related concept of text; and 3) the distinction between influence and intertextuality.

intersection of texts and context.[109] In addition, whereas Bakhtin looks from the perspective of one text to other texts, Kristeva does not look from the text, but from within the "intertext" or "the book of the culture" of which a text forms a small part. Little by little, these differences between two have become bigger, because in the course of time the theories concerning intertextuality have been developed further by the French (post) structuralists (especially the members of the Tel Quel group [P Sollers, J Kristeva], J Derrida and R Barthes, and American postmodernists (S Fish, J Bloom and P De Man) into an ever vaguer concept. They insist that it is not the writer who is determinative of the intertext, but the reader. In their view, furthermore, they regard a text as an unending universe, from which no escape is possible. Everything is text and everything has become intertext. At this point intertext is the impossibility of living outside the unending, as Barthes (1977b:160-161; 1981:39)[110] maintained early. Within this unending universe, only the reader can make distinctions and giving meaning. Through their perspective, we realize that the phenomenon of intertextuality has gradually become, not merely general, but absolute as well. The concept of

[109] Bakhtin seems to be considered mainly with regard to other contexts: sociology, formalism, general literary theory etc (e.g., D. Carroll, "The Alterity of Discourse: Form, History, and the Question of the Political in M. M. Bakhtin," *Diacritics* 13 (1983): 65-83; M. Davidson, "Discourse in Poetry: Bakhtin and Extensions of the Dialogical," in *Code of Signals: Recent Writings in Poetics* (Berkeley: North Atlantic Books, 1983), 143-50; D. LaCapra, "Bakhtin, Marxism, and the Carnivalesque," in *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1983), 291-324; A. Swingewood, *Sociological Poetics and Aesthetic Theory* (Basingstoke & London: Macmillan, 1986); A. White, "Bakhtin, Sociolinguistics and Deconstruction," in *The Theory of Reading*, ed. F. Gloversmith (Brighton & Totowa, N J: Harvester Press & Barnes & Noble, 1984).

[110] According to D. Patte, *Ethics of biblical interpretation: a reevaluation* (Louisville: Westminster & John Knox Press, 1995), 95, Barthes not only distinguishes a text from a work, but also argued that the metaphor of the text is that of network. In Barthes' view, a text is a new tissue of past citations, that is, a text is a subjective construct: "the text is not a line of words but a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash" ("The death of the author, and from work to text," in *Image-music-text: essays selected*, ed., trans. S. Heath [London, Fontana, 1997], 146). A text is, therefore, not an objective reality, but a subjective composition of which the existence is fleeting and forever changing. For him, in a strict sense, a text is constituted only in the moment of its reading. The reader's own readings, experiences and position within the cultural formation form crucial intertexts. In this view, Barthes does not limit intertextuality to anterior texts. Meanwhile, according to him a work is the image of an organism, which grows by vital expansion, by development.

intertextuality has broadly developed into an idea in which everything becomes an intertext. Nothing functions as a distinct concept anymore, but as a general philosophical statement. It suggests that Bakhtin's emphasis on text production in interaction with other texts and with reality has become completely displaced in favour of an all-embracing view of text.

At two points, one should like to criticize the very broad view of intertextuality found with Kristeva and other critics in terms of the vagueness of the term, and the opposition between the unending universe of the text and the individual intertextual manner of reading (cf. Van Peer 1987:16-18). As van Wolde (1997:429) points out "The term 'intertextuality' can function only as an instrument of analysis and an explanatory model when it is defined more closely, and (the repetition of) the elements to which it refers are well articulated." It seems not very important to observe a few arbitrary repetitions or intertexts in such an unending universe, just as there in no point in distinguishing individual drops of water in a wide river. From this, intertextuality is useful in clarifying the fact that a text is a differential one, as well as a self-contained structure. In addition it can only be meaningful when its later conceptual vagueness and universalization is limited, because it is necessarily a more restricted notion of intertextuality for a productive use of it.

1.2.2.3. The Limited Sense of Intertextuality

In recent years, discussions of intertextuality in biblical studies have come increasingly into vogue. At the same time, it is equally evident that competing and confusing

definitions of this poststructuralist[111] theoretical term, 'intertextuality,' are being employed.[112] In fact, the term cannot be contained or restricted because the linguistic phenomenon to which it points and the socio-literary contexts in which it occurs are large, more diffuse, and untraceable than any single definition or attribution could contain (cf. Plett 1991:3-29).[113]

In its broad sense, it is obvious that intertextuality refers primarily not to a text's dependence on another specific text but to its larger dependence on a whole cultural context (cf. Culler 1981:100-118). It is also worth noting that, in recent literary study, intertextuality[114] refers to "the fact that in any given use of language – text is intelligible only because and in terms of its interconnection with prior uses and understandings of its constituent metaphors, concepts, images, and symbolic world, etc" (Soulen & Soulen 2001:87-88; cf. O'Day 1990:259).

However, intertextuality can be defined in a specific sense as demonstrable relationships between texts (e.g., repetitions, cf. Riffaterre 1978). These demonstrable

---

[111] For detailed information on poststructuralism [ist], see Allen's view, n. 93 in p. 43.

[112] Cf. R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); Draisma, *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*; C. A. Evans & S. Talmon, *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A Sanders* Biblical Interpretation Series 28 (Leiden & Boston & Köln: Brill, 1997); and see also K. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), especially the chapter 3. While the term's origin can easily be traced, its use among contemporary literary theorists and critics is diverse (cf. Plett, "Intertextualities," 3).

[113] The boundless dissemination of intertextuality can be explained by two reasons: 1) it has been developed in poststructuralism as a theoretical rather than a methodological term (cf. J. Culler, "Presupposition and Intertextuality," *MLN* [1976]: 1383-384) and 2) the term has been subjected to the very phenomenon it describes which means that it will not stay within the bounds of any definition, but continually spills over (cf. J. Derrida, *Dissemination*, trans. B. Johnson [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981]). Because of its literal expansiveness, P. D. Miscall, "Isaiah," 43-45, regards it as a "covering term" for various approaches to reading texts in relation to other texts.

[114] Etymologically, the term stems from the Latin *texere* ('to weave') and *intertexere* ('to weave into,' or 'to intermix by weaving'), and is a sort of coinage in English formed under pressure from French *intertextualié*. Thus, R. Barthes, "The death of the author," 161, expresses that "the metaphor of the text is that of the next work." A text is a web, fabric, or network (cf. E. R. Harty, "Text, context, intertext," *JLS* 1 (1985): 1-6).

relationships are usually based on a kind of repetition. It is not a question of repetitions of sounds and words, since these are necessary for any form of language use, but a question of the repetition of sentences and texts or parts of texts. In addition, intertextuality is based on transformations. In these aspects, intertextuality can thus be defined as the potential transferability of utterances (sentences or text fragments) beyond the borders of the text, and their assimilation in new text structures" (Van Peer 1987:20). In consequence, repetition and transformation are intertextuality's two major characteristic features. At the same time, intertextuality has two distinctive visions: 'text production' and 'text reception.' The notion of intertextuality can be diagrammatised by the following figure (cf. van Wolde 1997:430):

Intertextuality: Text Production	Intertextuality: Text Reception
Writer	Reader
diachronic	synchronic
sources	functions
causality	analogy
indexicality (i.e., indexical signs)	iconicity (i.e., iconic signs)
compulsory relations	potential relations

As stated above, a text is not only imported into other texts, but also absorbed by later one. When this happen, an intertextual relationship could be approached from two perspectives: from the original text (genotext/architext),[115] or from the later text

[115] Since nineteenth century, biblical exegesis (i.e., historical-critical exegesis – esp. tradition, source, and redaction approach) has deemed a text as something, which is produced by one or more authors or editors. These exegetical approaches have concentrated upon the origin of the text and the intention of the author. In other words, they aim not merely to search for the oral or written sources and traditions, but also to investigate how they have been used by the writer as genotexts – the influences of sources. The same applies to many comparative studies, in which extra-biblical texts are often studied as

(phenotext). In this view, intertextuality is a phenomenon that is operative both in the ***production*** or in the writing process of a text, and in the ***reception*** or reading of a text.

In the view of the productive intertextuality, the presumed historical process (i.e., diachronic; e.g., historical-critical exegesis) is the most important consideration. Thus, from the diachronic standpoint, the writer has central importance, because he/she has used other texts in his or her writing, and has indicated these explicitly or implicitly, by means of quotations (or echoes[116]), allusions and so forth. The reader, then, knows or discovers which texts the author used when writing, because they form the very foundation of the origins of the text. In this case, the form of intertextuality is essentially historical in nature. From this, it is obvious that the text components are in fact viewed as indices (i.e., as signs), and, thus, are directly and causally determined by earlier texts.[117]

In the second view of the receptive intertextuality, the final text, which is compared with other texts in synchronic relationships, is significant. In contrast with the

---

genotexts of biblical texts. These approaches have been concerned to recover the intention of the author by identifying the sources the writer has used and the intentional and historical relationships are considered to be compelling for the reader. In contrast to these older methodologies, intertextuality enables us to understand a text as a complex network both within itself as well as without in relation to other texts which are not only pretexts to it but intertexts to many others (cf. W. S. Vorster, "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Iersel*, ed. S. Draisma [Kampen: Kok, 1989], 15-26).

[116] Echoes in this work will be strictly defined as words in the quotation that appear either just prior to or just after the line in which the quotation appear. See, J. Hollander, *The Figure of Echo*, Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 14-21 and J. C. Beker, "Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, eds. C. A. Evans & J. A. Sanders JSNTSup 83; SSEJC 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 64-69. Beker rightly urges us towards constraint in the use of "echoes" so that those which are thunderous are not confused with those that are subliminal. In this sense, intertextuality helps scholars to understand the form, scope, and purpose of a finely chiselled literary unit of the Abraham cycle. Intertextuality thus performs a service to exegesis similar to that provided by rhetoric (cf. B. L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 21).

[117] Causality is always based on 'tangentiality' or indexicality, that is to say, on the actually existing connection or contiguity between signs and reality, or between signs or texts themselves. By calling one text a source and the other a text influenced by the source, the text components in the biblical texts were viewed as indexical signs.

productive intertextuality, the principle of causality is rejected; its place is taken by the principle of analogy. Words are viewed as iconic signs[118] which infers the principle that phenomena are analogous or isomorphic (cf. van Wolde 1989:43-49; 1994:160-199, esp. 165-168).[119] In this way, similar and different texts are explained as being indirectly related to each other and having a similar or iconic quality or image in common.[120] In such a case, the intertextual reading is a synchronic reading. By putting two texts side by side, the reader becomes aware of the analogies (repetitions and transformations) between the texts. The reader, then, is in the central position, based on the idea that it is the reader who allows the texts to interfere with one another (cf. Rashkow 1992:57-73). Intertextual relationships that are intertextual in the second meaning of the word are specific to the extent that they are more suited to text relationships than Kristeva's general understanding of intertextuality, but at the same time less restricted than the necessary indexical relationships, because they are free or possible (i.e., potential) relationship. The reader perceives similarities and lets these function as possible ways of (or as signs pointing to) relating texts to one another. In

---

[118] Signs, iconic pointers to intertextual relationships, can be classified according to two qualities – stylistic and semantic nature, and narratological feature. Stylistic and semantic nature is comprised of:

1. The repetitions of words and semantic fields which refer to identical or similar areas of meaning;
2. Repetitions of larger textual units or structures (e.g., similarities in stylistic structures, in temporal of spatial arrangements, in sentences, in discourses or ways of expression);
3. Similarities in theme or genre, which create analogies in textual backgrounds.

Narratological feature can be described such as:

1. Analogies in character descriptions or in character types;
2. Similarities in actions or series of actions;
3. Similar narratological representations, meaning, the ways in which the narrator represents actions of the characters (cf. E. J. van Wolde, "Intertextuality: Ruth in Dialogue with Tamar," in *A Feminist Companion to Reading the Bible*, eds A. Brenner & C. Fontaine [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, 432-33).

[119] Indexicality, on the other hand, works on the basis of the cause-effect sequence. Iconicity works on the basis of simultaneity and analogy.

[120] That is to say, agreements or differences in texts are not expounded from the point of view of direct causal or diachronic influence, but from a communal picture or similarity (iconic quality).

short, intertextuality is, in a specific sense, based on iconicity, synchronicity and the interaction between texts and reader.

In conclusion, intertextuality provides a more coherent methodology that opens up new vistas and perceptions of the originating force and creativity of a text, as well as its literary world (Clayton & Rothstein 1991:3; cf. Miscall 1992:43). The task of biblical exegesis is to focus on a particular text, without losing perspective of the social and literary context. Thus, we can understand the putative author and so comprehend his or her meaning, by careful, judicious, and where possible, perspicacious use of historical and philological methods (as well as other methods, such as sociology). We must avoid myopic a myopic focus on methodology in the concerted effort "to place textual and intertextual concerns within a comprehensive theoretical framework" (see, Phillips 1991:78-97). We must also see what is before us, a particular text, and not simply understand it as a mirror image of another text or family of texts. A text must be seen, first and foremost, as a distinct (if not necessarily unique) text, with its own integrity. Its own, unique voice must be heard, even if intertextuality helps us hear it within a chorus of supporting voices. Intertextuality must not become a substitute for older faithful methods, but an additional method in biblical historical criticism; and it must be employed using criteria and data provided only by the text. Thus, intertextuality must be used conservatively and with carefully defined criteria. Accordingly, the present work shall add intertextuality to another method, the composition approach, illustrated earlier.[121] However, this new literary method will be employed in a narrow sense. It is hoped that this work will demonstrate how this approach can create a

[121] As M. A. Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 1, states: "The field of biblical criticism knows no methodology that circumvents the act of reading or hearing the text."

greater appreciation for the literary qualities of the Abraham narrative.

1.3. Summary and Sequence

This study is an exegetical investigation of the Abraham narrative to trace the literary compositional strategy of it in the narrative structure of the Pentateuchal corpora, by attempting to analyze and describe its structure and the semantics of the arrangement of source material in the periscope as stated earlier. The greatest concern in this study thus is about the role of the literary unit played in the compositional strategy of the author/the final composer of the Pentateuch as a whole; the most interest in this thesis is to understand how these different literary units are compositionally arranged as the final form and related to each other. In order to read the Abraham narrative the two kind of methodology have employed, composition criticism and intertextuality. In terms of the narrative strategy, the author/the final composer employed some narrative techniques presented in Genesis: recursion, contemporization and foreshadowing (Sailhamer 1995:292).[122] On the one hand, it helps us to see not simply the lesson taught by the text; it also provides the means for appreciating the basic narrative structure not mere to the Abraham narrative, but to the whole Pentateuch. On the other hand, it will reveal textual interrelatedness between texts. This interpretive enterprise implies that the conscious decision in this work has been made to focus on the transmitted canonical the Abraham text and treat it as coherent, literary units,

[122] The narrative techniques used in the Book of Genesis are recursion, contemporization and foreshadowing. Recursion is the composer's/the author's deliberate shaping of narrative events so that key elements of one narrative are repeated in others (e.g., the same pattern in Genesis 1 and Gen 7:24-9:17).

regardless of the original processes that may have brought the various strata into existence.[123] Put another way, the main concern is with the aesthetic qualities of the final form of the Abraham narrative, as it now exists. The study, thus, will be an exegetical proposal to the biblical text as holistic approach in an analytical, integrative, and thematic fashion (Chap. 1).

The following chapters thus examine in detail determining of the inner literary arrangement of the Abraham narrative in the narrative frame of Genesis and the Pentateuch as well (Chap. 2). It is followed by a discussion of the inner textual integrity of logic, syntax, and historical milieu of the Abraham narrative (Chap. 3), and intertextual relationships of the periscope by syntactically examining of the texts at semantic and thematic level (Chap. 4). Primarily, attention is given in these two chapters (Chap. 3 and 4) to the theories and methods of composition criticism and intertextuality, with attempts made to carry out these methods on the compositional strategy. The theological considerations of the narrative proceed by these scrutinized intra/inter-textual examination of the texts. The final chapter (Chap. 5) summarizes some of the advantages of applying the method to the narrative and some exegetical suggestions in terms of pre-critical angle.

---

[123] Theories related to the probable text, sources and redacted elements of the Book of Genesis, see, J. Barton, "Form Criticism (OT)," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York, New York: Doubleday, 1992a), 2:838-41; "Redaction Criticism (OT)," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York, New York: Doubleday, 1992b), 5:644-47; "Source Criticism (OT)," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York, New York: Doubleday, 1992c), 6:162-65; T. B. Dozeman, "OT Rhetorical Criticism," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D.N. Freedman (New York, New York: Doubleday, 1992), 5:712-15; H. Gunkel, *Genesis*, Mercer Library of Biblical Studies trans. M.E. Biddle (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1997), xlviii-lxxxvi; D. M. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 62-77; J. H. Sailhamer, "Genesis," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1990), 2:6-10.