

וְאֲנִי לֹא אֶחָד מֵעַלְמֵי
הָעֵיזִר הַגְּדוֹלָה אֲשֶׁר
יִשְׁבְּבוּהָ הָרַבָּה מִשְׁתַּ



Journal of
HEBREW SCRIPTURES



VOLUME 22 | ARTICLE 6

COOPER SMITH

*Inner-Biblical Allusion and the
Direction of Dependence: Toward a
Comprehensive List of Criteria*

Articles in JHS are being indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, RAMBI, and BiBIL. Their abstracts appear in Religious and Theological Abstracts. The journal is archived by Library and Archives Canada and is accessible for consultation and research at the Electronic Collection site maintained by Library and Archives Canada.

ISSN 1203-1542 <http://www.jhsonline.org> and <http://purl.org/jhs>

INNER-BIBLICAL ALLUSION AND THE DIRECTION OF DEPENDENCE: TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF CRITERIA

COOPER SMITH

TRINITY EVANGELICAL DIVINITY SCHOOL

“Nothing is more difficult . . . than from a *mere* comparison of parallel passages to determine on which side the priority lies.”¹ Written over a century ago, these words from S. R. Driver ring true today. In many cases the combination of shared lexemes, similar syntax, and conceptual correspondence make it likely that one text in the Hebrew Bible is directly borrowing from another. Even where such a literary relationship can be reasonably established, it is difficult to determine which text is the prior source and which is the later borrower. Despite the interpretive benefits of determining the direction of dependence in cases of putative inner-biblical allusion, there is no agreed-upon set of criteria that can be used for this purpose.² Richard Schultz makes the same claim regarding borrowing in Isaiah: “Despite the attention given to such intertextual connections, consensus over criteria for determining the direction of borrowing remains elusive.”³ Due to this lack of clear and decisive criteria for

¹ S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 6th ed. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1897), 312, emphasis original.

² *Inner-biblical allusion* refers to cases where biblical authors repeat portions of earlier biblical texts and where such reuse is intended to be recognized by the audience for a communicative purpose. Disagreement persists over the terminology with proposals including echo, allusion, quotation, inner-biblical exegesis, and intertextuality. For others who use the term inner-biblical allusion, see Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, eds., *Bringing Out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14*, JSOTSup 370 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2003); G. Brooke Lester, “Inner-Biblical Allusion,” *TbLib* 2 (2009): 89–93; Ziony Zevit, “Echoes of Texts Past,” in *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible* ed. Ziony Zevit (Sheffield: Equinox, 2001), 1–21. For a treatment of allusion as a literary device, see Ziva Ben-Porat, “The Poetics of Literary Allusion,” *PTL* 1 (1978): 105–28; Carmela Perri, “On Alluding,” *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289–307; William Irwin, “What Is an Allusion?” *JAAC* 59 (2001): 287–97; Gregory Machacek, “Allusion,” *PMLA* 122 (2007): 522–36.

³ Richard L. Schultz, “Isaianic Intertextuality and Intratextuality as Composition-Historical Indicators: Methodological Challenges in

determining the direction of dependence, Lyle Eslinger eschews any attempt at determining priority and instead champions a reader-centered approach.⁴ In response, Benjamin Sommer admits the difficulty in demonstrating that one biblical text draws on another, but Sommer urges against a “flight to the synchronic” and instead calls for “the careful construction of an argument” to, first, attest that borrowing exists before, second, discerning the genetic relationship.⁵

But what means are available to construct such an argument for textual dependence? What is needed is an agreed-upon set of valid criteria for determining the direction of borrowing once a literary relationship between two biblical texts is reckoned. To make progress toward establishing a comprehensive list, this study will catalog, illustrate, and evaluate eight criteria used to substantiate a claimed direction of dependence in cases of inner-biblical allusion between Isaiah and other books in the Hebrew Bible. The goal is to make three contributions to studies of inner-biblical allusion. First, by collating criteria used by others, the list will be more expansive than those offered previously. Second, identifying and categorizing the various arguments used in Isaianic scholarship provides a viable means to argue for the direction of dependence in investigations of literary dependence across the Hebrew Bible. Third, I will analyze the relative strength of each criterion in order to discern its persuasive potential. This study brings methodological clarity when claiming a direction of borrowing by increasing descriptive precision.

In previous lists of criteria for a direction of dependence, criteria pertaining to the text under consideration are listed and analyzed. But unless the examined instances of borrowing employ every valid criterion for determining the direction of dependence, such studies imply the existence of additional valid criteria that do not obtain in the case at hand.⁶

Four examples from across the Hebrew Bible will be representative. In an insightful study, Jeffery Leonard offers six questions that aid the task of discerning the direction of dependence between

Determining Literary Influence,” in *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*, ed. Daniel I. Block and Richard L. Schultz (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015), 37. For a similar claim regarding the Pentateuch, see David Carr, “Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34,11–26 and Its Parallels,” in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10*, ed. Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum, WGT 18 (Gütersloh, Germany: Chr. Kaiser, 2001), 107–108.

⁴Lyle Eslinger, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category,” *VT* 42 (1992): 47–58.

⁵Benjamin Sommer, “Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A Response to Lyle Eslinger,” *VT* 46 (1996): 489.

⁶For example, William Tooman recognizes his criteria for dependence in Ezekiel 38–39 derive from the text at hand and are not comprehensive (*Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39*, FAT-2 52 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 24).

Psalm 78 and the Pentateuch.⁷ Similarly, Michael Lyons articulates four criteria that he uses to determine which text is the borrower in his study of Ezekiel's use of the Holiness Code.⁸ For his investigation into Job's use of Psalms, Will Kynes recognizes prior attempts to provide lists of criteria, but he opts for simplicity by reducing them to two, which he asserts "basically encompasses them all."⁹ Finally, John Harvey articulates eight criteria he uses to discern a direction of dependence between the Deuteronomistic History and Genesis–Numbers.¹⁰

These scholars helpfully define the criteria relevant to their own study, and the arguments have applicability for future investigations. However, these proposals are not comprehensive. For example, Leonard's questions do not account for Criteria 5, 7, and 8 below. Additionally, Lyons includes Criterion 8 (unlike Leonard), but his criteria of "modification" and "interpretive expansion" are species of Criterion 6. Thus, Lyons accounts only for three of the eight criteria discussed here (Criteria 2, 6, and 8).¹¹ While Kynes' concern for clarity and simplicity is laudable, his two categories are most suited to Criteria 6, 7, and 8. As a result, it is unlikely that Criteria 1–5 (especially 2 and 4) would be obvious to someone operating under Kynes' categories. Finally, Harvey's framework touches on seven of the eight criteria here, but he omits Criterion 6 and includes only species of Criteria 1, 3, and 5 without recognizing the broader ways these three criteria can be employed.

This situation raises the question of strength. Were certain arguments for textual dependence omitted in these studies due to a perceived inherent weakness in their plausibility? While such a situation is possible, it is nowhere stated. Neither Leonard, Lyons, Kynes, nor Harvey claims to be comprehensive nor do they consider and then dismiss other criteria that do not relate to their case at hand. Admittedly, the following is true: 1) certain interpreters will find some criteria more or less compelling than others and 2) individual uses of each criterion can be more or less persuasive in specific cases. Nevertheless, as will be shown below, each criterion is valid when certain situations obtain and can be used to marshal a convincing argument for a direction of borrowing. Minimally, each criterion discussed below has been deemed compelling by multiple interpreters

⁷Jeffery Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case," *JBL* 127 (2008): 258–64.

⁸Michael Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 59–67.

⁹Will Kynes, *My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job's Dialogue with the Psalms*, BZAW 437 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 53.

¹⁰John Harvey, *Retelling the Torah: The Deuteronomistic Historian's Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives*, LHBOTS 403 (New York: Bloomsbury, 2004), 42–53.

¹¹David Carr critiques Lyons, in part, for not including Criterion 4 in his analysis (*The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2011], 301n101).

to discern the direction of dependence. Thus, even if certain criteria are dismissed by some because of a perceived inherent weakness, there is still benefit in collating these arguments together since each criterion is used regularly in the field to argue for a direction of borrowing and can be so used in additional studies.

The discrepancies between the stated criteria of Leonard, Lyons, Kynes, and Harvey highlight the need for and benefit of the present study. Identifying and cataloging the various arguments used by others allows for a more extensive collection of useful criteria than any individual proposal since previous studies only examine criteria that obtain in their given case. Further, an expansive list of valid criteria can prompt creativity by suggesting potentially relevant arguments for interpreters to determine the genetic relationship of parallel texts. Thus, the current study is a methodological contribution by cataloguing and analyzing the available criteria for determining a direction of dependence that may exist in instances of inner-biblical allusion.

LIMITATIONS AND METHOD

The criteria below were derived by examining many studies that address the direction of borrowing in cases of Isaianic allusions.¹² The arguments claiming a direction of dependence were identified, categorized, and found to be one of eight types. All eight criteria can be found in four monographs that have proven their significance in the field by being regularly cited: *Remember the Former Things* (1997) by Patricia Tull Willey, *A Prophet Reads Scripture* (1998) by Benjamin Sommer, *The Search for Quotation* (1999) by Richard Schultz, and *The Mouth of the Lord has Spoken* (2006) by Risto Nurmela. Additional works that address Isaianic allusions use the same eight criteria and are indicated in the footnotes.

Isaiah serves as a fitting case study for determining the direction of dependence in cases of inner-biblical allusions due to its highly allusive nature and disagreement over its compositional history. As a result, scores of interpreters analyze its allusions and sources, but determinations regarding the direction of borrowing are often not straightforward.¹³ Accordingly, scholars use diverse criteria to argue

¹² “Isaianic allusions” does not assume a specific construal of the book’s composition nor a prevailing allusive pattern throughout the book. Instead, this recognizes that intertextual links and inner-biblical allusions have been found in all major sections and discerned compositional layers. For an introduction to the various inner biblical parallels in Isaiah, see Gary Schnittjer, *Old Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2021), 213–58 and the essays in *Isaiah and Intertextuality: Isaiah Amid Israel’s Scriptures*, ed. Wilson de Angelo Cunha and Andrew Abernethy, FAT-2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 23).

¹³ Some studies circumvent the difficulty by analyzing Isaianic parallels without explicitly addressing the assumed direction of borrowing (e.g., John Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah: A Study in Literary Dependence,” *Proceedings* 10 [1990]: 31–38; Carl Gross, “Literary Allusions in Isaiah: Isaiah

for the direction of borrowing, which provides a solid basis for this empirical study.

Further, while the four sources that form the focus for this analysis are representative of Isaianic studies, Isaiah is representative of inner-biblical allusions throughout the Hebrew Bible. For example, Lyons, Leonard, Kynes, and Harvey all use forms of these same eight criteria as they examine allusions in non-Isaianic texts.¹⁴ All of the sources I have consulted—whether pertaining to Isaiah or the rest of the Hebrew Bible—use some form of the following eight criteria when arguing for the direction of dependence. Nevertheless, as an inductive analysis, the proposal here is necessarily tentative. There may be other criteria used in the broader field that are not listed. Even more likely, additional criteria may be crafted in the future. Thus, these eight criteria provide a strong basis to establish a comprehensive list that serves as a kind of interim conclusion by accounting for the known arguments used to claim a direction of borrowing in cases of inner-biblical allusion.

Three parameters define the limits of this study. First, this study examines only cases of borrowing between Isaiah and other books in the Hebrew Bible. As Schultz rightly points out, allusions within the same work are of a “hermeneutically different order” than allusions to separate texts because the former operate on the reader in a determined sequence while the latter require a presumed relative chronology.¹⁵ The criteria below may apply to allusions within a biblical book, but I will focus only on those arguments used to determine the direction of allusive borrowing between texts.¹⁶

Second, these criteria presume a literary relationship exists between the texts being considered. Demonstrating literary dependence is beset by its own methodological challenges.¹⁷ Two similar

44:28–45:13 Revisited,” *BT* 54 [2003]: 317–25; Thomas A. Keiser, “The Song of Moses as a Basis for Isaiah’s Prophecy,” *VT* 55 [2005]: 486–500).

¹⁴ Similarly, Carr’s criteria for determining a direction of dependence in cases of dependence within the Pentateuch are accounted for in Criteria 1, 4, and 7 below (“Method in Determination,” 123–26). Occasional references to other non-Isaianic studies that use the same criteria will be included below.

¹⁵ Richard Schultz, *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*, JSOTSup 180 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 233.

¹⁶ Accordingly, works like those of Hugh Williamson that examine reuse and rewriting within the book of Isaiah fall outside of the present investigation (*The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah’s Role in Composition and Redaction* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994]).

¹⁷ For a survey of the problems and literature pertaining to demonstrating dependence, see Geoffrey Miller, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research,” *CBR* 9 (2011): 294–98. For inquiries into the method of identifying dependence, see Paul Noble, “Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions,” *VT* 52 (2002): 219–52; Joseph Kelly, “Identifying Literary Allusions: Theory and the Criterion of Shared Language” in *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Ziony Zevit (Sheffield: Equinox, 2017), 22–40.

texts may share verbal and conceptual parallels due to other causes besides borrowing such as mutual dependence on a non-extant third source, use of formulaic language without conscious dependence on a specific source, and coincidence.¹⁸ Logically, demonstrating the likelihood that borrowing exists between two similar texts must be reasonably established first before answering the subsequent question, “Which text is the borrower and which text is the source?” This study is focused on a methodological inquiry into only this subsequent question.¹⁹ Accordingly, these criteria all presume that dependence is demonstrable and that what remains is to determine the direction of borrowing.

Third, the eight criteria are most relevant for studies of inner-biblical allusion, which is one species of dependence between biblical texts. For this study, allusions meet two requirements: 1) a degree of shared wording between the texts and 2) an intentional communicative purpose by the author of the later text to implicitly reference the prior work, where—ideally—the audience will recognize the verbal parallel and infer the proper motive for the reference.²⁰ However, the criteria remain generally applicable for determining the direction of dependence where later authors or editors consciously incorporated words or phrases from an earlier source, even when such borrowing is not intended to be noticed (i.e., it is non-allusive). This is because the criteria analyze features of the verbal parallels and surrounding context—features which obtain in cases of verbal dependence that is allusive and non-allusive.²¹ Where there is no shared verbal expression, the criteria are inapplicable as in cases of transformed structures,²² motifs, themes, and forms.²³

¹⁸ For example, Jiseong James Kwon re-evaluates the supposed literary relationship between Isaiah and Job (*Scribal Culture and Intertextuality*, FAT-2 85 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016], 225–28) as well as between Isaiah and the Torah (“Re-examining the Torah in the Book of Isaiah,” *RB* 126 [2019]: 547–64). In both cases, Kwon argues against any direct literary dependence.

¹⁹ Similarly, Joachim Krause helpfully recognizes the difference between these two related but distinct questions (*Exodus und Eisodus: Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1–5*, VTSup 161 [Leiden: Brill], 61, 62).

²⁰ For more on these two conditions as necessary for an allusion, see Cooper Smith, *Allusive and Elusive: Allusion and the Elibu Speeches of Job*, BINS 198 (Brill: Boston, 2022), 35–61.

²¹ With some modifications, Criteria 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are most relevant for determining direction of borrowing in cases of non-allusive, verbal dependence.

²² For an introduction to structural dependence that does not require verbal parallels, see Jeffery Leonard, “Identifying Subtle Allusions: The Promise of Narrative Tracking” in *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Ziony Zevit (Sheffield: Equinox, 2017), 91–113.

²³ For Isaianic examples: Klaus Kiesow argues that successive redactors of Isaiah 40–55 altered the exodus motif in conflicting ways (*Exodustexte im Jesajabuch: Literarkritische und motingeschichtliche Analysen*, OBO 24 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979], 158–203); Konstantin Zobel argues that

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING THE DIRECTION OF BORROWING

For each of the eight criteria, the analysis will proceed in the same manner: 1) an explanation of the criterion, 2) an example of its use in Isaianic scholarship, and 3) an evaluation of its persuasive power. The examples were chosen for their brevity and clarity in using the criterion under consideration, not necessarily the force of its persuasive power in that specific instance. Where the example is deemed un-compelling, a more persuasive instance is included in the evaluation section to illustrate how the criterion can be used effectively.

CRITERION 1: COMPOSITIONAL DATING—INFERRED DATES OF COMPOSITION

Explanation

The first criterion considers the supposed dates of textual composition to determine the direction of borrowing. If the texts or redactional layers that contain the verbal parallels can be dated on grounds unrelated to the allusion and on the basis of evidence such as philology, grammar, historical references, source criticism, or ideology, this provides a way to determine which text is the later borrower and which text is the earlier source.²⁴ Even though deriving exact dates of composition is unlikely, it may be possible to discern a relative chronology by, for example, dating one text as pre-exilic and the other as post-exilic.

Example

Tull Willey uses this argument to argue for the direction of borrowing.²⁵ Although she recognizes that “one of the greatest obstacles to

Deuteronomy reworks various themes from the eighth century prophets—including Isaiah 1–39—without citing or alluding to any specific prophetic texts (*Prophetie und Deuteronomium: Die Rezeption prophetischer Theologie durch das Deuteronomium*, BZAW 199 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992], 216–22); Bernard Gosse examines the deployment of the form of the oracle against the nations in Isaiah 13–14 by comparing it with other ANE exemplars (*Isaïe 13,1–14,23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d’Isaïe et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations*, OBO 78 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988]). The criteria do not apply to studies like these where there is no verbal dependence.

²⁴ The efforts to date compositions through these means are also fraught with differing perspectives and approaches. For example, see the overview by Shimon Gesundheit of conflicting views on the viability of dating texts based on Hebrew grammar (“The Strengths and Weaknesses of Linguistic Dating” in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, ed. Jan Gerts, et. al. FAT 111 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016], 295–302).

²⁵ Others use this same argument to determine the direction of borrowing between Isaiah and other texts: Erich Bosshard-Nepustil, *Rezeptionen von*

this discussion [of allusions in Isaiah] is the dating of texts,”²⁶ she relies on the scholarly consensus to determine the relative chronology between Isaiah and the texts she examines. For example, she begins by affirming the “unusually wide agreement” for dating Isaiah 40–55 between 550 and 538 B.C.E.²⁷ Then when discussing Lamentations, she affirms its chronological priority by noting that the book “is viewed by nearly all recent scholars as datable to the early or mid-sixth century.”²⁸ From this basis she argues that it is the author of Isaiah 40–55 who alludes to Lamentations.²⁹ By determining the dates of composition of both texts on grounds unrelated to the allusion, the direction of borrowing may be inferred.

Evaluation

This criterion for determining which text is the borrower can be compelling but depends on an important premise: assuming or proving a degree of compositional unity where both the potential allusion and source segment belong to the same compositional layers as the textual material that was used to determine the date of origin. Accordingly, this argument requires that the evidence used to deduce the date of composition is correct and that the biblical texts (e.g., Isaiah 40–66 and Lamentations) or redactional layers are generally unified. Thus, this argument will not prove convincing in every case, especially in a book whose compositional history is debated like Isaiah. For example, the discussion by Otto Kaiser of multiple redactional layers in both Isaiah 14–15 and Jeremiah 48 illustrates how compositional reconstruction can support mutual dependence in the final form.³⁰ Alternatively, the allusion in Neh 9:7–8 to the Abrahamic narrative of Genesis 15:6,7, 20 is universally affirmed because

Jesaja 1–39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit, OBO 154 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997); Baruch Halpern, “The New Names of Isaiah 62:4: Jeremiah’s Reception in the Restoration and Politics of ‘Third Isaiah,’” *JBL* 117 (1998): 623–43; Dominic Rudman, “Zechariah 8:20–22 & Isaiah 2:2–4//Micah 4:2–3,” *BN* 107/108 (2001): 50–54; Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, “Two Prophets, Two Laments and Two Ways of Dealing with Earlier Texts,” in *Die Textualisierung der Religion*, ed. Joachim Schaper, FAT 62 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 185–90; Alphonso Groenewald, “Isaiah 1:2–3, Ethics and Wisdom. Isaiah 1:2–3 and the Song of Moses (Dt 32): Is Isaiah a Prophet Like Moses?” *HTS* 67 (2011): 1–6. Similarly, Leonard, “Identifying,” 258–59. Harvey’s criteria of “Multiple Occurrence” and “Source Criticism” are two species of this larger argument since both date the texts on grounds unrelated to the allusion (*Retelling Torah*, 43, 51, 52).

²⁶ Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, SBLDS 161 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 3.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 84–85.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 86.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 125–32.

³⁰ Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39*, trans. R.A. Wilson, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 60–61, 65–75.

of the agreement on the relative dates of composition for the texts. Rather than dismiss the criterion out of hand,³¹ what is needed is the construction of an argument since compelling indications for the time of composition provide strong evidence in determining a direction of dependence.

***CRITERION 2: CONCEPTUAL DEPENDENCE—ONE TEXT
ASSUMES KNOWLEDGE PROVIDED BY THE OTHER***

Explanation

When two texts are presumed to have a literary relationship between them and one text presupposes knowledge or background provided in the other, the text that assumes the knowledge is the later borrower and the text that provides the assumed content is the earlier source. For example, when two texts are likely to be dependent and one laconically refers to characters or events in a way that presupposes the audience's familiarity and the other text provides a fuller account of those characters and events, the text that presents the fuller account is presumed to be the earlier source, and the text that assumes knowledge of the fuller account by referring to it subtly is presumed to be the later borrower.³² There is an exception to this principle. On the one hand, when the fuller text can account for all the details in the elliptical text, it is likely that the fuller version came first and the terse reference to the text came second and presupposes the audience's knowledge of the more detailed source text. On the other hand, if the subtle, laconic text contains irreducible tension with the fuller text by, for example, referencing components of a tradition that are incompatible with the fuller text, then it becomes more likely that the elliptical account preceded the fuller version and assumes knowledge of a non-extant source. In such a case, the fuller text likely came second and may cast itself as providing the tradition to which the laconic text refers by filling out some details though not

³¹ Carsten Vang eschews this criterion by calling it a "trap" since it assumes the direction of borrowing based on preconceived judgments regarding dates of composition rather than on the internal evidence of the dependence itself ("Inner-Biblical Quotations in Old Testament Narratives: Some Methodological Considerations [e.g., 1 Sam 15:2 and Deut 25:17–19]" *OTE* 33 [2020]: 515–37). Better is the view of Krause who prefers this criterion when the evidence is available, which he admits is disappointingly rare (*Exodus und Eisodus*, 62).

³² Similarly, Leonard, "Identifying," 260–62; Harvey, *Retelling Torah* 43; Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 34; Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus* 63. This combines into one criterion two of Leonard's questions to determine priority: 1) is one text capable to produce the other and 2) does one text assume knowledge of an expansive tradition. As defined by Leonard, these two criteria seemingly share a distinction without a difference. It is unclear from Leonard's discussion when a laconic text would have the capability to produce a more expansive text as discussed here.

perfectly since observable tensions remained. Examples will illustrate these two possibilities.

Example

Nurmela uses this argument in his discussion of likely dependence between Isa 51:2 and Gen 22:17 since only these two verses share בָּרַךְ in the Piel and רְבָה in the Hiphil when referring to the progeny promise to Abraham.³³ When determining the direction of borrowing, Nurmela states, “Here Isaiah is also obviously dependent on Genesis and not vice versa since the references indisputably presuppose the Abraham narrative.”³⁴ If dependence between these texts is deemed likely, Nurmela’s argument for the direction of dependence is compelling. The Isaiah passage refers to a pre-supposed Abrahamic tradition, and there is no appeal to any traditional material in Isaiah 51 that does not have its parallel in Genesis 22.

A more complex example is Hosea’s use of the Jacob tradition in Hosea 12. William Whitt claims that Hosea draws on a different tradition than what is recorded in Genesis due to irreconcilable differences between the accounts.³⁵ If true, this would illustrate the proviso that the terse, elliptical account (i.e., Hosea 12) should be considered dependent on the fuller text (i.e., Gen 25–32) only if the fuller text is compatible with the details in the shorter account.³⁶ If Whitt is correct, Hosea cannot be dependent on Genesis because they reflect irreconcilable traditions. However, others see Hosea reflecting the same details as recorded in Genesis, and so conclude that Hosea is dependent on the Genesis account.³⁷

³³ Risto Nurmela, *The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Second and Third Isaiah*, Studies in Judaism (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006), 59–60.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 60.

³⁵ William D. Whitt, “The Jacob Traditions in Hosea and Their Relation to Genesis,” *ZAW* 103 (1991): 18–43.

³⁶ Debate over the chronological relationship between Judges 4 and 5 is a similar case where Baruch Halpern argues for dependence on different traditions due to disparities between the accounts (“The Resourceful Israelite Historian: The Song of Deborah and Israelite Historiography,” *HTR* 76 [1983]: 379–401).

³⁷ Peter R. Ackroyd, “Hosea and Jacob,” *VT* 13 (1963): 245–59; Steven L. McKenzie, “The Jacob Tradition in Hosea 12:4–5,” *VT* 36 (1986): 311–22; Erhard Blum, “Noch Einmal Jakobs Traum in Bethel—Genesis 28, 10–22,” in *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and in the Bible*, ed. Steven McKenzie and Thomas Römer, *BZAW* 294 (New York: de Gruyter, 2000), 44–49. Similarly, Marvin Sweeney, though he is unsure whether Hosea is dependent on a written or oral tradition (“Hosea’s Reading of Pentateuchal Narratives: A Window for a Foundational E Stratum” in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, ed. Jan Gerts, et. al. *FAT* 111 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016], 851–71).

Evaluation

This criterion is compelling. In the absence of reasons to the contrary, the text that assumes knowledge provided in another text should be considered the borrowing text as long as there are no appeals to assumed elements that are incompatible with the fuller text.

CRITERION 3: IMPLICIT MARKING—SIGNALING DEPENDENCE OF THE SHARED MATERIAL

Explanation

The third argument used to determine the direction of borrowing is the inclusion of textual features in only one text that implicitly mark the shared material as secondary and derivative.³⁸ Although not present in Isaiah, an explicit citation formula signals a self-conscious dependence on the earlier source through a phrase like, “As it is written” (e.g., Jer 26:18 // Mic 3:12).³⁹ However, such an explicit formula is used to mark quotation, not allusion, which is the focus of this study. Other phrases can be used to signal the secondary nature of the shared content in less obvious ways. For example, Norman Whybray considers the otherwise innocuous phrase, “and he said” (וַיֹּאמֶר) in Isa 57:14 to be a kind of “introductory formula” or implicit citation formula whereby the author indicates the belated, derivative nature of the phrase that follows in apparent dependence on Isa 62:10–11.⁴⁰ Similarly, Leonard cites Psalm 78:2–3 as warrant to search for the psalmist’s biblical sources since the text draws attention to its own dependence on prior traditions (“I will pour forth riddles from of old, Which we have heard and known, which our fathers have told us”).⁴¹ Accordingly, phrases attached to the shared textual segment that indicate the derivativeness for the shared material can be cited as evidence that the author recognizes—and perhaps consciously signals—the belated and borrowed nature of his words, which indicates that the shared text is an allusion.⁴²

³⁸ Similarly, Leonard, “Identifying,” 258; Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 64. Harvey’s criterion of “Cross-Reference” is a subset of this criterion (*Retelling the Torah*, 42).

³⁹ For a study on citation formulas in the Hebrew Bible, see Kevin L. Spawn, *‘As It is Written’ and Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament: Their Use, Development, Syntax, and Significance*, BZAW 311 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002).

⁴⁰ Norman Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66*, NCBC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 209. Similarly, Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 274.

⁴¹ Leonard, “Identifying,” 258.

⁴² For a helpful introduction to the related topic of writers marking allusions so that they are recognized by the audience, see Joachim Krause, “Citations, Allusions, and Marking them in the Hebrew Bible: A Theoretical Introduction with Some Examples,” *BibInt* 31 (2023; in press). For Krause, signaling a shared textual segment as belated and derivative is one way that biblical authors mark allusions.

Example

Extensive verbal parallels between Isa 2:2–4 and Mic 4:1–3 demonstrably prove some sort of literary relationship between these texts. Micah 4:4 ends with a phrase attributing the preceding oracle to YHWH (“for the mouth of YHWH of hosts has spoken”). Schultz tentatively suggests that since this phrase appears elsewhere only in Isa 1:20, 40:5, and 58:14, it may serve as an implicit recognition by the author of Mic 4:4 that what follows derives from other than the prophet himself, which would indicate that what precedes is borrowed from a previous source, in this case Isaiah 2.⁴³

Evaluation

Implicit indicators of dependence are uncertain evidence for determining the direction of borrowing since this criterion depends on one significant, but unproven, premise: that such a marker indicates that the accompanying text is borrowed. For example, prophets often attribute their words to YHWH so Micah’s statement in the example above does not unequivocally indicate borrowing (e.g., Mic 2:3, 5; 3:5; 6:1). However, this potential indicator of dependence coupled with the stylistic argument of the phrase’s uniqueness in Micah (Criterion 8) strengthens the case. Given the possibility that some phrases may serve as an indicator of dependence, such a criterion has merit in determining the direction of borrowing, even if it may not be decisive on its own.

CRITERION 4: ALLUSIVITY—THE ALLUSIVE NATURE OF THE TEXT

Explanation

Literary theorists Ziva Ben-Porat, Robin Jarvis, and Marko Juvan argue that multiple allusions can accumulate in the same text or section of a text which makes “allusivity” an inferred quality of the composition.⁴⁴ Accordingly, other allusions in the same text can be cited as evidence that the particular parallel under investigation is also an allusion. Thus, a text that is shown to be more allusive than the other is more likely to be the borrowing text in a case where the direction of borrowing is unsure.⁴⁵ There are four permutations of this argument that vary with regard to their persuasive potential.

⁴³ Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 293.

⁴⁴ Ben-Porat, “Poetics,” 111; Robin Jarvis, *Wordsworth, Milton, and the Theory of Poetic Relations* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991), 112; Marko Juvan, *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*, trans. Timothy Pogačar (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University, 2008), 146.

⁴⁵ Similarly, Leonard, “Identifying,” 262; Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 64. Harvey’s criterion of “Multiple Occurrence” is a species of this criterion—specifically “Allusion to the Same Source” discussed below (*Retelling the Torah*, 53).

Permutations with Examples

Generally Allusive Text

A text that is shown to be generally allusive is more likely to be the borrowing text in a case where the direction of borrowing is unsure, especially if the other text is not as allusive.⁴⁶ When considering parallels between Jeremiah 48 and Isaiah 15–16, Schultz appeals to this standard when he says, “Numerous links between Jeremiah 48 and a variety of biblical texts at least suggests that Jeremiah rather than Isaiah is the quoting text.”⁴⁷

Generally Allusive Immediate Context

This permutation narrows the scope from the allusive nature of the text as a whole to focus on the immediate context. If one text alludes in the vicinity of the parallel under consideration, then it is more likely to be the borrower in an additional case. Since an allusion is nearby, both author and reader are in an allusive frame of mind increasing the potential for additional allusions.

Nurmela provides a clear example in his discussion of an allusion between Isa 58:14a and Ps 37:4.⁴⁸ Nurmela uses a supposed allusion in Isa 58:14b to Deut 32:13 to bolster his claim that Isaiah is dependent on the psalm in the preceding line.

Allusion to the Same Text

If Text A has been shown to depend on Text B in any other instance, then the same relationship is likely in all demonstrable parallels between these texts. Sommer likewise states, “An author may repeatedly allude to certain texts, and the author’s preference for those texts increases the probability that additional parallels with them result from borrowing.”⁴⁹ Such a claim is both narrower and broader than the previous permutation. It is narrower since it focuses only on allusions between the two texts under consideration. It is broader since it considers all previous allusions between the two texts regardless of proximity to the parallel under consideration.

For example, Nurmela proposes that a literary relationship exists between Isa 61:8 and Ps 37:28. Nurmela also argues for three

⁴⁶ Yitzhak Berger uses this criterion in his study of Ruth (“Ruth and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Case of 1 Samuel 25,” *JBL* 128 [2009]: 255–56).

⁴⁷ Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 310. Even stronger, Hans Wildberger considers this to be decisive evidence for Isaiah’s dependence (*Isaiah 13–27*, trans. Thomas Trapp, Continental Commentaries [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997], 124–25).

⁴⁸ Nurmela, *Mouth of the Lord*, 102. Carr cites this permutation as one of his five criteria for determining a direction of dependence within the Pentateuch (“Method in Determination” 124, 126).

⁴⁹ Benjamin Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*, Contraversions (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 35.

other connections between Isaiah 40–66 and Psalm 37 (Isa 51:7//Ps 37:31; Isa 58:14//Ps 37:4; Isa 60:21//Ps 37:28, 29). When he discusses the direction of dependence between Isa 61:8 and Ps 37:28, Nurmela cites as part of his evidence his previous conclusion that Isa 51:7 alludes to Psalm 37:31 so that the author of 61:8 presumably developed this connection.⁵⁰

Allusion to the Same Text in the Immediate Context

The final instance of this type of argument is the most demanding. When Text A is shown to borrow from Text B in the immediate context, then the same direction of borrowing can be presumed for additional cases of borrowing between the same texts. In this case, it is more likely that Text A alludes to the same text multiple times than supposing a complicated compositional history with contrary directions of borrowing in close proximity.

Nurmela makes occasional use of this argument to defend a particular direction of dependence.⁵¹ Based on the triad of verbs בָּרָא (“create”), יָצַר (“form”), and עָשָׂה (“do”), Nurmela proposes an allusive connection between Isa 43:7; 45:7, 18 and Gen 1:1; 2:7, 18. When discussing 45:7, Nurmela draws on his discussion of 43:7 by using this previously argued case of dependence as his key evidence for the direction of borrowing in 45:7. Since Isaiah has already alluded to the same text in close proximity, the same direction of borrowing is affirmed.

Evaluation

The permutations all follow from the idea that instances of allusion in a text count as evidence for it being the borrowing text in additional cases of dependence. This criterion requires two caveats to its applicability. First, compositional reconstructions can complicate this criterion so that allusive dependence may go both ways in the final form of the text.⁵²

Second, this criterion depends on one or more strong and generally recognized instances of allusion that can justify the conclusion that one of the texts has an allusive nature and so is the likely borrower in additional cases of dependence. If these anchor allusions come under doubt either by undermining their direction of

⁵⁰ Nurmela, *Mouth of the Lord*, 117.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 40, 43, 132. Similarly, John Day, “A Case of Inner Scripture Interpretation: The Dependence of Isaiah 26:13–27:11 on Hosea 8:4–9:10 (Eng. 9) and Its Relevance to Some Theories of the Redaction of the ‘Isaiah Apocalypse,’” *JTS* 31 (1980): 316–17.

⁵² Similarly, Christophe Nihan urges openness to mutual interdependence between texts since he argues that both Ezekiel and the Holiness Code borrow from each other at various compositional stages (“Ezekiel and the Holiness Legislation: A Plea for Nonlinear Models,” in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, ed. Jan Gerts, et. al. FAT 111 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016], 1015–39).

borrowing or by denying the case for any literary dependence at all, then this undercuts not only the direction of influence for the anchor example but also any additional cases of dependence that are based on the allusive nature of the text. This risks creating a house of cards so that many cases arguing for the direction of dependence can collapse if the supposedly clear cases of borrowing come under doubt. This does not undermine the legitimacy of the argument, but it should appropriately caution interpreters to account for this weakness. The persuasive power of the argument increases if the proposed source text for the allusion is shown to lack allusions in general or in the immediate context of the parallel passage.

The order presented above moves from least to most compelling. First, the generally allusive nature of the text as a whole is suggestive but not definitive regarding the direction of dependence and should be used with caution. Applied rigidly, this criterion would wrongly negate any possibility of single allusion. Accordingly, just because a text like Isaiah is shown to be generally allusive does not have any necessary bearing on whether it is the borrower in any specific instance. The next form of the argument, the generally allusive nature of the immediate context, carries more weight since it is contextually sensitive. The higher the number of agreed-upon allusions in a small space, the more probable that another discerned parallel to a separate text follows the same direction, if both are part of the same compositional layer and (especially) if there is a lack of allusions in the potential source context. Allusions to the same text regardless of distance, the third permutation, creates an even stronger basis to argue for the direction of borrowing since once a text has shown an awareness and willingness to cite a particular source it can do so again. Such an argument depends on assuming or defending a degree of compositional unity for both texts. The final permutation that cites an agreed upon allusion to the same text in the immediate context is most persuasive. Absent compelling reasons to the contrary, the proximity increases the probability that both the agreed-upon allusion and the allusion being considered are part of the same compositional layer and follow the same direction of borrowing.

***CRITERION 5: ALLUSIVE PATTERNING—AN
ESTABLISHED PROFILE OF ALLUDING***

Explanation

This criterion discerns a pattern of allusion in a text to create a borrowing profile and then argues that other passages within that text that follow this same pattern are also instances of borrowing. This collapses what is normally a two-step process into one. Usually, similarity between two texts is noted in order to argue that dependence exists as a first step before then arguing for the direction of dependence as a second step. By identifying text-specific features that mark allusion, finding such features not only signals a literary relationship

(usually step 1) but also signals the direction of borrowing (usually step 2). Thus, with this criterion, to identify the presence of the alluding techniques also determines the direction of dependence.⁵³

Example

Sommer uses this criterion as his primary means to support his claimed direction of dependence.⁵⁴ Sommer identifies four unique techniques used by the author of Isaiah 40–66 to mark allusions. These include the “split-up pattern” where Isaianic references to a continuous source text can be separated by intervening words or verses, “sound play” where Isaiah uses a different lexeme that has a similar phonetic quality with a word from the source text, “word play” where the same lexeme is used as the source text with a different sense, and “word order” a relatively less common technique where key words in the Isaianic text follow the same order as the source text even if there is not an identical phrase.⁵⁵ Based on these techniques, Sommer claims to have identified a “stylistic signature” of allusion in Deutero-Isaiah so that when these features are present, dependence can be affirmed and Isaiah is the later, borrowing text.⁵⁶

A specific example illustrates Sommer’s method at work. Sommer argues that Isa 42:5–9 borrows from Jer 31:31–36 by finding three of the four signals of Isaianic borrowing in the Isaiah passage. First, he notes that the phrase *ברית חדשה* (“a new covenant”) from Jer 31:31 follows the split-up pattern in Isaiah so that the lexeme *ברית* appears in Isa 42:6 and *חדשה* in 42:9. Second, the sound play criterion is also present: “Jeremiah’s *רגע* (*roga*, ‘stirs up’) [Jer 31:35] becomes *רקע* (*roqa*, ‘spread out’) [Isa 42:5]: the marker in Deutero-Isaiah hints back at a different but similar-sounding word in the source.”⁵⁷ Third, citing a type of word play, the object of the two verbs from the sound play are the sea (*הים*) in Jer 31:35 and the earth (*הארץ*) in Isa 42:5, which is a stock word-pair in poetry. The Isaiah passage possesses three of the four techniques that Sommer contends demonstrates both that a parallel exists and that Isaiah is the borrower.

⁵³ If such techniques were intended by the author/writer to be recognized by the audience, they become signals marking an allusion. See more in Krause, “Citations,” in press.

⁵⁴ Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 35, 71. Leonard cites Sommer to corroborate one of his criteria for determining textual priority (“Identifying,” 262–63). However, Leonard uses Sommer as an instance of Criterion 6 and does not recognize that Sommer employs a distinct argument for determining priority.

⁵⁵ Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 67–72.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 48.

Evaluation

Sommer's use of this criterion seems problematic, but the underlying argument is valid. Sommer depends on the four techniques he identifies as rightly and uniquely defining Isaiah's allusive signature. But Sommer's criteria have drawn criticism from Schultz and Nurmela for being too subjective and too common to reliably indicate dependence.⁵⁸ For instance, the "split-up pattern" allows excessive latitude; the passages above only share two lexemes and these are separated in Isaiah by twenty-five words. Further, the "sound play" marker should be discounted since it is not surprising to find similar sounding words given Hebrew's tri-consonantal system. Additionally, the "word play" technique, far from supporting the case for a unique allusive technique, actually reduces the possibility of any literary relationship since there are fewer verbal parallels.

Further, if the same techniques are used by other authors, then this undermines Sommer's argument since the supposed source could be marking an allusion to Isaiah. Yet this is the case as Jonathan Kline argues for the pervasiveness of the sound-play technique throughout the Hebrew Bible.⁵⁹ Especially problematic for Sommer's instance above is the assertion by Michael Fishbane that Jeremiah—the purported source in Sommer's example—uses the same split-up technique that Sommer finds in Isaiah, a technique that Lyons also finds in Ezekiel.⁶⁰ Sommer's argument only works if he both identifies cases of literary dependence, which Schultz and Nurmela protest, *and* if such features that signal dependence are unique to Isaiah 40–66, which the works of Kline, Fishbane, and Lyons bring under doubt.

This does not mean that Sommer's underlying argument is without merit. Determining a pattern of allusion based on clear examples can provide a legitimate basis for determining the direction of borrowing in other less-clear cases. For example, Michael Stead first discerns Zechariah's unique pattern of borrowing from five relatively clear and accepted cases of inner-biblical allusion before determining the presence and direction of dependence in less-clear cases.⁶¹ Such an approach puts a great deal of weight on the validity of those cases used to determine the pattern but, when convincing,

⁵⁸ Schultz, "Isaianic Intertextuality," 51–56; Nurmela, *Mouth of the Lord*, viii.

⁵⁹ Jonathan Kline, *Allusive Soundplay in the Hebrew Bible*, SBLAIL (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016).

⁶⁰ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 301–2; Michael Lyons, "Marking Innerbiblical Allusion in the Book of Ezekiel," *Bib* 88 (2007): 245–50.

⁶¹ Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8*, LHBOTS 506 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 29–37. For the same argument applied to Hosea's reuse of prior material, see Cooper Smith, "The 'Wilderness' in Hosea and Deuteronomy: A Case of Thematic Reappropriation," *BBR* 28 (2018): 254–57.

this criterion contributes strong evidence to the question of textual priority.⁶²

***CRITERION 6: RHETORICAL DESIGN—LIKELIHOOD OF
COMMUNICATIVE PURPOSE***

Explanation⁶³

An allusion, by definition, is a literary device that serves a rhetorical function by drawing on the contextual associations of the borrowed text. Since this rhetorical function should be discernible and analyzable, the borrowing text is the one with the more likely rhetorical purpose for making an allusion. Using this argument is a two-step process. First, potential rhetorical purposes for both directions of borrowing need to be discerned. Once a literary relationship can be demonstrated, one must ask, “Assuming that Text A came first, why would the author of Text B draw on Text A in this way?” One must also ask, “Assuming that Text B came first, why would the author of Text A draw on Text B in this way?” Second, the possible rhetorical purposes need to be compared, and the one judged more likely indicates which is the later, borrowing text. Studying the potential rhetoric of the purported allusion from both directions provides evidence to discern a probable diachronic relationship. While it may be possible to subdivide this criterion into various permutations, the multiplicity of possible motivations to allude casts doubt on the viability of such an endeavor. Rather, it seems better to treat each instance individually.

Example

Many interpreters use this criterion to discern the direction of borrowing.⁶⁴ As one example, Nurmela uses this argument to defend the assertion that Isa 56:7 draws on Ps 43:3, 4.⁶⁵ A compelling rhetorical purpose exists for Isaiah to draw on Psalm 43 as analogous support. Just as God answers the psalmist’s prayer and leads him to

⁶² Harvey’s criterion of “Deuteronomistic Tendency” is a text specific way to frame this broader criterion (*Retelling the Torah*, 53).

⁶³ For the framing of this section, I am indebted to the discussion in Kynes, *My Psalm*, 52–54.

⁶⁴ Samuel Terrien, “Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaïe,” *VTSup* 15 (1966): 309–10; Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 320–29; Ronald Bergey, “The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1–43) and Isaianic Prophecies: A Case of Early Intertextuality?” *JSOT* 28 (2003): 33–54; Joel Edmund Anderson and P. M. Venter, “Isaiah 36–39: Rethinking the Issues of Priority and Historical Reliability,” *HTS* 65 (2009): 50–54; Christina Brinks, “Job and Deutero Isaiah: The Use and Abuse of Traditions,” *BibInt* 20 (2012): 407–20. Similarly, Leonard, “Identifying,” 262–63; Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy*, 61–66; Harvey, *Retelling the Torah*, 43–45; Schnittjer, *Old Testament Use*, 30.

⁶⁵ Nurmela, *Mouth of the Lord*, 90–91.

the temple for worship (Ps 43:1–4), so also God will allow foreigners into the temple for worship (Isa 56:3–7). When considering the reverse possibility, that the psalmist draws on Isaiah, a rhetorical purpose is harder to identify. Nurmela considers it unlikely that the psalmist would refer to Isa 56:3–7 since this would require the Israelite psalmist to liken himself to a eunuch and foreigner. Further, unlike the eunuchs and foreigners in Isaiah, nothing in the psalm suggests that the psalmist is incapable of entering the temple (cf. Isa 56:3), so referring to Isaiah would not be an apt comparison. When comparing these two possible rhetorical functions, Isaiah borrowing from the psalm is more likely since an allusion to Psalm 43 would have an identifiable and rhetorically powerful function.

Evaluation

This argument has strong potential to substantiate a claimed direction of dependence since it analyzes rhetorical function, which is a necessary feature of inner-biblical allusion, to identify the source and the borrower. Nevertheless, two limitations complicate this criterion. First, the subjective nature of a proposed rhetorical purpose means that what seems obvious and compelling to some may seem contrived and weak to others. As a second limitation, both directions of dependence can have a viable rhetorical purpose. For example, Sommer claims that authors occasionally allude to other texts simply to create a level of literary artistry, which forges a link between the author and the audience that may not directly support the explicit argument of the text.⁶⁶ It follows that literary artistry may be a sufficient purpose for an allusion even if no other function can be discerned. However, although cogent arguments can be made demonstrating a possible rhetorical purpose in both directions, this does not mean that both arguments are equally persuasive. In the example above, Nurmela's reasoning is persuasive and counts in favor of Isaiah 56 alluding to Psalm 43. Given the inherently rhetorical nature of allusions, weighing the likelihood of the rhetorical purposes can count as determinative evidence when proposing a direction of dependence.

CRITERION 7: TRANSFORMATION—DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OTHERWISE SIMILAR ELEMENTS

Explanation

This criterion considers the differences between otherwise similar elements in the two texts and determines that some or all of these differences can best be explained due to an intentional change of one text by the author of the other. When the opposite diachronic relationship is considered, the changes are more difficult to explain.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 19.

⁶⁷ Similarly, Tooman *Gog of Magog*, 33.

For example, one text may alter the parallel element in a way that suggests dependence. In such cases, both texts are roughly equivalent in size, but the transformation signals the borrowing text. A common form of this argument is that a later, borrowing text substitutes clearer, more common terms than the original based on the assumption that a later writer would make a text more understandable and explicit rather than more complicated by using obscure words.⁶⁸ Alternatively, the later text may insert a clarifying expansion or some other addition so that the borrowing text is longer and more explicit.⁶⁹ Unlike the previous criterion, which examined rhetorical/ideological purposes for the allusion as a whole, this criterion examines discrepancies between the parallel content to see if only one direction of borrowing can account for the changes without referring to any overall strategy of the larger context.

Example

When discussing the relation between Isa 48:21 and Ps 78:15, 20, Nurmela uses this criterion to argue that Isaiah is the borrower.⁷⁰ Only these two passages preserve the tradition that YHWH “split the rock” in the wilderness to provide water. The shared collocation in Isaiah is a *wayyiqtol* (ויבקע־צור); in Ps 78:15 it is in the imperfect (יבקע צרים). This difference in the otherwise parallel element is best explained by Isaiah borrowing the imperfect form from Psalm 78 and then adding a *waw* in order to make a *wayyiqtol*, which is compatible with the past tense reference of the verse. Otherwise, the psalmist would have borrowed from Isaiah, which had a *wayyiqtol*, and inexplicably changed it into an imperfect in Ps 78:15 in contrast with the *wayyiqtol* string of 78:13–14. This is different from the previous criterion in that the overall rhetorical strategy of the passage is not considered but only the possible motivation that led to the differences between the otherwise paralleled elements.

Evaluation

A trio of factors complicates the applicability of this argument. First, the differences that create space for the criterion to operate also undermine the very likelihood of any dependence. This argument depends on observable, significant differences between otherwise similar elements. But if the differences between the two texts are too

⁶⁸ For example, Ezek 34:4 substitutes “with strength” (ובחזקה) instead of the rare term “with harshness” (ובפרד), which signals dependence on Lev 25:43 (Schnittjer, *Old Testament Use*, xxxii–xxxiii).

⁶⁹ Three of Carr’s six criteria fit within this umbrella of the later text adding material to the source, which Carr calls “pluses” (“Method in Determination,” 126). Krause similarly combines these criteria from Carr into one due to the commonality that the later text includes substantive additions (*Exodus und Eisdodus*, 64–65).

⁷⁰ Nurmela, *Mouth of the Lord*, 49–50.

great, then it becomes difficult to suppose that a literary relationship exists in the first place.

Second, this criterion can require belief in some tenuous assumptions by imputing motives or a lack of motive for perceived changes. Third, any argument based on the supposedly later text using more common wording may lack sufficient grounding since the biblical corpus might not reflect the relative pervasiveness of words in the broader culture. Nevertheless, this argument has merit by explaining some of the differences between the shared elements in such a way that one direction of borrowing better accounts for the extant data.

***CRITERION 8: CONTEXTUAL INCONGRUITY—DISPARITY
BETWEEN THE PARALLEL AND ITS CONTEXT***

Explanation

The final criterion compares the parallel elements with their respective contexts to discern any incongruities. If incongruities exist between the parallel element and the context in one text but not the other, the text with the incongruity is presumed to be the later, borrowing text. This argument assumes that Text A preserves elements from Text B that mark the allusion even though those shared elements create a tension in the grammar or sense of the surrounding context. Nurmela uses this criterion as his preferred method and summarizes it well:

We should consider the integration of the connecting expression in its contexts. Shifts of number or person are significant for this purpose: the connecting expression may interrupt a first person oracle by referring to God in the third person in one context, whereas the other is harmonious in this respect. In other instances the connecting element may break a chain of parallels in one of the contexts. Such inconsistencies may indicate that the expression was originally formulated as a part of the context where it is well integrated, whereas it makes an allusion in the context where the integration is not as smooth.⁷¹

Whereas the previous criterion focused on *differences* between the parallel elements as indicating the direction of borrowing, this criterion focuses on the *sameness* between the parallel elements that creates tension with the surrounding context of only one text. Although Nurmela nowhere categorizes the variations of his criterion, they can be grouped into four permutations.

⁷¹ Ibid., viii.

Permutations with Examples

Stylistic Disparity

According to Nurmela, if the portion of Text A that has the parallel to Text B fits the vocabulary and style of Text A and not Text B, then Text A is likely the source of the borrowing and Text B is the later borrower. In this case, the author of Text B incorporated into the later text a segment that does not align with the author's own stylistic tendencies. This criterion depends on the shared element having unique vocabulary or style when compared to one of the sources.

Nurmela uses this form of the argument in a supposed connection between Isa 49:8 and Ps 69:14.⁷² The fact that רִצּוֹן occurs 13 times in the Psalms but only here in Isaiah 40–55 is cited as partial support for seeing the psalm as the source of the Isaianic allusion. The shared element does not fit the literary style of Isaiah, so the Isaianic author is likely to have incorporated the expression from the Psalm. This argument is not determinative since it is possible that Text B alludes to what is a unique section of Text A precisely because the author of Text B resonates with that vocabulary and style of Text A, which is otherwise absent.⁷³ Nevertheless, it is more likely that an author maintains consistency, so that the shared element is more likely original to the text with similar vocabulary and style.

Tautological Repetition

Another common form of this argument is what Nurmela calls “tautological repetition:” a lexical or semantic repetition indicates that the element creating the tautology is borrowed. For example, Nurmela perceives a connection between Isa 63:7 and Ps 89:2 due to the phrase חֲסָדֵי יְהוָה (“steadfastness of YHWH”) used by both to introduce a psalm. When determining the direction of dependence, Nurmela cites the fact that Isa 63:7 contains a tautology.⁷⁴ The first half of the verse reads חֲסָדֵי יְהוָה אֶזְכֵּר תְּהִלַּת יְהוָה (“I will remember the steadfastness of YHWH, the praised acts of YHWH”). The grammatically and referentially superfluous mention of YHWH is judged tautologous, which suggests that the shared element (i.e., חֲסָדֵי יְהוָה) is borrowed from an external source (i.e., Ps 89:2). While it is admittedly speculative to claim what a poet should have written, when the shared element creates an unnecessary repetition within the immediate context, this reasonably supports the claim that the paralleled element is borrowed.

⁷² Ibid., 53.

⁷³ Similarly, Tooman affirms the validity of this criterion, but recognizes it is not absolute since a later author may reuse what is distinctive from an antecedent text (*Gog of Magog*, 33).

⁷⁴ Nurmela, *Mouth of the Lord*, 122.

Grammatical Awkwardness

Nurmela uses this argument in another way by noting a discrepancy in grammar between the shared element and the surrounding context in the presumably borrowing text. The grammatical discrepancies can be syntactical (i.e., the text that has unclear or incorrect grammar due to the shared element is the borrowing text) or reflect a difference in person/number between the surrounding context and the borrowed element (i.e., the shared element is first-person but the surrounding context is third person in only one text; the one with the discrepancy would be the borrowing text).

For example, Nurmela uses a grammatical awkwardness in Isa 40:5 to argue that Isaiah borrows from Ezek 21:4.⁷⁵ Isaiah 40:5 and Ezek 21:4 are the only two passages to contain the expression “and all flesh will see” (וראו כל בשר). Nurmela notes that, unlike Ezek 21:4, Isa 40:5 lacks a grammatical direct object for this clause. He goes on to state, “The omission, however, is not necessarily a mistake: the lack of a suffix highlights the similarity to Ezek 21:4.”⁷⁶ Since the shared element is grammatically awkward in Isaiah but well-incorporated in Ezekiel, Isaiah is presumed to be the borrower.⁷⁷

Change in Topic, Motif, or Theme

A final permutation of this criterion recognizes a discrepancy when a topic, motif, or theme in the parallel element is abrupt and out of place in one text but not the other. The text where the borrowed element is poorly integrated is judged the borrower. Nurmela argues for a literary relationship between Isa 61:3 and Ps 45:8 due to the uniquely shared phrase שמן ששון (“oil of gladness”).⁷⁸ Given the royal context of the psalm, the presence of oil is a natural fit whereas Nurmela judges it to be awkward and unnecessary in Isaiah. Isaiah is then assumed to be the borrower. If a literary relationship can be supposed based on the two shared lexemes, Nurmela’s argument for Isaiah as the later, borrowing text seems credible.

Evaluation

This criterion as argued and exemplified by Nurmela has received mixed evaluation. Kynes challenges this argument on two grounds: the inherent “subjectivity of identifying awkwardness in ancient

⁷⁵ Ibid., 3. For an example of Nurmela arguing for the direction of borrowing based on a discrepancy regarding case, see page 89. For an example based on a shift in number, see 43–44.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 3.

⁷⁷ The same criterion is at work in Jer 34:14 and Deut 15:12. In Deuteronomy, the context is consistently 2ms, but in Jeremiah, the shared element is 2ms but awkwardly paired in a 2mp context (Schnittjer, *Old Testament Use*, xxvi).

⁷⁸ Nurmela, *Mouth of the Lord*, 114–15.

texts” and “the demonstrated ability of biblical authors to adapt allusions to their surrounding context.”⁷⁹ Schultz is more positive but still recognizes that Nurmela’s arguments do not guarantee objectivity.⁸⁰ Positively, Lyons cites Nurmela favorably and uses this standard as one of his four means for determining the direction of influence in Ezekiel.⁸¹

In response to Kynes’ first concern, while we may not possess native proficiency in evaluating incongruity of ancient texts, we do have an adequate basis for recognizing discrepancies in some cases, for example, between number and person. Further, our ability to recognize incongruities can be compared with our ability to infer rhetorical purpose, which is Kynes’ preferred method; both require a basic trust in our capacities to understand and evaluate the meaning of ancient texts. In response to Kynes’ second criticism, Nurmela affirms with Kynes that the author could integrate allusions into the context more fully, but this would have risked obliterating the parallel. The author intentionally preserves the incongruity to signal the allusion.⁸² For example, someone could say, “Quoth the ———, ‘Nevermore’” as an allusion to “The Raven” by Edgar Allan Poe. The use of the archaic word *quoth* constitutes an incongruity with the style and register of the response, but more fully integrating the allusive marker into the response risks obscuring the allusion itself.

This criterion helpfully recognizes that borrowers may leave incongruities so that the allusion can be recognized.⁸³ However, there are cases where a seeming incongruity is due to stylistic practice and not an inner-biblical allusion. For example, poetic texts, especially in prophetic literature, frequently alternate grammatical person as a stylistic pattern. This possibility does not negate the usefulness of this standard but shows that it may not be equally valid or compelling in every case. This argument is strongest when it demonstrates that the perceived incongruity runs counter not only to contemporary sensibilities regarding style but also to the author’s prevailing tendencies.

⁷⁹ Will Kynes, “Job and Isaiah 40–55: Intertextualities in Dialogue,” in *Reading Job Intertextually*, ed. Katharine Dell and Will Kynes, LHOTS 574 (New York: T&T Clark, 2013), 97.

⁸⁰ Schultz, “Isaianic Intertextuality,” 43–50.

⁸¹ Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy*, 62–64. Though not citing Nurmela, the same criterion is used approvingly by others: Harvey (*Retelling the Torah*, 52–53), Vang (“Inner-Biblical Quotations,” 527), Tooman (*Gog of Magog*, 33–34) and Schnittjer (*Old Testament Use*, xxvi–xxvii).

⁸² See more on marking allusions in Krause, “Citations,” in press.

⁸³ Compare with Michael Riffaterre’s discussion of “ungrammaticalities” that signal intertextual references (“Interpretation and Undecidability,” *New Literary History* 12 [1981]: 227–42).

CONCLUSION

These criteria, while derived from studies of Isaiah, are the same as those used in studies of inner-biblical allusions throughout the Hebrew Bible. However, these eight criteria have not been previously gathered together and analyzed with regard to their nature, function, and persuasive power. A summary of these eight criteria that can be used to discern the direction of dependence is included below.

1. Criterion 1 (Compositional Dating): The text judged to be later due to the inferred dates of composition is the borrower while the text that is earlier is the source.
2. Criterion 2 (Conceptual Dependence): The text judged to assume prior knowledge is the borrower while the text that provides the knowledge is the source.
3. Criterion 3 (Implicit Marking): The text judged to implicitly signal belated dependence of the shared material is the borrower while the text without the implicit marker is the source.
4. Criterion 4 (Allusivity): The text judged to have a more allusive nature is the borrower while the text that is less allusive is the source.
5. Criterion 5 (Allusive Patterning): The text judged to follow its established pattern of alluding is the borrower while the text that does not follow a pattern of alluding is the source.
6. Criterion 6 (Rhetorical Design): The text judged to have a more likely rhetorical purpose for alluding is the borrower while the text whose rhetorical purpose for alluding is less likely is the source.
7. Criterion 7 (Transformation): The text judged to better explain the differences between the otherwise parallel elements is the borrower while the text without the better explanation is the source.
8. Criterion 8 (Contextual Incongruity): The text judged to contain incongruity between the shared elements and the surrounding context is the borrower while the text whose shared elements are well integrated is the source.

By way of conclusion, I will consider two implications of this study. First, the individual criteria are neither universally applicable nor equally persuasive in every case. For example, at times both passages will be equally well-integrated into their contexts so that there is no incongruity to analyze (Criterion 8). At other times, different criteria (or even the same criterion) can be used to support conflicting conclusions regarding the direction of borrowing. For example, weak evidence for implicit marking of belated dependence (Criterion 3) may not be as convincing as a strong argument based on rhetorical purpose (Criterion 6). In these cases, the merits of both directions of dependence must be considered and, whenever possible, a tentative conclusion offered. Further, interpreters will disagree over the

inherent strength of certain criteria.⁸⁴ While the criteria here will not be judged to be universally valid by all interpreters in every circumstance, these criteria have been deemed compelling by multiple interpreters in certain circumstances. Accordingly, each criterion can be used as part of a comprehensive argument for a direction of dependence.

Second, these criteria are *mutually inclusive*, meaning that more than one argument can be used to analyze a single allusion. Given the lack of certainty for any of these standards, the ability to marshal several that support a single direction of borrowing is more persuasive than claims that depend on only one line of reasoning. The possibility and desirability of using multiple arguments in support of the direction of borrowing underscores the usefulness of this type of list. Scholars can bring clarity and precision to their claims by identifying which criteria apply in a given case.

This study takes a step toward the goal of a universal list of accepted criteria that can be used to argue for directionality by categorizing the types of criteria scholars use in analyzing allusions in Isaiah. This list of eight criteria is intended to foster clarity and creativity; clarity by encouraging precise articulation of operative criteria and creativity by suggesting possible ways to argue for the direction of borrowing.

⁸⁴ For example, Krause finds Criterion 4 to be compelling while Lyons doubts its value (Krause, *Exodus und Eisdodus*, 62; cf. Lyons, “How Have We Changed? Older and Newer Arguments about the Relationship between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code” in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, ed. Jan Gerts et. al., FAT 111 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016], 1063).