

ANIMADVERSIONES

Aesthetics of Production and Aesthetics of Reception in Analyzing Intertextuality: Illustrated with Joshua 2*

Intertextuality has become a veritable vogue word in Hebrew Bible scholarship. The notion that texts refer to each other and that neglect of such references leads to an imperfect understanding of a given text is increasingly taken into account, and rightly so. Indeed, the potential of this perspective for our purpose is immense, especially in light of the major impact of phenomena like redactional rearrangement, inner-biblical interpretation, and ‘Fortschreibung’. At the same time, applying the perspective of intertextuality as developed in the study of modern literatures to Hebrew Bible studies necessitates a thorough methodological reflection¹. For this purpose, two competing claims regarding an intertextual relationship of Joshua 2 are singled out for discussion in this paper.

I. Intertextuality and the Study of the Hebrew Bible

For quite a few, the very term raises red flags. When hearing ‘intertextuality’, they think of post-structuralist or deconstructionist concepts². These concepts feature, roughly speaking, the following three theoretical presuppositions: first, everything is a text, or at least every cultural system is; second, it is the reader, not the author, who determines what is in a text; third, as it is the reception of a text that matters, the historical circumstances of its production become meaningless. Because of these presuppositions, the said concepts are of little help when it comes to concrete textual analysis — and indeed textual analysis is not their goal. Derrida was a philosopher, not a philologist.

Intertextuality, however, is not synonymous with deconstructionism. From the seminal impetus of Julia Kristeva, yet another set of concepts

* Thanks are due to Walter Bühner (Bochum) and Chris Thomson (Cambridge) for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.

¹ Most recently, see R.L. MEEK, “Intertextuality, Inner-Biblical Exegesis, and Inner-Biblical Allusion. The Ethics of a Methodology”, *Bib* 95 (2014) 280-291. But see below, n. 3, on his argument.

² For an introduction, see M. PFISTER, “Konzepte der Intertextualität”, *Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien* (eds. U. BROICH – M. PFISTER) (Tübingen 1985); for a discussion and full bibliography, see J.J. KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus. Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1–5* (VTS 161; Leiden – Boston, MA 2014) 37-45.

developed³. For the sake of convenience, these concepts of intertextuality may be labeled structuralist or hermeneutic⁴. Aiming at textual analysis proper, they focus on written texts; they presuppose that texts are written by authors pursuing a certain intention vis-à-vis their addressees; and, as a consequence, they look for intertextual references established by the author of a given text. To put my point bluntly: analyzing intertextual relationships within the Hebrew Bible, we are served better by the second set of concepts.

II. Analysis of Intertextual Relationships within the Hebrew Bible

But what is an intertextual relationship within the Hebrew Bible, and what is not? In an age of electronic concordances, we are quick to note affinities between texts. But are they always significant? And significant for what? After all, there is more than one explanation for such affinities⁵.

If two texts belong to the same system, any affinity between them which betrays that system cannot be counted as evidence for a proposed intertextual relationship. For example, two texts written in the same language may feature the exact same idiomatic stock phrase and still be independent of each other. This holds true for two texts belonging to the same genre or addressing the same topic as well.

If none of the above (affinity due to common language, genre, or topic) applies, there is reason to assume that the affinity in question is a *textual* affinity, that is to say, that one of the texts influenced the author of the

³ This is not taken into account by MEEK, "Intertextuality", 282-284. Following the lead of B.D. SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*. Allusion in Isaiah 40-66 (Stanford, CA 1998) 6-9 and others, Meek argues for a narrow definition of intertextuality which excludes the realm of "author-centered" studies altogether. Admittedly, this allows for a neat distinction. Yet I would be reluctant to draw this distinction, for it deprives whole schools of literary studies of their own terminology; see, e.g., the pertinent contributions in BROICH – PFISTER (eds.), *Intertextualität*; J. KLEIN – U. FIX (eds.), *Textbeziehungen*. Linguistische und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Intertextualität (Tübingen 1997); H.F. PLETT (ed.), *Intertextuality* (Berlin 1991), to name but three classic volumes.

⁴ Following PFISTER, "Konzepte der Intertextualität", 1-30.

⁵ See the recent discussion in KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 46-66. See also B.D. SOMMER, "Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible. A Response to Lyle Eslinger", *VT* 46 (1996) 479-489; Id., *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 6-31; J.M. LEONARD, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions. Psalm 78 as a Test Case", *JBL* 127 (2008) 241-265; and the seminal study by R.B. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT 1989).

other. To be influenced by a text, however, is not the same as intending to refer to that text. If an author draws on school material or uses a template in producing a text, this new text usually does not require the addressees to be aware of, let alone consult, the source.

Unlike such cases of influence, an intertextual relationship is an affinity between two texts which has been established as an actual reference: one text is designed to be interpreted in conjunction with the other. It will only fully disclose its message in light of that other text ⁶.

An initial and most basic distinction, however, has to be drawn between intertextual relationships intentionally established by the author of a given text (aesthetics of production) and others that originate merely with the reader's response (aesthetics of reception). Trivial as it might seem, this distinction — or rather: the lack of it — has caused misunderstanding upon misunderstanding in recent research ⁷. It is this problem I wish to address in the present paper.

III. Joshua 2 as a Case in Point

A perfect case in point is provided by Joshua 2, the story of two anonymous Israelite spies who are rescued by the Canaanite “prostitute” Rahab. The text is replete with intertextual references of all sorts, from verbal quotations to subtle allusions. Just which texts are alluded to remains disputed. At the heart of the Rahab story, we find a confession of the foreign woman's faith in the God of Israel (Josh 2,9-11). In this confession Rahab offers, as is well known, a precise summary of the Exodus, verbally quoting texts such as the Song of the Sea in Exodus 15 and the monotheistic creed found in Deuteronomy 4. As Wellhausen put it, Rahab acts as if she had read the whole Pentateuch ⁸. While the references in Rahab's confession are rather uncontroversial, recent research has seen two competing claims regarding an intertext of the story as a whole. Both maintain that Joshua 2 fully discloses its message only in light of another story — but which other story?

⁶ While I heartily agree with most of what David Carr said in Helsinki (cf. D.M. CARR, “The Many Uses of Intertextuality in Biblical Studies. Actual and Potential”, *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010* [ed. M. NISSINEN] [VTS 148; Leiden 2012] 522-523 and *passim*), at this point I must disagree. Understood in the sense described above, talk of intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible is more than a fashionable face-lift for old-school influence studies.

⁷ See G.D. MILLER, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research”, *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 (2011) 285-294.

⁸ J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin ⁴1963) 117: “sie tut, ‘als habe sie den ganzen Pentateuch gelesen’”.

1. *A Reversal of the Spy Episode in Numbers 13–14: How Canonical Readers Respond to Joshua 2*

Joshua 2 occupies a prominent position. At the point when Joshua sends two spies to Jericho, Israel is finally ready to conquer Canaan. A new generation of hope stands at the threshold of the promised land⁹. In this narrative context, canonical readers can hardly help but recall another mission. Like a *déjà-vu*, Joshua's sending of spies evokes Moses' sending of spies from Kadesh Barnea (Numbers 13–14, par. Deut 1,19-46). Once again, Israel stands at the threshold of the Promised Land. Will they forfeit it a second time? They do not. Thus, in the eyes of canonical readers, the spy mission of Joshua 2 might seem to present itself as a reversal of the spy mission of Numbers 13–14.

Taking into account the firm evidence for the late, post-priestly provenance of Joshua 2 that has been presented recently¹⁰, such a response to the narrative could commend itself even further. Indeed, a growing number of scholars argue that Joshua 2 has been composed to function as counterpart of Numbers 13–14. Thus, they posit an intertextual reference through which Joshua 2 alludes to Numbers 13–14 and, according to some, to Deut 1,19-46¹¹. Without doubt, this juxtaposition of the two

⁹ Cf. D.T. OLSON, *Numbers* (Louisville, KY 1996) 85; see also ID., *The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New. The Framework of the Book of Numbers and the Pentateuch* (BJSt 71; Chico, CA 1985).

¹⁰ The ground has been broken by J. VAN SETERS, *In Search of History. Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven, CT – London 1983) 325; ID., “Joshua’s Campaign of Canaan and Near Eastern Historiography”, *SJOT* 4 (1990) 3-4. For further studies that build on Van Seters’ work, see E. BLUM, “Beschneidung und Passa in Kanaan. Beobachtungen und Mutmaßungen zu Jos 5”, *Textgestalt und Komposition. Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten* (ed. W. OSWALD) (FAT 69; Tübingen 2010) 221-223; E.A. KNAUF, *Josua* (ZBK.AT 6; Zürich 2008) 46-47; V. HAARMANN, *JHWH-Verehrer der Völker. Die Hinwendung von Nicht-israeliten zum Gott Israels in alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen* (ATHANT 91; Zürich 2008) 126-127; and KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 146-152.

¹¹ E. ASSIS, *From Moses to Joshua and from the Miraculous to the Ordinary. A Literary Analysis of the Conquest Narrative in the Book of Joshua* (Jerusalem 2005) 58-66 (Hebrew). Assis draws on the unpublished dissertation of G. HAUCH, *Text and Contexts. A Literary Reading of the Conquest Narrative* (Jos 1–11) (Princeton 1991). For similar approaches, see also J.F. CREACH, *Joshua* (Louisville, KY 2003) 40; J.E. HARVEY, *Retelling the Torah. The Deuteronomistic Historian’s Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives* (JSOTSup 403; London – New York 2004) 43, 45, 66; A.G. AULD, *Joshua. Jesus Son of Naue in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series 1; Leiden – Boston, MA

episodes allows for an interesting reading of the Rahab story. But is it the reading intended by the author? Did he or she want the readers or listeners to whom the Rahab story was originally addressed to read or hear it in light of Israel's failure at Kadesh Barnea? The answer is in the text. If the author intended the proposed intertextual reference, that is, if he or she designed the Rahab story to be interpreted in conjunction with the spy episode, we will find prominent features pointing us in that direction.

Often the first feature that attracts our attention and makes us juxtapose two texts is a word or sentence that occurs in both of them¹². Such a parallel lexeme or syntactical structure can be part of an argument for an intertextual reference intended by the author of one of the texts — if it is specific enough. If the parallel has come to mind only after using means unavailable to the original addressees, such as an electronic concordance, it is probably not.

Indeed, there are parallel lexemes and structures in Joshua 2 and Numbers 13–14 or Deut 1,19-46, respectively, which have been interpreted as evidence for the proposed relationship¹³:

וישלה... אנשים Josh 2,1	שלה... אנשים Num 13,2
ראו את הארץ	ראיתם את הארץ Num 13,18
ויבאו	ויבאו Num 13,23
וישבו Josh 2,23	וישבו Num 13,25
ויעברו ויבאו	וילכו ויבאו Num 13,26
ויספרו לו	ויספרו לו Num 13,27
ויאמרו Josh 2,24	ויאמרו
נתן יהוה בידנו	יהוה... הארץ... Num 14,8
את כל הארץ	נתנה לנו

2005) 94; A. SHERWOOD, "A Leader's Misleading and a Prostitute's Profession. A Re-examination of Joshua 2", *JSOT* 31 (2006) 49, 51, 57-58; S.L. HALL, *Conquering Character*. The Characterization of Joshua in Joshua 1–11 (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 512; London – New York 2010) 29-32; and R.S. HESS, *Joshua*. An Introduction and Commentary (Downers Grove, IL 1996) 80, 84-85, 96; and R. POLZIN, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History, Vol. 1: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges (New York 1980) 85-86.

¹² See also LEONARD, "Identifying", 246 and 252; and R.L. SCHULTZ, *The Search for Quotation*. Verbal Parallels in the Prophets (*JSOTSS* 180; Sheffield 1999) 214.

¹³ What follows is a synopsis of observations produced by ASSIS, *From Moses to Joshua*, 58-66; AULD, *Joshua*, 94; CREACH, *Joshua*, 40; HALL, *Conquering Character*, 29-32; HARVEY, *Retelling*, 43, 45, 66; HESS, *Joshua*, 80, 84-85, 96; POLZIN, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 85-86; SHERWOOD, "A Leader's Misleading", 49, 51, 57-58.

... הנה אנשים באו הנה... Josh 2,2	נשלחה אנשים לפנינו Deut 1,22
לחפר את-הארץ	ויחפרו לנו את-הארץ
... לחפר את-כל-הארץ באו Josh 2,3	
וימס לבבנו Josh 2,11	אחינו המסו את-לבבנו Deut 1,28
יהוה... אלהים בשמים	ערים גדלת ובצורת בשמים

Yet can these parallels plausibly be interpreted as evidence for an intertextual reference intended by the author of Joshua 2? I argue they cannot. Words like **בוא** (“to enter”, “come”, “arrive”), **שוב** (“to return”), **ספר** Piel (“to tell”), or **אמר** (“to say”) are everyday words in the strict sense. Does it sound reasonable that anyone reading or hearing the story of Rahab should be prompted to understand it in light of the spy episode (or any other episode) by the occurrence of these words? This view commends itself all the less when it is observed that the words in question are isolated from each other. There are hardly any syntactical parallels of significant complexity. As for expressions such as **נתן + ארץ** (“to give + land”), or **לב + נמס** (“to melt + heart”), one has to bear in mind that they are idiomatic stock phrases belonging to the realm of holy war. These expressions are part and parcel of conquest narratives in the Hebrew Bible. That is to say, they do not point the reader or hearer towards any specific conquest narrative.

At most, some significance may be claimed for the occurrence of **חפר** (“to dig”, “to search”), in Deut 1,22 and Josh 2,2.3, as the verb is used to describe the task of spying in these two instances exclusively. But this finding cannot carry the burden of proof loaded onto it, for it is all by itself, isolated with regard not only to syntax but also to semantics. In order to make a cogent argument for an intertextual reference intended by the author, one has to demonstrate how parallel lexemes and/or syntactical structures are integrated into the bigger picture of semantics, that is, into the story as a whole¹⁴. When we claim that the author of a story wanted us to understand it in light of some other story, we should be able to show how the gist of that other story corresponds to the gist of the story at hand.

The gist of the spy episode of Kadesh Barnea is that the generation of Israelites that has been freed from the house of slavery forfeits the Promised Land. Because of their disobedience and lack of faith, the people are sentenced to forty years in the desert. Only the next generation will conquer Canaan. Accordingly, proponents of an intertextual reference in Joshua 2 to Numbers 13–14 and Deut 1,19–46 interpret the spy mission to Jericho as a reversal of the spy mission from Kadesh Barnea. The old generation of despair is superseded by a new generation of hope, which proves to be obedient and hence worthy of entering the Promised Land¹⁵.

¹⁴ See also LEONARD, “Identifying”, 255.

¹⁵ As is well known, the versions of the spy episode in Numbers 13–14 and Deut 1,19–46 do make distinct points when it comes to the questions of

None of this, however, is at stake in Joshua 2. To be sure, to treat the theme of the two generations would have made for a fitting opening to the conquest narrative. But this has not been done. There is not the slightest hint of the generation theme in Joshua 2¹⁶, and neither the people nor the spies are in the foreground. The people do not even appear¹⁷, and the two spies, pale and passive as they are, remain flat characters. We do not even learn of their names, let alone of any outstanding acts of obedience and faith. Such acts are reserved for somebody else — Rahab. The story is all about her. In Joshua 2, a foreign woman — and a prostitute at that! — is the heroine. Indeed she is presented as a shining example of faith in the God of Israel¹⁸.

2. A Counternarrative to the “Othering” of Foreign Women in Num 25,1-5: What the Author of Joshua 2 Intended

The heroine of the Rahab story is Rahab, and in order to put her in perspective, the author of Joshua 2 points us towards another story. This other story also features sexually seductive foreign women, and it is also concerned with faith in the God of Israel. The reference is, of course, to Num 25,1-5. Just a few weeks before the conquest of Canaan, in their very last camp before they will finally enter the Promised Land, the Israelites are confronted with foreign women. Seemingly unable to resist this temptation, they enter into sexual relations with these Moabite women (וַיִּהְיוּ, v. 1). And that is only the beginning. The ensuing disaster proves the worst apprehensions of the Deuteronomists to be valid: sexual seduction by foreign women inevitably results in religious seduction by foreign gods. The Moabite women invite their new companions to worship their gods, and the Israelites accept that invitation. “Thus Israel yoked itself to the Baal Peor” (v. 3).

The gist of this story is a shrill warning: do not even come close to foreign women — they will lead you astray! Such aggressive “othering”¹⁹

who is guilty of the failure and who is punished. Surprisingly, this problem is mentioned neither by ASSIS, *From Moses to Joshua*, nor by the other proponents of the intertextual relationship in question.

¹⁶ A full-blown treatment of this theme is to be found in Josh 5,2-9.

¹⁷ Based on an interpretation of the word קרש (“silence”) in Josh 2,1, one might even argue that the Israelites are unaware of the spies’ mission to Jericho. For a discussion, see J.J. KRAUSE, “Vor wem soll die Auskundschaftung Jerichos geheim gehalten werden? Eine Frage zu Josua 2:1”, *VT* 62 (2012) 454-456.

¹⁸ See the reception in Heb 11,31.

¹⁹ Coined in postcolonial studies, the term “othering” denotes any action by which an individual or group happens to be perceived, portrayed or classified in somebody’s mind as “not one of us”.

of foreign women is a well-known theme of Deuteronomistic ideology (cf. Deut 7,3-4 and Exod 34,15-16), and in fact Num 25,1-5 has been aptly characterized as a Deuteronomistic example story illustrating this theme²⁰. Situated just before the Israelites enter the land, the story is meant to teach them — and with them the hearers and readers of the story — a lesson about life in the land: how to relate — or rather, not to relate — to foreign women²¹.

Against this backdrop, it does not come as a surprise that the very first woman the Israelites encounter is in fact a prostitute (זונה אשה Josh 2,1)²². That the spies “went and entered the house of a prostitute” (v. 1) makes us fear the worst. But, to our utter astonishment, this fear turns out to be unfounded. Just when we expect her to lead the Israelite men astray, this foreign woman proves us wrong. Rahab is a ‘prostitute’ who does not act like a prostitute, thereby convicting the hearers and readers of their stereotypes. She does not even try to approach the spies. On the contrary, at the risk of her own future Rahab rescues them, and as if that were not enough, she confesses her faith in the God of Israel. Astonishing as it is, this story appears to be yet another example story. Just as the Moabite women serve as an example, so does Rahab. Her story has been conceived of as a counter-narrative to the “othering” of foreign women propagated in Num 25,1-5²³:

Numbers 25	Israelite men foreign women sexual seduction religious seduction	Joshua 2	Israelite men foreign woman no sexual seduction no religious seduction
------------	---	----------	---

²⁰ E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin – New York 1990) 115. According to Blum, Num 25,1-5 is a pillar of the D-Composition of the Pentateuch. For a recent approach which challenges the accepted distinction between non-priestly and priestly material in Numbers 25, reading vv. 1-5 in conjunction with the priestly sequel, see J. BLENKINSOPP, “The Baal-Peor Episode Revisited (Num 25,1-18)”, *Bib* 93 (2012) 86-97.

²¹ According to BLENKINSOPP, “The Baal-Peor Episode”, 86-97, Numbers 25 is paradigmatic of the hostile disapproval of intermarriage in the Persian period.

²² To be sure, there is a difference between “occasional” and “professional” prostitution. Whereas the Moabite women prostitute themselves, Rahab is said to be a prostitute. I would argue, however, that this depiction of the first foreign woman the Israelites encounter is meant to reflect a perception of foreign women in general — in order to prove it erroneous (see below).

²³ For similar interpretations, see BLUM, “Beschneidung und Passa”, 227, and HAARMANN, *JHWH-Verehrer*, 119-120. See also C. PRESSLER, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth* (Louisville, KY – London 2002) 23: “Joshua 2 reverses (and redeems) that memory [sc. of Numbers 25]. The journey of the two Israelite men from Shittim to Jericho involves a foreign woman, a prostitute, but she will lead them to renewed faith in Israel’s God.”

The Rahab story has been conceived of as a counternarrative, and to phrase my claim in this manner implies that the intertextual relationship at hand is not merely a fancy of the interpreter. Rather, it has been intended by the author of Joshua 2. He or she actually wanted the addressees to understand the Rahab story in light of the Deuteronomistic example story of Num 25,1-5, thus enabling them to fully comprehend the moral of the story.

Admittedly, it is rather bold to determine what a biblical author did or did not intend. In order to support such a claim, we should seek further evidence. And there is further evidence. In addition to the semantic correspondence of Joshua 2 and Num 25,1-5 demonstrated above, there is another feature linking the two texts. In Num 25,1 the camp's location is called Shittim (הַשִּׁטִּים), and Josh 2,1 explicitly states that Joshua sent the spies from Shittim (taken up in Josh 3,1). Measured against the lengthy list of observations adduced in favor of the alleged relationship with the spy episode, this single finding might seem negligible. Yet in contrast to the former, it is significant. Apart from Numbers 25 and Joshua 2, there is no other narrative in the Hebrew Bible connected with the place name Shittim²⁴. Moreover, it should be noted that the mention of a place name in Josh 2,1 (and even more so its repetition in Josh 3,1) is superfluous from a narrative point of view (cf. Josh 1,1). Hence this feature seems to serve a different function. It is a textual marker, that is, a means used by the author to call attention to the intertextual relationship²⁵. Especially in the context of the theme of foreign women treated in both texts, the addressees of the Rahab story can hardly have failed, I would argue, to notice this marker.

Finally, in light of Num 25,1-5 certain conspicuous peculiarities of Joshua 2 are easily explained — if they do not explain themselves altogether. First and foremost, this is the case for the role played by Rahab. Of course the story is all about her. The foreign woman gains center stage, since 'foreign women' is the theme addressed by the author. In like manner Rahab's confession, too, can now be accounted for. The foreign woman is presented

²⁴ Mention of it is made also in the itinerary of Numbers 33 (v. 49) and in Mic 6,5; Joel 4,18.

²⁵ For the marking of intertextuality, see J. HELBIG, *Intertextualität und Markierung*. Untersuchungen zur Systematik und Funktion der Signalisierung von Intertextualität (Heidelberg 1996); for the use of place names as textual markers, see K. NIELSEN, "Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible", *Congress Volume Oslo 1998* (eds. A. LEMAIRE – M. SÆBØ) (VTS 80; Leiden – Boston, MA 2000) 23. Another example where explicit reference to the locale is an essential part of the narrative and provides the reader with a clue to a textual relationship would be the preparation for Joshua 24 and its setting in Shechem in Gen 35,1ff.; see also Gen 33,19 with Gen 50,25b.26 and Exod 13,19; for a discussion, see E. BLUM, "Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter. Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag", *Textgestalt und Komposition*, 269-273.

as an example of faith in the God of Israel, thus providing an alternative paradigm. According to Deuteronomistic ideology as illustrated in Numbers 25, foreign women lead to apostasy and hence must be excluded from Israelite society. This ideology found its full-blown expression in the Deuteronomistic conquest account of Joshua *1–12, with its depiction of the ethnic cleansing of Canaan promoting the idea that the exclusion of foreigners is demanded by obedience to YHWH. Deliberately contradicting this view, the author of Joshua 2 inserted a counternarrative of a God-fearing foreigner and her inclusion into the community²⁶. The “Rahab paradigm” thus introduced argues for the possibility of integrating foreigners — on the double condition that they prove loyal to Israel and worship YHWH²⁷.

III. Aesthetics of Production and Aesthetics of Reception in Analyzing Biblical Intertextuality

The latter reasoning raises intriguing questions concerning religion and politics in the Persian period. But this discussion is beyond the scope

²⁶ The rescue of Rahab in Josh 6,17-19 has been inserted by the same hand. Both passages are part of a comprehensive reworking of the Deuteronomistic conquest account which is also responsible for the story of Achan in Joshua 7 and a ‘Fortschreibung’ of the Jordan crossing in Joshua 3–4, according to which the miracle’s rationale was to inspire fear of YHWH in “all the peoples of the earth” (see the finale in Josh 4,21ff. and note the unmistakable parallels of this passage with Rahab’s confession in Josh 2,9-11). For a discussion, see KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 415-427.

²⁷ Constraints of space forbid a detailed justification of the proposed direction of dependence. The case seems quite clear-cut, however. In my view, the principal argument is the conflation of references to various pentateuchal texts to be found in Joshua 2; for the theoretical background, see D.M. CARR, “Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence. An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exod. 34,11–26 and Its Parallels”, *Gottes Volk am Sinai. Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10* (eds. E. BLUM – M. KÖCKERT) (VWGTh 18; Gütersloh 2001) 107-140, here 124. In addition, the intertextual relationship between the Deuteronomistic example story of Num 25,1-5 and its counternarrative in Joshua 2 is one of the “specific cases” described by David Carr in which “the character of one and/or the other parallel makes it an unlikely source for the other” (Id., *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible. A New Reconstruction* [New York 2011] 428). Or does it seem likely to assume that the author of a Deuteronomistic example story warning against the wickedness of foreign women would refer to the most favourable depiction of a foreign woman to be found in the Hebrew Bible? *Mutatis mutandis*, the latter argument also renders the possibility of a common authorship of both texts or their affiliation with one and the same redactional layer implausible.

of the present paper. Here, the question is one of intertextual relationships and how to distinguish those intended by the author from those that merely lie in the eye of the beholder. In conclusion, let me sum up what can be learned from the case of Joshua 2.

First of all, what seems to suggest itself to a canonical reader can serve only as an initial clue to go by. At best, it is a reasonable suspicion. Such a suspicion must be proven, and it can turn out to be either founded or unfounded. If the author of a given text wanted the addressees to understand it in light of another text, he or she has in all likelihood inserted features which point towards that intertext. Such features include parallel wording (lexemes and syntactical structures) as well as aspects of semantics. Depending on the historical communication context and the original addressees' previous knowledge, these features may be more or less obvious. But, as a rule, they should be visible with the naked eye (again, there were neither concordances nor computers). Hence the feature in question ought to be significant, and it ought to be confirmed by other features. A convincing case for an intertextual reference intended by the author can hardly be built upon isolated lexemes or phrases. Rather, one should be able to demonstrate how parallel wording is integrated into the semantic structures of the two texts in question and how these structures correspond to each other. When we claim that the author of a story wanted us to understand it in light of a certain other story, it is not enough to come up with an interesting reading. Rather, we should be able to show that it was this reading that interested the author, too.

A further step — and indeed, one might argue with reason, the more challenging step — would be to construct, not only reconstruct, relationships of a biblical text with other texts, biblical and extra-biblical, and eventually with the textual world in which we live. But this step is most certainly beyond the scope of this paper, and it is also beyond the scope of Hebrew Bible scholarship as I understand it²⁸. Derrida was a philosopher; I am not.

Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen
Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät
Liebermeisterstr. 12
D-72076 Tübingen

Joachim J. KRAUSE

²⁸ This is, be it noted, a verdict neither on the study of reception history nor on productive reception itself, which is essential for religious practice in both Judaism and Christianity (one need think only of concepts like Halacha or homiletics). Rather, my argument addresses misleading applications of the category of reception where really something else is at stake, namely the quest for authorial intent in analyzing biblical intertextuality.

SUMMARY

That intertextuality has come into vogue in Hebrew Bible scholarship is hardly surprising given some general trends in the field. In fact, the reconstruction of redactional activity and 'Fortschreibung' as well as inner-biblical interpretation are heavily dependent on the perception of intertextual relationships. But therein lies the problem. Has the perceived relationship indeed been established by the author of one of the biblical texts in question (aesthetics of production), or does it merely lie in the eye of the beholder (aesthetics of reception)? Two competing claims regarding an intertextual relationship of Joshua 2 are singled out for discussion.