

# Seeing the Old Testament in the New: Definitions of and Criteria for Discerning Old Testament Quotations and Allusions

G. K. Beale  
Westminster Theological Seminary  
Philadelphia, PA

(This essay will appear as “chapter 3” in a forthcoming book titled *A Handbook on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, forthcoming in 2012]).

One has to get started somewhere in studying the use of the OT in the New. The obvious starting point is first to identify where the NT quotes and alludes to the OT. This is fairly easy in the case of quotations but more difficult with allusions. We will look first at the definition of or criteria for recognizing a quotation, and then address the thorny problem of allusions.

## I. Recognizing Quotations in the New Testament

A quotation is a direct citation of an OT passage that is clearly recognizable by its clear and unique verbal parallelism. Many of these quotations are introduced with an introductory formula, such as “that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled” (Matt. 2:15) or “it is written” (Rom. 3:4) and other similar expressions. Other citations without such introductory indicators are so obviously parallel to an OT text that it is clear that a quotation is being made (e.g., see Gal. 3:6; Eph. 6:3). The vast majority of what should be recognized as quotations from the OT are agreed upon by most commentators.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Benjamin L. Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion: the Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with Its Bearing on First Corinthians* (BZNW 160; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 2-3, and Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (Biblical Interpretation Series 96; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008), 15-17, for discussion by various scholars on the nature and definition of what is a quotation. See Stanley E. Porter, “The Use

There is, however, debate about whether or not writers like Paul adapt quotations and intersperse their own wording or merely quote various OT texts in unaltered form.<sup>2</sup> It is likely that he does both at various points. It may sometimes be difficult to know when there is a direct unaltered quotation or when authors are clearly citing the OT Hebrew, since there is room for debate about when a Greek translation is “literal” or not. It needs to be recalled that it is often impossible to translate a word or expression in exactly the equivalent way from the source language into the receptor language. When the Greek Septuagint is the source of citations, it is still hard to know how much Paul, for example, may be altering the reference, since he may be citing from different forms, proto-revisions or variant textual traditions of the Septuagint, some of which may no longer be extant. Nevertheless, that he sometimes does alter his quotations is highly probable.

One writer has counted 295 separate quotations of the OT in the New (including quotations with and without formulas). These make up about 4.5% of the entire NT or about 352 verses. Thus,

---

of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology,” in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, edited by C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (JSNTS 148; SSEJC 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79-96, who also reviews the different perspectives on the nature of quotations, allusions, and echoes, while offering his own recommendations. Also see Stanley E. Porter, “Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice* (ed. Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter; NTM 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007), 107-109, who categorizes direct references to the OT as formal quotation (with an introductory formula), informal quotation (which must have a minimum of three words in common with the OT reference), and “paraphrase” (which has enough unique words that a recognizable link with the OT text can be observed). Porter’s “paraphrase” is what most in the field would consider to be an “allusion,” but he restricts “allusion” to that which may not be consciously intentional” and is less focused on language and more concerned with making a link to a “person, place, or literary work” and applying it to the contemporary material” (Ibid., 109). He defines “echo” as “invocation by means of thematically related language of some more general notion or concept” (Ibid., 109).

<sup>2</sup> See a summary of the debate in Kenneth D. Litwak, “Echoes of Scripture? A Critical Survey of Recent Works on Paul’s Use of the Old Testament,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 6 (1998), 280-283.

every one verse in 22.5 verses in the NT is a quotation.<sup>3</sup> In Paul, for example, there are about one-hundred quotations, the majority of which come, to one degree or another from an OT text most resembling the Greek Septuagint.<sup>4</sup>

## II. Recognizing Allusions in the New Testament

In contrast to quotations, there is, on the other hand, greater debate about the definition of an “allusion” and the criteria by which one can discern an allusion. Accordingly, commentators differ about how many allusions there are in the entire NT. The count goes anywhere from around 600 allusions to 1,650 and even up to about 4,100.<sup>5</sup> In the book of Revelation, for example, where there are no formal quotations, the tally of allusions goes anywhere from 394 (UBS<sup>3</sup>) to 635 (NA<sup>26</sup>) up to 1,000.<sup>6</sup> The wide disparity in the calculation is due to the disparity in how scholars define an allusion. To make matters more complicated, most commentators acknowledge that the validity of allusions must be judged along a spectrum of virtually certain, probable, and possible allusions, the latter being essentially equivalent to “echoes.”

---

<sup>3</sup> These statistics are from Roger Nicole, “The New Testament Use of the Old Testament,” in *Right Doctrine from Wrong Texts?* 13. For a different count of 401 quotations together with allusions (and a breakdown book by book) on the basis of the United Bible Societies first edition of the Greek NT, see Klyne Snodgrass, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New,” in *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* 35.

<sup>4</sup> See D. Moody Smith, “The Pauline Literature,” in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars, edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 267-276, and Moisés Silva, “Old Testament in Paul, in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph. P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove/Leicester: InterVarsity, 1993), 630-633, who cites a few more than Smith.

<sup>5</sup> See Nicole, “New Testament Use of the Old Testament,” 14, who cites this statistic from counting the allusions found in E. Hühn, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1900).

<sup>6</sup> For the various statistics in Revelation in this respect, see G. K. Beale, “Revelation,” in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars, edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 333.

Some books on the use of the OT produce elaborate criteria for validating whether or not something is an allusion, while others set out briefer more basic criteria. This discussion will attempt to steer a course between these two extremes.

An “allusion” may simply be defined as a brief expression consciously intended by an author to be dependent on an OT passage. In contrast to a quotation of the OT, which is a direct reference, allusions are indirect references (i.e., the OT wording is not reproduced directly as in a quotation). Some believe that an allusion must consist of a reproduction from the OT passage of a unique combination of at least three words or so. While this may be a good rule of thumb, it remains possible that fewer than three words or even an idea may be an allusion. The telltale key to discerning an allusion is that of recognizing an *incomparable or unique parallel in wording, syntax or in concept or in a cluster of motifs in the same order or structure*.<sup>7</sup> When both unique wording (verbal coherence) and theme are found, the proposed allusion takes on greater probability. Recognizing allusions is like interpretation: there are degrees of probability and possibility in any attempt to identify an allusion.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> For this latter criterion, see Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1981), 47-62, who gives such examples in the OT as repeated betrothal scenes that follow the same basic pattern and allude to prior betrothal scenes (Genesis 24; Genesis 29; Exod. 2:15b-21; the book of Ruth; see also further Geoffrey D. Miller, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 [2010], 296-298). This occurs also in the NT, for example between Luke and Acts (on which see Michael Goulder, *Type and History in Acts* [London: S.P.C.K., 1964]), and can be found elsewhere in the NT (e.g., see G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* [Lanham: University Press of America, 1984], 178-228).

<sup>8</sup> See Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion*, 3-4 (n. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9), and Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul’s Letter to the Colossians*, 17-20, for discussion of the nature of allusion and perspectives on the subject by various scholars. There is much literature on the literary and philosophical nature of allusion, but the nature of this Handbook does not allow indepth survey and interaction with this material (nevertheless, for a good evaluative overview, see Matthew Dudreck, “Literary Allusion: A Hermeneutical Problem of Theory and Definition in Biblical Studies,” *Westminster Theological Journal* [forthcoming]). Thus, while the present discussion of “allusion” in this chapter could be more nuanced, we shall have to rest content with our more general analysis.

Some commentators speak of “echoes” in distinction to “allusions.” This distinction ultimately may not be that helpful for a number of reasons. First, some scholars use the two terms almost synonymously.<sup>9</sup> Second, those who clearly make a qualitative distinction between the terms view an echo to contain less volume or verbal coherence from the OT than an allusion. Thus, the echo is merely a reference to the OT that is not as clear of a reference as is an allusion. Another way to say this is that an echo is an allusion that is possibly dependent on an OT text in distinction to a reference that is clearly or probably dependent. Therefore, I will not pose criteria for discerning allusions in distinction to criteria for recognizing echoes.<sup>10</sup> It is fine to propose specific criteria for allusions and echoes, so readers can know how an interpreter is making judgments. However, the fact that scholars differ over specifically what criteria is best has led me to posit a more general and basic criteria for allusions and echoes. At the end of the day, it is difficult to come up with hard and fast criteria that can be applicable to every OT in the NT allusion or echo. A case by case study must be made.

Probably the most referred to criteria for validating allusions is that offered by Richard Hays.<sup>11</sup> He discusses several criteria, which have an overall cumulative effect in pointing to the presence of an allusion.

---

<sup>9</sup> E.g., see Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 18-21, 30-31, 119; yet, on the other hand Hays at other times clearly distinguishes between quotation, allusion, and echo, viewing them to represent OT references on a descending scale respectively of certain, probable, and possible (Ibid., 20, 23-24, 29).

<sup>10</sup> Echoes may also include an author’s unconscious reference to the OT, though such references are more subtle and more difficult to validate. See, e.g., Beale, “Revelation,” 319-321, and Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, 20-24, 34-35, for discussion of the possibility of distinguishing conscious from unconscious allusions and echoes, though Beetham sees a clear distinction between “allusion” and “echo.” His argument for such a distinction is the best that I have seen.

<sup>11</sup> *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 29-32, on which Hays elaborates further in *The Conversion of the Imagination* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 34-44; I have added a few of my own explanatory comments to Hays’ criteria and I have revised some. See also Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, 28-34, who also follows and expands somewhat on Hays’s criteria.

- (1) The source text (the Greek or Hebrew OT) must be available to the writer. The writer would have expected his audience on a first or subsequent readings to recognize the intended allusion.
- (2) There is a significant degree of verbatim repetition of words or syntactical patterns.
- (3) There are references in the immediate context (or elsewhere by the same author) to the same OT context from which the purported allusion derives.
- (4) The alleged OT allusion is suitable and satisfying in that its meaning in the OT not only thematically fits into the NT writer's argument but also illuminates it and enhances the rhetorical punch.
- (5) There is plausibility that the NT writer could have intended such an allusion and that the audience could have understood it to varying degrees, especially on subsequent readings of his letters. Nevertheless, it is always possible that readers may not pick up an allusion intended by an author (this part of the criterion has some overlap with the first). Also, if it can be demonstrated that the NT writer's use of the OT has parallels and analogies to other contemporary Jewish uses of the same OT passages, then this enhances the validity of the allusion.
- (6) It is important to survey the history of the interpretation of the NT passage in order to see if others have observed the allusion. This is, however, one of the least reliable criteria in recognizing allusions. Though a study of past interpretation may reveal the possible allusions proposed by others, it can also lead to a narrowing of the possibilities, since commentators can tend to follow earlier commentators and since commentary tradition always has the possibility of distorting or misinterpreting and losing the fresh and creative approach of the NT writers' intertextual collocations.

Hay's approach is one of the best ways of discerning and discussing the nature and validity of allusions (though he likes the

term “echoes”), despite the fact, as we have seen, that some scholars have been critical of his methodology.<sup>12</sup>

### **Excursus on the Criteria for Validating Allusions and Echoes**

For a review of those supporting Hays and criticizing his view, see Litwak, “Echoes of Scripture?” For discussion of the nature of allusions and echoes see Stanley Porter, “Allusions and Echoes,” in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley (SBL Symposium Series 50; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 29-40. Porter has been one of the foremost critics of Hays’s criteria, contending that they are contradictory and some are mutually exclusive of others. It is true that Hays does sometimes appear to contradict himself and leaves himself open to such criticisms. Nevertheless, Porter’s criticisms at times reflect a too narrow understanding of Hays’s criteria (especially of Hays’ qualified embracing of a fivefold scheme of where meaning is to be located [Ibid., 26-27]. Porter also makes some valid criticisms of Hays’ sevenfold criteria for discerning allusions, but again they sometimes go too far. For example, Hays’s first criterion (“availability”) asks whether the source of the allusion or echo was available to the author and/or the readers. Porter rightly criticizes this, asking if sources were not available to the audience does that mean the text is different or just the audience. However, this is still an excellent and basic criterion from the authorial standpoint, so that the entire criterion should not be discarded. Porter contends that Hays’s second criterion of volume is wrongly defined as “explicit repetition,” which Porter says is “a separate issue from verbal coherence” (Ibid., 38). This is, however, a pedantic criticism, since it is fairly evident that Hays has in mind a criterion of the same unique wording that coheres between the OT and NT text. In addition, Porter says that the last four criteria are not so much about establishing the validity of OT references as they are for interpreting those references. Porter concluded, therefore, that only Hays’s first three criteria deal with validating the presence of allusions (Ibid., 38-39). But why does Porter put the fourth criterion of “thematic coherence” as purely interpretative, since one of the basic criteria for judging the validity of an allusion is that of a unique thematic link between an OT and NT text? While this criterion does shade into interpretation, it still has relevance as an important criterion of validating an allusion. It is true that the last three criteria (“historical plausibility,” “history of interpretation,” and “satisfaction”) are less reliable guides to validating allusions. Indeed, “thematic coherence” and “satisfaction” are so overlapping that they are virtually synonymous. They both focus on how the theme from the OT context functions in the NT context and how much that OT theme illuminates the NT author’s argument in the context. This is why I collapsed these two into one

---

<sup>12</sup> For a sampling of scholars favorable and unfavorable to Hays’ approach, see the following excursus and Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion*, 3-4 (n. 5 and 9), the latter specifically discussing those who generally follow Hays’ above criteria for discerning and interpreting allusions.

criterion and have listed only six criteria above. Likewise, the first and fifth criterion have some overlap. Thus, one could reduce Hays's seven criteria down to five.

Thus, I find that Porter makes some valid criticisms of Hays's criteria but these do not invalidate the entirety of the various criteria concerned. It is also important to remember that Hays himself admits that some of the criteria ("history of interpretation" and "satisfaction") are not very strong evaluative standards. This topic of criteria for the validity of allusions deserves further discussion, but, unfortunately, further elaboration is not possible because of space constraints.

### III. Sources for Recognizing Quotations and Allusions in the New Testament

There are several published sources that indicate where quotations and allusions occur in the NT. The following is a list of the most helpful sources and some annotated comments about them.

The first source to turn to are the margins of the twenty-seventh edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*.<sup>13</sup> The editors have placed in the outer margins of each page an OT reference where they think a quotation or allusion occurs in the corresponding part of the body of this Greek NT text. Quotation references are put in italics and allusions are in regular font. In addition, in an appendix of the NA<sup>27</sup>, there is a complete listing of all the quotations and allusions in their OT canonical order that are found throughout the margins of this Greek edition. Interpreters have to decide whether or not the references to allusions meet the criteria for being valid allusions. One must also remember that there may well be allusions where nothing will be listed in the margins beside the NT passage in the NA<sup>27</sup>. Parallels to other NT texts are also found in the outer margins.

The same setup is also found in the fourth edition of the United Bible Societies' *Novum Testamentum Graece (Greek New Testament)*,<sup>14</sup> though one will notice that this Greek edition lists far fewer allusions than does the NA<sup>27</sup>. In contrast to the NA<sup>27</sup>, the UBS

---

<sup>13</sup> Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Kareavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1993).

<sup>14</sup> Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1993).



edition includes an appendix of quotations that occur in the canonical order of the NT. Also in contrast to the NA<sup>27</sup>, together with allusions are listed various kinds of parallels (literary and otherwise).<sup>15</sup> Very helpfully, the UBS4 cites a quotation, the first and last principle word of the citation are given at the bottom. Similarly, there is also cited at the bottom the principle words of which allusions are viewed to consist.

Reference may also be made to the second edition of the *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (THE NEW TESTAMENT)*,<sup>16</sup> where OT references are also found in the outer margins, but there is no distinction between quotations, allusions and parallels.

Readers should also consult the full (not abbreviated) editions of the various standard English translations of the NT,<sup>17</sup> where also in the outer margins are references to quotations, allusions, and general parallels. Of course, except for quotations, readers will have to judge for themselves whether such marginal references are valid allusions or are mere general parallels. Such marginal references in the English translations are also a veritable gold mine of possible references to the OT.

A few important caveats must be made about the use of the English translations. First, they will not be as precise as a Greek NT when comparing their wording to the Hebrew or Greek OT. On the other hand, it is still a useful exercise to compare the English translation of the Greek NT with the English translation of the Hebrew OT or the English translation of the Greek OT. A second qualification is important in the use of English-only translations. Comparing formal equivalent NT English translations with formal equivalent OT English translations will yield more precise

---

<sup>15</sup> In the body of the Greek text are listed at the bottom of each page first quotations and then allusions. Parallels to other OT texts, NT texts, and other kinds of texts are found listed under the section headings in the body of the Greek text.

<sup>16</sup> (London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958).

<sup>17</sup> Among the less interpretative or formal equivalent translations are the following: New American Standard Bible, English Standard Version, New King James Version, Revised Standard Version, New Revised Standard Version, the Holman Christian Standard Bible, New English Translation (= NET) Bible, etc. Among the more interpretative or dynamic equivalent translations are the following: New International Version, the New Living Bible, the New English Bible, the New Jerusalem Bible, etc.

comparisons than in the case of comparing dynamic equivalent translations. Of course, there will be differences sometimes because of a different preference by the various translations in dealing with text-critical problems and because NT writers sometimes produce their own interpretative paraphrases of OT texts.

Other important tools for identifying and/or discussing quotations and allusions are the following:

1) Archer, G. and Chinichigno, G. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey* (Chicago: Moody, 1983).

2) Beale, G. K. and Carson, D. A. (editors), *A Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2007).

3) Bratcher, R. G. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1984).

4) Dittmar, W. *Vetus Testamentum in Novo: Die alttestamentlichen Parallelen des Neuen Testament im Wortlaut der Urtexte und der Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1899). 2 vols. Vol. 1 of the Gospels through Acts may be found online at Google books.

5) Fairbairn, Patrick. *Hermeneutical Manual* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876), 354-460. Found online at Google books.

6) Gough, Henry. *The New Testament Quotations Colated with the Scriptures of the Old Testament* (London; Walton and Maberly, 1855). This may be found online at Google books.

7) Hübner, H. *Vetus Testamentum in Novo* Vol. 1,2 (Johannesvangelium); Vol. 2 (Corpus Paulinum) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997 - ).<sup>18</sup>

8) Hühn, E. *Die alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1900).

9) McLean, Bradley. *Citations and Allusions to Jewish Scripture in Early Christian and Jewish Writings through 180 C. E.* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1992).

---

<sup>18</sup> Hübner's volumes are designed to be a revision of the earlier work of Dittmar.

10) Toy, C. H., *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1884). This may be found online at Google books.

11) Turpie, D. M., *The Old Testament in the New* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1868).<sup>19</sup> This may be found online at Google books.

12) Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 2005), 342-409.

Some of the above sources treat only quotations (Archer/Chinichigno, Bratcher, Toy, and Turpie), while others include allusions and sometimes even parallels (Beale/Carson, Dittmar, Hübner, Hühn, and McClean). Some of these sources will not only provide lists of quotations and allusions but will contain significant discussion of them (Beale/Carson, Toy, Turpie, and Fairbairn).<sup>20</sup> Evans' work includes quotations, allusions, and parallels not only from the OT but also from the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Classical and Hellenistic pagan writings, Philo, Josephus, Targums, Qumran, rabbinic literature, papyri, and Gnostic writings.

Other helpful lists of quotations may be found in various books and articles on the use of the Old in the New.<sup>21</sup> It should be

---

<sup>19</sup> The above work by Hühn is no longer in print and cannot be found online but can be obtained at various online used book stores and may also be found in a number of university or seminary libraries, as can the works by Gough, Toy, Turpie and Dittmar.

<sup>20</sup> Archer and Chinichigno have brief discussion typically of textual comparisons of the Hebrew, Septuagint, and the NT. Other works like those of Toy and Turpie, though perhaps not quite as helpful are: H. Maclachlan, *Notes on References and Quotations in the New Testament Scriptures from the Old Testament* (Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood and Sons, 1872); E. Böhl, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate im Neuen Testament [The Old Testament Citations in the New Testament]* (Wien: W. Braumüller, 1878), and Franklin Robinson, *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896). Böhl's work may also be found online at google books.

<sup>21</sup> Among such lists, see the useful register of OT quotations in Paul respectively by D. Moody Smith, "The Pauline Literature," 267-276, M. Silva, "Old Testament

underscored that those who do not know Greek can still benefit from the above-cited Greek sources to a significant degree. They can refer back to their English Bibles for a representation of what the Hebrew text has said and to a Greek-English Septuagint edition for what the Greek OT has said.<sup>22</sup> And, of course, English readers without knowledge of the biblical languages should remember to make use of the margins of the various standard English translations of the Bible.

Naturally, NT commentaries will propose additional allusions that the above sources may lack, though, again, readers will have to judge the validity of such proposals.

In my opinion, the most useful of the above tools is the NA<sup>27</sup>, UBS<sup>4</sup>, Beale and Carson, and Hübner. The work by Beale and Carson, however, is the only one among these that also gives substantial analysis of the quotations and clear allusions. Though this book does not provide a list of quotations and allusions in summary form, it is a commentary that covers each quotation and allusion that can be found in the canonical order of the entire NT.

Gough's book is particularly helpful since, unlike all of the other above sources, he gives the OT quotations and many of the allusions in the NT in the order of the canonical OT. In addition, this is the first work of which I am aware that cites subsequent places in the OT where the initial quotation or allusion is referred to. For example, Gough cites Exod. 20:6 ("and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments" and then cites subsequent references or close verbal parallels to this passage in Deut. 5:10, Deut. 7:9, Neh. 1:5, and Dan. 9:4; he then shows where he believes the NT alludes to this particular Exodus passage (or to the other OT passages that reiterate it): Jn. 14:15, 21; 15:10; 1 Jn. 5:2-3. Gough's work, however, lists only the parallels

---

in Paul," 630-633, and Steve Moyise, *Paul and Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), 126-132.

<sup>22</sup> There are two standard English translations of the Greek OT: L. C. L. Brenton, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament and Apocrypha with an English Translation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972), which is dependent on Codex B (Vaticanus), published by special arrangement with Samuel Bagster and Sons, London, originally published in 1844), and *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

and does not discuss how these OT passages are related to one another nor does he discuss the way they are used in the NT.<sup>23</sup>

Finally, very important sources in addition to the above ones, are concordances. Here one should try to search for unique word combinations that perhaps can be found only in your focus text and one or two other OT texts.<sup>24</sup>

If such unique combinations are found, they are good candidates to consider as either quotations or allusions to the OT text.

Since chapter 2 above has surveyed some of the major debates in the field of the Old in the New and this chapter has attempted to clarify what is meant by “quotation,” “allusion,” and “echo,” it is now time to focus on the heart of this book: after an OT quotation or allusion has been identified, how does one approach a study of how the NT uses this OT reference? The next chapter will strive to answer this question.

### **Excursus: Recognizing and Understanding Quotations and Allusions as “Intertextuality”?**

One more issue involving quotations and allusions still needs comment. It is not unusual in the field of biblical studies today to hear the word “intertextuality” used to refer to how later parts of scripture refer to earlier parts. This applies to both quotations, allusions, and so-called echoes, though the term is used more often with respect to allusions and echoes. The term “intertextuality,” however, is a fuzzy word. The word’s original meaning and its ongoing typical definition is the synchronic study of multiple linkages among texts that are not the result of authorial intent but are considered often only from the readers’ viewpoint. Accordingly, intertextuality associates at least two texts (and their contexts), which creates a new context in which to understand a text (often the earlier text); this also means that texts are open to the influence of past

---

<sup>23</sup> Gough also has concluding sections on quotations and allusions from the Apocrypha and Judaism in the NT.

<sup>24</sup> Here electronic concordances have special search functions to determine whether or not unique combinations of words occur between various OT books (or within such books). E.g., cf. Accordance for Apple OS X and Bibleworks, GRAMCORD, or Logos for Microsoft Windows. These are usually somewhat sophisticated search operations, so students may want to consult the technicians of the software programs they are using for advice.

texts and to the contexts of present readers.<sup>25</sup> According to many, intertextuality entails that the reader and the reader's new context is what gives most meaning to these linkages.<sup>26</sup> Others would see a fusion of the author's and reader's meanings being combined to produce a new meaning, often a completely new and different meaning.

As noted above, in biblical studies "intertextuality" is sometimes used merely to refer to the procedure by which a later biblical text refers to an earlier text and how that earlier text enhances the meaning of the later one and how the later one creatively develops the earlier meaning.<sup>27</sup> In this respect, "intertextuality" may be seen as a procedure of "inner-Biblical exegesis" that is crucial to the doing of biblical theology,<sup>28</sup> that is, for understanding the relation of the OT to the New.

There are, however, numerous ways of how "intertextuality" is used and understood. The above are the primary uses. Debates in this area often revolve around whether meaning lies with readers of earlier texts or whether the intention or speech act of an author has the power to inform later readers of that original meaning and whether such readers have the ability to perceive that earlier meaning.<sup>29</sup> This debate involves philosophical and epistemological issues,

---

<sup>25</sup> For this definition, see Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 132-133.

<sup>26</sup> For a sampling of only a few works on intertextuality, see *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*, FS for B. van Iersel, ed. by S. Draisma (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989); M. A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); D. Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University, 1990); R. L. Schultz, *The Search for Quotation* (JSOTSup 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), and the accompanying bibliography; idem., "The Ties That Bind: Intertextuality, the Identification of Verbal Parallels and Reading Strategies in the Book of the Twelve," in *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, edited by P. L. Redditt and A. Scharf (BZAW 325; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2003), 27-45; Paul E. Koptak, "Intertextuality," in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, edited by Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Grand Rapids/London: Baker/SPCK, 2005), 332-334, and the accompanying bibliography.

<sup>27</sup> This would be how the word is typically used by Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* and in his later work, *Conversion of the Imagination*. This would also be how the term would be understood in G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, which provides numerous examples of this kind of phenomenon, as defined above. Likewise, see further R. L. Schultz, *The Search for Quotation*.

<sup>28</sup> Though this "inner-Biblical" exegesis begins already with later OT authors alluding to and interpreting earlier OT texts (on which, e.g., see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*).

<sup>29</sup> E.g., for the nature of the debate in the OT see Miller, "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research," and in the NT see G. K. Beale, "Questions of Authorial Intent, Epistemology, and Presuppositions and Their Bearing on the Study of the

which cannot be taken up further here. Therefore, it may be better to use the phrase “inner-biblical exegesis” or “inner-biblical allusion” instead of “intertextuality,” since the former two nomenclatures are less likely to be confused with postmodern reader-oriented approaches to interpretation, where the term “intertextuality” had its origin.<sup>30</sup>

---

Old Testament in the New: a Rejoinder to Steve Moyise,” *Irish Biblical Studies* 21 (1999), 1-26, which builds on Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?*, and E. D. *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University, 1967) in arguing that later readers can understand earlier author’s meaningful speech acts that are written down.

<sup>30</sup> Following Miller, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research,” 305. See Porter, “Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” 84-85, who considers the use of the term “intertextuality” in biblical studies to be a fad and to be an unnecessary introduction into the field of biblical studies, since the term is typically used differently than in postmodern literary studies.