Intertextuality: Lost (and Found) in Translation

Philip Towner*

The purpose of this study is to discuss the literary process known as intertextuality and define it as a translation challenge for Bible translation. After the a brief background to the concept (A), some common examples will illustrate the ways in which it works, the levels at which it can operate, and the degree to which intention or purpose often affects translation strategies (B). Here the important distinction within literature between sacred and secular text will be identified. Then, two NT examples of “intertextual play” will be set out and developed to demonstrate its importance for meaning (C). In the context of this discussion, some failed translation strategies will be exposed and the relative value of foreignizing versus domesticating translation approaches will be discussed. Finally, I will identify some questions which the phenomenon of intertextuality force us to ask ― questions about translation and the way in which translation might address intertextuality; and I will discuss some options for dealing with intertextuality in translation (D).

1. Introducing Intertextuality

A history of the discovery and development of “intertextuality” as a literary phenomenon would take at least a book to treat adequately. That depth of treatment is not necessary for the purposes of this paper, but some indication as to the complexity of the phenomenon and its relevance for Biblical Studies and translation has to be given. In a general way, the term itself suggests the topic it seeks to describe: the process of a text within the confines of its own discourse exceeding its discourse and narrative boundaries by engaging and connecting with another

* United Bible Societies Director of Translation Services

existing text which functions within its own discourse and narrative boundaries. In reading the NT, for instance, we are most familiar with this process in the case of well-marked quotations of OT material: quotation formulas (“it is written”, “for the Scripture says”, etc.) provide the reader or hearer with the immediate and explicit clue that the writer is drawing another text into the present discourse. What we have to become aware of is the fact that this literary device can be activated in much more subtle — sometimes almost undetectable — ways. All that is really required for the device to be employed is that author and reader/hearer (and sometimes perhaps only the author) is sufficiently familiar with another text or set of texts which are intentionally connected to the present text by one of various means.

As indicated, NT scholars have been aware of the technique of quoting the OT for as long as the NT texts have been studied. Without even introducing the term “intertextuality” academic studies plumbed the depths of rabbinic writings and then the Qumran texts in the effort to discover the secret of intention in quoting ancient texts. And a range of answers emerged. For some, the intention of NT quotations of OT texts was best interpreted on the basis of the authority of the OT for the early Christian communities. Thus authoritative proof texts could serve to ground or confirm the authority of a NT apostolic utterance or pronouncement. C. H. Dodd took the lead in suggesting, however, that an OT quotation intended to call to mind more than just the text itself; it created a link to an entire narrative, so that to discern the sense and function of the material quoted within the NT writing, the original hearer or reader would need to place the present discourse within the story containing the quoted material. As soon as Dodd developed this theory, of course, scholars began to place limits on his findings: in certain cases, entire OT stories/narratives could be called up in this way for at NT audience, but it will be interpretation of the NT writing/discourse employing the quotation that will yield the clues suggesting this extensive connection with the OT.

Again, pioneers in this kind of literary interrelationship did not use the language of “intertextuality.” This emerged through literary studies, where again the process by which a writer intentionally forges links with other existing literature has been observed for as long as there has been literature. With modern and post modern discussions of the locus of meaning (in the author or in the reader or in some combination of the two), however, “intertextuality” has come fully into its own as an element of communication with huge implications for the interpretation of

meaning, and ultimately, even in the literary world, for translation.

2. Some Common Examples

Once the concept is introduced, it is apparent that intertextuality operates on all levels of communication, and the "texts" in the process — both those being created or uttered and those being engaged by the author — are not at all limited to written texts. My daughters used to constantly insert into our family dinner conversations lines from the popular movies — usually comedies — that we had all watched. Why? Sometimes the purpose was just to break the tension created by the discussion of a disappointing test score by drawing us all back into a funny scene: (from Robin Williams in "Mrs. Doubtfire") "Layla, don't make me get the hose!" In a movie, "You've Got Mail", the character played by the actor Tom Hanks engages in an extended intertextual connection to the movie "The Godfather", in order to describe for his email recipient what it means to "play rough" in the business world. In advising the person he was in conversation with to treat business as business and not take it personally, he urged her to "go to the mattress." What is interesting is that for those who have not seen the movie this phrase refers to, it is often mistaken as advice to the woman to seduce her competitors (i.e. "take them to bed"). But the purpose of the allusion is quite the opposite. The phrase "Go to the mattress" called to mind the gruesome scene in "The Godfather" where the lieutenants of one family were sent to the house of a Hollywood director, whose success had been assured by mafia assistance in the past, to call him back to obedience in a particular situation where he had been straying from the family's control. The Hollywood director woke up early in the morning to find the bloody severed head of his prize racehorse in his bed with him.

Of course, political figures in the context of speech-making often draw on texts that not only exist in the public's awareness but also frequently bear enormous authoritative and sentimental weight. Martin Luther King did so famously, often drawing whole Biblical OT narratives into his listeners' purview. Interestingly, his own technique, which often involved personalizing the Biblical allusions, reveals not only his hermeneutics but also his understanding of the dynamic of intertextuality. "I have been to the mountaintop" allows him to take his hearers back

to the story of Moses, at the close of his ministry, looking into the Promised Land but unable to enter: an OT example of an eschatology that is already and not yet. In Martin Luther King's case, however, he as a new Moses was prophetically sure that he was about to do the very thing Moses was not allowed to do — enter the Promised Land.

This is intertextuality — the engaging of an existing text by the author of a text in process to make some point or another. If any of this was lost on you in the examples I chose, because you were not familiar with the background texts, or because you only know the movies through translation, then you begin to realize how difficult translation of intertextuality can be.

Umberto Eco discusses techniques for translating intertextuality in the case of his book *Foucault's Pendulum*. At one point in the story, he describes a character's visual experience of beautiful landscapes in a drive through the Italian hills. Out of the blue readers of the original Italian encounter the phrase "beyond the hedge" which sits oddly in the context, since there had been no mention of a hedge. Eco in this way makes allusion to a poetical piece, well known to Italians. In this case, the point of Eco's intertextual connection with the sonnet is explained by the author himself — a recourse we in Biblical Studies ordinarily do not have open to us. He says the point of the literary contact is simply that the reader should understand that the character depends on the poetical experience of another to enjoy the beauty of the landscape. Translators could not hope to render this connection of thoughts, and so achieve the deep sense of the story, by reproducing the original poetical phrase, because non-Italian readers would not know the text to which Eco originally linked. So Eco suggests that radical changes could be made: and in the case of the English translation of Eco, the translator achieved the same result by inserting instead an allusion to the English poet Keats.

But this way of translating an intentional intertextual allusion in the literary domain of fiction points us to a critical distinction which we almost certainly need to make. What is the difference between translating intertextuality (or translating anything) when one moves from literary fiction to sacred literature? How do the rules differ?

The first question disguises a very large topic and I will simply suggest one feature of this distinction which affects translation. The various ecclesiastical traditions down through the centuries have agreed that the meaning of the story told

by the Scriptures (with some variety allowed for shifting from Hebrew to Greek as an OT base text, for including or rejecting the Deuterocanonicals, and for a preference for the Vulgate or New Vulgate) cannot be separated from the original narrative structure and sequences in and by which that story was first told. This observation is not intended as a comment on the relative strengths and weaknesses of domesticating (common language, functional equivalence, meaning-based) and foreignizing (literal) translation strategies. It is simply to say, rather, that in the history of the churches, as in the history of Judaism, because of the cultural function of the story of YHWH's redemption and its link to a sense of history and time, "deep" meaning and "surface" structure are not easily (if at all) separated. In fact they are intrinsically related. And this has consequences for how intertextuality — a biblical writer forging a connection to another Biblical narrative — will be negotiated in translation.

Before pressing on to NT examples of intertextuality, let me return to the topic of intertextuality within the Biblical tradition. If you have studied Hebrew, you will undoubtedly recall your instructors in Hebrew exegesis or reading courses calling attention to the use of language in the Psalms or the prophets that creates a rich and obvious connection to the language and stories of the Pentateuch. Again and again the OT writers alluded to the Exodus and Wilderness experience as they described the current disobedience of the Jewish people (in exile, perhaps) and reminded them of God's covenant faithfulness. This is intertextuality, and in the Hebrew mind, this interplay of texts was linked closely to a hermeneutics and a world view constructed on the belief that God's story was Israel's story, and the emerging Scriptures telling that story and calling people back to it were authoritative and dynamic.

Thus the Scriptures had a kind of potency for life — they were not simply records. The proof of this is the role in the community of the public reading of Scripture that grew up especially in second temple Judaism. The reading of the Scriptures was carefully set out on a yearly (or triennial) schedule so as to ensure that the people heard the story of redemption, with all its ups and downs, constantly. Practically this of course inundated the people not just with the stories but also with the language of Scriptures and so gave them a sensitivity to the subtle ways in which language and verbal "hooks" could be used by one writer to tell his story within an already existing story — i.e. intertextuality. This high degree of Biblical literacy went hand in hand with the writer's craft.

At the same time, there grew up in Judaism methods of exegesis which would later be attributed to the rabbis. While we may be most familiar with these methods through what we take to be its excesses (numerology, the counting of letters in the Hebrew Bible, strange rules of logic), one important feature of this exegesis was sensitivity to the repetitions of language and concepts that served as “hooks” to link one part of Scripture (or writer) to another. Intertextuality. Qumran literature, especially the *pesharim*, reflect such practices of exegesis by which the community was able to make contemporary sense of past prophecy and find itself within the story. This carries over to the NT writers and communities.

The point is this, within Hebrew culture leading up to (and following) the NT period, the belief about the nature of Scripture’s potency, the practice of its public reading and the generally high level of Biblical literacy that resulted, and the methods of exegesis that developed to ensure that all of Scripture’s potency and relevance was discovered for the contemporary people all are related in some way to the literary feature of intertextuality.

The translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek for the Diaspora Jewish communities (the LXX in the centuries leading up to Christ) would have obscured or obliterated a good deal of the intertextual play among the Hebrew writings, particularly the more subtle links created by lexical choice. However, the amazing fact that the Greek translation came to have canonical status (more or less) in the Diapora made it possible to for Paul to continue on in the literary traditions in which he had been immersed (including intertextual play) when he wrote letters to Disapora Jewish and Gentile Christians which constantly made contact, in overt (quotations) and subtle (allusions and echoes) ways, with the LXX. Presumably, the LXX was his narrative touchstone because the Diaspora synagogues mainly had access to YHWH’s story through the Greek translation of the OT.

3. Two Examples of NT Intertextual Play

While NT intertextuality is most often considered in terms of NT use of the OT — and so “inter-canonical” — the examples I will provide of the technique both focus mainly on the less observed “intra-canonical” case in which Paul echoes Paul. In the second example, however, an OT allusion provides an OT narrative reason

for an intentional lexical shift. Both examples are drawn from the letter which closes the Pauline story — 2 Timothy. Questions about authorship can be set aside for the purposes of our study: either we will be observing cases of the actual Paul engaging his own earlier texts or writings, or a student of Paul engaging his master's earlier texts.

3.1. 2 Timothy 4:6(-8) and Philippians 2:12-18 (1:23)

The language of this section of 2 Timothy is thought to echo (or depend upon) Philippians 2:12-18; the passages are comparable in terms of topic (Paul's suffering as sacrifice), and Philippians 2:17 contains the only other occurrence of the graphic verb "to pour out [like a drink offering]."[1] Theories of literary dependence generally presume the author of 2 Timothy was not Paul, but rather that an excessive tone of self-exaltation is evidence that a later student or admirer of Paul crafted this discourse modeled on the Philippians passage.[2] Others have stressed more accurately that this is not an unexpected tone for Paul to adopt:[3] this is particularly true in light of a passage such as Philippians 2:12-18. There are indeed grounds for thinking that Paul may be intentionally echoing the Philippians letter at this point (and below), just as he has echoed Romans in earlier passages (1:7; 2:11). Let us briefly consider the connections.

2 Tim 4:6

GNT Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου ἐφέστηκεν.

NIV For I am already being poured out like a drink offering, and the time has come for my departure.

NRSV As for me, I am already being poured out as a libation, and the time of my departure has come.

GNB As for me, the time has come for me to be sacrificed; the time is here for me to leave this life.

2 Timothy 4:6 describes an event in Paul's mind. How does he conceptualize it?

---

1) See Hanson, 155; Bassler, 171; Dibelius and Conzelmann, 121.
2) So Dibelius and Conzelmann, 121; Brox, 265.
3) Marshall, 805; Barrett, 118; cf. Johnson, *Paul's Delegates*, 92-96.

Both parts of the sentence allude to Paul's death. The first indication of this comes in the first half of the sentence and the passive verb, "to be poured out as a drink-offering", which refers to the libation that was poured out (often) to accompany and complete a (grain, animal) sacrifice. The Greek term is *spendomai*.[4] In technical use, the term does not refer to sacrificial death, but the metaphor with its allusion to wine may well intend to evoke the imagery of Paul's blood (i.e. his life) being poured out.[5] And the language clearly places Paul's upcoming death into the sacrificial context as an offering (though the passive verb suggests it is God who is acting here)[6] that accompanies another, perhaps, more fundamental offering. It is possible in the present context that he sees his death as complementing the ultimate bloody sacrifice of Messiah (Col 1:24).[7] Above all, the passive voice and the sacrificial imagery underline that this death is not a meaningless but rather a necessary event in the furtherance of the work of the gospel.

The only other NT use of the verb of sacrifice, *spendomai*, is also Pauline in Philippians 2:17.

> Phil 2:17
>
> GNT Ἀλλὰ εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν·
>
> NIV But even if I am being poured out like a drink offering on the sacrifice and service coming from your faith, I am glad and rejoice with all of you.
>
> NRSV But even if I am being poured out as a libation over the sacrifice and the offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with all of you—
>
> GNB Perhaps my life's blood is to be poured out like an offering on the sacrifice that your faith offers to God.

This and the thematic affinity of the passages (also cf. 4:6b with Phil 1:23;

---

4) Gk. σπένδομαι (pass. pres.; Phil 2:17); see the noun (σπονδή) or verb in LXX Exod 29:40; Lev 23:13; Num 4:7; 29:6; Jer 51:17, 25; Sir 50:15; Philo, *Who is the Heir* 183; *Life of Moses* 2.150; Josephus, *Antiquities* 6.22. See O. Michel, *TDNT* 7, 532.

5) Cf. O. Michel, *TDNT* 7, 536; Quinn-Wacker, 792.

6) So it is questionable whether there is any emphasis on Paul's acting "voluntarily" (*pace* Michel, *TDNT* 7, 536; Quinn-Wacker, 792); the thought is rather of obedience.

7) But it is notable that in the other use of the term in Phil 2:17, Paul conceived of his death as completing the service of the Philippian church, which in turn can be seen as its embodiment of the death of Christ (see Marshall, 806).

references to “crown” in 4:8 and Phil 4:1; and the use of athletic imagery in general in both letters) suggest the later text is intentionally echoing the earlier. Bear in mind that 2 Timothy is ostensibly addressed to Timothy and that Timothy certainly knew the letter to the Philippians (Phil 1:1). What should be noticed, however, is the difference in the degree of certainty registered in each text employing the “pouring out” imagery: Philippians 2:17 has “if indeed” (“even if”), while 2 Timothy 4:6 states definitely “I am already” (cf. also the denial “Not that I have already …” of Phil 3:12). What is presented as a distant possibility in the earlier setting has now become imminent certainty in Paul’s mind.

When it is recognized that Paul’s sense of imminent “departure” envisioned in 2 Timothy 4:6b (Gk. noun *analysis*) has a counterpart in his desire “to depart and be with Christ” in Philippians 1:23 (Gk. verb *analyō*), and that the same shift between the texts from uncertainty to certainty is again evident, the case for an intentional intertextual connection becomes almost certain.

What purpose would Paul have had in creating this literary connection for Timothy and other readers of his concluding letter? The main function of the language and imagery in 2 Timothy (as in Philippians) is to provide a theology for suffering and hardship. This is achieved by Paul separately in each letter. What Paul is able to strengthen for Timothy and others who might have known the earlier reflection on these things given in Philippians is the sense of completion and historical certainty whereas in the earlier setting desire and commitment were further removed from historical certainty. One therefore sees progression, and for Timothy to be drawn back into the earlier setting by means of the intertextual echo is to allow him observe how the realities of imprisonment have not diminished Paul’s commitment and hope but have rather confirmed these things. For one who is about to receive the mantle of service, the echo of a passage containing Paul’s theological evaluation of his crisis would have been all the more poignant a device to enact the hand-over of ministry responsibilities.

The interpretation can of course be debated and enlarged upon. My concluding observations relate to translation strategies. If the connection between these two passages is intentional, then translations of each text must be such that they grant access to the intertextual connection. A comparison of the translations offered above allows a very simple conclusion: the more literally inclined (NIV, NRSV) allow the attentive modern reader to make the connection by treating the unusual NT word,

spendomai, consistently as references to the drink offering; the common language translations observed obscure the link by resorting to a translation that settles for what is the semantic lowest common denominator: sacrifice. It can surely be argued that former literal translations represent a foreignizing approach, since the specific concept of the drink offering or libation is not typical for most of the audiences utilizing these modern translations. And the common language aim to domesticate — by seeking a broader concept that will resonate even with modern Westerners — does in fact lessen the jolt of the original text. But in such cases it is the verbal linkage which signals the intertextual play (chiefly *spendomai/analysis-analy*ō), and a translation strategy that does not somehow recreate the signal will not be able to deliver the full meaning intended by the intertextuality in the discourse of 2 Timothy.

3.2. 2 Timothy 1:7 and Romans 8:15

In this text in 2 Timothy there is a clear connection with the language of Romans 8:15. The suitability of a text from Romans for instructing Timothy need not be questions (Rom 16:21). Both texts are "Spirit" texts, though, as we will see, the situation in which we find Timothy in 2 Timothy requires a reshaping of the earlier teaching. It is in the reshaping of the text, I would argue, where the evidence for conscious intertextuality emerges.

> 2 Tim 1:7
> GNT οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ
> NIV For God did not give us a spirit of timidity, but a spirit of power, of love and of self-discipline.
> TNIV … Spirit …
> NRSV for God did not give us a spirit of cowardice, but rather a spirit of power and of love and of self-discipline.
> GNB For the Spirit God has given us does not make us timid; instead his Spirit fills us with power, love and self control.

In this case it will be helpful to compare immediately the translations' renderings of Romans 8:15.

Rom 8:15

GNT οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· αββα ὁ πατήρ.

NIV For you did not receive a spirit that makes you a slave again to fear, but you received the Spirit of sonship. And by him we cry, “Abba, Father.”

TNIV … Spirit … Spirit

NRSV For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father!”

GNB For the Spirit that God has given you does not make you slaves and cause you to be afraid; instead the Spirit makes you God’s children, and by the Spirit’s power we cry out to God, “Father! my Father!”

The basic observation to be made from this comparison of translations is that NIV and NRSV treat the reference to “spirit” as a reference to the human spirit. In my judgment, this cannot have been intended in either Romans or 2 Timothy in view of the dominance of the Holy Spirit in each case. The TNIV has corrected the NIV; and the GNB’s theological reading of the texts in question shows good Pauline instincts.

The context of 2 Timothy 1:6-14 is taken up with an exhortation to a faltering Timothy. For some reason he has suffered a blow to his confidence, and in order to prepare Timothy to make the trip to Rome, where Paul is anticipating his execution, to receive the mantle of ministry from the apostle, the text seeks various means by which to cause Timothy to re-engage in his mission. This is the context for the Spirit statement about to be made.

Given Timothy’s résumé, which included service as Paul’s mission coworker and occasional assignments within established congregations (e.g. 1 Cor 4:17), separate references to a congregational commissioning (1 Tim 4:14) and to an apostolic commissioning in conjunction with his conversion/initiation present no great problem. The literary character of the respective letters corresponds just as well to this situation. In this case, the commissioning event in mind — the handing on of the mission from Paul to his coworker — might quite suitably call for this reminder of the earlier formative event in which the gift of the Spirit came to Timothy. Though the parallel is not quite complete, the traditions of Moses handing on authority to Joshua (see below) and of Elijah passing the mantle on to Elisha may not be far from mind.[8)]

In order to strengthen the admonition, Paul adds to his acknowledgment of Timothy's genuine faith a theological reason for stepping back into action. This reason ("for"; *gar*) is to be found in the recollection of a theology of the Holy Spirit. The language of this verse is very similar to Romans 8:15:[9)]

> Rom 8:15 — [For] the Spirit you received does not make you slaves, so that you live in fear again; rather the Spirit you received brought about your adoption to sonship.
>
> 2 Tim 1:7 — For the Spirit God gave us does not make us timid, but gives us power, love and self-discipline.

Although the texts are not identical, the latter text must be understood as a conscious echo of the earlier teaching about the Spirit.[10)] The text is reshaped to meet the present need. In this ministry context, Paul transposes the concern expressed in Romans for enslavement to the law (*douleias*) to timidity (*deilias*) in the face of opposition.[11)] As I mentioned above, this particular "reshaping" is indication of intentional play. Yet the intentional shift to a near homophone at the same time opens the door to another echo—this time of the command spoken by the Lord in the commissioning of Joshua:

> Jos 1:9 I have commanded thee; be strong and courageous, be not cowardly [*deiliasēs*] nor fearful, for the Lord your God is with you wherever you go (cf. 8:1).

This verbal echo, if present, is admittedly faint.[12)] But the tone, narrative setting and intention of the instructions create a plausible match. The effect would be to call

---

8) For the background, see Wolter, *Paulustradition*, 218-222.

9) Cf. esp. the Greek :
Rom 8:15: οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας ... ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας...
2 Tim 1:7: οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ.

10) Cf. Oberlinner, 32; Hanson, 121.

11) Cf. Oberlinner, 32.

12) But cf. also how Joshua is instructed to "guard" (φυλάσσεσθαι) what Moses commanded (1:7), and Timothy is to "guard" (φύλαξον) the good deposit entrusted to him by Paul (2 Tim 1:14). Cf. the promise that the Lord will never abandon (ἐγκαταλείψω) Joshua in and the use of the "abandonment" (ἐγκαταλείπω) theme in 2 Timothy 4:10, 16.

on the image of Joshua, who in his commissioning was urged to be strong and courageous and not timid because God would be present. In the Pauline adaptation of the OT promise, Timothy, by virtue of the Spirit in him, can count on the same protective presence of God.

In the end, both the connection to Rom 8:15 and the present language itself[13] make clear that it is God's gift of the Holy Spirit, and qualities associated with this gift, that provides the reason Paul's logic requires.[14] First, the echoing of Romans reveals that the intended backdrop to this teaching is Paul's fundamental teaching about the Spirit and Christian identity—possession of this gift ensures and confirms adoption into God's family (Rom 8:14-17). The additional contact created with the Joshua text redirects the earlier teaching to the theme of encouragement and handing over of mission.

As with the first example, the question here is whether translations are effective in giving access to the intertextual connections. The more literal translations of the NIV and NRSV do recreate the basic rhythm, though the TNIV is needed to correct the reference to the Spirit.

The GNB, while expanding the language of each text (explicitation), actually in three specific and noticeable ways invites the two texts to be connected, though I cannot be sure the goal was enable readers to observe the intertextuality. First, GNB harmonizes the key opening verbs: the preference is for the verb "to give" (from 2 Tim 1:7) over "to receive" (Rom 8:15), which in the end causes both texts to emphasize the Spirit as a gift given by God. Second, in translating 2 Timothy 1:7, GNB repeats (for clarity) the term Spirit, which then creates an affinity for the twofold reference to Spirit in Rom 8:15. Third, in translating the original relative clause of Rom 8:15 ("by [in] whom we cry out") by means of the expanded idea "by the Spirit's ***power*** we cry out", GNB adds to the Romans text the concept of "power", not originally present, which again creates a balance with the explicit reference to "power" 2 Timothy 1:7 ("[the Spirit] of power").

Thus the domesticating and theologizing approach of the GNB which created distance between the texts in 2 Timothy and Philippians in the first example of

13) Gk. δίδωμι; the verb "to give" in one form or another typically describes God's action in respect to this gift (Luk 11:13; Act 5:32; 8:18; 15:8; Rom 5:5; 1 Cor 1:22; 5:5; etc.).

14) In the present context, reference in some sense to Timothy's commissioning in v.6 has led some to interpret "Spirit of power" in this statement as a specific charisma received with ordination; see Brox, 229; Kelly, 159-60; Hasler, 57.

intertextuality here serves to create an attraction between the texts in 2 Timothy and Romans.

4. **Questions and Options**

The illustrations of intertextuality given are not the most obvious and easy to interpret (quotations), and in fact it could be challenged whether they should be categorized as intertextuality at all. Obviously it is my opinion that intertextuality, as defined above, is in play in these cases, but that does not answer the questions about how to deal with the phenomenon in translation. Here I will raise a few more questions in the way of concluding observations.

First, if intertextuality is discernable in the biblical texts, then coming to terms with the meaning of those texts has to involve access to the intertextuality. Translations not sensitive to these cross-textual connections will fail to deliver a translation with the full potency required. Of course it has to be observed that no translation can deliver an unobscured form the original with all of these nuances. The LXX, as I pointed out, essentially obliterates a good deal of the Hebrew word play contained within the Hebrew Scriptures it translated into Greek. Since it obtained authority in the Diaspora (apparently), this did not deter Paul from forging his own intertextual connections with it for his Greek-speaking communities and colleagues. However, we are in a situation, more or less, where the MT and Greek NT form our authoritative base texts. And without some device or other, this deters translators in many cases from providing an OT translation that would correspond to the one that Paul might have been reading and engaging through intertextuality — the MT lies behind the OT translation, while the LXX undeniably lies behind Paul's OT quotations and allusions. This is a conundrum.

One kind of solution, at least when dealing with the Greek text of the NT, is that offered by the Nestle-Aland tradition of giving marginal references to other texts similar in language and phraseology which might then reflect some kind of intentional echo or allusion. This NA apparatus limits itself to the most obvious connections, but at least this is a start. The problem, again, is that for a translation to employ this kind of device to aid the reader in tracing intertextual connections would not overcome the difficulty posed by a NT writer engaging the OT via the

LXX and the translation providing an OT rendering based on the MT. A Study Bible with additional notes to account for this kind of literary play might be able to cover at least the ground that NA does. But it might be a cumbersome product.

A better solution might now lie in the digital realm. Texts have already been prepared which could easily be adapted for hyper-texting to reveal other texts that might be related to the surface or default text. By running the cursor over the default text, related texts underlying the default could be exposed in windows. The technology exists, if the will to produce such a specialized tool can be found.

In any case, the point of the two illustrations given is that the texts in 2 Timothy cannot be fully appreciated on their own. Translations can help or hinder the reader in making the intended intertextual connections. Within a canon — either OT or NT — where the base text remains more or less constant, the task is challenging but good results could be achieved. However, when crossing from NT to OT, and the complication of the LXX is factored in, the task becomes far more complex. Is it sufficient to leave these considerations to those who write commentaries in hopes that some will read them?

This might end up in a strong argument for the need of continued mastery of the original Biblical languages — Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek. And I would argue that only a high level of facility with these languages makes discernment and interpretation of intertextuality in the Biblical texts possible. But this is not practical for non-specialists in the the diversity of the world's churches.

Second, many church communities and traditions (perhaps most) do not practice the public reading of Scripture to a degree that would allow the depth of familiarity with the Biblical writings that probably characterized ancient Judaism and the early church. Competing world views and value systems disseminate their stories more efficiently and with greater effect. Some method of keeping the churches within the Biblical story could be devised and practiced, but the base text for this story would not be Greek or Hebrew, and access to the story would be through a derivative translation. For most communities, Scripture is authoritative in and through the accepted translation — on the model of the LXX. But apart from some device built into the translation for allowing access to intertextual cues, a translation in a church community that is consistently read is more likely to create its own intertextualities. These would be features owing to the translation and community interaction with the translation, and not to the original languages. In any case, discernment of

intertextuality is a by-product of community familiarity with the biblical story.

Third, most church traditions (certainly evangelical ones) tend to resist the sort of hermeneutical methods that sought discovery of subtle intertextual connections on the basis of word and language play. Literal methods, and those which focus on single meaning, a strict view of authorial intention, historico-grammatical interpretation, and so on, shy away from the sort of search for subtle literary links that characterizes intertextuality. While the presence of intertextual intentions should be verified, its sometimes less than obvious nature should not disqualify it from serious study. The point is, the ground rules for interpretation in a given community or church tradition might well place intertextuality fairly low on the agenda. Another way of viewing this is to say that it is the nature of the Biblical writings themselves (and the literary features they employ) that gave rise to ancient methods of reading them. Simply to write off rabbinic exegesis as fantastical or arcane, or simply to link (e.g.) allegorical exegesis with philosophical developments in Alexandria may be to fail to appreciate an ancient awareness of how Scriptures "work" in community reading and application.

Finally, it is clear that once intertextuality is admitted to be a feature of the texts that make up the Biblical story, we are in a better position to engage with the story in a deeper way. What is not clear is how intertextuality can be translated. Will readers' tools be sufficient to give access to this level of the text? Perhaps some ground can be gained here. My suggestion would be that reaching this level of the text in church communities will require a reshaping of their reading, listening and interpreting cultures, and translations which function authoritatively may (as read and interpreted) produce new and dynamic intertextualities.

<Keyword>
intertextuality, narrative, translation, literalism, Pauline texts

<Abstract>

본문 상호성: 번역에서 잃어버린 것과 찾은 것

필립 타우너 박사
(세계성서공회연합회 번역 총책임자)

"본문상호성", 즉 저자나 화자가 이미 존재하는 본문이나 내러티브를 언급하거나 그 요소들을 다루는 것은 신약과 구약 성서의 한 요소로서 분명히 인식된다. 문학적-이야기의 요소에 대한 이 연구에서는 세심한 연구가 필요하다는 것을 지적하였다. 이것은 본문으로 하여금 더욱 풍성하게 의미를 표현할 수 있도록 해주며, 번역자들에게는 자신들의 번역 기술에 대해 도전을 안겨준다. "본문내적 연결성(intra-textuality)" (예를 들면 "바울"의 본문끼리 서로 연결되는 것)이라고 부를 수 있는 것을 살펴볼 때, 결국 문제는 본문상호성이라는 것이 번역에 있어서 어떻게 설명될 수 있는가라는 질문으로 이어지게 된다.

(양재훈 역)