

THE ACCORDANCE 'INFER' SEARCH
AND IT'S USE FOR INTERTEXTUAL STUDIES

Robert Marineau, Student
Dallas Theological Seminary
Paper Presented in the Open Section
National Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society
New Orleans, Louisiana, 19 November 2009

This presentation will, primarily, explain the mechanics and use of the Accordance INFER search. Before doing so, however, this paper will provide a summary of the current state of Intertextual studies in the Old Testament. I'm sure many of you already have a grasp of this approach, but a summary will provide a helpful context for explaining the INFER search. Lastly, after explaining the mechanics and use of the INFER search, I will provide an example of the results this search can uncover.

Old Testament Intertextual Studies

Among Biblical scholars the term intertextuality has tended to be used to describe a reference or relationship of one text to another (presumably earlier) text. For example, this term has been used in studies on use of the Old Testament in the New Testament. Various other terms have arisen to more specifically describe some of these references/relationships (e.g., allusion, echo, intratextuality, inner-biblical exegesis,¹ inverted quotation,² etc.). In the process, this term

¹ For this last term see especially Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

² See Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and Their Dynamics," in *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. J. de Waard L. J. de Regt, and J. P. Fokkelman (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 31-50.

has morphed into a catchall term to identify any and all references/relationships between texts.³ The reason for the more general meaning of the term is that originally it was “developed... as a *theoretical* rather than a *methodological* term.”⁴

Julia Kristeva first coined the term “intertextuality” in the context of post-structuralist literary criticism.⁵ She understood it not in terms of “literary borrowing or poetic influence” but “to describe every discourse, whether written or spoken. Every discourse is intertextual.”⁶ Robert P. Carroll elaborates on what this means, “Intertextuality, among so many other things, means that no text can ever be seen as existing as a closed system or as a hermetic or self-sufficient text. It always exists in terms of and over against other texts. Other texts helped to create it. Its writers are always readers of other texts. So it always exists in reference to other texts.”⁷ In other words all texts are written in the context of or in light of other texts to one degree or another.

Philosophers have developed this idea of intertextuality to define contextualized truth within communities. All truth within a community is defined by that community’s values, laws, history, culture, etc. In a similar way, post-structuralist literary critics such as Kristeva are saying that every text is defined by its context and its context is nearly infinite.⁸ For Kristeva and others,

³ Timothy K. Beal, “Glossary,” in *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 23; Richard L. Schultz, “The Ties That Bind: Intertextuality, the Identification of Verbal Parallels, and Reading Strategies in the Book of the Twelve,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 2001 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 40; Kirsten Nielson, “Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible,” in *Congress Volume Oslo 1998*, ed. A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 17.

⁴ Timothy K. Beal, “Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production,” in *Reading Between Texts*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 27.

⁵ Beal, “Glossary,” 22; Beal, “Ideology and Intertextuality,” 27; Nielson, “Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible,” 17.

⁶ Beal, “Glossary,” 22.

⁷ Robert P. Carroll, “Intertextuality and the Book of Jeremiah: Animadversions on Texts and Theory,” in *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum and David J. A. Clines, JSOTSup, vol. 143 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 74.

⁸ George Aichele and Gary A. Phillips, “Intertextuality and the Bible,” in *Semeia*, ed. George Aichele and Gary A. Phillips, vol. 69/70 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 9-10. Aichele and Phillips mention Derrida as well who refers to this sort of boundless context as the “general text” 10.

“the basic force of intertextuality is to problematize, even spoil, textual boundaries—those lines of demarcation which allow a reader to talk about *the* meaning, subject, or origin of a writing. Such borders, intertextuality asserts, are never solid or stable. Texts are always spilling over into other texts... ‘No text is an island.’”⁹

Moving beyond the theoretical observation that all texts are derived from all texts, Biblical scholars changed the concept into a lens through which to read scripture.¹⁰ Novel as this may sound, reading various passages in the Bible in light of others is nothing new. For example, Noth’s Deuteronomistic History theory was derived from such a reading and all the debates on use of the OT in NT are centered on it as well. But the *purpose* for such a reading has drastically changed in the wake of the post-structuralist perspective on intertextuality.¹¹ Instead of looking for links to reconstruct history or “what really happened,” scholars are beginning to look for literary relationships to understand the meaning of the final form of the text.¹² The shift to looking for intertextual relationships while also accepting the final form of the text has brought

⁹ Beal, “Glossary,” 22-23. In the introduction to a collection of Kristeva’s essays, Leon S. Roudiez defines several terms that Kristeva uses. Concerning *intertextuality* he says, “It is defined... as the transposition of one or more *systems* (sic) of signs into another, accompanied by a new articulation of the enunciative and denotative position,” Leon S. Roudiez, “Introduction,” in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez and Alice Jardine (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 15.

¹⁰ Kirsten Nielson notes that this “change” has also been described as an “abuse” of Kristeva’s theory. Agreeing that Kristeva’s theory has been abused, he says further, “I am also willing to commit the sin that is here called ‘abuse’, if this kind of abuse places certain tools in my hand that make me a better textual reader. What I present on the subject of intertextuality does *not* therefore correspond to Kristeva’s definition, but is nonetheless inspired by it” Nielson, “Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible,” 17-18.

¹¹ This is not to imply that the post-structuralist perspective is the only influence to the recent change in purpose when observing intertextuality. Rather, as a post-structuralist might say, a trend like this one begins in the midst of a nearly infinite context. Therefore, a new chapter in literary criticism is hardly worthy of full credit for the rise of this new purpose.

¹² Childs says, “This concept allows interpretation to engage the Bible’s heterogeneity with a new mode of understanding of the whole, and thus to overcome the pitfalls of fragmentation caused by critical scholarship’s attempts to disentangle the text’s multiple voices” Brevard S. Childs, “Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 115 (2003): 175. Similarly, another scholar summarizes his study saying, “What I have proposed in this paper is an intertextual way of reading that focuses on the process of meaning making rather than on an attempt to recover ‘what really happened’” Timothy Frederick Simpson, “Paradigm Shift Happens: Intertextuality and a Reading of 2 Samuel 16:5-14,” *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Society* 17 (1997): 66.

forth new insights to the theology and rhetorical strategies of (at the least) the final redactor or (at most) the original author.

Method for Determining Intertextual Relationships

The difficulty of doing an intertextual study lies primarily in the criteria for identifying a legitimate intertextual relationship between two texts. This difficulty has been answered different ways. Timothy Beal frankly states that “the reader’s ideology” is “what determines which intertextual relationships are legitimate and which are not.”¹³ Richard Schultz, on the other hand, is a little more optimistic in the ability of the interpreter to correctly identify intertextual links. He says that using terms such as “quotation, allusion, catchword, and motif” are helpful in identifying intertextual links, but states that “focusing on verbal parallels that offer a more extensive textual basis for positing *intentional* interrelationships is a more viable approach to the ‘ties that bind.’”¹⁴ But going with Schultz by no means solves the problem. In a recent article, Jeffery Leonard notes, “Even among those who accept the notion that textual relationships can be established, there is considerable disagreement as to the kind of evidence that should take precedence in demonstrating the connection.”¹⁵ This is reflected most clearly in the fact that most who do work in intertextual studies do not have clear criteria of classification for their identifications of intertextual connections. In light of this situation, Leonard nuances what this “textual basis” might look like by suggesting eight principles as methodological guidelines that focus on how to evaluate instances where two passages share language.¹⁶ These guidelines help indicate what kinds of “shared language” are more important than others.

¹³ Beal, “Ideology and Intertextuality,” 28.

¹⁴ Schultz, “The Ties That Bind,” 40.

¹⁵ Jeffery M. Leonard, “Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 243.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 246. Leonard lists them out and then applies them to Ps 78,

There has been an emphasis on rhetorical use of a passage to validate the existence of an intertextual link.¹⁷ In other words, an intertextual link has to mean something beyond what exists in the context already or to bolster the argument or meaning of the text one is reading. Fishbane bases his book on this assumption. The very nature of his “inner-biblical exegesis” is that a later text is interpreting and reapplying an earlier text in a new historical context to give the earlier text a renewed meaning that goes beyond, in some way, what it meant originally.¹⁸

The Accordance INFER Search

In the early part of the summer of 2008, Accordance released a new search function in version 8.0 called the INFER command. It is called the “INFER command” “because it gives you a way to infer literary connections between two texts.”¹⁹ The INFER command accomplishes this “by building a list of multi-word phrases found in one text and then searching for those phrases in the other one.”²⁰ When setting up an INFER search, there is a prompt that allows you to determine the length of the phrase you want to search for (the default number of words is six). When executed, the search will build a list of phrases six words long in the base text²¹ and will then look for those phrases in another text²² of the user’s choice. Accordance has also built in a little flexibility into the search, thus allowing for stylistic variation. “By default, the INFER command allows for one word either to be dropped from the phrase or inserted into the phrase,

¹⁷ See, for example, the list and discussion in Gordon H. Johnston, “Nahum's Rhetorical Allusions to the Neo-Assyrian Lion Motif,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158 (2001): 287-90.

¹⁸ See, for example, Fishbane’s discussion of Lev 23 in Neh 8:13-17, Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 109-12. See also Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*, Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplement Series, vol. 26 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 302-03.

¹⁹ David Lang, “INFER-mation,” in *Accordance Blog* (www.accordancebible.com, May 30, 2008).

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Defined as the text from which you are searching.

²² I.e., the “search text.”

so that the approximate rather than exact matches can be found.”²³ In this way, the search can be modified to find either multiple or few hits. However, as more and more ambiguity is built into the search, there will be more and more hits that are not legitimate intertextual links. Yet, when the search is built with little to no ambiguity, while the results will certainly be legitimate intertextual links, there will also be passages with intertextual links that are excluded in the results. So, depending on the purpose of the researcher, one needs to decide what will fit his or her needs given the occasion for performing this search. If one desires to do a haphazard search to find one or two juicy connections then the search should be built with less ambiguity. But if one is doing rigorous research demanding comprehensive and accurate results, then more ambiguity should be used and the data sifted through.

INFER Search Test Case: Judg 2:1-3²⁴

For Judg 2:1-3, the INFER search found several significant verbal parallels. Judg 2:1 introduces this section and contains marked citation of a previous text followed by a short speech that interacts with antecedent teaching (this speech continues through v 3).²⁵

Research on Judg 2 has received a lot of scholarly attention especially in regards to its relationship to Joshua and Deuteronomy and the role it plays in the Deuteronomistic History. There are some who label this section as filled with Deuteronomistic language and make zero

²³ Lang, “INFER-mation.” There are other ways to limit and expand the INFER search. For a detailed description with examples of the other options see David Lang, “In Depth INFER-mation,” in *Accordance Blog* (www.accordancebible.com, July 8, 2008).

²⁴ The following is reproduced almost exactly from a final paper I wrote in the Fall semester of 2008 for an independent study with Dr. Robert B. Chisholm entitled, *Legal Background of the Book of Judges*. That study focused on the relationship of Judges to the legal portions of Exodus, in particular Exod. 20-40.

²⁵ Fishbane describes and discusses various formulae for marked citation in chapter 6 entitled “Legal Exegesis with Verbatim, Paraphrastic, or Pseudo-citations in Historical Sources” Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, beginning on 107.

reference to Exod 20-40.²⁶ While others have devoted entire articles to studying the relationship between Judg 2 and portions of Exod 20-40.²⁷

Determining that Judg 2:1-3 is related primarily to Exod 20-40 rather than to Deuteronomy is largely based on the first part of Judg 2:1,²⁸ which says, “the Mal’ak Adonai went up from Gilgal to Bochim.” While there is much debate on the identity of the “Mal’ak Adonai,” this title and the tone of the Mal’ak’s speech are clear references to the Mal’ak in Exod 3:2; 14:19; 23:20; 32:34; and 33:2.²⁹ This Mal’ak is not mentioned one time in Deuteronomy.³⁰ From the beginning of this passage, the reader is reminded of the text of Exodus.

Judg 2:1b-3 is the speech given by the Mal’ak. As noted above, some assert that the

²⁶ Susan Niditch, *Judges: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 47-50; Robert H. O’Connell, *The Rhetoric of The Book of Judges* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), e.g., 59-60, see also the scripture index on Exod 20-40 and Judg 2, pp. 506, 11-13; Tammi J. Schneider, *Judges*, Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry, ed. David W. Cotter (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000), 25-33; J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary*, trans. J. S. Bowden, Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), 30-44. One commentator notes one connection with Exod 34 but says nothing of the possible meaning of the connection: Barry G. Webb, *The Book of Judges: An Integrated Reading* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1987), 103, see endnote 86.

²⁷ E.g., Hans Ausloos, “The “Angel of YHWH” in Exod. xxii 20-33 and Judg. ii 1-5. A Clue to the “Deuteronom(ist)ic” Puzzle?,” *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 1-12. Others who mention or discuss portions of Exod 20-40 while commenting on Judg 2 include Yairah Amit, *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*, Biblical Interpretation Series, vol. 38 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), e.g., 156; Robert G. Boling, *Judges*, vol. 6A, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1975), e.g., 62; Barnabas Lindars, *Judges 1-5* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), e.g., 75; Janet E. Tollington, “The Book of Judges: The Result of Post-Exilic Exegesis?,” in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (Boston: Brill, 1998), 189. Although these commentators do mention portions of Exod 20-40 in their discussion, most still describe the content of Judg 2 as predominantly Deuteronomistic. Conversely, however, one commentator significantly says, “Anyone who is familiar with previous books of the Old Testament will recognize most of the expressions and concepts presented here. Indeed the narrator seems to have gone out of his way to link this episode with several in the Book of Exodus, specifically Exod 23:20-33 and 34:11-15” Daniel I. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 110.

²⁸ Although there is other evidence for this, see below

²⁹ “Since chap. 6 clearly distinguishes between the prophet (v. 8) and the *mal’ak YHWH* (v. 11), the present personage is best understood as a heavenly envoy. This is probably the same figure whom Yahweh had promised in the time of Moses to send ahead of the Israelites in their campaigns against the Canaanites (cf. Exod 23:20-23; 33:2; also 32:34) and who functioned as the alter ego of God” Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 110. For more on the identity of the Mal’ak see the discussion and research in Ausloos, “The “Angel of YHWH” in Exod. xxiii 20-33 and Judg. ii 1-5,” 610; Gregory T. K. Wong, *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study*, *Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series*, vol. 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 199-223.

³⁰ The only occurrence of the word *mal’ak* in Deuteronomy is in the plural form in Deut 2:26, which is clearly referring to human messengers sent by Moses to Sihon king of Hesbon.

content of this speech is Deuteronomistic.³¹ But, in light of the data collected with the INFER search, the language and phraseology is characteristic of that in Exod 20-40 rather than in Deuteronomy.

The INFER search connected Judg 2:1 with Exod 23:20, 23; and 33:1. The connections for this verse are not overly strong except for the presence of the Mal'ak. For the connection with 23:20 and 23, in addition to the presence of the Mal'ak, there is a parallel with the hiphil form of בוא followed by the preposition אל.³²

ויעל מלאך־יהוה מן־הגלגל אל־הבכים פ ויאמר אעלה אתכם ממצרים ואביא אתכם אל־הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאבותיכם ואמר לא־אפר בריתי אתכם לעולם:	Judg 2:1 ³³
הנה אנכי שלח מלאך לפניך לשמרך בדרך ולהביאך אל־המקום אשר הכנתי:	Exod 23:20
כי־ילך מלאכי לפניך והביאך אל־האמרי והחתי והפרזי והכנעני החוי והיבوسی והכחרתיו:	Exod 23:23
וידבר יהוה אל־משה לך עלה מזה אתה והעם אשר העלית מארץ מצרים אל־הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לאמר לזרעך אתננה:	Exod 33:1

³¹ See note 26 above.

³² There was a certain level of ambiguity built into the search in order to find approximate rather than exact matches. So in Judg 2:1 there are the intervening words אַתְּכֶם, while in Exod 23:20, 23 there are no words between בוא and the preposition אל.

Lexically, the connection between Judg 2:1 and Exod 33:1 is stronger than that of Judg 2:1 and Exod 23.³⁴ The connection is established by a repeated and identical, six-word phrase.³⁵ It must be noted however, that the key to this connection is the verb נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי. The other words could be just one innocuous coincidence of words that are commonly used together. So, as a challenge to understanding Judg 2:1 in light of Exod 33:1, the INFER search found sixty-one connections between this verse and Deuteronomy; many of which contained the verb נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי, seemingly undermining the legitimacy of reading Judg 2:1 in light of Exod 33:1.³⁶ However, while the passages surfaced by the INFER search contain many compelling parallels and similarities, of the twenty-eight times the verb is נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי used in conjunction with other words related to Judg 2:1, only six are in the same form as that of Judg 2:1.³⁷ In all but one of the Deuteronomy passages at least one word from the phrase in Judg 2:1 is missing. Two of the closest parallels are Deut 31:21 and 31:23. Deut 31:21 merely lacks the final preposition לְ at the end of the phrase. Deut 31:23 contains the phrase in its entirety.³⁸ The context of Deut 31:21 and 23, however, is of the commissioning of Joshua to lead Israel into the land and the decommissioning of Moses just before he dies (beginning at Deut 31:14). So now the question is, which text more naturally forms the background of Judg 2:1? Based on the presence of Mal'ak in

³³ The vowels have been left off to facilitate the identification of lexical parallels via underlining.

³⁴ Block notes the differences between Judg 2:1 and Exod 23:20, 23 but seemingly does not see the more exact parallel found in Exod 33:1; Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 113. It must also be noted, however, that there are further parallels in this section of Judges to Exod 23. “The best explanation is that the author intends a reference to the angel in Exod 23.20-33, which seems to be the principal literary model for the whole section...” Lindars, *Judges 1-5*, 75.

³⁵ Including prepositions and the article, that is.

³⁶ Which could confirm Boling description of this passage: “The language of the envoy of the old epic sources is here thoroughly Deuteronomic” Boling, *Judges*, 62; O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of The Book of Judges*, 71-72.

³⁷ Deut 1:35; 10:11; 31:20, 21, 23; 34:4.

³⁸ In addition, Deut 31:20 also has a near parallel: אֶל־הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לָאֲבֹתַי

Exod 33:2 and his commissioning to go before Israel, Judg 2:1 connects more readily to Exod 33:1-2 than to the Deuteronomy passages.³⁹

To a certain extent reading Judg 2:1 in light of Exod 23 or 33 has very little rhetorical effect. Read on its own the function of Judg 2:1 as the introduction to 2:1-5 is for the Mal'ak to establish his identity as well as the justification for the indictments and punishment delivered in the following two verses. The contribution that Exod 23 and 33 have for Judg 2:1 is only to reinforce the meaning of Judg 2:1 by tying it to the past via a literary source available to the author/editor, i.e., Exod 23 and 33.

The INFER search connected Judg 2:2 with Exod 34:12, 13, and 15. These connections are strong. Almost the entire first phrase of Judg 2:2 shares exact wording with Exod 34:12 and 15 (see chart below). Interestingly, in Judg 2:2 this phrase, which was used as both a warning and a prohibition in Exod 34,⁴⁰ is slightly re-worded to have a stronger imperatival force and the warning aspect is dropped entirely.⁴¹

³⁹ Ausloos believes that this phrase (i.e., אֱלֹהֵי אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְאַבְרָם) “resembles much more the Deuteronomic phraseology than Exod 23” (he includes Deut 1:8; 6:10, 18, 23; 8:7-10; 9:5; 10:11; 26:3; 31:7, 20, 21, 23), Ausloos, “The "Angel of YHWH" in Exod. xxiii 20-33 and Judg. ii 1-5,” 11.

⁴⁰ Exod 34:12 and 15 have the telic particle **פֶּן** indicating the possible outcome (apodosis) of not guarding themselves. The presence of **פֶּן** indicates that the verb **תִּכְרַת** is in the subjunctive mood; see Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Accordance Electronic ed. ver. 2.0. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 511, §31.6.1c. Cf. Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Accordance Electronic ed. ver. 1.6, Subsidia Biblica, vol. 27 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006), 596-97, §168g. They say that **פֶּן** is used “to indicate a negative wish of a speaker or speakers.” In footnote 9 they say, “In those rather rare cases where **פֶּן**, at the very beginning of a sentence, has a negative optative sense, it appears that it stems from **פֶּן נִשְׁמַר** to guard oneself against something, naturally something causing fear. Thus in Exod 34:15 is no doubt an elliptical expression of the fuller form in vs 12.”

⁴¹ The particle **פֶּן** is replaced by the emphatic use of the 2mp personal pronoun. Concerning this use of the personal pronoun, “the pronoun indicates strongly focused attention; the speaker may be giving a command or leading up to a demand” Waltke and O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 296, §16.3.2e.

ואתם לא־תכרתו ברית ליושבי הארץ הזאת מזבחותיהם תתצון ולא־שמעתם בקלי מה־זאת עשיתם:	Judg 2:2
השמר לך פן־תכרת ברית ליושב הארץ אשר אתה בא עליה פן־יהיה למוקש בקרבך:	Exod 34:12
כי את־מזבחתם תתצון ואת־מצבתם תשברון ואת־אשריו תכרתון:	Exod 34:13
כי לא תשתחוה לאל אחר כי יהוה קנא שמו אל קנא הוא:	Exod 34:14 ⁴²
פן־תכרת ברית ליושב הארץ וזנו אחרי אלהיהם וזבחו לאלהיהם וקרא לך ואכלת מזבחיו:	Exod 34:15

Interestingly, the INFER search did not find any passages from Deuteronomy that were parallel to Judg 2:2 by containing any of the words that Exod 34 shares with Judg 2:2. All of them were variations of the second to last phrase in Judg 2:2: ולא־שמעתם בקלי. Only by performing a search for passages with כרת and ברית within five words of each other (any order) were any Deuteronomy passages found that could be considered as the background for Judg 2:2. The closest parallel passage is Deut 7:2:

ונתנם יהוה אלהיך לפניך והכיתם החרם תחרים אתם לא־תכרת להם ברית ולא תחנם:ס

This verse certainly has similar themes and message, but in comparison to Exod 34:12 and 15, this parallel is weak. The context of Deut 7:2, however, is very similar to Exod 34 and Judg 2:1-3. In Deut 7:5 is the second phrase from Judg 2:2 “destroy their altars.” However, the form of the verb “destroy” is not exactly the same in Deut 7:5 as it is in Judg 2:2: תתצו, תתצון, respectively. The difference is not great (lack of energetic nun in Deut 7:5), but because the verb in Exod 34:13 is not different at all, this puts priority more heavily on Exod 34:13 than on Deut 7:5. In addition to the phraseological and morphological differences between Deut 7:1-5 and Judg 2:2, Deut 7:1-5 seems to be an expanded version of Exod 34:11-13, 16. In Deut 7:1-5 the concepts it shares with Exod 34:11-13 and Judg 2:2 are expanded and explained. Deut 7:1 expands Exod 34:11 by describing God’s promise to drive out the nations with more words and even adds a seventh nation to the six in Exod 34. Deut 7:2 expands and clarifies only the first phrase of Exod 34:12.

⁴² Exod 34:14 is included to complete the context of Exod 34 and also because it has a similar theme to the other Exodus verses as well as to Judg 2:2.

Deut 7:3-4 expands and explains Exod 34:16: one way (intermarriage) they might “make a covenant” with the nations and warns that their sons would be turned away from the Lord. Deut 7:5 concludes the explanation by expanding Exod 34:13. So, because Exod 34:11-15 is more phraseologically and morphologically parallel as well as more succinct (like Judg 2:2), it seems clear that Judg 2:2 intentionally quotes Exod 34:12, 13, and 15.⁴³ In addition, Judg 2:2 is still the speech of the Mal’ak, therefore these commands “must again be interpreted primarily in light of Exod 23:20-33; 34:11-15.”⁴⁴

In addition to the lexical parallels, reading Judg 2:2 in light of Exod 34 enhances the rhetorical effect of the passage. As it stands alone, the Mal’ak’s speech certainly has rhetorical punch to it. He states the covenantal stipulations for himself (Judg 2:1) and then for the people (Judg 2:2). Once he established that the people broke their end of the bargain (Judg 2:2b), he then states that he is free from his covenantal responsibilities and tells them the consequences (Judg 2:3).⁴⁵ But, by connecting Judg 2:1-3 with Exod 34 (via vs 2), the meaning behind the covenant language in Exod 34 is transported to the Mal’ak’s speech. The context of Exod 34 is Moses pleading for mercy to God for the sake of Israel right after the golden calf incident (Exod 32:11-13). After the people are punished and Moses reestablishes order in the camp, Exod 33-34 reestablish the covenant. Connecting this incident and its aftermath with the situation in Judg 2 compares the sinfulness of the generation entering the land to the generation who sinned while being in the immediate vicinity of the glorious manifestation of God on Mount Sinai. Right after God had established His covenant with Israel, the people rejected God and acted like the other nations. In the midst of God leading the people into the land and conquering the peoples who

⁴³ So also Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 113-114.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 114. Concerning Judg 2:1-3, Chisholm notes “the brief message draws on earlier tradition, especially those found in Exod 34 and Josh 23” Robert B. Chisholm, “A Commentary on the Book of Judges,” (2008), 116. Contrast this evidence with the grid of Deuteronomistic History assumed by those listed in note 35 above.

⁴⁵ Concerning Judg 2:3 and the consequences see below.

lived there, they followed the customs of the other nations by making covenants with the people and not destroying the cultic places of worship.

The INFER search connected Judg 2:3 to Exod 23:29, 31, and 33. These connections are strong. The first phrase of the quotation in Judg 2:3 is a somewhat longer version of the same phrase in Exod 23:29. Basically all the pieces are the same, except for the addition of the direct object marker in Judg 2:3. The connection with Exod 23:31 is lexically parallel but not morphologically parallel. Instead of having an imperfect form of גרש followed by a direct object marker with third person plural suffix (so Judg 2:3), Exod 23:31 has a perfect form with a third person plural suffix attached to it. The connection with Exod 23:33 has good lexical parallels with a couple of variations. While Exod 23:33 refers to Israel in the second person singular, Judg 2:3 does so in the second person plural. In addition to these connections, the fact that they are all within the same passage adds weight to its validity as the source of the quote.

וגם אמרתי לא־אגרש אותם מפניכם והיו לכם לצדים ואלהיהם יהיו לכם למוקש:	Judg 2:3
לא אגרשנו מפניך בשנה אחת פן־תהיה הארץ שממה ורבה עליך חית השדה:	Exod 23:29
ושתי את־גבלך מים־סוף ועד־ים פלשתים וממדבר עד־הנהר כי אתן בידכם את י־שבי הארץ וגרשתמו מפניך:	Exod 23:31
לא ישבו בארצך פן־יחטאו אתך לי כי תעבד את־אלהיהם כ־י־יהיה לך למוקש:	Exod 23:33

The INFER search found very little in Deuteronomy that could be viewed as a possible source for Judg 2:3. The vast majority of the verses it found were connected by inconsequential words like pronouns, common nouns, prepositions, etc. Two were found that contained some of the unique vocabulary in Judg 2:3: Deut 7:16 and 33:27. Deut 7:16 is talking about the responsibility of the people to kill all the people in the land so that their gods would not be “a snare” (מוקש) to them. Deut 33:27 is in the context of Moses’ song of blessing upon Israel. In it he also praises God because “he drove enemies from before you” (ויגרש מפניך אויב). For

Deut 7:16 the parallels are too weak to confirm any real connection. The context of Deut 33 rules 33:27 out. Judg 2:3 says that the Mal'ak is recounting what *he* said not what Moses said.⁴⁶

In addition to the connections with Deuteronomy, the INFER search surfaced a few possible connections with the book of Joshua. Primary among these is Josh 23:13. Not only were some verbal parallels found, but also several commentators refer to it as the possible background to Judg 2:3.⁴⁷ The INFER search connected Josh 23:13 to Judg 2:3 through the presence of unique terms like “snare” (מִקְשָׁ) and “sides” (צַדִּים) along with a couple other more minor connections. The main problem is, Josh 23:13 is missing some key words that Exod 23 does have. The word “dispossess” is used in Josh 23 rather than “drive out” as used in Judg 2 and Exod 23. Chisholm notes, “The messenger’s words, while faithful to the overall thrust of Joshua’s statement, are a paraphrase of the earlier warning and included adaptations from other passages as well as other modifications.”⁴⁸ Based on the results from the INFER search, the “earlier warning” is most plausibly Exod 23. The strong phraseological parallels between Judg 2:3 and Exod 23 as well as the clustering of connections within the same passage in Exodus heavily favor Exod 23 as the intentional background and “earlier warning” of Judg 2:3.

The problem, however, is that the meaning of the phrases in Exod 23 are somewhat different than in Judg 2:3. In the milder case, Exod 23:31, instead of the Lord saying, “I will drive them from before you,” it says, “and you will drive them from before you.” The lexical connection is valid, but the morphological (and therefore contextual) connection is quite different.

⁴⁶ Even if this could be accounted for, the lexical and morphological connections are weaker than those in Exod 23. Also of note, is the chart in O’Connell: “Judges 2:1-5 contains several key phrases that allude to Joshua 23, Deut 7 and 31” O’Connell, *The Rhetoric of The Book of Judges*, 71. Using the INFER search, this writer has concluded that the Deuteronomy passages that O’Connell puts forward are not connected as convincingly as Exod 23.

⁴⁷ Chisholm, “Judges,” 117-119; Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 116; Lindars, *Judges 1-5*, 78-79, 88; O’Connell, *The Rhetoric of The Book of Judges*, 59-60, 71.

⁴⁸ Chisholm lists five adaptations and modifications, Chisholm, “Judges,” 117-119.

The more difficult case is with Exod 23:29. The lexical and morphological connection is very strong. The structure is nearly identical: negative particle + imperfect 1cs of *גרש* + 3mp suffix⁴⁹ + preposition + second person pronominal suffix.⁵⁰ The real problem arises with the words following this phrase in Exod 23:29: “in one year lest the land become desolate.” In Exod 23:29, “I will not drive them out before you,” is intended to be a promise for the *benefit* of Israel.⁵¹ The words following this phrase in Judg 2:3, however, do not indicate benefit. Rather they indicate detriment: “and they will be thorns in your side/snare and their gods will be to you for a snare.” The result of the Lord refusing to drive the Canaanites out would be constant turmoil in the land “flowing with milk and honey,” i.e., a curse.⁵²

So how is it that Judg 2:3 is quoting from Exod 23:29? Up to this point the intertextual links have enhanced the texts by positively importing the contexts of the earlier texts. Judg 2:3 does not do that. What seems to be happening, however, is not a linear or straightforward assimilation of the context of Exod 23 but rather a reversal. In Judg 2:1-2 the audience is reminded of their covenant with God, both its blessing for them and its stipulations for them. Then the Mal’ak questions/condemns them, “What is this you have done?” Instead of immediately turning to passages of punishment for breaking the covenant, he uses a phrase (“I will not drive them out from before you”) that originally indicated blessing for Israel, but now, with the words that follow, it indicates a curse. Perhaps as the Mal’ak spoke, he paused after this phrase to let the people think for a moment of how the Lord preserved the land before they

⁴⁹ Judg 2:3 has the direct object marker while Exod 23:29 has the pronominal suffix attached directly to the verb. This is the biggest lexical/morphological difference (but it is not significant); see chart above.

⁵⁰ Here is another point of variation. Exod 23:29 has the 2ms suffix while Judg 2:3 has the 2mp suffix.

⁵¹ So also Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 202. There is nowhere in either Exodus or Deuteronomy where the phrase “I will not drive them out from before you” is intended as a judgment. Not until the people have entered the land and disobeyed the command to not make a covenant with the locals is this phrase turned into a statement of punishment. Cf. Josh 9; 23; Judg 1; 2:2.

⁵² Fishbane comments, “This transformation of an ancient source into a conditional prescription is remarkable” Ibid.

arrived. Then, while they held on to the hope of avoiding punishment, he shattered their hopes by turning the meaning of this phrase up side down.

Summary and Suggestions for Further Study

As shown above, the Accordance INFER search has the ability to present data for doing an in-depth intertextual study. The search can be fined tuned to build in or keep out as much ambiguity as one may choose.

In Accordance, this search can be used in all texts that contain grammatical tagging or are English texts. It can be used not only in Biblical texts but in extra-Biblical texts as well. As demonstrated you can use it between Biblical and extra-Biblical texts. It can be used to find connections of OT in OT, OT in Qumran Sectarian Mss, OT in Rabbinic texts, NT in NT, LXX in NT or the Fathers, NT in the Fathers, and Pseudepigrapha in the NT or Fathers. Of course you need to *purchase* these texts in order to use them. But the data that can be collected for an understanding of the history of interpretation of a passage as well as the basic meaning of texts is unparalleled in earlier tools for research aside from a thorough mastery of not only the contents of all these texts but also of the language and turns-of-phrase within them in order to observe the same connections on your own.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aichele, George, and Gary A. Phillips. "Intertextuality and the Bible." In *Semeia*, ed. George Aichele and Gary A. Phillips, vol. 69/70. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Amit, Yairah. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Biblical Interpretation Series, vol. 38. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Ausloos, Hans. "The "Angel of YHWH" in Exod. xxii 20-33 and Judg. ii 1-5. A Clue to the "Deuteronom(ist)ic" Puzzle?". *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 1-12.
- Beal, Timothy K. "Glossary." In *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell, 21-24. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Beal, Timothy K. "Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production." In *Reading Between Texts*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell, 27-39. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. "Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and Their Dynamics." In *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. J. de Waard L. J. de Regt, and J. P. Fokkelman, 31-50. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- Block, Daniel I. *Judges, Ruth*. New American Commentary. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.
- Boling, Robert G. *Judges*. Vol. 6A. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1975.
- Carroll, Robert P. "Intertextuality and the Book of Jeremiah: Animadversions on Texts and Theory." In *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum and David J. A. Clines. JSOTSup, vol. 143, 55-78. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Childs, Brevard S. "Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 115 (2003): 173-184.
- Chisholm, Robert B. "A Commentary on the Book of Judges." 2008.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

- Johnston, Gordon H. "Nahum's Rhetorical Allusions to the Neo-Assyrian Lion Motif." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158 (2001): 287-307.
- Joüon, Paul, and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Accordance Electronic ed. ver. 1.6. Subsidia Biblica, vol. 27. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Intituto Biblico, 2006.
- Lang, David. "In Depth INFER-mation." In *Accordance Blog*: www.accordancebible.com, July 8, 2008.
- Lang, David. "INFER-mation." In *Accordance Blog*: www.accordancebible.com, May 30, 2008.
- Leonard, Jeffery M. "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 241-265.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *Judges 1-5*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.
- Niditch, Susan. *Judges: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Nielson, Kirsten. "Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible." In *Congress Volume Oslo 1998*, ed. A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø, 17-31. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- O'Connell, Robert H. *The Rhetoric of The Book of Judges*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Roudiez, Leon S. "Introduction." In *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez and Alice Jardine, 1-18. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Schneider, Tammi J. *Judges*. Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry, ed. David W. Cotter. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Schultz, Richard L. "The Ties That Bind: Intertextuality, the Identification of Verbal Parallels, and Reading Strategies in the Book of the Twelve." In *Society of Biblical Literature 2001 Seminar Papers*, 39-57. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Simpson, Timothy Frederick. "Paradigm Shift Happens: Intertextuality and a Reading of 2 Samuel 16:5-14." *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Society* 17 (1997): 55-69.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Judges: A Commentary*. Translated by J. S. Bowden. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.
- Tollington, Janet E. "The Book of Judges: The Result of Post-Exilic Exegesis?" In *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel*. Boston: Brill, 1998.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Accordance Electronic ed. ver. 2.0. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

- Watson, Wilfred G. E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*. Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplement Series, vol. 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Webb, Barry G. *The Book of Judges: An Integrated Reading*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1987.
- Wong, Gregory T. K. *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series, vol. 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.