<u>Intertextuality and the Relationship Between John and the Synoptics</u>

Mark A. Matson

Milligan College

I. JOHN AND THE SYNOPTICS AND THE "SOURCE MODEL"

The study of gospel relationships, whether the study of the Synoptic Problem or the relationship

between John and the Synoptics, has often focused on explicit examples of quotation (citation) or clear

instances of verbal agreement between the gospels. Evidence of agreement in wording between two

gospels would suggest some kind of literary relationship, while the absence of clear agreement points

away from a literary relationship. This is a well-worn track for those who are interested in the sources

of our gospels.[1] In the case of the relationship between John and Synoptics, for instance, we can see

how this key issue influenced Johannine scholars in the last century. On the one hand we find scholars

such as C. K. Barrett and Frans Neirynck who are convinced that the similarities in arrangement and

occasional wording between John and the Synoptics point to John's knowledge and use of these other

gospels, especially Mark and Luke.[2]

On the other hand, however, we find a much larger array of scholars, perhaps best represented by

---

[1] The literature on the relationship of John and Synoptics is extensive, and certainly I cannot even attempt a sketch of all the issues involved. I refer, instead, to the comprehensive study of the problem in D. Moody Smith's *John Among the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), of which a second edition, updated, is soon to be published.

[2] C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to John*, second edition (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), p. 42 ff.; Frans Neirynck has expressed his view in many articles, for a quick summary see "John and the Synoptics" in *L'Evangile de Jean*, ed. M. De Jonge (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987), pp. 73–106.

Percival Gardner-Smith.[3] He emphasized the significant differences between John and the Synoptics, and concluded that the similarities must have come from oral traditions instead, and that there could be no literary relationship between them.

What has marked these studies, and manifold others on the subject which have arrived at various solutions, has been a fairly one-directional and simple view of the use of "sources." If one can identify points of commonality between two gospels, especially common wording or a close similarity to the same language, then there is an assumption of one gospel's "use" of another. So far as this goes, this is fine. But along with this entry point to the question, there is a general assumption that subsequent gospels will use a previous gospel as a "source" to simply bolster or affirm the basic story. Thus, a subsequent gospel is an expansion upon, or interpretation of, the source material, usually directed to a new audience that is unaware of the previous gospel. It would be useful here to quickly survey how Barrett and Neirynck perceive John's use of the Synoptics.

Barrett acknowledges that John is not simply taking over synoptic material, but rather that this is a sophisticated reinterpretation of the material. It is noteworthy how Barrett explains some of the big differences between John and the Synoptics – the absence of key events such as the virgin birth, the baptism, the temptation, the transfiguration, the agony in the Garden. Barrett sees John as incorporating the meaning of these events in his new narrative so as to avoid misinterpretation: "John thus probes into the meaning of the synoptic narratives and expresses it in other terms... John does not so much import foreign matter into the gospel as to bring out what was already inadequately expressed in the earlier

---

[3] Percival Gardner-Smith, *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).

tradition."[4] In other words, John has accepted the synoptic accounts and used them as a "source," but

has even safeguarded their meaning by recasting the "meaning" of the former gospels.

Neirynck imagines John doing something similar. This can be seen in his examination of John

20:1–18. The evangelist, according to Neirynck, has at hand the account by Luke and by Matthew,

and combines elements of both in a reworking of the story. He takes Luke's account of Peter going to

the tomb and expands it with the addition of the Beloved Disciple. And he takes the account from

Matthew of Jesus' appearance to the women and modifies it to become Jesus' appearance to Mary

Magdalene. John is simply combining and harmonizing his sources under the influence of a theological

tendenz. But in general Neirynck sees John utilizing synoptic materials, combining them, and producing

a new version which is generally in harmony with the preceding narratives.

What I find interesting in both of these approaches, and frankly in most approaches to source

criticism generally, including those dealing only with synoptic relationships, is this linear, one-directional,

authorially driven, and authoritative approach. In each case scholars have tended to assume that (a) the

author uses previous gospels as raw material, with little engagement with the previous text other than to

fit this material into a new narrative context, (b) the audience of the latter gospel was unaware of any

previous gospels (or simply to ignore the audience altogether), so modification is never thought of as a

challenge to the previous texts, and (c) use of the sources is consonant with the former gospel – it is

"only" an interpretation that expands on ideas implicit in the former gospel. Put simply, the normal

approach to Johannine dependence is to conceive of the Fourth Evangelist as a harmonizer, an

---

[4] Barrett, p. 53.

expander, a sympathetic interpreter of the previous gospels that serve as sources.   And, on the other side of the argument, those who see less harmony and less sympathy between John and the Synoptics reject any literary relationship in favor of oral traditions. The problem seems to be that the basic models view sources in ways that ignore rhetorical purpose and dialogical interplay that authors actually use when working with previous sources.

There has been a minority approach to John's relationship to the Synoptics, which is often overlooked but is provocative for considerations of how precursor texts and audiences might be conceived in the process of the production of a new text. I speak here of Hans Windisch's approach to John and the Synoptics.[5] He found the prevailing models of understanding the relationship between John and the Synoptics—the interpretation theory, the supplementation theory, and the independence theory—inadequate, and proposed instead that John must have been intending to replace the Synoptic accounts with his own gospel. Notice here that Windisch concludes that (a) the Synoptic gospels are already known by the audience of John, (b) that John might not be pleased with the previous accounts, and (c) writes with an eye to displacing those accounts. I find Windisch's approach interesting because he was willing to imagine the production of the Fourth Gospel in terms of a rhetorical thrust, one in which previous gospels are cross-examined, used but not necessarily adopted. In other words, he has imagined John engaging in a critical dialogue—a dialogue which involves both the texts of Synoptic gospels and the audience.

Windisch was, I think, anticipating a new approach toward conceiving of literary documents,

---

[5] Hans Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Wollte der vierte Evangelist die ältern Evangelien ergänzen oder ersetzen?* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1926.

one which is both dialogical and rhetorical. The recent approach in literary criticism to the relations

between texts, specifically that view of textual relations called intertextuality, works precisely in this

intersection of rhetoric of documents, even narratives, and the dialogical nature of texts. I believe this

approach may broaden the perspective for our examination of the relationship between the gospels, and

may help us appreciate the interpretive perspectives of the various evangelists. In this paper I would

like to briefly sketch a theory of intertextuality, and from that basic overview attempt a functional

approach toward using intertextuality in the task of exploring source relationships between the gospels.

I will then take a couple of trial soundings in the relationship between John and one of the Synoptic

gospels, Luke. Using two more or less common texts in John and Luke, the Anointing of Jesus and the

Trial before Pilate, I would like to explore how Luke might have created a new text, born from the

dialogue between John and Mark. This more dynamic concept of intertextual dialogue is suggestive for

a study of a wide range of gospel relationships and gospel interpretation.

II. INTERTEXTUALITY

Intertextuality is a very broad term, which is applied to approaches with very different

assumptions.[6] At its most basic level, intertextuality suggests that all authors write from a perspective of

pre-existing "texts"— written and unwritten.[7] An author always engages a wide variety of themes,

---

[6] The term "intertextuality" was coined by Julia Kristeva based on her reading of Mikhail
Bakhtin. Based on his concept of dialogue in utterances, she proceeds "Yet, what appears as a lack of
rigor is in fact an insight first introduced into literary theory by Bakhtin: any text is constructed as a
mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of
intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double." ("Word,
Dialogue, and Novel," in Desire in Language [NY: Columbia University Press, 1980], p. 66).

[7] As Helen Reguerio Elam puts it, "Texts are fragments without closure or resolution. No text is
self-sufficient; each text is fraught with explicit or invisible quotation marks that dispel the illusion of its

ideas, structures, and specific ways of expressing the world that already exist, drawing on already known texts, versions, and ways of expressing and viewing the world. In this way of speaking of intertextuality, all of speaking and writing is intertexual in that it enters into a pre-existing cultural and linguistic web:

> [The text is] woven entirely with citations, references, echoes, cultural languages (what language is not?) antecedent or contemporary, which cut across it through and through in a vast stereophony. The intertextual in which every text is held, it itself being the text-between of another text, is not to be confused with the origin of the text: to try to find the 'sources', the 'influences' of a work, is to fall in with the myth of filiation; the citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable, and yet *already read*: they are quotations without inverted commas.[8]

 While doubtless there is much to commend this approach to intertextuality, this broad view is probably not terribly helpful, however, as a functional tool for the literary critic, especially the biblical literary critic.[9] As a critique of this expansive idea of intertextuality, which might be termed the poststructuralist or semiotic model, it should be noted that it focuses primarily on the act of reading, with little or no interest in the function of the author or the initial communicative act. It opens up all "texts" as valid intertexts with which to read and interpret a given text. In seeking to explore the meaning of a text, some boundaries are necessary simply to delimit the potentially unlimited network of intertextual

---

autonomy and refer endlessly to other texts..." ("Intertextuality" in *The New Princeton Handbook of Poetic Terms*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994, pp. 141–143.)

[8] Roland Barthes, *Image–Music–Text* (London: Fontana, 1977), p. 160.

[9] As H. F. Plett notes, "An intertextual theory bent on clarity and precision has to make methodological decisions which restrict the field of inquiry. A total semiosis of the intertext will remain an ideal objective and hence fall short of ever being put into practice." (In "Intertextualities" in *Intertextuality*, ed. by Heinrich Plett [NY: Walter de Gruyter, 1991], p. 7). For the hermeneutical approach to the Gospels, I believe a Bakhtinian limitation offers the most help.

connections that the reader might impose.

The origination of Kristeva's term, intertextuality, comes from the works of Mikhail Bakhtin, the Russian post-formalist, who developed extensively the idea of dialogism in literature. Some of Bakhtin's approaches are particularly helpful to provide boundaries and structure to an intertextual approach to the literature. In particular, his emphases on the importance of the utterance as the basic unit of communication, the inherently dialogical nature of the utterance, and the historical situation of each utterance, provide a useful structure around which to develop a beginning framework for intertextual analysis.

Bakhtin emphasizes, in reaction against a general theory of linguistics, that the specific utterance, created within the context of discourse, is the basic unit of communication. For Bakhtin, the specific nature of the utterance—as a socially specific act, located in time and in a specific social context, is crucial. So Baktin would note that "Whatever the moment of the utterance-expression we may consider, it will always be determined by the real conditions of its uttering, and foremost by the nearest social situation,"[10] and "Verbal communication will never be understood or explained outside of this link to the concrete situation."[11] Thus, the utterance is always situated in a historical and social context, and is the act of communication which embraces a speaker/writer and a listener/reader. This social construction, then, also suggests certain limits on the extent to which the meaning of the utterance-text can be inscribed with meanings drawn from extraneous inter-texts. The very social situatedness of the

---

[10] Mikhail Bakhtin, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, (NY: Seminar Press, 1973), p. 101.

[11] Ibid, p. 114.

utterance is the frame around which understanding should be drawn.

At the same time, however, the utterance is fundamentally dialogical. That is to say, the utterance is always directed toward an addressee, from whom there is already an expected or anticipated response. This is, of course, obvious in the spoken language and in rhetorical forms of discourse, as Bakhtin notes:

> All rhetorical forms, [though] monologic in their compositional structure, are oriented toward the listener and his answer. This orientation toward the listener is usually considered the basic constitutive feature of rhetorical discourse. It is highly significant for rhetoric that this relationship toward the concrete listener, taking him into account, is a relationship that enters into the very internal construction of rhetorical discourse. This orientation toward an answer is open, blatant and concrete.[12]

But this dialogical nature of the utterance is also present in other forms of discourse, including narrative constructions such as the novel, and even poetic forms, although it is less obvious here. This other-directedness of the utterance suggests that all forms of literature have a rhetorical impulse, even if it is not always obvious.

But the dialogic element of an utterance also suggests another dimension, one which addresses the web of dialogue which preceded it. At the same time as addressing an "other" in the form of an addressee, the speaker or writer is also engaging an "other" in the form of utterances which have preceded it. Each new utterance must confront previous utterances about the object of discourse that are already known, and furthermore each new utterance will respond in some way to these previous utterances. So, as Todorov translates Bakhtin:

---

[12] Mikhail Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 280.

No member of a verbal community can ever find words in the language that are neutral, exempt from the aspirations and evaluations of the other, uninhabited by the other's voice. On the contrary, he receives the word by the other's voice and it remains filled with that voice. He intervenes in his own context from another context, already penetrated by the other's intentions. His own intention finds a word already lived in.[13]

Or, again in "Discourse in the Novel", Bakhtin argues:

The dialogic orientation of discourse is a phenomenon that is, of course, a property of any discourse. It is the natural orientation of any living discourse. Of all its various routes toward the object, in all its directions, the word encounters an alien word and cannot help encountering it in a living, tension-filled interaction. Only the mythical Adam, who approached a virginal and as yet verbally unqualified world with the first word, could really have escaped from start to finish this dialogic inter-orientation with the alien word that occurs in the object.[14]

Here we find in Bakhtin's writings the root idea of intertextuality, that is, that a speaker or author is already having to work around previous thoughts which have already been expressed about the object of the discussion. The author can acknowledge the thoughts, quote them, augment them, interpret them, allude to them, deliberately ignore them (although in doing so they still remain present in their absence), distort them, refute them, or polemicize against them. They may appear in the form of stylistic imitation, be echoed in characterization, or become the basis of deliberate interaction. But the presence of previous thoughts and expressions about the object of discussion is a fundamental part of the expression of an author.

But this dialogic feature of an author or speaker's engagement with previous discourses on a particular subject also interacts with the other dialogic aspect of the utterance: the addressee. Not only is the author implicated in this web of alien pre-existing words, so also is the addressee, since the author

---

[13] Bakhtin "Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics," in Tzvetan Todorov, *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principal* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 48.

[14] Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," p. 279.

must already anticipate the addressee's reaction not only to his or her word, but also to the other words which have already been spoken:

> Only now this contradictory environment of alien words is present to the speaker not in the object, but rather in the consciousness of the listener, as his apperceptive background, pregnant with responses and objections. And every utterance is oriented toward this apperceptive background of understanding, which is not a linguistic background but rather one composed of specific objects and emotional expressions.[15]

Finally, one last feature of Bakhtin's approach toward the nature of the discourse as a core feature of meaningful language is important to note, namely its production within a situated historical moment. For Bakhtin, since the utterance is a real engagement between an author/speaker and some addressee, the historical and cultural situation become important.[16] Which is really to say, that for Bakhtin there remains implicit a concept of diachronic relations, not synchronic relations, between text and intertext. This is a crucial issue which separates Bakhtin's approach and those of the semiotic poststructuralists who have been the primary users of intertextuality as a key theoretical component.[17] The question of which "texts" might be present to function as intertexts, both for the speaker/author and the listener/reader is an important one, since the utterance is grounded in a historically situated dialogic engagement.[18] The speaker/writer, in addressing a particular object, is in dialogue with "other" alien

---

[15] Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," p. 281.

[16] Note, for instance, that in his discussion of Tolstoy, he argues that historical or literary commentary is often necessary to explicate its references (Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," p. 283). Similarly, Bakhtin's own analysis of Rabelais (*Rabelais and His World*) is historical and contextual.

[17] See, for instance, the discussion in Thomas A. Hatina, "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism," *Biblical Interpretation* 7 (1999): 28–43.

[18] Paul Riceour's theory of the primacy of discourse as the center of meaningful statements, as opposed to a linguistic system, is very amenable to Bakhtin's approach toward the utterance and

words, and is similarly engaging in a dialogue, if only by anticipation, with the listener/reader's expected response in light of these alien words; there must, then, already be a definable corpus of previous words with which the speaker/writer is engaging, and which he or she anticipates the audience will also engage with. This is the historical context, the cultural competency of both utterer and listener.

It might be useful, then, to summarize some of the key issues which might define a Bakhtinian approach toward intertextuality, as opposed to a poststructuralist approach:

1. Intertextuality acknowledges that any speaker or writer engages in discourse in an environment in which there are already pre-existing texts, both written and unwritten. These texts will necessarily influence the communicative act, shaping thoughts and the form of the utterance.

2. The very nature of discourse is dialogical, not monological. This dialogical feature suggests that any engagement with pre-existing texts will meet these texts in a variety of ways—at times adopting, at times distorting, at times distancing, and at times deliberately ignoring them as the new utterance makes its way in the web of words which are already at hand.

3. The dialogical nature of discourse is inherently rhetorical, since the addressee is also completely implicated in the utterance. Each utterance anticipates a response, and assumes some degree of knowledge of the pre-existing texts with which the speaker/writer is interacting.

4. Given the concreteness of the act of speaking and writing, there is implicitly a historical boundary which surrounds the utterance. Most specifically this historical boundary would give some validity to the diachronic reading of text and intertext.

---

dialogism. See *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth, Texas Christian University Press, 1976), especially pp. 1–23.

Intertextuality, then, in the Bakhtinian perspective, is not simply a part of the linguistic framework, but lives in the real discourse in which an author engages both an audience and previous utterances about the subject at hand.

III. INTERTEXTUALITY AND INFLUENCE–SOURCES, ALLUSIONS AND MISREADING

From this Bakhtinian perspective toward intertextuality, then, we can return to the question of the interrelationship of the gospels, especially John and the Synoptics. In what way might we consider this interrelationship as intertextual, and what does this add to the previous approach? Can the intertextual theory accommodate and contribute to discussions that involve an evangelist's use of "sources?" I think so, but it does involve a shift in thinking, especially an openness to the complexities of dialogue.

In most poststructuralist approaches there has been a notable aversion to linking the concept of intertextuality with influence.[19] This is due, in large part, to the implicitly diachronic limitation of theories of influence. But some allowance for influence seems appropriate. What does not seem appropriate, however, is a simplistic approach which sees subsequent texts as simply an extension of pre-texts, in which the later text is always in agreement with the former texts. Certainly Bakhtin's concept of dialogue would mandate a full range of reactions to texts that precede and inform the new text's birth.

---

[19] As, for instance, Jonathan Culler remarks: "The study of intertextuality is thus not the investigation of sources and influences as traditionally conceived; it casts a net wider to include anonymous discursive practices of later texts." (cited in Ulla Musarra-Schroeder, "Influence versus Intertextuality" in *The Search for a New Alphabet*, ed. Harald Hendrix et. al. [Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1996], p.168.

In this regard the approach of Harold Bloom can add a significant perspective to our discussion. In a number of works, especially *The Anxiety of Influence*, Bloom argues that any literary work is based in large part on a misreading of previous texts.[20] Thus, the intertexts exert an influence on the text, but they do that primarily through a deliberate distortion in an attempt to gain control over the previous texts.

Misreading can suggest a broad range of relationships between the author and texts which have exerted influence over the author. It can, of course, simply imply a misunderstanding. But misreading can also, as Bloom's approach generally suggests, be an attempt (either conscious or unconscious) to gain control over another text. Thus, misreading can and often does involve the deliberate distortion or "taming" of another text so that it is subordinated and used in the rhetorical thrust of the new text.

With Bloom's general theory of poetics, which involves misreading precursor poems–even or especially ones that are unconscious or subconscious–we approach in a roundabout way Windisch's approach to the relationship of John and the Synoptics introduced previously in this essay. Windisch, we recall, posited that John's use of the Synoptics was an attempt to displace the former gospels–what we might call, in Bloom's terminology, a misreading in attempt to wrest control over a dominant pretext. Windisch, then, was approaching in a pre-intertextual critical stance what Bloom seems to be developing from an intertextual perspective. We might broaden this perspective a bit for all use of sources in the gospels. **An evangelist's use of sources is always, in one degree or another, a misreading and reappropriation of the material from those sources, whether it is a previous**

---

[20] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973) and A *Map of Misreading* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

gospel, an oral story, an Old Testament citation. In recasting the story, the evangelist is

utilizing tradition in such a way that a new story is told which is different than that told by texts

which preceded it.

When we reintroduce the rhetorical element—the importance of the addressee—in Bakhtin's

concept of discourse, together with the dialogical nature of that rhetorical thrust, we can then also see

that the misreading might also serve a deliberate communicative impulse. In recasting a source,

knowledge of which might be presumed to be shared by the writer/speaker and the reader/listener, then

misreading actually becomes directed misreading. That is to say, the misreading by the author/speaker

is meant to be detected by the reader/listener, and so create what Bakhtin calls "double words": words

which are meant to be read in two ways. In this case, they are to be read within the framework of the

new text, the new narrative, but at the same time the old text and the old narrative are invoked so that

the reader/listener can make comparisons and draw meaning as well from the misreading of the original

text.[21] The intertext, the former text, is thus presented as an "other voice" which constantly challenges

the readers/listeners into their own dialogue with the text.

While Bloom's work primarily was an attempt at psychological analysis of the author, struggling

to gain supremacy over texts which exerted control over the author, the addition of the rhetorical aspect

of discourse's dialogical nature demands some qualifications to Bloom's approach. For Bloom, the

---

[21] This dynamic is noted with respect to allusions and quotations by a number of scholars using intertextuality. So, for instance, Alan Nadel "Literary allusions, in other words, are a covert form of literary criticism, in that they force us to reconsider the alluded-to text and request us to alter our understanding of it." ("Translating the Past: Literary Allusion as Covert Criticism," *Georgia Review* 36 (1982): 650).

precursor text with which an author struggles could be any dominant poem, even one which he or she had not read, which strongly influenced the author. But this idea of the anonymous intertext, while certainly possibly exerting influence on the author, means little if the author is also engaging in a dialogue with an audience. In this case, only intertexts which might be known by both author and reader can reasonably be considered. By moving outside of the psychology of the author– the vague world of authorial intention– to the world of discourse which involves a communicative act between writer and reader, the theory takes on a more detectable, albeit still difficult, purpose.

The use of intertexts, then, always involves a misreading and a recasting of previously known texts by an author/speaker. This dynamic of misreading and recasting is part of the dialogue between the author and the "other voices" with which he or she must contend. But with a discourse oriented model of literature, a dialogue is also always being carried out between the author and the addressees. And intertextual references in this case also have a rhetorical thrust to them.   The dialogue with former texts is carried out in public, so to speak, with the purpose of engaging the audience in the dialogue the author is having with "other voices." Any use of sources, quotations, or allusions, I suggest, falls into this dynamic area of dialogical discourse.

IV. PRAGMATICS OF A RHETORICAL-INTERTEXTUAL READING

A. Identifying the Intertext.

On a practical level, then, how might one utilize this approach to intertextuality in reading the gospels?   As a beginning point, the following issues will help delineate how accurately the reader/critic can utilize intertextuality in the reading process. This listing of issues is only suggestive of some of the issues that can and should be taken into account.

15

In the first instance, it is necessary to identify those places in a text which might reasonably be

understood to be intertextual references. Many of the issues at stake here are the same as have been

dealt with in source criticism, although the possibility and rhetoric of allusion and misreading of

influences has tended to restrict the range for source criticism, at least gospel source criticism, to only

clear direct references. The variables involved in such an identification would include:[22]

1. Quantity. How much of a portion of text in question would seem to be a reference, either a

citation or allusion, to another text, a precursor text? A few words here and there, especially if

disconnected, would be less noticeable as an intertextual reference than a longer, more extensive

citation. The greater the quantity of a text which is referential, the more important its intertextual

emphasis (the greater the rhetorical "punch"), and the easier it will be for the reader to identify it as

such.

In the case of the gospels, for instance, Matthew's or Luke's quoting of Mark is extensive.[23]

But if we consider the possible relationship between Mark and John or Luke and John, the amount of

possible intertextual references is significantly smaller, although still significant.

This should not, however, only limit the legitimate identification of intertextual material to

obviously extensive quotations. Occasional quotations or allusions may also be significant uses of

intertextual references, drawing the reader into memories of other texts and thus opening up a dialogue.

---

[22] These categories, albeit slightly modified, are heavily drawn from Heinrich Plett, "Intertextualities," in *Intertextuality*, ed. Heinrich Plett (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), pp. 3–29.

[23] I use the terms "quoting" or "quotation" here in a broad literary sense. In actuality, both careful citation and allusions can be considered quotations; the only difference being the closeness or lack of interference between the intertext and the precursor text.

But the quantity of reference, as well as the quality, certainly influence the ability of the interpreter to easily identify its presence and its role in the dialogue requested of the reader.

2. *Quality.* The nature of the reference is particularly important for ease of identification, as well as for exploring the rhetorical emphasis it plays in the text. Intertextual references, of course, can vary in the degree to which they clearly evoke the intertext. The quality can range from quotations, which can be word-for-word, to quotations with ellipses or slight modifications, to allusions, which draw upon the intertext in a more tenuous and elusive way. While quotations can often be identified with some certainty (though not always), allusions are more difficult.

In the case of quotations, more confidence can be gained if there are specific markers of the quotation. Explicit reference to a text (as in a citation formula) or the use of quotation marks (or the *hoti* in Greek texts) are clear indications that a text is referring to an intertext, and are also explicit signals to the reader that he or she is to utilize the intertext in the reading process. Quotations can, however, be unmarked, relying on the alert detection by the reader. Moreover, quotations can be modified or distorted (see interference below), which may resist efforts at identification.

We can see the difference in the quality of quotations more clearly by considering what I propose are two instances of quotations: the use by a subsequent gospel author of a previous gospel (e.g. Luke's use of Mark) and an Old Testament citation. The former is never explicitly cited, although more extensive. The latter is usually cited explicitly, although it is used less frequently. But what is the essential difference between these quotations if, as seems likely, the audience of Luke would have known and recognized Mark? The Old Testament citation would naturally by used as an "authoritative" reference, even if it were modified, while the previous gospel would not have been so

17

considered. Still, both uses would constitute a quotation and would be subject to the same intertextual

interplay, especially if some interference (see the discussion below) creates a more intensive dialogue

between intertext and precursor text.[24]

Allusions, of course, are much more difficult to identify clearly. Is a word or phrase which

seems to draw on language or imagery of another text really an allusion, or simply part of the raw

material of the subject matter being discussed? Intertextual theory has often emphasized that many

intertexts are unconscious or unknown, part of the cultural competency that an author draws on in

composing a text. It is quite possible, then, that an allusion might be an indication of a precursor text

which has influenced the author and which is presumed to be part of the cultural competency of the

reader as well. So, while identifying allusions is more difficult than direct quotations, they are

nonetheless important features in considering the relationship between and text and "other" texts, which

might be important in exploring the dialogical nature of the text. Indeed vague allusions may be vague

precisely because they are modifications or permutations of the precursor text; the very vagueness itself

may contribute to part of the desired dialogue between the text and the evoked text.

This is again a significant issue in the gospels. The citations by the evangelists of the Old

Testament, for instance, is generally fairly clear and functions in the realm of quotations. And, again,

---

[24] More work probably needs to be done to clarify the different kinds of quotations that occur
in the gospels. In a reaction to an early version of this paper, Mark Goodacre was kind to point out the
difficulty of equating Luke's use of Mark with Luke's use of the Old Testament. While it is true that the
use of the Old Testament is more authoritative, it is not always used so — as, for instance, allusions and
typology in the gospels suggest: we sometimes are not sure if an Old Testament text is actually being
referred to. Granted that because of the relative shift in authority they work differently in the gospels, I
would propose that they both function intertextually, however.

while no quotation formula occurs, Matthew's and Luke's use of Mark would come under the category of an extended quotation. When we turn to John-Synoptic relationships, however, the quality of possible intertextual relations is less clear, being more in the nature of allusions or very loose quotations.

3. Frequency. In seeking to identify an intertext within a text, the frequency of citation or allusion is also important for establishing the volume or weight they play in explicating the text. Repeated references, whether quotations or allusions, only adds to the importance of the dialogue between the text and the intertext. With a variety of intertexts present, which is normally the case, the frequency will allow a certain ranking of priorities as well. More frequent references suggest a stronger dialogue partner; less frequent references may suggest that a particular intertext is considered marginal.

If we consider Luke's intertextual use of Mark, again, we must say that the frequency is extensive. But what of Luke's possible intertextual use of John, or vice-versa, John's possible intertextual use of Luke? There are an extensive number of points of commonality, although not the frequency that Luke has to Mark. We would still have to say, though, that the frequency of such linkages are extensive and would have been detected by early readers.

4. Availability of Intertext. Of course, in identifying possible intertexts within a particular text, it is important to consider how available the intertext might be to the author and to the implied readers. Here the historical situatedness of a text comes into play: if we confine ourselves to the hermeneutic explication of a text, intertexts which were produced chronologically later than the text being explored would be of no value, although subsequent readers could profitably explore connections between such texts within a context of aesthetic appreciation or theological reflection.

Beyond the question of historical priority, though, one needs to consider whether a precursor text might have been generally available to function as an intertext. In the case of the gospels, this is a particularly difficult question since we are not completely certain about either chronological priority of the various gospels, or of the availability of them in the churches. But it is possible that an intertextual approach might provide either support or objections to previously existing source-critical and historical conclusions. In the Bahktinian model of diachronic dialogue, such historical relationships would be important. As a result, the existing models of gospel relationships can be tested by a literary-rhetorical reading.

5. Interference. Whenever a precursor text is appropriated by an author into a text, there is the possibility that it will be modified in some significant way. The modifications of the intertext within a particular unit of discourse we might call interference. This feature of interference is certainly to be expected given the possibility of creative misreading and the rhetoric of dialogical interplay. The varieties of interference can be grouped into four basic categories: addition, deletion, substitution, and permutation. Obviously an intertextual reference could be expanded by the adding of explanatory or even qualifying language. Words or sections could be deleted which would affect the reception of the intertextual reference in its new location. A substitution of a word or name could take place, in which it is clear that a change has taken place in the reference. Or some other permutation, either changes in order, or time, or tense, or other change can be performed on the reference. Some of this interference might make a reference more difficult to identify; at other times, though the modification be extreme, it might still be recognizable and hence designed to evoke the dialogue with the referenced intertext..

To take a couple of examples from the Synoptic gospels, we might consider first Luke's reference to the Cleansing of the Temple in 19:45–46.   Here Luke is clearly drawing on Mark 11:15–17: the initial wording is almost identical, and the quotations from Is. 56 and Jer. 7 are identical. But Luke has deleted the central section which refers to overturning the seats of the moneychangers and those who sold pigeons. Here an intertextual reference has the interference pattern of deletion. The question, of course, is what is Luke's dialogical relationship with Mark, and how should the reader deal with this modification of the Markan quotation?

Similarly, in Luke's opening reference to the coming desolation in Luke 21:20, the evangelist once again draws on Mark 13:14. But Luke modifies the reference so that it is specifically about the city Jerusalem and the existence of armies surrounding it. Mark's "desolating sacrilege," an intertextual allusion itself to Daniel 9:27, is modified to become simply "desolation," which obscures or even rejects the intertextual reference in Mark. Here Luke has resorted to some extensive permutation of an intertext. Once again, the difficulty is not in identifying the reference, but in exploring the nature of the dialogic exchange between Luke and Mark, and the reader of Luke and both Luke's text and Mark's text.

B. Rhetorical Dimension of Intertexts

Having identified possible intertexts, one might then move to the way in which those intertexts are used in a specific setting. This pragmatic involves the rhetorical moment, that in which the writer anticipates a reader's response and the range of associations which the reader might bring to the

reading. It is in this rhetorical dynamic, located as part of a discourse between a writer/speaker and a reader/listener, that a key component of the text's meaning is located.[25]

The very existence of an intertextual citation, whether a quotation or an allusion, draws the reader into an active involvement between the current text and "other texts"—previous texts which serve as shadow texts which are themselves, by virtue of comparison, constantly commenting upon the current text. The reader is invited to draw comparisons and evaluate those comparisons in the process of assembling the meaning of the text. In the process of evaluation, the intertext which is evoked thus becomes part of a process of dialogical interaction. That is, the reader not only compares the text and the precursor text, but the intertext (that is, the quoted or alluded to version of the precursor text) is also compared with the evoked precursor text: how close is the intertext to the precursor text? If not an exact citation, in what ways and why does the allusion differ from the original version of the intertext? Does the text embrace the precursor text, or reject it? Is there an implied closeness between these differing texts, or is the allusion being used to suggest a distance, a differentiation, a misreading of the precursor text? In the cases of irony, sardonic misreadings, or deliberate transformation, the difference

----

[25] Riceour helpfully focuses attention on they dynamic interplay between the utterer's intention and the actual text produced as the locus of meaning. Hence "To mean is both what the speaker means, i.e., what he intends to say, and what the sentence means, i.e., what the conjunction between identification function and the predicative function yields. Meaning, in other words, is both noetic and noematic" (*Interpretation Theory*, p. 12). I gather that what Riceour wants to assert is similar to Bakhtin, that the dynamic interplay between speaker/writer and the reader/listener is the locus of meaning. This rejects both the Schleiermachian emphasis on the psychology of the speaker/writer, but also the structural approach which simply takes the text "as is" with no attention to the communicative dynamic.

between intertext and precursor text are often crucial to understanding the meaning of the text which quotes the intertext.

For instance, Luke's citation from Isaiah in 4:18-19 does not conform to any texts; it has been proposed that he loosely quotes from Isaiah 61:1-2 and 58:6. But the citation makes seemingly deliberate modifications, including the deletion of the second half of Isaiah 61:2, "to proclaim... the day of vengeance of our God." Rather than simply a casual conflation of scriptures, this appears to be more a deliberate attempt to play off the original text of Isaiah, and draw the reader into a comparison between the Old Testament text and the new context in which Luke utilizes it. This citation embraces the Isaiah text, but engages in a dialogue which heightens some aspects (e.g. the idea of releasing those in bondage, drawn from Is. 58:7), while deliberately and openly suppressing others (e.g. the idea of God's vengeance).

In seeing quotations or allusions as openly inviting a comparison between the intertext and the original precursor text, we are clearly talking about a rhetorical use of intertexts. Any intertext, whether a vague allusion or a direct citation, is written so that the reader will draw upon the precursor text in the reading process. But the transformation of the intertext especially signals areas of dialogue; the transformed quotation or allusion begs comparison and the possibility of a new or enriched meaning which derives from the comparison of intertext and precursor text, and yet controlled to some extent by the new context in which it is found.

With this perspective of quotations and allusions functioning as intertexts which invite dialogue between the current use in the new text and the precursor text, we gain a possible additional perspective with which to explore relationships between texts. The inherent diachronic nature of the

23

textual conversation means that a former text is being rhetorically reused. If we can identify the most plausible form of this intertextual dialogue, it may cast light both on the logical order in which related texts were penned, but also enrich our understanding of the rhetorical thrust of the later text, the one which uses an intertextual reference to expand its narrative meaning.

V. THE ANOINTING OF JESUS

In order to actually see how reframing "source" questions in terms of an intertextual relationship might affect the reading of the gospels, I would like to compare two examples in which the gospels of Luke and John bear strong similarity. It has often been noted that Luke and John have a special link, the existence of a number of points of similarity and ordering that suggest some kind of relationship.[26] But the relationship between Luke and John has not easily been defined, as indeed all relationships between John and the Synoptics resist easy classification. Are these links perhaps indications of intertextual quotations or allusions? The first pericope I would like to explore is the Anointing of Jesus, found in John 12:1–8 and Luke 7:36–50.

John's story of the anointing takes place in Bethany, just before Passover. Mary, the sister of Lazarus, took nard ointment and anointed Jesus' feet and then wiped his feet with her hair. This action produced a reaction by the disciples, especially by Judas Iscariot, who objected to the waste of costly ointment, which was worth 300 *denarii*. In response to this, Jesus said that Mary should keep the remaining ointment to be used for his burial.

---

[26] I have explored this relationship between Luke and John more completely in my dissertation, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* (Atlanta: SBL, 2001), especially chapter 3 where I catalogue the relationships and refer to other scholars who have commented on them.

This story has striking similarities at various points with the Synoptics. With Mark and Matthew, the similarities are found in the setting at Bethany before the Passover, the use of costly nard (both Mark and John refer to very costly nard, p?st?-? p???te??Ø? in Mk, p?st?-? p???t?μ?? in Jn), and a reference that its value was 300 *denarii*. Both Mark and Matthew share with John an expression of outrage over the value of the ointment, which could have been used for the poor. And John, as do Mark and Matthew, links this action with Jesus' burial, although for Mark and Matthew this "anointing" was a pre-burial anointing, while John only points forward to a post-burial anointing with the ointment (it should be saved for the burial).

At the outset, one can certainly read John's account of the anointing of Jesus without reference to any other gospel account. It presents a scene which flows well within John's narrative. The key actors, Jesus and Mary, have already had a significant interchange in the previous scene at Lazarus' raising. In that scene, Mary has already knelt at Jesus' feet (11:32), although there with a word of complaint. The anointing presents a companion, a natural follow-up to this scene, in which Mary again kneels at Jesus' feet, but now offers a thankful gift. Moreover, this foot-anointing scene anticipates the Passion, but also the foot-washing scene at the Last Supper in which Jesus himself kneels and washes the disciples' feet. It is, then, a very satisfying and self-contained story which need not be read in reference to any other account. From the standpoint of John's independence, the story "works" very effectively.

But it is certainly possible that John, in this anointing story, is offering a deliberate echo of Mark's anointing story, or that the audience might have perceived this to be an echo of Mark's gospel and treat it as such. It is possible and even fruitful, then, to read this intertextually with reference to

25

Mark. The specific phrases "very costly nard," "300 denarii," the reproach by the disciples that this could have been given to the poor, and Jesus' response that "the poor you will always have with you," all point to a possible echo of Mark's gospel. The number of key references to Mark across the pericope, and the rather pointed specific items (e.g. very costly nard, 300 denarii, the quotation from Jesus) all would point to moderate quantity and high quality of intertextual references. And it seems likely that Mark would have been written by the time John's account was composed, even if we posit an early date for John. As a result, there is certainly the possibility that John should be read intertextually with Mark, although it is also certainly possible that these features came to John via an independent tradition.

But if John is referring to Mark's version of the anointing, this account also contains interference—significant modifications that suggest a deliberate dialogue which is meant to modify the sense the of the story. John's version appears to modify Mark's account using all the categories of interference noted above: addition, deletion, substitution and permutation.

If John was engaging in a dialogue with Mark, then John has reset the story in Mary and Martha's house, not Simon the leper. This setting has been anticipated earlier in the story, in 11:2 when Mary was first introduced as "the one who anointed the Lord with perfume and wiped his feet with her hair." Thus John goes out of his way, with multiple references, to link the anointing story with the Mary/Martha/Lazarus tradition that is unique to his gospel. This would probably fall into the category of a permutation or substitution in the setting of the story.

Another modification, also a substitution, would be that Mary anoints Jesus' feet, not his head. Of course the term "anoints" is itself a bit of modification. Mark only says that Jesus had ointment

applied to him (μ?????), a term used only in Mark in the New Testament, and one never used in the

LXX for anointing. But John says that this was an anointing (•?e?f?), even though it was applied to

his feet. And John also retells the story so that the anointing act itself becomes a more central feature of

the story: Mary anoints Jesus' feet, and then wipes them clean with her hair thus filling the whole house

with fragrance. The actual act of anointing becomes a more vivid centerpiece of the entire story,

perhaps drawing attention to these major modifications—the deliberate use of the word "anoint" and its

application to Jesus' feet not his head. And, as noted before, John's response to the disciples about the

woman is that she should be allowed to retain the ointment for his burial, rather than saying this was a

perfuming of his body in advance of his burial.[27] John's substitutions or permutations are significant,

and in dialogue with Mark's more sparse account, seem to demand attention and intepretation.

Finally, one should note that in the anointing pericope John also anticipates Judas' betrayal,

modifications which would be additions to the Markan account. The protest against Mary's use of the

ointment is placed on the lips of Judas, not simply some who were present (Mark), or the disciples

(Matthew). Moreover, the reason is attributed to a character failing—Judas was a thief—and hence his

work as the keeper of the group's moneybox is given specific meaning in the context of the coming

betrayal (notice also the subsequent reference to the common purse in 13:29, when Judas does leave

the group). For John, Judas' betrayal is linked directly to the activity of Satan (13:2, 13:27), and so

Judas' character failings are linked to diabolical attributes even in this story. The central role of Judas,

---

[27] Although Barrett reads the word "keep" as being only a mental recollection (e.g. "let her keep in mind" (p. 345). Barrett downplays the possibility that she is to keep some of the ointment for later use. But is he attempting to harmonize the Markan and Johannine accounts, and not allow for the possible explicit dialogue and disagreement between the accounts?

and its linkage to the later scene at the Last Supper, is part of John's extensive addition to the material he has received.

At the same time, John has deleted the comment that the woman has done something beautiful, and that this act would be mentioned wherever the gospel was preached.

One must consider, then, the rhetorical impact such perceived modifications, in all their modes, might have had on the readers of the gospel. As an intertextual reference, reader would have been drawn rather quickly to these significant modifications. The Markan account would have been recalled, and comparisons would have been made which would emphasize some of the Johannine features. The identification of the anointing woman as Mary would have served to strengthen the role she and her family had in the Johannine version of Jesus' life. By linking the anointing to Lazarus' raising, both by the anticipatory statement in 11:2 and the repeated references to Lazarus in 12:1–2, the anointing is connected to the final sign which precipitated the arrest and conviction of Jesus. The specific reference of Mary also adds a certain specificity and personal interest which heightens the importance of the story.

But, more importantly, the difference between a pre-burial perfuming of Jesus in Mark and a foot-anointing in John would have been dramatically apparent. Might this have been an attempt to reframe a possible misinterpretation of the Markan account? While Mark does not use •?e?f ? or ???? to describe the action of the woman in 14:3, it could easily have been taken as a sign of his Messianic nature, an anointing on his head as David was anointed. Does John want to emphasize to his audience that this is an inappropriate interpretation, and so specifically uses •?e?f ? to draw attention to the action, but applies it to feet, which certainly excludes the interpretation of a messianic anointing?

As the subsequent footwashing in John demonstrates, the Fourth Evangelist is at great pains to show

Jesus as Messiah in the very act of service, of washing feet and drying them. The similarity of these two

narratives in John–anointing of Jesus' feet and then Jesus washing the disciples' feet– is striking, and all

the more so as the first of them, Mary's anointing of Jesus' feet, is cast as a striking reconfiguration of

Mark's account.

At this point, however, we must also consider Luke's form of the anointing story. Luke also

has a woman who anoints (•?e?f ?) Jesus feet with ointment, but this has been preceded by her

washing them with her tears and drying them with her hair. Here the use of the word anoint, •?e?f ? , is

emphasized even more, since Jesus contrasts the woman's anointing of his feet with ointment to the

failure of his host to anoint his head with oil (7:46). Apart from this striking similarity between Luke and

John, Luke's account differs significantly from both Mark's and John's account. The setting is early in

the ministry, not in Bethany, but somewhere in Galilee (the previous geographical references were to

Capernaum and Nain). The host is a Pharisee, but who is named, like Mark's account, Simon. And

the woman who anoints Jesus' feet is an unnamed sinner. There is no reference to the cost of the

ointment, although it is contained in an alabaster flask like Mark described, and certainly any reference

to Jesus' burial is excluded.   The issue at stake is not use of resources or burial, but rather hospitality

and forgiveness. To make this even more interesting, Luke has excluded any anointing in the week

prior to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem—this account set in Galilee seems to be a direct substitution of the

Markan account, for it is certain that Luke knew and used Mark.

As we consider John's relationship to the Synoptics, it is certainly tempting to see in John a

reference or allusion to Luke's account in order to account for the striking similarity in the details of the

29

woman's hair and Jesus' feet. But what does an intertextual approach offer to our consideration of this

similarity? If we imagine John alluding to both Mark and Luke in an intertextual reference, a narrative

that is to be read engaging these two gospels as dialogue partners, what rhetorical emphasis might be

implied by this misreading and comparison of these diverse accounts?

If John were referencing Luke alongside Mark in his reconfigured story of the anointing at

dinner, John would be recasting and setting-aside the sinner/forgiveness motif of Luke, and only

adapting the form of the foot-anointing. This feature, which is now simply part of a servant role by

Mary, has been stripped of its salvific force, and becomes only a striking element of the story—standing

in contrast to Mark's head-anointing, to be sure, but clearly lacking the meaning of Luke's use. It is

difficult to see why John would have included this feature of the foot-anointing from Luke as a

deliberate intertextual reference. It is more probable that John has received this element of the foot-

anointing from a tradition, perhaps oral, rather than using Luke as a dialogue partner.

One possibility, of course, is that John has simply created a conflated account which uses part

of Luke, but misses the import of the Lukan scene. So Goulder, for instance, suggests that John has

created a muddle of an account, one in which the image of a woman with hair let down is applied to

Mary without recognition that this is a sign of a sinner, and that John then inexplicably has Mary wipe

up the ointment with her hair, thus actually getting the ointment on her rather than on Jesus.[28] But is it

likely that John would have been so confused by Luke's presentation? This, of course, presumes a

---

[28] Michael Goulder, *Luke a New Paradigm* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), p. 403. cf. also
Barrett (p. 343) who notes that the unbound hair makes more sense in Luke, and hence that John has
combined Mark and Luke with some considerable confusion.

private use of Luke by John—an authorial confusion. If, however, we apply an intertextual model, one in which John wanted the audience to read the Fourth Gospel intertextually with Luke, then this reading becomes very inexplicable.

On the other hand, if we consider Luke's use of John, we can see a possible intertextual reference. Luke, almost without doubt, had Mark as a major source and is using Mark regularly as an intertextual source throughout the Third Gospel. It is striking that Luke reframes the narrative context of the anointing, from just before the Passion to early in the gospel narrative. This must be seen as an intentional modification of Mark's (and possibly John's) telling of the story. The reframing of the story, such that the central force has to do with forgiveness, is consistent with Luke's emphasis on this theme of forgiveness, as well as the inclusion of women and other marginalized people. It is not insignificant that Luke places the anointing story just before his summary statement of 8:1–3, in which Luke describes a number of women who were part of Jesus' traveling band, women who had been healed by Jesus and who supported Jesus out of their own resources. The anointing story serves in many ways to anticipate this summary statement. And it is probably not insignificant that this same group mentioned in 8:1–3 seems to reappear at the tomb to prepare Jesus' body, Lk 24:10 (although this group is not identical, still there are strong linkages). In a tantalizing way, then, Luke has still linked the story of the anointing to the burial of Jesus. Thus, Luke's account reworks John's account that some of Mary's ointment should be used at his burial even while the Fourth Evangelist avoids terming the foot-anointing a pre-burial anointing; women from early in the story, perhaps including the sinner woman of 7:36–50, do prepare Jesus for burial.

Luke's account has captured the hospitality feature of a foot-anointing at dinner that is implicit in John's version, and has amplified its essential meaning by making it the centerpiece of a comparison between the woman, as a sinner, and a Simon (from Mark's story) as a Pharisee. The anointing of the feet becomes the centerpiece of the story, used to contrast her act of hospitality and contrition with Simon's failure to anoint his head upon entering.

Could Luke's account be offered as an opportunity to deliberately read his account against the already existing accounts found in Mark and John? This certainly would be plausible. The reframing of Mark, a clear source and an already well-circulated gospel, points to the high probability that an intertextual reading and comparison, a dialogue between texts, was expected and encouraged. If so, then the appearance of this striking feature of the foot-anointing, carefully used in terms of the hospitality motif which it invites, and as a modification and strengthening of an element in the Mary and Martha stories, that women were accepted by Jesus and served and followed him, seems to be another intertextual linkage. Luke can thus be read as inviting comparison with John's account, and possibly even John's example of the foot-washing by Jesus later in the Fourth Gospel, as a dialogue partner that brings out in greater relief the emphasis he is making of this event in the Third Gospel.

Seen intertextually, as Luke's engaging two dialogue partners—both Mark and John—in a significant retelling of their different accounts, Luke is performing a sophisticated rhetorical move. He invites his readers to recall the previous accounts, perceive the modifications to the story told in these preceding gospels, and to clarify and enlarge their perception of the underlying meaning of this event. In recasting the stories, then, Luke has been able to sharpen the focus on the central features of the story in such a way that it underlines one of his theological understandings of Jesus.

VI. THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE

Pilate's trial of Jesus, which is contained in all the gospels, provides another opportunity to test the possible intertextual relationships between the gospels. In all the gospels, Jesus is delivered to Pilate for disposition, the final prelude before his crucifixion. But the various accounts contain elements of similarity, but also have striking differences. While a full exposition of the possible intertextual relationships are not possible here,[29] a brief look at the the Pilate Trial does support some of the approaches and observations seen in the previous discussion on the Anointing pericope.

Mark's account of the Pilate trial is relatively brief. After the Jewish council present Jesus to Pilate, Pilate abruptly asks Jesus if he is the King of the Jews, to which Jesus responds cryptically "You have said so." Thereafter Jesus makes no further statement. The chief priests present accusations, to which Jesus makes no response. Following Jesus' silence, Pilate then presents the gathered crowd with a choice: release either Barabbas or Jesus. The crowd chooses Barabbas and, upon asking what he should do to Jesus then, they respond "crucify him." Pilate orders Jesus crucified, and he is flogged and then humiliated by the guards, and led to the cross.

John's version is strikingly different, although at the heart of the account the key elements remain the same: Jesus is accused by the Jews, has a hearing, the crowd chooses Barabbas over Jesus, and Jesus is scourged and humiliated and sentenced to be crucified. But John's presentation of the trial has a much fuller and sympathetic representation of Pilate, and the accusers are portrayed more

---

[29] I study the possible relationship between Luke and John in the Pilate Trial in much more depth in my study, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?*, pp. 319–362.

negatively.   At the core of John's account is a split setting of the trial; Pilate and Jesus converse inside

the praetorium, while Pilate's exchanges with the Jewish leaders take place outside of the praetorium.

This setting allows for both narrative movement – a literal movement as Pilate shuttles between the two

audiences—and sets the stage for the fuller representation of Pilate's exchanges with Jesus.

The distinctive features of John's account which are important to note are the following:

1. The Jewish leaders specifically request a death penalty for Jesus at the outset.

2. Jesus' response to the question of whether he is King of the Jews leads to a spirited exchange over

the nature of his kingship—a role which he ultimately accepts, although Jesus has redefined it as "not of

this world."

3. Pilate explicitly finds Jesus not guilty—three times!—and tries to have him released.

4. In response "the Jews" request Barabbas to be released instead of Jesus.

5. The scourging and humiliation of Jesus occur during the trial, seemingly as an attempt to mollify the

crowd before a second attempt to release him.

6. The crowd insists that Jesus be crucified, over Pilate's own objections.

7. Pilate finally hands Jesus over to "them" to be crucified.

Given the strong similarity in the basic outline structure of the event, it certainly seems possible

that John may well have known Mark and relied on it as a structure upon which he built his more

detailed narrative. If so, John's re-writing of the trial account would perhaps involve an expected

intertextual reading of the Fourth Gospel with Mark's account. Such an intertextual reading would

present to the reader the striking differences noted above. In particular Pilate's attempts to free Jesus,

and the crowd's more emphatic response to that, would have emphasized John's more sympathetic

construction of Pilate and, at the same time, made the Jewish reaction all the more dramatic. Within this context, the chief priest's response to Pilate's final question "Shall I crucify your King?" would have driven home even more emphatically its irony: "We have no king but Caesar!" Moreover, Jesus himself, seen in contrast to Mark's muted presentation, declares his kingship and claims to have the ultimate power over the proceedings. This portrayal of Jesus, of course, fits the Fourth Gospel which has presented Jesus at numerous times engaging in extensive discourse, and even disclosing his nature and his character in these discourses. All of the characters, then, are painted in fuller and more dramatic ways, and these differences are emphasized if we read John intertextually with Mark. While each narrative certainly can stand on its own, John's narrative allows and even cooperates with an intertextual reading of Mark.

When we bring Luke into the mix, we notice another very different presentation. Unlike Mark, Luke has the Jewish leaders presenting charges at the outset, including the specific charge that he claims to be Christ the king. But what follows is almost verbatim from Mark; when Pilate asks if he is Christ, Jesus answers simply "You have said so."   But from this very Markan beginning, Luke then takes a dramatic turn. He has Pilate declare Jesus innocent, sends him to Herod for a hearing, then proceeds to declare him innocent twice more, seeking to release him. Only when the Jewish crowds demand Barabbas be freed and Jesus be crucified does Pilate finally accede to their demand, and he hands Jesus over to be crucified.

Again, Luke and John share a number of similar features, especially the description of Pilate attempting to release Jesus and the attempts by the crowds to have him crucified and Barabbas released instead. In each of these two gospels, Pilate finally gives in to the demands of the Jewish

crowds and turns Jesus over to be crucified. In both gospels it is unclear who actually crucifies Jesus; both gospels imply that it may have been the Jewish crowds that actually carried out the sentence.

Reading these gospels intertextually, we find that each gospel could be read against the other. If John had Luke available, and expected his audience to already know the Third Gospel, then John's depiction of a three-fold declaration of innocence would resonate with the audience's memory of Luke. The early accusations against Jesus, that he forbids paying tribute to Caesar, could have been amplified in the final ironic statement in John that the Jewish leaders had no king but Caesar. The very points at which Luke differs from Mark could have been picked up and amplified by John, so that the antithetical representation of Pilate, who desired to release Jesus, and the Jews, who insisted on Jesus' death, could have been expanded and given a fuller narrative voice.

At the same time, if Luke had both Mark and John available, it is very reasonable to see how his depiction of the Pilate trial could have been formed in a dialogue with these gospels. Luke could have signalled his knowledge and use of Mark in the opening passages; but when he departs from the Markan story with Pilate's declaration of Jesus' innocence, not once but three times as John has done, he may have been inviting comparison on the part of his reading audience to favorably compare the Johannine account.   Perhaps this dialogue between Luke, John and the reader would encourage a deeper reflection on the role of Pilate and the Jewish leaders, raising questions about Mark's previous depiction of the event. Even little features, such as the crowd's two-fold cry "crucify, crucify," could have been intended as an explicit reference to John's account, encouraging a dialogical engagement with the crowd's emotional response. Since Luke's trial takes place after the Passover, the conceit of Pilate's movement in and out of the praetorium would have been deleted—perhaps to make the

36

chronological point, perhaps even to explicitly correct what Luke considered to be a faulty estimation of the timing of the Passover in the Fourth Gospel. And since Luke, like Mark, avoids showing Jesus engaged in self-revelatory discourse, the private exchanges with Pilate could have been trimmed. Again, this recasting of Jesus as silent could be as much a reaction against, and a dialogue with, John's representation of Jesus engaging in long self-descriptive discourses. Luke, then, would not only have been sifting his sources as a historian, he would have been inviting his readers into this process also, so that they too could participate in the dialogue with the narratives which had preceded him, and in the course of this dialogue could come to better appreciate his own depiction of the forces which were at work in sending Jesus to his death.

VII. CONCLUSION

Intertextuality presents us with a way of considering the web of words and stories which engulf the reader and influence the process of interpretation. A Bakhtinian model of intertextuality, one which emphasizes the imagined dialogue between the writer, the reader, and the documents which are drawn into the composition process, is a particularly helpful approach to considering the dynamic interplay of text and reader. In such a model, the sources themselves become part of the reading and interpretation process—an additional dialogue partner, if you will. Differences between existing versions of the story are not necessarily simply variants that are due to geographical isolation, but become part of the dynamic engagement of the author with his or her audience.

Certainly the intertexual readings I have offered are conjectural. But such is the nature of much of our reading of the gospels. The process of gospel interpretation must imagine some kind of communication between gospel writer and the intended audience, using whatever clues are available.

This approach offers, at least, a way of reconceptualizing the way that later gospels may have used previous gospel narratives rhetorically and dialogically. Moreover, the engagement with the sample pericopes, along with the theoretical discussion of intertextuality, is necessarily brief.   But it is hoped that this essay at least provokes further interest in the relationship between the gospels, not just as an archeological field, but as a vital part of the interpretive process.