INTERTEXTUALITY AS A PRAGMATIC FRAME OF REFERENCE IN JESUS'S PARABLES IN SELECTED BIBLICAL VERSES

Joel Iyiola Olaleye[1] and Toyese Najeem Dahunsi[2]

Abstract

The theoretical foundation of lexical pragmatics posits that each word in an utterance embodies a range of meanings from which the interpreter is tasked to select the relevant sense which the word conveys in the context of use. However, extracting meaning from Biblical texts may pose a serious challenge to readers because some Biblical discourses, especially parables, are often fortified with metaphorical qualities and cryptic expressions which may be obscure to readers. This paper employs elements of pragmatic intertextuality to explicate Jesus's parable contained in Matthew 13:33. To achieve this, the study explored the meanings of key expressions in the parables through the application of some macro elements of pragmatic intertexts such as presupposition, speech act, intertextual echo, exegetical intertextuality, and dialogical intertextuality and mapped the meanings through the inferential process of intertext to arrive at the central message of the parable. The data consists of keywords contained in the parables. The study revealed that meanings of expressions in the parables transcend the overt senses conveyed by the lexical items in the immediate semantic net of the utterances but are appended on other Biblical texts. Also, inference processes demonstrated that Jesus utilized the parables to forewarn the Church against infiltration of doctrinal errors through some agencies. Based on these findings, it is concluded that familiarisation with different but related texts in the Bible is crucial to unravelling the full meanings of words in their immediate contexts of use. Otherwise, the correct meaning and interpretation of Biblical parables may be elusive, with the implication that misinterpreted Biblical messages may lead to misleading and unbiblical applications.

Keywords: Pragmatics, lexical pragmatics, intertextuality, extralinguistic realities, inference processes.

1.   Introduction

Ever since the emergence of the field of pragmatics which has advanced language research into how participants in a particular communicative event use language to generate meaning, there has been an ever-growing interest in meaning-oriented analysis of both literary and non-literary texts. For instance, the meaning-oriented works of notable scholars such as Lemke (1985), Fairclough (1992, 1995), and Bahrami (2012) within the frameworks of Critical Discourse Analysis gave impetus to the field of pragmatics. This explains why Wu (2011) submits that pragmatics has achieved substantial

---

[1.]   Department of English, School of General Studies, Waziri Umaru Federal Polytechnic, Birnin-Kebbi, Nigeria. Email: Iyiolaleye15@gmail.com

[2.]   Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Humanities and Culture, Osun State University, Osogbo, Nigeria. Email: deoladahunsi@gmail.com

progress and has become an independent research field concerning the study of language use. With the prosperity of this field, there have emerged many different pragmatic schools. One such influential pragmatic school relevant to the interpretation of Biblical texts is lexical pragmatics. Green (2007) corroborates this in his assertion that the arrival of lexical pragmatics, whose focus is on the exploration of the way word meaning is modified in use, has provided useful and essential perspectives for the analysis of any communication, including the interpretation of biblical literature.

Most existing studies on intertextuality have been on general texts (including literary works, political speeches, student essays, etc.) with none or very few of such focusing on religious texts, especially the Bible. For example, Velykoroda and Moroz (2021) examined intertextuality in media discourse and concluded that only few readers could interpret media discourse as failing to recognise intertextual references. Intertextuality frameworks have also been shown to enhance language learning in the context of classroom discourse (Rechin, 2022). An understanding and application of intertextuality frameworks has also been shown to be very helpful in teaching and learning new literary texts (Fagsao & Mi-Ing, 2023) and in explicating the complex meaning-making resources in advertising discourse (Xing & Feng, 2023). The study reported here therefore attempts to fill this knowledge gap by applying the concept of intertextuality in the analysis of the Parables of Jesus in the Bible. Parables as parts of Biblical discourses or religious texts are highly volatile texts for meaning exploration because their meanings are not exclusively absolute in their immediate linguistic contexts but are appended to other contextual sources that are derivable from other texts from other parts of the Bible. Parables are fortified with metaphorical qualities and cryptic expressions which may be obscure to readers who may not have prior awareness of Biblical principles. Extracting meaning from Biblical texts may therefore pose serious challenges to such readers. This view is corroborated by Bahrami (2012, p. 2) who asserts that "the utterance refers covertly or indirectly to an object or circumstance from an external context. It is left to the audience to make a connection where the connection is detailed in depth by the author."

The present paper therefore aims at unpacking meaning inherent in Jesus's parable written in Matthew 13:33 by exploring how intertextuality has been used as a pragmatic frame of reference in the text. To achieve this, the study explored the meanings of key expressions in the parable through the application of some macro-elements of pragmatic intertexts such as presupposition, speech act, intertextual echo, exegetical intertextuality, and dialogical intertextuality and mapped the meanings derivable from the various macro-elements through the inferential process of intertext to arrive at the central messages of the parables.

1.1 Intertextuality as a linguistic theory

In the last two decades, more linguists have shown increased interest in the concept of intertextuality with such leading to a great volume of research

and contributions to linguistic knowledge (Bahrami, 2012). Tracing the origin of the concept of intertextuality, Moyise (2002) submits that the term *intertextualité* was first introduced into literary discussion in 1969 by Julia Kristeva; while the term "intertextuality" was introduced into biblical studies in 1989 with its focus on the complex relationships that exist between texts.

The various scholars along this dimension of scholarship can be categorised into two schools of thought. The first conceives intertextuality as literary theory for the exploration of the complex and heterogeneous nature of literary works, as shown in the works of such scholars as Kristeva (1986), Leppihalme (1997), Barthes (1998), and Allan (2000) from the literary semiotics. The second school focuses attention on non-literary texts as they conceive intertextuality as a pragmatic tool for exploring extra-contextual meaning of a text, with such works as De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), Fairclough (1992, 1995), Bahrami (2012), and Frrelly (2020), which are all from the fields of discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis and pragmatics. This explains why Leppihalme (1997) describes "allusion" as "intertextuality" (p. 2) and Bahrami (2012, p. 1) describes allusion as "one of the most powerful figures of speech since it can refer to an external text." In literary contexts, allusion has been described as a passing reference to a literary or historic person (Abrams, 1999) and an interactive device for the construction of a community or culture in which the sender invites the receiver to share (Sell, 2004). What scholars concurrently suggest is that a consideration of allusive elements in a text provides a platform to enhance meaning exploration beyond the immediate contexts of the texts.

Gordon (2009) categorises intertextuality into "Intratextual Repetition" and "Intertextual Repetition", with further explanation that while the former refers to the repetition of words, phrases, or syntactic structures within one communicative event, the latter is concerned with repetition across communicative events which can only be identified or recognised with knowledge of the original or source texts. Within the frameworks of the second group, text-linguistic studies such as de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) incorporate intertextuality as one of the seven standards of textuality (others enumerated as cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity and situationality). They further define intertextuality as "the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts" (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981, p. 10). For Fairclough (1992), intertextuality is the property which texts exhibit by being snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in through assimilation, contradiction, ironical echo, and others. He also distinguishes between 'manifest intertextuality', a direct or explicit use of intertextual surface textures such as quotations and citations (from external sources); and constitutive intertextuality, that is, such discursive features as structure, presupposition, negation, parody, and irony etc., whose source texts may be opaque to the readers.

Sell (2004) emphasises the importance of intertextuality in pragmatics

by noting that "allusion is a useful means to all sorts of ends, some of which deserve fuller investigation by both intertextualists and students of literary stylistics and pragmatics alike." (p. 41). These definitions provide an insight into intertextuality as a process of exhuming meaning from texts by keeping track of extra-textual information through other sources relevant to the interpretation of the texts.

The concept of intertextuality is an important pragmatic frame of reference in keeping track of relevant information for the interpretation of texts. This accounts for why Shie (2018, p. 4) introduces the term "pragmatic intertexts" to argue that there are connections and interactions between the 'alluding text' and the 'source text', and that these connections enable the hearer/reader to infer the meaning of the latter based on the earlier text. The intertextual link not only triggers the construction of the meaning but also determines the function of the pragmatic intertext. Shie (2018, p. 7) argues that "pragmatic intertexts are situated speech acts in the sense that the activation or evocation of the source text can be viewed as the realisation of a perlocutionary act." Going by this submission therefore, the theoretical construct of intertextuality can be seen as relevant to pragmatics because macro elements such as Mutual Conceptual Beliefs, Presupposition, Implicature, Inference, etc. which are crucial for extracting the meaning of an utterance cannot be trivialised. This submission also points to the fact that intertextuality cannot be trivialised in the exploration of meaning of an utterance.

Moyise (2002) discusses five macro-elements of intertextuality which have been identified by scholars. These include Intertextual Echo, Narrative Intertextuality, Exegetical Intertextuality, Dialogical Intertextuality, and Postmodern Intertextuality. The term Intertextual Echo was introduced by Hays (1989) to cover three interrelated concepts of quotation, allusion and echo which explain the adoption of expressions or themes from another text to frame a new text. Quotation is differentiated from allusion in that, while quotation involves the introduction of exact words from an earlier text to a later text, allusion is rather less precise in terms of wording. Echo involves similarity of themes between texts that share a network of reference (Hays, 1989; Moyise, 2002; Habibova, 2022). Narrative Intertextuality is a type of intertextuality that relates to story shaping through explicit retelling. Here, the author of a new text draws upon the familiarity of the existing story to frame the new text. Narrative intertextuality also involves the concepts of continuity and discontinuity to explain how the source story is disrupted and regenerated when used in a new and unforeseen situation.

Exegetical Intertextuality explains a network of reference in which the later text redefines, interprets, or reconstructs the meaning of the earlier text. Dialogical Intertextuality is concerned with the associative influence between texts that share a network of reference. It is postulated that the old text exerts so strong an influence in the production of meaning in the new text because when readers are interpreting the new text, they are connected

back to the familiar source text. In other words, there is no superimposition of meaning to the later text other than the meaning in the earlier text. Lastly, Postmodern Intertextuality explains the interaction between texts in which the writer of the later text creates a new context out of the earlier text and superimposes his own meaning to it. The superimposition of meaning has a way of expanding the scope of the new text, thereby giving the readers opportunity to seek meaning beyond the earlier text. Therefore, the existence of different ideologies creates room for subjective and different readings of a text.

Going by Levin's (1997) submission that pragmatics reckons with "mechanisms that relate the language to its context of use, its audience, and the non-linguistic setting" (p. 48); the linguistic concept of "intertextuality" becomes a powerful mechanism within the framework of lexical pragmatics for the exploration of a text's meaning through a consideration of linguistic resources in another/other text(s) which allude(s) to the text under consideration.

Many scholars have therefore employed the mechanisms of pragmatic intertextuality to explore both literary and non-literary texts including Biblical texts. Such works include Hays (1989) which employed the concepts of intertextual echo to establish that meanings of most expressions in the Letters of Paul have their background from the Old Testament scriptures. Alkier (2005) employed the semiotic concept of intertextuality to analyse the first chapter of the Book of Matthew and concluded that meanings are not locally confined in the texts. Shie (2014) worked on the pragmatic and cross-cultural workings of perlocutionary intertexts and established that the source text forms the basis of the intertextual association of the alluding text. Peter (2015) explored intertextuality in essay writings of students in selected High Schools in Tharaka Nithi County, Kenya, and documented evidence of fragments of other texts which were predominant in the students' essays. Adika (2021) has also confirmed that Egbewogbe's collection of short stories is a recreation of some works of first generation postcolonial Ghanaian authors, using intertextuality as an analytical framework. One of the most recent works on intertextuality is that of Ellah (2022) who employed aspects of Fairclough's (1992) analytical model of intertextuality on President Mohammadu Buhari's 2015 Inaugural Speech and concluded that all parts of the speech were a constellation of several other religious, literary, and historical discourses which were reconstructed to index the President's political ideology. Intertextuality as a theoretical framework has also been explored in the contexts of translation and translation studies, with the example of Aziza (2022), who examines translation as intertextuality and translation of intertextuality.

From the foregoing discussions, it is obvious that various scholars have posited different macro-elements of intertextuality for the analysis of texts. This explains why Fairclough (1995) argues that intertextual analysis is an interpretative activity, which depends highly on the researcher's personal

judgement and experience. Bahrami (2012) also corroborates this position when he submits that intertextuality encompasses any element (macro- or micro-) that enables readers to identify and derive meaning from the surface features of the text in question by reference to other texts or text features they have previously come across.

2.   Research Methods

The research methodology adopted in this paper is essentially descriptive and analytical. The data consist of keywords contained in the parable narrated in Mathew 13:33 of the Holy Bible, King James Version (KJV). Generally, parables perform a wide range of functions in the Bible. These functions include teachings about the kingdom of God, peaceful co-existence, repentance, justice, unity, hard work, righteousness, cooperation, virtues, etc. The parable contained in this text, which was purposively selected for this study, is commonly read in Christian worship because of its informative value to forewarn believers of some agencies. This parable was selected among the seven popular parables of Jesus in the chapter for this study for the simple reason that it is more fortified with cryptic expressions and subject to different interpretations among readers. Thus, the pragma-semantic features of the short text with elaborate meanings are of relevance to this study. The text, Matthew 13:33, though a Biblical discourse, is significant not only because it provides moral enhancement and admonitions to readers, but it is also a valid object of linguistic analysis due to its richness in artistic qualities.

A study of this type has the potential of gaining more intellectual insights, thereby enhancing the frontiers of pragmatic theories. The application of pragmatic mechanisms to the analysis of a Biblical text such as this offers a precise objective and scientific account of meanings; thereby obviating the impressionistic intuitions of interpreters. Through the inbuilt search functionality of the e-Sword Bible application, all the keywords in the parable were electronically searched in different Biblical contexts. Thus, this enabled the researchers to holistically garner all instances of Biblical inter-texts connected to the parable. For centuries, Bible scholars have attempted to translate the earlier Greek and Latin Scriptures into the English language with a view to making the Bible lucid and accessible to readers. This effort has however, resulted into so many English versions of the Bible such as the New Living Translation Bible, the Revised Standard Version Bible, the King James Version Bible, etc. However, the version used in this study is the King James Version (KJV).

The choice of the King James Version (KJV) for this research is because many Christians hold the version in high regard because they believe that this version has not been distorted from its original rendition. Fairclough (1995) argues that intertextual analysis is an interpretative activity, which depends highly on the researcher's personal judgement and experience. Bahrami (2012) also corroborates this position when he submits that "intertextuality

encompasses any element (macro- or micro-) that enables readers to identify and derive meaning from the surface features of the text in question by making reference to other texts or text features they have previously come across." Therefore, to arrive at the fuller meanings of the parable in question, the study adopted pragmatic concepts such as presupposition, speech act, and Moyise's (2002) macro-elements such as intertextual echo, exegetical intertextuality, and dialogical intertextuality. The choice of Moyise's elements of intertextuality among others hinges on the incorporation of exegetical intertexts, which aptly helps to address the totality of meanings in religious writings. The utilisation of these macro-elements of pragmatic concepts is believed to have the potential of demystifying the myth that a parable is a volatile and an impenetrable discourse genre.

3.   Results and Discussion

The main purpose of the discussion in this section is to explore the meanings of key expressions in Jesus' parable in Matthew 13: 33 through the application of some macro elements of pragmatic concepts such as presupposition, speech act, intertextual echo, exegetical intertextuality, and dialogical intertextuality. The in-text data is presented below:

> *Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.* (Matthew 13:33; Bible KJV)

3.1   *Pragmatic Features in the Text*

(a) ***Semantic Presupposition****:* Giving attention to the expression 'another parable' in the text above, a presupposition can be postulated that, Jesus has previously told his audience one or more parable(s) before the current one. The immediate context (both the preceding and succeeding verses) of the parable in Matthew 13:33 above shows that, it is the fourth parable among the seven (7) parables of the kingdom contained in the entire Matthew chapter 13.

(b) **Illocutionary Act**: The illocutionary act performed in the parable is a directive act of warning. The pragmatic import is that Jesus used the parable to pre-inform and forewarn his audience about imminent activities in the kingdom.

3.2   *Elements of Intertextuality*

(i) ***Intertextual Echo****:* The logical relation that holds between the foregoing text and other six parables in its immediate context involves similarity of thematic coverage. In all the seven parables contained in the entire Matthew chapter 13, Jesus introduced images that trigger the audience's imagination with a view to echoing how Satan would invade the kingdom (the Church of Christ) to corrupt the gospel of righteousness. The activity in each parable has a different

context but a similar theme involving (i) a sower, (ii) a farmer, (iii) a gardener, (iv) a cook, (v) a treasure seeker, (vi) a merchant, and (vii) fishermen respectively. In the first parable called the parable of the sower (Matthew 13: 3-9) Jesus revealed how the wicked one (Satan) would corrupt the children of the kingdom by snatching away the seed of the gospel of righteousness planted in their hearts. In the second parable involving a farmer otherwise called the parable of the tares and wheat (Matthew 13: 24-30), Jesus revealed how the sons of the evil one (Satan) would be planted among the children of the kingdom.

In the third parable involving the gardener who planted a mustard seed (Matthew 13: 31-32), Jesus revealed how different birds (good and evil) would perch in the branches of the mustard tree. In the fourth parable involving a cook (Matthew 13: 33), Jesus revealed how leavened bread was introduced into the kingdom despite the existing law which says: 'Ye shall eat nothing leavened; in all your habitations shall ye eat unleavened bread' (Exodus 12:20). Jesus likened the kingdom of heaven to yeast which the cook mixes with flour until the yeast works through the dough. In relation to the first three parables in the preceding verses, flour in the above parable is a product of the good seed (good gospel) of the sower; flour comes from the wheat (good gospel) planted by the farmer. Also, yeast is like tares (gospel of Satan) which is mixed with flour (good gospel). Thus, there is a mutual existence of two types of gospel in the kingdom. In the fifth parable (Matthew 13: 44), Jesus revealed how Satan would attempt to keep the precious gospel of righteousness secret from people through the treasure seeker who hid it after discovering it. In the sixth parable involving a merchant (Matthew 13: 45), Jesus revealed how some people planted in the kingdom, that is, the Church of Christ, by Satan would merchandize the gospel of righteousness. In the seventh parable involving fishermen (Matthew 13: 47-48), Jesus revealed how all kinds of fish (good and bad) were caught in the gospel net. Thus, in terms of Intertextual echo, all the seven parables harmoniously convey the message concerning the infiltration of satanic activities into the kingdom (the Church) through different agencies.

(ii) Exegetical Intertextuality: Jesus encoded the meaning of the parable above partly on the assumption that his audience has a basic understanding of the keyword in context, that is, 'leaven' which refers to a substance mixed with flour to make it rise. He also encoded the meaning of the parable on the assumption that his audience has pre-knowledge of other Biblical texts which redefine or construct the meaning of this keyword in context. Therefore, certain contextual factors which are external to the keyword 'leaven' tend to predetermine the choice of the word in the parable. The interest

of lexical pragmaticians is to identify other texts where either Jesus himself or other Biblical authors redefine or construct the meaning of the expression in a better light. This is done as follows:

Text A: (Matthew 16: 6-12; KJV) Leaven is used to mean false doctrine

> *Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves… How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, <u>but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.</u>*

It is evident from the text above that while Jesus used the word 'leaven' to refer to the 'doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees', the audience misconstrue him by limiting the semantic scopes of the word to a fermenting substance added to flour to make bread. In terms of exegetical intertextuality, the above text provides a platform where Jesus defines or constructs his communicative intent about the word 'leaven' to encode 'false doctrine'. Jesus who set the foundation of the gospel of righteousness was warning his audience against false doctrine that could lure them away into another gospel.

Text B: (1 Corinthians 5: 5-8; KJV) Leaven is used to mean moral and spiritual perversion

> *Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that <u>a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?</u> Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore, let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with <u>the leaven of malice and wickedness;</u> but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.*

The text above is Paul's admonition to the audience to purge themselves from any moral and spiritual perversion capable of corrupting the assembly of believers. In terms of exegetical intertextuality, the above text provides a platform where the word 'leaven' is clearly defined or constructed to mean ungodly acts of malice and wickedness. An inference can be made here that, the leaven, which Satan introduced through some agencies to pervert the gospel of righteousness are ungodly deeds.

(iii) Dialogical Intertextuality: It is also necessary to explore the internal consistency with which different authors have pragmatically

communicated by the choice of the word 'leaven' in the entire Bible (especially the Old Testament books containing existing laws about leaven) with a view to discovering how this consistency exerts so strong an influence on the production of the meaning of the parable. Apart from Matthew 13: 33 and Luke 13:21 which contains the account of the same parable under investigation, the word 'leaven/leavened' occurs in other 27 verses of the entire Bible. These are pragmatically analysed in Table 1.

Table 1: Showing occurrences of the word 'Leaven/Leavened' in the entire Bible

S/N	Book	Content	Speaker's Intention/ Illocutionary Act	Attitude Expressed
1	Exodus 12:15	Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day <u>ye shall put away leaven out of your houses</u>: for whosoever eateth <u>leavened</u> bread… that soul shall be cut off from Israel.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	Negative attitude to leavened bread
2	Exodus 12:19	Seven days <u>shall there be no leaven found in your houses:</u> for whosoever eateth that which is <u>leavened</u>, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel…	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	Negative attitude to leavened bread
3	Exodus 12:20	<u>Ye shall eat nothing leavened;</u> in all your habitations shall ye eat unleavened bread.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	Negative attitude to leavened bread
4	Exodus 12:34	And the people took their dough before it was <u>leavened</u>, their kneading troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders.	Assertive Act of reporting: Telling how the people desisted from eating leavened bred	Negative attitude to leavened bread
5	Exodus 12:39	And they baked <u>unleavened</u> cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not <u>leavened;</u> because they were thrust out of Egypt…	Assertive Act of reporting: Telling how the people desisted from eating leavened bred	Negative attitude to leavened bread

6	Exodus 13:3	And Moses said unto the people, Remember this day, in which ye came out from Egypt...there shall no <u>leaven</u>ed bread be eaten.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	N e g a t i v e attitude to leavened bread
7	Exodus 13:7	Un<u>leaven</u>ed bread shall be eaten seven days; and there shall no <u>leaven</u>ed bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be <u>leaven</u> seen with thee in all thy quarters.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	N e g a t i v e attitude to leavened bread
8	Exodus 23:18	Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with <u>leaven</u>ed bread; neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain until the morning.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	N e g a t i v e attitude to leavened bread
9	Exodus 34:25	Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven; neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left unto the morning.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	N e g a t i v e attitude to leavened bread
10	Leviticus 2:11	No meat offering, which ye shall bring unto the LORD, shall be made with leaven: for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering of the LORD made by fire.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	N e g a t i v e attitude to leavened bread
11	Leviticus 6:17	It shall not be baken with leaven. I have given it *unto them for* their portion of my offerings made by fire; it *is* most holy, as *is* the sin offering, and as the trespass offering.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	N e g a t i v e attitude to leavened bread
12	Leviticus 7:13	Besides the cakes, he shall offer *for* his offering <u>leaven</u>ed bread with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace offerings.	Directive Act of c o m m a n d i n g : Ordering the use of leavened bread for specific sacrifice	P o s i t i v e attitude to leavened bread

13	Leviticus 10:12	And Moses spake unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons that were left, Take the meat offering that remaineth of the offerings of the LORD made by fire, and eat it <u>without leaven</u> beside the altar: for it *is* most holy:	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	Negative attitude to leavened bread
14	Leviticus 23:17	Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth deals: they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baken with leaven; *they are* the first fruits unto the LORD.	Directive Act of commanding: Ordering the use of leavened bread for specific sacrifice	Positive attitude to leavened bread
15	Deuteronomy 16:3	Thou shalt eat no <u>leavened</u> bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat un<u>leavened</u> bread therewith, *even* the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	Negative attitude to leavened bread
16	Deuteronomy 16:4	And there shall be no <u>leavened</u> bread seen with thee in all thy coast seven days; neither shall there *any thing* of the flesh, which thou sacrificedst the first day at even, remain all night until the morning.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning against eating leavened bread	Negative attitude to leavened bread
17	Hosea 7:4	They *are* all adulterers, as an oven heated by the baker, *who* ceaseth from raising after he hath kneaded the dough, until it be <u>leavened</u>.	Assertive Act of reporting: Telling the people's adulteration of holy vessel	Negative attitude to leavened bread
18	Amos 4:5	And offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim *and* publish the free offerings: for this liketh you, O ye children of Israel, saith the Lord GOD.	Assertive Act of reporting: Telling Israel's hypocrisy at Bethel	Negative attitude to leavened bread

19	Matthew 16:6	Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning to the audience	Negative attitude to leaven
20	Matthew 16:11	How is it that ye do not understand that I spake *it* not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees?	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning to the audience	Negative attitude to leaven
21	Matthew 16:12	Then understood they how that he bade *them* not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.	Assertive Act of reporting: Telling the understanding of the audience	Negative attitude to leaven
22	Mark 8:15	And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and *of* the leaven of Herod.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning to the audience	Negative attitude to leaven
23	Luke 12:1	In the meantime, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning to the audience	Negative attitude to leaven
24	1 Corinthians 5:6	Your glorying *is* not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning to the audience	Negative attitude to leaven
25	1 Corinthians 5:7	Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us:	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning to the audience	Negative attitude to leaven
26	1 Corinthians 5:8	Therefore let us keep the feast, not with [old leaven], neither with the [leaven of malice and wickedness]; but with the unleavened *bread* of sincerity and truth.	Directive Act of commanding: Giving warning to the audience	Negative attitude to leaven; Positive attitude to 'unleavened'

27	Galatians 5:9	A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.	Assertive Act: Stating the negative effect of leaven	Negative attitude to leaven
Total		**27 Verses**	**Directive Act = 21** **Assertive Act = 6**	**Positive = 2** **Negative = 25**

As indicated in the table above, the speech acts consistently utilised in 21 out of 27 verses are directives where the speaker's intention was to advise, warn, caution, and restrain the audience against what is leavened. Moreover, in the 6 instances where assertive acts are performed, the speakers' intention is to disagree with whatever is leavened. This is done by stating the negative effect of the leavened with a view to condemning people's hypocrisy regarding the leavened. As demonstrated in the table above, the various speech act mechanisms adopted where the word 'leaven/leavened' is utilised in the entire Bible provide strong evidence that the authors have the goal of denouncing, cautioning, advising, and restraining the audience from whatever is leavened. Therefore, in terms of dialogical intertextuality by which exploration of internal consistency within the entire Bible on the use of the word 'leaven' is sourced, it is evident that the meaning outside the immediate context of the parable exerts a strong influence on the production of the meaning of the parable.

As shown in the table above, the word 'leaven/leavened' is also utilised to highlight negative dispositions of the different authors. With the exemption of Leviticus 7: 13 and Leviticus 23:17 where specific regulations regarding 'offering of thankfulness' and 'wave offering' are stated in the table above, it is obvious that the word 'leaven/leavened' was persistently used to express negative attitudes towards any leavened substances. This further gives a strong conviction that since the woman or the cook mentioned in the parable under investigation was neither performing 'offering of thankfulness' nor 'wave offering', her infusion of yeast is a negative activity to the kingdom of heaven.

3.3 The Pragmatic Intertext of the Expression 'Three Measures of Meal': Exegetical Intertextuality

Jesus also encoded the meaning of the parable partly on the assumption that his audience has a basic understanding of the key expression "three measures of meal". A meal is a substantial amount of food taken at a time to satisfy hunger. However, in the context of use in the parable, the word 'meal' is used figuratively to mean spiritual foods such as 'milk' and 'meat' which are figurative of the word of God for the young and mature believers respectively. Some external sources establish this. For instance, Matthew 5:6 says "Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled". This suggests that believers were encouraged to desire spiritual meals of righteousness. Such meals are mentioned in 1Peter 2:2, which says "As newborn babes desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby". Here, young believers 'new born babes' were encouraged

to desire to learn the rudimentary word of God that they grow spiritually. Also, in Hebrew 5:13-14, it is written that "For every one that useth milk *is* unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, *even* those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." Here, meat represents hard words of righteousness that would make the mature believers grow into perfection. Therefore, it is apparent that the word 'meal' used in the parable refers to spiritual food of righteousness which gives spiritual satisfaction to believers. Thus, the 'three measures of meal' used in the parable is figurative of the three cardinal teachings of Christianity about salvation which are Justification, Sanctification and Glorification (otherwise called the Baptism of the Holy Spirit).

3.4   *Pragmatic Intertexts: Mapping the Meanings of expressions in the Parable*

This section focuses on mapping the meanings derivable from the various macro-elements through the inferential process of intertext to arrive at the central message of the parable**.** On the basis of the various elements of intertextuality which provide platforms to unveil the hidden shades of meaning in the words 'leaven' and 'three measures of meal', readers can therefore access or infer the meaning of the parable in Matthew 13:33. It is apparent that, the word 'leaven' in every respect was used to express negative dispositions of different Biblical authors. Bearing in mind that the parable is among the seven parables explaining the infiltration of Satan into the kingdom of God, otherwise referred to as the church, an inference can be made that, the leaven, which Satan introduced into the kingdom through some agencies to pervert the gospel of righteousness, is false doctrine as evidenced in the analyses above.

By meaning mapping, since the word 'leaven' refers to false doctrine, while the 'three measures of meal' refers to the three cardinal doctrines of Christianity; the central message of the parable therefore points to how these cardinal teachings of Christianity would be corrupted through false doctrines. This is evident in modern day Christianity where believers are denominated based on their different doctrinal positions on these three cardinal teachings. The fragmentation can be explained in terms of the gospel of Christ and false doctrines which co-exist in Christendom. Therefore, in terms of speech act, the illocutionary function of the parable is a directive act of warning by prefiguring the co-existence of false doctrines and the gospel of righteousness in the church of Christ. Hence, the parable is a presage heralding the invasion of false gospels by some satanic agencies into the church to pervert the words of righteousness by which people might be saved.

4.   **Findings and Implications of the Analysis**

Considering the substantial simplifications in both the structure and the descriptions of the parable as revealed in the above analysis, several inferences can be made. First, the meanings of the utterances in the parable transcend

the overt senses conveyed by the lexical items in the immediate semantic net of the utterances. Thus, readers could misconstrue the parable by limiting the semantic scope of the word 'leaven' to mean the fermenting substance added to flour. This is because the meanings of some expressions in the parable are not absolutely restricted to the immediate linguistic context of the parable but are anchored to other Biblical texts. Second, exploration of other biblical texts is crucial to perceiving the additional level meaning inherent in the expressions. The implication of this finding is that intertextuality has the tendency to expand the thematic scope of an utterance when fuller information is obtained through an exploration of the extralinguistic context of the utterance. Third, the meaning of the parable may be elusive if other Biblical texts are not explored, or if the reader is unfamiliar with source texts to which allusions were made.

The findings above clearly show that Biblical texts, especially relating to the parables of Jesus, have tendencies to accumulate meanings through allusions and references to other texts. This corroborates the findings of some existing studies (e.g., Fagsao & Mi-Ing, 2003; Velykoroda & Moroz, 2021; Rechin, 2022), which have shown how one part of a text relates to other parts of the text, and how an understanding of one part of a text helps in the interpretation of other parts of the text. The findings further reveal that every text is influenced by other texts, and by recognizing and understanding these intertextual relationships, readers can gain a richer and deeper understanding of texts, and they can become more informed and critical readers of texts. Intertextuality is therefore essential for understanding the meanings of texts because it allows readers to see how texts are connected to other parts of the text, how texts are situated within a larger body of work, how texts can be used to create new meanings, and how to interpret allusions and references in texts.

5.   Conclusion

This study has applied macro elements of pragmatic intertexts to analyse Jesus's parable in Matthew 13:33. The analysis has revealed that meanings of expressions in the parable transcend the overt senses conveyed by the lexical items in the immediate semantic net of the utterances because references are made to extralinguistic realities contained in other Biblical texts. Also, inference processes through the macro elements of pragmatic intertexts have demonstrated that the meaning of a Biblical expression may not be absolutely restricted to the local context where the expression is used. Because of these findings, it can be concluded that an exploration of sourced texts is crucial to perceiving additional levels of meaning inherent in words; otherwise, meanings of textual parts may be elusive if readers are unfamiliar with the alluded texts.

Works Cited

Abrams, M. H. (1999). *A glossary of literary terms* (7th ed.). Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers Inc.

Adika, P. K. (2021). Deconstructing the terrible gift of postcolonial African lives: An intertextual reading of Martin Egblewogbe's *Mr. Happy and the Hammer of God & other Stories*. Legon *Journal of the Humanities, 32*(1). 27-48. *DOI:* https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ljh.v32i1.2

Alkier, S. (2005). From text to intertext: Intertextuality as a paradigm for reading Matthew. *HTS*, 61(1&2). 1-18.

Allan, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Aziza, M. (2022). The theory of intertextuality as a paradigm and the impact of this theory on translation. *Евразийский Журнал Академических Исследований*, *2*(5), 990-995.

Barthes, R. (1998). *The Pleasure of the Text*. R. Miller and R. Howard, trans. New York: Hill and Wang.

Bahrami, N. (2012). Strategies used in the translation of allusions in Hafiz Shirazi's poetry. *Journal of Language and Culture. 3* (1).1-9.

de Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.

Ellah, S. M. (2022). Intertextuality in Political Discourse: A Study of President Mohammadu Buhari's 2015 Inaugural Speech Journal of Languages, *Linguistics and Literary Studies,* 11 (1), 9-17.

Fagsao, J. D. & Mi-lng, J. G. K. (2023). Reading the word and the world: Intertextuality in teaching literature. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science.* 7 (1). 998-1023.

Fairclough, N., (1992). *Discourse and social change*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

Farrelly, M. (2020). Rethinking intertextuality in CDA. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *17*(4), 359-376.

Gordon, C. (2009). *Making meanings, creating family*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gordon, C. (2023) *Intertextuality 2.0: Metadiscourse and meaning-making in an online community*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Green, G. L. (2007). Lexical pragmatics and biblical interpretation. *Journal of the   Evangelical*, *50* (4).799–812.

Habibova, M. (2022). Theories of intertextuality and the basic framework of kristeva's formulation of her theory of intertextuality. *Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры*, *2*(5), 301-307.

Hays, R. B. (1989). *Echoes of scripture in the letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, Dialogue and Novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 34-61.

Leppihalme, R. (1997). *Culture bumps: An empirical approach to the translation of allusions*. England: Multilingual Matters.

Lemke, J. L. (1985). Ideology, intertextuality, and the notion of register. In J. D. Benson &. S. Greaves (Eds.), *Systemic perspectives on discourse* (pp. 275-294). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Levin, S.R. (1977). *The semantics of metaphor*. London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Moyise, S. (2002). Intertextuality and biblical studies: A review. *Verbum Et Ecclesia JRG 23* (2).418-431.

Peter, C. A. (2015). Intertextuality in essay writing by students in High Schools in Tharaka Nithi County, Kenya. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies,* 2(8). 57-63.

Rechin (2022) in his "Intertextuality and its roles in the classroom. *Learning to Teach Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies Through Research and Practice,* 11 (1). Retrieved from:

https://openjournals.utoledo.edu/index.php/learningtoteach/article/view/568

Sell, J. P. A. (2004). *Allusion and ambiguity in Seamus Heaney's "Blackberry-Picking"*. Portada: Enrique Perez.

Shie, J. (2018). *"Out of print, maybe, but not out of mind": Pragmatic intertexts and their intercultural workings*. Kaohsiung: Crane Publishing Company.

Velykoroda, Y. & Moroz, O. (2021). Intertextuality in media discourse: A reader's perspective. *Explorations in English and Linguistics*. 9 (1). 56-79. DOI:10.2478/exell-2022-0003

Wu, J. (2011). Understanding interdiscursivity: A pragmatic model. *Journal of Cambridge Studies,* 6 (2-3). 95-115.

Xing, C. & Feng, D. W. (2023). Multimodal intertextuality and persuasion in advertising discourse. *Discourse and Communication,* (17 (5). 613-629. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/17/17504813231170579