4. The material base includes for Miller 'the one time only of each unique act of reading; the here and now of the man or woman with the book in hand ... what is ... radically inaugural in each act of reading.' 125

5. Miller (288) sees the importance of the problem of the material base in this that it shows 'that an apparently abstract, purely "theoretical" issue may have decisive institutional and political consequences.'

What Miller's link of rhetorics with literary theory ultimately leads to is what he calls 'the most difficult part' of what he has to say on the subject. And this difficulty is caught in his succinct formulation of the problem that 'even the most vigilant and theoretically enlightened reading is the resistance to reading,' and that 'the triumph of theory is the resistance to reading' even though 'reading is always theoretical.' 126

The rebirth of rhetorics in modern literary theory, as Miller views it, results in one familiar, and one unfamiliar focus for rhetorical studies applied to biblical exegesis: (1) The 'recognition of the way the rhetorical or tropological dimension of language undermines straightforward grammatical and logical meaning,' and (2) to confront 'the performative or positional power of language as inscription over what we catachrestically call the material.' 127

But there are warnings now sounded 'that the liaison of literary theory and biblical criticism has been too unidirectional, from literary theory to biblical hermeneutics, and that biblical hermeneutics could provide to literary theory a valuable "chastening perspective" about "relations between readers and texts."' 128

1.4.6.3 Rebirth into Ideology as Social Imagination

For Ricoeur, there is a rediscovery of the positive meaning of rhetoric which coincides with the emphasis on the positive or integrative (as opposed to the negative or distortive) meaning of ideology, because ideology is 'the rhetoric of basic communication.' It has come to this coincidence, because the study of the practices and theories of both rhetoric and hermeneutic has increasingly stressed the need for including in its critical considerations what Barner calls 'die grundlegenden Faktoren politischer, religiöser und sozialgeschichtlicher Art,' 129 or what Bakhtin calls 'the historically aktuell forces at work in the verbal-ideological evolution of specific social groups.' Bakhtin's view relies on the premise that 'we have restored rhetoric to all its ancient right ....' 130

Jameson felt at one time that 'Ricoeur's seminal reflections on the dual nature of the hermeneutic process' was still far too much 'modeled on the act of communication between individual subjects, and cannot therefore be appropriated as such for any view of meaning as a collective process.' 131

But Ricoeur's recent work on ideology may invalidate Jameson's critique. For the rebirth of rhetoric in ideology it is worth calling attention to the following observation of Jameson: the traditionalist distinction, advocated by E D Hirsch, between Sinn und Bedeutung (cf Ricoeur's adaptation of 'sense' and 'reference'), as the distinction between the scientific analysis of a text's intrinsic 'meaning' and the
'ethical' evaluation of its 'significance' for us, 'corresponds to the traditional Marxist distinction between science and ideology.'

2. The Hegemony of Hermeneutics and the Realm of Rhetorics

In the following I am indebted to the reflections on hermeneutics by philosopher Hubert L Dreyfus and anthropologist Paul Rabinow in their interpretation of Michel Foucault's work as leading us 'beyond structuralism and hermeneutics', as the subtitle of their study reads. How can one be 'interpretive' in one's work, as Foucault is, without being hermeneutical? Scientific hermeneutics, and structuralism or formalism of all kinds, led to what Noll calls 'the unthinking academic imperialism in which the universe is reduced to the horizon I can see from where I stand.' We have witnessed the challenge of the hegemony of hermeneutics in the recent developments of feminist hermeneutics, of political hermeneutics, and in the rise of non-Western, Third World hermeneutics. It is in such developments as these that the interrelation between hermeneutics and rhetorics asserts itself, and in the process challenge the hegemony of hermeneutics as we have known it in most of Western history.

2.1 Hermeneutics 'frames' Rhetorics (and not vice versa)

The study of 'the kinds of effects which discourses produce, and how they produce them,' which is the rhetorical dimension of all discourse, came to be 'framed' by three successive stages of hermeneutics:

(1) The focus was on the individual subject and its meaning; this stage remains in effect when rhetoric is taught as part of the trivium. Language and logic, or topic, 'frame' the approach to rhetoric. Logic and dialectic focused on the universals and the truth components; language on the particulars and the contingent.

(2) Then the focus shifted to meaning as part of a larger field of particular and contingent practices (the socio-cultural contexts; the generic social setting of the Sitz im Leben, etc). These practices transcended the purely linguistic, discursive level. This stage remains in effect when rhetoric's link with psychology or history remains intact, as Dockhorn for instance pointed out, but also when there is a link with other aspects of 'rhetorics' material base.' The study of these nonlinguistic, nondiscursive factors falls into two distinct categories:

(2.1) Those based on the accessibility of such factors to scientific study in the development of scientific exegesis as highlighted in Kümmel's historical survey of the development of the scientific, analytical, historical critical study of the New Testament. Von Bormann calls this 'analytic hermeneutics' which could easily be matched with an analytic rhetoric.

(2.2) The access to these nonlinguistic factors in terms of philosophy's focus on the noncontingent, nondiscursive, but logical and ontologically coherent propositions. Von Bormann calls this 'philosophical hermeneutic' which has its parallel in the works of those who emphasize rhetoric as inherent in logic and dialectic, whether as early as medieval scholasticism, or Renaissance
humanism, or Cartesian and Port-Royal rhetorics, or Schleiermacher (so Von Bormann, against Gadamer).

(3) In the work of the hermeneutical philosophers and theologian-exegetes of the 20th century (from Heidegger to Ricoeur and Habermas, the final shift is from historical and linguistic contingency to two schools of conceptual or collective coherence:

(3.1) the schools of philosophical hermeneutics, including the hermeneutics of suspicion; and

(3.2) the schools of those who no longer can, and care to, see either hermeneutics or rhetorics as a fixed or fixable method, but schools of literary theory. The latter include the awareness of the crucial importance of ideology as inescapable part of the 'discursive fields' which we need to decipher in the materiality of a text's efficacy in 'the here and now of the man or woman with the book in hand ... [in] what is ... radically inaugural in each act of reading.'

2.2 The Four Characteristics of Traditional Hermeneutics as The Science of 'Intersubjectivity'

2.2.1 Signification rooted in Reality; or: Meaning and Reference

Language and literature (or any other 'sign system') are based on some 'organizing [nondiscursive] practices' (language/'sign' as essentially a social phenomenon). Hermeneutic and pragmatic thinkers insist that such nonlinguistic practices, such common sense horizon underlying all language 'cannot be represented or objectified.' They are what they are; they are self-grounding and self-referential. Not so for rhetorical thinkers, i.e those devoted to literary or rhetorical theory (= rhetorics), for whom, as with Derrida and Foucault, the very 'unthought background of serious [= efficacious] discourse is made the object of study.' Traditional rhetorics also had made such background the object of its study in the theories about inventio, stasis, and the general (= common sense) vs the special topoi.

Traditional hermeneutics rests on the classical Western philosophical (and theological) assertion 'that the nonobjectifiable horizon ... is the condition of the claim to meaning and intelligibility.' That makes hermeneutics essentially a discipline and theory devoted to 'excavation' or extraction of meaning. Philosophically, or theoretically, it is the methodological search of the essence in the diversity; of the universal in the particular; of the one in the many; the spirit in the letter; the divine in the human; the coherent in the contingent; the logic in the rhetoric; the topics in the arguments. Between the modern philosophical hermeneutics, or hermeneutical philosophers/theologians on the one hand, and the other extreme of actual or potential 'wholesale nullification of all interpretive activity' witnessed in various quarters (ranging from Derrida, Foucault, Baudrillard, Deleuze, Guattari, Lyotard, to Kristeva and others), we may have to pay attention to the middle ground claimed by Jameson in his 'construction of some new and more adequate, immanent or antitranscendent hermeneutic model.' For me
this antitranscendent hermeneutics is made possible, indeed mandated, by ancient and modern rhetorics.

2.2.2 Deep, hidden meaning; or: Hermeneutic of Suspicion

Hermeneutics offers methods for discovering what works really mean. The reform movements of the 16th century, despite all disclaimers and polemics against the medieval and scholastic emphasis on the multiple senses of the Bible's literary sense, did not, and could not, escape the gravitational pull of that discursive field, with its underlying nondiscursive organizing practices, pervading all of Western Europe, both in its Christian and its Rabbinic Jewish traditions.\textsuperscript{141}

The shift in excavating, extracting meaning by way of hermeneutics from the traditional to the modern methodology, known and made popular as Ricoeur's 'hermeneutic of suspicion,' still leaves the study of the nature and efficacy of texts where it had been all along: some hidden or universal truth is seen deflected or even distorted by some historical or linguistic contingency. The hermeneutics of suspicion operates on the theory that deep meaning or deep truth has been purposefully hidden, as was argued since Patrictic times about the purpose of Scripture's obscurities and contradictions,\textsuperscript{142} as tokens of God's transcendence and perfection distorted in human imperfection; symptoms of some 'otherness' or 'alterity,' Foucault sees in these but glimpses of the 'fundamental experience of unreason which beckons us beyond the bounds of society' and 'the opening for a "total contestation" of Western culture.'\textsuperscript{143}

In contrast to the traditional solution to the obscurities and contradictions which was found in the final disclosure of all meaning at the end (the eschaton) and fulfilment and goal (the telos) as the realization of the scope (the rhetorical skopos!) of God's ways with humankind, the hermeneutic of suspicion saw a solution to the same problem in the creative potential of the disruption and disorder per se. In the latter case the pathos part of rhetoric is co-ordinated with the logos part (as we saw in Reformation rhetorics and hermeneutics); in the former case the pathos is sub-ordinated to logos (as we saw in Medieval and Renaissance hermeneutics).

2.2.3 Practice Subordinated to Theory; or: Triumph of Theory/Method

Hermeneutics, no less than rhetorics, as traditional forms of literary theory, came to be conceived as subordinating exegetical or rhetorical practice to prescriptive hermeneutical or rhetorical theory. But the reverse, theory being subordinated to social practice, was and remains the primary issue. Noll recalls Emerson's vision of "American scholars" who extrapolate theory appropriate for their own experience.\textsuperscript{144} The hermeneutical and rhetorical theories (as manifest in the various handbooks and Fachliteratur) as subordinate to social practice can be understood as 'one of the essential components through which the organizing practices operate' - such practices as institutionalized Hellenistic and Roman paideia, Rabbinic 'schools', Christian exegetical 'schools' (Alexandria) and monasteries, courts of law, etc. But when practice gets subordinated to theory, then the priority
has shifted to the 'object' or 'text.' Is practice viewed as primary, then the attention falls more naturally on 'that which conditions, limits, and institutionalizes discourse formation' (Foucault).

Another aspect of the subordination of exegetical practice to theory as one of the characteristics of the tradition of hermeneutics is the socially privileged position of the academically trained hermeneut (the professor of exegesis, the professor of literature, the professor of law) controlling the social practice of interpretation. Noll briefly touches on 'the incongruity of the privileged expert in a militantly democratic society.' The scientific scholarly hermeneut offers prescriptive interpretations which 'delimit the boundaries of normal science every bit as effectively as papal pronouncements did [and still do, I may add!] for Roman Catholics.'

Academic experts of the theory and methodology of exegesis (which could, and did occasionally, include expertness in rhetoric), 'while insisting that the truths they uncover lie outside the sphere of power, seem fated to contribute to the strategies of power [by their very "scientific hermeneutics"]. They claim a privileged externality [academic, scientific objectivity and neutrality], but they actually are part of the deployment of power.' Foucault clearly distinguishes the exegetical commentary 'production and circulation of elements of meaning' from 'certain results in the realm of power' which both the objective and the consequence of hermeneutics 'can have.' The objective capacities of commentaries, of the perfected technique, overlap with the capacities of the production of meaning in the actual communication of this exegetical information (e.g. in publications) and both in turn overlap with the capacities of power relations, of certain ways of acting upon other persons (e.g. in public places like schools or churches). Each of the three supports the others reciprocally; each uses the other 'mutually as means to an end.' The 'intentional fiction of presuppositional neutrality [in any of professional biblical societies, whether SBL, or SNTS, or NTSSA]; [their] extraordinary respect for integrity of underinterpreted data, and [their] careful cultivation of civility,' make us realize that 'the really interesting work [for the politics of American, European, African, Asian biblical scholarship] is not that which has been done, but that which has not been done.'

2.2.4 Why Hermeneutics generates Commentary: Discourse added to Discourse

Hermeneutics generates commentary, but rhetorics generates action. The commentary genre is generated by the hermeneutical effort of recovering meaning and truth from another person's or other people's past practices. It is neither impossible, nor wrong, to paraphrase and explicate the surface meaning of the text or practices being interpreted. The New Testament may be taken as the Christian commentary on the 'Old Testament', as Mishnah and Talmud are the Jewish 'commentary' on The Book. Foucault criticizes the commentary as exegesis, because it merely adds to the proliferation of discourse 'without getting at what is really going on.' One of the increasingly fruitless manifestations of hermeneutics is the commentary whose genre in the service of hermeneutics has been recently called
into question. What is problematic about both the commentary and hermeneutics is not any failure in understanding 'the surface significance of what [actors] are saying and doing,' but rather their inability of giving any reply to the question: 'What is the effect of what they are doing? All commentary can do is further elaborate the background meanings shared by the actors.'  

By contrast, rhetorics' concern for the kinds of effects which discourse produce, and how they produce them - a concern for 'texts as process' vs 'texts as objects' - has yet to generate a 'commentary' genre appropriate to it. The emphasis on the anagogical, or tropological dimension of the medieval commentary as the final, climactic of the four 'senses' indicates what to 'the medieval theorists ... constituted a methodological upper limit and a virtual exhaustion of interpretive possibilities.' The commentaries of the 16th century Reformation continued this tradition (as did the Pietists and Puritans) with their emphasis on the relation between the literal and the tropological senses.

2.3 Rhetorical Criticism in the Twentieth Century

2.3.1 What Rhetorical Criticism Is Not

Rhetorical criticism is not a set of analytical techniques, not a set of approaches or methods of interpretation, which, when applied, will produce interpretations or solve interpretive problems. Rhetorical critics, provided they do not restrict themselves to only one or the other aspect, such as stylistics (as in Muilenburg's distorted, albeit conventional use of 'rhetorical'), do not operate on the same level as other critics, such as text critics, literary critics of various stripes, historical critics, etc. Nor is rhetorical criticism either interested or able to meet the desire for finding a single super method of criticism suitable and appropriate to the special status of the Bible as 'the great code' of Western culture, even outside institutional religious bodies.

Mindful that rhetorics in antiquity was known as the rhetorike techne, we nevertheless, or because of it (i.e., its consequences of having been misunderstood as a 'technique' to be applied), need to emphasize that modern rhetorics is more than, if not other than, one of the literary 'arts' or 'technique.' Instead, it is one of the forms of modern literary theory, which includes the theory of reading.

2.3.2 Rhetorics as Theory of Literature

Why does modern literary theory involve what for Eagleton amounts to 'the reinvention of rhetoric'? And how can literary theory, as a theory of discourse and discursive practices, avoid running into 'the same problems of [1] methodology and [2] object of study which we have seen in the case of literary [criticism]'? Eagleton's answer focuses on the particularity and boundaries of literary theory which is given with literary theory's 'concern for the kinds of effects which discourse produce, and how they produce them' (205). For Culler, literary theory focuses on the nature and efficacy of (literary and nonliterary) texts, in order to activate and sharpen our 'awareness of rhetorical structures and forces, awareness of
textuality.\textsuperscript{153} For Jameson, it is a theory designed to make us appreciate literature for what it is: 'a socially symbolic act' with its built-in 'political unconscious,'\textsuperscript{154} what for us is truth's relation to power or transformation (as in Foucault or Burke).

We have, then, three intertwining issues:

(1) The nature and efficacy of texts, and the concern for the kinds of effects which discourse produce, and how they produce them. This issue is closest to traditional and modern rhetorics. Seen in this light, one can appreciate the relative merit of McKnight's onesided notion of 'the rhetorical approach [which] maintains the autonomy of the text by viewing the reader as a textual reality.' But by contrasting the rhetorical approach with the psychoanalytic approach which does not maintain the autonomy of the text, and by insisting that both approaches 'must be seen in the light of the American new critical heritage and the desire for academically acceptable objectivity,' McKnight does more harm than good.\textsuperscript{155}

(2) Another issue is the textuality character modified by concerns for 'the material base' of all three aspects of texts or signs: the text-producer/author in the one-time act of production/writing in the material inscription/encipherment; the 'autonomous efficacy of the [text's] discursive field' (Foucault) in the text, requiring decipherment through literary theory, and not excavation through hermeneutics; and the text-consumer/reader hermeneutic/rhetorical 'reading.' This issue relates to Miller's agenda of deconstructive criticism as a modern form of rhetorical criticism.

(3) Different still is the issue of the interpretive, as opposed to hermeneutic, method of interacting with texts and their textual efficacy. This issue is related to Foucault's 'interpretive analytics' with its proposed change of focus away from 'truth and method' to 'truth and power,' or Jameson's proposal for a 'new and more adequate, immanent or antiranscendent hermeneutic model,'\textsuperscript{156} or Kenneth Burke's rhetorical theory as based not so much on convincing and persuasive discourse, as on identification and transformation.\textsuperscript{157}

3. Reintegration of Rhetorics and Hermeneutics in biblical Exegesis

3.1 The Theory

When I first proposed the prioritizing of rhetoric in exegesis in 1976, I emphasized the point that rhetorical studies were not simply to be added to an already crowded agenda of exegetical procedures and methodologies. Nor was I, nor am I, advocating a pluralism of methods, even though every interpreter of the Bible - at least those who claim or attain any relevance - will have to work with a number of exegetical disciplines simultaneously. By making my plea for the priority of rhetorics, I evoke now, in support of my plea, my two main witnesses: the one attesting to the priority of rhetoric in portions of our past history in the West. This testimony need not ignore, nor apologize for, the times past when rhetorics became fragmented, restrained, even nearly eclipsed. The other witness is the powerful rebirth of rhetorics in our current generation.
The priority of rhetorics over hermeneutics rests ultimately on the priority of power as the efficacy of truth within and for 'the common good.' We noted earlier that Jameson saw reason for calling the much maligned patristic and medieval hermeneutical system of the four senses a 'great system' because it had systemically accounted for the political or rhetorical reading (which for him is synonymous with the collective meaning of history and nature). The various efforts of establishing a universal hermeneutics all seem to fail, or fall short, for mainly one reason. Medieval hermeneutics had anticipated two of the major modern efforts: a universal hermeneutics based on reason, logic, dialectic or rationality; and a universal hermeneutics based on language as a sign system. As Kümmel's myopic overview of the history of the critical study of the New Testament shows, most of the interpretive energies were spent along these two traditional tracks. In this process, rhetorics asserted itself repeatedly, occasionally but always successfully only briefly, but then only to be marginalized to the point of near irrelevance.

Even the for Jameson 'only really new and original hermeneutic' since medieval times, the Freudian interpretive system focusing on the mechanism of desire, failed to live up to its promise. This was due to its systemic inability of transcending the 'individualistic categories and modes of interpretation' - something which imprisoned New Testament scholarship for centuries - when it could and should have pressed on to the collective and associative categories and modes of interpretation. It is in this connection that Jameson has as much surprisingly positive to say on Northrop Frye's 'archetypal system' as he had to say on the abiding merits of the patristic and medieval system of the four senses. What gets rhetorics back into the picture is what constitutes 'the greatness of Frye' (Jameson), which is 'to raise the issue of community and to draw basic, essentially social, interpretive consequences from the nature of religion as collective representation.'

Rhetorics makes us alert to the collective dimension by virtue of its concern both for the kinds of effects which discourse produce, and for how discourses produce those effects. But rhetorics was more often than not perverted by privatizing or individualizing the interpretation of the effects of religious discourse, whether in rhetorics' application to biblical hermeneutics, or its application to homiletics. Likewise, Jameson (74) criticizes Frye in the end for transforming the Bible's 'political and collective imagery [the anagogical sense in patristic and medieval hermeneutics suffered exactly the same fate!] ... into a mere relay in some ultimately privatizing celebration of the category of individual experience.' The revalued rhetoric in the beginning of the 16th century was likewise transformed into Pietism's 'rhetoric restrained' at the end of the 16th century. But without engaging in the study of the 'social practices' which have shaped, and continue to shape, the theory and practice of both rhetoric and hermeneutic, - a study encouraged, indeed demanded by Foucault's work - we will forever remain puzzled about these persistent transformations. We are not doomed simply to repeat, again and again, the disenfranchisement and disempowerment of rhetoric.
The reintegration of rhetorics and hermeneutics is theoretically not only possible again, but moreover mandated again by the changes in the deep structure of our modern society.

3.2 The Practices

3.2.1 Rhetorical Criticism in Current Exegesis

The rebirth of rhetorics in current biblical exegesis is nothing but short of spectacular. I shall ignore those rehabilitations of rhetorics which keep it in its restrained form by limiting it to stylistics. The legacy of Muilenburg and his 'school' is still very much with us. The historical overview makes understandable why there is such continuing restraint and what its roots are, but that does not excuse it. Instead, I will concentrate on those efforts which seek to promote a rhetoric revalued, or even aspire to the goal of reinventing rhetoric, or of restoring rhetoric to all its ancient right.

I will limit myself here first of all to New Testament exegesis, and, after briefly outlining the two areas of narrative rhetorics and epistolary or didactic rhetoric, then focus more on the application of rhetorics to Pauline studies, both exegetical and theological. Amos Wilder had been one of the earliest to recall the importance of rhetoric. George Kennedy set a new agenda with his 1984 book on rhetorical criticism and the New Testament, as did Northrop Frye shortly before then.

3.2.1.1 Narrative Rhetoric

The categorical difference between literary criticism and rhetorical criticism, between literary hermeneutics and literary rhetorics, was highlighted by Wayne Booth in his influential book, The Rhetoric of Fiction. His reception by exeges of biblical narrative is more noticeable than that of another great rhetorical critic of our age, Kenneth Burke. Then there is the access of exeges to rhetorics by way of modern structuralism and semiotics; a number of their leading exponents have influenced biblical exeges. Speech act theory and reader criticism did their parts in bringing rhetorics back into focus. And so did deconstruction. But we also need to mention another contributory to the broadening stream of exegetical publications with a renewed interest in rhetorics, and that contributory is political hermeneutics and ideological criticism. These hermeneutical approaches are quite distinct from the both objectifying and subjectifying approaches used by advocates of sociological criticism. All of these, quite apart from feminist criticism which deserves special mention later, brought rhetorics into focus though mainly in connection with biblical narratives.

Daniel Patte's work on Matthew; Robert Fowler's work on Mark; Robert Tannehill's work on Luke-Acts, and Alan Culpepper's work on John are but the tip of a growing iceberg. Everyone has something to say about the narrative's, or the narrator's, or the evangelist's rhetoric. Sometimes the reference to narrative rhetoric is hardly distinguishable from Muilenberg's restrained and restraining conception of
rhetorical criticism, but on the whole there is a better, because more comprehensive, understanding and use of rhetorics in the interpretation of narrative texts. The rhetorical dimension stands out when a narrative text is perceived as a 'system of influence.'\textsuperscript{167} This 'rhetorical' hermeneutics (Mailloux) differs from the emphasis on texts as system of meaning in traditional literary hermeneutics.

3.2.1.2 Epistolary Rhetoric

Here, too, we have experienced a sharp increase in publications devoted to the rhetorical nature of New Testament epistles (e.g. the rhetoric of Paul), in contrast to the traditional token recognition of the rhetorical aspects \textit{in} the epistles (e.g. rhetoric \textit{in} Paul). Though a special section might be devoted to this matter, I will only briefly mention here the recent effort of demonstrating the rhetorical origin of the New Testament notion of \textit{pistis}, which establishes the central importance of rhetoric for the central \textit{biblical} notion of faith, as had been done earlier for Luther's notion of faith.\textsuperscript{168}

Among the major works which manifest the rebirth of rhetorics in the study of New Testament epistolography are Hans Dieter Betz's two commentaries in the \textit{Hermeneia} series, the one on Galatians; the other on 2 Cor 8-9; Bouman on Romans,\textsuperscript{169} Donelson on the Pauline Pastors,\textsuperscript{170} Hughes on 2 Thessalonians,\textsuperscript{171} Jewett and Johanson on 1 Thessalonians,\textsuperscript{172} and a host of other works on either smaller textual units, like Siegert on Romans 9-11, or on specific rhetorical units, like Lyons on amplifying autobiography, or, though only indirectly related to rhetorics, Marshall's study of the role of social conventions in Pauline argumentation.

Compared with twenty years ago, when rhetoric was barely mentioned in either narrative or epistolary exegetical, let alone theological study, there has been a veritable revolution in both Jewish and Christian biblical exegesis: - suddenly, rhetorics is everywhere!

3.2.2 Feminist Criticism

One of the practices which encouraged the reintegration of rhetorics and hermeneutics was that of feminist criticism, 'one of the most powerful forces of renovation in contemporary criticism' (Culler). Authors like Mieke Bal [\textit{Lethal Love: Feminist Literary Readings of Biblical Love Stories} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987]), Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza [\textit{Bread not Stone. The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation} (Boston: Beacon, 1984)], Phyllis Trible [\textit{God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality} (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978)], and numerous others in biblical studies,\textsuperscript{173} not to speak of feminist critics in other fields of study, have demonstrated the effectiveness in the change of focus, not so much \textit{away} from, as beyond 'truth and method' to 'truth and power.'

The reason feminist criticism deserves special mention here, in connection with our concluding reflections on the exegetical practices which have succeeded in
reintegrating rhetorics and hermeneutics, is basically this: the insistence on including in one's hermeneutical practice the critical consideration of the social practices serving as overt or covert premises (1) in narrative or didactic biblical rhetoric, but also (2) in the theories of narrative and didactic rhetorics. The recognition of these social conventions, or social, cultural codes, as integral to both (1) the kinds of effects which biblical discourse produces, and (2) to how biblical discourses produce those effects, brought out into the open the social imagination, viz the ideology, in the role of gender and of patriarchy. This was a far cry from the familiar practice of mere social description or even social hermeneutics of sexual and social roles in biblical literature.

It made a revolutionary difference to take the familiar notion, that human beings in general, and religious persons in particular, are hermeneutically constituted, and replace it with the ancient notion familiar to Jews and Greeks alike, that we are rhetorically constituted. We have not only the capacity to understand the content or propositions of human signs and symbols (= hermeneutics); we also have the capacity to respond and interact with them (= rhetorics). As rhetorical critics (rhetorics as part of literary theory) we face the obligation of critically examining the fateful interrelationship between (1) a text's rhetorical strategies, (2) the premises upon which these strategies operate (gender in patriarchy or matriarchy; race in social, political power structures), and (3) the efficacy of both, text and its interpretation (= truth claim, or validity); of both, exegetical practice and its theory (= method).

Where Foucault envisions and evokes the critical move beyond structuralism and hermeneutics to interpretive analytics, we propose then as alternative the reintegration of structuralism and hermeneutics with rhetorics. For thus it was in the beginning (as the historical overview in Part I indicated), is now (as the 'rebirth of rhetorics' showed at the end of Part I), and - as we hope - ever shall be, world without end.

---
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