

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.'<sup>125</sup>

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.'<sup>126</sup>

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.'<sup>127</sup>

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".'<sup>128</sup>

#### 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,'<sup>129</sup> 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 ....'<sup>130</sup>

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.'<sup>131</sup>

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.'<sup>132</sup>

## 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.<sup>133</sup> 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.'<sup>134</sup> 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'<sup>135</sup> 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.'

136

## 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.'<sup>137</sup> 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.<sup>138</sup> Philosophically, or theologically, 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),<sup>139</sup> 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.'<sup>140</sup> 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.<sup>141</sup>

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 Patristic times about the purpose of Scripture's obscurities and contradictions,<sup>142</sup> 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.'<sup>143</sup>

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.<sup>144</sup> 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.'<sup>145</sup>

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.'<sup>146</sup> 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.'<sup>147</sup>

#### 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.<sup>148</sup> 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.<sup>149</sup> 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.'<sup>150</sup>

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.'<sup>151</sup> 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 stylists (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]?'<sup>152</sup> 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.<sup>153</sup> 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,'<sup>154</sup> 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.<sup>155</sup>

(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 antitranscendent hermeneutic model,'<sup>156</sup> or Kenneth Burke's rhetorical theory as based not so much on convincing and persuasive discourse, as on identification and transformation.<sup>157</sup>

### 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.<sup>158</sup> 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.<sup>159</sup> George Kennedy set a new agenda with his 1984 book on rhetorical criticism and the New Testament, as did Northrop Frye shortly before then.<sup>160</sup>

#### 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*.<sup>161</sup> His reception by exegetes of biblical narrative is more noticeable than that of another great rhetorical critic of our age, Kenneth Burke.<sup>162</sup> Then there is the access of exegetes to rhetorics by way of modern structuralism and semiotics; a number of their leading exponents<sup>163</sup> have influenced biblical exegetes. Speech act theory and reader criticism did their parts in bringing rhetorics back into focus.<sup>164</sup> 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.<sup>165</sup> These hermeneutical approaches are quite distinct from the both objectifying and subjectifying approaches used by advocates of sociological criticism.<sup>166</sup> 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 Muilenburg'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.'<sup>167</sup> 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 in the epistles (e.g. rhetoric 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 *pistis*, which establishes the central importance of rhetoric for the central biblical notion of faith, as had been done earlier for Luther's notion of faith.<sup>168</sup>

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 *Hermeneia* series, the one on Galatians; the other on 2 Cor 8-9; Bouman on Romans,<sup>169</sup> Donelson on the Pauline Pastorals,<sup>170</sup> Hughes on 2 Thessalonians,<sup>171</sup> Jewett and Johanson on 1 Thessalonians,<sup>172</sup> 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 [*Lethal Love: Feminist Literary Readings of Biblical Love Stories* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987)], Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza [*Bread not Stone. The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon, 1984)], Phyllis Trible [*God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978)], and numerous others in biblical studies,<sup>173</sup> not to speak of feminist critics in other fields of study, have demonstrated the effectiveness in the change of focus, not so much *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.

---

## Endnotes

1. Wilhelm Wuellner, 'Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?' *CBQ* 49 (1987) 448, 449.
2. 'The Hermeneutics: Outline of the 1819 Lectures,' trans. Jan Wojcik and Roland Haas, in: *New Literary History* 10 (1978) 1-16. H Hübner, 'Methodologie und Theologie,' *Kerygma und Dogma* 33 (1987) 150-175 speaks of '... das in der Praxis der Argumentation implizierte Verstehensproblem' (171). '... beim Argumentieren [geht's] um Verstehen ...' (= glaubendes Verstehen) (175).
3. Folker Siegert, *Argumentation bei Paulus gezeigt an Röm 9-11*. *Wunt* 34 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1985) 176-180. Joseph Kopperschmidt, *Rhetorica*. Philosophische Texte und Studien 14 (Hildesheim/Zürich/New York: Olms, 1985) p XII pleads 'Die Wiederentdeckung der Rhetorik, soll sie forschungspraktisch folgenreich bleiben, muss die Wiederentdeckung des mit ihrem Namen verbundenen Frage- und Erkenntnisinteresses sein.'

4. Non-Western approaches to rhetorics and hermeneutics, and their relation to each other, have only recently begun to be explored. For the Jewish tradition, see n 58, and n 113 below. On Slavic and Byzantine 'regionally-centered studies', see the works cited by James J Murphy, 'The Historiography of Rhetoric: Challenges and Opportunities', *Rhetorica* 1:1 (1983), 4-5, notes 7 and 8. For Asian rhetorics, see Robert T Oliver, *Communication and Culture in Ancient India and China* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1971).

5. For a bibliographical survey of select sources of rhetorical studies in English, see Richard Leo Enos, 'The Classical Period', in: W R Horner (ed), *Historical Rhetoric An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Sources in English* (Boston: Hall, 1980) 1-42.

6. D A Russell, *Criticism in Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 1981), 119. On some of 'the aspects of the history of rhetoric as, on the one hand, 'control' and, on the other, as 'unreason' or irrational disruption,'...' see Ward's essay in *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 57ff.

7. In: *Rhetorica* 5 (1987) 59-86.

8. So Walter Magass, 'Claritas versus Obscuritas. Semiotische Bemerkungen zum Wechsel der Zeicheninventare in den Confessiones des Augustin (Conf. XIII, xv, 18)', *Linguistica Biblica* 48 (1980) 7-18. See also Fuhrmann's essay referred to below in n 132; and Johannes G Du Plessis, 'Clarity and Obscurity: A study in textual communication of the relation between sender, parable and receiver in the synoptic gospels.' Th D Dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa, November 1985.

On 'the concept of obscurity in Greek literature,' see George Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*. *Analekta Vlatadon* 17 (Thessalonike: Patriarchal Institute, 1973), 63-100.

Hermeneutically and rhetorically related to Scriptural obscurity is the problem of contradiction. Nils A Dahl ['Contradictions in Scripture,' in: *Studies in Paul* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1977) 159-177] laments the fact that 'there is little literature on this topic, although the question of contradictions in Scripture has been discussed almost as long as the canon itself has existed' (160).

9. G R Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages* (Cambridge/London/New York/Sidney: Cambridge University Press, 1984) 35 and 33 respectively. What applies to uses in institutions like early monastery schools, applies *mutatis mutandis* to uses in all other places of power: not only political power, but also 'pastoral power' as 'a very special form of power.' See pp 213-15 in H L Dreyfus/P Rabinow, *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Second edition, with an afterword by and an interview with Michel Foucault (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

10. Bruce A Kimball, *Orators and Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education* (Teachers College Press, 1986). H. Kirkby, 'The Scholar and his Public,' in: M T Gibson (ed), *Boethius, His Life, Thought and Influence* (Oxford, 1981) 44-69. See also Claude Mondésert (ed), *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*. Bible de tous les temps, 1 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984); T P Halton, 'Paideia in Transition in the Greco-Roman World: 200-400 A D,' in: W Haase (ed), *ANRW* II, vol. 35:1 Sprache und Literatur (1988); E G Weltin, Athens and Jerusalem. An Interpretive Essay on Christianity and Classical Culture (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988).

On Augustine's hermeneutic and rhetoric, see Anne-Marie le Bonnardière (ed), *Saint Augustin et la Bible*. Bible de tous les Temps 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), 253-85, Madeleine Moreau's essay 'Lecture du *De Doctrina Christiana*,' Charles Kannengiesser/Pamela Bright, A Conflict of Christian Hermeneutics in Roman Africa: Tychonius and Augustine. Protocol of the 58. Colloquy of the Center for

Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, (ed) W Wuellner (Berkeley, CA: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1989); and earlier J J Murphy, 'St Augustine and the Debate about a Christian Rhetoric,' *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 46 (1960) 400-410; W R Johnson, 'Isocrates Flowering: The Rhetoric of Augustine,' *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 9 (1976) 217-231; A Brinton, 'St Augustine and the Problem of Deception in Religious Persuasion,' *Religious Studies* 19 (1983) 437-450.

11. Russell, *Criticism in Antiquity*, 169. On the relation of the teaching of literature to performance of literature, see David W Thompson et al (eds), *Performance of Literature in Historical Perspectives* (Lanham, N.Y./London: University Press of America, 1983), especially pp 1-65 Robert P Sonkowsky's essays on 'Oral Performance and Ancient Greek Literature,' and 'Oral Interpretation of Classical Latin Literature.'

On the role of rhetorics in the formation and development of the biblical epics in early Greek and Latin Christianity, in serving educational as well as devotional, apologetic as well as interpretative purposes, see Michael Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity*. *ARCA* 16 (Liverpool: Cairns, 1985) 61-64.

On the effect of rhetoric on Christian and Jewish leaders alike in the late fourth century, see Robert L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews. Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*. *The Transformation of the Classical Heritage*, 4 (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 58f.

12. See Mariette Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'Herméneutique Biblique. Etude des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu* (Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1983); and Christoph Klock, *Untersuchungen zum Stil und Rhythmus bei Gregor von Nyssa: Ein Beitrag zum Rhetorikverständnis der griechischen Väter. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, 173 (1987).

For an overview of the general effect of Greek culture on the study of Scripture, see Claude Mondésert (ed), *Le Monde Grec Ancien et La Bible*. *Bible de tous les Temps* 1 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984).

13. Luke Reinsma, 'The Middle Ages,' in: W R Horner (ed), *Historical Rhetoric: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Sources in English* (Boston: Hall, 1980) 43-108; the quote is from p 45.

John O Ward ['Magic and Rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance: Some Ruminations,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 57-118] notes that 'the larger manuals of classical rhetorical theory ... replace [the] use of the minor Latin rhetoricians begin[ning] in the ninth century and reach[ing] visible fruition in the eleventh' (90). In the fourth book of Boethius' *De differentiis topicis* Ward sees an early evidence of 'the routinizing of [the] interest [in rhetoric as *techne*]' (104). Concerning the revival of interest in rhetoric during the Carolingian renaissance, Ward wonders whether the fascination with 'the power of classical rhetorical and poetic writing', which went hand in hand with 'the increase in magical beliefs in all classes during the Carolingian period', was just 'a mania of the intellectuals ... or their reaction to a developing passion among the lower orders?' (111, n 200).

14. M C Leff, 'The Material of the Art in the Latin Handbooks of the Fourth Century A D' in: Brian Vickers, (ed), *Rhetoric Revalued*. *Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 19. (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Renaissance Studies, 1982), 71-78.

For the study of medieval hermeneutics and rhetoric and its social context, see now Barbara Haupt (ed), *Zum Mittelalterlichen Literaturbegriff*. *Wege der Forschung* 557 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985).

John O Ward ['Magic and Rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance: Some Ruminations,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 57-118] sees in the oscillating emphasis on rhetoric as *techne* in one age, and on rhetoric as magic in another age, 'the more sinister struggle between groups, between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, between authorized (validated, legitimated) discourse, and unauthorized (or self-authorized) discourse, between insiders and outsiders, winners and losers' (69). For an enumeration of several 'compelling reasons for the strong association between the medieval clerical castes and magic and rhetoric, between rhetoric as control ... and rhetoric as magic/disruption,' see Ward 74-78, and his 'conclusion' 110-18.

For the study of 17th century rhetorics in its socio-political contexts, see Rudolf Behrens, *Problematische Rhetorik* (Munich: Fink, 1982).

U von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf points out ['Asianismus und Attizismus,' *Hermes* 35 (1900) 17/18] that Marx had noted how much Greek rhetoric had influenced the Roman revolution, in theory and in praxis.

For the contemporary situation, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 'The Ethics of Interpretation: De-Centering Biblical Scholarship,' *JBL* 107:1 (1988) 3-17.

15. See Reinsma's bibliography of English studies in Medieval rhetoric, cited above in n 13. A succinct overview is provided by R R Bolgar, 'The Teaching of Rhetoric in the Middle Ages,' in: Brian Vickers (ed), *Rhetoric Revalued* (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1982), 79-86. For earlier observations, see Eduard Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, vol 2, p 895-96, n 1 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 6th ed, 1971).

16. On medieval exegesis having anticipated nearly all of the critical problems and critical methods of modern times, see G R Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible*, 168. Cf David Tracy's observation [*Plurality and Ambiguity. Hermeneutics, Religion, Hope* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987) 65] that 'modern hermeneutical discourse analysis ... is ... only a modern return to, and rethinking of, both ancient rhetoric and earlier hermeneutics.'

See also Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon (eds), *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*. Bible de tous les Temps, 4 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984).

17. G R Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The beginnings of theology as an academic discipline* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), see pages 3, 18-19, and 70.

See also Paolo Bagni, 'Grammatica e Retorica nella Cultura Medievale,' *Rhetorica* 2:3 (1984) 267-280; also Paul Zumthor, *Speaking of the Middle Ages*. Transl. by Sarah White [from the French original *Parler du Moyen Age*. Paris, 1980] (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986).

On rhetoric occupying a minor place in liberal arts studies at Paris and Oxford compared with logic and philosophical grammar, see Osmund Lewry, 'Rhetoric at Paris and Oxford in the Mid-Thirteenth Century,' *Rhetorica* 1:1 (1983) 45-63. For a history of grammatical theory, see R H Robins, *Ancient and Medieval Grammatical Theory in Europe with Particular Reference to Modern Linguistic Doctrine* (London, 1951).

18. Wesley Trimpi, *Muses of One Mind. The Literary Analysis of Experience and Its Continuity* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983), 243.

19. Hennig Brinkmann, *Mittelalterliche Hermeneutik* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1980). See also Eckart Conrad Lutz, *Rhetorica divina. Mittelhochdeutsche Prologgebete und die rhetorische Kultur des Mittelalters*

(Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1984), and John O Ward, 'Magic and Rhetoric' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 73 on William of Auvergne's treatise *Rhetorica divina* about the rhetorical art of prayer.

20. See James J Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. A History of Rhetorical Theory from St Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1974, pb 1981), 135-355. On Rabanus Maurus as 'the first to enunciate the principle of pragmatic adaptation,' see Murphy, 362.

21. George Kennedy, in *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 9:3 (1976), 181-82. Richard A. Lanham, *The Motives of Eloquence: Literary Rhetoric in the Renaissance* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1976) made a similar point about Renaissance rhetoric.

John O. Ward ['Magic and Rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 102f] enumerates among the 'many generative sociological environments,' for the concrete application of rhetoric in the 12th century renaissance, the following: 'the universities, the courts, the monasteries, the world of the traditional semi-literate miles, the world of the 'rustic' drawn from the non-literate environments into the disturbed literate world of court-service, the world of the 'villain' upstart civis or burgher, the world of the new heretical confraternities, or 'textual communities,' ...'

22. See Charles Stanford, 'The Renaissance,' in: W R Horner (ed), *Historical Rhetoric An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Sources in English* (Boston: Hall, 1980) 109-184. See also Warren Treadgold (ed), *Renaissances before the Renaissance* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1984), and John O Ward, 'Magic and Rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance: Some Ruminations,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 57-118.

23. See R Behrens, *Problematische Rhetorik* (1982), 176, n 139-140. See also Ernstpeter Ruhe (ed), *Bernard Lamy: De l'Art de Parler/Bernard Lamy: Kunst zu Reden*. Introduction by Rudolf Behrens on 'Perspektiven für eine Lektüre des art de parler von Bernard Lamy' (Munich: Fink, 1980), 8-55.

24. G R Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Road to Reformation* (Cambridge/London/New York/Sydney, 1985), 3.

25. Craig Kallendorf, 'The Rhetorical Criticism of Literature in Early Italian Humanism from Boccaccio to Landino,' *Rhetorica* 1:2 (1983) 33-59; the quote is from p 59. See also D Kelly, *Medieval Imagination, Rhetoric, and the Poetry of Courtly Love* (Madison, 1978).

26. Susi Hausammann, *Römerbriefauslegung zwischen Humanismus und Reformation. Eine Studie zu Heinrich Bullingers Römerbriefvorlesung von 1525* (Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1970), especially pp 88-185 on Bullinger's 'rhetorica methodo,' and 178-82 on the theological justification of the use of secular rhetorics for the hermeneutics of sacred texts. The quote is from p 179.

27. Helmut Schanze, 'Vom Manuskript zum Buch: Zur Problematik der 'Neuen Rhetorik' um 1500 in Deutschland,' *Rhetorica* 1:2 (1983) 61-73. See also Hermann Wiegemann, 'Allgemeinbegriff und Rhetorik. Zur theologischen, politischen und literarischen Argumentation im frühen 16. Jahrhundert,' *Rhetorik* 5 (1986) 87-96.

28. R R Bolgar, 'The Teaching of Rhetoric in the Middle Ages' (1982), 85. On the 'diminution of interest in rhetoric/techne and rhetoric/magic' which can be detected from the late 12th century on, see John O Ward, 'Magic and Rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 103f.

29. Richard Waswo, *Language and Meaning in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 288. See also Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle, *Erasmus on Language and Method in Theology* (Toronto:

University of Toronto Press, 1977), and especially her study *Rhetoric and Reform: Erasmus' Civil Dispute with Luther* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983); also Jacques Chomarat, *Grammaire et Rhétorique chez Erasme*, I-II. Les Classiques de l'Humanisme (Paris 1981).

30. Waswo, *Language* (1987), 289. 290. The same point will be made by historian Mark A. Noll [in his 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' *JBL* 106:3 (1987) 493-509] when he quotes from Ernest Sandeen, *The Bible and Social Reform*, p 7: 'In spite of the terminology of *sola scriptura*, in practice Protestants depend upon communities of definition to interpret the Bible as much, if not as openly, as Catholics.'

31. So Mark A Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' 504. Similarly John O Ward, 'Magic and Rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 57-118.

32. Mark Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' 506.

33. Michel Foucault, 'Afterword: The Subject and Power,' in: Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Michel Foucault* (1983), 208-26; the reference is to 213-14.

34. Hansjörg Sick, *Melanchthon als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Biblischen Hermeneutik 2 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1959) 41-42. See also Q. Breen, 'The Subordination of Philosophy to Rhetoric in Melanchthon. A study of his reply to Pico della Mirandola,' *ARG* 43 (1952) 13-28.

Heinz Scheible, 'Melanchthon zwischen Luther und Erasmus,' in A Buck (ed), *Renaissance - Reformation: Gegensätze und Gemeinsamkeiten* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984) 155-80; W. Maurer, *Der Junge Melanchthon* (Göttingen, 1967), vol 1, pp 171-214; U. Schnell, *Die homiletische Theorie Philipp Melanchthons* (Ph D Dissertation Rostock, 1965).

On the Melanchthon reception in England, see Leonard Cox, *The Arte or Crafte of Rhetoryke* (1530) which has also the distinction of being the first vernacular rhetoric in English.

On Bullinger, see Susi Hausamann, 'Die Rhetorik im Dienst der reformatorischen Schriftauslegung,' *Kerygma und Dogma* 20 (1974) 305-314; and in her monograph on *Römerbriefauslegung zwischen Humanismus und Reformation* (1970) 178-82 on the *theological* justification for using secular rhetorics in the service of the hermeneutics of sacred texts.

On Calvin, see William J Bouwsma, *Calvinism as Theologia Rhetorica*. Protocol of the 54th Colloquy, Sept. 28, 1986; (ed) W Wuellner (Berkeley, CA: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1987). On the connections between Calvin and Jean Sturm (professor of rhetoric) in Sturm's Strasbourg Academy (whose ideal was *sapiens ac eloquens pietas*), see Maretta D Nikolaou, *Sprache als Welterschliessung und Sprache als Norm: Überlegungen zu R Agricola und J Sturm* (Neuried: Hieronymus Verlag, 1984).

On Luther, see Klaus Dockhorn, 'Rhetorica movet. Protestantischer Humanismus und karolingische Renaissance,' in: H Schanze, (ed), *Rhetorik. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte in Deutschland vom 16.-20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1974) 17-42; Dockhorn, 'Luthers Glaubensbegriff und die Rhetorik,' *Linguistica Biblica* 21/22 (1973); and Dockhorn's review of Hans-Georg Gadamer's 'Truth and Method', in *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 13:3 (1980) 160-180, esp 164-66. See also Brigit Stolt, *Studien zu Luthers Freiheitstraktat mit besonderer Rücksicht auf ... die Stilmittel der Rhetorik* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1969).

35. For a modern approach to this problem, see Kenneth Burke's 'Lexicon Rhetoricae' in: *Counter-Statement* (University of California Press, 1931, 1968), 124-49 on the nature and individuation of form; on 'the ideology of form,' see Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious* (1981), 99; and



Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

36. See E Harris Harbison, *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983; original 1956).

37. Hausammann, *Römerbriefauslegung* (1970) 175.

38. Waswo, *Language* (1987), 291.

39. Folker Siegert gives one example in his *Argumentation bei Paulus* (1985) 85-107, a whole chapter devoted to 'Methodische Anleihen aus Nachbarwissenschaften.' Bruce C Johanson, *To All the Brethren. A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to I Thessalonians* (Stockholm: Almqvist, 1987) shows throughout his book adaptations of various methods.

40. Hausammann, *Römerbriefauslegung*, 180 f.

41. For a good overview of the issues, see Debora Shuger, 'Morris Croll, Flacius Illyricus, and the Origin of Anti-Ciceronianism,' *Rhetorica* 3:4 (1985) 269-84.

42. For a characterization of 'Protestant rhetorics' and hermeneutics, see Klaus Dockhorn, 'Rhetorica movet. Protestantischer Humanismus und karolingische Renaissance,' in: H Schanze, (ed), *Rhetorik. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte in Deutschland vom 16.-20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1974) 17-42. See other references above under n 34.

See also Jody M Enders, 'The Rhetoric of Protestantism: Book I of Agrippa d'Aubigné's *Les Tragiques*,' *Rhetorica* 3:4 (1985) 285-294; note the conclusion (294): '... D'Aubigné's work suggests, then, not only a Protestantism conveyed by rhetoric [used in biblical commentaries and in books on the art of preaching], but a rhetoric (deliberative and sermonic) that might, in fact, have suggested Protestantism.'

43. Siegert, *Argumentation bei Paulus*, 6 notes that 'the striving for a distinctively sacred hermeneutics accompanies the inquiry into the linguistic nature of the Bible till today,' but he obviously disapproves of the distinction.

See the references to Flacius (pp 15-17) and Lücke (n 62).

44. What Heinrich Plett observes about recent studies in rhetorics' role in the English renaissance [*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 237:1/2 (1985) 77-97; see p 96] that further and better results could be achieved by differentiating between 'akademischer und volkstümlicher sowie zwischen nicht-literarischer und literarischer Rhetorik' is every bit as relevant for the future studies in rhetorics' role in both early Christian literature and in modern biblical and patristic studies.

A similar point is made by Mark A. Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' *JBL* 106:3 (1987) 493-509.

45. Elisabeth L Eisenstein, *The printing press as an agent of change. Communications and cultural transformations in early modern Europe* (Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2 vols 1979).

46. The chief works on Ramus are by Walter J Ong, *Ramus. Method and the Decay of Dialogue. From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958); Kees Meerhoff, *Rhétorique et Poétique aux XVIe Siècle en France. Du Bellay, Ramus et Les Autres*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1986); and James J Murphy's Introduction to *Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian*. Translation and Text of Peter Ramus' *Rhetoricae Distinctiones in*

*Quintilianum* (1549). Transl. Carole Newlands (Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986), 1-76.

For an overview of 'Recent Work on Peter Ramus (1970-1986),' see Peter Sharratt's essay in *Rhetorica* 5:1 (1987), 7-58.

47. Shuger, *Rhetorica* III:4 (1985) 283 sees this 'conventional antinomy' overcome in the 16th century reformers' persistent refusal of severing emotions from the will and reason.

For a sweeping overview of Western culture's bias in favour of reason and cognition as primary and positive, and bias against the emotions as secondary and negative, see Genevieve Lloyd, *The Man of Reason. 'Male' and 'Female' in Western Philosophy* (London: Methuen, 1984).

On the contribution of feminist criticism to the rebirth of rhetorics, see below chapter 3.2.2.

On 'the generative sociological environments' for the control and priority of reason over emotion, see Ward, 'Magic and Rhetoric,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 102f.

48. Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Michel Foucault* (1983), 217. 218.

49. See Siegert, *Argumentation bei Paulus*, 8.

50. Charles Stanford, in: Horner (ed), *Historical Rhetoric*, 112.

51. John C Adams, 'Alexander Richardson's Puritan Theory of Discourse,' *Rhetorica* 4:3 (1986) 255-74, see p 256; see also Kieth Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames: Duach backgrounds of English and American Puritanism* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois press, 1972) 3-26; Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954) 300-362 on Ramist rhetoric providing the Puritans with the means of logically interpreting the religious discourse found in the Bible; Donald K McKim, 'Ramism as an exegetical tool for English puritanism as used by William Perkins,' *SBL 1984 Seminar Papers*, (ed) K H Richards (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984), 11-21, and McKim's essay 'The Function of Ramism in William Perkins' Theology,' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 16:4 (1985), 503-17.

See also Ann Kibbey, *The interpretation of material shapes in Puritanism: A study of rhetoric, prejudice, and violence* (Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

On biblical interpretation in the service of national self-perception among the American Puritans, see Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).

See also below n 59.

52. Adams, in *Rhetorica* 4:3 (1986) 274.

53. See Helmut Schmidt, 'Rhetoric of the Spirit' versus 'Ancient Rhetoric' am Beispiel der Quäkerpredigt. Ein psycholinguistischer Beitrag zur Erforschung der rhetorischen Prinzipien des frühen Quäkertums,' *Poetica* 8 (1977) 85-95.

54. See Mark Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' 502 on 'the derivative character of American Bible scholarship;' also Ira W Brown, 'The Higher Criticism comes to America,' *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 38 (1960), 193-212; and T D Bozeman, *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1977).

55. James P Zappen, 'Aristotelian and Ramist Rhetoric in Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan: Pathos versus Ethos and Logos,' *Rhetorica* 1:1 (1983) 65-91; the quote is on p 91.

Among the advocates of counterreforms against Ramism, Zappen cites for the European continent Gerhard Johannes Vossius; for England Thomas Hobbes and Thomas Farnaby. In England the counterreforms took the form of compromise or accommodation with Ramism.

On Francis Bacon as rhetorical theorist, see Karl R Wallace, *Francis Bacon on Communication & Rhetoric. Or: The Art of Applying Reason to Imagination for the Better Moving of the Will* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1943).

56. Jane Sutton, 'The Death of Rhetoric and its Rebirth in Philosophy,' *Rhetorica* 4:3 (1986) 203-26; the quotes are from p. 211. Or: '... the continual separation of rhetoric into parts [was] so fatiguing that rhetoric was depleted of its vitality and thus 'life.' (212, n.31)

57. Murphy, *Arguments in Rhetoric against Quintilian*, 14.

58. As an excellent example of how a Jewish author on Biblical rhetorics and hermeneutics, like Christian authors, could be still largely unaffected by the cultural differences between Latin and Greek on the one hand, and the vernacular languages, including Hebrew, see Robert Bonfil, *Nofet Zufim, on Hebrew Rhetoric by Judah Messer Leon* (Jerusalem: Jewish National and University Library Press and Magnes Press, 1981); and Isaac Rabinowitz, (ed), *Judah Messer Leon: The Book of the Honeycomb's Flow*. (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1982); Rabinowitz 'Pre-Modern Jewish Study of Rhetoric: An introductory bibliography,' *Rhetorica* 3:2, (1985), 137-144; and Yehoshua Gitay, 'Yehuda Messer Leon: *Nofet Zufim*; A review article on the history of Hebrew writing on rhetoric,' *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 7 (1985) 379-93.

59. John Knott, *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible* (Chicago, 1980); John C Adams, '[Ramist] Alexander Richardson's Puritan Theory of Discourse,' *Rhetorica* 4:3 (1986) 255-74.

For the general cultural context, see Wilbur S Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961).

On Puritan rhetorics as 'forerunner of Romantic pragmatism,' see Ernst G Bormann, *The Force of Fantasy* (Carbondale/Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985) 26-52.

See also above, n 51.

60. See Marc Fumaroli, *L'âge de l'éloquence: Rhétorique et 'res literaria' de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980).

61. Deborah Shuger, 'Morris Croll, Flacius Illyricus, and the Origin of Anti-Ciceronianism,' *Rhetorica* 3:4 (1985) 269-84; the quote is from 280.

For a bibliography of textbooks on rhetoric published in Germany between 1500 and 1750, see Dieter Breuer/Günther Kopsch, 'Rhetoriklehrbücher des 16. bis 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine Bibliographie,' in: H Schanze (ed), *Rhetorik. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte in Deutschland vom 16. bis 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1974), 217-292.

62. Werner Georg Kümmel, *The New Testament. The History of the Investigation of its Problems* (London: SCM & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 27.

63. Rudolf Keller, *Der Schlüssel zur Schrift. Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes bei Matthias Flacius Illyricus. Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums*, N F 5 (Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1984), 150.

64. Shuger, *Rhetorica* 3:4 (1985), 284.

65. Shuger, *Rhetorica* 3:4 (1985) 278, and n 26.
66. The quote is Dilthey's and quoted by Dockhorn, *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 13 (1980), 170 to highlight the roots of modern psychological hermeneutics in the pathos part of classical rhetorics.
67. *The Sermons of John Donne*, (eds) Simpson and Potter, 10 vols. (Berkeley, 1953-62), vol 2, p 282. The quote is taken from Shuger's essay (cited in note 61), p 278, n 26. See also Thomas O. Sloane, *Donne, Milton, and the End of Humanist Rhetoric* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).
68. Barner, *Barockrhetorik* (1970), 450-51.
69. See James O Duke, *Horace Bushnell: On the Vitality of Biblical Language* (Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1984), especially his chapter on 'The Rhetoric of Revelation.'
- On rhetoric's role in pietism's inherent social and political activism, especially in North American Lutheranism and its rejection of pietism, see Paul P Kuenning, *The Rise and Fall of American Lutheran Pietism: The Rejection of an Activist Heritage* (Mercer University Press, 1988).
70. In vol 5 of the English *Gnomon* edition of 1859, a 27-page 'Index of Technical Terms occurring throughout the Gnomon,' provided by J A Burk and A R Fausset, makes very obvious that most of the technical terms belong to traditional rhetorics.
71. Kümmel, *The New Testament* (1973), 48.
72. See Kümmel, *The New Testament* (1973), 117, and 425 n 159.
73. Kümmel, *The New Testament* (1973), 51-61; the quote is from p 61. In his *TRE* essay on 'Hermeneutik' Claus von Bormann suggests on p 114 that the rise of *general* (or rational) hermeneutics can be seen also in the tradition of (1) the Alexandrian commentators on Aristotle, (2) the empirical school of Galen, and (3) the juridical tradition of interpretation, along with the philosophical influence. Kümmel highlights only the latter.
74. Herbert Kosak, *Leitfaden Biblischer Hermeneutik* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1970), 55 correctly observes that 'Im Verfolg dieser Aufgabe [Heinrici's stylistic or Schleiermacher's psychological approach] werden die biblischen Texten auf ihre literarische Kategorie hin untersucht, um so das Verhältnis der biblischen Schriften zu den Kunstformen ihrer Zeit mit Rücksicht auf Ausdrucksweise und Darstellung deutlich zu machen.'
75. Kosak, *Leitfaden* (1970), 51.
76. Kümmel, *The New Testament* (1973), 60.
77. Kümmel, *The New Testament* (1973), 62 and 65.
78. Mark Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America' (1987), 504. See below.
79. Hendrikus Boers, *What is New Testament Theology? The Rise of Criticism and the Problem of a Theology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979)
80. Kümmel, *The New Testament* (1973), 116. See also W Schultz, 'Die Grundlage der Hermeneutik Schleiermachers, ihre Auswirkung und Grenzen,' *ZThK* 50 (1953), 158ff.
81. G Ebeling, 'Hermeneutik,' *RGK*, III (1959), 242-262, see 245ff; Kümmel, *The New Testament* (1973); J D Smart, *The Interpretation of Scripture* (Philadelphia, 1963), 232ff; J Wach, *Das Verstehen*, vol II (1929), 113ff.
82. Barner, *Barockrhetorik*, 407-418.

83. Barner, *Barockrhetorik*, 413-14. It would be helpful to supplement this list with the centres in Protestant Scandinavia, England and Scotland, and the American colleges.
84. Otto Merk, 'Anfänge neutestamentlicher Wissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert,' in: Georg Schwaiger (ed), *Historische Kritik in der Theologie*. Studien zur Theologie und Geistesgeschichte des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 32 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 39.
85. Siegert, *Argumentation bei Paulus*, 10, n. 34.
86. A F CVilmar, *Die Theologie der Tatsachen wider die Theologie der Rhetorik*. Bekenntnis und Abwehr (Marburg, 3rd ed 1857).
87. See Rosalind J Gabin's review of Gregorio Mayáns y Siscar's *Rhetórica* of 1757, edited by Antonio Mestre (1984), in *Rhetorica* 5:2 (1987) 198-206.
88. Barner, *Barockrhetorik*, 249.
89. Mark Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America' (1987), 500/501. For an overview of biblical studies in the age of the enlightenment, see Yvon Belaval and Dominique Bourel (eds), *Le Siècle des Lumières et la Bible*. Bible de tous les Temps 7 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986).
90. See above n 66, and below n 110.
91. Dockhorn, *Rhetorica* 13:3 (1980) 170 and 169 respectively.
92. For critical reflections on the hermeneutical circle, and on the connections between practical criticism and philosophical hermeneutics, see David C Hoy, *The Critical Circle: Literature, History, and Philosophical Hermeneutics* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1978). Unlike Gadamer, Hoy never acknowledges any influence of rhetorics on hermeneutics.
93. Herbert N Schneidau, *Sacred Discontent. The Bible and the Western Tradition* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, pb edition, 1977), 255.
94. Schneidau, *Sacred Discontent*, 257.
95. See Murray Roston, *Prophet and Poet. The Bible and the Growth of Romanticism* (London: Faber, 1965); Brian Vickers, 'The Atrophy of Modern Rhetoric, Vico to DeMan,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 21-56.
96. C von Bormann, 'Hermeneutik,' 118. See also Reinhold Rieger, *Interpretation und Wissen. Zur philosophischen Begründung der Hermeneutik bei Friedrich Schleiermacher und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund*. Schleiermacher-Archiv 6 (Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: De Gruyter, 1988; Tübingen dissertation 1986).
97. George Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill/London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 160, 159.
98. Erich Auerbach, *Literatursprache asnd Publikum in der lateinischen Spätantike und im Mittelalter* (Bern: Francke, 1958), 25-53, with an appendix on the role of pathos in rhetoric! (See 'Gloria Passionis' pp 54-63).
99. George A Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation* (1984), 158.
100. See Kosak, *Leitfaden Biblischer Hermeneutik* (1970), 66-69.
101. Kosak, *Leitfaden*, 70-72.

102. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translated by Vern W McGee; (ed) by C Emerson/M Holquist. University of Texas Press Slavic Series, No.8 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 144,111,125; cf also p 145 'the responsive nature of contextual meaning.'
103. See James L Kinneavy, *Greek Rhetorical Origins of Christian Faith* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987). See also Kinneavy's essay in W B Horner (ed), *The Present State of Scholarship in Historical and Contemporary Rhetoric* (Columbia University Press, 1983) 199-213.
104. Kosak, *Leitfaden*, 79-83.
105. Kosak, *Leitfaden*, 83-86.
106. Kosak, *Leitfaden*, 86-89 on Gadamer (see above n. 34 on Dockhorn's review of Gadamer); 89-91 on Jüngel; on Paul Ricoeur, see *Essays in Biblical Interpretation*. Edited, with an Introduction by Lewis S Mudge (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); on linguistics, see L Poland, *Literary Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics: A Critique of Formalist Approaches*. AAR Academy Series 48 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985).
- For an overview of the philosophical orientation in biblical hermeneutics, see A C Thiselton, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980); Robert S Corrington, *The Community of Interpreters. On the Hermeneutics of Nature and the Bible in the American Philosophical Tradition*. Studies in American Biblical Hermeneutics 3 (Macon,GA: Mercer University Press, 1987).
- Claude Savart/Jean-Noël Aletti (eds), *Le Monde Contemporain et la Bible*. Bible de tous les Temps, 8 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1985), make no reference to the rediscovery of rhetoric in modern biblical studies.
107. Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd ed 1982), 441. See also his 'Systematic Wonder: The Rhetoric of Secular Religions,' *JAAR* 53:3 (1985) 677-702.
108. Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory. An Introduction*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983) 205. 206. See also 'The Rhetorical Turn' in Calvin O Schrag, *Communicative Praxis and the Space of Subjectivity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986).
109. See J Hillis Miller, 'The Triumph of Theory, the Resistance to Reading, and the Question of the Material Base,' *PMLA* 103:3 (May 1987) 281-91, his MLA Presidential Address 1986.
110. Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Foucault*, xix.
111. Dockhorn, *Rhetorica* 13:3 (1980) 160 and 171 respectively. For Gadamer's positive response to Dockhorn's critical review, see 'Rhetorik, Hermeneutik und Ideologiekritik: Metakritische Erörterungen zu 'Wahrheit und Methode',' in: *Hermeneutik und Ideologiekritik* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp 1971), now also in *Kleine Schriften*, I. Philosophie. Hermeneutik (Tübingen, Mohr, 1976, 2nd ed) 113-130.
- On 'Rhetorical Hermeneutics,' see Steven Mailloux, in *Critical Inquiry* 11 (1985) 620-41.
112. Dockhorn, *Rhetorica* 13:3 (1980) 161 and 162 respectively.
113. See Jacob Neusner, *Understanding Seeking Faith*. Essays on the Case of Judaism. Vol. 2: Literature, Religion and the Social Study of Judaism (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 15-17 on rhetoric, topic, logic as the three criteria for analyzing Midrash as literature; 23-34 on the Rhetorical Plan of Sifra; 71-74 on Topic and Rhetoric in the Mnemonic Program of the Mishnah; 85-94 on Mnemonic Rhetoric and Reality.

114. For one of the earliest treatments of the emotive part of rhetoric which 'also treats ecclesial rhetoric' (Shuger), see William Fenner, *A Treatise of the Affections; or The Souls Pulse* (London, 1650), see pp 90-104, the chapter on rhetoric.

See also Erich Auerbach, *Literatursprache und Publikum in der lateinischen Spätantike und im Mittelalter* (Bern: Francke, 1958), 54-63 'Gloria Passionis' on the role of pathos in rhetoric; Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg (ed), *Pathos, Affekt, Gefühl*. Philosophische Beiträge (Freiburg/München, 1981); Klaus Dockhorn, 'Memoria' in der Rhetorik,' *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 9 (1964) 27-35; Heinrich Plett, *Rhetorik der Affekte: Englische Wirkungsästhetik im Zeitalter der Renaissance*. Studien zur Englischen Philologie, NF 18 (Tübingen, 1975); Ian Thomson, 'Rhetoric and the Passion, 1760-1800,' in: Brian Vickers (ed), *Rhetoric Revalued* (1982) 143-48. Of limited value for our concerns here is Hendrika Vande Kemp, *Psychology and Theology 1672-1965. A Historical and Annotated Bibliography* (Millwood, N.Y.: Kraus International Publications, 1984).

On the *political* implications of the recognition of the pathos part of rhetorics, see the comments by Waswo on 'affective semantics' which emphasizes the 'sociohistorical context as semantically constitutive,' n 29, and by Adams on Puritan rhetorics, n 51.

115. Barner, *Barockrhetorik* (1970), 455. See also John O Ward, 'Magic and Rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance: Some Ruminations,' *Rhetorica* 6:1 (1988) 57-118 on the oscillating emphasis on the rationality of rhetoric as techne and on the irrationality of rhetoric as magic.

116. Dockhorn, *Rhetorica* 13:3 (1980) 171. Cf Barner, *Barockrhetorik*, 247-48 on balancing rhetorics' emphasis on *verba* with greater emphasis on *realia* in the 17th century.

In the Medieval universities history was studied as part of rhetoric. See also E Breisach (ed), *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1985).

117. See Wayne C Booth, 'Rhetorical Critics Old and New: The case of Gérard Genette,' in: L Lerner (ed), *Reconstructing Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 123-141; Booth refers to Genette's *Figures of Literary Discourse* (Columbia University Press, 1982), 103-126 'Rhetoric Restrained.'

118. See Jane Sutton's essay in *Rhetorica* 4:3 (1986) 203-26. Cf Calvin O Schrag, 'Rhetoric Resituated at the End of Philosophy,' *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71 (1985) 164-74.

119. See R Behrens, *Problematische Rhetorik* (1982), 177, n 9 on Louis Marin's work *La critique du discours* (Paris, 1975), chpt 10 on the issue of rhetoric inherent in logic. On the Reformed tradition's relation to Cartesianism, see Ernst Bizer, 'Die reformierte Orthodoxie und der Cartesianismus,' *ZThK* 55 (1958) 306-72.

120. Not as understood in the hermeneutical system of Dilthey, where the concept of intentionality stands for 'emotional activity within a certain situation,' (see Dockhorn, in *Rhetorica* 13:3 [1980], 170), but in John Searle's sense of intentionality related to the philosophy of the mind, and the philosophy of action.

On intentionality as the modern equivalent to the concern for 'the scope' or skopos in classical, humanist, and Baroque rhetorics, see section 1.3.1.

121. William Bryan Horner, in: Horner (ed), *Historical Rhetoric* (1980), 187.

122. The quote is by Meir Sternberg, as cited by Susan S Lanser, '(Feminist) Criticism in the Garden: Inferring Genesis 2-3,' in: Hugh C White (ed), *Speech Act Theory and Biblical Criticism*. Semeia 41 (Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), 82, n 22.

- On the 'ambivalence regarding intentionality and conventionality (or "constitutivity")' as the 'ambivalence concerning the relationship of the subject to constitutive rules,' see Hugh White, *ibid*, 12-13.
123. J Hillis Miller, 'The Triumph of Theory ...' (1987), 283.
124. Miller, 'The Triumph of Theory', 284. See also Fredric Jameson, *The Ideologies of Theory. Essays 1971-1986. Vol 2: Syntax of History. Theory and History of Literature*, 49 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988).
125. Miller, 'The Triumph of Theory ...' 288, 289.
126. Miller, 'The Triumph of Theory ...', 288, 289.
127. Miller, 'The Triumph of Theory ...', 291.
128. Susan S Lanser, '(Feminist) Criticism in the Garden: Inferring Genesis 2-3,' *Semeia* 41 (Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), 82, n 23.
- 129 Barner, *Barockrhetorik*, 453.
130. M M Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, (ed) M Holquist. University of Texas Press Slavic Series, 1 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 270 and 267 respectively.
131. Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious. Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, N Y: Cornell University Press, 1981), 284, 285.
132. Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, 75, n 56.
133. Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (1983).
134. Mark Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' 502.
135. Claus v Bormann, 'Hermeneutik: Philosophisch-theologisch,' *TRE* 15 (1987), 108-137, see especially 123-27 on philosophical hermeneutic, 127-30 on 20th century hermeneutical theology.
136. See J Hillis Miller quotes above n 125. Claus von Bormann expresses the same idea in the conclusion of his article in hermeneutics: 'Hermeneutik ist also keine Methode, sondern die Frage, wie ich, wenn ich verstehe, etwas verstanden habe, in der unaufhebbaren Endlichkeit einer gemachten *Erfahrung*. In der bewussten - also auch methodischen - Begegnung mit einem Text, mit einer Person, verstehe ich nichts Neues, sondern entfalte ein *Wissen*. "Hermeneutische Erfahrung" ist eben doch nicht Lebenserfahrung' (131).
137. Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Foucault*, 94.
138. Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Foucault*, 94.
139. See Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, 21, n 5, and 23, n 7.
140. Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, 23, and his elaboration on 23-102.
141. On the Jewish tradition, see Geoffrey H Hartman and Sanford Budick (eds), *Midrash and Literature* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1986), see index, s v Exegesis, Interpretation, Midrash, Rhetoric.
142. See Eden's essay in *Rhetorica* 5 (1987) 59-86, cited above p 3, n 7 See also Manfred Fuhrmann, 'Das Problem der Dunkelheit in der rhetorischen und literaturästhetischen Theorie der Antike,' W Iser



(ed), *Immanente Ästhetik. Ästhetische Reflexion*. Poetik und Hermeneutik (München: Fink, 1966), 47-72. See also Magass, n 8 above.

143. Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Foucault*, 11.

144. Mark Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' 503.

145. Mark Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' 504.

146. Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Foucault*, 180-81 and 217-18 respectively.

147. Mark Noll, 'Review Essay: The Bible in America,' 508.

148. The hermeneutical (and rhetorical!) implications of this perception of the 'commentary'-character of Mishnah/Talmud here, and of the New Testament there, as part of 'canonical hermeneutics' (and canonical rhetorics = the rhetorics of the Bible, and not merely rhetorics *in* the Bible), are laid out in a new and challenging way by James A Sanders, *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text: Canon as Paradigm* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987).

149. Massey Shepherd, et al. *The Commentary Hermeneutically Considered*. Protocol of the 31. Colloquy (11 Dec. 1977), (ed) E C Hobbs (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1978).

150. Dreyfus/Rabinow, *Foucault*, 123. Stephen D. Moore ['Narrative Commentaries on the Bible,' *Forum* 3:3 (1987) 29-62] wants to distinguish between a commentary's 'function or content' and its 'purely formal category' (53). On his vision of *metacommentary*, see below n 167.

151. See F Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, 29-32 on that 'medieval system ... its practical function in late antiquity, its ideological mission ...'

152. Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, 205.

153. Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs. Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (Ithaca, N Y: Cornell University Press, 1981), 226. See also the essays in Charles E Winquist (ed), *Text and Textuality*. Semeia 40 (Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1987).

154. Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, 17-102.

155. Edgard V McKnight, *The Bible and the Reader. An Introduction to Literary Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 101-103.

156. For an examination of Jameson's model, see William C Dowling, *Jameson, Althusser, Marx: An Introduction to The Political Unconscious* (London: Methuen, 1984).

157. For an appreciation of Burke's rhetorics, see Frank Lentricchia, *Criticism and Social Change* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1983), especially Part 5, pp 145-163.

158. Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, 68-74.

159. Amos N Wilder, *The Language of the Gospel: Early Christian Rhetoric* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964; repr 1971).

160. George A Kennedy. *A New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill/London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); see his earlier *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (University of North Carolina Press, 1980). Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York/London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981).

161. Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
162. Kenneth Burke, 'Rhetoric, Poetics and Philosophy,' in: Don M Burks (ed), *Rhetoric, Philosophy and Literature: An Exploration* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1978) 15-33; see also his *A Grammar of Motives* (University of California Press, 1945, 1962).
163. Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978); Umberto Eco, *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press, 1979); Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse* (Cornell University Press & Basil Blackwell, 1980); Josué Harari (ed), *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979); Susan Lanser, *The Narrative Act: Point of View in prose Fiction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981); Gerald Prince, *Narratology: The Form and Function of Narrative* (Mouton, 1982); Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (Methuen, 1983); Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987); Wallace Martin, *Recent Theories of Narrative* (Ithaca, N Y: Cornell University Press, 1986); and others.
164. On speech act theory, especially the pragmatic or perlocutionary speech act theory and its relation to rhetorics, and its impact on recent exegesis, see Hugh C. White (ed), *Speech Act Theory and Biblical Criticism*. Semeia 41 (Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1988). On speech act theory and rhetorics, see Frans H van Eemeren/Rob Grootendorst, *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions*. Studies of Argumentation in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis 1 (Dordrecht, Holland/Cinnaminson, USA: Foris Publications, 1984).
- On reader criticism see Robert Detweiler (ed), *Reader Response Approaches to Biblical and Secular Texts*. Semeia 31 (Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1985).
- For an overview of the influence of reader criticism on the genesis and gestation of a supposedly new genre of 'narrative commentary,' see Stephen D Moore, 'Narrative Commentaries on the Bible' (1987); see n 137. See also the essays in Edgar McKnight (ed), *The Role of the Reader in the Interpretation of the New Testament*. Semeia Series (Atlanta: Scholars Press, forthcoming).
165. Terry Eagleton, besides his *Literary Theory* (1983), his *Criticism and Ideology* (London: New Left Books, 1976); Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious. Narrative as Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981); W J T Mitchell (ed), *The Politics of Interpretation* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1983); J Arac (ed), *Postmodernism and Politics*. Theory and History of Literature 28 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986).
- On ideological criticism, see Paul Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, (ed) George H Taylor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986); John B Thompson, *Studies in the Theory of Ideology* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984); W J T Mitchell, *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Nannerl Keohane/Michelle Z Rosaldo/Barbara C Gelpi: *Feminist Theory. A Critique of Ideology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
166. Norman K Gottwald (ed), *Social Scientific Criticism of the Hebrew Bible and Its Social World: The Israelite Monarchy*. Semeia 37 (Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), and its parallel for the New Testament, the Semeia 35 (1986) volume edited by John H Elliot.
- For a critique of both 'the objectifying' and 'the subjectifying social sciences,' see Dreyfus/Rabinow (eds), *Michel Foucault* (1983), 160-67 and 178-183.

167. Robert Tannehill *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts. A literary interpretation*. Vol 1: The Gospel according to Luke (Fortress, 1986), 8. In his essay on 'Narrative Commentaries on the Bible,' *Forum* 3:3 (1987), Stephen Moore speaks of commentaries sensitive to the narrative *rhetorics* as 'metacommentaries' which are 'directed to the interpretive strategies, conventions, assumptions, and contextual factors which constitute the biblical commentator's art.' And he refers to Mailloux's phrase of 'rhetorical hermeneutics' to define the *NEW* perception of 'what gives the text its perceived properties, meanings, etc.' (56, n 95).
168. See Dockhorn on the rhetorical origin of Luther's concept of faith (above n 34), and Kinneavy on the Greek rhetorical roots of biblical faith (above n 103).
169. G Bouman, *Paulus aan de Romeinen. Een retorische analyse van Rom 1-8*. Cahiers voor levensverdieping, 32 (Averbode, 1980). See also the promising probes by Jean-Noel Aletti on Paul's argumentation in Romans, in *Biblica* 68 (1987) 41-55, and 69 (1988) 47-62.
170. Lewis R Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986).
171. Frank W Hughes, *Early Christian Rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians*. JSNT Suppl.Ser. vol 30 (Sheffield: Almond, 1987).
172. Robert Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millennial Piety* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986); Bruce C Johanson, *To All the Brethren. A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to I Thessalonians*. CB, NT Series 16 (Lund, 1987).
173. Adela Y Collins (ed), *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship* (Scholars Press, 1985); and J Cheryl Exum/Johanna W H Bos (eds), *Reasoning with the Foxes: Female Wit in a World of Male Power*. Semeia 42 (Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1988).