

Modern Literary Approaches to the Old Testament Interpretation and its Assessment

구약해석에 대한 현대 문학적 접근과 평가

신득일 교수

Prof. Dr. Deuk-Il Shin

1. New Criticism
2. Structuralism
3. Rhetorical Criticism
4. Narrative Criticism
5. Reader-Response Criticism
6. Conclusion

초록

최근 20년간 구약 비평학계의 두드러진 변화는 과거의 역사 문헌 비평에 근거하여 본문을 자르고 나누는 작업에서 벗어나 현존의 본문을 하나의 단위로 보려는 시도가 현저하다는 것이다. 그것은 저자와 역사적 배경에 대한 관심이 본문 자체나 독자 중심으로 바뀌었다는 말이다. 이런 해석의 현상은 언어학과 일반 문학 이론의 영향을 받은 것이지만 지난 세기의 Gunkel의 전승사적 방법과도 밀접한 관계가 있다.

1920년대에 시작된 신비평은 1960년 초부터 성경해석에 적용되었다. 이 방법론은 저자의 의도와 본문 외적인 평가에는 관심을 두지 않고 본문의 자율성과 충족성을 강조해 본문의 최종적 형태에 관심을 갖는다. 신비평의 임무는 구조나 글의 성격과 주제 같은 내적인 면을 연구하는 것이다. 그렇지만 그 구조는 단순한 형식이 아니고 내용의 본질로 본다.

구조주의는 Saussure의 언어학에서 왔는데, 성경해석에 적용된 구조 분석도 이 구조주의에서 발전한 것이다. 성경해석과 관련하여 구조주의의 장점은 본문의 최종 형태를 전체로 보는 것이고, 성경본문의 문학적 틀을 설명하는 것이다. 그러나 구조주의는 성경의 영감성을 설명하지 못하고, 발견한 구조가 저자가 의도한 것과 맞는지 알 수 없고, 너무나 주관적이라는 점이 있다. 사실 같은 본문을 두고 학파마다 구조가 다르게 나타난다. 어떤 경우는 수학적 공식과 같은 구조를 나타내는데 그것은 혼란스럽기만하지 해석에 별 도움을 주지 못한다. 구조주의자는 결정적으로 본문이 역사적인 사실을 지시하는 기능을 제한하고 있다. 결국 구조분석 자체는 주석이나 해석이 아니고 해석 이전의 단계인 분석일 따름이다.

수사비평은 양식비평의 한계를 극복하려는 의도에서 비롯되었다. 이 방법론의 목적은 저자의 사상이 어떻게 문학의 한 단계에서 다음 단계로 전개되는가를 연구함으로써 저자의 의도를 드러내는 데 있다. 구약에 적용된 수사비평은 고대 이스라엘에서 사용된 문학적 틀을 알아내어 구약 본문의 특정한 단위에 나타난 특별한 예술적 문학을 발견하고 분석하도록 한다. 다른 문학비평과 같이 이 방법론도 본문의 의미와 내용보다는 방법에 치중하는 것이다.

내라티브비평은 문학 작품이 독자들에게 미치는 효과와 그 이유를 분석하고 설명하는 데서 수사비평과 비슷하지만 실제 독자와는 다른 상상에 의해 설정된 내재된 독자의 관점에서 본문을 해석하는데서 차이가 있다. 그래서 이 비평도 실제 독자의 역사적 상황을 이는데는 관심이 없다. 구약해석에 이 방법이 적용될 때 성경 본문은 하나의 드라마와 같은 구성을 가진 것으로 보고 하나의 단위를 가진 이야기를 만들기 위해서 본문을 여기저기서 선택해서 재배열하는 일이 종종 있다. 이 방법은 내레이터를 모든 사실을 알고 있는 사람으로 생각하는데 성경의 권위를 인정하는 입장에서 그는 성령에 영감된 저자와 같은 것이다. 내라티브 비평은 복잡하지만 다른 문학비평보다 장점이 많다고 볼 수 있는데 성경 이야기를 영감된 것으로 본다면 해석에 도움을 줄 수 있을 것이다.

독자 중심해석은 해석에 독자의 능동적인 역할을 강조하는 것이다. 본문은 모든 시대의 독자들의 필요를 충족시켜주어야 한다는 점에서 의미가 있는 방법론이다. 하지만 여러 부분에서 해석과 적용을 혼동하고 있다. 방법론의 주된 문제점은 독자가 저자의 의도와는 관계없이 본문의 의미를 창조해 낼 위험이 있다는 것이다.

결론적으로 성경의 여러 문학적 유형은 다양한 문학적 접근 방법을 필요로 한다. 그렇지만 여기서 소개한 문학비평이 과거의 해석법을 대치한다고 볼 수는 없다. 역사적이고 신학적 방법과 함께 문헌학적 방법의 일부로 보아야 할 것이다. 사실 문헌학적 방법은 비역사적이기 때문에 성경의 역사

신득일, 고신대학 및 동 대학 신학대학원에서 석사학위(M. Div.) 동 대학원 신학과를 수료(Th.M.과정). 화란 캄펜 신학교 대학원에서 구약학(Th. Drs.)과 남아공 Potchefstroom 대학원에서 구약학 수석(Th. D. Cand.). 현재 고신대 신학과 구약학 교수제직. 저서 및 역서로 「성경히브리서문법」(고신대학교출판부), 「율기강해」(고신대학교출판부), 「설교학강의」(기독교문서선교회), 「성경지리학개론」(기독교문서선교회) 외 다수

성과 조화될 수 없다. 문학적 접근 방식이 아무리 중요하다고 해도 문제점은 너무 자주 내용보다는 형식에 치중하는 것이다. 문학적 유형은 목적을 위한 수단이지 목적 그 자체는 아니다. 그래서 이 방법론은 구약해석에서 부차적인 역할을 할 수 밖에 없다.

Modern Literary Approaches to the Old Testament Interpretation and its Assessment

During the last twenty years, literary criticism has shifted its focus of attention from the author, to the text itself, and thence to the reader. A parallel movement can be traced in the literary criticism of the Bible¹. While many scholars concluded that historical criticism dividing and atomizing texts had almost run its course and overemphasis on historical detail undermined a proper understanding of plot, theme, and character, literary criticism gave them new approaches into exegesis in several directions. However this methodology is nothing new to biblical study, since it is closely connected to the traditio-historical method which Gunkel and Gressmann initiated,² giving the essential insights which underpin not only the methods of form- and redaction criticism, but also the modern literary criticism as is above mentioned, even if the latter is the method adopted by general literary science to interpret the Bible. Gunkel paved a way to a view that the Bible is no more than literature and advanced in earnest a literary criticism to be applied to the study of Scripture by focusing attention on the all-important issue of identifying the genre of a text in the process of interpretation.

¹ Cf. M. Davies, *Literary Criticism*, in: R.J. Coggins & J.L. Houlden (eds.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, London: SCM Press, 1990, p. 402.

² H.J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, Neukirchener, 1988, p. 329.

Although the problems of the modern literary approach which evoked much controversy among the studies of biblical exegesis cannot be explained here in detail, they should be mentioned in the proper way to point to their benefits and pitfalls in the interpretation of the Bible. At the inception of such literary tendency, New Criticism appears as a new theory of 'general' literature adopted to biblical study.

1. New Criticism

New Criticism, as the term suggests, was itself conceived in opposition to an 'older' criticism which, in Europe and America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, had largely concerned itself with material extraneous to the work under discussion: with the biography and psychology of its author, or with the work's relationship to 'literary history',³ even though this criticism is no longer new but already *passé*. New Criticism which is obviously (though unknowingly) related to Russian Formalism, was developed by I.A. Richards and T.S. Eliot in the 1920s, flourished and grew in the 1930s and 1940s, to the extent that by the mid 1950s it had become - in the English speaking world at any rate - an established orthodoxy. The general principle of the theory can be formulated simply, as the effect of a work of literary art being regarded as an autonomous entity and therefore not to be judged according to reference to criteria or considerations beyond itself; this being an interpretative process

³ Terence Hawkes, *Structuralism and Semiotics*, London: Routledge, 1992, pp.151f.

concentrating on the self-sufficiency of the literary text; the author's intention and suchlike information 'extrinsic' to the text like historical background being in concordance to this process unimportant to the critic.⁴ The task of New Criticism as a interpretative theory is to study the so-called 'internal' aspects of the text such as structure, themes, character of literary writing; or alternatively, approaches the texts as a unified whole rather than the amalgam of sources. It thus describes itself as being 'synchronic' rather than 'diachronic' i.e., dealing with the text as it stands rather than with its prehistory.⁵ Barton depicted its three major theses as such: the literary text is an "artefact"; "intentionalism" is a fallacy; and "the meaning of a text is the function of its place in a literary canon".⁶ Such postulations imply a break with the traditional historical method in the study of classical literature extant over a 200-year period.

The ideas associated with New Criticism are adopted for the interpretation of the Scripture by Jewish biblical scholar Meir Weiss. In biblical criticism, his position is rooted in Gunkel's *Formgeschichte* but he does not bind his interest to the problematics of the traditional biblical study as does the question "Was sind die Baumaterialien, die für den Bau der Erzählung verwandt wurden?", because he turns it into

⁴ Cf. Meir Weiss, *The Bible From Within: The Method of Total Interpretation*, Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1984, p. 8; Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987, pp. 25f.; Gerhard Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995, p.135.

⁵ David J.A. Clines & J. Cheryl Exum, The New Literary Criticism, in: J. Cheryl Exum & David J.A. Clines, Valley Forge (eds.), *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1993, p. 16.

⁶ John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1996, p. 144.

a question of the general literary science: "Welches sind die Bauformen?"⁷ He attempts to understand the form as content and meaning. In other words, *Form* is not only *ästhetische Hülle, Technik*, not any *Mittel des Erzählers*, but the forms constitute the substance of the story. Accordingly, his work focuses on an analysis of sentences and sequences of sentences and research on structure.⁸ He stresses that the textual components must be seen in totality: "Es gilt ferner ihre inhaltlichen und formalen (ihre eigentümlichen wie traditionsgegebenen, gesellschaftlich verpflichtenden) Komponenten, nicht in ihrer Losgelöstheit von der Gesamterzählung an sich zu studieren, sondern ihren funktionellen Sinn innerhalb des Ganzen, die Art, wie sie die Erzählung in ihrer jetzigen Gestalt formen, zu betrachten".⁹ He thought that the method of concentrating on the texts, New Criticism, least exposed the subjectivity of the exegete: "Die neuere Literaturforschung hat erkannt, dass die Erschliessung des Sprachwerks - welches wissenschaftliche Ziel sie auch habe - dann am wenigsten der Subjektivität des Forschers ausgesetzt ist".¹⁰ In any case, in his opinion relating to biblical interpretation, it is generally emphasized "dass diese Erkenntnis der neueren Literaturwissenschaft und die daraus erfließenden methodologischen Folgerungen auch die Methode der wissenschaftlichen Erforschung der Bibel bestimmen

⁷ Meir Weiss, Einiges über die Bauformen des Erzählens in der Bibel, VT 13, 1963, p. 459.

⁸ Cf. Meir Weiss, Weiteres über die Bauformen des Erzählens in der Bibel, Biblica 46, 1965, pp. 196-200.

⁹ Meir Weiss, Einiges über die Bauformen des Erzählens in der Bibel, 1963, p. 459.

¹⁰ Meir Weiss, Weiteres über die Bauformen des Erzählens in der Bibel, 1965, p. 181.

bzw. ergänzen muss, da doch diese Erkenntnis aus dem Wesen des Sprachwerks, als solchem, fließt, sie also von den zeitbedingten und -gebundenen Zügen der Schrifturkunde völlig unabhängig ist".¹¹ His stress on the text as a totality implies a conscious attempt to break loose from the paradigm of scientific history as well as from its limitations and problems. As total interpretation works with 'the final form of the text', so his work begins with studies of texts on the word and phrase levels, proceeds to an analysis of sentence, and ends in research on structure and whole texts.¹²

Besides Weiss, New Criticism gave many insights into biblical exegesis to "the Amsterdamse school", "the Sheffield school" and those more or less associated with it. M.A. Beek, known as a founder of "the Amsterdamse school" or "Amsterdamse traditie", has not only expressed serious doubts with regard to both the premises and the results of the literary-critical, *traditionsgeschichtliche* analysis of the text; but he has also shown a new way for exegesis, linking with a trend in modern theories of literature: New Criticism and the *Werkinterpretation* in which literature is regarded as 'work of art'.¹³ His successor K.A. Deurloo also takes the same stance: "Niet de oorsprong of de analogie is beslissend voor de exegese, maar hoe bijvoorbeeld een bepaald motief of een directe ontleening gebruikt is in een onderhavige tekst, volgens de regel verba valent usu ... Het is de

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Meir Weiss, *The Bible From Within: The Method of Total Interpretation*, Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1984, pp. 74-378.

¹³ M.A. Beek, Verzadigingspunten en onvoltooide lijnen in het onderzoek van de oudtestamentische literatuur, VT 38, 1968, p. 7.

individualiteit en de autonomie van deze tekst".¹⁴ Good examples of "the Sheffield school" may be cited in D. Gunn's stimulating studies of the Saul and David materials.¹⁵ J. Barton has advanced the provocative thesis that B. Childs' "canonical approach" depends on the New Criticism,¹⁶ though Childs himself maintains that his method has no relationship with such a literary tendency: "it is a basic misunderstanding to try to describe a canonical approach simply as a form of structuralism (*contra* Barton)".¹⁷ For Childs, contrary to a literary understanding of the Bible, "the initial point to be made is that the canonical approach to Old Testament theology is unequivocal in asserting that the object of theological reflection is the canonical writing of the Old Testament".¹⁸ Nevertheless, Childs' treatment of biblical texts as being self-sufficient entities to be understood within a literary tradition (canon) bears a close relationship to the principles of New Criticism affected by formalism¹⁹.

Even if the starting point of New Criticism - which disregards any authorial intention - is an objection to the historical criticism which stresses the original author's meaning, the common ground

¹⁴ K.A. Deurloo, *Kaïn en Abel: Onderzoek naar exegetische methode inzake een "kleine literair eenheid" in de Tenakh*, Amsterdam, 1967, p. 19.

¹⁵ David M. Gunn, *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*, Sheffield: JSOT, 1978.

¹⁶ Barton, op.cit., p. 167.

¹⁷ B.S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985, p. 6.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Cf. Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*, 1987, p. 27.

that they can be relied on is the objectivity of the text.²⁰

2. Structuralism

Another trend reflecting disappointment in the historical method employed traditionally in biblical exegesis is structuralism. Structuralism was a dominant force in the study of language, culture, and literature in the 1960s, 70s, and into the 80s. Though its quasi-scientific pretensions are not able to stand up to deconstruction's powerful critique²¹ and the popularity of alternative methods like narrative criticism²², it is still necessary to deal briefly with this type of methodology, since structuralist studies of biblical texts are easily found.

While the concept of structuralism was originated by the like of G. Vico (1668) in the sociocultural field, it was developed and refined in the domain which distinguishes man that of language.²³ In spite of American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce's independent and strong influence on structuralism, its roots are to be found principally in the linguistic theories of Ferdinand de Saussure. His posthumous published in 1915, two years after his death, *Cours de*

²⁰ Cf. W.C. Kaiser & Moises Silva, *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994, p. 243.

²¹ Tremper Longman, *Literary Approaches and Interpretation, NIDOTTE1*, 1997, p. 107.

²² Paul R. House, The Rise and Current Status of Literary Criticism of the Old Testament, in: Paul R. House (ed.), *Beyond Form Criticism*, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992, pp. 4f.

²³ Cf. Philip Pettit, *The Concept of Structuralism: A Critical Analysis*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: university of California Press, 1975, p. 1.

Linguistique Générale soon became accepted as an authoritative work in linguistics, and established a number of fundamental principles which are inherent in linguistic and structuralist methodologies to the present day.²⁴ In this book he proposes a series of distinctions regarding structural linguistics.

Saussure begins with a consideration of the whole phenomenon of language in terms of two fundamental dimensions; that of *langue* and that of *parole*.²⁵ The dialectical distinction he draws between these two has proved to be of fundamental importance to the development of linguistics in general, and of structuralism in particular. The division between *langue* and *parole* is more or less the delineation between an abstract language system - called 'language' - and the individual utterances made by speakers called 'speech'. *Langue* is like the rules of chess; while *parole* is like an individual chess move. *Langue* comprehensively contains two concepts simultaneously: "à la fois un produit social de la faculté de langue et un ensemble de conventions nécessaires, adoptées par le corps social pour permettre l'exercice de cette faculté chez le individu".²⁶ In the relationship between the two, *parole* as the small part of the iceberg that appears above the water is controlled by *langue*; The nature of *langue* lies beyond and determines the nature of each manifestation of *parole*, yet it has no concrete existence of its own, except in the piecemeal

²⁴ Cf. David Greenwood, *Structuralism and the Biblical Text*, Berlin: Mouton Publishers, 1985, pp. 1f.; Longman, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*, 1987, p. 28; 1997, p. 107; Terence Hawkes, *Structuralism and Semiotics*, 1992, pp. 19ff.

²⁵ Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de Linguistique Générale, publié par Charles Bally et Albert Sechehaye*, Paris: Payot, 1931, pp. 30-39, 112.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

manifestations that speech affords. Hjelmslev and Chomsky substitute these two terms for *schema* and *usage* or *competence* and *performance* respectively.²⁷ After all, *langue* inheres not in *la substance matérielle des mots* but in the *système de signes*.²⁸ The nature both of signs and of the relationship between them is seen to be structural.

Saussure's next distinction identifies the two aspects of a sign, particularly the linguistic sign: *signifié* (signified) and *signifiant* (signifier).²⁹ The structural relationship between the *concept* of tree (*signifié*) and the *image acoustique* made by the word 'tree' (*signifiant*) thus constitutes a linguistic sign. Language is made up of these signs, because for him language is *un système de signes exprimant des idées* (a system of signs expressing ideas).³⁰ The relationship between the *signifié* and *signifiant* is arbitrary (*le lien unissant le signifiant au signifié est arbitraire*) in that there is no necessary 'fitness' in the link between the *concept* and the *image acoustique*.³¹ The meaning of a sign is acquired by the structure of the language, for *le principe de l'arbitraire du signe n'est contesté par personne*. After all, according to Saussure, "La langue est un système dont tous les termes sont solidaire et où la valeur de l'un ne résulte que de la présence simultanée des autres" (Language is a system of interdependent terms where the value of each term results only from the simultaneous

²⁷ Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1965, p. 4; Louis Hjelmslev, *Prologomena to a Theory of Language*, translated by Francis J. Whitfield from Danish, Baltimore: Waverly Press, INC, 1953, pp. 48-52.

²⁸ Saussure, *op.cit.*, p. 37.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 100f.

presence of the others)³².

Furthermore, Saussure presents two dimensions of the linguistic relations: *rappports syntagmatiques* and *rappports associatifs*.³³ The former pertains to the horizontal and diachronic relation, while the latter to the vertical and synchronic. This distinction is illustrated simply on the level of the sentence. In *Dieu est bon* (God is good), a syntagmatic approach would analyse the three words in the sentence in their relationships to each other. An associative analysis, on the other hand, examines each slot in the sentence: *Dieu / est / bon*. Each word has formal associations with those other words from among which it has been chosen and "partie de ce trésor intérieur qui constitue la language chez chaque individu"³⁴ helps to define the meaning of the word. In the above sentence, part of the meaning of *bon* derives from the fact that it turns out not to be *méchant* (wicked) or *vilain* (nasty), as the full relationships of the word in the sentence are extrapolated by the relationships of terms *in praesentia* and *in absentia*. This kind of approach can be thought of as operable on a synchronic plane so as to distinguish it from the simultaneously functional yet quite distinct relationships of the diachronic, syntagmatic plane.³⁵ Ultimately, it appears that the concepts a language expresses are defined and determined by its structure.

This third distinction is particularly important in differentiating

³² Ibid., p. 159.

³³ Ibid., pp. 170-175.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 171.

³⁵ Cf. Hawkes, op.cit., p. 27; Günther Schiwy, *Der französische Strukturalismus: Mode Methode Ideologie*, Hamburg: Rovohlt Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1970, pp. 40ff.)

the variation between Propp's and Lévi-Strauss' method of studying narrative: These two structuralists affected Barthes' and Leach's later structural exegesis on the Old Testament narrative. Especially, the associative led to Jakobson's structural phonology, while the syntagmatic led to Chomsky's generative syntax and to Philip Pettit's differential semantics. The three aspects of the Saussurean linguistic model were applied to fields outside of linguistics: the anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss, the psychiatric theories of Jacques Lacan on the structure of the unconscious,³⁶ and Marc Barbut's concepts of structure in mathematics.³⁷

It was Vladimir Propp who first applied a broadly-speaking structuralist approach to narratives. His *Morphology of the Folktale* deserves to be noted as one of the major contributions of Russian formalism. In the book Propp endeavoured to establish a scientific explanation of the way Russian fairy-tales are composed. After close inspection of approximately a hundred such tales, Propp reckoned that he had found a deep structure or grammar of possible relationships which all fairy tales 'obey'.³⁸ This structure was composed of a limited number of possible actions of the characters in the stories. Propp called these actions functions which are essentially the same,

³⁶ Vladimir Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale*, Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1968; Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie Structurale*, Paris: Plon, 1958, 1973; Roland Barthes, *La lutte avec l'ange*, in: F. Bovon (ed.), *Analyse Structurale et Exégèse Biblique*, Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1971; Edmund Leach, *Genesis as Myth and Other Essays*, London: Jonathan Cape, 1969; Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*, Vol. I: Phonological Studies, The Hague: Mouton, 1962; Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures*, The Hague: Mouton, 1957; Philip Pettit, op.cit.; Jacques Lacan, *The Language of the Self: The Function of Language in Psychoanalysis*, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968.

³⁷ Cf. Greenwood, op.cit., pp. 5f.

³⁸ Propp, op.cit., pp. 9-14.

while the characters in the tales seem to be variable. He inferred from his research the permanent or monotypical structure which turned out to be a kind of Russian alphabet of thirty-one functions including seven types of characters.³⁹ While not all functions occur in any one text, they always occur in the same sequence. These functional categories were later applied to Barthes' exegesis on Genesis 32:22-32.

The second seminal application of a structuralist approach to a narrative genre was made by the French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, who used Saussure's linguistic system and Jakobson's binary opposition of phonology in his study of myths: "La Structure des Mythes", the eleventh chapter of *Anthropologie Structurale*. Lévi-Strauss did not apply his own methods directly to Hebrew mythology, but he did provide the foundations for later scholars who used it to analyse initially the 'mythical' material in Genesis, and subsequently other portions of the Scriptures. According to Lévi-Strauss, myth as "ce mode du discours où la valeur de la formule *traduttore, traditore* tend pratiquement à zéro" contains both *langue* and *parole* whose nature is respectively synchronic and diachronic in myth.⁴⁰ A myth is always, in its individual telling, located in time: that is to say, it always refers to events alleged to have happened a long time ago. Yet, in operation, the specific pattern or structure of events described is bound to be timeless; linking in an explanatory mode the present with both past and future, while it is told. Myth is language, but the language used in myth presents us with a peculiar sense of the existence of another meaningful level of operation *au dessus* the

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 19ff., 25-65.

⁴⁰ Lévi-Strauss, op.cit., pp. 231f., 234.

ordinary linguistic expression.⁴¹ Moreover, for Lévi-Strauss myth is composed of constituent units which will be analogous to the constituent units discernible in ordinary language, but will differ from these in that they also "belong to a higher and more complex order" which entitles them to be called *grosses unités constitutives or mythèmes*. Thus, his procedure in analysing a myth was to break down its story into the shortest possible sentences, and write each sentence on an index card bearing a number corresponding to the unfolding of the story. Almost every card, he claimed, showed that a certain function was at a given time linked to a given subject (e.g. "Oedipus kills his father"), or in other words, each gross constituent unit consisted of a relation. He poses "que les véritables unités constitutives du mythe ne sont pas les relations isolée, mais des paquets de relations, et que c'est seulement sous forme de combinaisons de tels paquets que les unités constitutives acquièrent une fonction signifiante." The *bundles* function like phonemes in two dimensions: diachrony and synchrony; *langue* and *parole*.⁴² He perceives myth as involving a system of mythological texts, i.e. a system of mythical signs but being not the only mythical signs. A myth mediates fundamental, metaphysical oppositions through a theoretically infinite number of secondary oppositions which are amenable to a mediation: "la pensée mythique procède de la prise de conscience de certaines oppositions et tend à leur médiation progressive".⁴³ It appears to reflect Hegel's dialectics. His binarism is presented as a general theory about the way the human mind works. Not only the thought process but perceptual

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 231.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 233f.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 248.

experience displays binary organisation. In reading Lévi-Strauss, one therefore finds a concentrated preoccupation with the degree of mediation between certain universal contrasts, such as simple/complex, light/dark, above/below, immortal/mortal, male/female, parent/child, etc.⁴⁴ This type of structural analysis was first applied by the anthropologist Sir Edmund Leach to an analysis of 'biblical myth': "Lévi-Strauss in the Garden of Eden" (1961).

Propp's structural narratology and Lévi-Strauss' structural study of myths, which were rooted in Saussure's structural linguistics, directly or indirectly contributed to the structural criticism of the Bible in their own ways. Milne, however, estimates that it is A.J. Greimas who most affected the structural study of the Bible.⁴⁵ Greimas is primarily interested in semantics, placing heavy emphasis on the use of scientific method in structuralist procedures. His structuralist approach to the matter of meaning has produced two influential books, *Sémantique Structurale* (1966) and *Du Sens* (1970). In these works, his principal aim is to uncover the semantic structures underlying narrative, by attempting to describe narrative structure in terms of an established linguistic model derived from the Saussurean notion of an underlying langue which generates a specific parole, as well as from Jakobson's concept of the fundamental signifying role of binary opposition. Greimas argues that our fundamental concepts of *signification* present themselves to us through the opposition we feel to exist between basic 'semes' or semantic units: "La seule façon d'aborder, à l'heure actuelle, le problème de la signification consiste à

⁴⁴ C. Lévi-Strauss, *L'Homme Nu*, Paris: Plon, 1971, p. 619.

⁴⁵ Pamela J. Milne, *Vladimir Propp and the Study of Structure in Hebrew Biblical Narrative*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988, p. 49.

affirmer l'existence de discontinuités, sur le plan de la perception, et celle d'écart différentiels (ainsi Lévi-Strauss), créateurs de signification, sans se préoccuper de la nature des différences perçues".⁴⁶ Thus, *blanc* (white) is defined principally by our sense of its opposition to *noir* (black), and *grand* (big) by our sense of its opposition to *petit* (small). This perception of oppositions underlies *la structure élémentaire de la signification* on which his semantic theories rest: "Nous percevons des différences et, grâce à cette perception, le monde «prend forme» devant nous et pour nous".⁴⁷ He also contends that these binary oppositions constitute the basis of a deep-lying *modèle actantiel* from whose structure the superficial surface structures of individual stories derive; parallel with Saussure's notion of a langue which underlies parole and with Chomsky's notion of competence and performance.⁴⁸ The fundamental structures of the language of *homo loquens* (talking man) must inevitably inform and shape the fundamental structures of his stories. Even if those stories seem different on the surface, a structural analysis reveals that they spring from a common grammar or *énoncé-spectacle* (enunciation-spectacle) which Greimas employs to give the sense of the model's fundamentally dramatic, interlocutory nature. This spectacle is unique in that it is permanent: "le contenu des actions change tout le temps, les acteurs varient, mais l'énoncé-spectacle reste toujours le même, car sa permanence est garantie par la distribution unique des rôles".⁴⁹

⁴⁶ A.J. Greimas, *Sémantique Structurale*, Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1966, p. 8.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴⁸ Cf. Fredric Jameson, *The Prison-House of Language*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972, p. 124; Hawkes, *op.cit.*, p. 89.

⁴⁹ A.J. Greimas, *Sémantique Structurale*, p. 173.

At the surface level, the structure of the *énoncé-spectacle* is manifested through the various actants who embody it, as is *parole* to its *langue*. In other words, the deep structure of the narrative generates and defines its *actants* at a level beyond that of the story's surface content. An actant may embody itself in a particular *acteur* or it may reside in the function of more than one character in respect of their common role in the story's underlying oppositional structure. Greimas has classed the possible uses of the *actant* as follows: 1. as *sujet* (subject) and *objet* (object), in which the form the basic event of the enunciation-spectacle will be that of a desire for an object; 2. as *destinateur* (destinator) and *destinataire* (destinee), in which case the basic event will take the form of a communication; and 3. finally, as *adjuvant* (auxiliary) and *opposant* (adversary) in the action.⁵⁰ His intention in this division of actants is to make the structure of the sentence roughly homologous to the plot of a text. In essence, Greimas' methodology in this area constitutes a development and refinement of Propp's original insights, and his ultimate goal is the same as Propp's: the establishment of basic plot paradigms and an exploration of the full range of their combined potential: the construction. In the field of biblical study, Jean Calloud employed Greimas' methodology to exegetise Matthew 4:1-11 (the story of Jesus' temptation).

In contrast to the scientific methodology of Greimas, Marxist and Freudian Roland Barthes, is suspicious of scientific assumptions involved in his method, because he contended that narrative was too complex to be reduced to a single paradigmatic model. Rather than engaging in extensive comparative analysis to develop a single structural

⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 173-180.

narrative model, Barthes probed intensively into the individual text to demonstrate the unique way in which each narrative discloses its meaning through the use of overlapping codes.⁵¹ The purpose of structural analysis of narrative, he maintains, is to analyse what relations the text establishes, what its rules of organization may be, and how it allows for meaning, rather than to explore the historical process by means of which it was produced as a literary entity: "il y a une différence fondamentale entre l'Analyse structurale du Récit et ce qu'on appelle traditionnellement l'explication de textes."⁵² This attitude leads towards the perception of what Barthes describes as the "ineffable individuality" of the text, which is also referred to by him as the 'difference' of the text⁵³; i.e., the primal sense of difference which is the point of origin of the author's own sense of individuality, and which is the point of departure and return for the process of his writing. The notion of this 'difference' requires the reader's imagination of *contre-texte* in the process of analysis of the text: "Le bon analyste du récit doit avoir une sorte d'imagination du *contre-texte*, imagination de l'aberration du texte, de ce qui est narrativement scandaleux."⁵⁴ Barthes' theory can be fully appreciated in the framework of Freudian thought which he presupposes.

According to Freudian theory, language is understood as

⁵¹ Cf. Roland Barthes, *Image Music Text*, Essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath, London: Fontana Press, 1977, pp. 109-113; *Le Degré zéro de l'écriture*, Paris: Seuil, 1972, pp. 41-45; *S/Z*, translated by Richard Miller, New York: Hill and Wang, 1974, p. 11f.

⁵² Barthes, Roland, L'analyse structurale du récit: A propos d'actes X-XI, in: Xavier Léon-Dufour (ed.) *Exégèse et herméneutique*, Paris: Seuil, 1971, p. 184f.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 185.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 187.

resulting from the deflection of incestuous desires by the Prohibition which is primordial Law, from their real object to a symbolic object, i.e. language.⁵⁵ The prohibition of incest is merely its subjective pivot: the object forbid the subject's choice⁵⁶; the subject is viewed as neutral, constituting a symbolic, homonymic language. But language constitutes a negation which separates the sayable from the un-sayable (the notion developed by Lacan from Freud's theory "the unconscious")⁵⁷, reflecting the negativity of the prohibition itself. Then, the *I* is constituted in the moment of the prohibition as an awareness of difference and separation, and as the subject of the prohibition. The subject constituted in the forgotten moment of the prohibition becomes the conscious *I*, the primary symbol of the act of speech.⁵⁸ The *I* thus belongs to this primary level of symbolization, and hence to the primary negativity of language.

Under the strong influence of both Freud and Lacan, Barthes asserted that the relationship between the subject and the primary symbol is one of desire deflected from its primary object. In Barthes' view *écriture*, especially of a narrative kind, portrays a subject oriented by desire towards symbolic values. The subject reports the now forgotten event which resulted in the desire directed towards the symbolic object. Thus *écriture* involves a return to the silence of the pre-verbal

⁵⁵ Cf. Jacques Lacan, *Écrits: A Selection*, New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1977, pp. 82f.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 66; cf. Alain Juranville, *Lacan et la philosophie*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1984, pp. 200f.

⁵⁷ Jacques Lacan, The insistence of the letter in the unconscious in: *Structuralism, Garden City*, New York: Doubleday & Company, INC, 1966, pp. 117-137.

⁵⁸ Cf. Jacques Lacan and Anthony Wilden, *Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991, p. 83.

state in order to achieve this re-portrayal of the primary process through which the self dramatically emerges as a differentiated, conscious entity. The process of return and re-portrayal of differentiation is the "paradigm of the difference" which underlies and produces the structure of the narrative.⁵⁹

Maintaining the traditional position that narrative is structured in sentences, Barthes further asserts that, however complex it may be, a narrative sentence can be reduced to two basic elements: the subject and the predicate. He thus elaborated on the structure of the narrative sentence; "To narrate is to raise the question as if it were a subject which one delays predicating; and when the predicate arrives, the sentence, the narrative are over, the world is adjectivized."⁶⁰ He aimed to demonstrate the text's *totally* signifying nature, by making use of plural,⁶¹ overlapping codes. For instance, in Barthes' analysis of *Sarrasine*, the entire text is presented as "a stereographic space where the five codes, the five voices intersect."⁶²: the hermeneutic code; the code of semes are signifiers; the symbolic code; the proairetic code; the 'cultural' code. These codes, in one sense, are a network of multivalenced signs, the "signifying" of which depends wholly upon the cooperation of the critical reader. With regard to these codes, he stresses the role of the reader. He argues that literature may be divided into that which gives the reader a role, or function, and that which

⁵⁹ Cf. Greenwood, *op.cit.*, pp. 43f.

⁶⁰ Roland Barthes, *S/Z*, translated by Richard Miller, New York: Hill and Wang, 1974, p. 76.

⁶¹ Barthes, Roland, *L'analyse structurale du récit: A propos d'actes X-XI*, in: Xavier Léon-Dufour (ed.) *Exégèse et herméneutique*, Paris: Seuil, 1971, p. 188.

⁶² Roland Barthes, *S/Z*, p. 21.

renders the reader left with no more than the poor freedom either to accept or reject the text. This notion offers a ground to 'reader-oriented criticism' later.⁶³ The basic method which Barthes uses in his textural analysis of Genesis 32:22-32 is largely derived from that which he developed in *S/Z*, though he makes no use of all five codes to analyse the text. His procedure in discussing Jacob's struggle is to analyse the text under two categories, a "sequential analysis" (textual analysis) and a "structural analysis". The former point should be emphasized, for in his sequential analysis (of surface structures) Barthes' method and conclusions are closer to the world of biblical studies. The latter analysis utilizes concepts derived from Propp and Greimas, partly because their methods are as appropriate to ancient texts as to modern. He is one of the first to apply the structural method deriving from Propp and Greimas to biblical narrative, but he abandoned structuralism towards the end of his life, referring to the impossibility of establishing a universal network of relations characteristic of narratives⁶⁴.

The above mentioned survey of structuralists and their theory offers us some major principles and assumptions of structuralism that they can share. These assumptions can provisionally be summarized in the following points.⁶⁵ First, the appearance in human conduct

⁶³ Ibid., p. 4.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 5f.; cf. Greenwood, op.cit., P. 41; Edgar V. Mcknight, *The Bible and the Reader: An Introduction to Literary Criticism*, Philadelphia: Rortress Press, 1985, p. 56.

⁶⁵ Cf. Robert A. Spivey, *Structuralism and Biblical Studies: The Uninvited Guest, Interpretation* 28, 1974, p. 134; Chales E. Reagan & David Stewart, *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, Boston: Beacon Press., 1978, pp. 109f.; Jean Pouillon, *Structuralism: A Definitional Essay*, in: Alfred M. Johnson (ed.), *Structuralism and Biblical Hermeneutics: A Colliction of Essays*, Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1979, pp. 29-52.

and affairs is not reality. Thus any phenomenon which is seen ought to be reinterpreted by deep structure which exists behind and below it. Second, reality is structured. It presupposes that the structure is what an internal analysis of the totality reveals--the elements, relationships between the elements, and the arrangement or system of these relationships themselves. An understanding of mutual dependence of the elements is stressed: "Il n'y a pas d'être, ni d'individu, sans structure, et c'est ici que prendra place l'analyse structurale."⁶⁶ Third, the structuring is code-like, i.e., human activity expresses deep structure with signs. Reality can be approached or apprehended in the level of the codes seen as different terms like convention, grammar, etc. Fourth, structuralists pursue a plurality of the meaning of a text, for the text which has more than one deep structures bears its life. Fifth, structuralism itself is ahistoric in nature. Structuralists' first concerns are not the author's intention and historical background of the text but its meaning obtained by analysis of relationships. This character is interlocked with formalism.⁶⁷ Sixth, structuralists tend to look for functional oppositions in whatever material they are studying: "all structures within which meaning can be generated, whatever they be linguistic, social or aesthetic, can be analysed in terms of pairs of opposites."⁶⁸ These above mentioned assumptions actually imply that structuralism itself is a kind of world view related to the philosophical perspective of the likes of Hegel, Marx and Freud.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Henri Cazelles, *Écriture Parole et Esprit; trois aspects de l'herméneutique biblique*, Paris: Desclée, 1971, p. 99.

⁶⁷ Cf. Paul R. House, op.cit., p. 13.

⁶⁸ John Barton, op.cit., p. 111.

⁶⁹ Cf. Spivey, op.cit., p. 137; Hugh C. White, *French Structuralism and OT*

Structuralism made a great appeal to Marxists, because it offered the possibility of applying their deterministic theories to literature.⁷⁰

A variety of structuralist methodologies are offered in relation to the view that structuralists see the text as a manifestation of various kinds of structures, and analyses it in terms of these structures. However, the different kinds of methodology that each structuralist contends in his own way are converged to a general emphasis on the synchronic and paradigmatic rather than the diachronic and syntagmatic, and to attempt finding the meaning of the texts and deep-structure through its relationship.

The more specific term "structural analysis" prevailed in the domain of biblical study appears to signify almost any kind of textual-analytical work. Structural analysts, at least with reference to the system known as structuralism, would agree that the structure of language is in some way central to reality. Finding the reality reflected by structure is the true goal of analysis. It is not always clear that biblical scholars using the methods of structuralism fully share this assumption, but in its purest form that is what structuralism implies.

The first experiments in biblical structural analysis were carried out on Genesis, perhaps because it was felt that this, compared to other books of the Bible, most closely resembles the genres of fairy tale and myth. One of the first scholars to use the method deriving from Propp and Greimas was R. Barthes. In *La lutte avec*

Narrative Analysis: Roland Barthes, *Semeia* 3, 1975, pp. 100, 120; Pettit, op.cit., p. 78; Carl E. Armerding, *The Old Testament and Criticism*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1983, p. 71.

⁷⁰ Cf. Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation: Past and Present*, Leicester: Apollon, 1996, pp. 486f.

l'ange, he attempted to test the implications of the grammatical approach in narrative to the context of biblical narrative, specifically Gen. 32:22-32. He begins with the assumption that structural "analysis endeavours to 'see' each particular text in its difference - which does not mean in its ineffable individuality, for this difference is 'woven' in familiar codes; it conceives the text as taken up in an *open* network which is the very infinity of language, itself structured without closure".⁷¹ But he maintains that this attempt is merely a 'way of proceeding.' His essay is made up of two parts: Sequential Analysis and Structural Analysis. In the first part, he observes three sequences: the Crossing (vv. 22-24), the Struggle (vv. 24-29), and the Namings (vv. 27-32). It should be noted, incidentally, that there is some degree of textual overlap in these sequences, where Barthes' first procedure is to examine the pattern of the major actions found in the Jacob story, and then to reconstruct the structure of the sequences. In his progress to explain the structure making parallel series, he indicated that there is structural paradox: "A, who gave the blow, is not the victor ... the sequence then take an unexpected course".⁷² The combat *marks* one of the combatants. The structural meaning of the episode is that a situation of balance is disturbed by the unlikely victory of one of the participants. In the second part, he subjects the narrative to the kinds of approach established by Propp and Greimas⁷³. The originator could step in and help the hero defeat his opponent. A magical helper could appear to transport Jacob away. But what actually

⁷¹ Roland Barthe, *Image Music Text*, Essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath, London: Fontana Press, 1977, pp. 126f.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 129-133.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 137-141.

occurs is in effect unexpected. Finally, Jacob recognizes that his opponent is no other than God himself. Barthes' structural analysis reveals how and why Genesis 32:22-32 is a tale of the unexpected.

In *Genesis as Myth*, Edmund Leach uses Lévi-strauss' structural analysis of myth in order to highlight the permanent mythical structures behind Genesis. He maintains that "in every mythical system we will find a persistent sequence of binary discriminations" between such opposites as gods and men, mortal and, immortal, good and bad, male and female, etc. Likewise, Genesis presents such common oppositions: Heaven and Earth, Light and Darkness, Man and Garden, Tree of Life and Tree of Death, and so on. He concludes that "every myth is one of a complex" and "any pattern which occurs in one myth will recur, in the same or other variations, in other parts of the complex".

In relation to structural analysis of biblical narrative, Luis Alonso-Schökel advocates systematically doing research on style in the field of the Old Testament: *stilistische Analyse*. He concretely designs two *sich geschlossene Erzählungen* from the book of Judges in view of the deeper-going style.⁷⁴ Furthermore he offers some fundamental *methodische Erwägungen*, and deals with the relationship between *Stilanalyse und Quellenkritik* in four points; Surprisingly, the relationship is depicted as complementary rather than substitutionary.⁷⁵ He also refers to relation of *Gattungsforschung* to *Stilanalyse*: "Gattungsforschung ist für unsere Kenntnis des Alten Testaments ergiebiger als Stilanalyse; aber beide gehören zusammen

⁷⁴ L. Alonso-Schökel, *Erzählkunst im Buche der Richter*, *Biblica* 42, 196, pp. 148-167.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 167ff.

und werden am reichsten gedeihen, wenn sie Hand in Hand gehen..."⁷⁶ This attitude is positively estimated in that he, as a style- and structural analyst, took a constructive stance in the dialogue with the traditio-historical criticism in biblical scholarship.⁷⁷ However the problem seems to be how to harmonize two conflicting concepts: "C'est cette diachronie qui, pour une théologie des traditions, donne à penser."⁷⁸ His study on prophets (1960) based on *stilistische Analyse* is an analytical research on small and large compositional units, which are understood as "eine von der Betrachtung der Ganzheit ausgehende und zur Deutung der Ganzheit hingerichtete Untersuchung. Es handelt sich also um Gestalt, um innere Form, um Stil im modernen Sinn des 'Werkstls.'"⁷⁹ He suggested parallel structures of some verses from Isaiah, seemingly related to „*handwerkliche Tradition* (Is. 40:9; 9:2; 40:4; 30:9ff. etc.).⁸⁰ In the study of Psalms, Alonso-Schökel asserts that the first person, singular form "I" in Psalms does not mention so much the author of the Psalm as it does the third person whom the author supposes, resting on the theory of 'poetry of situation' belonging to modern literary theory.⁸¹ He seems to be oblivious of the fact that the Psalm is ancient poetry bearing a

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 171f.

⁷⁷ R. Oost, *Omsreden Bijbeluitleg: Aspecten en achtergronden van de hermeneutische discussie rondom de exegese van het Oude Testament in Nederland*, Kampen: Kok, 1987, p. 119.

⁷⁸ Ricœur, 1973:49; cf. Daniel Patte, *What is Structural Exegesis?*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979, pp. 9-17.

⁷⁹ L. Alonso-Schökel, *Die stilistische Analyse bei den Propheten*, in: *VTS 7* (Congr. Vol. Oxford 1959), Leiden, 1960, p. 161.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 156-158.

⁸¹ L. Alonso-Schökel, *Psalm 42-43: A response to Ridderbos and Kessler*, *JSOT* 1, 1976, pp. 62f.

religious aim, distinguished from modern 'pure' art. These works are good examples reflecting his structural and literary tendency in biblical study.

The French structuralist, Paul Beauchamp (1969), owing a great deal to the literary methodology of his Roman teacher Alonso-Schökel, contributed to structural analysis of the creation narrative in his book *Création et séparation*. The title itself appears to reflect the theory of binary opposition of Lévi-Strauss, but such contrast is apparently not considered as important as is anticipated. His lengthy first chapter is devoted to the literary composition of Genesis 1, in which the ten words and the seven days of creation form a framework for discussion of various themes in a variety of contexts. On the basis of assumption that the creating work does not follow a chronological order, he laid emphasis on artificiality and refinement by numbering words: The fourth day finishes the first half, by the government of the stars, just as the sixth day finishes the second half by the government of mankind. It is noticed that the total of words (207 + 206 = 413) is a multiple of 7 (7 x 59); by adding 7 x 3 for 1:1-2 and 7 x 5 for 2:1-3, one gets 7 x 63 for the first tablet.⁸² For him the meaning of text depends on its internal structure.

In *Narrative Art in Genesis*, Dutch scholar J.P. Fokkelman (1975) studies two of the "smallest literary units" (Gen. 11:1-9; Gen. 28:10-22), and then examines an "extended complex of about fifteen scenes" (Gen. 25-35) in terms of a "stylistic and structural analysis". In the Tower of Babel story, he regards the pun on "Babel" as a "gate

to the story and primarily to its sound stratum."⁸³ He suggests the parallel symmetry to elucidate the meaning of the story: men (a. natural unity, b. plan, c. building, d. making a name, e. hope to avert a dispersion) and God (a. observing their unity, b. thwarts their plan, c. the abandonment of the building, d. resulting in an anti-name, e. dispersion).⁸⁴ In the research on the narrative of the book of Samuel not belonging to *Thronnachfolgegeschichte*, he shows a variety of structures like parallelism and chiasmus in the narratives on the basis of synchronic description. He refers to style and structure of the seven sequences in the first chapter in which the fourth is the central sequence which should be emphasised highlighted (vv.12-18).⁸⁵ In the process of analysis, he found different binary oppositions: Peninnah/Hannah, the passive Eli/the active Hannah, taking/relinquishing, etc. According to him, a stylistic analysis which exposes the basic forms of the symmetry provides the key to the meaning. Form has communicated content.

In a series of articles Robert Culley endeavoured to develop a structural analysis in his own way. Culley (1972) initially offers a critique of E. Leach. Recognizing that Leach follows Lévi-Strauss in denying that surface structure contains the key to analysis, Culley asked if anyone not committed to a view of the all-pervasive role of binary opposites would also discover the deep structures discovered by Leach in the Garden of Eden narrative. For him structural analysis

⁸³ J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis*, Assen and Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975, p. 13.

⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 20-23.

⁸⁵ J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, Vol. IV, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993, pp. 14-74.

⁸² Paul Beauchamp, *Création et séparation: étude exégétique du chapitre premier de la Genèse*, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1969, pp. 17-31.

"directs attention rather to exploring other kinds of patterns in the text relating to things like narrative action, the relationships of characters, as well as many other aspects of texts such as temporal and spatical frameworks."⁸⁶ He illustrates his method in an analysis of three group of brief biblical stories: miracle, deception, and punishment stories. In the miracle stories he finds a common pattern, "problem-miracle/solution," while in the seven deception stories the pattern is "problem-deception/solution."⁸⁷ In attempting to move from the surface to the deep structures, he finds a fundamental opposition between life and earth in each group of stories. Although his study is linked with Lévi-Strauss' theory, his emphasis on the surface of the text is convincing, which appears that on narrative criticism. In his work on Job, R. Polzin speaks of "three elements which we would consider fundamental to a structural analysis," the "framework," the "code," and "message" of the book. He relates these categories to the structural distinctions of Greimas, Jakobson and Barthes.⁸⁸ The three steps are made up of a process to determine the meaning of the text, namely the first step as large units offers four "movements" which correspond to four functions in the story; the second shows the procedure to pass from the surface structures to the "deep structures" which is reality; the third step treats meaning of the book.⁸⁹ In the revised article on Job issued in 1977, he applied Lévi-Strauss' formula

⁸⁶ Robert C. Culley, *Structural Analysis: Is it Done with Mirrors?*, Interpretation 28, 1974, p. 169.

⁸⁷ Robert C. Culley, *Themes and Variations in Three Groups of OT Narratives*, Semeia 3, 1975, pp. 3-13.

⁸⁸ Robert Polzin, *The Framework of the Book of Job*, Interpretation 28, 1974, p. 187.

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 190, 200, 188.

to the study on the framework of the book of Job more concretely and meticulously.⁹⁰ The method of the three steps was also employed in his study of Genesis 12, 20, and 26 which provides a fine example of thematic or stylistic analysis⁹¹: first, lack of wealth and progeny, second, according to the structural laws wealth, progeny, and blessing by God can be linked with the patriarchal narratives, third, the blessing is related to the will of Yahweh. It is of my opinion that the message of the texts surpasses the focus on wealth and progeny Polzin lays: it is concerned with God's promise.

Jobling is one of the structuralists who in the clearest way applied the structural theory of the precursors like Propp, Lévi-Strauss and Greimas to the analysis of biblical narrative. Following Greimas' *actantial* schema, he offered an *actantial* model for 1 Samuel 13-31 to expose the role of Jonathan and the structure of the text: Yahweh (Sender) - David (Receiver); Philistines and Jonathan (Helper) - Saul (Jonathan); David (Subject) - Saul's kingship (Object).⁹² In a structural analysis of Numbers 11-12, he largely employed the theory of binary opposition of Lévi-Strauss: Egypt/Canaan; rebellion/faith; outside camp/tent of meeting; impure/pure; sickness/health; prophet/priest, etc.⁹³ In the study of Gen. 2-3, he (1986) probes the myth of the fall to lay bare its deep structure, in which woman is the mediating principle between the binary oppositions: man and animal. In the

⁹⁰ Polzin, Robert, *Biblical Criticism*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977, pp. 75-83.

⁹¹ Robert Polzin, 'The Ancestress of Israel' in Danger, Semeia 3, 1975, pp. 81-96.

⁹² David Jobling, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament (1 Samuel 13-31, Numbers 11-12, 1 Kings 17-18)*, JSOTSS, 7, Sheffield: JSOT, 1978, p. 15.

⁹³ Ibid., pp. 26-62.

structure, it is described that the myth of the fall functions to avoid censuring God and man for life's difficulties by making their contraries, the serpent and the woman, responsible, but it does so at the cost of attributing to man an unwanted passivity while justifying patriarchal power, a contradiction which the story serves to obscure.

With regard to biblical study, structuralism can aid exegesis in two ways: it is seen as an important methodology for the holistic appreciation of the final form of a text, and it explores and makes explicit the conventions of biblical literature in order to understand the message it intends to carry. At same time, structuralism contains some pitfalls as follows⁹⁴: 1. Structuralist methodologies do not take into account the inspired nature of the biblical text. The fact that the biblical authors wrote as they did was not primarily the result of grammatical forces. On the contrary, the biblical authors knowingly or unknowingly were recipients of divine guidance. 2. Structural analysis ignores and obliterates the figure of the author. With result that a text is interpreted from a perspective different from the original author's. No biblical author had a structuralist perspective. Thus structural method may have to remain in the level of analysis rather than interpretation. 3. There is an arbitrariness and subjectivity about some structural classifications. This leads to varied results of an analysis of a text, depending on which scholars and "schools" are doing the analysis. There is no objective or correct solution in structural method. 4. It is difficult to agree with the notion that the

⁹⁴ Cf. Greenwood, op.cit., p. 118; Longman, op.cit., 1987, pp. 47-58; 1997, pp. 108f.; Mark W.G. Stibbe, Structuralism, in: R.J. Coggins & J.L. Houlden (eds.), *Dictionary*, 1990, p. 654.

meaning and content of a text depends on its structure. For it is possible to reason that different meaning and contents are seen in same structure and vice versa. 5. Some structuralist analyses of narrative in the Bible are quite esoteric in a way that obscures rather than illuminates the meaning of a text. Following the method of Lévi-Strauss, Polzin summarizes the message of the book of Job with the following math-like formula: $F_x(a): F_y(b) = F_x(b):F_{a-1}(y)$.⁹⁵ 6. Structuralists have the tendency to deny or to limit severely any referential function to literature. It implies that the Bible as a literary text does not refer outside of itself and makes no reference to history. This position leads on the part of some to a complete or substantial denial of a historical approach to the text. The a-historical approach of the style- and structure method of analysis does not do justice to the specific character of Old Testament literature.⁹⁶ It, nevertheless, appears to be undesirable to attempt mixing historico-literary criticism with structural analysis which is increasing in some circles of biblical study.⁹⁷ Such an attempt to mix two in biblical studies leads to the fact that the structural analysis has turned out to be much the same as form criticism, with only a few additional details.⁹⁸

The possibility of using structural analysis on a biblical text rests on how it is applied to exegesis in order to avoid the above mentioned pitfalls and presuppositions which conflict the character of the biblical text. In spite of its value, the most important question is

⁹⁵ Polzin, Robert, *Biblical Criticism*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977, pp. 77-83.

⁹⁶ W. Richter, *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft: Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie und Methodologie*, Göttingen, 1971, p. 187.

⁹⁷ Paul Ricœur, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, *Semeia* 4, 1975, p. 29.

⁹⁸ Cf. Bray, op.cit., p. 487.

whether approaches based upon modern theories of linguistics and literature can readily be applied to Old Testament texts, since it cannot be assumed beforehand that these texts are so constituted that they have a structural unity, and if they do, to what extent.

3. Rhetorical Criticism

An attempt to describe the kind of literary approach which operates without structuralist philosophical presuppositions was made in "rhetorical criticism" proposed by Muilenburg.⁹⁹ This criticism, as a matter of fact, has its provenance in facing substantial limitations in source criticism and form criticism, such as source criticism's tendency to use literary criteria derived from modern culture as a basis for finding inconsistencies in the biblical text and separating it into earlier sources, or source criticism's tendency to dice the biblical text into tiny components. Muilenburg, especially observed that form criticism had run its course, though he noted the significance and merits of form criticism that exist for Old Testament studies.¹⁰⁰ He seeks another method which should be consistent enough to illuminate every literary type in Scripture, and which should reveal the individual qualities of single texts. His method is concerned with finding the writer's thought woven into linguistic patterns and formulations, that is to say, he believes that language and style may reveal as much about an author's intentions as that author's historical situation: "And this leads me to formulate a canon which should be obvious to us all:

⁹⁹ James Muilenburg, *Form Criticism and Beyond*, *JBL* 88, 1969, p. 8.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-4.

a responsible and proper articulation of the words in their linguistic patterns and in their precise formulations will reveal to us the texture and fabric of the writer's thought, not only what it is that he thinks, but as he thinks it."¹⁰¹ His method being helpful to grasp intention and meaning with a thorough examination of linguistic patterns and artistic texture is called rhetorical criticism: "What I am interested in, above all, is in understanding the nature of Hebrew literary composition, in exhibiting the structural patterns that are employed for the fashioning of a literary unit, whether in poetry or in prose, and in discerning the many and various devices by which the predications are formulated and ordered into a unified whole. Such an enterprise I should describe as rhetoric and the methodology as rhetorical criticism."¹⁰² In short, the goal of rhetorical criticism is to expose the author's basic intention or intentions of the text through a procedure that examines how the single unit shifts or breaks in the development in the writer's thought and how the writer's thought progress should be charted from one unit to the next, as Muilenburg illustrates some biblical pericopes like Jeremiah 3:1-4:4, Judges 5:19-21, Psalm 22, etc.¹⁰³

Rhetorical criticism for Old Testament study, in the functional aspect, can be defined as a form of literary criticism which uses our knowledge of the conventions of literary composition practiced in ancient Israel and its environment to discover and analyse the particular literary artistry found in a specific unit of Old Testament text. This definition implies that rhetorical critics wish to avoid the trap of judging the literary artistry of the Old Testament by modern or

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-18.

contemporary literary standards, which often are quite different than those used in ancient Israel. They are interested in studying the literary artistry of a particular unit in the context of literary artistry as practiced in ancient Israel, and studying the impact that the literary piece being analysed would have had on an ancient Israelite audience. This character of rhetorical criticism has proclivity to be interwoven with structural analysis and stylistics: it is reflected in the works of the likes of Exum (1973), Boadt (1973), Fokkelman (1981) and Clines, Gunn and Hauser (1982).

Two works (Warner; Patrick and Scult) published in 1990, however, show stress on distinctive character of rhetoric in some way as well, because they regard rhetoric as the ways by which the persuasive strategies employed in the biblical text relate to their preoccupations with religious and historical truth, and means by which a text establishes its relationship to its audience in order to achieve a particular effect.¹⁰⁴ In the elaborated study on the book of Job, Van der Lugt suggested rhetorical criticism as a 'fresh' approach, by propounding four reasons to support the necessity for a renewed investigation of the rhetorical framework of Hebrew poetry: 'strophic' structure; formal devices; strophes, canticles and cantos; and formal aspects as a starting point.¹⁰⁵ As the major aim of his study is to investigate the poetic structures of the speeches in the book of Job, his primary concern lies in elucidation of verbal structure with rhetorical analysis. It is felt that this kind of analysis is not only limited to a

¹⁰⁴ M. Warner, *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*, London: Routledge, 1990, p. 1; Patrick, D. and A. Scult, *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990, p. 12.

¹⁰⁵ P. van der Lugt, *Rhetorical Criticism & the Poetry of the Book of Job*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995, pp. 31-34.

literary genre like poetic writing, but still remains in distance of biblical exegesis, though his exhaustive analysis of the texts is useful for understanding the biblical texts. In New Testament study, Kennedy first developed rhetorical methodology. His methodology has a number of interrelated stages: Determination of the rhetorical unit; Examination of the rhetorical situation; Consideration of the rhetorical arrangement of the text; Analysis of the devices of style; and Evaluation of the rhetorical effectiveness of the rhetorical unit.¹⁰⁶ This methodology has become influential as a starting point for rhetorical analysis.

Rhetorical criticism appears to have some merit in that it provides access to the purposive and persuasive nature of the author's utterance. It can thus open up the rhetorical vision in given texts, and so fire the reader's imagination and elicit response.¹⁰⁷ The original situation of biblical texts shows that the text was not always intended to be read but often to be listened to by an audience. It is true that it is helpful for the reader to know what the original audience may have understood. But a limitation of rhetorical criticism lies in the question of how we can explain a case in such a manner that the modern reader appears to understand it better than what the original audience may have understood. Primary concerns of rhetorical criticism, furthermore, are not so much in *what* (meaning or content) as in *how* (means or way) like other methodologies of literary criticism. The question, thus, lies in to what extent *how* can reach for *what*. The

¹⁰⁶ G.A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1984, pp. 33-38.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. J.I.H. McDonald, Rhetorical Criticism, in: R.J. Coggins & J.L. Houlden (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, London: SCM Press, 1990, p. 600.

fact that House circumspected rhetorical criticism to the first period (1969-1974) of literary criticism of the Old Testament seems to imply that the methodology affected Old Testament studies less successfully,¹⁰⁸ though a number of rhetorical studies on the Bible have been issued after the period.

4. Narrative Criticism

Narrative criticism is a method of interpreting biblical narratives with the help of modern and ancient literary theory. It approaches the biblical narrative as a literary text that may be analysed in literary terms like other works of literature. Although Powell thinks of narrative criticism as an independent movement in its own right, apart from secular literary movement,¹⁰⁹ this criticism is basically subsumed under the broader label 'literary criticism'.¹¹⁰ The goal of narrative criticism is to read the text as an *implied reader* who is presupposed by the narrative itself, and who is distinct from any real, historical reader, but is rather a hypothetical concept. Whereas the concrete concept of an *implied reader* can not be set up, the idea is considered as the interpretive principle by the narrative critic. With regard to the aim, narrative criticism tends to focus on the text understanding and thus regards the real author and the real reader as

¹⁰⁸ House, op.cit., p. 4.

¹⁰⁹ Powell, Mark Allan, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990, p. 19.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Tannehill, Robert C., Narrative Criticism, in: R.J. Coggins & J.L. Houlden (eds.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, London: SCM Press, 1990, p. 488.

extrinsic to the communication act that transpires within the text itself. This concept of the implied reader, the reader in the text, moves narrative criticism away from being a purely reader-centered type of criticism and makes it a more text-centered approach.¹¹¹ Narrative as a literary type has two aspects: *story* (the content of narrative) composed of events, characters, settings, and plots; *discourse* referring to the rhetoric of the narrative. Unlike other literary method, narrative has the concept of time in the level of plot: 'plot is a sequence of actions often explicitly connected in terms of cause and effect, leading from an initial situation, through complication, to some sense of resolution or 'revelation'.¹¹² Because narrative critics, however, tend to think that the reader is guided through devices intrinsic to the process of storytelling, they are interested in some basic elements respecting to how the story is told like another literature: point of view, narrator, rhetorical devices, narrative patterns.¹¹³

To put narrative criticism concretely, it is necessary to compare it with its closer methodologies as follows: while narrative criticism is like structuralism in that it is also a text-centered approach to literature, the two methods are distinctive in that narrative criticism is more concerned with defining the surface meaning of the story than with discovering deep structures that undergird it. While narrative criticism is similar to rhetorical criticism in that it also is interested in discerning the effect that a work has on its reader and in explicating

¹¹¹ Powell, op.cit., pp. 19ff.

¹¹² David M. Gunn & Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University, 1993, p. 2.

¹¹³ Cf. Powell, op.cit., pp. 23-34; Grant R. Osborne, *The hermeneutical Spiral*, Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 1991, pp. 154-164.

the reason of this effect; they differ in that narrative criticism interprets the text from the perspective of an idealized *implied reader*, and in narrative criticism it is less necessary to know the historical situation of the actual readers for whom the text was originally intended.

As the tendency of narrative gives impact to biblical narrative, biblical narrative is in general written using certain recurrent literary techniques, which become apparent when one examines the following main feature of biblical narrative; its use of patterns of gaps and variation of repetition, its presentation of narrative events out of chronological sequence, and its selectivity in what the reader is told.¹¹⁴ When the general theory of narrative criticism is applied to interpretation of biblical narrative, one seems to be able to overcome some problems issued in another interpretive methodologies. For instance, in historical criticism the patterns of gaps and variation of repetition are seen as indications of a composite narrative, a secondary compilation of earlier sources. But for narrative critics those are very common in narratives and understood as an inherent device of the text, a strategy of the narrator¹¹⁵: "it is a key to perception, to interpretation."¹¹⁶ In narrative criticism the historicity of biblical narrative is not expunged in the process of the presentation of the narrative events out of chronological sequence, in the development of the plot, unlike other literary movements in secular literary criticism that repudiate the

¹¹⁴ Cf. Philip E. Satterthwaite, *Narrative Criticism: The Theological Implications of Narrative Techniques*, in: Willem A. Van Gemeren (ed.), *NIDOTTE I*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1997, p. 125.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987, pp. 138ff., 242-247.

¹¹⁶ Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983, p. 136.

significance of historical investigation for the interpretation of texts. Furthermore, narrative criticism can overcome the problem of redaction criticism which tries to seek the theology of a biblical writer, because narrative critics investigate the narrator's control of narrative time, including order, duration and frequency. Such investigation can reveal how the narrator evaluates and what he selectively emphasizes as the story is told.

These apparent advantages, however, are not always operational as an actual merit in biblical study: In order to create a coherent narrative, narrative critics generally have to select and reorder events, as well as extrapolate the similarities and differences extant between them, because although narrative criticism tends to view the narrative as an interactive whole, it does not view the given text of the Bible as a whole. The process of such reconstruction, in a sense, appears to be similar to that of historical criticism. In many cases, the historicity of biblical narrative is, indeed, undermined or disregarded in expounding biblical narratives on the basis of narrative criticism. Alter sees biblical narrative as "historicized prose fiction."¹¹⁷ For him the book of Esther is "in fact a kind of fairytale."¹¹⁸ Sometimes narrative critics take an ambiguous position on time and history. Ricoeur distinguishes between mortal time in which the characters of a story live out their lives is measured by calendars, watches and monumental time which refers to the broad sweep of time that includes but also transcends history.¹¹⁹ This notion of time seems to

¹¹⁷ Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, New York: Basic Books, INC, Publishers, 1981, p. 24.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

¹¹⁹ Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, Vol. 2, 3, Chicago: University of Chicago

reflect Neo-orthodox view of history. In nature narrative criticism usually pertains not so much to theological statement as to the narrator's control, but theological and dogmatical statements have a place in narrative criticism, in the case that biblical narratives mainly suggest such utterances (e.g. Ex. 3; Matt. 16:16).

Like another literary methodologies, narrative criticism requires a high level of literary technic in its application to biblical interpretation. A full understanding of biblical narrative can only be achieved with the assistance of the kind of professional expertise that only a trained literary critic can offer. Indeed, it is too laborious or sometimes impossible for non-specialist, or even specialists to grasp the concept of the terms like real author, implied author, narrator, narratee, text, narrative, implied reader and real reader and to discern their relationships.¹²⁰ Narrative criticism regards the role of the narrator as important whom the *implied* author employed to tell the story. While for Powell the narrator's relationship with the implied author and the real author is not clear, Alter and Sternberg may opine that the biblical narrator is reliable and authoritative and not to be distinguished from the author.¹²¹ Alter considers the biblical narrator as "omniscient," for he is presumed to know what God knows, as on occasion they may remind us by reporting God's assessments and intentions, or even what He says to Himself: "We are never in serious doubt that the biblical narrator knows all there is to know" (Alter, *idem*, 1986; 1988).

¹²⁰ Cf. Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University, 1978, p. 151; Osborne, *op.cit.*, p. 155.

¹²¹ Powell, *op.cit.*, p. 25; Alter, *op.cit.*, pp. 155-177; Sternberg, *op.cit.*, pp. 380ff.

about the motives and feelings, the moral nature and spiritual condition of his characters, but, as we have seen on repeated occasions, he is highly selective about sharing this omniscience with his readers."¹²² It is of my opinion that the narrator is not necessarily to be "omniscient", but as much as he is just *inspired* by the Holy Spirit. Otherwise confusion between author and narrator will not disappear. Biblical narrative is a superb work of art in its own right as a form of literary art, but strictly speaking, it hardly follows the structure of narrative by modern literary theory: exposition, complication, crisis, climax and resolution.¹²³ This fact implies that it is not always appropriate to analyse the biblical narratives by methods normally used for the study of modern fiction. It, thus, will be an unilateral statement that the full meaning of the text can only be apprehended when its literary qualities are appreciated. Narrative criticism tends to evoke readers excessive imagination from biblical narrative and to dramatize the narrative in the terms that it is literature. It is doubtful that the rich imagination of the reader helps him to distill the actual message from the biblical narrative: Kaiser too warns against this point.¹²⁴ Powell enumerates the benefits of narrative criticism: 1. Narrative criticism focuses on the text of Scripture itself; 2. Narrative criticism provides some insight into biblical texts for which the historical background is uncertain; 3. Narrative criticism provides for checks and balances on traditional methods; 4. Narrative criticism tends to bring scholars

¹²² Alter, *op.cit.*, p. 158.

¹²³ Edgar V. Roberts, *Writing about Literature*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1995, pp. 54f.

¹²⁴ Walter C. Kaiser, Narrative, in: D. Brent Sandy & Ronald L. Giese, Jr., *Cracking Old Testament Codes*, Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1995, pp. 86f.

and nonprofessional Bible readers closer together; 5. Narrative criticism stands in a close relationship to the believing community; 6. Narrative criticism offers potential for bringing believing communities together; 7. Narrative criticism offers fresh interpretations of biblical material; 8. Narrative criticism unleashes the power of biblical stories for personal and social transformation.¹²⁵ In consideration of these statements, it may have to be acknowledged that narrative criticism has not only a rightful place in the pantheon of critical methodologies within the hermeneutical temple, but in some way bears more advantages than other literary approaches. Its merits, however, may be able to prove themselves to be valuable for explication of the biblical narrative only under the premise that the biblical narrative should be regarded as *inspired* narrative. Biblical scholars may have to be interested in narrative approach, not because human beings are storytellers by nature, but because God put his revelation in the vessel of 'narrative.'

5. Reader-Response Criticism

Recently some literary critics have turned their attention away from the author and text towards the reader who comprehends the text, for they believe that reading elicits a response in the reader and thus the reception of literature is active and constructive. In consideration that different readers interpret the same text sometimes similarly, sometimes in vastly different ways, the importance of the reader's role in the production of meaning appears, if meaning is not inherent in the author's intention or in the text itself. The reader, indeed, creates

¹²⁵ Powell, op.cit., pp. 85-91.

the meaning of the text. Reader-response theories call attention to the active role of communities of readers in constructing what for them is what the text means. Reading the text, then, should constitute not an exercise for passive spectators, but an eventful and creative process. According to Iser who sees the reader's activity as filling in the blanks in the text, central to the reading of every literary work is the interaction between the text and the reader.¹²⁶ Though Iser's theory of interplay between text and reader is indirectly drawn from E. Husserl's phenomenology,¹²⁷ it greatly affected biblical interpretation.

McKnight states that the relationship between the reader as subject (acting upon the text) and the reader as object (being acted upon by the text) is not seen as an opposition but as two sides of the same coin.¹²⁸ Thiselton appears to identify a theory of perception which establishes the role of readers in *filling in or completing* a textual meaning with the *concrete actualization of texts within the time-horizons of readers*.¹²⁹ Reader-response criticism focusing on the preunderstanding and ideology of the reader to shape the 'meaning of the text' runs the spectrum. A more radical role of the reader leads to reader's construction of meaning all together. Good examples taking an extreme stance of the reader-response are Liberation Theology, Black Theology, and some post-modern literary criticisms such as political, psychoanalytical, and feminist. Some advocate the

¹²⁶ Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978, pp. 21f., 167-170

¹²⁷ Ibid., pp. 107-134.

¹²⁸ McKnight, op.cit., p. 128.

¹²⁹ Anthony C. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1992, p. 515.

conservative view that highlights the importance of the reader in the interpretive process, but recognizes that the text provides a limit on the reader's interpretation.¹³⁰ In the aspect of contextualization, evangelical scholars are becoming increasingly sensitive to the fact that each reader approaches the Scriptures with certain cultural and personal question and assumptions.¹³¹ The fact that no one person can exhaust the meaning of a literary text, and his gender, race, economic status, religion, education, and so on, will predispose that person to attend to certain aspects of a text. While extreme form of this approach should be declined, caution may, in several points, have to be taken regarding the evangelical view accepting the intense involvement of the reader in the process of exposing Scripture.

First, the expression that no one can approach the biblical text objectively and neutrally cannot do justice to the intense involvement of the interpreter in the process of interpreting the text. It appears to be undesirable to objectify that an inevitable limitation of the reader concerning objectivity makes him to open to subjective explanation of the biblical text. Otherwise, exegesis is likely to be *eisgesis*. Creating the biblical meaning by the reader may intervene to hear the voice of the Holy Spirit in the text. Secondly, reader-response criticism in relating to contextualization frequently confuses interpretation with application (especially for Silva). Longman tends to have broad concept of application: "the interpretation of the biblical text involves its application to the respective contemporary situations."¹³² This tendency is linked with a denial of determinate

¹³⁰ Longman, op.cit., 1997, p. 108.

¹³¹ Cf. Longman, op.cit., 1987, p. 40; Kaiser & Silva, op.cit., pp. 240-245.

¹³² Longman, op.cit., p. 41.

meaning all together. It is hardly persuasive to maintain that the meaning of the biblical text can be changed according to the situations. It is natural that the result of the interpretation is able to be applied in different situations in different way. Interpretation is one thing, application is another. Third, if creating the reader's meaning bears contemporary significance, God's intention in the text will be secondary or meaningless. Those who underpin reader-response criticism may have to acknowledge that 'actualization' is not only stressed in reader-oriented theory. Finally, evangelical scholars positively accepting reader-response criticism should answer this question: to what extent can authorial intention be recognized in finding the meaning of the text? Thus a recent commentary series reflecting the attempt to overcome such flaws of the criticism is intentionally entitled '*Historical Commentary on the Old Testament*': "In contrast to the ahistorical approach of much of contemporary reader-oriented exegesis, in which it is mainly the interaction between the modern reader and the final text that matters, the editors of the *HCOT* are committed to an approach which takes seriously the historical embeddedness of the message of the Old Testament."¹³³

6. Conclusion

As a conclusion of this article, the form of the Bible itself insists that a literary approach is legitimate. Artful presentation of historical events, prophetic utterances, and even more clearly, hymns

¹³³ Marten, J. Mulder, *I Kings*, HCOT, Leuven: Peeters, 1998, p. ix.

of praise and lament demonstrate the need for a literary approach.¹³⁴ However, literary approaches to the Bible should not be treated as a new paradigm that totally replaces past approaches to the text, but rather should be considered as a part of the philological-historical approach, to be used alongside historical and theological methods. Nevertheless, the problem of how the 'a-historical' character of the literary approach is able to be harmonized with historicity of the biblical text still remains, because it is necessary to persist in emphasizing the significance of historical questions and the study of the history of the text as fundamentally important for the understanding of this literature.

Indeed, the main weakness of the literary approach, interesting and important though it is, is that it too frequently puts form before content. Beautiful meaninglessness is preferred above ugly significance - an aesthetic aberration which cannot do justice to the gospel of him who was 'without form or comeliness'. In the Bible, literature is a means to an end, not an end in itself, and literary critics must therefore accept that they can never play more than a secondary role in its interpretation.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ Longman, op.cit., 1997, pp. 113-123.

¹³⁵ Cf. Bray, op.cit., p. 486.

중세에서의 신학과 신학함

Theologie und Theologieren im Mittelalter

- 중세 스콜라 신학의 방법론과
배경에 대한 일고(一考) -

전광식 교수

Prof. Dr. Koang-Sik Chon

- I. 서론
- II. '스콜라 신학'의 개념적 논의
- III. '스콜라 신학'의 본질과 특성
- IV. 스콜라 신학의 방법론
 1. 교회적 권위(auctoritas)
 2. 이성적 사유(ratio)
 3. 수도원적 명상(meditatio)
- V. 스콜라 신학의 배경
 1. Platon-Augustinus 사상
 2. Aristoteles의 사상
 3. 신플라톤주의
- VI. 결론