

From:  
To Each Its Own Meaning  
(Westminster, 1999)  
8

## RHETORICAL CRITICISM AND INTERTEXTUALITY

---

PATRICIA K. TULL

---

Rhetorical criticism, like many forms of biblical interpretation, is understood in a wide variety of ways by scholars of both the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament. This variety in approaches is related not only to the diverse kinds of writings in the Bible, but also to scholarly differences in understanding the nature of language itself. These differences reflect deep divisions that have arisen in recent discussions in the wider field of literature and literary criticism, divisions often having to do with whether, and to what extent, a text may be viewed as a single whole, relatively self-contained, or whether a text must be viewed in relation to its surroundings. Some critics attend primarily to stylistic features or rhetorical devices of the text itself, while others attend in various ways to factors that lie beyond the immediate text. These factors may include the text's having been situated in a dissonant rhetorical environment, the stances that the text anticipates and attempts to address in its audience, and even the text's interactions with subsequent readers and environments unanticipated by the author. Because relationships among texts are so central to many forms of rhetorical criticism, this chapter will include a discussion of the development in current literary theory known as "intertextuality."

### Rhetoric as a Historical Category

From classical times until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, rhetoric was considered the foundation of Western education. Among ancient Greeks, rhetoric was the art of effective communication, often particularized as persuasive public speech. Various handbooks teaching rhetorical technique began to appear by the fifth century B.C.E. In the late fourth century B.C.E., Aristotle cataloged types of rhetoric (judicial, epideictic, deliberative), modes of persuasion (logos, ethos, pathos), and steps in the compositional process (invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery). His structures became the basis for the teaching of rhetoric for many centuries.

This tradition passed into the Roman world, was developed particularly by Cicero in the first century B.C.E. and in turn deeply influenced many Christian patristic writers who had themselves been educated in the rhetorical tradition. Most notable among these was Augustine, who in his *On Christian Doctrine* borrowed from Cicero to develop his own theory of Christian rhetoric, and interpreted the letters of Paul as having drawn upon classical rhetorical style.

The subject of rhetoric developed throughout the Middle Ages. The category of "style" in particular became a subject of great interest as rhetoricians amassed lengthy lists of stylistic devices and ornaments intended to beautify speech. As the Enlightenment progressed, however, interest in rhetoric declined. This was partly due to the increasing focus on style to the neglect of argumentation, which led to a view of rhetoric as chiefly ornamental.

The downfall of rhetoric was due primarily, however, to the rise of scientific inquiry and the consequent drive to view knowledge as founded upon observable fact rather than upon logic or persuasion. Whereas classical rhetorical studies had always preserved the insight that language "invented" (or in more recent terminology, "constructed") perceptions of reality, during the Enlightenment scientific language came to be privileged as referential speech conveying certain knowledge about a world objectively perceived. Nonscientific language was relegated to categories of poetry, self-expression, and propaganda (thus the modern phrase, which the ancients would not have understood: "mere rhetoric"). Rhetoric came to be understood as a subcategory describing the stylistic features of language that were subjective or persuasive, and therefore inferior to scientific language. As a result, by the beginning of this century rhetoric had been dropped from university curricula altogether or relegated to courses on writing skills offered by English departments to college freshmen.

No more than a generation after its demise, rhetoric began to be resurrected by theorists such as Chaim Perelman, Kenneth Burke, I. A. Richards, and Richard Weaver. These scholars sought to restore the term "rhetoric" to its ancient fullness as characteristic of all speech, not merely the poetic and ornamental. Yet whereas classical rhetoric concentrated on prescriptions for effective speaking, the "new rhetoric," as it is called, deals more broadly with theories of discourse and epistemology, investigating the relationships among language, persuasion, knowledge, and social control.

Many have attended to the question left open by ancient rhetoricians regarding the nature of the links between language and knowledge. In doing so, they have come to view rhetoric and persuasion as inherent in all forms of communication—as the means by which common understanding and knowledge are both achieved and transformed within a society. This has allowed the critique of forms of discourse that purport to be

nonrhetorical, universal statements, and has led to a recognition of speech as inevitably value-laden. Naturally this work has involved investigations not only of scientific and political language but also of religious truth claims.

In addition, great emphasis has been placed on the dialogical interaction of language with its rhetorical contexts. I. A. Richards, for instance, claimed that words are meaningful only within a wider discourse (not in isolation), and that people understand them only in reference to their previous experiences of the same expressions. When contexts change, interpretation is altered. These concepts developed by twentieth-century rhetoricians are crucial for understanding the range of studies that fall under the umbrella of rhetorical criticism in biblical studies.

### Rhetoric as Literary Artistry

The entrance of the term "rhetorical criticism" into biblical studies is related only indirectly to the fortunes of the discipline of rhetoric. The birth of interest in rhetorical criticism in biblical studies arose not from a revival of classical rhetoric or interaction with the "new rhetoric," but from dissatisfaction with historical criticism of the Bible.

James Muilenburg was a form critic whose interest in the particular compositional structure of individual Old Testament texts led him to look beyond what he perceived as limitations in the practice of form criticism. In his presidential address at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in 1968, Muilenburg pointed out that in their quest to analyze texts according to catalogs of conventional speech genres, form critics had neglected the texts' own unique qualities.<sup>1</sup> As an antidote to this problem he suggested that "the circumspect scholar will not fail to supplement his form-critical analysis with a careful inspection of the literary unit in its precise and unique formulation."<sup>2</sup>

Muilenburg emphasized analysis of the structural patterns of literary units and discernment of "the many and various devices by which the predication are formulated and ordered into a unified whole."<sup>3</sup> Although he frequently used the term "stylistics" to describe this enterprise, he adopted the term "rhetorical criticism" as an overall designation for his proposed program.<sup>4</sup> Muilenburg called attention to chiasms and inclusios, repetition of key words, strophic structure, repetitions of particles and vocatives, and rhetorical questions, all of which contributed to his perception of Hebrew poetry as unified and carefully wrought, "often with consummate skill and artistry."<sup>5</sup>

While Muilenburg himself viewed rhetorical criticism as a subcategory of form criticism, his suggestions lent official sanction and voice to a movement already gestating within biblical studies. This new trend worked toward a kind of literary analysis that was completely different from what previous

generations of Old Testament scholars had meant by "literary criticism" (that is, source criticism—see chapter 2), but much nearer to the sort of "close reading" that had been practiced in English departments for years. Studies of the stylistic, aesthetic features of biblical texts proliferated very rapidly and came to be known variously as literary criticism, narrative criticism, poetics, and, especially among followers of Muilenburg, rhetorical criticism.

Such work took many of its cues from the earlier, parallel movement in secular literary analysis known as "New Criticism," which similarly resisted appeal to factors beyond a text such as historical or authorial context, and gave close attention to the text's structural and stylistic features. Many practitioners of the new literary criticism in biblical studies followed New Critics in taking a polemical stance against historical criticism and excluding from their discussion all factors lying beyond the immediate text. Extremists among these critics would view the field of biblical studies as bifurcated into a diachronic and synchronic polarity.

As a result of Muilenburg's description of it in terms of stylistics, rhetorical criticism is still viewed in many circles as synonymous with literary criticism.<sup>6</sup> This is particularly true in studies of Hebrew scriptures. Several of Muilenburg's students, most notably Phyllis Tribble and Jack Lundbom, have refined and clarified the enterprise of rhetorical analysis, each building upon his insights in differing ways.

Tribble, for instance, has written *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*, an entire book describing and exemplifying her method.<sup>7</sup> The foundation of her method is this statement, adapted from Muilenburg: "Proper articulation of form-content yields proper articulation of meaning."<sup>8</sup> Stressing the organic unity of form and content, she describes close reading of the parts and whole of a text as full rhetorical analysis. Tribble does not bracket out the findings of historical-critical, sociological, or intertextual analysis when they are useful, but views rhetorical criticism as focusing primarily on an "intrinsic reading" of the text. In her instructions for rhetorical study of a text, Tribble recommends attention to these details of textual construction: the beginning and ending of the text; repetition of words, phrases, and sentences; types of discourse; design and structure; plot development; character portrayals; syntax; particles.

Jack Lundbom's 1973 dissertation, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*,<sup>9</sup> was republished in 1997 along with an introductory essay, written in 1991, entitled "Rhetorical Criticism: History, Method and Use in the Book of Jeremiah."<sup>10</sup> In his essay Lundbom attends not only to the work of Muilenburg but also to the discipline of rhetoric as developed in universities in the past century. In his estimation, "the Muilenburg program appears somewhat narrow"<sup>11</sup> in comparison with the rhetorical criticism practiced in the universities, since it does not concern itself with the audience or

persuasive qualities of speech. "Most of the effort is expended doing close work on the biblical text," Lundbom comments, making the enterprise "little more than an exercise in textual description."<sup>12</sup>

The dissertation itself, which is not revised in the 1997 edition, examines instances of *inclusio* and *chiasm* in the book of Jeremiah and discusses in depth the structure of these stylistic devices. Occasionally these discussions include consideration of a passage's function in Jeremiah's rhetoric, or the possible effects of the rhetoric on Jeremiah's audience. Although anticipating the shift to the more audience-oriented discussion of rhetoric that was soon to come, Lundbom's work on Jeremiah concentrates, in the Muilenburg style, primarily on stylistic concerns.

Muilenburg's impact upon biblical studies cannot be overestimated. His 1956 commentary on Isaiah 40–66 drew much-needed attention to the literary coherence, aesthetic beauty, and structured argumentation of texts that in the hands of other interpreters were being characterized as artless deposits of layers of untidy tradition, awaiting sophisticated and methodologically obscure systems of sorting to rescue them from their own redactors.<sup>13</sup> Muilenburg's thorough familiarity with historical criticism through a lifetime of study enabled him to articulate its shortcomings in convincing ways.

Moreover, the very fact that a well-respected form critic and president of the SBL would point out the excesses of his own discipline and suggest such new directions conferred much-needed legitimation upon literary interests. This legitimation facilitated the acceptance of methods that attended to the biblical texts themselves, leading to a sense of literary appreciation and even pleasure that could be shared by nonspecialists and scholars alike. Ironically, Muilenburg's use of the term "rhetorical criticism" to refer to stylistic analysis reflected the very reduction that had helped signal rhetoric's eclipse in earlier centuries. Still, his reintroduction of the concept of rhetoric into biblical studies soon directed attention both to classical rhetoric and to the work of twentieth-century rhetorical theorists.

### Rhetoric as Persuasion

According to Aristotle, rhetoric is "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion."<sup>14</sup> Muilenburg's use of the term "rhetorical criticism" has inspired many biblical scholars to reexamine such classical definitions of rhetoric. Consequently, many have begun to direct attention to the hortatory nature of much of the Bible—that is, its effort to persuade audiences not merely to appreciate the aesthetic power of its language but, even more importantly, to act and think according to its norms. Thus while rhetorical critics often begin with textual, literary

questions reminiscent of the approaches of the Muilenburg school, many also inquire about the ways in which a text "establishes and manages its relationship to its audience in order to achieve a particular effect."<sup>15</sup>

George Kennedy summarizes the task of New Testament rhetorical criticism as follows: Rhetorical criticism "takes the text as we have it, whether the work of a single author or the product of editing, and looks at it from the point of view of the author's or editor's intent, the unified results, and how it would be perceived by an audience of near contemporaries."<sup>16</sup> In distinction from methods that bracket historical setting, this form of rhetorical criticism draws attention to the contexts in which texts arose and were read. Scholars who view rhetorical criticism in this way are generally more attentive to classical formulations of rhetoric. Consequently, like many traditional interpreters from Augustine on, several contemporary scholars understand parts of the New Testament as having been directly informed by Greek and Roman rhetorical practices. Others do not posit direct relationships to classical rhetoric, but understand it to provide categories that are useful for assessing a text's persuasive features.

George Kennedy begins his book on rhetorical criticism of the New Testament by differentiating his approach from those who investigate stylistics. He emphasizes the orality and linearity of biblical texts as well as the particularities of religious rhetoric (characterized by immediacy, metaphor and imagery, absoluteness and urgency, and authoritative truth claims rather than the logic of inference). In his opinion, the writers of the New Testament may not have received formal training in rhetoric, but they had enough cultural contact with a world dominated by classical rhetorical education to be aware of its norms and practices. Moreover, because the classical formulations were intended to describe not merely Greek practice but all rhetorical categories humanly available, they are apt templates for analysis of texts from all over the world, including the Bible.

For Kennedy, rhetorical analysis involves, first, a determination of the rhetorical unit to be studied; and second, a determination of the rhetorical situation, that is, the condition or situation that invited this utterance, with the particular problem that the author is seeking to overcome. Next comes study of the material's arrangement and its stylistic devices, and finally, a review of the unit's success in addressing the rhetorical problem. Kennedy and others who draw from the classics in analyzing biblical rhetoric tend to focus primarily on the displays of persuasive intentionality within texts. Sensitivity is shown to the text's strategies of argumentation (including stylistic devices) and to the ways in which the author, through the text, posits, persuades, and even rhetorically manipulates the intended audience.

Yehoshua Gitay, in his discussion of Second Isaiah, follows Kennedy in paying close attention to classical models.<sup>17</sup> For Gitay, rhetoric is the art of

pragmatic persuasion—that is, persuasion with a specific pragmatic goal in mind. In his analysis of each of ten units in Isaiah 40–48, Gitay follows classical categories closely, not because he thinks the prophet employed them, but because he sees them as useful for examining and evaluating rhetoric. Each section of Gitay's work begins with structural arguments for viewing a particular passage as a rhetorical unit. Next he analyzes the unit on the basis of its invention, organization, and stylistic features. Many of the details he notes are similar to concerns raised by Muilenburg, but Gitay's focus on pragmatic persuasion leads him to inquire into the intended effects of Second Isaiah's arguments on its audience.

Though he does not appeal to classical categories, Meir Sternberg also sets out to demonstrate the persuasive strategies of biblical authors in relation to their intended audiences.<sup>18</sup> Sternberg's work on narrative, in which he seeks to describe the unique narrative rules governing the Hebrew Bible, displays literary virtuosity in its intricate assessment of the aims and effects of narrative details. In Sternberg's view, the author not only persuades but actually manipulates the audience into accepting certain views of the stories and the characters within them. The narratives display "foolproof composition"; that is, they are created in such a way as to make it "virtually impossible to counterread" them.<sup>19</sup> Readers' responses are controlled by the narrator throughout the reading process.

To Sternberg, biblical narrative is regulated by three principles coexisting in "tense complementarity" with one another: ideology, historiography, and aesthetics. Although one might conclude that these principles would drive the discourse in contradictory directions, Sternberg is convinced that the Bible's ideology is reinforced and underscored by its aesthetic choices. In Sternberg's view, the most important rhetorical goal of biblical narrative is to inculcate in its readers a divine system of norms: By appearing to serve the readers, the narrator seeks the readers' subjugation to God and God's ways. In intricate retellings of biblical stories in which every word and every silence counts, Sternberg shows how the reader is ineluctably drawn into the narrator's ideological orbit—that is, if the reader first lays aside his or her own opinions to "play by the Bible's rules of communication."<sup>20</sup>

As the authors of *The Postmodern Bible* point out, however, most readers do not easily lay aside their own opinions.<sup>21</sup> When Sternberg labors to demonstrate that the biblical narrator has shown Levi and Simeon in a sympathetic light even as they were slaughtering the Shechemites (Genesis 34), these critics observe that Sternberg

puts forth his formidable powers of persuasion to persuade us (Sternberg's readers) that the biblical narrator is a skillful persuader who puts forth his own formidable powers to persuade us (readers of

Genesis) to side with the sons. But if the narrator is so rhetorically powerful, why are there so many readers he has failed to persuade? There is at least the suspicion that the one who wants to persuade readers of Genesis 34 to take a certain view is not the biblical narrator, but Sternberg himself.<sup>22</sup>

Sternberg's equating of his own interpretation with the narrator's intent, and of narrative intent with narrative effect, points to some important issues in rhetorical criticism that cannot be addressed by analysis of the text alone. First, rhetorical criticism (or for that matter any exegetical method) is not simply a kind of criticism; it is also a kind of rhetoric. That is to say, it is essential to take seriously the rhetorical, persuasive, value-laden nature of *all* discourse. The very practice we are analyzing, we are also ourselves exercising, since any stance that an interpreter takes concerning the text is by nature a rhetorical stance. Those of us studying the Bible as rhetoric should be aware of the persuasion that we are practicing as we "present" the persuasive interaction of biblical writers.

Second, the very fact that interpreters must work hard to persuade others of their views should make it clear that not all readers are the ideal readers we may see the text as projecting, nor even the alert and obedient readers the actual writer may have had in mind. In describing the effects of a biblical text upon audiences, Gitay and Sternberg reconstruct from the signals within the text an intended, or authorial, audience, and assess the text's success in persuading this ideal audience. Other scholars who agree on the importance of the audience-directed and persuasive nature of biblical texts do not posit such obedient audiences or unobstructed paths to rhetorical success. According to them, no text, not even the Bible, enters an ideological vacuum waiting expectantly to be filled. Rather, even in the most submissive of readers, even in the readers closest to the authors' own contexts, texts meet assumptions, experiences, questions, and demands that the authors could not have anticipated. Echoes of the claims and language of previously heard texts compete with the new text. Its words, forms, and cadences are recognized from previous encounters in other texts, and this makes them understandable. Yet the connotations imported from other texts by means of these particulars are also what color, bend, and even determine what is heard in the next text.

In other words, many scholars see rhetoric as an open, dialogical, intertextually laden practice, filled with ideological commitments and charges. Without neglecting the style and structure of biblical passages and their persuasive elements, many rhetorical critics also attend to issues lying beyond the boundaries of the text immediately in front of them. Within this category are interpreters with widely diverse methods, goals, and insights.

What they share is a view of texts as arising within, and being read within, contexts in which there is rhetorical tension, contexts filled not only with voices that are similar to that of the text, but also with those that may contradict it. This dialogical atmosphere influences not only the argumentation of the text but also the ways in which it is received by its readers.

Some interpreters train attention on a text's rhetorical environment in order to bring to clearer focus the dialogues into which the text is entering. Others point out the elements in the text that create problems for a unified, assured interpretation or that expose tensions or fissures in the author's own assumptions. Still others note the questions that a less-than-submissive audience may bring to a text. Or, reading from a social location different from that of the author's intended audience, they may offer an ideological critique of the text. Or, by reframing questions asked of the text, they may suggest that the text itself offers critique of some dominant interpretive tradition. In one way or another, such rhetorical critics examine the nature of the text's complex intertextual relationships. To understand better the basis of their work, it is necessary first to explore what is meant by the term "intertextuality."

### Intertextuality as a Property of Texts

Learning a language involves a process of associating new sounds, words, phrases, and grammatical patterns—which at first appear meaningless and opaque—with what is already known. The first time a completely new word is heard it has no meaning; it is only a sound, sometimes indistinctly heard. Upon subsequent hearings it becomes meaningful only insofar as it can be associated with previous recognitions. After several encounters, the sound and its meaning merge so that the concept is called up whenever the word is heard. At that point the brain has so thoroughly connected the sound with the idea that they seem to be naturally, intrinsically connected. But they are not; if they had been, the word would have been recognized on first hearing.

Although most of us do not remember, acquisition of our first language depended upon a structure of associations that built on one another and that were practiced until the associations became so habitual that they were no longer noticed. Every word we acquired was learned within a context that rendered it understandable by association with other words, gestures, and facial expressions. Similarly, every word we recognize in a new text came to us first in another context. Every text we hear or read becomes intelligible by means of association with what has already been heard or read. Moreover, every text we write or speak is constructed from the building blocks of previous texts.

This is true not only on the level of words and grammatical constructions but on the level of much larger complexes of ideas as well. When readers

come to this book on biblical interpretation, for instance, they come with a previously developed concept of what it means to read the Bible. They understand that the Bible is to be studied and interpreted, that study of the Bible occurs in complex and systematic ways, and that total strangers are engaging in similar enough processes with similar enough goals that reading their suggestions could be useful. More basically, they come with the knowledge of how to open a book and begin to read, of how to associate certain squiggles on the page with certain sounds and concepts and how to associate squiggles that have no known association with the same squiggles in a dictionary. In other words, we all approach books (or any text, whether written or oral) filled with presuppositions and associations based upon previous experience, without which a new book would be as indecipherable as the rows of wedged-shaped indentations on an ancient Sumerian tablet.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, all new texts, including this one, are formed from the building blocks of other texts—from the use of previously learned words to the restating of information received from elsewhere to the direct quoting, with citation, of other books.

This property of texts, that is, their inseparability from associations with other texts, is known as "intertextuality." In a general sense, intertextuality simply refers to the interconnections among texts. These connections can be as general and indirect as shared language, or sound as specific and direct as the footnoted quotation of one text in another.

What makes intertextuality interesting, however, is that the shared webs of meaning and association that enable communication between people are never fully and completely shared. Five people in a room simultaneously hearing the word "rhetoric" may all have heard something intelligible, but may each, because of different previous associations, have heard something different. Even the concept of intertextuality itself is subject to such dispute: Some associate it with general, untraceable intelligibility; others with direct, traceable literary borrowing or allusion. Still others (including myself) view it as a phenomenon that manifests itself on all levels from the general and untraceable to specific quoting.

Thus, even with a shared term, tension arises over how it ought to be used, who is right, and to which authorities (intertextually related texts) appeal will be made. Rhetoric begins with the reality of shared texts—it is not possible without them—but it arises because texts are not fully shared. It arises in the desire to make one's own internalized text (one's own view of the subject) a text that an audience will internalize as well.

This brings us back to the issue of how rhetorical criticism is understood. In the opinion of some, many of the forms of rhetorical criticism we have considered so far fail to take seriously enough what it means to call texts and their intertextual environments "rhetorical." In an attempt to delimit the

task of interpretation, these approaches analyze texts as if they were self-contained depositories of information that, if appropriately received by audiences (that is, received in the way the current interpreter receives them), would persuade of their beauty and truth or, in other words, would be rhetorically effective.

But if rhetorical contexts influence both writing and reading, consideration of texts in isolation from the rhetorical contexts of authors and readers yields interpretation that is truncated and incomplete, maybe even irrelevant. In fact, to ignore one's own rhetorical context is to offer interpretation that is unconsciously overdetermined by one's reading practices.

Like many other concepts in biblical interpretation, intertextuality is more helpful in providing an angle of vision on the nature of biblical texts than in prescribing a precise set of procedures for producing an interpretation. Attention to intertextuality and rhetoric calls forth certain ways of posing questions, and benefits from both imagination and disciplined analytical skills. In order to describe ways in which the insights of intertextuality may affect biblical interpretation, I will draw upon the work of Russian theorist Mikhail Bakhtin.

### Mikhail Bakhtin's Dialogism

Julia Kristeva, who first coined the term "intertextuality" to describe the intrinsic interrelationship of texts, credited Bakhtin with introducing this concept into literary theory. Addressing the previously puzzling question of the stylistic qualities of prose fiction, Bakhtin suggested that novelistic prose is characterized by its dialogical quality—that is, the propensity of prose fiction to lack a unified voice of its own, but rather to mirror, emulate, and even set side by side a variety of the kinds of language found in the author's own world.<sup>24</sup> Bakhtin's criticism of "stylistics" as a useful category for describing prose fiction has been found equally applicable to literature in general and to biblical studies in particular:

Stylistics has been . . . completely deaf to dialogue. A literary work has been conceived by stylistics as if it were a hermetic and self-sufficient whole, one whose elements constitute a closed system presuming nothing beyond themselves, no other utterances. . . . From the point of view of stylistics, the artistic work as a whole—whatever that whole might be—is a self-sufficient and closed authorial monologue, one that presumes only passive listeners beyond its own boundaries. . . . Stylistics locks every stylistic phenomenon into the monologic context of a given self-sufficient and hermetic utterance, imprisoning it, as it were, in the dungeon of a single context; it is not able to

exchange messages with other utterances; it is not able to realize its own stylistic implications in a relationship with them; it is obliged to exhaust itself in its own single hermetic context.<sup>25</sup>

In other words, Bakhtin accuses literary critics of assuming that when readers read, communication proceeds in a simple, direct, and uniform line from text to reader: The reader does not protest against or contribute insights to the text, no other texts are appealed to by the text or recalled by the reader, and the text itself is the only influence on the reader's interpretation. In sum, the text is assumed to speak in monologue to the reader. In opposition to such assumptions, Bakhtin calls attention to three loci where some sort of dialogue is operative. All three are points of intertextual exchange affecting the text and its reception by the reader. The first is the existence of a variety of other, foreign, even competing utterances already present in the environment into which the text enters, that attach themselves to the subject about which the text wishes to speak; the second, an internal dialogism operating within the text as it responds to the utterances in its environment; and the third, the active, sometimes competing responses of the audience.

### Dialogue in the Text's Rhetorical Environment

According to George Kennedy, the "rhetorical environment" is the situation that calls forth the text; it is the question seeking an answer. Bakhtin's understanding of rhetorical environment is more complex, for it involves competing answers to the same question, competing constructions of the same event, competing views of the same world, differing characterizations and valuations of the same idea, and a profusion of other voices already speaking before the text adds its voice:

Between the word and its object, between the word and the speaking subject, there exists an elastic environment of other, alien words about the same object, the same theme, and this is an environment that is often difficult to penetrate. . . .

Indeed, any concrete discourse (utterance) finds the object at which it was directed already as it were overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, already enveloped in an obscuring mist—or, on the contrary, by the "light" of alien words that have already been spoken about it. It is entangled, shot through with shared thoughts, points of view, alien value judgments and accents. The word, directed toward its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents.<sup>26</sup>

For Bakhtin, then, the rhetorical environment is the plurality of other discourse—not simply the plurality of questions but the plurality of other answers. Nor can it be thought of as the plurality of wrong discourse, for if these other voices were not in some measure persuasive there would be no need for the new voice to compete with them, declaring them unpersuasive. Thus before a discourse begins to describe its object, that object is already in the midst of being described and imagined in other ways, some slightly different, some extremely different. To reflect on the object of this very chapter, if I had been able to declare the first word ever uttered on rhetorical criticism, I could have assigned it a single definition—my definition, *the* definition—and it would have been persuasive, because there would be no other contestants. But alas, before I began writing, “rhetorical criticism” was a term already subject to dispute, overlain with differing definitions and characterizations, charged with the values of diachronic and synchronic exegesis, enveloped in the obscuring mist of diverse allegiances: some claiming descent from form criticism, some claiming cohesion with Aristotle, others declaring fidelity to Muilenburg, and still others desiring to clear the field and start over.

The disputed rhetorical environment surrounding many biblical texts, especially in the Hebrew scriptures, is difficult for us to perceive because we no longer have access to many of the voices to which these texts were responding. Nevertheless, the idea of rhetorical environment has been useful in comparing texts with obvious precursor texts, such as Chronicles with Samuel-Kings, or Matthew and Luke with Mark. In his monumental treatise on interpretive texts within the Hebrew scriptures, Michael Fishbane pays particular attention to Chronicles as an exegetical revision of Samuel-Kings, reflecting later practices and sensibilities.<sup>27</sup> In his view, Chronicles was not meant to supplement but to replace Samuel-Kings as a depiction of history. But modern readers with access to both texts can attend to the similarities and differences between them to arrive at a fuller understanding of the Chronicler’s rhetorical agenda. Transformations in divine speech—for example, from “go before me” (1 Kings 8:25) to “go in my Torah” (2 Chron. 6:16)—show a concern to present the postexilic ideal of devotion to Torah as one that the kings in Israel’s past knew and lived. Knowing that the author deliberately altered a text in this way helps train the exegete’s attention to other ways in which the role of Torah has been enhanced. This may help the interpreter understand more precisely the unique features and trends of the Chronicler’s setting and ideas.

Earlier discussions of Chronicles tended to dismiss it as a tendentious and inaccurate revisionist history, inferior to the text upon which it depended. Such dismissals were related to a nineteenth-century preference for the “original” and disdain for writings that were clearly derivative. But as

Fishbane pointed out, Samuel-Kings was a product of exegetical revisions of previous texts too, and was far from pristine in its presentation of facts. Like Chronicles—and in some sense like all texts—Samuel-Kings is a derivative text. What is significant is not the mere fact that these books used earlier material, but the way in which earlier material was used for a new rhetorical purpose. It is less pertinent to say that the texts are influenced by previous texts and more accurate to note the ways in which the new texts *appropriate* previous material, establishing a complex system of relationships of opposition, agreement, partial agreement, and reformulation. In his discussion of the web of relationships among works of art, Michael Baxandall concocts a virtual thesaurus of reutilization that applies to biblical texts as well. In relation to an older work of art, he says, a new work may

draw on, resort to, avail oneself of, appropriate from, have recourse to, adapt, misunderstand, refer to, pick up, take on, engage with, react to, quote, differentiate oneself from, assimilate oneself to, assimilate, align oneself with, copy, address, paraphrase, absorb, make a variation on, revive, continue, remodel, ape, emulate, travesty, parody, extract from, distort, attend to, resist, simplify, reconstitute, elaborate on, develop, face up to, master, subvert, perpetuate, reduce, promote, respond to, transform, tackle. . . . Everyone will be able to think of others.<sup>28</sup>

Moreover, the clarity of the Chronicler’s reutilization of Samuel-Kings can sensitize interpreters to the presence of inner-biblical transformations even when a precursor text no longer exists or has not been directly copied, and helps alert us to what can be learned by attending to such transformations. As the next section will show, even markers within texts can be clues to the rhetorical struggle the author is engaging and attempting to win.

## Dialogism within Texts

One of the Chronicler’s techniques in reshaping the story in Samuel-Kings was to expunge problematic material, such as the story of Bathsheba and Uriah. Without knowledge of the precursor text, the existence of that story and of its later repression would not have been known. Undeniably, many such revisions occurred during the long centuries of writing and rewriting through which the Bible came into existence. As 1 Chron. 20:1–3 indicates (compare 2 Sam. 11:1–12:31), materials may disappear without a trace and be replaced by other materials that tell a very different story. Without Samuel-Kings we would not be aware of some of the less complimentary views of King David that circulated in ancient Judah.



Yet it is not always the case that dissonant voices are so easily silenced. To suppress a textual voice is one rhetorical technique; to acknowledge it and organize against it is often a more effective one. In order to respond to a plurality of viewpoints, a text often actively voices approval of some and rejection of others. Thus it is the "tension-filled environment," not simply the conventions of artistry, that shape and define a text and that may be detected in the text's own content. Bakhtin describes the text's entrance into this rhetorical environment with these words:

The word, directed toward its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile.<sup>29</sup>

In order to achieve credibility, a new text must show that the pertinent issues are being considered—that the author knows what people are saying about the subject and can argue a new viewpoint in relation to the other voices. This means that even rejected ideas may be acknowledged and disputed rather than ignored. Often they will even be given a chance to speak within the text, if only within the most severe quotation marks.

Here the self-reflective example should be obvious. In order to create a description of rhetorical criticism that responds to and organizes other descriptions and allows them what I consider their proper place in my universe of discourse, I must quote them and describe them, give them voice, group them, allow them to speak to one another, and respond to them myself. While the rhetorical environment in 1998 does not absolutely determine the kind of chapter that I write, it does shape it in important ways.

In terms of the Bible, internally dialogized texts are much easier to find than direct, or even indirect, relationships among texts. In every part of the Bible the speech of others is quoted, organized, and laid open to dispute. Second Isaiah, for instance, presents viewpoints disputed by its author in the form of quotations:

Now therefore hear this, you lover of pleasures,  
who sit securely,  
who say in your heart,  
"I am, and there is no one besides me;  
I shall not sit as a widow  
or know the loss of children"—

both these things shall come upon you  
in a moment, in one day:  
the loss of children and widowhood. . .  
(Isa. 47:8–9a, NRSV)

But Zion said, "The LORD has forsaken me,  
my Lord has forgotten me."  
Can a woman forget her nursing child,  
or show no compassion for the child of her womb?  
Even these may forget,  
yet I will not forget you.  
(Isa. 49:14–15, NRSV)

In these passages, the prophet is quoting the symbolic figures "Virgin Daughter Babylon" and "Daughter Zion." Their words can in no wise be understood as representing the prophet's own understanding; rather, these figures are given voice in order to sharpen the contrast with the divine words that follow. Furthermore, since both of these female entities are symbolic figures, it should be clear that the prophet is projecting imaginative, not actual, conversations between God and these women. Yet through dialogue the prophet presents what he apparently considers fair representations of the (faulty) opinions of groups represented by these figures: that is, real Babylonians and real Judeans. In this way, competing interpretations of current events are highlighted, organized, and placed in relation to the prophet's own message. Over against any claims to the contrary, YHWH's ascendancy over Babylonian arrogance is asserted; YHWH's sustained attention to Jerusalem is affirmed.<sup>30</sup>

Narrative can also contain internal dialogism, reflecting a disputed environment. The words and attitudes of characters, even if they are fictionalized, reflect words and attitudes encountered in the author's world. Giving these characters voice and body in a story, the author is able to comment upon their words and attitudes using the narrator, the other characters, or the chain of circumstances that befall them. For instance, in Luke 16:19–30, Jesus tells a story to illustrate his dire warning to those who "were lovers of money" and "ridiculed him" (16:14). The parable of the rich man and Lazarus enables Jesus to comment indirectly upon his opponents by casting them as the ones doomed to torment. On yet another level the parable enables the author of Luke to comment upon those in the authorial context who are wealthy detractors of the faithful. The rich man's own words, directly quoted, allow readers to gaze ironically upon his arrogance, as he continues to assume—even in Hades—that Lazarus's purpose in life and in death is to serve him and his five brothers. Through the voice of



Father Abraham, the narrator communicates to the audience that the law and the prophets, though sufficient, are of no help to those who refuse to live by them.

But direct quote is only one form of internal dialogism. Bakhtin also describes the double-voiced quality of speech that adopts within it the cadences of another while retaining its own control. In doing so, it in effect winks at the audience even as it weaves in and out of others' speech. Job, for instance, mocks the inflated self-opinion he perceives in his three friends, and through Job's voice the narrator undercuts wisdom's spokespersons. Answering a lengthy and rhetorically overblown description of Job's future should he repent of whatever sins he has committed, Job says, "No doubt you are the people, and wisdom will die with you" (Job 12:1). Note the complexity of dialogism here: The narrator's own viewpoint is communicated through Job's anguished sarcasm, which echoes and magnifies his tormenters' pompous message.

Although the internal dialogism of biblical texts usually moves toward resolution, privileging one viewpoint over others, there are texts in which the competing discourses are allowed to remain in tension. The book of Job, as many have noted, begins and ends with prose narrative that contrasts with the poetic dialogue of the rest of the book not only in genre but also in linguistic sophistication and, more surprisingly, in theological outlook. One voice gets most of the lines; yet the other is allowed to begin and, more importantly, to end the story. Together these voices create tensions for those trying to decide what Job is finally saying. Though it is tempting to try to collapse these tensions into one dominant message, Carol Newsom has suggested that the struggle among dissonant messages is an essential feature of the book's meaning, deepening the reader's engagement with the mystery of human suffering:

By leaving the tension between the two parts unresolved, the book as a whole allows the frame story and the dialogue to explore different dimensions of the complex question of the moral basis for divine-human relations. That dissonance both recognizes and refuses the reader's desire for closures to the story and a definitive resolution of the issues it has raised.<sup>31</sup>

Many other studies have pointed out the profit to be gained from taking seriously the dialogical dissonance within biblical books. Mieke Bal's work on Judges reveals both the violence in the social order that the book reflects and the continuing inclination, exemplified by scholarly commentaries, to ignore and hence to perpetuate this violence, particularly as it is expressed against women.<sup>32</sup> In that way the book of Judges becomes a mirror reflecting the danger-filled experiences of real women.

## Dialogism in the Audience

The presence of many differing voices and opinions in a text's environment not only necessitates that the author engage and manage these voices, but also that audiences themselves, even before coming to the text, are already managing and organizing a variety of perspectives and pronouncements upon the same subject. Effective orators anticipate this process and the obstacles it may create within their listeners. Preachers, for instance, should be aware that their sermons on the Prodigal Son are likely to be the twentieth or thirtieth their parishioners have heard, and that elements of previous interpretations linger in their minds and influence what they hear.

Bakhtin noted the ways in which a text is shaped by such anticipation:

Every word is directed toward an *answer* and cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that it anticipates.

The word in living conversation is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction. Forming itself in an atmosphere of the already spoken the word is at the same time determined by that which has not yet been said but which is needed and in fact anticipated by the answering word. Such is the situation in any living dialogue.

All rhetorical forms, monologic in their compositional structure, are oriented toward the listener and his answer. This orientation toward the listener is usually considered the basic constitutive feature of rhetorical discourse.<sup>33</sup>

In other words, a text responds to other texts not simply to correct the previous record, but in order to persuade an audience of its author's view of the world. To do so, the author must envision the desired audience and anticipate its responses, even to the point of defusing possible objections before they are made.

Stanley Kent Stowers, in his 1981 dissertation, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, studies Paul's use of classical forms that anticipate audience response. He identifies the "diatribe" as a "type of discourse employed in the philosophical school [that] . . . presupposes a student-teacher relationship."<sup>34</sup> Paul employed this style in his letter to the Romans, addressing his readers as if they were his pupils, and making rhetorical use of a form he knew his audience would recognize. More specifically, the imaginary interlocutor against whom Paul argues in Romans anticipates many of the questions and objections Paul expected in his actual audience. Stowers shows the ways in which Paul shaped his letter to the Romans, tailoring his theological message to the specific philosophical needs of the Gentiles he envisioned reading it.

Insofar as the author can assess an audience, their dialogical context and concerns shape the text's creation. But even more significantly, the audience's dialogical context shapes the way the text, once composed and delivered, is actually received. As reader-response critics have pointed out (see chapter 11), different audiences in different contexts will receive the same text in a variety of ways. It is not simply that some choose to disagree with the obvious meaning of a text, or that "everyone else" is misinterpreting. Rather, in different environments the same text *means* differently.

This is especially important in terms of biblical reading and reception. The canonization of biblical books in the Jewish and Christian traditions has meant that generations of audiences in different settings have read texts written without them, their needs, questions, or intertexts in mind. Whenever a text is handed on with its interpretation, that interpretation predisposes the next audience to view the text from an angle that may not have been anticipated by the original author. Theologies of the "living word" are ways of articulating the notion that this is acceptable, that biblical texts are reactualized by succeeding generations in new ways that become part of the text's expanding afterlife.

For instance, Isa. 52:13–53:12, the famous "suffering servant" passage, has been appropriated in very different ways throughout the course of its history. Paul's failure to discuss this passage as a reference to Christ's suffering is consistent with the Jewish background from which he came, in which none of the previous interpretations or reutilizations of the servant passages had to do with messianic expectations.<sup>35</sup> In fact, a brief survey of New Testament texts shows a degree of latitude in appropriation of Isaiah 53, even when it is used in reference to Jesus. Matthew 8:17 associates Isa. 53:4 ("He took our infirmities and bore our diseases") not with Jesus' suffering, but with his healing ministry. Acts 8 links the "sheep led to the slaughter" of Isa. 53:7 to Jesus, without providing an explicit interpretation of this link. First Peter 2:18–25 refers the passage to Jesus' passion in order to show how slaves should obey their harsh masters.

Over the first several centuries of the church's existence, however, Christian interpretation of Isa. 52:13–53:12 crystallized. As the passage's importance as an allusion to Jesus' sufferings took shape, its perceived usefulness as Christian apologetic grew. For both John Chrysostom and Augustine in the fourth century, Isaiah 53 served as a proof text predicting and confirming the crimes of the Jews against Jesus.<sup>36</sup> By the Middle Ages, the passage was used to supply lurid details to retellings of Jesus' passion. For instance, based on the reference to sheep shearers in Isa. 53:7, the idea spread that Jesus' hair and beard were completely pulled out by his persecutors, who in paintings and popular sentiment were synonymous with contemporary Jews.<sup>37</sup> Christian frustration that Jews have not read

Isaiah 53 as proof of Christian claims about Jesus continues to be voiced to this day.

In contrast to this trajectory, beginning very early and continuing throughout the Middle Ages and into the present, the servant in Isaiah has been seen in Jewish interpretation not as a messianic figure, but as a representative of Israel or of the faithful in Israel. In fact, it was often in the face of Christian persecution that this passage became significant as a model for Jewish faithfulness to God. Rabbi Abraham of Cordova (c. 1600), for instance, turned the Christian message completely on its head, asserting that the servant was Israel, while the ones persecuting him were the ones who claimed that the servant was Jesus:

The chastisement and penalty which should have been ours [speaking for the heathens] for having invented the fiction of the advent of our Messiah, fell upon Israel instead during the long years of his bitter captivity, although he always steadily adhered to the truth, and would never acknowledge our errors; hence we never ceased to afflict him, imagining that by his stripes which were produced when, in zeal for our own lying belief, we visited him with the rod of our anger.<sup>38</sup>

A rhetorical critic examining the interactions of the Isaiah passage with a variety of social contexts would note the ways in which the passage and its interpretations are affected by the particular rhetorical needs of interpretive communities to produce disparate and even contradictory interpretations. Knowledge of the diversity of interpretive possibilities that have operated in the past not only opens unexplored vistas on the passage itself, but also helps readers understand the sources of their own assumptions. Explorations of the history of biblical interpretation have helped recent exegetes become more critically aware of the ideological interests that have influenced not only the text but its interpretations as well.

## Conclusion

The concept of intertextuality has helped rhetorical critics recognize that a text is more than the sum of its words. As important as stylistic analysis is for attending to particulars, it does not sufficiently account for all that texts do and come to mean. Arising out of a writer's desire to communicate a particular viewpoint in relation to other relevant viewpoints, a text is designed to maximize its persuasive powers. Although originally addressing particular intended audiences, biblical texts encounter a wide variety of readers in different settings, readers who ask—and see answered—questions that the original writer may never have imagined. Rhetorical criticism helps

interpreters attend to the persuasive intents and effects of biblical texts and to the long history of theological interpretation that has shaped our own reception and reading.

Two recent studies, one dealing with Proverbs and the other involving Romans, are particularly commendable as illustrations of the sort of rich rhetorical interpretation that proceeds from integrating attention to rhetorical environment, textual dialogism, and the positioning of intended and real readers. Carol Newsom's study of Proverbs 1–9 appeals intertextually to Genesis, Job, and Ecclesiastes; points out the author's use of a variety of voices, including voices quoting voices; and explores the crisis that results for the text when the actual audience differs from that envisioned by the author.<sup>39</sup> Stanley Stowers's *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* attends to four intertextual perspectives: (1) interpretations of Romans in different places and times throughout Christian history; (2) rhetorical conventions and generic conceptions available to readers in Paul's time; (3) cultural codes and interrelated texts available to Paul's readers; and (4) the audience and author as textual strategies in Romans.<sup>40</sup> Both of these works successfully employ a variety of rhetorical and intertextual clues to produce fuller readings of biblical texts than can be achieved from observation of the text alone, in isolation from the contexts in which it is written and read.

## Rhetorical Criticism in Action: Genesis 1

In this chapter I have discussed several angles of vision that rhetorical criticism might open. In this final section I will briefly illustrate how the constellation of rhetorical approaches might illuminate Genesis 1.

Stylistic analysis would attend to the unfolding repetitions of the creation story: the repetitions of God's words that speak the universe into being, of creative actions that proceed from those words, of God's positive responses to what God sees, and of the cycles of day and night. Within this basic framework, each day is described in increasingly complex detail as the number of created entities proliferates. Two verses describe the first day, but the sixth day requires a climactic eight verses, before the seventh day reverts to the simplicity and brevity of the first.

A critic viewing this text in terms of pragmatic persuasion might be hampered by a lack of direct clues for understanding the viewpoints the text is opposing. Here some subtle intertextual features become useful. For instance, references to the "great sea monsters" in verse 21, along with references in verse 2 to the "deep," and in verses 9–10 to the making of boundaries for the sea, whisper echoes of an earlier ancient Near Eastern tradition in which creation comes about through a divine battle against the sea or a sea monster (see Isa. 51:9–10; Ps. 89:9–10; Ps. 74:14–15; Mark

4:37–41; Rev. 21:1). In opposition to those texts, Genesis 1 depicts even the sea monster (which remains, like the sun and moon, unnamed) as God's creation, and God as powerful enough to create by fiat rather than through battle.<sup>41</sup> Similarly, the reference to God's "image" in verse 27 echoes texts in which idols are called "images" of other gods or even of the people making them (see especially Num. 33:52; 1 Sam. 6:5; 2 Kings 11:18; Ezek. 16:17; Amos 5:26). This twist on the language of image-making, in which it is the god who forms the human, becomes especially noticeable in view of Isa. 46:1–7. In that text the Babylonian gods Bel and Nebo ride helplessly into captivity, unable to save the worshipers who made them, while God is depicted as the one who made, bears, and will save Israel.

Critics interested in Genesis 1's interactions with a variety of subsequent communities might note the very different concerns the text has been made to address over the centuries. Modern creationism is by no means the first attempt to use Genesis 1 for purposes it was never intended to fulfill. Very foreign to our modern sensibilities, yet much closer to the original text, for instance, is its retelling in the pseudepigraphic book of Jubilees from the second century B.C.E., which emphasizes the Sabbath day and commandments related to it, and draws a parallel between the Sabbath as a sacred day and Israel as a sacred people. In fact, the entire book of Jubilees is structured around a delimitation of time sequences based on the Sabbath.

Throughout history, the minutest details of Genesis 1 have been used to support various ideological programs. In the mid-second century C.E., Justin Martyr used the phrase "let us make man after *our* image and likeness" to argue that God was speaking to the preexistent Christ.<sup>42</sup> The great eleventh-century commentator Rashi (Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac) used the absence of a single unnecessary consonant in the word "subdue" in verse 28 to argue that "the male controls the female in order that she may not become a gadabout; teaching you also that to the man, whose nature is to master, was given the divine command to have issue, and not to the woman."<sup>43</sup> In both cases, details of the text that can be interpreted in a number of ways are used to buttress the interests of a commentator's own community. Rhetorical analysis of the Genesis text side by side with its commentaries can illuminate the creativity of biblical interpreters and the danger of overlooking their inventive additions.

As this brief survey has shown, rhetorical criticism can address a variety of questions related to the persuasive powers of texts. When exercised in relation to other critical methods such as textual criticism, form criticism, social-scientific criticism, or ideological criticism, rhetorical criticism can sharpen our picture of a text and its world in remarkable ways. Rhetorical criticism's attention to the constructed, persuasive nature of all communication can offer a much-needed reality check for all who are involved in the

interpretive enterprise. As with other forms of criticism, its chief limitations lie with the imagination, analytical faculties, and intellectual honesty of the exegete.

## Notes

1. This address was subsequently published as "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 1-18.
2. *Ibid.*, 7.
3. *Ibid.*, 8.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, 18.
6. See, for example, the 1974 Festschrift for Muilenburg compiled by his students: *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. J. J. Jackson and Martin Kessler (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1974); and Duane F. Watson's "Notes on History and Method" in Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994).
7. Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994).
8. *Ibid.*, 91.
9. This work was first published in 1975 by Scholars Press.
10. Jack Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997).
11. *Ibid.*, xxviii.
12. *Ibid.*
13. James Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," *The Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 5 (New York: Abingdon, 1956), 381-773.
14. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, trans. W. Rhys Roberts (New York: Modern Library, 1954), 1.1.1355b.
15. Dale Patrick and Allen Scult, *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 12.
16. George Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 4.
17. Yehoshua Gitay, *Prophecy and Persuasion: A Study of Isaiah 40-48* (Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1981).
18. Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985).
19. *Ibid.*, 50.
20. *Ibid.*, 37.
21. George Aichele et al., *The Postmodern Bible* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995).
22. *Ibid.*, 182.
23. "Intertextuality is the defining condition for literary readability. Without intertextuality, a literary work would simply be unintelligible, like speech in a language one has not yet learned" (L. Jenny, "The Strategy of Form," in *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader*, ed. T. Todorov [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982; French original, 1976], 34).
24. Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, 1981; Russian original, 1975).
25. *Ibid.*, 273-74.
26. *Ibid.*, 276.
27. Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).
28. Michael Baxandall, "Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality," in J. Clayton and E. Rothstein, eds., *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 6.
29. Bakhtin, *Dialogic Imagination*, 276.
30. For a detailed discussion of Second Isaiah's use of such previously known figures as Daughters Babylon and Zion, see Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, SBL Dissertation Series 161 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1997).
31. Carol Newsom, "Job," *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 4 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 634.
32. Mieke Bal, *Death and Dissymmetry: The Politics of Coherence in the Book of Judges* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
33. Bakhtin, *Dialogic Imagination*, 280.
34. Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, SBL Dissertation Series 57 (Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981), 175.
35. Morna Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1959), 53-58.
36. J. F. A. Sawyer, *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 112.
37. *Ibid.*, 89.
38. Cited in A. D. Neubauer and S. R. Driver, *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah, according to the Jewish Interpreters*, vol. 2: *Translations* (New York: Ktav, 1969), 292.
39. Carol Newsom, "Woman and the Discourse of Patriarchal Wisdom: A Study of Proverbs 1-2," in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*, ed. Peggy L. Day (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).
40. Stanley Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1994), 16.
41. See also Psalm 104, which shows many parallels with Genesis 1. Battle imagery is echoed in the psalm's description of the fleeing waters (v. 7). Yet, as in the Genesis account, the sea monster Leviathan is portrayed as a part of God's harmonious creation (v. 26).
42. Justin Martyr, "Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), chap. 62.
43. *Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary*, vol. 1 (London: Shapiro, Vallentine & Co., 1946), 7.