GEORGE BONDOR

PAUL RICOEUR AND THE BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS

George Bondor
Department of Philosophy, Al. I. Cuza University of Iasi, Romania.
Email: bondor@uaic.ro

Abstract: The main aim of this paper is to analyze the texts in which Paul Ricoeur discusses the relation between biblical and philosophical hermeneutics and to argue that biblical hermeneutics is the central part of Ricoeur's philosophical project. If the modern hermeneutics (Schleiermacher, Dilthey, etc.) aims to reveal the general principles of interpretation that can be applied to every text, including the sacred one, Ricoeur's biblical hermeneutics reveals the limits of general hermeneutics when it deals with an unusual text. The consequences of the biblical hermeneutics refer to specific problems such as revelation and faith, but also to philosophical themes such as the self and its place in the world.

Key Words: Biblical Hermeneutics, Exegesis, Interpretation, Paul Ricoeur, Text, Discursive Forms, Narration, Self

Introduction

The purpose of this text is to analyze the way in which Paul Ricoeur discusses the relation between philosophical and biblical hermeneutics. I argue that biblical hermeneutics, especially because of its ontological and existential consequences, is the central part of Ricoeur's philosophical project.

Starting with the universal philosophical hermeneutics of Schleiermacher and Dilthey the following question appeared: Are there general rules of interpretation that can also be properly applied to a very special text as the sacred one? Or, on the contrary, must the philosophical hermeneutics rethink its status at the meeting with exceptional texts and phenomena? Does not philosophical hermeneutics have much more to learn from its meeting with biblical hermeneutics than conversely?[1] Biblical hermeneutics takes from the philosophical hermeneutics a minimal organon, which Ricoeur exposed in an answer given to Don Ihde, an organon that includes the categories of text and interpretation, the explanation-understanding dialectics, and the reflection on the role of the reader and of community.[2] But biblical hermeneutics is not a simple application of general hermeneutics, mainly due to the absolute originality of the central referent of the Bible (the name of God and of Christ) and of the world proposed by it, called the Kingdom of God.[3]

Ricoeur discusses this issue in several writings, the most important being: the chapter "Introduction to Bultmann" from *The Conflict of Interpretations* (1969) and the chapter "Philosophical Hermeneutics and Biblical Hermeneutics" from the book *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics II* (1986), initially published in the collective volume *Exegesis. Problèmes de méthode et exercices de lecture*.[4] To these we may add some texts which were generally published in collective volumes which develop one aspect or another of the mentioned issue.[5]

Hermeneutics of the Text and the Analysis of Discursive Forms

Interpretation became a genuine philosophical problem when it was no longer understood as a secondary aspect of philosophy, but was recognized as an independent phenomenon, worthy of being investigated for itself. This happened when, in addition to the already existing special hermeneutics (sacred, legal, literary), a general hermeneutics was also formed (Scheiermacher, Dilthey), which meant to be a universal methodology of understanding, applicable to any type of text. In the twentieth century, together with Heidegger's and Gadamer's phenomenological projects, hermeneutics defined itself as an ontology, namely as an interpretation (*Auslegung*) of the being of man, a being whose constitution is a hermeneutical one. Between the two orientations – the

hermeneutics of texts and that of existence – there seems to be a significant difference. Paul Ricoeur's philosophical reflections explore exactly this distance that seemed to be irreconcilable. Although he seems to rather choose a methodological hermeneutics, he does not exclude for any moment the ontological stake of hermeneutics. After dealing in his first papers especially with the issue of symbol, his writings from the second period (starting with the 70s) highlight the concept of text. In the last period of his work, Ricoeur's philosophy acquired an existential-ontological orientation, taking the form of a "hermeneutics of the self".

During the second period of his creation, Ricoeur proposes a "hermeneutics of the text," probably under the influence of structuralism and of Greimas' semiotics.[6] In fact, he proposes a new form of exegesis, which mediates between the genealogical method (the historical-critical interpretation that investigates the history of text formation) and the structural one. This new method investigates the history of discursive forms. The "hermeneutics of the text" starts from an idea which is close to Dilthey's philosophy, namely that understanding of the self and of the world are possible only after the interpretation of the spirit's objectivations, namely after the interpretation of texts. In fact, the texts mediate, our relationship with the world, with the other people and with ourselves. Because of them we belong to a tradition and also because of them we are receiving the world in which we live in. The text opens what Ricoeur calls "the thing of the text" or "the world of the text," a world that is born through the participation of the reader and which is afterwards inhabited by the reader.[7] The text is not a mere intermediary of a transcendent meaning, but it carries a meaning in itself, being a sort of "immanent transcendence," with a Husserlian expression used by the author.[8]

From this idea there is only one step to the analysis of textual structures. A certain content may not be expressed otherwise than in a certain discursive form, the latter not being an external rhetorical aspect. Ricoeur draws up a typology of discursive genres (narrative, prescriptive, prophetical, hymnic, sapient, with several sub-genres), which he says that it is a kind of "anatomy" that also includes a history.[9] Between some structures there is even an opposition, for example between narration and prophecy, which creates a tension inside the Bible.[10] Using a Chomskian expression, to which however he gives a new meaning, Ricoeur speaks about a "generative grammar" of the Bible's language, one that shows how a certain discursive form generates a specific content.[11]

The idea of analyzing the text in itself induces the thesis according to which the text exercises a form of authority, which points to the issue of forming the biblical canon.[12] Ricoeur takes over several data from the analysis made by Northrop Frye in his book *The Great Code.* According to Frye, the biblical text constructs its unity along a network of images and metaphors. The literal meaning of the Bible refers only to itself, as a

"unique, gigantic and complex metaphor".[13] The evidence of the Bible's statements is supported only through the relation between the Old and the New Testament. "The two testaments form a double mirror, each reflecting the other one, but none the world outside."[14] According to Frye, the Bible's literal basis exists, but it is not "natural," to be more precise, it does not come from the external world that exists outside the Bible.[15] In the Bible we deal with a "rhetoric of authorities". God appears as the necessary condition of all the possibilities of verbal expression,[16] but His voice makes the reader sense an external authority. In fact, the authority is a purely textual one, coming from the text itself and not from outside it. The events that the Bible describes are "language events".[17] The authority of the Great Code does not depend on a divine presence outside the text, but on the fact that the text identifies itself metaphorically with this presence.[18] In other words, the biblical text projects a world and identifies with it (it is an internal projection of the world). This happens only if the reader responds to the invitation of "identifying himself with the book". Ricoeur comments Frye's idea by using the patristic metaphor of the book and the mirror (*liber et speculum*): "Receiving the text, we identify with it and we make a mirror out of the book" in which we can discover ourselves.[19] Man's life is thus solved in the mirror of the sacred text, the new meaning that it actualizes going as far as the smallest details of everyday life.[20] According to Ricoeur, the self-constitution and self-sufficiency of the Bible, N. Frye speaks about, support themselves only through the reading effect that it causes, namely that of arousing the reader's "desire to understand himself in the light of the Great Code".[21]

Narration and Biblical Canon

Among all discursive forms, a special place is occupied by narration. Ricoeur analyzes it with the belief that the identity of human existence is a narrative one.[22] Narration is conceived as the principle that organizes the whole life, both the individual one (perception, memory, thought), as well as that of entire cultures and historical ages.[23] The narrative analysis was applied to the sacred text, not only to the explicitly narrative texts (ex. *The Book of Acts*), but also to psalms, Pauline epistles or to the Biblical canon in its whole (Northrop Frye speaks about a canonical narrative).

What exactly does the specific of narration consist of? In literature, from the beginning of a narration the reader finds out about its characters more than we find out about other people in real life.[24] The author seems to have complete control over the characters and the story and, moreover, he always leaves us the impression that he is only telling the truth. In other words, he imposes his authority, transferring to the reader as well his knowledge about the characters' feelings and thoughts. The more obvious is this fact in the Bible's case. An example is the very beginning of the Book of Job: "There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job;

and that man was perfect and upright, one that feared God, and eschewed evil." In the Bible, such knowledge like the one about Job's moral perfection is often guaranteed by the word of God itself, which interferes directly in the text. In fact, the authors of the Gospels know a lot about how Christ feels or thinks (examples: Mark 1:41; Mark 5:30). When the text has as guarantor God Himself, everything that is said by the author must be considered as a truth. Thus, biblical hermeneutics meets a classical principle of philosophical hermeneutics, introduced by Georg Friedrich Meier and called the "principle of equity". This states that in interpretation we must start from the hypothesis according to which the author is always right. In other words, we must proceed as if the hermeneutical truth and the factual truth would coincide, at least until it is proved that things are exactly the other way around. The text itself can only be perfect. Therefore, in Judaism for instance, the canon is formed, according to the same principle of authority, by eliminating the aspects apparently contradictory or by a constant reference to the Jewish Bible taken as a whole.[25] Ricoeur sustains the assumption according to which a factor that contributed to the closure of the canon was the existence of an internal intertextuality, an internal saturation of the space of meaning created by the discursive genres presented in the Bible.[26]

The connection between content and discursive forms is extremely obvious in the case of narration. According to Ricoeur, something is said about Jahveh and about his relations with his people because it is said in the form of a chronicle, of a narration that tells the events about releasing from the past. However, this is not a primary text, independent from all the pre-existing ones. Different isolated legends, myths, traditional stories and novels are re-arranged and put together to form a unique narration, centered on an event that presents both a historical dimension, as well as a kerygmatic one.[27] This makes Ricoeur talk about a "hermeneutical operation internal to the text itself".[28] The narrative form is proper only to a theology that announces Jahveh as a great Actant of a history of liberation.[29] The specific of biblical narrative consists in the fact that it is a confessional narration or a narrated confession, without being reduced neither to the information about the past (historical narrative), nor to entertainment (novel), nor to moral education or restraining the passions (epic, drama, tragedy).[30]

The specific of the biblical narration derives from the way in which it uses the name of God. In the Bible there is a central referent, God, and the text presents His saying. The referent "God," Ricoeur shows, is both the coordinator of different discourses, as well as the index of incompleteness of these discourses. "The word «God» implies the total context constituted from the entire space of gravity of stories, prophecies, legislations, hymns and so on."[31] As it has been said before, we deal with a form of meta-communication: the word of God is not the same as people's sayings, but through it are given the conditions of all human messages.[32] The ineffable

character of God's name expresses the inexhaustible character of the Bible as a meta-narration.[33] A referent of the same kind is also Christ's name, which, besides the functions that the word "God" has, it also has the function of being able to embody all religious significations in a fundamental symbol, that of sacrificial love.[34] In Christianity, Christ is a principle that unifies both sacred texts and history, being at the same time an a priori of any interpretation of the Bible.[35]

In the case of prophecy, where we deal with an oracular structure, we also find a temporal mutation: when the God of Exodus becomes the God of Exile, this means that He is no longer just a God of memory, but also one of future.[36] Unlike narration, where God appears as a supreme actant, in the case of prophecy we deal with a character that speaks in the name of God.[37] There are, of course, other forms of discourse, which also create oppositions: the ones of legislation and wisdom, of hymns and proverbs. With each of these, God appears in different forms: as hero of the radical gesture of salvation, as God of anger and compassion, as person in an I-you relation.[38]

Interpretation and Reinterpretation

According to Ricoeur, the word expressed in the Bible is connected to a previous writing, reinterpreting the meanings already fixed in it. For example, Jesus himself interprets the Torah, Saint Paul and the author of the Epistles to the Jews interpret the Christian event in the light of prophecies and of institutions of the old alliance. All the "titles" that the exegetists consider as being Christian come from a reinterpretation of figures transmitted by the written Hebrew culture and the Greek one: the King, Messiah, the Great Priest, the suffering Servant, the Logos. As such Christianity is from the very beginning an exegesis.[39] But it is a re-reading of a previous writing in the light of *kerygma.* The hermeneutical situation of the Bible is: at the beginning there were not two Testaments, but only a text and an event, the latter suppressing and at the same time fulfilling the old letter, which it transforms in spirit through a mutation of meaning specific for the allegorical interpretation.[40] The spiritual meaning of the old letter is the New Testament itself. Thus, Ricoeur shows, the Christian event does not appear as being something irrational, but as the fulfillment of a previous meaning which had remained in suspension. "By this detour which is the reinterpretation of an old writing, *kerygma* enters into a network of intelligibility."[41] Reinterpreting some old themes may also be equivalent with a process of demythologization, to use Rudolf Bultmann's concept. We already encounter such a situation in the Old Testament, where the stories of creation resort to a demythologization of the sacred cosmology of the Babylonians; then, the announcement of "the name of Jahveh" destabilizes the old representations of the divine at the Baal's people; also, in the New Testament we deal with a demythologization of

the eschatological representations when John says that the future has already started in Jesus Christ.[42]

Another kind of reinterpretation consists in taking over some old interpretive techniques. As we know, the Judaic hermeneutics developed the interpretation based on key words, phrases and associations, which became extremely elaborated in the so-called *midrash*, the late hermeneutics of the Rabbis.[43] The Judaic practice of interpretation was taken over and practiced by Paul as well in his epistles. An example is his interpretation of the term "seed" (*sperma / zera'*) in Gal. 3.16. He shows that, when in Gen. 12.7 God promises Abraham "seed", using the singular and not the plural, the fact must be interpreted as a prophecy regarding the arrival of Messiah. Another example where Paul uses the Judaic interpretive tradition (to be more precise the Aramaic one) is Romans 10.6-7, where Paul rhetorically asks: "Say not in your heart, 'Who shall ascend into heaven?' that is, to bring Christ down; or, 'Who shall descent into the abyss?' That is, to bring Christ up from the dead." The text is an allusion to Deuteronomy 30.12-13, where Jonah is the one who "descends into the depths of the sea," and Moses is the one who ascends to heaven. For Saint Paul, Moses and Jonah are only typologies of Christ.[44]

The fact that the interpretation of the Bible is a reinterpretation becomes obvious if we study the hermeneutical situation of its readers today. Because of the writing, Ricoeur proves the biblical message outdistances itself from the initial situation and its first recipient. But the interpretation of the biblical text is possible precisely because of the first interpretative layer, the one that appeared in the community of those who witnessed *kerygma*, namely the presence of Christ. We, today's readers, interpret as listeners of some witnesses: *fides ex auditu*.[45] Thus, Ricoeur argues, Christianity is a hermeneutics since faith must always be deciphered in text and in the confession of faith of the original community. Ricoeur's emphasis on the text distinguishes his philosophy from Gadamer's hermeneutics of dialogue, for which it is essential to rediscover the verb beyond the written text.[46] In fact, Ricoeur takes over Bultmann's idea according to which understanding should not refer to the life of the author, but to "the meaning's essence expressed in the text," one that requires an exegetic exercise.[47] We thus have to deal with a hermeneutical circle that enounces a situation explained by Bultmann as well: "to understand the text, I must believe in that something that the text announces to me; but what the text announces to me is not given anywhere else but in the text; that is why I must understand the text in order to believe."[48] Thus, hermeneutics no longer has the task to reconstruct the author's intentions, as we had in Schleiermacher and Dilthey. As Gadamer notices as well, the concept of congeniality is inadequate when in stake is the kerygmatic meaning of the Scripture, as limited as the historical exegesis is as well. Could it be that the sacred meaning of the Bible is not necessarily something else than what it results

from the simple summing up of the intentions of the Bible's authors?[49] Moving the stress from the author to the text and reader opens at the same time the way of accepting the plurivocity of the sacred text. The pluralism of interpretations represents a positive aspect of biblical hermeneutics.[50]

The world of the text and the reader's self

According to Ricoeur, the object of hermeneutics is the "thing of the text," meaning the world developed by the text. Between the structural explanation and selfunderstanding we have the necessary stage of understanding "the world of the text," namely the way in which the text reveals its "world," its vision of the world, its particular ontology.[51] The latter builds and transforms the reader's self. The task of biblical hermeneutics is not to directly cause a decision of the reader, but to let the world of biblical text develop, that suggestion of a world that the biblical text calls "the new world," "the new alliance," "God's kingdom," "new birth". This projected world is "the horizon of the possible experience where the work moves its readers".[52]

The French philosopher distinguishes between text and work. The text becomes a work only after its interaction with its reader.[53] Ricoeur repeats here some data of Wolfgang Iser's theory of reading and of Hans Robert Jauss' theory of reception that start from Roman Ingarden's phenomenology of reading.

A few specifications regarding these theories are required here. According to a rhetorical approach that is classic already, the author and the reader are involved in the text, in the form of the "implied author" and the "implied reader". There is a distinction between the real author and the implied author, which is "the second self created in the work".[54] If I want to understand the work (and to feel an esthetical pleasure) I must assume the beliefs of the "implied author" regarding all themes. A similar distinction is made between the real reader and the implied reader, namely the self that the reader acquires in the act of reading when his beliefs coincide with those of the author. "Regardless of my real beliefs and practices, I must subordinate my mind and heart to the book if I am to enjoy it to the full."[55] "The author creates, in short, an image of himself and another image of his reader; he makes his reader, as he makes his second self, and the most successful reading is one in which the created selves, author and reader, can find complete agreement."[56]

The concept of "implied reader" is taken over by Wolfgang Iser, who understands it as a transcendental model. Assuming the role proposed by the text does not imply the disappearance of the reader's habitual dispositions. On the contrary, Iser shows, they made up a *Hintergrund*, the horizon that makes understanding possible.[57] It is a pre-understanding without which reception would not be possible or would lead to a total

destruction of the real ego of the reader. In fact, precisely because of it the role proposed by the text is always realized just selectively; it is an "episodic actualization".[58] For Iser, the "implied reader" is "a concept that provides the relational horizon for the plurality of the historical and individual actualizations of the text".[59]

Generally speaking, the implied reader is a concept built by the author depending on how he imagines his first reader or, more broadly said, the original public. A special situation is that of narrations, where the voice of the narrator dominates the text. Here, the narrator is the confident substitute of the implied author.[60] Although the implied author and the implied reader are textual concepts, they have a strong connection with the extra-textual reality. Together with rhetorical and linguistic structures, they are part of a network of texts, in other words of an intertextual reality.[61] Or, as Ricoeur proves, in an intertextual world words do not fade anymore in front of things, but, on the contrary, the circumstantial world (the external one) is occulted by the quasi-world of texts.[62]

According to Ingarden, the written work is always unfinished. It shows gaps, "places of indetermination" (*Unbestimmtheitsstellen*). Thus, "the text is a set of instructions that the individual or public reader fulfills in a passive or creative manner".[63] In Iser's terms, each text contains empty places (*Leerstellen*), which the reader fills in.[64] If Iser emphasizes on the response of the individual reader, Jauss is interested in the answer of a public reader at the level of the collective expectations.[65] Ricoeur considers that the theory of reading and that of reception should avoid the dangers of psychologism and sociologism. There is here another hermeneutical circle: "the individual reader assumes the already deposited expectations in the public guiding his reading and, on the other hand, these public expectations result from the infinite series of individual acts of reading."[66] This is why we have certain expectations concerning every text (and every context of life too), expectations that refer to what we already know about it, namely a preliminary understanding (*Vorverständnis*), a theme upon which, in different ways, authors like Heidegger, Gadamer, Iser and others insist. The circular relation between individual reading and public reception must be included in the wider circular structure that exists between the world of the work and that of the reader. In Ricoeur's terms, the work's referentiality must be discovered, namely its capacity to "reshape reality". Shortly, the "hermeneutics' task is to accompany the structuring activity that starts from the inside of life, invests itself in text and comes back to life thanks to private reading and public reception".[67]

The reader, who has his own world, receives "the new world" that the Bible makes possible, living however from the outset a feeling of belonging to it. The concept of "belonging" sends, of course, to Gadamer's hermeneutical ontology. The reader recognizes himself as being the heir

of an original giveness of meaning, which modifies his memory, expectations and hopes.[68] According to Ricoeur, the duty to this initial meaning and the fact of feeling its heir precede the tradition, namely the transmission of this meaning. In this respect, Ricoeur distances himself from Gadamer's hermeneutics. The authority of the Bible over the reader is a result of the existence of tradition, and this depends on our initial duty to the initial text. Thanks to this form of authority, the reader is authorized to understand himself in the light of "the thing of the text," an act that always implies an existential risk,[69] namely the danger for our entire existence to be confused through this act of reading.[70] Here we are dealing, again, with a hermeneutical circle which connects, this time, between the Christian meaning and the existential one.[71]

This hermeneutics implies a special type of objectivity: the new being designed by the biblical text, in front of the text but starting from the text, is a "being for us," but a being beyond our feelings, states of mind, faith or unfaith.[72] This new being develops inside me with the help of imagination (of its variations) and not with the help of will, since before any decision and choice there is our power to open ourselves to new possibilities.[73] The meeting with the sacred text produces a destruction of the previous state of the self. Thus, biblical hermeneutics presents a critical dimension as well, which Ricoeur compares with the so-called hermeneutics of suspicion, developed by Nietzsche, Marx and Freud, which was also a critique of the illusions of the subject.[74] With this "destruction," the ego is no longer its absolute master, but becomes a self which is "disciple of the text," received by the reader as a gift.[75] His usual experience and his manner of acting are resignified in the light of the limit experiences which Christianism proposes, a concept that Ricoeur takes over from Karl Jaspers.[76]

Another consequence of this approach refers to the issue of revelation. The revelation of the Bible must not be understood psychologically, as if the author was inspired with the meaning, but it refers to the "thing" of the text, namely to the new being that it proposes, to the biblical *world.* And this world is not transmitted through immediate psychological intentions, but in a mediate manner through structures of literary work: narration, oracle and so on.[77] The concept of world must be studied thoroughly here. Together with the biblical world discovered through the interpretation of sacred text we are dealing with an entirely new interpretation of reality. The entire secular culture is thus integrated into the new Christian meaning of the world.[78] The entire community interprets itself by interpreting the Bible.[79]

The concept of faith is also rethought. Faith is constituted in a hermeneutical manner through the new being which is the "thing" of the text. Biblical faith must not be separated from the interpretive movement which raises it to language. The signs and symbols in which faith was transposed, i.e. care, unconditional trust, the feeling of dependence, have

shaped men throughout the centuries. Taking these various forms, faith opens the possibility of my freedom, becoming for me the Word of God. Thus, faith is a form of *appropriation*,[80] a concept that refers to the application of the biblical text to the reader's situation. The existential effects on the reader are due to the authority that the Bible as a "living text" has on him.[81] God's Word offers itself as a call, as an imperative connected to the person of Christ. The moment of exegesis, which discovers "the sense" of the biblical text, causes a moment of "meaning," namely of the personal existential decision and of the actualization of the sense in the reader's life.[82]

Through all these resignifications, biblical hermeneutics shows which are the limits of general hermeneutics, but at the same time it is the central part of a broad philosophical project, which does not miss any of the hermeneutics' stakes and, in general, of philosophy.

Notes

[1] Paul Ricoeur, *Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1986), 133-4.

[2] Paul Ricoeur, "Réponse à Don Ihde." in *L'herméneutique biblique*, 98-9.

[3] François-Xavier Amherdt, introduction to *L'herméneutique biblique,* par Paul Ricoeur, 78.

[4] Paul Ricoeur, "Herméneutique philosophique et herméneutique biblique." in *Exegesis. Problèmes de méthode et exercices de lecture (Genèse 22 et Luc 15)*, ed. François Bovon and Grégoire Rouiller (Neuchâtel & Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1975).

[5] Paul Ricoeur, *L'herméneutique biblique*, présentation et traduction par François-Xavier Amherdt (Paris: Cerf, 2001).

[6] Jean Grondin, *L'herméneutique*, deuxième edition (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2006), 85.

[7] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 36-7.

[8] Philibert Secretan, "Herméneutique et vérité," in *Exegesis. Problèmes de méthode et exercices de lecture (Genèse 22 et Luc 15)*, 170.

[9] Paul Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique." in *La Bible en philosophie. Approches contemporaines*, ed. Dominique Bourg & Antoine Lion (Paris: Cerf, 1993), 29.

[10] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 134-5.

[11] Paul Ricoeur, "Paul Ricoeur et l'herméneutique biblique." in *L'herméneutique biblique*, 185.

[12] Jean Greisch, *Le buisson ardent et les lumières de la raison. L'invention de la philosophie de la religion*, tome III: Vers une paradigme herméneutique (Paris: Cerf, 2004), 814-820.

[13] Northrop Frye, *The Great Code. The Bible and Literature* (London, Melbourne & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), 62.

[14] Frye, 78.

[15] Frye, 56.

[16] Frye, 137.

[17] Frye, 60.

[18] Frye, 137-8.

[19] Paul Ricoeur, *Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969), 377; Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 47-8; Daniel Frey, *L'interprétation et la lecture chez Ricoeur et Gadamer* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2008), 278.

[20] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 377.

[21] Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 47; Frey, 278.

[22] Grondin, 86.

[23] István Czachesz, "Like a net thrown into the sea. Aspects of biblical interpretation." in *Interpretation of Texts. Sacred and Secular*, ed. Pierre Bühler & Tibor Fabiny. Proceedings of the International Conference organized by the Centre for Hermeneutical Research, Budapest and the Institut für Hermeneutik und Religionsphilosophie, University of Zürich, Hungary, 3-5 September 1998 (Zürich: Pano Verlag & Budapest: Centre for Hermeneutical Research, 1999), 39.

[24] Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 3.

[25] Wolfgang Iser, *The Range of Interpretation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 13-28; Nahum M. Sarna, *Studies in Biblical Interpretation* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2000), 74-5.

[26] Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 41-2.

[27] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 135-6; Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 36.

[28] Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 37-8.

[29] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 135.

[30] Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 35.

[31] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 144.

[32] Francis Jacques, "La condition de textualité. Le texte religieux comme livre." in *Penser la religion. Recherches en Philosophie de la Religion*, ed. Jean Greisch (Paris: Beauchesne, 1991), 388.

[33] Paul Ricoeur, "Vers une théologie narrative: sa nécessité, ses ressources, ses difficultés." in *L'herméneutique biblique*, 335.

[34] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 144.

[35] Stanislas Breton, "Sur quelques présupposés d'une certaine exégèse." in *La Bible en philosophie. Approches contemporaines*, 16.

[36] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 137.

[37] Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 39-40.

[38] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 137.

[39] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 138-9.

[40] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 374-5.

[41] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 375.

[42] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 384.

[43] Craig A. Evans, "From Language to Exegesis." in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity. Studies in Language and Tradition*, ed. Craig A. Evans, Supplement Series 33 of *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* (Sheffield: Sheffield Acad. Press, 2000), 19.

[44] Evans, 20-1.

[45] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 378.

[46] Ben Vedder, *Was ist Hermeneutik? Ein Weg von der Textdeutung zur Interpretation der Wirklichkeit*, trans. Gabriele Merks-Leinen (Stuttgart, Berlin & Köln: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2000), 166; Frey, 262.

[47] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 382.

[48] Paul Ricoeur, *De l' interprétation. Essai sur Freud* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1965), 505; Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 382.

[49] Hans-Georg Gadamer, "Hermeneutik." in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, Bd. 3 (G-H) (Basel: Schwabe, 1974), 1068.

[50] Paul Ricoeur, "Réponse à David Stewart." in *L'herméneutique biblique*, 108.

[51] Amherdt, 59.

[52] Ricoeur, "Vers une théologie narrative: sa nécessité, ses ressources, ses difficultés," 331-2.

[53] Paul Ricoeur, "Le texte comme identité dynamique." in *L'herméneutique biblique*, 142.

[54] Booth, 137.

[55] Booth, 138.

[56] Booth, 138.

[57] Wolfgang Iser, *Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung*, 4. Auflage (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1994), 65.

[58] Iser, "Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung," 65.

[59] Iser, "Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung," 66.

[60] Czachesz, 35.

[61] Czachesz, 36.

[62] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 158.

[63] Ricoeur, "Le texte comme identité dynamique," 142.

[64] Iser, "Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung," 284 ff.

[65] Ricoeur, "Le texte comme identité dynamique," 142.

[66] Ricoeur, "Le texte comme identité dynamique," 143.

[67] Ricoeur, "Le texte comme identité dynamique," 143.

[68] Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 32.

[69] Ricoeur, "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique," 32.

[70] Amherdt, 79.

[71] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 376.

[72] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 141.

[73] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 148.

[74] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 147-8.

[75] Amherdt, 61.

[76] Ricoeur, "Paul Ricoeur et l'herméneutique biblique," 236.

[77] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 141-2.

[78] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 376-7.

[79] Ricoeur, "Réponse à David Stewart," 108; Paul Ricoeur, "Le texte «sacré» et la communauté." in *L'herméneutique biblique*, 323.

[80] Ricoeur, "Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II," 146.

[81] Jacques, 413.

[82] Ricoeur, "Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique," 389-390; André Lacoque, and Paul Ricoeur, *Penser la Bible* (Paris: Seuil, 1998), 15.

References

Amherdt, François-Xavier. Introduction to *L'herméneutique biblique,* by Paul Ricoeur. présentation et traduction par François-Xavier Amherdt. Paris: Cerf, 2001.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction.* Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Breton, Stanislas. "Sur quelques présupposés d'une certaine exégèse." In: *La Bible en philosophie. Approches contemporaines*, edited by Dominique Bourg and Antoine Lion. Paris: Cerf, 1993.

Czachesz, István. "Like a net thrown into the sea. Aspects of biblical interpretation." In: *Interpretation of Texts. Sacred and Secular*, edited by Pierre Bühler and Tibor Fabiny, Proceedings of the International Conference organized by the Centre for Hermeneutical Research, Budapest and the Institut für Hermeneutik und Religionsphilosophie, University of Zürich, Hungary, 3-5 September 1998. Zürich: Pano Verlag & Budapest: Centre for Hermeneutical Research, 1999.

Evans, Craig A. "From Language to Exegesis." In *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity. Studies in Language and Tradition.* edited by Craig A. Evans. Supplement Series 33 of *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha.* Sheffield: Sheffield Acad. Press, 2000.

Frey, Daniel. *L'interprétation et la lecture chez Ricoeur et Gadamer.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2008.

Frye, Northrop. *The Great Code. The Bible and Literature.* London, Melbourne & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "Hermeneutik." In *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie.* Bd. 3 (G-H). Basel: Schwabe, 1974.

Greisch, Jean. *Le buisson ardent et les lumières de la raison. L'invention de la philosophie de la religion.* tome III (Vers une paradigme herméneutique). Paris: Cerf, 2004.

Grondin, Jean. *L'herméneutique.* deuxième edition. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2006.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung.* 4. Auflage. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1994.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Range of Interpretation.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Jacques, Francis. "La condition de textualité. Le texte religieux comme livre." In: *Penser la religion. Recherches en Philosophie de la Religion,*. edited by Jean Greisch. Paris: Beauchesne, 1991.

Lacoque, André, and Paul Ricoeur. *Penser la Bible*. Paris: Seuil, 1998.

Ricoeur, Paul.. *De l' interprétation. Essai sur Freud*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1965.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Le conflit des interprétations. Essais d'herméneutique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Herméneutique philosophique et herméneutique biblique." In *Exegesis. Problèmes de méthode et exercices de lecture (Genèse 22 et Luc 15).* edited by François Bovon and Grégoire Rouiller. Neuchâtel & Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1975.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1986.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Herméneutique. Les finalités de l'exégèse biblique." In: *La Bible en philosophie. Approches contemporaines.* edited by Dominique Bourg and Antoine Lion. Paris: Cerf, 1993.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Vers une théologie narrative: sa nécessité, ses ressources, ses difficultés." In: *L'herméneutique biblique.* présentation et traduction par François-Xavier Amherdt. Paris: Cerf, 2001.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Paul Ricoeur et l'herméneutique biblique." In: *L'herméneutique biblique.* présentation et traduction par François-Xavier Amherdt. Paris: Cerf, 2001.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Réponse à Don Ihde." In: *L'herméneutique biblique.* présentation et traduction par François-Xavier Amherdt. Paris: Cerf, 2001.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Réponse à David Stewart." In: *L'herméneutique biblique.* présentation et traduction par François-Xavier Amherdt. Paris: Cerf, 2001.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Le texte comme identité dynamique." In: *L'herméneutique biblique.* présentation et traduction par François-Xavier Amherdt. Paris: Cerf, 2001.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Le texte «sacré» et la communauté." In: *L'herméneutique biblique.* présentation et traduction par François-Xavier Amherdt. Paris: Cerf, 2001.

Sarna, Nahum M. *Studies in Biblical Interpretation.* Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2000.

Secretan, Philibert. "Herméneutique et vérité." In: *Exegesis. Problèmes de méthode et exercices de lecture (Genèse 22 et Luc 15).* edited by François Bovon and Grégoire Rouiller. Neuchâtel & Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1975.

Vedder, Ben. *Was ist Hermeneutik? Ein Weg von der Textdeutung zur Interpretation der Wirklichkeit.* translated by Gabriele Merks-Leinen. Stuttgart, Berlin & Köln: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2000.