scribing the visions of the Throne Chariot and the Temple he gave minute, graphic detail that evinces a keen interest in and appreciation for the artistic qualities of his subject. As B. Smalley (1983) notes, “What attracted him in the letter of Scripture was not the movement of human history, but the jewels, the songs, the flowers.”

R. wrote works of a more dogmatic nature, the most important of which is De Trinitate, in which his unique interpretation of the interior life of God, founded on the necessity of the character of love, requires not only Lover and Beloved but also a third who shares in that love—a model for a spirituality that involves interpersonal community, as G. Zinn (1979) notes.


M. A. ZIER

RICHARDSON, ALAN (1905-75)

A prominent English theologian, ecumenist, apologist, and outstandingly, widely read popularizer, R. developed a particularly Anglican blend of biblical theology in the decades following WWII, best seen in his volume on NT theology (1958). Having worked for the Student Christian Movement, he became canon of Durham in 1943, professor of Christian theology at Nottingham in 1953, and dean of York in 1964. His popular biblical works were widely read. He also edited a theological wordbook of the Bible (1950) and a dictionary of Christian theology (1969), both published by SCM Press, of which he was chair. His more systematic work, Christian Apologetics (1948), was followed by History Sacred and Profane (1964), which espoused a perspectival view of history. His English insistence on the apologetic value of history and his strong Anglican ties made him hostile to European thought, especially to K. Barth and R. Bultmann.

Works: The Miracle-stories of the Gospels (1941); Preface to Bible Study (1943); Christian Apologetics (1948); A Theoretical Workbook of the Bible (1950); Genesis 1-11: An Introduction and Commentary (1953); An Introduction to the Theology of the NT (1958); John (1959); History Sacred and Profane (1964); A Dictionary of Christian Theology (1969).


R. Morgan

RICOEUR, PAUL (1913- )

R. was born in Valence, France, on Feb. 27, 1913, and was raised by his paternal grandparents in Brittany in the tradition of the Protestant Huguenots. In 1935 he graduated from the Sorbonne, where he attended seminars conducted by G. Marcel. While interned in a German POW camp from 1940 to 1945 he was allowed to study German philosophy and theology, including the writings of I. Kant, E. Husserl (1859-1938), M. Heidegger (1889-1976), R. Bultmann, and K. Barth. These thinkers have had an abiding impact on his work.

After the war, R. first taught at a secondary school in Chambon-sur-Lignon, a village known for its aid to Jewish refugees during the Nazi occupation. He moved to the University of Strasbourg in 1948 and eventually returned to the Sorbonne to occupy the chair of general philosophy (1957-67). He was active in the Parisian socialist movement and in the promotion of social democracy against the threat of market-driven capitalism. In 1967 he left the Sorbonne and joined the faculty of the University of Paris in Nanterre. As dean, he was instrumental in mediating conflicts between faculty and students over the cries for reform in the French university system during the Paris uprisings of 1968. During this time he did collaborative work with E. Levinas and was one of J. Derrida’s teachers; he also became a permanent faculty member of the University of Chicago, with appointments in the divinity school, the department of philosophy, and the Committee on Social Thought. Having resigned from Nanterre in 1980, he became professor emeritus at Chicago in 1991. He lives in the Paris suburb of Catenay-Malabry, his permanent residence since 1957.

R.’s contribution to biblical studies can be noted by summarizing the contents of three of his most seminal writings on biblical hermeneutics, each stemming from a different period in his life. The Symbolism of Evil (1960) consists of philosophically informed exegetical readings of the phenomenon of evil, as presented in Greek and biblical texts. By way of these founding texts R. argues that to be human is to be estranged from oneself because all humans, though destined for fulfillment, are inevitably captive to an “adversary” greater than themselves. The bitter irony of this predicament is most effectively symbolized by the myth of Adam’s fall (see MYTHOLOGY AND BIBLICAL STUDIES). Although the story is putatively about historical origins, it functions as an etiological myth concerning a cosmic battle be-
between good and evil anterior to Adam's decision. R.'s point in this volume is that human beings enter consciousness as denizens of a world of prior symbols and myths. Thus figurative language interprets us before we interpret it. Since there are no shortcuts to selfhood, it is only when the subject traverses a hermeneutical "long route" through the revealing power of the symbol that he or she can arrive at an adequate self-understanding. This route follows a path from the loss of original belief in the sacred to a critical recovery of the power of myth in a world seemingly empty of meaning and hope. Along this interpretive path the voice of the sacred can be heard again, not in the mode of a pre-critical naïveté, but through an interpretive gesture, what R. refers to as a "second naïveté," that wagers on the power of myth and symbol to elucidate the nature of human being.

"Biblical Hermeneutics" (1975), an exercise in analyzing the discourse of Jesus' parables, is central to the second period in R.'s writings on biblical interpretation. The PARABLES employ extravagantly transgressive language to refigure time at its limits. R. stresses how the parables' power to reorient by subverting the reader's presuppositions about reality allows the Bible's zones of indeterminacy to come fully to light. His study of the iconoclastic nature of parabolic discourse clarifies the importance of attention to the diversity of biblical genres for a multifaceted understanding of the Bible's message. Some theologians and biblical scholars ignore parabolic discourse in favor of narrative modes of expression, reading the Bible as a seamless whole. However, such an interpretation ignores the Bible's irritations of radical discontinuity. R.'s point in "Biblical Hermeneutics" is that only as narrative is interanimated by other modes of discourse—e.g., Jesus' parables—can it effectively create meaning.

"Interpretative Narrative" (1990) in Figuring the Sacred reflects the progression in R.'s hermeneutics from discourse analysis to post-structuralism (especially through his use of the work of F. Kermode and J. D. Crossan). This piece characterizes the third stage in R.'s biblical scholarship. In an interpretation of the secrecy motif in the Gospel of Mark, he shows that the Markan story both creates meaning in recombination with other modes of discourse and, in its cross-pollinations with the counter-narrative stress on the enigmatic, also subverts literary and theological coherence by obfuscating what it purports to elucidate. In a POST-MODERN culture the pathos and the promise of a Ricoeurian hermeneutic is its ability to bring to light the darkness and opacity that shadows the Bible's most prized stories.

Taken as a whole, R.'s contribution to biblical studies has been to help move the field away from being a historical mode of study divorced from wider philosophical discussion toward being a thoroughgoing hermeneutical discipline informed by contemporary intellectual life. While his hope has been to engender a productive dialogue between the tasks of biblical hermeneutics and of philosophical inquiry, R. has not sought to subordinate the former to the latter (however; see K. Vanhoozer [1990] 190-289). Rather, he has endeavored to avoid theory-heavy methods of biblical reading in favor of a text-immanent approach. With other contemporary philosophical and literary readers of the Bible, he maintains that biblical meaning is produced through an interpretation of the diverse genres that constitute the intertext of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures.


RIEHM, EDUARD KARL AUGUST (1830-88)

Born Dec. 20, 1830, in Diersburg, Germany, R. studied theology in Heidelberg and Halle. In 1853 he received his doctorate and in 1858 habilitated in OT THEOLOGY, becoming an ausserordentlicher professor in Heidelberg (1861) and a full professor in Halle after H. Huppfeld's death (1866). He died Apr. 5, 1888, in Gießen.

R.'s work belonged to what has been called mediation theology. Combining scholarly work with south German church devotion, R. remained in serious, open-minded dialogue with new scholarly developments in HB studies, tending always to draw conservative conclusions. His dissertation Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab (1854) is a careful investigation of the state of the question since W. de Wette's Dissertatio critico-exegetica (1805), with a focus on theological interpretation. R.'s dating of Deuteronomy to the middle of the seventh century BCE dominated the coming period of scholarship. He was so certain that Deuteronomy was later than the bulk of the Pentateuch (see PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM) that he did not bother in 1854 to address the opposing view of J. vatke, P. von bohlen, and J. george that placed much of the Pentateuch after Deuteronomy. However, with K. Graf in 1866, he was forced at least to concede that the priestly legislation did not become influential until the period of the Second Temple.

Just as significant was his argument with A. Ritschl over the latter's neglect of the biblical view of God's wrath. R.'s basic biblical and theological concern was especially clear in Die messianische Weissagung (1875), in which he explained the individual predictions in their historical settings and as parts of a divine work of education until the onset of NT salvation truth. In Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbürges (1858-59), a systematic presentation dependent on the latest commentaries (especially on that of F. Bleek), he treated the same subject from an NT point of view.

R.'s work reached a broad audience through his Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums (1884) and his contributions to the revision of Luther's translation of the Bible. In 1865 he began coediting TSK, contributing studies and critical remarks that were respected because of their sober meticulousness.

Works: Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab: Ein Beitrag zur Einleitung ins Alte Testament (1854); Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbürges (2 vols., 1858-59, 1867); De natura et notione symbolica cheruborum (1864); "Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments: Zwei Historisch-kritische Untersuchungen," review of K. H. Graf in TSK 41 (1868) 350-70; "Die sogenannte Grundschrift des Pentateuchs," TSK 45 (1872) 283-307; Die messianische Weissagung (1875, 1885); ET 1876; "Der Begriff der Sünde im Alten Testament," TSK 50 (1877) 7-92; Religion und Wissenschaft (Rektoratsrede Halle, 1881); Zur Revision der Lutherbibel: Oster Programm der vereinigten Friedruchs-Universität (1882); Handwörterbuch des Biblischen Altertums (2 vols., 1884); Luther als Bibelübersetzer (1884); Altestamentliche Theologie (ed. K. Pahncke, 1889); Einleitung in das Alte Testament (2 vols., ed. A. Brandt, 1889-90).


R. SMEND

RITSCHL, ALBRECHT BENJAMIN (1822-89)

Born Mar. 25, 1822, in Berlin, son of a pastor and bishop in the Evangelical Church, R. was reared in Stettin and educated at the universities of Bonn (1839-41) and Halle (1841-43). He received his doctorate from Halle with a dissertation entitled Expositio doctrinae Augustini de creatione, mundi, peccato, gratia (1843), which raised some issues that would be the focus of his later work. He studied at Heidelberg (1845) and Tübingen (1845-46), where he became an enthusiastic disciple of F. C. Baüer. In 1846 he became a Dozent in NT THEOLOGY at Bonn, ausserordentlicher professor in 1852, and full professor in 1859, gradually moving after 1848 into the teaching of church history and the history of dogma. In 1864 he accepted a position at Göttingen, where he taught until his death Mar. 20, 1889, lecturing both in NT and in systematic theology.

Having given up the Pietism and supernaturalism of his background, R.'s first published works reflect Baüer's view of the early church as dominated by strife between Jewish-oriented (Petrine) and universalist Gentile-oriented (Pauline) parties, whose compromise produced the early Roman Catholic Church. Like Baüer he argued for the late dating of much of the NT, in his 1846 work maintaining that Marcion's version of Luke was the source of the Gospel. By 1856, however, he had completely broken with Baüer and in the 1857 revision of his work on the early church regarded both the early church and the NT as more homogenous and basically "uncontaminated" by either rabbinic Judaism or Hellenistic philosophy.

In R.'s great work on justification and reconciliation, several characteristics of his work become clear: (1) He saw himself as attempting to recover the essence of the
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