

Rachel L. Coleman

Walter Brueggemann's Enduring Influence on Biblical Interpretation¹

Abstract

This article highlights the far-reaching and dialogue-provoking influence, on both church and academy, of Walter Brueggemann's writings, and presents a brief analysis of three aspects of Brueggemann's work: the historical, cultural, and professional contexts that have shaped it; two distinctive paradigms that govern his theological reflection; and the major critiques of his work, both positive and negative.

Keywords: Walter Brueggemann, hermeneutics, dialectic, imagination, Old Testament, theology

Rachel Coleman serves with One Mission Society (Theological Education Team, Latin America) and is a doctoral student in Renewal Studies at Regent University. She is the co-author of *One Faith Multiplied* (with Dean P. Davis) and the translator of Dennis Kinlaw's *This Day with the Master* and *The Mind of Christ*.

Introduction

Walter Brueggemann is a force to be reckoned with in twenty-first century Old Testament studies, a prolific scholar whose work is not only acclaimed within the academy but also widely read across the contemporary church. Mark Theissen Nation, of the London Mennonite Committee, praises Brueggemann's work from a pastoral perspective, saying, "No one writing on the Bible is more consistently provocative, interesting, challenging, and imaginative than Brueggemann." He continues with an astonishing endorsement: "I would go so far as to say that if there is any one author every preacher should have in his or her library, it should be Walter Brueggemann" (2013:n.p.). James Howell sums up the response of many pastors to Brueggemann's work: "Through my now three decades of ministry, I have found Brueggemann to be a constant partner in thought, a provocateur who keeps me on my toes. He has made me a more insightful reader—of books, of culture, and of the church" (2014:32).

Within the academy, Brueggemann tends to be a polemical figure, drawing warm reviews from some peers while provoking sharp critiques from others. For example, in his review of Brueggemann's 1997 magnum opus, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*, Gordon Wenham writes: "Brueggemann's work is not just big, it is exciting, refreshing, critically self-aware and provocative. The freshness of its ideas is matched by the vigor of its style" (1999:169).² Brevard Childs' conclusion about the same book illustrates a distinctly different reaction to Brueggemann's work: "One does not have to look far to discover the striking analogies between Brueggemann's postmodernism and ancient Gnosticism . . . Both approaches work with a sharply defined dualism between a God of creation who is known and predictable, and one who is hidden, unknown and capricious" (2000:232). As these two sharply diverging opinions illustrate, Brueggemann's contribution to biblical studies has been consistently provocative. J. Richard Middleton puts it this way: "Walter Brueggemann has challenged the settled verities of Christian communities of faith and the orthodoxies of biblical scholarship" (1994:257).

These comments from church leaders and scholars provide a glimpse into the far-reaching and dialogue-provoking influence that Walter Brueggemann's work has had on both the church and the academy. This article will present a brief analysis of three aspects of that work: (1) the historical, cultural, and professional contexts that have shaped Brueggemann's thought; (2) two distinctive paradigms that govern his theology; and (3) the major critiques, both positive and negative, that his work has elicited. It will be shown that Brueggemann's contribution to biblical

interpretation continues to provide fruitful motifs and challenging questions for a new generation of biblical scholars, pastors, and teachers.

Brueggemann's Historical, Cultural, and Professional Context

Brueggemann's professional, historical, and cultural contexts have shaped his theologizing. On a professional level, Brueggemann's theological reflection has been formed in the context of seminaries (Eden Theological Seminary and Columbia Theological Seminary), rather than in university departments of religion. In his words, he has worked out his theological insights both "in the fray and above the fray" (1995:3), and has insisted on an intentional interface between theology and the church. Brueggemann is recognized as a scholar with a "commitment to stay within the church while offering strong prophetic critiques to its imperial allegiances" (Premawardhana 2011:230).

Brueggemann manifests keen awareness of his historical and cultural contexts and how they shape his theological work. He states in *Theology of the Old Testament* that he is doing "local" theology for a specific group of readers—the church in the capitalist West. "Our context within which to consider the viability of the Old Testament theology is the wider social context of the West, where another metanarrative is more powerful and compelling" (1997:718). He names this competing metanarrative "military consumerism." Brueggemann's early years as a scholar coincided with the tumult of the Civil Rights era and the Vietnam War, an historical period that was the perfect incubator for his growing dissatisfaction with this controlling narrative of Western culture (Parrish 1998:570). Awareness and suspicion of this overarching story is the predisposition Brueggemann brings to scripture, and it has prompted him to put a strong emphasis on the metaphor of "exile" to describe the experience of the Western church in relationship to the dominant metanarrative. Donald Burke summarizes Brueggemann's use of this exile metaphor:

It is not sufficient for the Church to mourn the now lost past, just as it was not sufficient for the Jews to mourn the loss of king and temple. What is necessary now for the Church is to find ways to be the Church in exile; to be both a critical voice in a secular and pluralistic society, and a constructive voice announcing unexpected hope in a world overshadowed by despair. According to Brueggemann, this new exilic situation of the Church creates the possibility that a largely enculturated Church will be able to recover the power of the Gospel in its exile (1999:27).

Brueggemann's own self-understanding locates him within postmodernity, which he defines as "the end of a cultural period that was dominated by objective

positivism that made a thin kind of historical scholarship possible, and that granted interpretive privileges to certain advantaged perspectives” (1997:61). He understands and welcomes postmodernity as an epistemological “unsettledness,” which manifests itself in a pluralism of faith affirmations, methods and interpretive communities (1997:61–64).

Two Central Paradigms of his Work

It is Brueggemann’s embrace of postmodernism’s epistemological unsettledness that gives rise to his emphasis on the unsettled and dialectical nature of both the biblical text and its interpretation. He asserts that Israel’s witness to Yahweh, and even Yahweh’s “irascible” character itself, is dialectical, rather than transcendental and monologic (1997:83). Because of the dialectical nature of the biblical witness, any interpretation of it “is reached only provisionally and is in turn subject to reconsideration” (1997:64). Various dialectical expressions appear repeatedly in Brueggemann’s reflection on Israel’s witness; these include: “testimony and countertestimony” (the central metaphor in his *Theology of the Old Testament*), songs “from above and from below,” movements of “protest” and “consolidation,” as well as the contrast between “structure legitimation,” which is the perspective from a place of power, versus the “embrace of pain,” the perspective from the margins, where the biblical text refuses to allow an unchallenged claim that all is well (Burke, 1999:27). In this latter dialectic, Brueggemann associates “structure legitimation” with the Abrahamic-Davidic tradition within scripture and assigns the “embrace of pain” to the Mosaic-prophetic tradition. Dialectic (or perhaps, trialectic) also characterizes the triad of categories that has greatly impacted Psalms studies: “orientation, disorientation, and reorientation” (Brueggemann, 1984).

Brueggemann’s insights into the unsettled and dialectical nature of the biblical witness have led him to approach scripture through two central paradigms: rhetorical criticism and imagination. Rhetorical criticism is, for Brueggemann, an approach consistent with both the pluralism of postmodernity and the supple nature of the Old Testament text itself. He says that there “can be no right or ultimate interpretation, but only provisional judgments for which the interpreter is prepared to take practical responsibility, and which must always yet again be submitted to the larger conflictual conversation” (1997:63). He finds the warrant for such a hermeneutical process within Israel’s own rhetorical reflections on its relationship with God. The hermeneutical prioritizing of Israel’s rhetoric, which he calls “testimony,” is expressed in quite radical terms in the *Theology of the Old Testament*:

I have proposed that Old Testament theology focus on Israel's speech about God. The positive warrant for this proposal is that what we have in the Old Testament is speech, nothing else. My approach assumes that speech is constitutive of reality that words count, that the practitioners of Yahweh are indeed *homo rhetoricus*. Yahweh lives in, with, and under this speech, and in the end, depends on Israel's testimony for an access point in the world (1997:714).

Brueggemann recognized the radical nature of this proposal, writing at the time: "This is, of course, a sweeping statement, one that I shall perhaps regret before I am finished" (1997:714). However, his more recent reflections on his claims about Israel's rhetoric contain not regret but reaffirmation of his commitment to the interpretive scheme of testimony and countertestimony:

It is of course unmistakably clear that the testimony of Israel to the character, agency, and reality of Yahweh is not seamless or singular or of one mind. Thus, I have proposed "testimony and countertestimony" as a practice of competing or conflicting voices about God. In retrospect, given the emerging importance of Mikhail Bakhtin in scripture study, one could conclude not only that we have "testimony and countertestimony," but that we have a cacophony of competing voices, each of which claims to tell the truth about God and the world. But my concentration on testimony and countertestimony is enough to support the ongoing and unsettled character of God in Israel's testimony that is in tension with dominant ideology, ancient or contemporary, and that, in many alternative genres, parses the world differently (2012: 30).

Brueggemann's rhetorical approach is both a response to the text as he finds it and a reaction against what he considers the hegemonic, privileged, and reductionist readings of modernity, epitomized for him by the historical-critical method as well as by Brevard Child's canonical criticism. For Brueggemann, the historical critical method represents the imposition of humanistic positivism on scripture, marginalizing the Spirit's contemporary, ever-new participation in the interpretive process. He (rather unfairly) sees Child's approach as a parallel imposition on the text of the categories of systematic theology (1997:96). While Brueggemann does not completely reject the value of these "centrist" methodologies, he advises caution in their interpretive use: "We continue to engage in such criticism, but with some vigilance about its temptation to overreach" (1997:105). This vigilance includes paying close attention to the interpretive voices from the periphery, such as liberationist or feminist readings, as well as to peripheral voices within the text itself. Brueggemann declares, "One of the primary demands of Old Testament theology

in our present context is to work precisely at the interface between these readings in conflict” (1997:102).

Paired with Brueggemann’s rhetorical analysis is his preference for imagination as the lens through which to view and interpret scripture. Imagination, for Brueggemann, is “the human capacity to picture, portray, receive, and practice the world in ways other than it appears to be at first glance when seen through a dominant, habitual, unexamined lens” (1993:13). Imagination, thus defined, is a crucial ingredient in Israel’s witness to its history with Yahweh, which legitimizes for Brueggemann the adoption of imagination as a lens for interpreting that testimony in scripture (1997:67). Brueggemann has been consistently developing this concept of imagination as an interpretive tool since his first major publication in 1978, *The Prophetic Imagination*, which highlights imagination as Israel’s central way of envisioning the biblical alternative to an oppressive status quo.

An Illustration from Brueggemann’s Work

Brueggemann’s emphases on imagination and dialectic as hermeneutical tools, as well as his insistence on the interface between the academy and the church, can be observed in his treatment of the Psalter. For Brueggemann, the psalms are “a genuinely dialogical literature” (1984:15) and they lend themselves to “a post critical interpretation that lets the devotional and scholarly traditions support, inform, and correct each other” (1984:16). Thirty years after *The Message of the Psalms*, Brueggemann continues to offer reflection on and analysis of the Psalms that is intended explicitly for the life and liturgical practices of the church, in *From Whom No Secrets Are Hid: Introducing the Psalms* (2014).

The interpretation of Psalm 88 in *The Message of the Psalms* is illustrative of Brueggemann’s approach. Psalm 88 is what he calls a psalm of “disorientation,” a kind of Hebrew poetry that recognizes the reality that life is not always balanced and coherent, but is also “savagely marked by disequilibrium, incoherence, and unrelieved asymmetry” (1984:51). Undaunted by the unsettled nature of this difficult song of disorientation and setting aside historical-critical questions of authorship, date, and *Sitz im Leben*, Brueggemann focuses on the fact that it is simply speech, born out of the darkness of divine silence: “The psalm is not interested in any theological reason Yahweh may have. The psalm is from Israel’s side. It engages in no speculation. It asks no theological question. It simply reports on how it is to be a partner of Yahweh in Yahweh’s inexplicable absence” (1984:79). Within the psalm Yahweh’s silence remains unbroken, but rather than leading to atheism, it moves the psalmist to increasingly intense, even accusatory, speech, as seen in verses 9-17 (1984:79–80). Finally, the song closes with the psalmist shunned and enveloped

in darkness (verse 18). Brueggemann observes: “The last word in the psalm is darkness. The last word is darkness. The last theological word here is darkness. Nothing works. Nothing is changed. Nothing is resolved” (1984:80).

While Brueggemann overstates the case in declaring that Psalm 88 asks no theological questions, his central insight is keen and helpful: Israel speaks out of the disorienting reality of Yahweh’s silence. Flowing directly out of this rhetorical interpretation is Brueggemann’s application of Psalm 88 to the life of faith. First, Psalm 88 is a biblical voice that is attuned to reality. “Here, more than anywhere else, faith faces life as it is” (1984:80). Although this is also an overstatement, it nevertheless highlights the undeniably disorienting aspect of Psalm 88 and its painful reflection in the faith journey of those who walk in the midst of divine silence. Second, although Yahweh is silent, Israel is not; the voice of faith still speaks—and must speak:

In the bottom of the Pit, Israel still knows it has to do with Yahweh. It cannot be otherwise. Yahweh may not have to do with Israel. That is a problem for Yahweh, not for Israel or Israel’s theologians . . . Israel must deal with Yahweh in his life-giving speech and answer. But Israel must also deal with Yahweh in the silence, in God’s blank absence as in the saving presence. Israel has no choice but to speak to this one, or to cease to be Israel. In this painful, unresolved speech, Israel is simply engaged in being Israel (1984:80–81).

Where Brueggemann fails to draw together the threads of orientation-disorientation-reorientation that weave together in Psalm 88 is in his own silence over the Psalm’s opening declaration of Yahweh as “the God of my salvation” (Psalm 88:1). As B. Embry notes, “If, indeed, ‘nothing is changed’ for the psalmist, then Yahweh, despite appearances, remains the God of salvation” (2015: n.p.). That is the faith-context that gives shape to Israel in its engagement with the divine silence.

Critiques of Brueggemann’s Work

It is no surprise that Brueggemann’s work has generated strong negative critiques. The most sensitive “hot button” has been his setting aside of questions of historicity and ontology in his approach to the text. As one pastor puts it, “I always want more historical critical backstory and rationale from Brueggemann” (Howell 2014:33). Gordon Wenham correctly sees the sidelining of historical-critical questions as a serious shortcoming, noting that because communication, or testimony, takes places in historical contexts, “reconstruction of the communicative situation is very useful to the rhetorical critic” (1999:175). Paul Hanson makes a

similar observation: “While I agree that the primary witness to the God of the Old Testament is found in Israel’s testimony, I find too limiting an approach that dismisses as irrelevant the light shed on that testimony by historians, epigraphists, and historians of religion, light that clarifies the grounding of biblical religion in the real world of its time” (1999:449). Alice Ogden Bellis, although valuing the usefulness of Brueggemann’s testimony framework as a lens for viewing Old Testament theology, nevertheless questions whether his focus on the “utteredness” of the text comes at the expense of ontology. “Brueggemann seems to have missed one of the most obvious themes in the Hebrew Bible; the text itself points to a God whose power is not dependent on any human utterance or other human form of power” (2001:233). In answer to such criticisms, Brueggemann contends that he has simply “bracketed out” historical and ontological issues in order to attend to the text itself (2012:32).

Brevard Childs also critiques Brueggemann’s handling of historical issues, particularly in regard to his concept of Israel’s “countertestimony.” According to Childs, Brueggemann betrays a serious misunderstanding of the canonical process, which in essence was a sorting out of authoritative testimony by Yahweh’s covenant people: “Israel shaped its literature confessionally to bear testimony to what it received as containing an established range of truthful witness” (2000:230). Childs views Brueggemann’s category of countertestimony as a presumptuous reconstruction of “voices on which Israel’s authors had already rendered a judgment” (2000:230). Brueggemann’s highlighting of the multiple voices within the canon brings to the surface a significant textual reality with which all serious Old Testament interpreters must grapple, but Childs’ caution is well-taken: the canon itself represents a certain level of decision about the parameters of that polyphonic witness. And there is a sense in which Brueggemann himself fails to follow his own advice about giving space to the polyphonic voices of the text, since he consistently privileges the prophetic voice over the priestly witness.³

Criticisms also emerge from uneasiness about the theological implications of Brueggemann’s understanding of Israel’s God as “irascible” and conflicted. His characterization of God as one whose “self-regard is massive in its claim, strident in its expectation, and ominous in its potential” (1997:296) pushes this writer to question how accurately Brueggemann’s vision of Israel’s God reflects the self-revelation of Yahweh in the Old Testament canon. Childs critiques Brueggemann’s position at this point as well, arguing “the stability of God in relation to his people sets Israel’s faith apart from all the arbitrariness and confusion of paganism” (2000:231).

Another contested point is the inconsistency in Brueggemann's claims to a postmodern perspective. Jon Levenson, for example, protests, "If we take as definitional Jean-François Lyotard's influential characterization of postmodern thought as the suspicion of metanarratives, Brueggemann . . . would not qualify as postmodern at all" (2000:266). Levenson points out that rather than rejecting all metanarrative, Brueggemann understands contemporary reality as a conflict between two metanarratives—the "script" of the Old Testament and that of Western culture. The hermeneutical result, as Levenson points out, is a far cry from postmodernism:

What we have, in other words, is not really a 'pluralistic interpretive context' in the postmodern sense, in which there is no bedrock of truth to which interpretation must either prove faithful or fall into discredit. Rather, we are confronted with something more akin to a capitalist market place, in which rival interpretations engage in 'conflict and competition' until one of them—Brueggemann hopes it will be 'the metanarrative of the Old Testament (or of the Bible or of the church)'—emerges triumphant. In spite of Brueggemann's frequent employment of the postmodernist rhetoric of subversion, protest, and plurality, what he actually envisions is more like the liberal vision of a public space in which different interpretations compete freely in the firm conviction that through this process the truth will eventually win out (2000:266).

Finally, a sometimes unspoken critique from those who have read widely in the Brueggemann corpus has to do with its sameness—the sense that his interests and insights remain largely the same in 2015 as they were in 1997. Pastor James Howell, an admittedly voracious reader of Brueggemann's work, describes a period when this perceived sameness began to color his reading: "At some point I wearied of him. I felt his *modus operandi* had become predictable. Pick any topic or person—peace, David, worship, or Ichabod—and Brueggemann would be off and running, exposing what is foolhardy in our culture in the light of the Bible's counterculture. I have the hang of his grammar; I've imbibed his perspective; I can perform a pretty fair impersonation of him" (2104:33).⁴

Not all analyses of Brueggemann's work have been negative. His voice has also been warmly welcomed, particularly in Psalms studies. Patrick D. Miller affirms: "Without having written a commentary on the Psalms, Walter Brueggemann has done more to influence the interpretation and 'use' of the Psalms than any other American scholar of his generation" (1995:xi). *The Message of the Psalms* (1984), while not a commentary in the historical-critical sense, is, as its subtitle suggests, a "theological commentary," a volume of great value to both Old Testament scholars and pastors.

As mentioned earlier, Brueggemann is open about his quest to “join exegesis of the text with the hermeneutics of its appropriation” (Miller 1995:xii), a search which meets with approval from some reviewers. Stephen Parrish, for example, notes that Brueggemann “has sensed well that faithful theological work has one foot in the church and the other in the academy” (1998:574). And Donald Burke comments, “Brueggemann is never satisfied with applying the critical method as an end in itself; he always pushes his interpretation to another level, where he is able to envision how the texts engage the large issues of life and faith” (1999:35). This intentional standing with a foot in both camps—church and academy—is one of the reasons for Brueggemann’s continued relevance, and it characterizes his most recent work, *Reality, Grief, Hope* (2014) and *Sabbath as Resistance: Saying No to the Culture of Now* (2014).

Brueggemann’s rhetorical approach and his embrace of dialectic in the text, which open up interpretation to include the polyphony of biblical voices, also find a welcoming space among some interpreters. According to Parrish, for example, Brueggemann has moved Old Testament theology away from “the elusive search for a *Mitte*” and has demonstrated the gains of viewing the hermeneutical task “as theological and not purely historical or descriptive” (1998:574). Tim Meadowcroft, despite some reservations about Brueggemann’s conclusions, applauds the fact that his approach “does induce a careful listening to all the voices of scripture rather than foreclosing on which voices should be privileged and which silenced in interpretation” (2006:43).

Conclusion

Walter Brueggemann continues to engage actively with a wide range of dialogue partners in conversation about theology and its real-life application. Two examples of the broad contemporary influence of Brueggemann’s work, both published in 2012, are *Living Countertestimony: Conversations with Walter Brueggemann*, a series of personal conversations with colleagues and students that reveal the man behind the bibliography, and *Nurturing the Prophetic Imagination*, a distinctively Wesleyan collection inspired by Brueggemann’s notion of the prophetic imagination. Essays in the latter volume reveal Brueggemann’s impact on interpretation—and Christian interpreters—across a wide range of disciplines: biblical studies, theology, economics, sociology, politics, ecology, church history, social justice, prophecy, and the arts. The two 2014 volumes, *Reality, Grief, Hope* and *Sabbath as Resistance*, continue the prophetic and pastoral challenge begun in 1997 with the *Theology*: a call to the North American church in the 21st century to cast off the controlling metanarratives (gods?) of empire (*Reality*) and of consumerism (*Sabbath*).

Brueggemann's challenge to Western theologians to hear the multiplicity of voices both within the text and within the interpretive community continues to hold rich potential on at least two fronts. First, it gives a welcoming embrace to the voices of exegetes from outside the Western-dominated academy, whose insights may challenge and clarify long-cherished presuppositions and interpretations.⁵ *Second*, Brueggemann's fearless approach to multiple testimonies in the canon opens the door for a renewed recognition of the important role of the Spirit in the work of theology, for, as Brueggemann insisted in a 2004 interview, it is in the very "raggedness" of scripture, the places where its conflicting voices collide, that the Spirit is most likely to work (2004 Emergent Theological Conversation with Walter Brueggemann, n.p.). May Walter Brueggemann's contribution to biblical interpretation continue to spur us to welcome that work of the Spirit as we grapple with the Old Testament's polyphonous and powerful witness to the God who is our Creator, Sustainer, Refuge and Savior.

End Notes

¹ A version of this paper was presented at the Regent University School of Divinity's PhD Research Seminar, Mar. 26, 2015. The respondent was Dr. Brad Embry, Associate Professor of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, Regent University.

² Wenham's review of Brueggemann's *Theology* is not unqualified praise; he also relates disappointment with what he perceives as "proof-texting" and an "anti-Christological" reading of the Old Testament (1999:176).

³ I am indebted to Dr. Brad Embry for this insight. In his response to this paper, he wrote: "I suspect that Brueggemann's own interpretive framework, which suppresses most concerns to those of social justice activism, simply cannot accommodate for those darn, head-in-the-clouds, fussy priests. Of course, he's a great fan of Ezekiel and Jeremiah—both priests—but only in their prophetic dispensations." For an example of Brueggemann's interaction with and appreciation of the priestly tradition, see his 2001 commentary on Deuteronomy in the Abingdon OT series.

⁴ Despite this momentary ennui towards Brueggemann's work, Howell found his interest recaptured by the 2014 *Sabbath as Resistance*, particularly captivated by Brueggemann's valiant foray into the New Testament. "It strikes me as rare, even gutsy, which only reveals how timid most scholars are about venturing beyond their narrow professional turf" (2014:34).

⁵ Alice Bellis welcomes Brueggemann's expressed openness to minority voices, particularly feminist and liberationist perspectives, but judges that this openness "does not translate into much more than a rhetorical advocacy of reparations" (2001:236).

Works Cited

Brueggemann, Walter

- 1978 *The Prophetic Imagination*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress.
- 1984 *The Message of the Psalms: A Theological Commentary*. Augsburg Old Testament Studies. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg.
- 1993 *The Bible and the Postmodern Imagination: Texts Under Negotiation*. London: SCM.
- 1995 *Old Testament Theology: Essays on Structure, Theme and Text*. Ed. Patrick D. Miller. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- 1997 *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- 2001 *Deuteronomy*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- 2012 "Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy Revisited." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 74: 28-38.
- 2014A *From Whom No Secrets Are Hid*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.
- 2014B *Reality, Grief, Hope: Three Urgent Prophetic Tasks*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- 2014C *Sabbath as Resistance: Saying No to the Culture of Now*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.

Brueggemann, Walter and Carolyn J. Sharp

- 2012 *Living Countertestimony: Conversations with Walter Brueggemann*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.

Burke, Donald E.

- 1999 "Walter Brueggemann's Bountiful Harvest," *Touchstone* 17, no. 1 (January): 24-36.

Childs, Brevard S.

- 2000 "Walter Brueggemann's *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 53: 228-233.

Embry, Brad

- 2015 "Response to Rachel Coleman, 'Walter Brueggemann's Enduring Influence on Biblical Interpretation,'" unpublished, March.

Gates, Jamie and Mark H. Mann, ed.

- 2012 *Nurturing the Prophetic Imagination*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

- Hanson, Paul
1999 "A New Challenge to Biblical Theology." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 67: 447–459.
- Howell, James C.
2014 "Subversion and Hope." *The Christian Century* 131, no. 13: 32–34.
- Levenson, Jon
2000 "Is Brueggemann Really a Pluralist?" *Harvard Theological Review* 93: 265–294.
- McCarthy, Brian
2000 "Response: Brueggemann and Hanson on God in the Hebrew Scriptures." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 68 (September): 615.
- Meadowcroft, Tim
2006 "Method and Old Testament Theology: Barr, Brueggemann and Goldingay Considered." *Tyndale Bulletin* 57: 35–56.
- Middleton, J. Richard
1994 "Is Creation Theology Inherently Conservative? A Dialogue with Walter Brueggemann." *Harvard Theological Review* 87(3): 257–277.
- Miller, Patrick D.
1995 "Introduction." In Walter Brueggemann, *The Psalms and the Life of Faith*, edited by Patrick D. Miller, xi–xviii. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Nation, Mark Theissen
2013 "About Walter Brueggemann." N.p. Cited 5 February 2013. www.thewords.com/articles/walterabout.htm.
- Parrish, V. Stephen
1998 "Brueggemann, Walter (b. 1932)." In *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, edited by Donald McKim, 570–575. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Premawardhana, Shanta
2011 "Greed as Violence: Methodological Challenges in Interreligious Dialogue on the Ethics of the Global Financial Crisis." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 39 (2): 223–245.
- "Walter Brueggemann's 19 Theses"
2004 Emergent Theological Conversation with Walter Brueggemann." www.soupisset.typepad.com/soupablog/Brueggemann_19_Theses.html.
- Wenham, Gordon
1999 "Walter Brueggemann—An Old Testament Theology for the New Millennium?" *European Journal of Theology* 8: 169–176.