

D. Mitternacht

A STRUCTURE OF PERSUASION IN GALATIANS: EPISTOLARY AND RHETORICAL APPEAL IN AN AURAL SETTING*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to ponder the reception of the Letter to the Galatians in an aural setting. How did the first recipients react, what can we expect that they remembered after having listened to the letter? Are there structural elements in the letter that would have aided the aural reception of the letter?

In four readings, the investigation traces textual indicators of interaction and emotion, compares their locations with epistolary and rhetorical structure-analysis and identifies a structure of persuasion. The focus on listeners is motivated by the supposition that illiteracy was the rule rather than the exception among those to whom the letter to the Galatians was sent.

The different readings reveal a structure of persuasion with a realistic prospect to succeed as a mnemonic device in an aural setting on a macro-structural level. Situational passages (1:6-10; 3:1-5; 4:8-20; 5:2-12 and 6:12-13), together with recurring affirmations of Christ and Paul as embodiments of faithfulness and commitment in suffering, imprint on the aural memory of the first listeners a concern for an *imitatio Christi crucifixi*.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this investigation is to identify a structure of persuasion in Galatians and its mnemonic potential for a listening audience. In a scribal culture where illiteracy is the rule rather than the exception and back looping over previous lines and paragraphs of the text the privilege of but a few, it seems appropriate to ponder the potential of a performance of the letter to the Galatian addressees for aural memory.

* I would like to thank my colleagues at Lund University, Samuel Byrskog, Bengt Holmberg and Rúnar Thorsteinsson, Mark Nanos at Rockhurst University, and the participants of the conference at the University of the Free State in Bloemfontein who commented on an earlier version of this paper.

Focusing on how these dynamics are ingrained in the text, I will present four readings, the first of which considers basic textual indicators of direct interaction that can be expected to attract the attention of listeners, and the second, how epistolary form and formulas communicate an epistolary structure. Using the findings as a basic grid, I shall investigate the distribution of *artistic* rhetorical proofs within that structure, and then how *inartistic* rhetorical proofs contribute to the persuasive force of the letter. In conclusion I shall consider some implications for exigencies and problems in the Galatian context.

1.1 Rhetoric and epistolography

It has become customary among some scholars to use “rhetorical” and “rhetoric” in a broad sense, so as to differentiate all kinds of *persuasive* communication from *convincing* persuasion.¹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, for example, state:

We are going to apply the term *persuasive* to argumentation that only claims validity for a particular audience, and the term *convincing* to argumentation that presumes to gain adherence of every rational being (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969:28).

Persuasive argumentation, thus, is “the chosen sphere of rhetoric” and rhetoric encompasses any kind of verbal persuasion. Hence, rhetorical theory combines ancient empirical data, as gathered and systematised by Aristotle and others, with new empirical data, aiming at a universal grammar of rhetoric. However, as Burton L. Mack and others have emphasised, persuasion is also determined by cultural contexts and, in part at least, historically conditioned (Mack 1990:25). I shall here try to walk the line between modern insights and historical settings, but with an emphasis on that which would seem culturally and contextually conditioned (cf. Anderson Jr. 1996:27).

This raises some fundamental questions as to how ancient rhetorical theory relates to ancient epistolography. Some scholars would still consider the Letter to the Galatians to be a “speech in an envelope”, in basic conformity with the rules according to which ancient speeches were composed (Kennedy 1984:141, Jegher-Bucher 1991:5, 204) and relegate epistolary analyses to separating prescript and postscript from the body of the letter. Others, while admitting that “there were never any detailed systematic rules for letters as there were for standard rhetorical forms” would assert with Stanley Stowers that

¹ Cf. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969:28, 29). The focus on persuasive argumentation was preceded by the Muilenburg School who saw “rhetorical criticism” as a form of literary criticism that dealt with stylistics (Anderson Jr. 1996:17-19).

the rules for *certain* types of speeches, however, were adapted for use in corresponding letter types. So, for example a letter of consolation written by a person with rhetorical training, may *more or less* follow the form of the consolatory speech (Stowers 1986:34, cf. also 52, italics added.)

The question would then be how to define the “more or less” and how to identify the applicable type. Duane Watson argues for a constant dialogue, where rhetorical analysis is *primarily* “responsible for defining function, due to the limitations of epistolary theory at this juncture” (Watson 1995:406). Dieter Sanger asserts convergence “in der Wirkungsabsicht und im sprachlichen Ausdruck” (Sanger 2002:385, n. 41). Lauri Thuren disconnects the two as “answering types of questions so dissimilar that the whole text, including the opening and ending can be analyzed with both methods” (Thuren 1990:58). Joachim Classen emphasises that *neither* manuals on letter writing nor rhetorical theory offer definite advice as regards the structure of letters (*dispositio*), which does not preclude rhetorical analyses of letter structures, however, since

there is no reason why one should restrict oneself to the rhetoric of the ancients in interpreting texts from antiquity, and not avail oneself of the discoveries and achievements of more recent times (Classen 2000:27).

The view adopted for this investigation ascribes to epistolary theory the primary function of identifying the overall structure and concern of the letter, and to rhetorical theory 1) a complementary and corrective assistance in terms of structure, and 2) a corroboration in the analysis of functions and techniques. Rhetorical theory is treated as a heuristic tool taken from the sphere of the ancient orator that is useful for the pragmatic analysis of all kinds of “texts”, especially as it comes to aspects of *inventio* and *elocutio* (Breuer 1974:142ff.)²

1.2 Rhetoric and situation

Lloyd Bitzer’s assertion that three constituents comprise everything relevant in a rhetorical situation: exigence, audience and constraints (Bitzer 1968:7-8) has been criticised by Richard E. Vatz for requiring “a ‘realist’ philosophy of meaning”. Not only will any rhetor sift and choose from an infinite number of possible choices, thus imbuing an event with his own view of salience; he

2 Rhetorical theory was, of course, devised for production, and with the express aim that an orator should not behave like a little child that keeps to the clothes that mother gave. Instead he should diversify in such a way that “these things seem to be born and sprung from Nature herself” (Quint 5.14.31-2). Such advice illustrates that there is no clear-cut path from devise to analysis.

will also translate “the chosen information into meaning. This is an act of creativity. It is an interpretive act. It is a rhetorical act of transcendence” (Vatz 1973:154, 156-7; cf. Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969:116-7, 121). Vatz reverses Bitzer’s claim that rhetoric is situational into its opposite, namely that “situations are rhetorical”, and concludes that

rhetoric is a cause, not an *effect* of meaning ... A prominent, high-ethos rhetor may create his own salient situations by virtue of speaking out on them ... It is only when meaning is seen as the result of a creative act and not a discovery, that rhetoric will be perceived as the supreme discipline it deserves to be (Vatz 1973:159, 160-1).

However, not all persuasion fits the same category, even within one and the same rhetorical situation. Assertions and interpretations that concern the situation of those to be persuaded will have no persuasive potential unless they contain a core of pertinence on which both sender and addressees agree. On the other hand, as to illustrations, examples and supporting arguments that are introduced from “outside”, there is an infinite number of possible choices and the rhetor will *cause* certain meanings.³

As we shall see, in the Letter to the Galatians we can distinguish situational from general or additional argumentation and find the most pertinent information regarding the situation in Galatia in situational passages.⁴ Also, it seems probable that in aural communication situational assertions will be remembered more vividly than general and complicated arguments and examples that are added in support.

This begs the question as to which parts of the letter should be ascribed priority for exigency identification. The sheer number of alternative and contradictory constructions of conflicting convictions and exigencies has led some scholars to conclude, not only that definite constructions of the exigencies in Galatia are impossible, but that the whole enterprise is futile.⁵ Instead of relinquishing the challenge, I suggest 1) a need for a hermeneutics of suspicion,

3 Even though Cicero commends the rhetor to employ the material for his own gain, and “twist everything to the advantage of his case” (Inv. 1.21.30), it would be counterproductive to contradict facts with which those to be persuaded are acquainted. The principle that “that which is persuasive is persuasive in reference to someone” (τὸ πειθανδὸν τιμὴ πειθανδὸν ἐστὶ, Arist. Rhet. I.2.11-12) demands prudence.

4 Cf. my model of this dynamic in Mitternacht (1999:61-108). Cf. also the interesting discussion in relation to the gospel genre on persuasion at all costs and persuasion by truth in Byrskog (2006:35-38).

5 Lyons (1985: e.g., 97). Vouga (1998:1-5), who accepts the hypothesis of D. Trobisch. Cf. also Vouga (1996:245-6). Trobisch (1989: e.g., 84-104 and 1994:124-126),

that is, a critical assessment of the letter's stereotypical and polemical characterisations and attributions of meaning, 2) a revision of the procedure according to which priority for construction is ascribed to certain portions of the letter over others and 3) a challenge to envision the persuasive effect of the letter on its first listeners. Having presented my view of the former in other studies,⁶ I shall here concentrate on the latter and suggest some observations on the level of macrostructure.

1.3 Persuading listeners

Based on his estimate of about 1000 Christ-believers around the year 40 CE and a growth rate of 3.4 percent per year, Rodney Stark suggested that by the year 100 CE Christianity comprised about 7000 individuals with about 2100 (30%) adult males (Stark 1997:5). Applying these numbers to literacy, Keith Hopkins concluded that within a Christian subpopulation of about 7000 we can expect about 420 (20%) adult males with some degree of literacy and 42 (2%) that are fluent and skilled literates. Recalculating the numbers for the year 55 CE the total number of Christ-believers comprises 1651 with 495 (30%) adult males of whom 100 (20%) had some degree of literacy and 10 (2%) were fluent and skilled literates. Of course, "the number is a symbol for a small number of unknown size" (Hopkins 1998:211-12) and even if we double or triple Stark's estimate of 1000 for the year 40 CE, we still get only 20 or 30 male adults that were fluent and skilled literates in all of "Christianity" around the year 55 CE. These approximations accentuate "that we have in the culture of Late Western antiquity a culture of high residual orality;"⁷

argues that Galatians has been edited and reworked into a "Rundbrief" in order to be included in a collection of four Pauline letters (Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians), wherefore identification of persons or communities has become impossible. For recent presentations of the history of research on exigencies, cf. Alvarez-Cineira (1999:295-312); Mitternacht (1999:26-38); Nanos (2002:110-92); on the problems pertaining to mirror reading cf. Berger (1980:372-400); Lyons (1985: e.g., 96-105); Barclay (1987:73-93); Mitternacht (1999:38-49). Another attempt at solving the problem by means of an interpolation theory has been presented by Thomas Witulski who argues that 4:8-20 is another or part of another letter that was interpolated into Galatians (Witulski 2000: e.g., 71-81).

6 Mitternacht (1999, 2002, 2004).

7 Pieter Botha suggested the label "scribal culture", that is "a culture familiar with writing but in essence still significantly, even predominantly, oral", where "reading is largely vocal and illiteracy the rule rather than the exception" (Botha 1990:42). Eric Havelock's definition of craft literacy as a stage of literacy where only a limited portion of the population are able to read and write (Havelock 1982:10) is reminiscent of Botha's label "scribal literacy". Keeping in mind geographical differences

and impinge “on our understanding of the production, dissemination, and understanding of the NT documents” (Achteemeier 1990:3).

We may conclude that the prospect for most of the addressees of Galatians to ever read let alone study in detail Paul’s letter was limited. Most of them were listeners, dependent on the oral performance of the letter in a group context. They had no ability to read passages over and over and study them in detail. Instead their familiarity with the letter was fractional and limited, “for the oral utterance has vanished as soon as it is uttered” (Ong 2002:39). They remembered certain passages more vividly than others. Only a few like Timothy or Silvanus would have had the ability to read, recite, take notes on a wax tablet (Achteemeier 1990:14) or even participate with Paul in the composition of a letter.⁸

Focusing on aural reception, the task of this analysis is to take into account means of attracting attention, such as direct address, confrontational assertion and emotional appeal, and epistolary form and formulas that would have generated recollection and evoked an awareness of a basic progression of argumentation. Within that progression I shall examine how arguments and examples are distributed, with simple and basic rather than intricate rhetorical techniques, in order to attract the attention of listeners and impress on them a memory of the performance.⁹

Regarding the emissary, whose function was to establish the sender’s presence, we may assume that he put special emphases on passages that address the listeners directly. In order to breach distance and substitute sender presence, his ambition would be to become the icon of the sender, collapse

on the one hand and coexistent diversity and stratification, one should not put too much emphasis on the concept of stages at a specific point in time (cf. Harvey 1998:37-8). Different scholars use similar terminology but mean different things, which can be confusing. Vernon Robbins, e.g., distinguishes between rhetorical culture as “environments where oral and written speech interact closely with one another” and scribal culture as “environments where a primary goal is to ‘copy’ either oral statements or written texts” (Robbins 1991:145).

- 8 While focusing on listeners I do not wish to preclude that Paul had more than one target audience in mind or suggest that he *simply* wrote “for one pass hearing”. Cf. my previous suggestion of a double target strategy for Gal. 2:6-10 (Mitternacht 1999:247-50). Nor should one neglect the power and control gain for those who had the competence to recite, read over, study and explain, as Mark Nanos emphasised to me in a response.
- 9 My interest in residually oral or scribal culture at this point is not with how communication functions as the bridge from the present to the past or from the past to the present, i.e. the function of orality for the transmission of traditions. For those issues cf., e.g., Byrskog (2002 and 2006).

the distance between Paul, performer and audience and to represent the embodiment of Paul-in-the-letter.¹⁰ He would try to make a lasting impression and heighten the alert of the listeners through the preferred means of oral performance through direct interaction and formulaic expressions that stick to memory, through agonistic tone, empathetic, participatory and situational types of communication rather than abstract thought (cf. Ong 2002:43-46, 107f.). These observations add legitimacy to the procedure adapted below where I shall distinguish between general passages and situational and confrontational passages in Galatians, viewing the latter as primary “habitats” of information that causes the alert of the listener.¹¹

2. FIRST READING: PASSAGES WITH “SITUATIONAL PERTINENCE”

In this first reading I shall be looking for places in the structure where interaction between sender and addressees is especially prevalent and where presence is enacted by expressions of direct address and situational pertinence.

10 Cf. Ward (1994:104; also Funk 1967). Achtemeier (1990:18) emphasises the importance of a concern for indications that “make themselves apparent to the ear rather than to the eye.”

11 There are other aspects of oral performance such as oral patterning that could be investigated. Harvey (1998:219-30) assessed the Pauline letters for oral patterns such as chiasm, inversion, alternation, inclusion, ring-composition, word-chain, refrain and concentric symmetry and found that chiasm and word-chain are the two patterns present in all seven of Paul’s letters. Regarding Galatians he concluded that “Galatians is the exception, having the second lowest total of oral patterns even though it is the fourth longest letter” (Harvey 1998:284). He identified two word chains in 1:6-10 and 1:11, and what he calls “extended examples of word-chains” throughout 3:1-4:11 (Harvey 1998:221). As to the former, it is not apparent to me why 1:11 should be separated from 1:6-10 except for the epistolary formula that introduces 1:11. This however is a different matter (cf. below). Instead, 1:6-11 shows a continuous prominence of εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγελίζειν. As to the extended example of word-chain in 3:1-14, where Harvey suggests that the antithetical pair πίστις and νόμος dominates, I would argue that the antithesis in 3:1-5 is not between πίστις and νόμος but between πνεῦμα and σὰρξ, thus preparing for the alternation in 5:16-25. Also, πνεῦμα which occurs three times in 3:2-5 qualifies more for a word chain than ἀκοή πίστεως and ἔργα νόμου which occur twice each and seem to form an *inclusio*. This would seem to suggest a structural separation of 3:1-5 from 3:6-14, where πίστις/πιστεῦω and ἔργα νόμου “collaborate” structurally with words from the δικ-root.

2.1 Basic indicators of situational interaction

I shall start out by looking for indicators of direct address and list the distribution of 1) second plural pronouns and verbs, dividing the verbs into indicatives, subjunctives and imperatives and 2) the vocatives. To these I shall add a selection of 3) first plural verb indicatives and subjunctives that include the addressees,¹² and 4) third plural verb indicatives and subjunctives that involve the situation in Galatia directly.¹³

I note, firstly, that the indicators accumulate in certain sections (1:6-13; 3:1-7; 3:26-4:21; 4:28-5:18; and 6:11-13), while they are very sparse or completely absent in two larger sections (1:14-2:21 and 3:8-25) and two shorter sections (4:22-27 and 5:19-23). Secondly, imperatives, subjunctives, and first person plural verbs that include the addressees are absent before 4:12. Thirdly, verbs and pronouns in the second person plural are most frequent in the sections 3:26-4:21 (Table 1).¹⁴

-
- 12 The shifts from second to first plural verbs in 3:25-26 and 4:5-6 illustrate the difficulties. As I shall argue below, these shifts coincide with structural transitions. First plural pronouns are excluded from the search. Critical occurrences are 3:13(*2), 24, 4:3 and 4:6. I agree with Jonas Holmstrand (1997:168), that these “we”-references distinguish people of Jewish origin from the Galatian addressees, who are of Gentile origin. I differ, however, from Holmstrand’s identification of the addressees as being “*predominantly* Gentile Christians”. The shift from first plural in 4:26 (ἡτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ὑμῶν) to second plural in 4:28 indicates, as I shall argue, a transition from example to situational frame.
- 13 The first plural verb indicatives in 1:8, 9; 2:4, 5, 16, 17; 3:23, 25; 4:3 and subjunctives in 2:10, 16; 3:14, 24; 4:5, and also the third plural verb indicatives in 1:23, 24; 2:4(*2), 6(*2), 9, 12, 13, 14; 3:7, 8, 9, 10(*2), 16, 17(*2); 4:24; 5:21, 24; 6:16 are omitted from the list, since none of them, in my view, includes the addressees.
- 14 Adjectives and participles that circumscribe the addressees and verb infinitives that are part of constructions in the second plural, occur in the same places as the finite verbs. Listing them would not alter the list in any way.

Table 1: Second plural pronouns and verbs, vocatives and certain first and third plural verbs¹⁵

| | 1:1 -5 | 1:6 -13 | 1:14 -2:21 | 3:1 -7 | 3:8 -25 | 3:26 -4:21 | 4:22 -27 | 4:28 -5:18 | 5:19 -23 | 5:24 -6:13 | 6:14 -17 | 6:18 |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------|------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|------|
| Pronouns 2nd pl | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | | 19 | | 9 | 1 | 4 | | 1 |
| Verbs 2nd pl ind | | 3 | | 5 | | 17 | | 11 | | | | |
| Verbs 2nd pl subj | | | | | | 1 | | 5 | | | | |
| Verbs 2nd pl imp | | | | | | 2 | | 5 | | 4 | | |
| Vocatives | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Selection | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Verbs 1st pl ind | | 2 | | | | | | 2 | | 3 | | |
| Verbs 1st pl subj | | | | | | | | | | 4 | | |
| Verbs 3rd pl ind | | 1 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| Verbs 3rd pl subj | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | |
| Total | 1 | 13 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 44 | 1 | 38 | 1 | 20 | - | 2 |

Looking at the individual occurrences and their involvement in the construction of passages, I find that certain second person plural verbs and pronouns are part of introductory phrases to passages that do not address the situation in Galatia and are not part of situational assertions (such as 1:13:

15 Pronouns second plural: 1:3, 6, 7, 8(*2), 9, 11, 20; 2:5; 3:1, 2, 5(*2), 28, 29; 4:11(*2), 12(*2), 13, 14, 15(*3), 16(*2), 17(*2), 18, 19, 20 (*2), 28; 5:2(*2), 7, 8, 10(*2), 12, 13, 21; 6:1, 11, 12, 13, 18.

Verbs second plural indicative: 1:6, 9, 13; 3:2, 3(*2), 4, 7, 26, 27(*2), 28, 29; 4:6, 8, 9(*2), 10, 12, 13, 14(*3), 15, 21, 28; 5:4(*3), 7, 10, 13, 15(*2), 18(*2).

Verbs second plural subjunctive: 4:17; 5:2, 15, 16, 17(*2).

Verbs second plural imperative: 4:12, 21; 5:1(*2), 13, 15, 16; 6:1, 2, 7, 11.

Vocatives: 1:11; 3:1, 15; 4:6, 12, 19, 27, 28, 31; 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18.

Verbs first plural indicative: 4:31; 5:5, 25; 6:9, 10.

Verbs first plural subjunctive: 5:25, 26; 6:9, 10.

Verbs third indicative: 1:7; 4:17(*2); 5:10, 12, 6:12, 13.

Verbs third subjunctive: 6:12, 13.

“You have heard...” which introduces a passage about Paul’s life before he met the Galatians). Similar instances of verbs and pronouns occur in 1:20; 2:5, 3:7 and 5:21, and of vocatives in 4:6 and 27. These references are excluded from the list of situational indicators.

4:21 is situational in itself (“Tell me, you who desire to be under the law, do you not hear the law?”). It introduces the allegory of Abraham’s two sons, which, in itself, lacks situational pertinence, but prepares for 4:28-5:1 where the situation in Galatia is associated to the allegory (v.29: οὕτως καὶ νῦν). It appears that 4:21 functions as a prelude to 4:28-5:1, notwithstanding the “interruption” of 4:22-27.

The second plural pronoun and imperative verb in 6:1 (ὑμεῖς ... καταρτίζετε) are deemed situational since, although preceded by εἰάν plus subjunctive protasis, the grammar implies a future more probable condition, the phrase implicates the present situation. Similar to 4:22-27, 6:3-8 gives the impression of an interlude between 6:1-2 and 6:9-10. 1:3 and 6:18 are part of greeting phrases, with good wishes of a general nature, and can therefore be excluded.

Some of the phrases that are passed over at this point will still play a role in the epistolary analysis. Passing over here only implies exclusion from the first reading with its focus on situational pertinence. Passages with clusters of the above indicators and passages where indicators of situational pertinence (*s p*) are sparse or absent are listed in Table 2.¹⁶

Table 2: Indicators of *s p* — second plural pronouns and verbs, vocatives and certain first and third plural verbs

| clusters of <i>s p</i> | absent or sparse <i>s p</i> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1:6-10 | 1:11-2:21 |
| 3:1-5 | 3:6-25 |
| 3:26-4:20 (21) | 4:22-27 |
| 4:28-5:18 | 5:19-23 |
| 5:24-6:2 | 6:3-8 |
| 6:9-13 | 6:14-17 |

16 The divisions still need to be refined in terms of rhetorical and argumentative units. But already a pattern emerges that basically coincides with the divisions proposed in Mitternacht (1999:107). Cf. a similar distinction of situational from narrative discourse units in Nanos (2002:62-72), and situation-related from more general sections in Dahl (2002:131-32).

2.2 Noting some differences

Certain recurring differences are evident between the two columns in Table 2. Whereas several of the persons and groups mentioned in 1:11-2:21 are referred to by name, nothing comparable is said about the persons and groups in the situational passages. Also, events in Jerusalem and Antioch referred to in 1:11-2:21 are put into situational frameworks such as meetings of named persons, special gatherings, activities of different parties, whereas events pertaining directly to the situation in Galatia are only vaguely referred to. Further, very little is mentioned regarding circumstances surrounding the choices and actions that are condemned in 1:6-9 and 4:28-5:18. We learn that the addressees wish to circumcise, but the causes remain unclear. Also, the reader is left in the dark as to what the nature of “the other gospel” is, or how the gospel of Christ may have been “perverted” (μεταστρέφω). In 3:1-5 the addressees are told that they are foolish and bewitched. But as to what they are actually accused of is not articulated. An antithesis of Spirit and flesh is presented but nothing is stated explicitly as to how that relates to the faith message (ἀκοῇ πίστεως) and the works of the law. No clear indication is given as to what actually had caused the addressees’ wish to get circumcised.

Some interpreters have concluded that the vagueness is due to Paul’s lack of first hand knowledge of the situation, its causes and effects,¹⁷ others that Galatians was not written for a particular situation, but as a circular letter or even a literary last will.¹⁸ In light of the one undisputable sign of a “real” letter, namely that it is “one of two sides of a dialogue”,¹⁹ I would suggest a different conclusion. The impression of a lack of information is most likely due to the positioning of the perceiver and indicates the *first* recipients’ familiarity with what is being articulated. Within the first dialogue, there is no need to reiterate that of which the addressees are well aware.

Support for Paul’s acquaintance with the situation in Galatia has also been gathered by M. Luther Stirewalt, who argued that the reference to “all the brothers that are with me” (οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί) most naturally points to a delegation from Galatia that had come to Paul and is now sent back with the letter. Stirewalt’s conclusion is based on several observations: 1) “Paul does not name as co-senders people only temporarily or peripherally connect with the letter-event”; 2) had the brothers been co-workers or co-senders like Timothy or Silvanus, they would have been mentioned by name, if not in the prescript then at least somewhere else in the letter, as is the case in all

17 Schmithals (1972:18); Marxsen (1978:63); Schmithals (1983:29-30).

18 Trobisch (1989: e.g., 84-104; 1994:124-126).

19 Demetrius, *On Style* 223, referring to Artemon, the editor of Aristotle’s letters. Cf. Seneca, *Moral Epistles* 75.1-2 (texts in Malherbe 1988:17, 29).

the other Pauline letters; 3) because of the “absence of even an indirect reference to the fund, its trustees or the mission to Jerusalem” it is unlikely that the brothers were members of the Famine Relief Commission;²⁰ 4) the use of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in the attributive position indicates that something is being identified as a whole and of a definite number, which suggests a definable and identifiable group;²¹ 5) had they been a chance group of “fellow missionaries” that just happened to support Paul, as H.D. Betz (1979:40) argues, Paul would probably not have chosen the preposition $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$. Stirewalt concludes:

The use of *syn* and the position of *pas* unite to define a limited group of brothers who are present with Paul; and, as is Paul’s custom in the naming of co-senders, it is concluded that they are participants in the letter-event (Stirewalt 2003:99).²²

Finally, the situational passages contain the majority of emotional appeals in the letter. It is in these passages that the author rebukes and curses (1:6-9), denigrates and complains (3:1-5), expresses friendship and love, praise and reprimand (4:8-20, 6:11-13), exhorts, accuses and expresses bewilderment and pain (5:2-15). Such expressions can be expected to have heightened aural alertness and resided in memory beyond the oral performance. A progression of admonishing and emotional imprints shaped a mental image of a structural grid of argumentation.

3. SECOND READING: EPISTOLARY ASPECTS

The point of departure for my second reading is based on two fundamental insights from the research in ancient epistolography and rhetoric:

1. The multiplicity of forms and the stability of *expressions* in ancient letters over a period of 800 years.²³

20 Stirewalt (2003:95-97). I thank Mark Nanos for pointing out to me that, based on the principle that lack of information indicates the *first* recipients’ familiarity, this point by Stirewalt could be taken both ways.

21 Stirewalt (2003:97-98) argues that of the 26 occurrences of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in the attributive position 21 are substantives. The remaining five are in 1 Cor. 12:19; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 16:15; Gal. 5:14 and Gal. 1:1.

22 Unlike the mentioning of Chloe’s people who had come from Corinth for advice (1 Cor. 1:11; 7.1), the brothers here are not recognised as a faction or a splinter group from Galatia. This may mean that they were representatives of all the congregations in Galatia (Stirewalt 2003:101).

23 Fourth cent. BCE to fourth cent. CE. Changes are so slow that “the history of the letter can actually be charted by these minute and gradual modifications” (Doty 1973:12-3).

2. The *limitation of forms* and the *great variety of expressions* in rhetorical theory.

Regarding the first insight, ancient rhetorical theorists tended to subsume all possible speeches under three types and public functions, whereas epistolary theorists emphasised the multiplicity of situations (private and public) and of letter types.²⁴ Also, while rhetorical theorists gave explicit instructions on the *dispositio* of speeches, letter theorists did not.²⁵ Neither do the epistolary manuals have much to say about style.²⁶ Their lists of letter types are long and open-ended. The τύποι ἐπιστολικοί by PseudoDemetrius²⁷ suggest 21 different letter types and the ἐπιστολημαῖοι χαρακτήρες by PseudoLibanus²⁸ 41, plus the possibility of mixtures.²⁹ Pseudo-Demetrius opposes the idea of completeness explicitly by adding that time may bring about more types.³⁰ Assertions of a multiplicity of letter form must not eclipse the fact, however, that even epistolary theorists categorised letters and identified certain kinds that belonged together or were similar in form.

24 Cicero distinguished public from private letters, simple letters containing facts from emotive letters, which subdivide into two *genera*, the *genus familiare et iocosum* and the *genus severum et grave*. (Ad Fam. 15.21.4, 2.4.1f., 4.13.1, 6.10.4. Texts found in Malherbe 1988:20-7.)

25 Strongly emphasised by Ermert (1979:174), Classen (1991:8). Cf. Stowers (1986:52); Anderson Jr. (1996:99-100).

26 Since the educational instructions in the *progymnasmata* differ in this respect, Malherbe concludes that the handbooks were meant for professionals (Malherbe 1988:7).

27 It has been dated anywhere between second century BCE and second century CE, was wrongly attributed to *Demetrius of Phaelarum* and has probably gone through several revisions. It must not be confused with the excursus on plain style (223-35) in the treatise *On Style [De elocutione]* by *Demetrius of Phaelarum*, the sources of which seem to go back to at least the first century BCE.

28 At times attributed to Proclus, dates to fourth to sixth century CE. For more on these issues, cf. Olsson (1925:7-9, Grube 1965:110-21 and Malherbe 1988:2-5).

29 In τύποι ἐπιστολικοί the friendly, the commendatory, the blaming, the reproachful, the consoling, the censorious, the admonishing, the threatening, the vituperative, the praising, the advisory, the supplicatory, the inquiring, the responding, the allegorical, the accounting, the accusing, the apologetic, the congratulatory, the ironic and the thankful type are discussed. The list of 41 in ἐπιστολημαῖοι χαρακτήρες includes among others the paraenetic, the requesting, the insulting, the enigmatic and the erotic letter type. Translations are from Malherbe (1988:33-41, 68-73).

30 “τάχα δ’ ἂν ἐνέγκοι πολλαπλάσια τούτων ὁ χρόνος” (Τύποι ἐπιστολικοί, Weichert 1910, 2.10).

Attempts at identifying summary categories letters continue among modern scholars of epistolography. F.X.J. Exler counts five,³¹ J. Schneider four³² and S.K. Stowers also four.³³ The categorisations focus on letter occasions, sometimes with sub-categories,³⁴ sometimes applying a certain perspective.³⁵ In the following discussion I shall adopt the categories suggested by J.L. White and K.A. Kensinger who combined situational and formal aspects and differentiated four main types of which the category *letters of request* is central to this investigation.³⁶ Main types may vary and mix, due to relations between sender and addressee (superior, subordinate, and equal),³⁷ but, as White has demonstrated, there is congruity in terms of three functions: 1) exchange of information; 2) request or command; 3) maintenance of relationships.³⁸

3.1 Identifying epistolary formulas

Regarding the second fundamental insight noted above, it has been shown that certain expressions occur with such consistency and frequency in ancient letters that one may assume that an addressee recognised the special function of the stereotype and even identified letter types based on certain formulas (conventions). These letter formulas, as T.Y. Mullins has put it succinctly “con-

-
- 31 “Familiar letters”, “Business letters”, “Petitions, Complaints, Applications” and “Official letters” (Exler 1923:24-36).
 - 32 “Privatbriefe”, “amtliche Briefe”, “literarische Privatbriefe” and “literarische Briefe”, (Schneider 1954:568-74).
 - 33 “Letters of friendship”, “Family letters”, “Letters of praise and blame”, “Letters of exhortation and advice” (Stowers 1986:7f. Cf. also Berger 1984:1328). For more examples, cf. Classen (1991:5).
 - 34 Schneider divides the literary letters into *publizistische, poetische, magische, Lehr-, Himmels-, Liebes-, and pseudonyme Briefe*. Stowers has 9 kinds of “Letters of exhortation and advice”.
 - 35 Stowers (1986:51-2); Doty (1973:4-8).
 - 36 The four categories are letters of request (including *letters of introduction and recommendation, letters of petition and memoranda, letters of information, letters of instruction and friendly and family-letters* (White and Kensinger 1976, followed by Berger 1984:1328). For “letters of recommendation”, cf. also Goodspeed (1951), Keyes (1935) und Kim (1972). The relationship between memoranda (ὑπόμνημα) and letters of petition depends on the inclusion of reminders of earlier petitions (PSI 9.3; PSI 502) or upcoming affairs and previous decisions that should not be neglected (PSI 429, 430).
 - 37 Already in the *Ars Rhetorica* 27 (De Epistolis) of I. Victor (Halm 1863:105f.) we find a description of how the relationship between the correspondents has an influence on tone and style of the letter.
 - 38 White (1986:193-7). One should add the basic characteristics identified by H. Koskenniemi of *philophroneis, parousia* and *homilia* (Koskenniemi 1956:35-46).

stitute a social gesture, not a thematic ploy. They show the writer's attitude toward the audience to which he is writing, not his attitude toward the material he is presenting" (Mullins 1972:388). In other words, letter formulas communicate a surplus of meaning.

The surplus may be to indicate a letter's *superscriptio*, *adscriptio* and *salutatio*. Such phrases are not only expected but necessary constituents of a letter and their presence simply satisfies the expectation of the ordinary. Changes in *necessary* formulas, or lack of such formulas would cause the addressees' attention. It can be expected that the addressees noticed a lack of greetings in the end of the Letter to the Galatians, but whether or not they also noticed an absence of thanksgivings in the beginning is uncertain. Letters did not "by necessity of form" have thanksgivings, and the presence of the rebuke formula as a body opening formula complies with the form of the letter of request (cf. below).

Other formulas functioned as indicators of letter types and relationship. An elaborate *subscriptio* such as Paul's autographic conclusion of Galatians ("Ἴδετε πηλίκους ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραφα τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ), a practice known from papyri letters, seems to combine the function of a *symbolon*,³⁹ of affection⁴⁰ and of sincerity. Especially judicial letters demanded a thorough *subscriptio* (ὑπογραφή), containing at least one whole sentence with a summary of the letter's main content in order to insure the authenticity of the main concern.⁴¹ In such cases, the inclusion of things that relate not only to themes in the prescript⁴² cannot be seen as a "trespass" of the rules for the postscript formula (cf. below).

Scholars disagree on the criteria for identifying epistolary formulas. Some apply the criterion of surplus meaning rigorously, others identify formulas so freely that the analytical value is watered down. I would suggest, therefore, that

39 Cf. 2 Thess. 3:17: ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ Παύλου, ὃ ἔστιν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ οὕτως γράφω. According to Deissmann (1924:132-33), "hat ξύμβολον (*sic*) [in dem Platon-Brief Nr. 13] sogar dieselbe Bedeutung wie σημεῖον bei Paulus: ein in dem Briefe selbst vorhandenes Merkmal der Echtheit". Cf. also Bruns (1876:41-138, esp. 69f., 81, 83, 90, 121, 137).

40 Cf. I. Victor, *Ars Rhetorica* [De Epistolis] 27.10-11: "Observabant veteres carissimis sua manu scribere vel plurimum subscribere." (Cf. Halm 1863:448.)

41 Kremendahl (2000:45-6). For subscriptions to petitions cf., e.g., P.Oxy. IV 718, VII 1031, 1032. Sometimes we find an addition indicating that something has come up in the last minute (PMich 490).

42 Cf. Wendland (1912:339-45). The close connection in the Greek letter between pre-, and postscript has been emphasised already by Exler (1923:134) and Roller (1933:116-52); cf. also Lohmeyer (1927).

we should probe for three aspects (*position, form and function*) in every case and require evidence for at least two. This would allow both for analytical value and some variation.⁴³ The aspect of *position* would be fulfilled if phrases appear predominantly at the same spot (obvious example: *superscriptio*), or if it can be demonstrated that phrases tend to form clusters with other formulas. The aspect of *form* requires compliance with a certain syntactical structure or with the letter type. Short expressions can be ascribed formulaic character only if there also is a semantic peculiarity (as has been demonstrated for θαυμαζῶ ὄτι). The aspect of *function* is fulfilled if the expression triggers some surplus meaning independent of the surrounding text, such as is the case with the *symbolon* formula. The *symbolon* exemplifies the usefulness of epistolary formulas as structural indicators of introduction and transition.⁴⁴

3.2 The autographic subscriptio and the postscript “proper”

A “normal” postscript consists of 1) greetings, 2) health wish and 3) date. In the Pauline letters the χάρις-formula (ἡ χάρις ... τοῦ κυρίου ...) ⁴⁵ seems to replace the otherwise common phrases ἔρρωσο or ἔρρωσθαι σε βούλομαι for the health wish with the inclusion of wishes for more than physical health. There is never a date in Paul’s letters and in Galatians there are no greetings.

Dieter Kremendahl alleges the absence of a postscript at the end of Galatians, since the addition of ἀδελφοί and ἀμήν after the χάρις-formula is otherwise unknown in the Pauline letters and claims that the χάρις-formula in Galatians is a “Glosse” that has been added later to the text (Kremendahl 2000:269). Kremendahl also rejects the possibility of an epistolary blessing in 6:16b (which could replace the greetings) since, in his view, the blessing is conditional and not at the end of the letter. Thus, Galatians concludes not like a letter but like a judicial document. “Weil die verhandelte Sache es erfordert, schreibt Paulus nicht ... mit ‘Gruß und Kuß’, sondern mit ‘Brief und Siegel’” (Kremendahl 2000:115). In fact, the letter form of Galatians as a whole is “eigentümlich unbrieftlich” and must have irritated the Galatians.

43 Cf. Mitternacht (1999:174-76).

44 Mullins gives examples from the Oxyrhynchus papyri, where disclosure, petition, ironic rebuke, thanksgiving and greeting occur in the middle of the letter body; others, where petition, thanksgiving and greeting are found in the postscript; and one letter (PMich 203), where disclosures are spread out over the whole letter (Mullins 1972:386-7).

45 For a synopsis of the χάρις-formulations in the Pauline pre-script-*salutationes* and *subscriptiones*, cf. Roller (1933: appendix, tables 3 and 4).

Regarding the form of the letter as a whole, Kremendahl identifies two large speeches (1:1-5:6 and 5:7-6:18) of which the first constitutes the original letter with the original *postscriptio* in 5:2-6. For lack of external evidence, treating 5:7-6:18 as an addition to the original letter would require compelling internal arguments. As far as I can see the section is more likely to be part of the whole letter in terms of structure and concern. Kremendahl's assertions highlight, however, that autographic *subscriptio* and postscript in Galatians do not simply correspond to the prescript but also to the body, especially in terms of affirmations regarding the situation in Galatia (6:11-13) and the autobiographic references (6:14-15).

3.3 Letter body formulas

First among the epistolary formulas of the letter body to be discussed among scholars were the so called "introductory formulas" and especially thanksgivings as introductory formulas. Most scholars continue to assert that the lack of thanksgivings in Galatians was recognised by the addressees as an epistolary signal.⁴⁶ I have argued above this was not necessarily so, since the rebuke formula *θαυμάζω ὅτι ...* (1:6) could function as an alternative introductory formula.⁴⁷ Formulas of the body that require some discussion here are the disclosure formula and the request formula.⁴⁸

Jack Sanders had shown that certain distinctive elements occur regularly after the thanksgiving and that their presence serves to indicate the end of that form. Subsequently Mullins identified among these elements the four constitutive elements of the so called disclosure formula:

- 1) *θέλω*
- 2) noetic verb in the infinitive
- 3) person addressed
- 4) information usually introduced by *ὅτι*⁴⁹

46 For a presentation of the debate, cf. Mitternacht (1999:179-88).

47 The ironic rebuke formula (*θαυμάζω ὅτι ...*) has been discussed extensively and has found wide support. The most comprehensive list of comparative papyri is now found in Kremendahl (2000:99-106). The label "ironic rebuke" was first coined in Mullins (1972:386). Cf. my discussion in Mitternacht (1999:197).

48 The "statement of compliance" identified in White (1971:96), which appears in the beginning of some Greek letters, may or may not be identified in 1:9. Identification is conditioned by the interpretation of the dynamics of 1:8-9, namely whether *ὡς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω* refers back to a statement made at an earlier time, or whether it simply refers back to 1:8. I accept it as a formula but indicate uncertainty by putting a question mark behind it in table 3.

49 Mullins (1964:46, 48, 50; 1972:382). It seems that both White and Mullins, without mentioning it explicitly, presumed the verb to be in the present tense. One should

An optional vocative address may be added. The order is usually but not always: *noetic verb/person addressed*/θέλω/*information*.⁵⁰ A “full-fledged” disclosure formula may look as follows: οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ... (Rom. 1:13).

White’s analysis of disclosure formula elements shows that θέλω (or βούλομαι) may be optional and, when absent, the noetic verb may be in the first person singular (White 1971:93-94). This seems to justify the identification of a disclosure formula in Gal 1:11: γνωρίζω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί ... ὅτι, and 4.15: μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι, (with a vocative close by in v. 12), especially since the variation in form in the latter is compensated by the satisfaction of the criterion of function, as Paul points to the good things the addressees had done to him during his visit to Galatia.

As we get to the question whether or not the expression γινώσκετε ἄρα ὅτι in 3:7 can be identified as a disclosure formula,⁵¹ I find that none of the criteria suggested above seems to be met. 1) As to position, imperative forms of disclosure formulas have only been found in letter body introductions (White 1971:93, 1986:207). 2) As to form, 3:7 has neither a personal pronoun nor a vocative address. 3) As to function, the information given (οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ) is derived from the contextual argument and no social gesture seems implied. 3:7 therefore needs to be rejected as a formula.

Already in 1962 T.Y. Mullins presented a study of *official letters of petition*, where he identified a consistent body structure that is made up of three basic elements: *background*, *petition verb* and *desired action*. Regarding the request formula, he found three constitutive elements:⁵²

also demand of a disclosure formulas to disclose information that is formerly unknown (in terms of how it is presented in the text!). Not paying close enough attention to these aspects earlier seems to have led Hansen, Longenecker and myself to identify disclosure formulas where their presence is questionable.

- 50 A notable variation of order is found in P.Oslo. 50: θέλω σε γεινώσκειν ὅτι παραγερόμενους εἰς τὴν πόλιν. Cf. also 1 Cor. 12:1, where the noetic verb comes last.
- 51 Hansen (1989: e.g., 43), Longenecker (1990:cvi), followed earlier by Mitternacht (1999:206).
- 52 Mullins (1962:47). Mullins looked at Oxyrhynchus papyri from the first cent. BCE to the first cent. CE, ranging from the long petition of “Dionysia to the Prefect” (P.Oxy. 237) to the simple petition of “Alypius to his brother” (P.Oxy. 1491). For unclear reasons Mullins, having identified Gal. 4:12 as in conformity with the petition formula, states that “the background and the desired action are both confused” (50).

- 1) a verb of request
- 2) an address
- 3) a courtesy phrase.

A typical request formula with the request verb δέισθαι may look as follows (Petition to the Epistrategos, P.Oxy. 487):

| Petition | Address | Courtesy phrase |
|----------|---------|----------------------|
| δέομε | κύρμαι | ἐὰν σοῦ τῆ τύχη δώξῃ |

Four kinds of requests are linked to four request verbs with different connotations. “The use of one petition [verb] rather than another tells much about the intent and attitude of the petitioner” (Mullins 1972:381). First, there is the most commonly routine petition with ἀξιούειν. Then there is the formal and demanding petition with δέισθαι, which seems to replace ἀξιούειν in cases where the request is urgent. The increase in formality is supported by the increase of courtesy phrases. Third, there is the familiar ἐρωτᾶν which is common when sender and addressee share the same social status. The demand may increase further, but there occurs no increase of courtesy phrases. Fourthly, the personal παρακαλεῖν is used by Paul only “wenn die Frage der Autorität kein Problem darstellen darf und der Apostel sich an die Glieder der Gemeinde wie an seine Brüder wenden kann”.⁵³ The selection of δέισθαι for the verb of request in Galatians 4:12 would seem to suggest a formal and demanding request.⁵⁴

3.4 Epistolary formulas and letter form

Analogous to my assertions concerning situational appeal and affective expressions, I submit that epistolary formulas participate in the shaping of the letter structure by means of attracting listener attention. Prescript- and postscript formulas signify the frame; disclosure formulas mark major transitions in the letter. Some formulas, such as the rebuke-formula and request-formula, have the additional function of setting their mark on a letter as a whole. With this strict application of formula criteria, a list of epistolary formulas in Galatians can be given (cf. Table 3).⁵⁵

53 Bjerkelund (1967:188, cf. 177-8); Berger (1984:1329), even attributes intimacy to the word. In addition, Thorsteinsson (2003:50), has emphasised that παρακαλεῖν was well apt for diplomatic purposes, “appropriate for a superior concerned with sustaining his or her autoritative status without being unnecessarily and unwisely commanding”.

54 For a more detailed treatment, cf. Mitternacht (1999:200-205).

55 This list mirrors a strict application of the principles for identifying epistolary formulas, heeding the admonition of Mullins: “Now, if a form is to be a form, there must

Table 3: Epistolary formulas in Galatians

| | | |
|------|---|---|
| 1:1 | <i>super-, adscriptio</i> | Παῦλος ... ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας |
| 1:3 | <i>salutatio</i> | χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη |
| 1:6 | rebuke formula | θαυμάζω ὅτι |
| 1:9 | compliance formula (?) | ὡς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω |
| 1:11 | disclosure formula | γνωρίζω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ ... |
| 4:12 | request formula | ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν |
| 4:15 | disclosure formula | μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι |
| 6:11 | indicator of autographic <i>subscriptio</i> | Ἴδετε πηλίκους ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραφα τῆ ἐμῇ χειρὶ |
| 6:16 | blessing | εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος |
| 6:18 | χάρις-wish with vocative | Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί ἀμήν |

The rebuke-request-character of Galatians has first been asserted in an unpublished paper from 1973 by N.A. Dahl,⁵⁶ who, in turn, got some of his insights from T.Y. Mullins. G.W. Hansen and R. Longenecker, who had access to Dahl's paper, accepted his proposal of a decisive transition point in the epistolary structure of the letter at 4:12. Consequently, they suggested a major division in 4:12 and divided the letter body into a rebuke section and a request section. This twofold division of the letter has since come to compete with common outlines that used to divide the letter into three main parts.⁵⁷

be something about it which is basic" (Mullins 1972:384). This implies a move away from the merging of indicators of epistolary signals in Mitternacht (1999:206) in which I had followed Hansen (1989:30-1, 42-3) and Longenecker (1990:cvi-cviii).

56 Parts of Dahl's paper have now been published as Dahl (2002:117-42).

57 In his form-critical study on the form and function of παρακαλῶ-sentences in the Pauline letters Carl J. Bjerkelund made the observation of a clear εὐχαριστῶ-παρακαλῶ (ἔρωτῶ)-structure in Philemon and 1 and 2 Thessalonians, with always the first *p*-request containing the main concern of the letter (Bjerkelund 1967:139, 189). With regard to Galatians, he notes the inappropriateness of a παρακαλῶ-request for such a polemical letter, but asserts: "Wir meinen mit Recht behauptet zu haben dass dieser Satz zu den *p*-Sätzen hinzugerechnet werden kann." Then he continues: "Der scharfe Ton, der sich durch den ganzen Brief hindurchzieht wird bereits mit dem erwähnten θαυμάζω angeschlagen" (177), affirming by implication that the εὐχαριστῶ-παρακαλῶ-form in Galatians is replaced by a θαυμάζω-δέομαι-form. Bjerkelund also emphasises that his findings should not be misinterpreted

Within the epistolary outline Longenecker then identified two rhetorical genres, and called 1:6-4:11 mainly forensic and 4:12-6:10 mainly deliberative. While this adaptation mitigates some of the problems with Betz's forensic genre for the letter as a whole, the problems with the *narratio* (1:12-2:21) as part of a forensic proof, with 2:15-21 as an enigmatic *propositio*, or with 3:1f. as part of an apologetic argument, remain unsolved.⁵⁸

The above mentioned three basic elements of a three-partite structure of *official letters of petition* identified by T.Y. Mullins (*background, petition verb and desired action*) was confirmed by J.L. White and others⁵⁹ for letters of request (letters of recommendation, letters of petition and memoranda).⁶⁰ In the body opening, the background leading up to the request is laid out. It consists of evidence considered necessary by the petitioner in order for the official to comply favourably. Possible wrong doings that have occurred, and/or references to situations and circumstances that have made the request necessary are mentioned. The body middle then contains the request, and the body closing states the favourable consequences in case of a positive response to the request.

Combining the form pattern with the observations regarding epistolary formulas, the letter body of Galatians opens at 1:6, reaches its middle point at 4:12 and closes at 6:10. The closing point at 6:10 is motivated by the fact that 6:11 indicates of the autobiographic beginning of a prolonged subscription.

The disclosure formula at 1:11 indicates a subdivision of the letter body opening and a major transition to the autobiographic section. This is in compliance with the elaborate postscript which is also divided by the blessing in 6:16, incidentally succeeded by an autobiographic assertion in 6:17. The pattern of subdivisions within the body is further confirmed in the middle section, where the combination of two formulas with the basic indicators identified in the first reading suggests a middle section that stretches from 4:8-20.

as a confirmation of the "bultmannian" indicative-imperative structure of the Pauline letters, and continues: "denn wie wir nachgewiesen haben, liegt die Bedeutung der *p*-Sätze nicht auf der theologischen, sondern auf der Ebene der persönlichen brüderlichen Begegnung" (190). The findings of Bjerkelund concerning form and function of *παρακαλῶ* in Romans have now been confirmed and elaborated in Thorsteinsson (2003:47-54) who argues that the discourse of Romans enters a new stage with 12:1 which constitutes the structural centre of the letter (cf. 53-54).

58 Cf. Classen (1991:27, 29).

59 White (1986:194); White (1984:1737), and Berger (1984:1328): "...ein außerordentlich streng gehandhabtes Schema."

60 There is some confusion as to the use of the term "official letters" as Thorsteinsson (2003) has observed: "While some want to distinguish between royal/diplomatic letters and other types of official letters ... others do not" (20, n. 36).

4. INTERMEDIATE RESULTS

We can now combine the findings of the first and second readings. There is a certain correspondence between tables 1, 2 and 3. Some of the sections with situational pertinence coincide with sections where epistolary formulas are found. Conversely, when there is no situational pertinence, there are no epistolary formulas, except for the disclosure formula in 1:11 that marks a transition (Table 4). I have ignored the prescript in tables 2 and 4 since my main concern there is to list elements of a structure for the letter body. I have included, on the other hand, part of the postscript, because of the peculiarities in terms of structure as noted above.

Table 4: Addition of epistolary formulas to Table 2
(*s p* = situational pertinence)

| clusters of <i>s p</i> | sparse or absent <i>s p</i> | epistolary formulas |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1:6-10 | 1:11-2:21 | 1:6, 9, 11 |
| 3:1-5 | 3:6-25 | |
| 3:26-4:20 (21) | 4:22-27 | 4:12, 15 |
| 4:28-5:18 | 5:19-23 | |
| 5:24-6:2 | 6:3-8 | |
| 6:9-13 | 6:14-17 | 6:11, 16 |

I conclude that epistolary formulas and clusters of indicators of situational pertinence mingle in 1:6-10; 4:8-20 and 6:11-13, and that the formulas signal letter type and social gesture. The rebuke formula in 1:6 sets the stage for the rebuking and ironic tone of the whole letter and indicates sender-frustration. The combination of the statement of compliance(?) in 1:9 with curses reinforces the tension.

The impression of frustration seems to culminate in 4:8-11, thus preparing for and pointing towards the request formula in 4:12 which with the addition of a strong personal appeal offers an explicit suggestion of a solution ("Become as I"). It reemphasises the personal concern and directs reader attention to passages that express personal convictions such as 1:10, 2:16-3:1 and 6:14-17, but also the expansion of the *intitulatio* (1:1). The disclosure formula in 4:15 accentuates the previous devotion and readiness of the addressees to share in Paul's sufferings. Finally, the autographic subscription directs the reader to 6:12-17 as the authoritative summary of the letter's main concern. Whereas problems and concerns may be manifold, the solution suggested by Paul is that the addressees heed his call to imitate him as the suffering servant of Christ.

Having thus summarised and interpreted my findings up to this point, I present a first suggestion of a letter structure that takes both readings into consideration. Accepting the request-formula as the highpoint of the epistolary structure of the letter I suggest 1) that 1:6-4:7 function as background and preparation towards the request; 2) that 4:8-20 form a unit with the request at its centre; and 3) that 4:21-6:10 articulate consequences to be expected in response to the request.

The background divides further into two (1:6-2:21 and 3:1-4:7). The division is indicated by opening clusters of second person pronouns and verbs in 1:6-9 and 3:1-5, the direct situational pertinence of these two passages and the parallelism of intense and emotional language in both sub-openings. In the first half the focus is on the ethos of the sender, his character and convictions, in the second half arguments are accumulated in order to impress on the addressees their lack of insight, but also their blessedness.

The consequence section divides into two as well. The first half (4:21-5:12) deals with necessity of suffering that follows a favourable response to the request, and the loss of Christ that follows a rejection of the request; the second half (5:13-6:10) elaborates the ethical ramifications of a favourable response to the request, namely the victorious life through the Spirit's power over the flesh. (Table 5).

Each major division in this macrostructure is introduced by a combination of situational interaction and alert and either epistolary formulas or emotional challenges. The attention of the listening audience is triggered every time a new section begins. The conclusion seems justified that lasting aural reception and memory was likely to have been one of the tasks intended for the macrostructure.

Table 5: Epistolary macrostructure of Galatians⁶¹

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 1:1-5 | Prescript |
| 1:6-2:21 | Background A – sender ethos and commitment |
| 3:1-4:7 | Background B – addressee confusion and blessedness |
| 4:8-20 | Request – preceded and succeeded by situational admonitions |
| 4:21-5:12 | Consequences A – necessity of suffering |
| 5:13-6:10 | Consequences B – fruit of the Spirit |
| 6:11-18 | Autographic subscription and postscript |

61 The divisions differ from the ones suggested by Dahl (2002:141-42), in that Dahl has the rebuke formula introducing a background section that stretches from 1:6-4:11, and the request formula introducing a pleading section that stretches

5. THIRD READING: RHETORICAL ASPECTS

Having asserted a mnemonically designed macrostructure, a third reading deals with the distribution of artificial rhetorical proof throughout the letter, again with a focus on questions of macrostructure rather than details of rhetorical techniques.⁶² I continue to put questions to the text that have a certain resemblance with questions of *dispositio*, without, however, involving the issue of rhetorical genre.

5.1 Artificial rhetorical proof: enthymemes and examples

Aristotle distinguished three kinds (τρία εἶδη) of proofs: The first depends upon the moral character of the speaker, the second upon putting the hearer in a certain frame of mind, the third upon the speech itself, in so far as it proves or seems to prove.

Among these “moral character, so to say, constitutes the most effective means of proof” (Arist. Rhet. 1.2.3,5). Moral character (*ethos*) and emotion (*pathos*) transcend the written form of communication and can be expected to play a part in the instructions given to the envoy(s) entrusted with the oral performance of the letter.⁶³ But they are also ingrained in the verbal expressions, wherefore Aristotle can claim that “all orators produce belief by employing as proofs either examples or enthymemes *and nothing else*” (Arist. Rhet. 1.2.8, italics added).⁶⁴ These two constitute the artificial (also called *entechnic* or intrinsic) rhetorical proofs (αἱ πίστεις αἱ ἔντεχνολ).

Cicero suggests a similar distinction of two, calling them “induction” and “ratiocination” (= ἐπιχειρήματα, De Inv. 1.49), Quintilian counts three kinds of technical proofs (signs, arguments and examples), but accepts also that many people regard signs as a species of arguments (Or. 5.9.1). The distinction of two modes seems widespread and shall be adapted here for assumptions regarding the production of macrostructure in the original cultural context.⁶⁵

from 4:12-6:10. The weaknesses of this two-partite division lie both in the fact that rebukes are also found in the latter section (cf. Nanos 2002:72), and that 4:12 as the first request of a letter of petition seems to indicate the structural centre of the whole letter rather than the introduction for the second part.

62 A comprehensive description of rhetorical techniques has been presented by Francois Tolmie, who has put together a very useful list (Tolmie 2005:249-55).

63 Grimaldi (1972:147-51) calls *ethos* and *pathos* premises of enthymemes.

64 Gal. 1:13-2:21, e.g., is full of *ethos*, and 3:1 or 4:15 contain strong *pathos* argumentation.

65 Dissatisfied with this two-fold division Perelman-Olbrecht-Tyteca include enthymeme among the quasi-logical arguments and state: “Our study of quasi-logical

Both Aristotle and Cicero consider proof by example (παράδειγμα, induction) an inferior means of persuasion, since it always represents a particular case and can only have persuasive force if all other particular cases of the same kind can be shown to collaborate. The superior proof is the enthymeme (the rhetorical syllogism), since it can persuade a particular audience in and of itself. Once an argument has been made, examples may be added as supplements for the purpose of increasing presence and making an abstract rule concrete.⁶⁶ Thus, enthymemes are sufficient proof in themselves, examples are not, but together the two reinforce each other.⁶⁷

Examples invoke persons, things or situations that promote or exemplify convictions, behavioral patterns, principles or truths. Aristotle lists two kinds of examples: historical facts (πράγματα προγεγεννημένα) and inventions (τὸ αὐτὸν ποιεῖν). The inventions are then subdivided into 1) παραβολαί — comparisons, such as if Socrates “were to say that magistrates should not be chosen by lot, for this would be the same as choosing as representative athletes, not those competent to contend, but those on whom the lot falls”; and 2) λόγοι — fables.⁶⁸ Cicero distinguishes comparison from example,

arguments makes it possible to see that such arguments are more varied than one might have thought” (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969:230). They also subsume examples (together with “Illustration”, “Model and antimodel” and “The perfect being as model” under the heading “Establishment through a particular case” (350-71). Hansen’s assertion that, according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, “an example may also function as an illustration” (Hansen 1989:89), is not quite in accord with their division of categories, nor with their intentions: “[T]he suggested division between illustration and example seems to us ... important and meaningful, for, as they have different functions, different criteria will be used in their selection” (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969:357).

66 Arist. Rhet. II.20.9; Cicero, Inv. 37.67; Cf. Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969:360), who also add that argumentation by example — by the very fact that one has resorted to it — implies disagreement over the particular rule the example is invoked to establish, but assumes earlier agreement on the possibility of arriving at a generalization (350).

67 Order is important however, for

if we have [enthymemes], examples must be used as evidence and as a kind of epilogue to the enthymemes. For if they stand first, they resemble induction ... if they stand last they resemble evidence (Arist. Rhet. II.20.11-17).

68 One of the fables provided by Aristotle may illustrate the concept:

A fox while crossing a river was driven into a ravine. Being unable to get out, she was for a long time in sore distress, and a number of dog-fleas clung to her skin. A hedgehog wondering about saw her and,

while Quintilian claims to return to the Greek tradition (“I am not afraid of appearing to disagree with Cicero”, OR. 5.11.2), though it remains somewhat unclear, what he means by that.

Enthymemes are syllogisms that deal with maxims (γνώμη)⁶⁹ and consist in theory of major and minor premise and conclusion. They occur in many forms in a text, sometimes reduced to a general assertion, sometimes as an assertion with a follow up sentence introduced by γάρ or ὅτι. Some enthymemes deal with particular topics, others are “common to all branches of Rhetoric” (Arist. Rhet. II.20.1).⁷⁰ As to their elements they can either be demonstrative or refutative (Arist. Rhet. II.22.13).⁷¹

Aristotle adds a third category, *apparent* enthymemes, which are not enthymemes, since they are not syllogisms (Arist. Rhet. II.22.17). This category may end

with a conclusion syllogistically expressed, although there has been no syllogistic process, “therefore it is neither this nor that”, “so it must be this or that”; and similarly in rhetorical arguments a concise and antithetical statement is supposed to be an enthymeme; for such a style appears to contain a real enthymeme (Arist. Rhet. II.24.2).

These general distinctions suffice for the present investigation, and further differentiation would seem inappropriate since 1) it cannot be ascertained that Aristotle’s definition of enthymemes did become standard within rhetorical

moved with compassion, asked her if he should remove the fleas. The fox refused and when the hedgehog asked the reason she answered: ‘They are already full of me and draw little blood; but if you take them away, others will come that are hungry and will drain what remains of me.’ (Rhet. II.20.6.)

- 69 “... example and enthymeme (for the maxim is part of an enthymeme)” (Arist. Rhet. II.20.1). Maxims are general statements that deal with “objects of human actions, and with what should be chosen or avoided in reference to them”. In a text a maxim may be stated such as “No man who is sensible ought to have his children taught to be excessively clever.” This can be a premise or a conclusion of an enthymeme, and it is when we ask why and for what reason or for which purpose this has been stated, that we construct the enthymeme (Rhet. II.21.2).
- 70 Scholars disagree as to how he implements these distinctions in regard to the three species of speeches (Rhet. I.3-II.19). Cf. comments on Grimaldi (1972) by Anderson Jr (1996:36-7). For the purpose of this investigation it suffices to note that enthymemes can have a common function that does not entail determination of rhetorical species.
- 71 Cicero considers refutative enthymemes to be the really effective enthymemes (Cic. Inv. 13.55).

circles;⁷² 2) his enthymeme theory is not very instructive for logical analyses of the forms of argumentation.⁷³

I adopt four general principles: 1) artificial rhetorical proofs were of two kinds, enthymeme and example; 2) their order of distribution should be noted; 3) some enthymemes belong within particular contexts of communication, some engage or presuppose a more general context; 4) ancient rhetoric articulates a major distinction between demonstrative and refutative enthymemes.

In a letter such as Galatians these distinctions help shape a rationale for separating proofs that are based on particular experiences by those involved in the case, from proofs that are dependent on compliance with a wider context than the situation in Galatia.

5.2 The distribution of examples and enthymemes in 1:6-4:7

There are two major sections of examples in the first part of the letter of which the first contains narratives that purport different experiences of Paul. The section starts with a prologue that asserts Paul's reception of the gospel as a revelation of Jesus Christ (1:11-12) and concludes with an epilogue that asserts the unity of Paul with the crucified Christ (2:18-21). In between there is an autobiographical narrative (1.13-2:21) that corresponds both in structure and content to elements of an ἐγκώμιον.⁷⁴ Framed by a προοίμιον (assertion of significance: “δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ”) and an ἐπίλογος (recommendation to imitate the virtue: here implicit in: “οὐκ ἄθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ”), there are some verses reminiscent of an ἀνατροφή (nurture and

72 I concur with Dean Anderson who states that the “prime use of ancient theory is to help us understand what may have been historically conditioned ways of using various argumentative forms” (Anderson Jr 1996:38).

73 Anderson Jr (1996:36-39, 306-8). There is definitely some ambiguity here. In his description of the enthymeme, Quintilian asserts that in his understanding the general sense of *enthymema*, *epicheirema* and *apodeixeis* is much the same and can be summed under the heading “argument” (Or. 5.10.1) Having discussed alternatives of definition back and forth, he settles for the following: “Argument is proof giving reason by which one thing is inferred from another, and which confirms what is doubtful from what is not doubtful” (Or. 5.10.11).

74 Cf. Burgess (1900:113ff., 125), who lists the following topics: προοίμιον, γένος, ἀνατροφή, πράξεις, σύγκρισις and ἐπίλογος. Subtopics occur and the choice of topic is dependent on circumstances and situations. An encomium may seem misplaced in an autobiographic section, but Lyons (1985:133ff.) argues and demonstrates that autobiography does not have to be apologetic but can be encomiastic.

training), followed by a threefold πράξεις that highlights the person's behaviour and attitudes, and a twofold σύγκρισις (comparison with others) (Table 6).⁷⁵

Table 6: The autobiographical section

| | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|
| 1.11-12 | I. προοίμιον | Paul's reception of the gospel as a revelation of Jesus Christ |
| 1.13-17 | II. ἀνατροφή | Paul's nurture and training |
| 1.18-2.10 | III. πράξεις | Paul's conduct and achievements |
| 1.18-20 | | A. In Jerusalem |
| 1.21-24 | | B. In Syria and Cilicia |
| 2.1-10 | | C. In Jerusalem |
| 2.11-14 | IV. σύγκρισις | 1. Episodic: Cephas and Paul |
| 2.15-18 | | 2. General: Jews and not sinners |
| 2.18-21 | V. ἐπίλογος | Paul's commitment to God's grace in Christ crucified |

The second example section (3:6-4:7) is introduced with questions to the addressees. They are asked to recognise that Gentiles are justified by faith, since those that have faith are sons of Abraham (Γινώσκετε ἄρα ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ). Although in 3:6-9 Abraham's faith is used as the point of reference for Gentiles, beginning with 3:10 the focus on Gentiles disappears and does not reappear until 4:6f. (with the exception of 3:26-28; cf. below), where the sonship of the addressees is confirmed and extended: if a son then also an heir through God (εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ). The demarcation of the concluding direct address from the preceding examples is indicated by the shift from first to second plural verbs in 4:5-6. For the reasons stated I consider 3:6-9 and 4:6-7 to constitute a prologue and an epilogue of section 3:6-4:7.

The "body" of the second example section contains at least four examples of the παραβολή-type that can all be fitted under the heading: the historical evidence of the superiority of Christ.

3:10-14: The curse on "all" and the curse on Christ

3:15-18: The promise (seed) of the covenant and the law

3:19-25: *The law and the faith* (both with quasi-personal attributes, vv. 24-25)

4:1-5: The pedagogue and the Son

⁷⁵ Divisions within the ἐγκώμιον of Gal. 1:11-2:21 differ between interpreters (cf. Lyons 1985:135-6, 171-3, Malina & Neyrey 1996:34-51, and Hester 2002:188-91).

All four examples include a chronological structure and purport to recount historical facts. This is true even of 4:1-5, where a generic comparison (vv. 1-2) is combined with a historical development (vv. 3-5). Each of the comparisons includes a historical contrast between the earlier and inferior and the latter and superior and every time Christ emerges as the eschatological superior: “The cursed”, “The seed”, “The faith” and “The son”.⁷⁶

Each of the examples starts out with a statement that resembles a maxim:⁷⁷

- 1) All who are of works of the law are under a curse (3:10);
- 2) No one annuls a will/covenant or adds to it once it has been established (3:15);
- 3) The law was added because of transgressions until the offspring (faith) would come (3:19);
- 4) The heir, as long as he is a child, is no better than a slave (4:1).

5.3 The special case of 3:26-28

3:26-28 does not seem to correlate structurally to the four surrounding examples for the following reasons: 1) there is a shift from “we” in 3:25 (who are no longer in need of a pedagogue) to “you” (who are children of God in Christ) and for the first time since 3:9 the addressees are included; 2) after the passage the focus on “we”, i.e. those under the law, returns (4:4-5); 3) whereas the four examples deal with matters that concern pre-history, in 3:26-28 the present situation in Galatia is the focal point.

In addition, if 3:26-28 were removed, 3:25 would connect without problems to 4:1 and the train of thought continue without interruption. Also, the passage contains the only reference in the letter to baptism and is reminiscent of 1 Corinthians 12:13 and also Colossians 3:11. These observations have led many to suggest that 3:26-28 is an insertion of a pre-Pauline baptismal formula.⁷⁸ However, it also seems that the formula has been adjusted in two places. Firstly, the parallelism of 3:26 and 3:28b indicates that διὰ τῆς πίστεως was added in 3:26. Secondly, the difference in parallelism between the first two and the third pair in v. 28 (and the absence of the third pair in 1 Cor. 12:13 and Col. 3:11) speaks for an addition of the third pair (cf. Table 7).

76 The chronological contrast distinguishes the examples from 3:6-9. The Scripture reference in 3:8 does not contrast an earlier and inferior over against a later and superior. Instead the faith of Abraham is presented as one of a kind (καθώς) with those who are of faith, then and now, Jews and Gentiles.

77 “[A] maxim is a statement not ... concerning particulars ... but general” (Arist. Rhet. II.21.1).

78 Among others Braumann (1962:24f., 62f.); Meeks (1974:180); Betz (1979:181-85), Longenecker (1990:154-55), Martyn (1997:378), Tolmie (2005:143).

Table 7: The adjusted baptismal formula

| | | |
|-------|---|--|
| v. 26 | Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε [διὰ τῆς πίστεως] ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· | |
| v. 27 | ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε· | |
| v. 28 | οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος [οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστε | οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, καὶ θῆλυ· ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· |

The first adjustment suggests that 3:26-28 was inserted into the structure in order to connect to connect the formula to ἡ πίστις in 3:25.⁷⁹ As a whole the insertion suggests an extension of the first three examples into the present situation.⁸⁰ This is confirmed by v. 29, where Abraham, σπέρμα and promise occur in one sentence and thus recapitulate what has been exemplified. With the reference to the heirs (κληρονόμοι) the verse looks both back to the inheritance in 3:18 but also forward to the topic that is central in the fourth example (4:1-5), namely the transition of the heir from childhood to sonship (ἡ υἰοθεσία).⁸¹

5.4 The distribution of examples and enthymemes in 4:21-6:10

Beginning with 4:21, the structural distribution shifts and we find 1) examples embedded, one at a time, in situational frames; 2) compared to the situational prologues and epilogues (1:11-12 and 2:18-21, and 3:6-9 and 4:6-7), that were affirmative, the situational frames are controversial in content; 3) the structural composition seems to indicate selective correspondence, which is corroborated by Quintilian's point that once an example is chosen "we have to consider whether it is similar as a whole or only in part, so that we can take either all its features into use or only the potentially useful ones" (Or. 5.11.6).

As noted earlier, 4:21 correlates with 4:28-5:1 and frames the allegory of 4:22-27. οὕτως καὶ νῦν (4:29) indicates a selective comparison of the allegory, the function of the example being that the son of the free should expect to be persecuted: in consequence of your being a follower of the crucified Christ: count on sharing your master's fate! The concluding significance deduced from the allegory in 4:31 (διό, ἀδελφοί ...) underlines that the addressees should

79 Cf. Schlier (1965:171), Betz (1979:181), Hays (1983:155-56).

80 H.D. Betz (1979:181) has even suggested that 3:26-28 "stands apart and seems to form the center of the probatio section (3:1-4:31)."

81 Similarly Betz (1979:201).

accept the fortune of the “free”, that is, suffering and persecution as a sign of their freedom.⁸²

The example, consisting of catalogues of vices and virtues gathered under the headings “works of the flesh” and “fruit of the Spirit” (5:19-23), is introduced by a situational address with allegations of conflicts in the communities and the admonition to see that the law is fulfilled in the love command (5:13-18). The example is succeeded by admonishing assertion (5:24-26). While the admonitions concern the struggle against the flesh and being governed by the Spirit, the example does not allude to struggles at all and it remains unclear which of the works of the flesh or the fruit of the Spirit corresponds to the situational frame.

5:2-12 is intensely situational. This has already been apparent from the first reading. As such we may expect the addressees to have been alerted especially as this passage was read to them. Within the section we find a proverb that often has been asserted to be enigmatic⁸³ or purposely open-ended.⁸⁴ This again raises the question of correspondence. I have argued elsewhere⁸⁵ that the point of the proverb is to illustrate that even though circumcision may be considered a small matter (μικρὰ ζύμη), that is “neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail” (v. 6), it is the motive that accompanies the desire that in the end will corrupt the calling to serve the crucified Christ (“But if I, brethren, still preach circumcision why am I still persecuted? In that case the stumbling block of the cross has been removed” — v. 11). If this is correct, the proverb has the selective function of underscoring the severity not of circumcision but of the motive behind it.

6:1a starts out with an admonition of the Πνευματικοί to help those that are overtaken in a trespass and 6:9-10 concludes with the admonition to do good as long as there is time. Within the situational frame, there is an example passage (6:1b-8) with a series of maxims with poetic and proverbial qualities.⁸⁶ The situational pertinence and the question of selective versus comprehensive correlation are difficult to penetrate. While these *maxims* have an

82 In his study “Phil 1:12-26 and the rhetoric of success”, Johan Vos (2005) argues that Paul transforms negative facts such as imprisonment into positive ones by attributing them with positive connotations (“Christ is being preached”). There seems to be a similar strategy at work in Gal. 4:21-5:1.

83 H.D. Betz (1979:266) speaks of Paul throwing it in without any further interpretation.

84 J.D.G. Dunn (1993:276) comments: “[W]e need not assume that he intended his audience in Galatia to make only one application of the proverb. Where the cap fitted..”

85 Mitternacht (1999:142-46).

86 According to Betz (1979:291), Paul here demonstrates his abilities as a gnomic poet.

obvious value of their own, the situational connection that comes to mind is that with the lament of lack of reciprocity in 4:15-18 and the underlying admonition that well-doing should be rewarded (v. 9). This would then connect well with the affirmation in 4:7.⁸⁷ The pattern of examples embedded in situational frames has been charted in Table 8.

Table 8: Examples embedded in situational frames

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------|---------|---------|--------|
| Situational argumentation | 4:21 | 5:2-8 | 5:13-18 | 6:1a |
| Example | 4:22-27 | 5:9 | 5:19-23 | 6:1b-8 |
| Situational argumentation | 4:28-5:1 | 5:10-12 | 5:24-26 | 6:9-10 |

In my first two readings I noticed how attention is drawn, throughout the letter, through situational alerts, emotional language and epistolary formulas to the introductory passages of the different sections. In this third reading structures within the sections emerged that are somewhat more difficult to detect but arranged in repetitious and mnemonic ways that would help the listening audience to retain a picture of the macro-structural design.

5.5 Passages with refutative situational assertions

I shall now return to the passages that have already been recognised in readings one and two above as constituting the situational highlights and macro-structural knots of the letter: 1:6-10; 3:1-5; 4:8-20; 6:12-13. In addition to what has been asserted already, I note 1) that these passages do not contain examples, but are based on arguments; 2) that the assertions made are directly related to the situation in Galatia; 3) that all assertions are confrontational and serve the purpose of refutation; 4) that the conclusions implied in the argumentation seem to function as overall themes for the ensuing example sections (with the exception of 6:11-13, which is part of the autographic *subscriptio*, see below). I shall not analyse the arguments except for pointing out in what sense they may state situational assertions that are then explicated in the sections of examples that follow.

In 1:6-10 the character of the argumentation is clearly refutative and confrontational. The focus is on the wrong choice made by the addressees (v. 6), the grave misguidance by οἱ παράσσωτες (v. 7) and the infallibility of Paul's gospel (vv. 8-9). As such one could argue that in 1:6-9 the main thesis of the letter is articulated (Vos 2002:94); were it not for v. 10, which is introduced

⁸⁷ Cf. Mitternacht (1999:95-7).

by ἄρτι γάρ and suggests itself as the conclusion of the passage, thus indicating that the purpose of 1:6-9 is to demonstrate Paul's impeccable conduct as Χριστοῦ δοῦλος. In my opinion, the purpose of Galatians 1:6-10 is to demonstrate that Paul is not pleasing men, and that the addressees' notion that he would comply with their choice on account of his open-mindedness, or that he may not resist the influencers⁸⁸ is being refuted in no uncertain terms (curses). With this emphasis, 1:6-10 prepares for the autobiographical section of 1:11-2:21, introduced by the first disclosure formula.⁸⁹

In 3:1-5 Paul focuses on the circumstances of presentation and reception and the content of the gospel in Galatia. Again the passage is highly confrontational, highlighting "that the addressees' unequivocal experience of the crucified Christ could simply not be misconstrued by anyone in the possession of a healthy perception" (Mitternacht 2002:424). The point of departure which prepares for the section of examples (3:6-4:7) is that Spirit reception, endurance in suffering (τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῆ;) and experience of God's δύνამεις happened independent of works of the law. Gentile Christ-believers are invited to the full experience of Christ crucified. As such the refutation prepares for the example section with its four affirmations of Christ's superiority to all that has gone before. There is no good reason why one should look for anything else but Christ: "The cursed", "The seed", "The faith" and "The son" (cf. above).

As we get to 4:8, a new confrontational passage begins, leading up to the request formula in 4:12 that, as indicated above, forms the structural centre of the letter. The four aspects of the main concern of the letter are taken up again: 1) the choices of the addressees; 2) the misguidance of the influencers; 3) the true content of the gospel; and 4) the character and commitment of Paul. Right before and right after the request formula, the focus is on the addressees. First their present actions are criticised (vv. 8-11), then their past conduct is praised (vv. 12c-14). Thereafter Paul articulates his bewilderment with their present behaviour (vv. 15-16), followed by a denigrating assertion regarding the bad intentions of the influencers (v. 17) and another reproach of the addressees (v. 18). The section concludes with Paul's heartfelt confession of love and pain for his beloved children (vv. 19-20).

88 I am using the term "influencers", as suggested by Mark Nanos in several publications (e.g., Nanos 2002:193-99), instead of troublemakers, agitators, opponents, etc. The commonly used derogative terms do not take into account the spectrum of possible attributions within the situation of communication. I have argued elsewhere that from an addressee perspective one might wish to call them counsellors or advisors (Mitternacht 1999:320-21, 2002:430-33).

89 In a forthcoming article, a preliminary version of which I have read at the SNTS meeting in Halle 2005, I am presenting my view on Galatians 1:1-10 in full.

The passage is an affront in one sense, but also full of friendship assertions. Compared to 1:6-10, 3:1-5, 5:2-12 and 6:12-13 it is relatively low key in terms of confrontation. No threats occur either to the addressees or to the influencers. The addressees are invited to recognise the loving concern behind the request (“Become as I for I as you”). 4:8-20 then relates back to 1:6-4:7 in summing up and reinforcing what has been asserted before. It also prepares for the second half of the letter, where negative and positive consequences of the request are laid out (4:21-6:10), and, most importantly, it articulates the concerns that are then recapitulated in the autographic *subscriptio* (6:11-18).

I have already discussed 5:2-12 as one of the examples with situational frames. The passage stands out for its intense situational appeal. For the first time in the letter circumcision surfaces as an issue in Galatia and the addressees are informed (5:3) that every man (πᾶς ἄνθρωπος) who is circumcised is obliged to do the whole law (ὅλον τὸν νόμον). At the same time the insignificance of both circumcision and uncircumcision is affirmed and contrasted against what is important, namely “faith working through love” (5:6, cf. 6:15 “a new creation”). The introduction with Ἴδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν (5:2) can be expected to attract the listeners’ attention. It is preceded by the assertion that suffering and persecution accompany the freedom for which “Christ has set us free” (4:28-5:1), which is then reinforced in 5:11, where Paul affirms his own persecution as a consequence of his message of uncircumcision. Several other contrasts appear (e.g., righteousness in the law versus the hope of righteousness by the Spirit) and it seems apparent that the challenge to freedom is a challenge not to faith as opposed to law, but to faithful love, thus preparing for 5:13-14, where it is said that “the whole law (ὁ πᾶς νόμος) is fulfilled in one word ...”

As the last example with its frame is completed, an autographic *subscriptio* is added (6:11-18). In a refutative introduction (6:12-13) Paul vilifies the influencers with his own hand, stating that their interest has never been with the law and claiming that their only motive was to avoid persecution. These, quite noticeably, are exaggerating and stereotypical assertions by any standard.⁹⁰ Except for 4:17, this is the only explicit articulation of the influencers’ motives.

Taking a bird’s eye view on the refutative situational passages, I note that 4:8-20 is the most complex and the least confrontational. Each of the other passages has a main focus that corresponds to the four main concerns expressed in 4:8-20. The main focus of 1:6-10 is on Paul’s character and submission to Christ, which is then elaborated in an autobiographic section (1:13-2:21). The main focus of 3:1-5 is on the addressees’ misconceptions

90 Cf. Mitternacht (2002:429-30).

regarding the message of faith. These misconceptions are then articulated and contradicted in the example section 3:7-4:5. 5:2-12 focuses on freedom characterised by love working through faith over against misguided attempts to avoid persecution. This freedom is then illustrated through in lists of virtues over against vices. The vilification in 6:12-13 is followed up and contrasted by a final and solemn self-description (6:14-15) and an intense affirmation regarding Paul's *imitatio Christi crucifixi* (6:17: "I bear on my body the marks of Christ"). In between benefits of peace and mercy are promised those who will follow this rule (6:16: ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στολχηθήσουσιν).

6. FOURTH READING: STRATEGIC MANOEUVRING AND INARTIFICIAL PROOFS

In a final reading I shall briefly consider the significance of inartificial (ἄτεχνου, extrinsic, external) proofs.⁹¹ According to Aristotle, inartificial "proofs are five in number: laws, witnesses, contracts, torture, oaths" (Rhet. I.15.2), and Quintilian adds "rumours" (Or. 5.1.2) and what he calls *auctoritas* (Or. 5.11.36). Cicero defines extrinsic arguments as topics from without that "are not inherent in the nature of the case" (Or. II.163), and as "arguments thought of without using a system" (Part. Or. 5-6). Quintilian explicates Cicero's slightly enigmatic descriptions by defining them as proofs "which the speaker receives from outside the principles of oratory", and asserts that "these things in themselves involve no art" (Or. 5.1.2). Inartificial proofs, then, correspond to the fundamental evidence on which systems of persuasive argumentation are built. The orator is expected to use his art to either utilise the evidence for his own purposes or to discard it.⁹²

Regarding Galatians, two kinds of inartificial proofs seem especially relevant: laws and witnesses. Laws would, roughly speaking, correspond to proof based on Scripture. "Witnesses are of two kinds, ancient and recent", Aristotle writes, the ancient referring to "poets and men of repute whose judgments are known to all". In the case of Galatians, Abraham would qualify as such an ancient witness. In Galatians his witness corroborates with Scripture in the construction of examples. Regarding recent witnesses, Aristotle distinguishes between well-known people of repute "who have given a decision on any point" and "those who share the risk of the trial". He then adds regarding the latter:

91 Regarding Aristotle's division of proofs into ἄτεχνου and ἔτεχνου Quintilian asserts: There has been almost universal acceptance of Aristotle's primary classification of proofs into those which the speaker receives from outside the principles of oratory, and those which he himself derives from his cause and in a sense generates (Or. 5.1.1)

92 Cf. Kennedy (1984:14: "Invention is based either on external proof, which the author uses but does not invent ...")

Such witnesses only serve to establish whether an act has taken place or not, whether it is or is not the case; but if it is a question of the quality of the act, for instance whether it is just or unjust, expedient or inexpedient, they are not competent witnesses (Arist. Rhet. I.15.13-16).⁹³

The recent witnesses that share, one way or another, the risk of the case in Galatia, would have to be the above mentioned brothers who had come to Paul and were now sent back with the letter. These witnesses had conveyed their views on recent developments in Galatia to Paul. I suspect that they had reported incidents that had taken place and articulated their opinions. Based on reports, opinions and his own assessment, Paul had constructed his reply.

Laws (Scripture) and ancient witnesses (Abraham and Paul, as part of and witness to experiences outside of Galatia), occur exclusively in the example sections. Recent witnesses (the brothers and Paul as an agent in Galatia) provide the information for the situational passages. Looking at the assertions in the situational passages, the information stretches beyond the limitations of “whether or not something is the case”. Instead “the quality of the actions” is evaluated. Since the one who evaluates is involved in the case, this would have been unacceptable in a court of law (thus the sobering limitation demanded by Aristotle). Galatians, of course, cannot be equated with a defence statement in a legal court and Paul did apparently expect trust and devotion from those he reprimanded.

This fourth reading again points to the situational passages as those that would have attracted the attention of the listeners most vividly. What had been reported to Paul? How did he respond to the allegations? Did he care about the opinion and needs of his addressees? The competence of the listeners would be at its peak whenever their own situation is evaluated, and the level of critical listening maximised whenever that of which they have first hand knowledge is presented with critical, derogative and vilifying attributions.

7. SUMMARY

The structural elements identified in this study are summarised in Table 9. I don't mean to suggest that the first listeners could be expected to recognise or remember all of these elements after a one time performance. Rather, the outline visualises for the reader of this article the relative simplicity of the structure as it may have emerged during oral performance. Each section is either headed or framed by situational passages and assertions. The situational divisions are reinforced by epistolary formulas. Within the structural units supporting arguments and examples are distributed.

93 These distinctions are confirmed and elaborated by Quintilian (Or. 5.7.1-26).

Table 9

| | Structure | Epistolary formula | Rhetorical proof |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| 1:1-5 | Prescript | <i>Super-, adscriptio, salutatio</i> | |
| 1:6-2:21 | Background A 1:6-10 Situational alert: the character of Paul 1:11-2:21 Paul's autobiographic <i>prooimion</i> | Rebuke formula (1:6) Disclosure formula (1:11) | Refutative argument Examples with assertive prologue & epilogue |
| 3:1-4:7 | Background B 3:1-5 Situational alert: the fault of the addressees 3:6-4:7 The superiority of Christ | | Refutative argument Examples with assertive prologue & epilogue |
| 4:8-20 | Request section 4:8-11 Situational alert: the return to no-gods 4:12-20 Situational alert: good and bad memories | Request formula (4:12) Disclosure formula (4:15) | Complex argument |
| 4:21-5:12 | Consequences A 4:21: Situational alert: "Don't you hear the law?" 4:22-5:1 Allegory and persecution 5:2-12 Situational alert: grave implications of what may seem minor | | Example framed by arguments Example framed by arguments |
| 5:13-6:10 | Consequences B 5:13-29 Catalogue of vices and virtues and the opposition between Spirit and flesh 6:1-10 Series of maxims and reciprocity | | Example framed by arguments Example framed by arguments |

| | | | |
|---------|---|--|---|
| 6:11-18 | <i>Subscriptio</i> & postscript 6:11-15 Situational alert: summary of main concern 6:16 Blessing 6:17 Situational alert: final emotional appeal 6:18 $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ -wish | Indicator of autographic subscription (6:11) Blessing (6:16) $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ -wish (6:18) | Refutative argument Self-assertion |
|---------|---|--|---|

8. SOME IMPLICATIONS

The four readings have made visible a surface structure of persuasion in Galatians that can be expected to have left its mark on the memory of the listener. The situational passages of direct interaction and confrontation, reinforced by epistolary formulas, heightened the alert of the listeners and shaped a structural grid. The epistolary formulas in 1:6 and 6:11 functioned as indicators of tone and importance, first a tone of ironic rebuke and last indicating alert for an authoritative summary statement. A structural centre of the letter was identified in 4:8-20 with the request formula of 4:12 as its peak. The three formulas surrounded by emotional and confrontational appeal with instant relevance for the situation in Galatia comprise a structural skeleton that would be remembered rather easily.

The distribution of rhetorical proofs within the epistolary structure leads up to 4:12. Paul's earnest request: "Become as I for I as you, I beseech you brethren" echoes positively the harsh rebuke and reprimand in 1:6-7 and 3:1, and highlights his concern for the addressees to live as fellow servants of Christ. In 6:11-15 the concern is summarised, first negatively (vv. 12-13), then positively (vv. 14-15). Negatively we learn that the influencers are concerned with persecution and not with law, positively that Paul's concern is not really with circumcision but with the pursuit of the cross of Christ "through which the world is crucified to me and I to the world". As though the listeners are to be exhorted not to "spiritualise" his concern, Paul adds a final emotional appeal, stating "I carry in my body the stigmata of Jesus" (6:17).

Viewing situational affirmations together with authorial self-assertions I find a correspondence in the theme of persecution and suffering. There appears to be a conflict between Paul's ideal of following the crucified Christ at any cost and of the Gentile addressees' wish for circumcision. Could they not claim to comply with his request ("Become as I") as they in fact became Jewish Christ-believers? Apparently, Paul did not think so. Instead, again and again he affirms that suffering is a natural and positive consequence of obedience to the crucified Christ.

Having heard the letter from beginning to end, the listeners in Galatia were left with a lasting impression that Paul's concern for the Galatian addressees was that they should share his passion for the passion of Christ. His request "Become as I" meant no less than "Participate with me in the *imitatio Christi crucifixi*".

The results of this investigation are not supposed to suggest that the argumentation of the letter to the Galatians is simple or easily grasped, especially not for the scholar who has the luxury of scrutinising every word and argument, day and night. Rather the purpose of this macro-structural analysis was to take into consideration the fact that aural reception *then* must have been quite different from what would be a typically modern reception. Most likely had the first addressees of the Letter to the Galatians a greater capacity to remember than would a listening audience today. But the notion that a detailed analysis of the argumentation of the letter reveals the lasting effect on a mainly illiterate audience seems incredible. Instead, the Galatian addressees would have been affected and disturbed by the letter's core challenge as it surfaced time and again through the macro-structural design of the letter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACHTEMEIER, P.J.

1990. *Omne verbum sonat: The New Testament and the oral environment of late Western antiquity*. *JBL* 109(1):3-37.

ALVAREZ-CINEIRA, D.

1999. *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Claudius und die paulinische Mission*. Freiburg: Herder. Herders Biblische Studien 19.

ANDERSON JR., R.D.

1996. *Ancient rhetorical theory and Paul*. Kampen: Pharos.

BARCLAY, J.M.G.

1987. Mirror-reading a polemical letter: Galatians as a test case. *JSNT* 31:73-93.

BERGER, K.

1980. Die impliziten Gegner. Zur Methode des Erschließens von "Gegnern" in neutestamentlichen Texten. In: D. Lührmann & G. Strecker (Hrsg.), *Kirche. Festschrift für Günther Bornkamm zum 75. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), pp. 373-400.

1984. Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament. In: W. Haase (ed.), *Prinzipat: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), ANRW II:25:2.
- BETZ, H.D.
1979. *Galatians*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- BITZER, L.F.
1968. The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1:1-14.
- BJERKELUND, C.J.
1967. *Parakalô. Form, Funktion und Sinn der parakalô-Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. Bibliotheca Theologica Norvegica.
- BOTHA, P.J.J.
1990. Mute manuscripts: Analysing a neglected aspect of ancient communication. *Theologica Evangelica* 23:35-47.
- BRAUMANN, G.
1962. *Vorpaulinische christliche Taufverkündigung bei Paulus*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. BWANT 82.
- BREUER, D.
1974. *Einführung in die pragmatische Texttheorie*. München: W. Fink. UTB 106.
- BRUNS, C.G.
1876. *Die Unterschriften in den Rechtsurkunden*. Berlin. Philologische und historische Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
- BURGESS, T.C.
1900. Epideictic literature. *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 3:89-261.
- BYRSKOG, S.
2002. *Story as history, history as story. The Gospel tradition in the context of ancient oral history*. Boston Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.
2006. Performing the past: Gospel genre and identity formation in the context of ancient history writing. In: S-W.A. Son (ed.), *History and exegesis. New Testament Essays in honor of Dr. E. Earle Ellis for his 80th birthday* (New York, London: T&T Clark), pp. 28-44.
- CLASSEN, C.J.
1991. Paulus und die antike Rhetorik. *ZNW* 82(1/2):1-33.
2000. *Rhetorical criticism of the New Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. WUNT.

DAHL, N.A.

2002. Paul's Letter to the Galatians. Epistolary genre, content and structure. In: M.D. Nanos (ed.), *The Galatians debate. Contemporary issues in rhetorical and historical interpretation* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson), pp. 117-142.

DEISSMANN, A.

1924. *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

DOTY, W.G.

1973. *Letters in primitive Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

DUNN, J.D.G.

1993. *A commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. London: A&C Black.

ERMERT, K.

1979. *Briefsorten. Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Empirie der Textklassifikation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. Germanistische Linguistik.

EXLER, F.X.J.

1923. *The form of the Ancient Greek letter. A study in Greek epistolography*. Washington. Diss. phil. Catholic University Washington.

FUNK, R.W.

1967. The apostolic parousia: Form and significance. In: W.R. Farmer & C.F.D. Moule & R.R. Niebuhr (eds.), *Christian history and interpretation: Studies presented to John Knox* (Cambridge: University Press), pp. 249-268.

GOODSPEED, E.J.

1951. Phoebe's letter of introduction. *HThR* 44:55-57.

GRIMALDI, W.M.A.

1972. Studies in the philosophy of Aristotle's rhetoric. *Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie*.

GRUBE, G.M.A.

1965. *The Greek and Roman critics*. London: Methuen.

HALM, K. (ED.)

1863. *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig: Teubner).

HANSEN, G.W.

1989. *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and rhetorical contexts*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. JSNTSS 29.

HARVEY, J.D.

1998. *Listening to the text. Oral patterning in Paul's letters*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

HAVELOCK, E.A.

1982. *The literate revolution in Greece and its cultural consequences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

HAYS, R.B.

1983. *The faith of Christ: An investigation of the narrative structure of Galatians 3.1-4.11*. Chico Texas: Scholars.

HESTER, J.D.

2002. Epideictic rhetoric and persona in Galatians 1 and 2. In: M.D. Nanos (ed.), *The Galatians debate. Contemporary issues in rhetorical and historical interpretation*. (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson).

HOLMSTRAND, J.

1997. *Markers and meaning in Paul. An analysis of 1 Thessalonians, Philippians and Galatians*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. ConBNTS 28.

HOPKINS, K.

1998. Christian number and its implications. *J ECS* 6:185-226.

JEGHER-BUCHER, V.

1991. *Der Galaterbrief auf dem Hintergrund antiker Epistolographie und Rhetorik. Ein anderes Paulusbild*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

KENNEDY, G.A.

1984. *New Testament interpretation through rhetorical criticism*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

KEYES, C.W.

1935. The Greek letter of introduction. *AJP* 56:28-44.

KIM, C.H.

1972. *Form and structure of the familiar Greek letter of recommendation*. Missoula/Mont. SBL Diss. Ser.

KOSKENNIEMI, H.

1956. *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400. Chr.* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae 102/2.

KREMENDAHL, D.

2000. *Die Botschaft der Form*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. NTOA 46.

LOHMEYER, E.

1927. Probleme paulinischer Theologie. I. Briefliche Grußüberschriften. *ZNW* 26: 158-73.

LONGENECKER, R.N.

1990. *Galatians*. Dallas: Word Books. WBC 41.

- LYONS, G.
1985. *Pauline autobiography: Toward a new understanding*. Atlanta: Scholars. SBLDS 73.
- MACK, B.L.
1990. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- MALHERBE, A.J.
1988. *Ancient epistolary theorists*. Atlanta: Scholars. SBLDS 19.
- MALINA, B.J. & NEYREY, J.H.
1996. *Portraits of Paul. An archeology of ancient personality*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- MARTYN, J.L.
1997. *Galatians*. New York: Doubleday. Anchor Bible 33A.
- MARXSEN, W.
1978. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- MEEKS, W.A.
1974. The image of the androgyne: Some uses of a symbol in earliest Christianity. *HR* 13:165-208.
- MITTERNACHT, D.
1999. *Forum für Sprachlose: Eine kommunikationspsychologische und epistolär-rhetorische Analyse des Galaterbriefs*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International. ConBNT 30.

2002. Foolish Galatians. A recipient-oriented assessment of Paul's letter. In: M.D. Nanos (ed.), *The Galatians debate. Contemporary issues in rhetorical and historical interpretation* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson), pp. 408-432.

2004. Paul's Letter to the Galatians in social-psychological perspective. In: J.H. Ellens & W.G. Rollins (eds.), *Psychology and the Bible: A new way to read the Scriptures. Volume three: From Gospel to Gnostics* (Atlanta: Greenwood-Præger), pp. 193-212.
- MULLINS, T.Y.
1962. Petition as a literary form. *NovT* 5:46-54.

1964. Disclosure. A literary form in the New Testament. *NovT* 7:44-50.

1972. Formulas in New Testament Epistles. *JBL* 91:380-90.
- NANOS, M.D.
2002. *The irony of Galatians*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- OLSSON, B.
1925. *Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römerzeit*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

- ONG, W.J.
2002. *Orality and literacy. The technologizing of the Word*. London: Routledge.
- PERELMAN, C. & OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, L.
1969. *The New Rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- ROBBINS, V.K.
1991. Writing as a rhetorical act in Plutarch and in the Gospels. In: D.F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive artistry. Studies in New Testament rhetoric in honor of George A. Kennedy* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, JSNT Sup. 50), pp. 157-186.
- ROLLER, O.
1933. *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. BWANT 4:6.
- SÄNGER, D.
2002. Vergeblich bemüht (Gal. 4:11)? Zur paulinischen Argumentationsstrategie im Galaterbrief. *NTS* 48:377-399.
- SCHLIER, H.
1965. *Der Brief an die Galater*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. KEKNT 7.
- SCHMITHALS, W.
1972. *The heretics in Galatia. Paul and the Gnostics*. (New York: Abingdon).
1983. Judaisten in Galatien? *ZNW* 74:27-58.
- SCHNEIDER, J.
1954. Brief A II a-d. *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*.
- STARK, R.
1997. *The rise of Christianity: How the obscure, marginal Jesus movement became the dominant religious force in the Western world in a few centuries*. San Francisco: Collins.
- STIREWALT, M.L.
2003. *Paul the letter writer*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- STOWERS, S.K.
1986. *Letter writing in Greco-Roman antiquity*. Philadelphia: Westminster. LEC 5.
- THORSTEINSSON, R.
2003. *Paul's interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and identity in the context of ancient epistolography*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International. ConBNT 40.
- THURÉN, L.
1990. *The rhetorical strategy of 1 Peter with special regards to ambiguous expressions*. Åbo: Åbo Academy.
- TOLMIE D.F.
2005. *Persuading the Galatians: A text-centred rhetorical analysis of a Pauline letter*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. WUNT 2:190.

TROBISCH, D.

1989. *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung. Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik*. Freiburg [Schweiz]/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. NTOA 10.

1994. *Die Paulusbriefe und die Anfänge der christlichen Publizistik*. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser. KT 135.

VATZ, R.E.

1973. The myth of the rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6(3):154-61.

VOS, J.S.

2002. *Die Kunst der Argumentation bei Paulus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. WUNT 149.

2005. Philippians 1:12-26 and the rhetoric of success. In: T.H. Olbrecht & A. Eriksson (eds.), *Rhetoric, ethic, and moral persuasion in Biblical discourse. Essays from the Heidelberg Conference* (New York, London: T. & T. Clark International), pp. 274-283.

VOUGA, F.

1996. Der Galaterbrief: Kein Brief an die Galater? Essay über den literarischen Charakter des letzten großen Paulusbriefes. In: K. Backhaus & F.G. Untergassmair (Hrsg.), *Schrift und Tradition: Festschrift Josef Erns* (Paderborn: Schöningh), pp. 243-258.

1998. *An die Galater*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. HNT 10.

WARD, R.F.

1994. Pauline voice and presence as strategic communication. *Semeia* 65:95-106.

WATSON, D.F.

1995. The integration of epistolary and rhetorical analysis of Philippians. In: S.E. Porter & T.H. Olbricht (eds.), *The rhetorical analysis of Scripture. Essays of the 1995 London conference* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSNT Sup. 146), pp. 398-426.

WEICHERT, V. (Ed.)

1910. *Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur TUPOI EPISTOLIKOI et EPISTOLIMAIOI XARAKTHRES* (Leipzig: Teubner).

WENDLAND, P.

1912. *Die urchristlichen Literaturformen*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). HNT 1:3.

WHITE, J.L.

1971. Introductory formulae in the body of the Pauline letter. *JBL* 90:91-97.

1984. New Testament epistolary literature in the framework of ancient epistolography. In: W. Haase (Hrsg.), *Prinzipat: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), ANRW II:25:2.

1986. *Light from ancient letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

WHITE, J.L. & KENSINGER, K.

1976. Categories of Greek papyrus letters. *SBLASP* 10:79-91.

WITULSKI, T.

2000. *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefs. Untersuchungen zur Gemeinde von Antiochia ad Pisidiam*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Keywords

Rhetorical analysis

Letter to the Galatians

Epistolographical analysis

Early Christian literacy

Oral culture

Trefwoorde

Retoriese analise

Brief aan die Galasiërs

Epistolografiese analise

Vroeg-Christelike geletterdheid

Orale kultuur