

P. Verster

THE IMPLICATIONS OF NON-AUTHENTIC QUESTIONS IN GALATIANS

ABSTRACT

A new classification of non-authentic questions is helpful in understanding the way in which Paul uses persuasion in Galatians. Paul uses many non-authentic questions, and the implications thereof are evident in the type of question used. The way in which he violates the maxims identified by Grice also entails certain implications which can be used to establish the meaning of certain passages. Questions used in Galatians include statements, empty statements, emphatic rhetorical interrogatives, ironical interrogatives and appeal questions. Paul often violates the rule of politeness in order to emphasise his point.

1. INTRODUCTION

Not all questions require an answer. Questions that do not require an answer are referred to as “rhetorical questions”. However, in my opinion, questions that do not require an answer and that have different meanings should rather be referred to as “non-authentic questions”. Such non-authentic questions have certain clear implications when used as rhetorical instruments, for example in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians. On the basis of speech act theory, which highlights the fact that utterances fulfil certain functions in speech (see Austin 1961 and Searle 1965; 1975), persuasion strategies and communication strategies in the form of non-authentic questions in Paul’s letters may thus be scrutinised, and their implications discussed.

In the past, most non-authentic questions were merely identified as “rhetorical questions”. However, from a speech act perspective, such questions may be classified with far greater precision, since speech act theory provides a sound framework for describing the function of speech (Searle 1965:125). Non-authentic questions may be mirrored against this background in order to facilitate a new classification of questions. Snyman (1989) applied this classification to the Letter to the Romans in order to determine the implications of non-authentic questions in this letter. A similar approach will be followed in this paper by describing the non-authentic questions in Galatians. The aim

Prof. P. Verster, Head of the Department of Missiology, Faculty of Theology, University of the Free State, P.O. Box 339, Bloemfontein 9300.

of this paper is to evaluate the various non-authentic questions in Galatians and to describe their implications in order to better understand their function and meaning in the letter.

In speech act theory, different levels of meaning are inferred from a sentence. According to this theory, the locutionary level has no implications, whereas implications¹ are inherent in the intention of the illocutionary force. Every locution can lead to many illocutions, which in turn can give rise to numerous perlocutions.² In fact, there are so many possible perlocutions that there is no direct link between the locution and the perlocution. The sender can have multiple intentions, but the perlocution cannot be established by means of a performative formula. Because the sender has little control over the perlocutions (except in the case of direct orders within, for example, a defence force context or certain laws of parliament), certain strategies must be used in order to ensure acceptable communication. Non-authentic questions form part of such strategies.

Searle (1975) explains how a sender attempts to have an effect on the receiver. When directness is the desired effect, the literal meaning is important. However, Searle (1975:171) indicates that all communication is not so simple. Communication is much more complex, for example when insinuations, ironic utterances or metaphors are used. An implication should be considered an indirect speech act. In order to understand the process of communication when complex utterances are used, certain questions must be asked, for example "How is it possible that the direct and indirect speech act can exist simultaneously?" or "How is it possible to distinguish between the implications?" A study of implicature and co-operative principles is necessary (Grice 1989:24). A set of principles has been laid down to enhance an understanding of utterances.

In the development of speech act theory, Grice's co-operative principles became important, since speech acts should not to be viewed in isolation (1989:26 ff.):

On the assumption that some such general principle as this is acceptable, one may perhaps distinguish four categories, under one or another of which will fall certain more specific maxims and sub-maxims, the following of which will, in general, yield results in accordance with the cooperative principle. Echoing Kant, I call these categories Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner.

-
- 1 According to Nuyts (1993:591), "representation intention" and "communication intention" are present in the illocutionary force. Intention is linked to the sender.
 - 2 "In short, the issuing of an utterance may produce an infinite number of perlocutionary effects" (Gu 1993:408).

According to Grice (1989:30), a person may violate these maxims or opt out of a conversation when facing a potential clash with the receiver of a message.

The *maxim of quantity* is violated when the sender disregards economy of his utterance in his speech act. The *maxim of quality* is violated when the sender disregards truth as a requirement for his speech act, and lacks evidence for his utterances. The *maxim of relation* is violated when the sender disregards relevance in his speech act. The *maxim of manner* is violated when the sender's speech act is not perspicuous, but obscure and ambiguous (see Grice 1989:26-27). Such violations have *implications*. Politeness is also added as a general rule of conversation (Swanepoel & Van Jaarsveld 1993:131). Some of these maxims and the rule of politeness may be violated in the interest of persuasion.

Furthermore, utterances may have different implications. One of these implications is *persuasion* of the receiver of the utterance. Larson (1973:10) is of the opinion that persuasion changes beliefs, behaviour and acts:

Persuasion is a process whereby decision options are intentionally limited or extended through the interaction of messages, sources and receivers, and through which attitudes, beliefs, opinions or behaviors are changed by a cognitive restructuring of one's image of the world or of his frame of reference.

Bettinghaus and Cody (1987:30) add:

As a minimal condition, to be labelled as persuasive, a communication situation must involve *a conscious attempt by one individual to change the attitudes, beliefs, or behavior of another individual or group of individuals through the transmission of some message.*

A preliminary conclusion is that persuasion changes beliefs, acts and behaviour by persuading the receiver that other beliefs, acts and behaviour are possible, or by strengthening certain beliefs, acts and behaviour by confirming them. The way in which Paul uses non-authentic questions in Galatians in order to persuade is thus of crucial importance to determine this aspect. This issue shall now be examined.

2. NON-AUTHENTIC QUESTIONS AS SPEECH ACTS

An outline of the classification and function of non-authentic questions will now be presented.

2.1 The difference between authentic and non-authentic questions

In antiquity a distinction was made between authentic and non-authentic questions (Lausberg 1963:146). There even existed a classification of rhetorical questions (Cronjé 1992:420). Modern linguistics differ from these classifications, and a new classification of questions based on speech act theory is envisaged (Verster 2000).

It is also important to indicate the way in which non-authentic questions and others are classified by various experts in the field. Two examples are given.

Van Jaarsveld (1987b:110) explains that authentic questions expect answers and that they are bound by specific rules. If questions do not expect answers, they should be regarded as non-authentic questions.

In his article “Interrogatives that seek no answers: Exploring the expressiveness of rhetorical interrogatives in Japanese”, Senko K. Maynard (1995:502) also refers to the difference between questions that expect an answer and those that do not. Rhetorical questions do not expect an answer. In cases where the emotion of the sender is important rather than the answer, Maynard (1995: 508) uses the term “rhetorical interrogatives.”³ “Rhetorical interrogatives” (RIs) can be distinguished on the basis of some main elements (Maynard 1995:510):

1. RIs do not expect direct information, but find their relevance in the relation to the whole.
2. In terms of the Lakoff classification, RIs cannot have an “answer”, whereas other questions may have “answers” and “replies”.
3. Many RIs have phonological elements that express emotion.

3 Maynard (1995:526):

In sum, a rhetorical interrogative, which reflects hidden dialogicality, creates in discourse an augmented sense of interactionality in two ways. First, the dialogic nature of a language brings to the fore the importance of context (e.g. addressee, information status), which is critical for the interpretation of rhetorical interrogatives. Second, just as human cognition is fuelled by hidden dialogicality, interpretation of a rhetorical interrogative is supported by the process of question-answer interaction — although of course deviated cases of that — which in part makes it possible to create in discourse various expressive effects.

2.2 Classification of non-authentic questions

From a speech act perspective, Van Jaarsveld (1987b:110 ff), Maynard (1995: 526ff.) and Snyman (1989) provide a classification of questions. Based on these classifications, Verster (2000) distinguishes seven main categories of non-authentic questions, namely (1) questions of action (directives), (2) questions as statements, (3) questions as empty statements, (4) questions that primarily convey emotions, (5) monological, self-directed questions, (6) rational-argumentative questions, and (7) theme enhancers. For the purposes of this article, this framework was slightly adapted and will be used and illustrated by means of a few types of questions. These will be discussed and their implications explained. It is hoped that this framework will prove useful.

2.2.1 Questions of action

Directives

There is only one category since other non-authentic questions do not expect action. This category is characterised by the following aspects:

- The Sender (S) uses a question.
- S supposes that the Receiver (R) will identify it as a non-informative question.
- S expects reaction to his question in the form of action.
- S uses the question to avoid using an imperative.
- S uses the question for instructions, petitions and invitations.
- S expects a perlocution in the form of a “reply”, and not an “answer”.

Example: *Don't you want to come over to us tonight?*

Rewritten as: *Come over tonight!* (Imperative)

2.2.2 Questions as statements

This category is characterised by the following aspects:

- S uses the question to make a normal statement.
- S's locution can be rewritten as a statement.
- S does not make the statement with absolute certainty.

Example: *Is faith not a gift?*

Rewritten as: *Faith is a gift.*

This classification can be made on the basis of the sender's intentions. Van Jaarsveld (1987b:115) puts it as follows: A question statement is a question with the implication of a statement. The sender expects the receiver to interpret it as a statement, and not as a question.

2.2.3 Emphatic rhetorical interrogatives

This category is characterised by the following aspects:

- S uses the question in order to make a statement.
- S makes the statement with strong emphasis and intensity.
- Words such as “surely”, “even”, or “at all” are often used. In Greek, these questions are often followed by *μη γένοιτο*.

Example: *Is it not very unacceptable?*

Rewritten as: *It is totally unacceptable.*

2.2.4 Questions that are rational, but not statements

Statements negative (Empty statements)

Van Jaarsveld’s (1987b:115) classification of these questions as “empty statements” should be reconsidered. These questions are not empty but negative, therefore they should be renamed “statements negative”.

This category is characterised by the following aspects:

- S reacts to the speech act of the communicator or receiver.
- S uses the question in order to make a statement with negative content.
- S wishes to expose R’s negative acts, and to break the line of argumentation.
- The rule of courtesy/politeness is broken.

Example: *Did you ask the girl to go out with you? Are you mad?*

Rewritten: *You are foolish if you asked the girl to go out with you.*

Van Jaarsveld (1987b:115) explains that statements negative (empty statements) are a form of question where the indirect aspect of the speech act can only be established in certain situations. These statements are impolite reactions that do not expect a reaction in return, thus implying that the statements are discourteous.

2.2.5 Monologous, self-related questions

This subgroup comprises two subcategories, namely rhetorical interrogatives of a self-inquiring nature and rhetorical interrogatives of a self-accepting nature. These types of questions are related to the informer himself/herself. They are not addressed to the receiver, and can be primarily rational or emotional.

Rhetorical interrogatives of a self-inquiring nature

This category is characterised by the following aspects:

- S creates an interrogative expression addressed to himself or herself.

Example: *How did I get involved in this?*

Rewritten: *I got involved in this in an unacceptable way.*

Rhetorical interrogatives of a self-accepting nature

This kind of question involves a rethinking of information. There is a certain amount of doubt in the evaluation of the information.

Example: *What was the conversation about? O, yes! The headmaster's post.*

Rewritten as: *When I think about the conversation, I remember that they talked about the new headmaster's post.*

This category is characterised by the following aspects:

- S is involved in noticing, thinking about, accepting and/or acknowledging information.
- Emotions are very important.

(See Maynard 1995:511ff. for examples)

The implications are that these questions refer back to the sender in order to focus on him/her.⁴

2.2.6 Rational-argumentative questions

Appeal questions

This category is characterised by the following aspects:

- No verbal reaction is expected from the receiver (R).
- The question is in the form of an appeal and it intends to draw the receiver's attention to a new theme.
- A new theme is introduced with the question.

4 Maynard (1995:517) refers to these questions as follows:

Rhetorical interrogatives discussed so far — including both self-inquiry and self-acceptance — express the speaker's attitude, that is, doubt, towards some state or event. The speaker does not engage in soliciting a response from the addressee as expected in ordinary question-answer interaction.

Example: *Class, today we will begin with historical criticism. What is historical criticism?*

Rewritten as: *Listen! Our theme today is historical criticism.*

Van Jaarsveld (1987b:115) states that appeal questions are question forms with the implications of an appeal, and could even have the intention of impolite rejection of the preconditions of questions. The attention of R is obtained for the statement which S wishes to make.

Ironical interrogatives

In this instance the meaning is the opposite of the expected content of the question.

Example: *“Why is the president so full of himself? I have also attained what he has attained”, says the clerk.*

Rewritten as: *The president is very full of himself but the clerk thinks this is not justified since he has reached the same heights, although he falls short in many ways.*

This category is characterised by the following aspects:

- S expresses doubt about a certain situation.
- The meaning of his question is the opposite of what R would initially understand.
- In the context, the irony is evident.

The non-authentic questions in Galatians will now be examined against this background.

3. NON-AUTHENTIC QUESTIONS IN GALATIANS

Galatians 1:10

Ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκει; εἰ ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἦμην.

Am I now trying to win the approval of men, or of God? Or am I trying to please men? If I were still trying to please men, I would not be a servant of Christ.

Rewritten as: *I am not trying to win the approval of men, but of God. I am not trying to please men.*

Type of question: Statement negative.

By means of this question, Paul wishes to expose the receivers' negative acts and break the line of argumentation to make a statement with negative content. This type of question violates the politeness rule, since a rejection of the receivers' conceptions is evident.⁵

Paul uses this statement to emphasise the fact that he is conveying the gospel of Christ, not his own opinions. This is in line with the interpretation of Du Toit⁶ who stresses Paul's allegiance to the gospel.⁷ In the process, Paul violates the maxim of quantity by saying more than is necessary in order to emphasise his point.

Galatians 2:14

ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾶ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων· εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἔθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαίειν;

When I saw that they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter in front of them all, "You are a Jew, yet you live like a Gentile and not like a Jew. How is it, then, that you force Gentiles to follow Jewish customs?"

Rewritten as: *You live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, though you are a Jew, yet you want to force Gentiles to follow Jewish customs.*

Type of question: Statement negative

In this instance the emphasis is on exposing Peter's negative act. Furthermore, this is an impolite reference by Paul to his endeavour to bring the gospel to gentiles, irrespective of anyone's opinion. He uses the non-authentic question to rebuke Peter.⁸ The way in which this statement is used in this context empha-

5 Guthrie (1981:64) indicates that Paul uses the rhetorical question against charges of self-seeking brought against him. See also Bruce (1982:84) and Mussner (1981:63). Silva (1996:48) discusses the problem of whether the emphasis is on Paul's denial that he is a people pleaser, or whether the emphasis is on Paul making the gospel known (thus emphasising γάρ. Silva prefers the last option. Witherington (1998:85) is of opinion that Paul is saying that he will not stoop to people pleasing.

6 Du Toit (1990:156ff.), Rohde (1989:46) and George (1994:100) find sarcasm in Paul's words.

7 See Lührmann (1992:12): "The dispute is not over his own legitimation but over the legitimacy of the gospel, with which his own stands or falls." See also Tolmie (2005:43) in this regard.

8 The rebuke is strong: see George (1994:117) and Tolmie (2005:87). Witherington (1998:162) differs from Dunn. He emphasises that Paul will not allow faith and observance of the law to be relieved of their restrictive and ritualistic aspects, since his gospel radicalises the aspect of grace.

sises Paul's rejection of the tendency to Judaize the gospel. He thus violates the maxim of quantity. Furthermore, this question has a double implication. The first implication is addressed to Peter, and the second is in the letter itself. The violation of the maxim of quantity and the rule of politeness is even stronger in the letter, as Peter seems to have had a high standing among the Galatians.

Galatians 2:17

εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιοθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ εὐρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἄρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος; μὴ γένοιτο.

If, while we seek to be justified in Christ, it becomes evident that we ourselves are sinners, does that mean that Christ promotes sin? Absolutely not!

Rewritten as: *Although it is evident that we are sinners when we seek to be justified in Christ, this does definitely not mean that Christ promotes sin!*

Type of question: Emphatic rhetorical interrogative

This statement is characterised by strong emphasis and intensity. It is a radical statement indicating that Christ does not promote sin, but that God's justification thereof through Christ is pure grace.⁹ This radical statement is in line with the absolute rejection of a view according to which justification in Christ means that the fact that people remain sinners implies that Christ is promoting sin. Paul responds: "Absolutely not — justification of sin is from God! It is his grace, given freely." He wishes to convey this notion beyond any doubt, and thus violates the maxims of quality and quantity.

Galatians 3:1-5

A few related questions follow in this section.¹⁰ Bruce (1982:148) is of the opinion that Paul wants to reject a possible return to the law: "If you have embraced the gospel, the return to the law is not possible."

9 Rohde (1998:112) emphasises that Paul's questions establish the truth of the atonement. See also Mussner (1981:176). Guthrie (1981:88) puts it as follows:

The thought is that if the process of justification leads men into sin, this would make Christ an agent for producing sin, which would clearly be opposed to the nature of Christ. Paul strongly repudiates such an idea.

Silva (1996:100) refers to the "polemical — even defensive — character" of this section. Dunn (1994:75) states: "To count Christian Jews who thus joined with Christian Gentiles as 'sinners' was tantamount to making the Christ who accepted both the 'servant of sin' — an impossible thought" (2:17).

10 See Lührmann (1992:51):

Galatians 3:1

ἽΩ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, οἷς κατ' ὄφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος;

You foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you? Before your very eyes Jesus Christ was clearly portrayed as crucified.

Rewritten as: *He appeals to the Galatians not to be as foolish as somebody who is bewitched, but that they should rather realise that Jesus Christ was clearly portrayed as crucified before their very eyes.*

Type of question: Appeal ¹¹

In this question the appeal intends, by strong emphasis, to draw the receivers' attention to a new theme. Paul wishes to draw their attention by stating that they are acting like people who have been bewitched, without acknowledging that this is possible. He thus attempts to obtain the attention of his audience in a negative way, as he questions it in the next sentence.

Galatians 3:2

τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν· ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως;

I would like to learn just one thing from you: Did you receive the Spirit by observing the law, or by believing what you heard?

Rewritten as: *They did receive the Spirit not by observing the law, but rather by believing what they had heard.*

Type of question: Statement negative

The statement is strongly negative. In this way Paul draws his audience into a discussion about the meaning of the law, thus violating the rule of polite-

He asks them questions that they can really answer only his way; otherwise, of course, everything that has happened before would truly be in vain, which he does not believe at all possible.

Silva (1996:88) refers to an interesting discourse analysis by Rogers, in which the role of the rhetorical question is highlighted.

11 Guthrie (1981:92) puts it as follows:

The apostle cannot imagine that any whose minds were not under some external influence would have been so foolish as these Galatians. He can only suggest somewhat ironically that they must be under some adverse magic.

ness.¹² He shows how they are deviating from the right intentions,¹³ with the emphasis on the truth of the Spirit, and not the law, being paramount.

Galatians 3:3

οὕτως ἀνόητοι ἐστε, ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε;

Are you so foolish? After beginning with the Spirit, are you now trying to attain your goal by human effort?

Rewritten as: *He appeals to them not to be so foolish. After beginning with the Spirit they should not try to attain their goal by human effort.*

Type of question: Appeal first, and then statement negative

In this question the appeal introduces a new element and the ensuing statement is negative. Furthermore, the two questions are impolite. First, Paul calls them to attention. He also puts his case very strongly by violating the maxims of quantity (a twofold question) and manner (by not being clear in his refutation).¹⁴ These questions effectively point out their foolishness.

Galatians 3:4

τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῆ; εἶ γε καὶ εἰκῆ.

Have you suffered so much for nothing — if it really was for nothing?

Rewritten as: *They really did not suffer so much for nothing at all.*

Type of question: Emphatic rhetorical interrogative

Paul uses this strong statement to emphasise that the Galatians' suffering should not have been in vain.¹⁵ He thus violates the maxim of manner to demonstrate how strongly he feels about the issue.

Galatians 3:5

ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως;

12 Guthrie explains: (1981:92): “[W]orks of law’ are works done in conformity with law, whereas the present phrase means the kind of hearing which leads to and is, therefore, accompanied by faith.”

13 Tolmie (2005:101) describes this question as an “accusatory rhetorical question.”

14 Tolmie (2005:103) shows that Paul does not want to reduce the power of his speech. See also Guthrie (1981:91), who emphasises Paul’s bewilderment at their folly.

15 Guthrie (1981:93) views the question as a hypothetical argument.

Does God give you his Spirit and work miracles among you because you observe the law, or because you believe what you heard?

Rewritten as: *God gave them his Spirit and worked miracles among them, not because they observed the law, but because they believed what they had heard.*

Type of question: Statement

In this instance, the statement is used to emphasise that faith is the key.¹⁶ In his argument, Paul leads them to the conclusion that it is not the law that saves, but faith in Christ.

Galatians 3:19

Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη, ἄχρισ οὐ ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου.

What, then, was the purpose of the law? It was added because of transgressions until the Seed to whom the promise referred had come.

Rewritten as: *He appeals to them to explain what the purpose of the law was other than that it was added because of transgressions, until the Seed to whom the promise referred had come.*

Type of question: Appeal

This question introduces a new theme. It appeals to the audience to determine the purpose of the law. Paul thus violates the politeness rule, because he wants to draw their full attention.¹⁷

Galatians 3:21

ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν [τοῦ θεοῦ]; μὴ γένοιτο.

Is the law, therefore, opposed to the promises of God? Absolutely not!

Rewritten as: *The law, therefore, definitely does not oppose the promises of God!*

16 See Guthrie (1981:94): “The question here arises from Paul’s doctrine of God. He could never conceive of God as being bound by law.”

17 Tolmie (2005:132) believes that Paul focuses on the purpose of the law. See also Guthrie (1981:103). Silva (1996:177-178) explains that the emphasis on the law as a redemptive-historical period has come to an end; the end of this period is identified with the coming of faith, and finally, the new stage is the fullness of time.

*Type of question: Emphatic rhetorical interrogative*¹⁸

In this question Paul emphasises very strongly the fact that the law is not against the promises of God. By using such a strong statement, he uses the non-authentic question in a masterly manner.

Galatians 4:9

νῦν δὲ γινόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῖν θέλετε;

But now that you know God — or rather are known by God — how is it that you are turning back to those weak and miserable principles? Do you wish to be enslaved by them all over again?

Rewritten as: *Now that they know God — or rather are known by God — it is impossible that they should turn back to weak and miserable principles and be enslaved by them all over again.*

*Type of question: Statement negative*¹⁹

In this instance the negative elements are emphasised. By using these non-authentic questions, Paul exposes the weak arguments of the audience.²⁰ He also violates the maxim of quantity by using the two questions jointly. Drawing the audience into the argument, he attempts to expose them.

Galatians 4:15

ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν;

What has happened to all your joy?

Rewritten as: *I appeal to you not to lose all your joy.*

18 Tolmie (2005:137) refers to it as a very strong statement. Bruce (1982:180) shows how the argument repudiates an argument that might be inferred from Paul's own reasoning. Silva (1996:187) explains:

What needs emphasis is that the apostle here encapsulates his assessment of the law by specifying in what respect the law may be viewed positively, and in what respect negatively.

19 See Tolmie (2005:153): "... used to convey a particular notion in a more forceful way." Guthrie (1981:116) emphasises Paul's utter bewilderment, but also his fear that apostasy is possible.

20 Lührmann (1992:83) explains that Paul emphasises the polemic.

Type of question: Appeal

In this appeal, Paul's bewilderment at their return to the law is clear.²¹ They experienced joy with Christ; now they are returning to an empty, joyless life under the law.

Galatians 4:16

ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν;

Have I now become your enemy by telling you the truth?

Rewritten as: *He appeals to them to accept that his telling them the truth does not make him their enemy.*

Type of question: Appeal

In this instance the break in the line of argumentation and the introduction of a new theme are evident. Paul again violates the rule of politeness as well as the maxim of manner by making such obscure statements. In his effort to persuade them, he is drawing their attention to the fact that he is not their enemy. This is not an ironical question, since Paul puts his cards on the table.

Galatians 4:21

Λέγετε μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;

Tell me, you who want to be under the law, are you not aware of what the law says?

Rewritten as: *It is ironical that they who want to be under the law, are not aware of what the law says.*

*Type of question: Ironical interrogative*²²

In this instance Paul exposes his adversaries by calling upon them to mirror their views against their own knowledge. He uses an ironical question which has an opposite implication, namely to show them that, although they may think they know exactly what the law says, they are mistaken. He also violates the maxim of relation by telling them to turn to the law, which is not clearly relevant to them because they think he is against the law.

21 Bruce (1982:210) refers to the exceptional relation between Paul and the Galatians. Witherington (1998:312) states: "[W]e may assume Paul means where has your graciousness and your willingness to be a blessing to me, and perhaps receive one from me, gone now?"

22 Tolmie (2005:171) refers to the fact that attention is drawn to the new argument.

Galatians 4:30

ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρως.

But what does the Scripture say? “Get rid of the slave woman and her son, for the slave woman’s son will never share in the inheritance with the free woman’s son.”

Rewritten as: *He appeals to them to listen to the implications of Scripture.*

Type of question: Appeal ²³

Paul uses this question to draw the attention of the Galatians to a new theme. Furthermore, he violates the maxim of quantity by asking them what Scripture states, and then quoting from it.

Galatians 5:7

Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν [τῇ] ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι;

You were running a good race. Who cut in on you and kept you from obeying the truth?

Rewritten as: *They were running a good race and should not be diverted from obeying the truth.*

Type of question: Statement negative ²⁴

In this instance, Paul violates the maxim of manner by not stating specifically who led them astray. Furthermore, he uses this non-authentic question to emphasise his opponents’ vanity.

Galatians 5:11

Ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι; ἄρα κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ.

Brothers, if I am still preaching circumcision, why am I still being persecuted? In that case the offence of the cross has been abolished.

23 Tolmie (2005:174) interprets this as strong emphasis on the following sentence. See also Rohde (1989:220). Guthrie (1981:126) points out: “Paul is about to appeal to a contrast, hence ‘but’ (*alla*) introduces this rhetorical question.”

24 Tolmie (2005:186) describes it as “a rhetorical question to refute criticism by his opponents.” Guthrie (1981:131) says that Paul poses the question “in order to challenge the readers.” Dunn (1994:7) refers to a questioning of Paul’s consistency. According to Dunn (1994:46), the cross is an obstacle for those who still refer to circumcision.

Rewritten as: *He appeals to them to realise that if he were still preaching circumcision he should then not be persecuted anymore.*

Type of question: Appeal, not self-inquiring, rhetorical interrogative ²⁵

Paul is asking the Galatians why he is still being persecuted; he is not self-reflecting on this issue. This would be an interesting case of self-inquiring rhetorical interrogatives if the context did not lead us to a different evaluation.

4. CONCLUSION

Does this research help us? To my mind it definitely does, due to the following reasons:

First, it provides a clearer picture of the argument in the Letter to the Galatians. By providing a tool to classify the non-authentic questions in Galatians, the difference between questions and their meaning can be described more accurately. Tolmie (2005), for instance, classifies all non-authentic questions in Galatians as rhetorical questions and loses some of the nuances of the implications of the various questions. Cronjé (1992) also misses the finer aspects of Paul's persuasion by not using the new classification of non-authentic questions. This paper indicated the potential of classifying and establishing the implications of the questions.

Secondly, it explains Paul's methods of persuasion. By classifying the questions, the way in which Paul uses persuasion in Galatians can be described in more exact terms.

Thirdly, it creates new interpretations.

What are the implications? Paul is so bound by the gospel that he has to do his utmost to proclaim — even by violating the rule of politeness — that the gospel is God's good news, not to be hampered by the law.

25 Rohde (1989:222) explains that Paul is not being opportunistic. Guthrie (1981:132) explains that Paul refers to the fact that he was persecuted, and that the readers were aware of this.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALAND, K. *ET AL.*

1983. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

AUSTIN, J.L.

1961. Performative utterances. In: A.P. Martinich (ed.), 1985, *The philosophy of language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 115-124.

BETTINGHAUD, E.P. & CODY, M.J.

1987. *Persuasive communication*. (4th ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

BRUCE, F.F.

1982. *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. A commentary on the Greek text*. Exeter: Paternoster.

CRONJÉ, J. VAN W.

1992. The stratagem of the rhetorical question in Galatians 4: 9-10 as a means towards persuasion. *Neotestamentica* 26(2):417-424.

DUNN, J.D.G.

1994. *The theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. New Testament Theology.

DU TOIT, A.B.

1990. Analise van die opbou, argumentasiegang en pragmatiek van die Galatebrief: 'n Eerste oriëntering. *Skrif en Kerk* 11(2):155-165.

GEORGE, T.G.

1994. *Galatians*. S.I.: Broadman and Holman. The New American Commentary.

GRICE, H.P.

1989. *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

GU, Y.

1993. The impasse of perlocution. *Journal of Pragmatics* 20(5):405-432.

GUTHRIE, D.

1981. *Galatians*. Grand Rapids Mi.: Eerdmans. The New Century Bible Commentary.

LARSON, C.U.

1998. *Persuasion: Reception and responsibility*. (8th ed.) Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth.

LAUSBERG, H.

1963. *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik*. München: Max Hueber.

LÜHRMANN, D.

1992. *Galatians*. Translated by O.C. Dean Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress. A Continental Commentary.

MARTINICH, A.P. (ED.)

1985. *The philosophy of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MAYNARD, S.K.

1995. Interrogatives that seek no answer: Exploring the expressiveness of rhetorical interrogatives in Japanese. *Linguistics* 33:501-530.

MUSSNER, F.

1981. *Der Galaterbrief*. (Vierte Auflage.) Freiburg: Herder. HTKNT 9.

NUYTS, J.

1993. Representation and communication: Searle's distinction revisited. *Journal of Pragmatics* 20(6):591-597.

ROHDE, J.

1989. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*. (1. Auflage der Neubearbeitung.) Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt. ThHK.

SEARLE, J.R.

1965. What is a speech act? In: A.P. Martinich 1985:125-135.

1975. Indirect speech acts. In: A.P. Martinich 1985:171-185.

SILVA, M.

1996. *Explorations in exegetical method. Galatians as a test case*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

SNYMAN, A.H.

1989. Vraagvorme as taalhandelinge in die Romeinebrief. In: W.J. Henderson & D.F. Pauw (reds.), *Theros. Studies opgedra aan Professor E.L. de Kock by geleentheid van sy 65ste verjaarsdag*. (Johannesburg), pp. 121-131.

SWANEPOEL L.M. & VAN JAARSVELD, G.J.

1993. Wat is oorreding? 'n Pragmatiese perspektief. *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Taalkunde* 11(4):129-135.

TOLMIE, D.F.

2005. *Persuading the Galatians*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. WUNT 2.190.

VAN JAARSVELD, G.J.

1987b. Vraagstelling as taalhandeling. In: G.J. van Jaarsveld 1987a:109-123.

VAN JAARSVELD, G.J. (RED.)

1982. *Wat sê jy? Studies oor taalhandelinge in Afrikaans*. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill.

1987a. *Wat bedoel jy?* Pretoria: Serva.

VERSTER, P.

2000. Nie-egte vrae in die Romeinebrief: 'n Taalhandelingsperspektief. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation. Bloemfontein: UFS

WITHERINGTON, B.

1998. *Grace in Galatia. A commentary on St Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Keywords

Rhetorical analysis

Pauline Letters

Letter to the Galatians

Rhetorical questions

Trefwoorde

Retoriese analise

Pauliniese briewe

Brief aan die Galasiërs

Retoriese vrae