

GARDNER-WEBB UNIVERSITY

RHETORICAL INTREPRETATION

A PAPER SUBMITTED TO

DR. LORIN L. CRANFORD

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

RELIGION 492L

BY

TIMOTHY A. LEDFORD

April 12, 2004

BOILING SPRINGS, NORTH CAROLINA

INTRODUCTION¹

The rich legacy of Western rhetoric, which has been neglected by scholars for several centuries, is now being reclaimed. As a result, rhetoric is no longer being reduced to a study of the biblical writer's style. Probing the language of the text is the emphasis of some particular scholars who attempt to analyze the rhetorical strategy of an author against principles and patterns of rhetoric.²



¹Editing of the form has been done in order to bring the paper closer to the Turabian style guidelines. Dr. Cranford

²Corley, Bruce, Lemke, Steve W., Lovejoy, Grant I., *Biblical Hermeneutics, A Comprehensive Introduction to Interpreting Scripture*, 2nd Edition, "Modern NT Interpretation," Lorin L. Cranford, (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publications, 2002), 158.



HISTORICAL BACKGROUND DEVELOPMENTS

Over the past two decades there have been attempts to understand and describe the integration of the Pauline letterform with the basic form of speeches.³ These attempts usually deal with things like identifying the letter structure and the parts of a speech and then arguing that the elements of the letter structure and the formula that are associated with them are a harmonious part of the rhetoric of the letter. They are based largely on literary-historical methods or on what might be loosely described as a variation of neo-classical rhetorical analysis.⁴

Such analyses are problematic in at least three levels. In the first place they tend to limit rhetorical analysis to description of *dispositio* or arrangement, which then is used for claims of identification of genre (forensic, deliberative, epideictic or "mixed").⁵ Or, they reduce our understanding of rhetoric to the formulaic application of structural elements determined by the identification of place (or, perhaps, occasion) -- i.e. is the argument designed for the law court, assem-

³E. Randolph Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, (WUNT 42) Tübingen, 1991, pp. 169 - 189, presents a detailed discussion of evidence for Paul's use of a secretary.

⁴Richards, 189

⁵Martin R. P. McGuire, "Letters and Letter Carriers in Christian Antiquity," *The Classical World* 53 (1960), pp. 148 - 153, 184 - 186, 199 - 200, gives the numbers for the classical writers; his count of the Pauline letters includes the 13 traditional letters, which he reckons as averaging 2500 words. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter Writer*, p. 121, also provides a word count of each of the letters traditionally attributed to Paul, including Hebrews(!). According to his count, the average length of the seven undisputed letters is 3442. On the basis of a computer count I did, I corroborated his figures for the undisputed letters. Aune, *The NT In Its Literary Environment*, p. 205, gives word counts for each of the letters; using his figures, the average count for the undisputed letters is 3427. The difference could be explained by the use of different editions of the Greek text. In any case, it is hardly a significant variation!

bly or public ceremony? -- and function -- i.e., is the alleged purpose defense, deliberation, or examination of values. Finally, they focus heavily on analysis of style, which is usually identified through its association with genre, an analysis that is in the end circular.⁶

While those are clearly important considerations for rhetorical criticism, they are as clearly derivative of other, earlier rhetorical moments. These moments -- the exigence, audience, speaker and rhetorical situation -- are the engines, which drive the inventional process. These moments exist within a context of cultural variables that may or may not be shared completely by both speaker and audience. They come to expression in a coding system that may or may not be able to represent details of the argument clearly. They use a channel of communication -- in the case of Paul's letters both the text itself and the interpretation the letter carrier may have given it -- that cannot necessarily shield out all the noise that affects the transmission of the message that the speaker/author has chosen to communicate. All of these and others occur and give shape to how the argument is presented, the nature of its content, and the way in which it is elaborated. And so, before the rhetorical critic should move to issues of genre and arrangement, a person must try to reconstruct the inventional process.

George Kennedy, has broken the stages of rhetorical criticism into six distinct groups, they are as follows: 1) Identify Rhetorical Unit, that is the beginning, middle and end of a particular text. Look for signs of opening and closure within the text. Use five to six verses as a

⁶For a useful overview of major representatives of these attempts, see Duane F. Watson, "Rhetorical Criticism of the Pauline Epistles since 1975, *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*, 3 (1995), pp. 219 - 248. Watson, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible*, p. 120, describes the controversy engendered by these attempts as a "vigorous debate" over the extent to which ancient rhetorical theory influenced the writing of letters. Among the more important voices cautioning against simple use of classical rhetorical theory in the analysis of Paul's letters has been that of C. Joachim Classen; see, e.g., "St. Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric," *Rhetorica* 10 (1992), pp. 319 - 344. Another is Jeffrey T. Reed, "Using Ancient Rhetorical Cate-

minimum. 2) Define Rhetorical Situation, A complex of persons, events, objects and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence" (Lloyd Bitzer). "Exigence" is a person called upon to respond to a situation to affect it; factors or "categories" influence what is said and why, basis for topics, often audience among most important factors. 3) Identify overriding Rhetorical Problem, that is often visible at beginning of unit; conditions *proem* and opening proofs, *insinuatō*, or indirect approach, may lay groundwork first before bringing up central issue. 4) Stasis– complex; should only follow extensive reading in rhetorical sources. 5) Identifying the Species of Rhetoric - Deliberative that is the preponderance of inductive argument based on past example, plus emphasis on advantages from course of action. 6) Consider Arrangement of Material, What subdivision it falls into, what is the persuasive effect of these parts? How they work together (or fail to) to unified purpose in meeting situation and the line-by-line analysis of argument, including assumptions, proofs, topics, formal features (*enthymemes*), devices of style (defining their function).⁷

Duane Watson writes, "There has always been limited classical rhetorical criticism of the New Testament. This has almost always pertained to stylistic matters, especially figures of speech and thought, and matters of genre and form. For example, Saint Augustine analyzed the rhetorical style of the biblical writers, especially Paul, in Book IV of his work *On Christian Doctrine*, and the Venerable Bede in his *De schematibus et tropis* analyzed figures and tropes in both

gories to Interpret Paul's Letters: A Question of Genre," in *Rhetoric in the New Testament*, p. 293 - 324.

⁷Kennedy, George Alexander, and Duane Frederick. Watson. Persuasive Artistry Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Testaments."¹ "Melanchthon...wrote rhetorical commentaries on Romans and Galatians utilizing classical conventions of invention, arrangement, and style, as well as more modern conceptions of these.... Erasmus...provided rhetorical analyses of 1 and 2 Corinthians.... Calvin...besides noting rhetorical features (particularly stylistic) throughout his commentaries on the New Testament, gives a rhetorical analysis of Romans."⁸

Wilhelm Wuellner notes that the focus was on stylistics: "Rhetoric continued to play a crucial role in the interpretation of the Bible, whether as part of the traditional *lectio divina*, or as part of the *via moderna* cultivated by the emerging European universities beginning in the 12th century. One of the developments that affected sacred and secular hermeneutics was the virtual identification of poetics and rhetorics in the Renaissance."⁹

Thomas Olbricht writes, "Puritan scholars embraced particularly the grammar, rhetoric and logic of Peter Ramus.... The biblical scholars of the era borrowed from these insights, structuring commentaries according to the dictates of the Ramian logical divisions and subdivisions. Beginning in 1730, interest in oratory and rhetoric returned to the classical traditions, especially the Ciceronian."¹⁰ Ramus reinforced the identification of rhetoric with stylistic concerns.¹¹

⁸Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 102-3. For a detailed study of Melanchthon's use of rhetorical criticism, see Carl Joachim Classen, *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament* (Boston: Brill, 2002), 8-16, 99-177.

⁹Wilhelm Wuellner, "Rhetorical Criticism and Its Theory in Culture-Critical Perspective: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11," in *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament* (ed. P. J. Hartin and J. H. Petzer; NTTs 15; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 173.

¹⁰Thomas H. Olbricht, "The Flowering of Rhetorical Criticism in America," in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference* (ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht; JSNTSup 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 80. The Ramian version of "rhetoric" was spartan. "Ramus went beyond Aristotle in his suspicion of rhetoric, limiting its role to ornamentation" (Don H. Compier, *What Is Rhetorical Theology?: Textual Practice and*

Folker Siegert writes that Johann Bengel's notes were "based on a masterful knowledge of rhetoric"; his *Gnomon* (1742) had the subtitle "from the natural (or inherent) strength of the words."¹² In 1753, Robert Lowth published his lectures on parallelism in OT poetry.¹³ Jack Lundbom notes that classical rhetoric "experienced an earlier revival in the mid-18th century, when, for the first time, the works of Cicero and Quintilian became widely available and new textbooks on rhetorical theory and practice were written."¹⁴ Watson writes, "Germany became the center of rhetorical analysis of the New Testament in the late 18th to early 20th centuries. Important in this stream of tradition is Karl Ludwig Bauer's massive study of Paul's use of classical rhetorical techniques."¹⁵ Olbricht notes that Johann Ernesti started (or revived) a trend of stylistic studies.¹⁶ English scholars included John Jebb and Thomas Boys.¹⁷

Public Discourse [Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999], 13). In a culture that disliked ornamentation, speakers would have to avoid it if they wanted to be persuasive.

¹¹"The extraordinary influence of Ramus hindered, and to a large extent actually destroyed, the tradition of classical rhetoric" (Chaim Perelman, "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning," in *The Great Ideas Today, 1970* [trans. E. Griffin-Collart and O. Bird; Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1970], 274). Ramus had a friend named Omer Talon who wrote two books on rhetoric, limiting rhetoric to stylistics (*ibid.*).

¹²Folker Siegert, *Argumentation bei Paulus: Gezeigt an Röm 9-11* (WUNT 34; Tübingen: Mohr, 1985), 9; my translation of Siegert's translation of the original Latin subtitle.

¹³Roland Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis: An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric* (JSOTSup 256; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 44. Meynet notes that similar ideas about parallelisms had been published by Christian Schöttgen in 1733 (*ibid.*, 53-54). These were analyses of structure, not of rhetorical effects. Meynet also credits Bengel with the discovery of chiasms or concentric structures (*ibid.*, 60).

¹⁴Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (2nd ed.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), xx.

¹⁵Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 103.

¹⁶Thomas H. Olbricht, "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 221.

The emphasis continued to be on style. Lundbom writes: "The 19th century also witnessed a specialization of disciplines that truncated rhetoric to the point that it became associated primarily with *belles-lettres*. Its emphasis was now largely on correctness, style, and the aesthetic appreciation of literature."¹⁸ Rhetorical studies were also done by Royards, Wilke, Blass, Norden, Heinrici, König, Weiss, Bultmann, Windisch, and Bullinger.¹⁹ "Since this outpouring at the turn of the century, the rhetoric of the New Testament has received only limited treatment."²⁰ The decline in rhetorical studies may have been caused by the limited usefulness of stylistic studies. Wuellner writes, "With the rise of historical (= scientific or modern) criticism, rhetoric became marginalised to the point of near extinction or at least increasing irrelevance, in contrast to its fif-

¹⁷Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 104, and Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis*, 65-126, 129-30. Meynet notes that in 1820, Jebb applied Lowth's observations to the NT, and identified chiasms. "It would not be an exaggeration to say that Jebb is the genuine inventor of 'rhetorical' analysis of the biblical texts" (Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis*, 88). As Meynet defines it, rhetorical analysis is primarily stylistics (ibid., 39).

¹⁸Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, xx.

¹⁹Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 103-4. Meynet mentions more obscure scholars: Charles Souvay in 1911 and George Gray in 1915; both worked with OT poetics (Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis*, 131-36). He says that Bullinger's questionable literary structures "discredited the discipline for a full generation" (ibid., 130, n. 39, quoting from Kenneth E. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980], xix).

²⁰Watson, *Invention*, 5. On page 6 he notes an article in 1931, a book in 1942, and isolated articles from 1953, 1958 and 1962. To his list we can add Walter A. Jennrich, "Rhetoric in the New Testament: The Diction in *Romans* and *Hebrews*," *CTM* 20 (1949): 518-31. Dean Anderson notes an article in 1926 and a different article by Jennrich in 1949 (R. Dean Anderson, Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* [rev. ed.; Leuven: Peeters, 1999], 21). Building on Jennrich's *CTM* article is Wilhelm C. Linss, "Logical Terminology in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *CTM* 37 (1966): 365-69. Meynet mentions French works by Marcel Jousse in 1925 and Albert Condamine in 1933, several studies on chiasm by Nils Lund in the 1930s and 1940s, and Albert Vanhoye's structural analysis of Hebrews in 1963 (Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis*, 136-165).

teen hundred year-long central importance to exegesis."²¹ Lundbom gives the same assessment: "Style, that darling of the Renaissance, dominated rhetorical instruction in other American colleges and universities through the end of the 19th century, with the result that by 1900 rhetoric found itself in sharp decline."²² Watson also: "New Testament studies became isolated from rhetoric"--perhaps because "rhetoric was truncated and had come to be understood as mere style or ornament."²³

²¹Wuellner, "Rhetorical Criticism," 174

²²Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, xxi.

²³Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 105.

THE NEW RHETORIC

An important tool of modern rhetorical criticism is argumentation theory. *The New Rhetoric*, the influential book of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, has the subtitle "A Treatise on Argumentation." A less influential but helpful theory of argumentation is that of Stephen Toulmin.²⁴ Anderson goes so far as to say that NT rhetorical scholars "have tended to emphasize rhetoric in terms of argumentation."²⁵ This focus on the rational component of persuasion may be an attempt to counterbalance the tendency of some rhetorical critics to concentrate on style.²⁶ Aristotle wrote that there are three components of persuasion: *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*,²⁷ which correspond to 1) the reputation of the speaker, or the way in which the audience's attitude toward the speaker can change during the message, 2) the mood of the audience, and the way that the speaker can change the mood during the message, and 3) the rational part of the message, the

²⁴Stephen Edelston Toulmin, *The Uses of Argument* (Cambridge: University Press, 1958), popularized and updated in Stephen Toulmin, Richard Rieke and Allan Janik, *An Introduction to Reasoning* (2nd ed.; New York: Macmillan, 1984). Frans H. van Eemeren critiques Perelman and Toulmin in his "Argumentation Theory: An Overview of Approaches and Research Themes," pp. 9-26 in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts* (ed. A. Eriksson, T. H. Olbricht, and W. Übelacker; Emory Studies in Early Christianity 8; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002).

²⁵Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical*, 23. This might be true for those who use modern rhetoric, but would not be true for those who restrict themselves to classical models

²⁶"Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca suggest that a new approach to rhetoric is needed because traditional rhetoric emphasizes matters of style at the expense of matters of rationality" (Sonja K. Foss, Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trapp, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric* (3rd ed.; Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland, 2002), 85.

²⁷Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.2. This three-part formula came from Plato, *Gorgias*.

facts and implications that are brought out in the message, which would also take into consideration the facts (or misunderstandings) the audience had before the message began. Thus part of a persuasive message (often the introduction) might be only tangentially related to the main purpose--it is designed instead to increase the audience's confidence in the speaker, and thus improve their willingness to listen to the discussion of the main issue. Vocabulary and style may influence audience emotions toward the author and the topic. Alan Mitchell says, "Every rhetorical venture seeks to persuade the audience on the basis of something more than mere logic.... The speaker is persuasive...because in the meeting between speaker and audience there is a recognition of truth, compelling as much for the *way* the speaker articulates it as for what is said."²⁸ Argumentation theory, although it does not leave emotion completely out of the picture, focuses on the rational part of the message.²⁹ Argumentation theory acknowledges that people rarely use formal logic in making day-to-day decisions, but there is a process of presenting and evaluating data. Compiere writes: "In human affairs decisions must usually be made before all the facts are in, in an inescapable and perpetual state of imperfect knowledge. Rhetoric offers a technique by

²⁸Alan C. Mitchell, "The Use of *πρῆπειν* and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 687, italics added.

²⁹Thurén tries to limit "persuasion" to volitional matters, and uses "argumentation" for cognitive matters (Lauri Thurén, *Argument and Theology in 1 Peter: The Origins of Christian Paraenesis* [JSNTSup 114; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995], 50). But this goes against the common use of the words--it is quite acceptable to say in English that I want to persuade people that love is more important than mercy. There may or may not be a volitional consequence of that comparison. Since it is sometimes difficult to discern if there is a volitional implication for a cognitive statement, it is not essential nor helpful to limit the word persuasion to volition. Aristotle included epideictic speeches, which do not involve volition or action, in his study of the art of persuasion.

Argument and persuasion can be distinguished in this way: An argument is an *attempt* to persuade; the word *persuasion* implies some success. Further, argumentation is only one of several methods of attempting persuasion; others include emotion, threat, and reward. Euripides gives a good illustration of the persuasive force of reward: "With mortals, gold outweighs a thousand arguments" (Euripides, *Medea and Other Plays* [trans. Philip Vellacott; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963], 46, line 966).

which persons can argue their way toward mutually agreed upon course of action based on probability, not certainty, and 'informed opinion,' not 'scientific demonstration.'"³⁰ Data is given, claims are made, warrants may be given as rationale, qualifications may be noted, and uncertainties acknowledged.³¹ Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca list numerous methods that people use to support their conclusions: the rule of justice, arguments by comparison, the argument of direction, argument from authority, illustration, model, analogy, and many others.³²

Arguments usually do not follow rigorous logic; they appeal to experience, generalities and probabilities. They do not even state all the facts. Compier writes, "Any writer assumes that his or her readers could read between the lines; the author did not need to state all the presuppositions and implicit knowledge held in common with contemporary readers."³³ For that reason, an argument that is effective with one audience is not necessarily effective with another, since a different audience may have different presuppositions and knowledge.

Argumentation theory must consequently consider the audience as an essential component of the argument--it is the audience that must supply part of the data and often supply the rationale

³⁰Compier, *Rhetorical Theology*, 10.

³¹This informal description is based on Toulmin's work. Good summaries of his theory are in Foss, *Contemporary Perspectives*, 117-53 and van Eemeren *et al.*, *Fundamentals*, 129-60. Mack summarizes arguments as stating a position, giving a reason, and lining up proofs (*Rhetoric*, 38). Speakers do not always use any specified order.

³²Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 185-410. These are descriptive of what speakers actually use; they are not prescriptive. For each type of argumentation, Siegert gives an example from the Septuagint (*Argumentation*, 23-84).

³³Compier, *Rhetorical Theology*, xx. "The argumentation process begins with premises the audience accepts"(Foss, Foss, and Trapp, *Contemporary Perspectives*, 90).

between data and conclusions.³⁴ Alexandre writes that rhetorical critics "emphasize above all the concept of audience, since they realize that rhetorical argumentation, in order to be effective, not only implies principles and premises accepted by the listener but must also adapt itself to the listener and his already-existing convictions."³⁵

Thurén writes, "One of the most fruitful, but also difficult tasks, is to reveal hidden, implicit elements in an argumentative structure.... We shall ask which basic information he omits, supposing that the addressees are familiar with it, and furthermore, what kind of statements he chooses as a starting-point for his argumentation taking their agreement for granted."³⁶ If the argument would be valid only if a particular concept is included, then the rhetorical critic generally assumes that the audience had that concept.³⁷ An audience with that concept is the audience *implied* by the text. The author *may* have been completely mistaken, but the author is likely to know the audience better than the modern critic does. In this way, argumentation theory can help us understand the audience.

Argumentation theory focuses on the logic of an argument, but this should not be the only tool of rhetorical criticism, just as stylistics should not be its only approach. Persuasion uses both

³⁴"The audience itself helps to produce the evidence by which it is persuaded" (Alexandre, *Rhetorical Argumentation*, 43).

³⁵*Ibid.*, 28-29.

³⁶Thurén, *Rhetorical Strategy*, 85, 56.

³⁷Van Eemeren gives this principle for analyzing the author: "The goal should be...to determine (1) to which proposition in the context and situation concerned the speaker or writer can be held committed to that not only (2) makes the underlying argument of the argumentation valid, but also (3) adds something informative to the explicit argumentation" (van Eemeren, "Argumentation Theory," 20). Van Eemeren wants argumentation to be more logical than it often is, but his principle is correct: If we can make the argument logically valid by supplying a certain premise, then we give the author and audience the benefit of the doubt by attributing that premise to them, unless we have reason otherwise.

logic and emotion--not only objective arguments but also subjective appeals to *ethos* and *pathos*. Since people are influenced by their emotions, any study of "the means of persuasion" must include the speaker's attempts to influence the audience's emotions. Even if the critic thinks that these attempts are improper, substandard, or unethical, they should be included in any study of the persuasive force of a message. As we look at style, structure, and even logic, we must remain aware of the non-rational dimensions of persuasion.³⁸ This may even help us in contemporary communications.³⁹ Aristotle's trio of *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* remains a helpful grid for modern rhetorical critics.

³⁸Wuellner says that stylistics can help us keep the non-rational in mind ("Where Is," 461).

³⁹"By providing knowledge of how a text was composed in order to be persuasive in its own period, rhetorical criticism enables the interpreter to understand better how a text functioned in its historical context and...to express the message of a text so that it can be persuasive to its contemporary audience" (Watson, "Rhetorical Criticism," 4:182).

CONCLUSION

With all the information that is available concerning rhetorical criticism, Socio-Rhetorical studies, Multi-Texture Socio Rhetorical Interpretation, Socio-Rhetorical Hermeneutics, and Multi-Disclosure Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation, the primary factor for all groups of study under the rhetoric umbrella, represents one of the largest growing areas of biblical interpretation found in recent years. With issues concerning the Pauline corpus, the rhetorical and argumentative situation describes the interaction between and among those situations requires a description of problems that Paul faced associated with producing a universal audience and its value system in order to make effective use of the formulae of a letter and the topics of an argument.⁴⁰

⁴⁰Hester, James D., *Rhetorical and Composition of the Letters of Paul*, University of Redlands, Redlands, CA.

WORKS CITED

- Corley, Bruce, Lemke, Steve W., Lovejoy, Grant I., *Biblical Hermeneutics, A Comprehensive Introduction to Interpreting Scripture, 2nd Edition*, "Modern NT Interpretation," Lorin L. Cranford. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publications, 2002.
- Foss, Sonja K., Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trapp, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric* (3rd ed.; Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland, 2002)
- Hester, James D., *Rhetorical and Composition of the Letters of Paul*, University of Redlands, Redlands, CA.
- Kennedy, George Alexander, and Duane Frederick. Watson. Persuasive Artistry Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Lundbom, Jack R., *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (2nd ed.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), xx.
- McGuire, Martin R. P., "Letters and Letter Carriers in Christian Antiquity," *The Classical World* 53 (1960)
- Meynet, Roland, *Rhetorical Analysis: An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric* (JSOTSup 256; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998)
- Mitchell, Alan C., "The Use of *πρεπειν* and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 687, italics added.
- Olbricht, Thomas H., "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990)
- Olbricht, Thomas H., "The Flowering of Rhetorical Criticism in America," in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference* (ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht; JSNTSup 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997).
- Perelman, Chaim, "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning," in *The Great Ideas Today, 1970* [trans. E. Griffin-Collart and O. Bird; Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1970]

- Richards, E. Randolph, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, (WUNT 42) Tübingen, 1991, pp. 169 - 189, presents a detailed discussion of evidence for Paul's use of a secretary.
- Siegert, Folker, *Argumentation bei Paulus: Gezeigt an Röm 9-11* (WUNT 34). Tübingen: Mohr, 1985.
- Thuren, Lauri, *Argument and Theology in 1 Peter: The Origins of Christian Paraenesis* (JSNTS). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Toulmin, Stephen Edelston, *The Uses of Argument* (Cambridge: University Press, 1958), popularized and updated in Stephen Toulmin, Richard Rieke and Allan Janik, *An Introduction to Reasoning* (2nd ed.; New York: Macmillan, 1984). Frans H. van Eemeren critiques Perelman and Toulmin in his "Argumentation Theory: An Overview of Approaches and Research Themes," pp. 9-26 in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts* (ed. A. Eriksson, T. H. Olbricht, and W. Übelacker; *Emory Studies in Early Christianity* 8; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002)
- Watson, Duane F. and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Watson, Duane F., "Rhetorical Criticism of the Pauline Epistles since 1975, *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*, 3 (1995), ??
- Wuellner, Wilhelm, "Rhetorical Criticism and Its Theory in Culture-Critical Perspective: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11," in *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament*. Edited by P. J. Hartin and J. H. Petzer. (NTTS 15). Leiden: Brill, 1991.