Scriptura 50 (1994), 1-22

RE-DISCOVERING AND RE-INVENTING RHETORIC

Prof James Hester
University of Redlands

Abstract

When one considers the growing number of 'rhetorical' readings of biblical texts published recently, both as monographs and articles, it is evident that a forceful new movement has entered into the biblical-critical world. As Wuellner (1987 [3]) has discussed, the promise of this movement is tremendous, for rhetoric leads us away from traditional content-/structure-oriented concerns of the analysis of scripture to a reading in which a text is allowed to interact, affect, strengthen and transform values and beliefs. Rhetoric concerns itself not simply with logical and rational dimensions of discourse, but emotive and imaginative. Rhetoric focuses upon context, but not just historical contexts: The audience, the reader of any age and place, becomes an active force in the interpretation, production, and persuasion of a text. The promise of rhetoric to biblical criticism lies in the promise of the transformation of scholarship to the level of the interdisciplinary and the relevant, of the responsive and accountable. (Wuellner, 1987[3] : 460-463).

1. Introduction

Difficulty has arisen in recent years concerning the direction and focus of rhetorical studies. No one rhetorical model has surfaced as defining the framework within which rhetorical 'criticism' is done and by means of which one is understood to be analyzing rhetorically (as opposed to sociologically, historically, literarily, source-critically, canonically, etc.). The result has been a confusion of emphasis.

On the one hand, sociological exegetes have embraced rhetorical criticism due to the relationship between text and context which rhetoric has traditionally addressed: a historical situation leads to a rhetorical exigence which a given rhetor seeks to address and influence through discourse. In order for this discourse to change the situation, it must appropriately address the situation in such a way as to influence effectively the audience to action or conviction. Sociological exegetes see this 'fit' as a means of entering into the social world through the text, and thereby use rhetoric for the purpose of social description. (Robbins, Mack, Fiorenza, Wire)

On the other hand, rhetoric for hundreds of years has been stuck with the notion of ornamentation and stylistics, thus reducing its focus to concerns of style, textual artistry and structure. Some biblical scholars, following the lead of Muilenburg, have concentrated on similar concerns, attempting to classify

various topics, lexis and figures used in the various texts of the Old and New Testament. A growing trend in this direction within New Testament circles is the nearly unquestioned used of the ancient handbooks, the theory among scholars being that there was a dominant, unified theory of rhetoric composed exclusively of Greco-Roman traditions which impacted new testament authors' education and writings. (Betz[1-4], Kennedy, Hester[1-2], Hall)

Rhetoric, especially as found within biblical studies, is a fluid discipline, with many interests and directions, theories and models. This article seeks to address some aspects of this phenomenon, and to propose the beginnings of a model whose purpose it is to attempt to address both the contextual and textual concerns of those who 'read rhetorically.' Some aspects of this model will need further theoretical and practical development; others will need clarification through further application. It is the intention here, however, to combine two emphases necessary for the continued growth of rhetoric within biblical studies, and perhaps within the discipline at large: *re-discovery* and *re-invention*.

1. Current Discussion of Text: 1 Corinthians

One immediate example of the disarray of rhetorical criticism in biblical studies is the variety of readings/interpretations obtained by application of several different models to the same text. With respect to 1 Corinthians, for example, we see three opposing interpretations of the genre classification and intended persuasive effect of the letter.

1.1 Forensic

For our first perspective we turn to Nils Dahl, who has argued from a content-based and contextual analysis that 1 Cor 1-4 be understood as an *apology* put forth by Paul to re-establish his authority as an apostle and as the spiritual 'father' of the whole Corinthian community. (Dahl, 1977) The historical reconstruction, as envisaged by Dahl, suggests that the quarrels in Corinth were as a result of the congregation attempting to decide to whom they should turn for advice concerning matters of conduct and social position within the community. Certain members thought Paul the best choice; others, who saw Paul as weak in speech, spirit, and social position, wished to seek the advice of other important figures (Peter, Apollos). Eventually, the letter was sent to Paul, but it was only when Chloe's people indicated to him that there was quarreling and strife within the community that Paul realized the problems facing him: He must not only unite the congregation, but must bring them under *his* leadership; for although they may scorn at his teaching as 'milk' and not 'solid food', they are nevertheless in need of just such (his own!) elementary instruction (as Paul elaborates in chs. 5-6).

Dahl's article does not set out to analyze the letter with the purpose of discovering its rhetorical function. Rather, he assumes its apologetic purpose and goes on to base his historical reconstruction of the events leading to the production of the letter on this basis. Dahl (1977: 61, n. 50) later recognizes that such an assumption might be misleading, as certain characteristics of assumed apologetic letters seem to be missing in this letter, and the characterization seems to down-play other important points made by Paul (e.g., critical assessment of *his own* followers, not just his opponents). More

importantly, Dahl's assessment of the rhetorical genre does not look to the text itself, but builds first the situation to which the text is supposed to have been addressed.

Seeking to secure Dahl's historical reconstruction of the rhetorical situation confronting Paul in Corinth, Bradley Chance (1982) picks up on this last point and argues for a forensic *structure* in 1 Corinthians 1-6 by analogy to Betz's analysis of Galatians. (Betz, 1976) After discovering a general outline of a formal apology, he notes similarities in 'various modes of argumentation employed by Paul in his Galatian apology,' including appeals to experience, use of the arguments of his opponents against them, citing of scripture, direct attacks upon his opponents, and paraenesis. It is his conclusion that Paul is defending his status as apostle ('father') of the *entire* congregation at Corinth by means of appealing to unity. His appeal is based on a consistent devaluation of his ministry; that is, he tries to show himself not as the spokesman for any one group or faction in Corinth, but as the spokesman for Christ's gospel. Paul de-emphasizes himself, but defends his ministry of weakness in the face of a radical wisdom christology at Corinth. He thereby removes any barrier to unity, but at the same time secures his position as *the* example toward whom the Corinthians should turn for guidance and direction.

Although Chance has attempted to turn to the text itself to find its rhetorical goal and function, thereby strengthening Dahl's understanding of the problem at Corinth, certain important methodological difficulties undermine his argument. Among the most important is the assumption which Chance makes, following Betz, that one can judge the genre of a speech on the basis of its arrangement and greater structure. Unfortunately, since all three major speech types can use the same divisions, such a structural analysis cannot help to secure the identification of any one genre. (Lyons, 1985: 112-119). Chance has only touched upon the surface of the argument when he seeks to prove the apologetic function of the letter by reference to the presence of pro-oemium (introduction), narratio (statement of facts), propositio (the issue at hand), argumentatio (supporting argumentation), and paraenesis ('conclusion'). The fact is, such broad structures are offered by both ancient and modern rhetoricians as general structs which could be applied, in part or as a whole, for every genre of speech.

In contrast, an analysis

> 1) which turns to the argumentative strategies within the text,
>
> 2) which seeks to discern the relational posturing (modalities),
>
> 3) which considers the presumed and explicit values and argumentative topoi upon which the argument is founded, and
>
> 4) which takes into account the shifts of argumentative situation throughout the discourse, would note the presence of formal structures, but would define them in terms of their argumentative effect.

Such an analysis would also note the 'contextuality' generated *by means of* the argumentation, noting the motivational and perspectival dimensions of the discourse. This model would eliminate any immediate assumptions regarding the his/storical situation, assumptions which typically determine beforehand the persuasive intention and effect of the argument.

1.2 Deliberative

For our second perspective, we turn now to the discussion written by Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, given as a presentation to the Society for New Testament Studies (1987). Searching for the 'actual rhetorical historical situation to which the letter is addressed,' Fiorenza has combined ancient and modern rhetoric (modern theory of argumentation, but also discourse theory, speech/act theory, and reader-response criticism) in order to ascertain an important difference among the levels of discourse within a text: the 'inscribed rhetorical' situation (analogous to implied author/reader), the 'actual' historical circumstance(s) inviting utterance, and the contemporary rhetorical context. Stressing that scholarship has accepted Paul's reconstruction of the events and exigencies requiring a response by him, and has continued to view his argument within its canonical/biblical context, she seeks to point out implied codes/messages in Paul's arguments which may indicate other aspects of the actual historical situation overlooked in the research so far.

She suggests that 1 Corinthians be viewed as deliberative discourse, defined as the discourse of persuasion of the audience to take action for the future, action for its best interest. The goal of this letter is to persuade the Corinthians to be united and without dissensions (1 Cor 1:10), and to recognize and subject themselves to the leadership of certain members of the community (16: 15-18: Stephanus and co-workers). The main issues to be settled are marriage and sexuality (1 Cor 5-7), meat sacrificed to idols (8: 1-11: 1), worship (11: 2-14: 40), resurrection (15: 12-37), and the collection for the saints (16: 1-4).

She then goes on to reconstruct a 'plausible' historical rhetorical situation to which such a letter might be construed as a 'fitting' response: Debates within the Corinthian community take place concerning social definition of members as a result of new self-understanding in Christ. As a result of competing interpretations and practices, the members have written to different missionaries for their advice, since these various interpretations originated in their different theological emphases. Paul, among them, must have heard that some in the community held both his pneumatic competence and his lifestyle in low esteem. He thus sets out to secure his interpretation by asserting the authority of his message over that of others; indeed, Paul sets himself up as the 'father' of the community, and stresses a hierarchy of social roles. In order to succeed, he appeals to those who are of higher social rank (excluding, indeed subjugating, the women of any social rank) to make the 'necessary' ecclesial decisions.

Fiorenza has contributed some important insights by introducing new literary theoretical and modern rhetorical methods to the criticism. The distinction between historical, rhetorical, and modern situations is helpful, and she has appropriately pointed out that biblical scholars assume the canonical context to help them reconstruct the historical through the rhetorical situation. Nevertheless, she works under the assumption that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between a rhetorical genre and a historical situation, not taking into account the motivational dimension of the discourse which are determined through the argumentation itself: Because Paul chooses to address these issues in a certain, deliberative fashion, does not necessarily imply anything more than a *choice* on his part regarding effective argumentative strategy.

What she has done is to propose a rhetorical interpretation to the letter as deliberative oratory (without discussing the specific internal strategies that lead her to the conclusion) and then to assume a council-like setting to her historical reconstruction of the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians: Paul is seen as but one of many different missionaries with relationship to the congregation, but who is attempting through appeals to authority and appeals to those in the community who are socially important and powerful to subjugate the community to him and his spokesmen. Once done, he can then involve himself in the deliberation of the congregation, primarily by authoritative demand. In other words, Fiorenza's reconstruction of the historical situation justifies an assumption of a direct connection between situation and rhetoric: Since the rhetoric is deliberative, the historical situation must be a council-like setting. The difficulty is that she confuses the *historical* with the *argumentative* situation.

The issue is that the argumentative situation can change and develop during the discourse, reflecting different strategies and attempts at persuasion, the selection of each being determined by the rhetor's interpretation of the audience's situation. The argument itself, through its strategies, develops a 'context,' but one which does not necessarily match any historical circumstance or event, except and unless the argument has been effective in influencing the audience in the roles it demands of them. Paul has attempted many various perspectives in his attempt to convince the Corinthians to act correctly. The first question for the rhetorical critic to ask is what those perspectives are, why and how they are generated in the argumentation, and only then consider their possible implications and consequences (intentions and possible effects) upon the view generated of the audience. They may or may not 'fit' certain historical reconstructions, nor bring light to the quest for 'the' actual circumstance. They are also decidedly one-sided: They come from the perspective of the rhetor as s/he interprets the audience's reactions to the developing argument.

A rhetorical analysis of an ancient text whose historical context is not know outside of the perspective of argumentation directed to it must consider questions of

> 1) argumentative strategies which develop the 'contexts' in which the audience is supposed to find itself, and
>
> 2) the perspectival dimensions of the argument, discerned by the agreements (presumptions, values, loci) assumed by the rhetor in the selection of both what needs to be said and what does *not* need to be said, before any attempt at historical reconstruction can be made.

1.3 Epideictic

Turning now to the final perspective under consideration, Wilhelm Wuellner (1979 [1]) has long championed the view that 1 Corinthians functions as epideictic or demonstrative discourse, (re-)defined by Perelman as that discourse which 'sets out to increase the intensity of adherence to certain values, which might not be contested when considered on their own but may nevertheless prevail against other values that might come into conflict with them.' (Perelman, 1971: 51) Epideictic is less interested in changing beliefs than in reinforcing a sense of communion between the orator and the audience.

It aims toward directing the audience, by every available means, to what is already accepted, and therefore attempts to obtain not so much a decision to act than a disposition toward action.

Paul does this in his letter by means of the use of digressions. Digressions are used to realize/make 'present' an issued for the audience through amplification, example, intensification, etc. Wuellner examines the role of three major digressions within the letter (1: 19-3: 21, 9: 1-10:13 and 13: 1-13), all of them serving effectively to intensify adherence to the issue-at-hand. Furthermore, Paul's use of himself as the example which the audience should imitate, as the 'paradigm of the values lauded,' further functions to increase commitment and the disposition to 'appropriate' action. Therefore, in contrast to both Fiorenza and Dahl, Wuellner suggests that Paul does not argue concerning his position within the community to establish or re-establish his authority, but to reinforce his gospel.

Wuellner's introduction of the concerns and insights of the New Rhetoric run closest to those about to be explored here. It is in particular the re-definition of 'epideictic' as educational discourse aimed at securing the disposition to action which best helps to explain the argumentative features of this letter. It is also the sensitivity to the functionality of structural features of an argument which the New Rhetoric offers as an important corrective to the division between form and content so often presumed when ancient rhetorical models are applied to these texts: It is not just that Wuellner can locate the presence of digressions in 1 Corinthians that is of significance, but that he considers their argumentative importance at strategic points of the discourse. Too often, reference to ancient rhetorical handbooks become identification of forms, rather than of strategies.

A model of rhetoric should therefore also concentrate upon the functional presence of the structures, loci, figures, etc., defining them in terms of their argumentative effect and impact. The result will be, on the one hand, a flexibility regarding the identification of traditional and modern forms and strategies of argumentation, but on the other hand, a more accurate description of the argumentative features in the discourse.

2. A New Model

The concerns rhetorical models must address, such as considering the generation of 'context' with respect to the argumentative situation and the role of the audience, as well as the concerns raised by the impact a historical context (of any time and place, not just the 'original' historical situation) might have upon the reception and interpretation of the discourse, must be met within any rhetorical reading. A new model for rhetorical criticism must attempt to balance the current interest in social description (by reference to the rhetorical situation (as defined by Bitzer, 1968) and the pragmatic dimension to argumentative discourse) with the traditional devolution of rhetoric into stylistics. The balance, I suggest, is not achieved through compromise, but through a theory of argumentation which brings to light the *generation* of argumentative 'context' by analyzing the modalities, methods, and shifts in strategy in the discourse. This perspectival and motivational dimension of persuasion helps us to identify the role the implied audience of the discourse is expected to play. Effectiveness of the persuasive strategies, i.e., the question

of whether the audience (of any performance) is willing to enter into this role and be moved to adhere to the proposition(s) being argued for, is dependent on a great range of factors, none of which are certain.

On the one hand, this suggests that any attempt at reconstruction of the 'actual historical' situation must depend on the assumptions regarding effectiveness which the scholar must be willing to make. These assumptions, in turn, depend upon the circumstances of the audience within whom the scholar abides and to whom the scholar addresses his/her conclusions. This model can guarantee no certainty regarding such reconstruction and its persuasiveness.

On the other hand, this model can help us to understand the shared values and presumptions which the rhetor assumes to be effective in his/her attempt at persuasion. In this regard, we are in a very good position to determine a great deal about the broader social concerns and perspectives of the rhetor.

Finally, such a model can help us describe how it is an ancient text continues to function persuasively. A broader conception of 'context', meaning not only the original events and circumstances addressed by the rhetor, but also interpreted and argumentatively altered by the discourse, will provide us with the theoretical tools by means of which we can describe the continuing argumentative ability and function of an ancient text. Indeed, a broader conception of 'context' will help to describe the persuasive dimension of discourse by reference to other literary and social 'contexts' in which the text continues to function throughout his/story and across cultures.

Thus, the promise of rhetorical criticism to biblical studies, a promise which hopes to expand both the relevance and accountability of biblical interpretation, must take shape within a rhetorical theory attempting to combine the *rediscovery* of rhetoric's focus upon persuasive discourse with the *re-invention* of a theory of argumentation which focuses upon the impact of an audience upon discourse and its reception/interpretation.

2.1 A Modest Proposal

Let me propose the following for testing with respect to the concerns outlined so far:

1) Rhetorical Unit. The rhetorical unit might be a literary unit, except that for rhetoric the unit must be argumentative, it must attempt to persuade or convince the audience, affect some sort of change. The unit to be considered might be very small, such as a maxim, metaphor, parable, chreia, enthymeme, hymn, commandment, or narrative. The next step is a combination of units into a greater argumentative structure: Sermon on the Mount or Plain, Little Apocalypse, the digressions in 1 Corinthians, speeches in Acts. Then one must consider the text as a whole (Mark, Acts, 1 Corinthians), the text with other texts (Synoptic gospels, Pauline epistles, catholic epistles), the text within the canon, and even the canon within the greater literary culture. (Muellner 1987[3] on Kennedy 1984)

2) Relational Posture of the Rhetorical Unit. By this I mean that one must then turn to the text to see how the text chooses to relate itself to the audience, with respect to modality assumed (assertive, injunctive, interrogative, optative; active or passive; affirmative, negative, negation as affirmation; coordination and subordination), deixis used (personal,

intonational, spatial, temporal) and Aktionsart (continuous, repetitive, punctual). What we are looking for is not the 'topic' or 'heading' of the argument, but how the orator/author chooses to express his/her point with respect to the audience. It is also here that textual 'intentionality,' as well as the 'intentionality' of author and reader, can be discussed with respect to the 'context' (not just historical as in 'ancient', but also historical as in 'modern', as well as literary) of the text. (Wuellner, 1987[2])

3) Method of Argumentation. With a special focus on Perelman's categories of both loci (quantity, quality, preferable) and strategies (associative, dissociative), the direction here is to discover the ways in which the argumentation of the rhetorical unit is given shape. This is different from the step above, insofar as the consideration is not with respect to the means by which the orator/author assumes to interact with the audience. What we are trying to do, although perhaps artificially, is to view separately the argumentative strategy itself: Dissociative, quasi-logical, appealing to reality, establishing reality. (Perelman 1971)

4) Shifts in Argumentative Situation. This next important step indicates the possibility that several argumentative points might be made in any one larger rhetorical unit. Shifts in the argumentative situation take place as a result of the influence of earlier stages of the discussion which determine the selection and direction of topics, perspectives, tone, etc. The strategies for persuasion may change in the mind the orator as a result of perceived changes made by the discourse within the audience. In other words, 'movement along the trajectory produces new stages in the argumentative situation and new argumentative possibilities open to the speaker, allowing for the introduction of new forms of argumentative discourse.' (Hester, 1987: 4)

5) Classification of Argument: Stasis and Rhetorical Situation. It is only *after* these considerations that one can be in a position to step back and indicate the unit's role in the greater textual structure with respect to the stasis (the basic issue; see Hester, 1984: 226-228) of the rhetorical text. It is also my point that perhaps the stasis of the text can only be determined after a careful reading and understanding of the relationship of the various rhetorical units within the text. On this basis, one can then determine (suggest?) the genre identification of the text. This is a controversial determination, as biblical critics entering into rhetorical analysis are undecided whether to accept the textbooks' definition of the genre, or to suggest their own interpretations. It is my point that perhaps both are necessary: The discipline will not be able to rid itself of the traditional terms, and yet it is necessary to realize that even the ancients understood these classifications as fluid and possible to combine (Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 8.3.1) Only after careful consideration of these points can one speak of determining the rhetorical situation of the whole text. Rhetorical situation is not historical situation, but the perspective of the exigence as understood and interpreted in the argument by the orator/author (and later critic).

6) Contextual Meaning: Historical Reconstruction. By 'historical reconstruction' I mean to indicate one of many possible contextual situations in which the text might be read and analysis compared. Indeed, reading in context allows for the possibility of multiple reactions to and highlights of portions of the text. No one context is automatically and 'objectively' determinative for the interpretation of the text, for, as was seen in the

discussion of rhetorical units, the text is influenced by its placement within the relationship to other texts, and attitude toward these texts by the audience/reader. That is, a text has a rhetorical situation as determined by the argumentative strategies employed by the rhetor/author. However, the relationship between rhetorical and historical situations is not identical. The determinative interpretive-historical context is arbitrary (Is it the 'original' performance? How is this influenced by which social, political, literary, religious experiences? Is it an 'informed reading' which seeks out reconstructed authorial intention, but perhaps not necessarily the actual audience's responses/interpretations? Is it a reading within a tradition, institution, canon? All of these questions and many others are answered either implicitly or explicitly by readers and critics when they engage in analysis and interpretation.) Finally, it is important to note that 'context' is also determined by medium: written, spoken, sung, danced, dramatized.

We will now turn to the text of 1 Corinthians to test the model and its results.

2.2 Application of Model to 1 Corinthians

2.2.1 Rhetorical Units

The greater rhetorical unit is the letter of 1 Corinthians as a whole. Within this unit lies several major rhetorical units:

1 Corinthians 1: 1-10: Introduction

1 Corinthians 1: 11-6: 11: First argumentative unit

1 Corinthians 6: 12-11: 1: Second argumentative unit

1 Corinthians 11: 2-14: 40: Third argumentative unit

1 Corinthians 15: 1-58: Fourth argumentative unit

1 Corinthians 16: Concluding remarks

Within these, in turn, lie still smaller units or argumentation:

Introduction: Salutation (1: 1-3), Thanksgiving (1: 4-9), and 'parakalo' period (1: 10) which itself is the stasis of the speech.

- *First* argumentative unit: Begins with a narration of events (1: 11-12) which lays the exigence for this first argument, whose proposition centers upon the 'word of the cross' in 1: 18. A digression ensues, amplifying this theme in 1: 19-31, referring to Corinthian's call status in 1: 26-31 as example; discussing the authentic wisdom he preaches in 2: 6-16; elaborating the nature of relationship of ministry and congregation in 3: 5-17; ending with a brief peroration in 3: 18-20. Then he argues against the Corinthian's judgment of him (4: 1-5), setting up an ironic contrast between the apostles/missionaries and the Corinthians (4: 6-14). (Humphries, 1979: 119) The argument climaxes with an appeal for them to imitate him (4: 15-21), an appeal he further supports by use of paraenesis in 5: 1-6: 11 (cf. Chance, 1982: 147) (which itself contains vice lists).

- *Second* argumentative unit: A ring composition which begins and ends with the proposition ('All things are lawful for me,' but not all things are helpful; 6: 12-20 and 10: 23-11: 1) governing the rest of the discussion. Two

major topics are addressed, marriage and such relations (or lack thereof) in 7: 1-40, and food to idols in 8: 1-10: 22. In these there are smaller units, including 7: 17-24, 7: 32-35, 9: 1-10: 13, and an epideictic apology in 9: 2-27.

- *Third* argumentative unit: Another ring composition beginning and ending with concerns centered around women's roles in prophecy, prayer (11: 2-16, 14: 27-40), the primary concern being order in the service. Topics focused on include the Eucharist meal (11: 17-34), and spiritual gifts (12: 1-14, 14: 40) Digressions are found 12: 12-26 and in chapter 13 (Wuellner, 1979)[1].

- *Fourth* argument: Begins with confessional statement in 15: 1-11. He then argues against the denial of the resurrection of the dead in 15: 12-34, finishes with question of when/how the dead are to be raised in 15: 35-57, and a recapitulation (stand fast!) in 15: 58.

Still more units might be discussed, including the important final notes concerning the collection, his visit, commendation of Timothy, Stephanus, etc. (Do the final notes constitute a rhetorical whole? What would the rhetorical interaction of these notes be? This is different from asking what the rhetorical function of these notes would be within the greater text.) Furthermore, still smaller units might be defined and discussed within these greater movements. At the same time, still larger units could be considered: the Corinthian correspondence, the Pauline corpus, the canon, and so on. The shift to larger rhetorical units brings no new methodological change, but *may* be delayed appropriately in the analysis to a later stage. *(2.2.6 Contextual Reading)*

2.2.2 Relational Posture

This is the most theoretically complex step in the analysis, as so many different aspects of the text can be discussed and evaluated here. Wuellner (1987)[2] has provided a thorough example of such an analysis with respect to the reading of Romans. In this, he explores the relationship of modality and deixis to the network of intentions (of text, author and reader) which become a part of the 'background' or 'context' of the reading. For the purposes of this presentation, we can only touch upon the potentialities of this step in the analysis, but perhaps enough so to whet the appetite of others wishing to explore this more fully.

Modalities control the presentation, that is, the relationship asserted within an argument concerning the items discussed. Modalities 'modify the reality, the certainty, or the importance' of an argument, (Perelman, 1971: 154; in Wuellner, 1987[2]: 13) and operate not only within the text's intentionality, but in the audience as well. For specific forms of modalities to function in this interaction, there must be a set of conditions provided by background or context, this being determined by natural possibilities (author's and reader's ability/skill in communication), norms, social values and desires, and the communicants' beliefs and knowledge. (Wuellner, 1987[2]: 13, 19)

I find two major modals among the major argumentative units (as Wuellner also finds in Romans; 1987[2]: 19-20): Cognitional and volitional modes. With respect to the *cognitional* modal, the author and audience share a call status

(1: 2,9), the 'grace of God' enriching 'all speech and knowledge' (1: 4; 12), a common commitment to known traditions (2: 1; 11: 2; 15: 1, 11).

Within the *volitional* modal we see a give and take in a discussion of topics (6: 12-14: 40) made both within an atmosphere of independence of judgment (7: 6-7, 35), exhortation and education (9: 1-10: 13; 15), and authoritative command and shame (5: 1-5; 11: 2-22). The location of certain codes, postures, judgments, etc., against a background of context (not just historically limited to the time of utterance!) of understanding can also be explored here.

Deixis orients the content of a sentence in relationship to time, place and personal participants. Indexical expressions are used to construct contexts of utterance and reference, relating both what is said and the reader of what is written to a cultural, social and historical context in which people interact through language reflecting their social roles, perceptions and positions. The basic function of deixis is to relate the actors and concerns referred to in a text 'to the spatiotemporal... here-and-now of the context of utterance,' that is, not just of the production, but also of the performance. (Wuellner, 1987[2]: 14)

The *personal* deixis includes the use of person and demonstrative pronouns, as well as the use of personal names and perhaps substantives. For instance, the author Paul speaks not just of 'our Lord' (1: 2, 9, 10) and 'our Father' (1: 3), but also 'both their Lord and ours' (1: 2), and of 'I' (1: 4-16; 2: 1-5; 3: 1-10; 4: 6) in relationship to 'we' (1: 23; 2: 6, 12; 4: 1, 9-13) which only becomes exclusive (1: 3, in distinction from 'you') in 3: 1-4: 21. Later on, 'I' is set in distinction from 'they' (15: 10), who then become 'we' as distinct from 'you' (15: 11). Similar examples can be found throughout the letter.

The readership is addressed not just as 'the church of God which is at Corinth,' but to 'those sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints together with all those who in every place call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ...' But once the first argumentative unit begins, 'you' = 'Corinthians,' especially as among 'those who believe' and 'who are called.': This is in distinction from 'Jews' and 'Greeks,' but is also composed of 'both Jews and Greeks' (1: 24).

In this respect, one should also note the use of proper names and by referring to specific persons (Paul; Apollos; Cephas; Stephanus; Christ; Spirit; Adam; Moses, etc.) or types (wise/wisdom; foolish/fool; idolators, etc., Jews/Gentiles; called; fleshly ones; the Rock; wife/husband, etc.) or places (Ephesus; Galatia, etc.). Through them the text directs the attention of the reader to some intentional content (Wuellner, 1987[2]: 16), that is, to their representational aspects. A name or attribute both refers to some social or linguistic code and to psychological mode (true/false; successful/unsuccessful; fulfilled/unfulfilled). Thus, when Paul refers to groups or individuals or places, certain implications are being made, but these implications are highly contextual (on the part of text, author *and* audience).

One last note here with respect to the use of personal deixis: Argumentative references become more inclusive or universal/general ('we' - 'we' and 'you'; Jew, Greek, fool, the 'wise'; any, all) as the appeal becomes more convincing. Paul's address to 'all' in the conventional letter opening specifically sets the audience within the perspectives and roles of a 'universal audience.' The result is an argument which is directed toward securing the disposition to action, by

using strategies meant to be effective according to universally acceptable standards and values.

Intonational deixis is clearly evidenced in the ironic rebuke of 4: 8, the Äreport of 5: 1-2, the address 'foolish one' in 15: 36, and the 'behold' of 15: 51, just to select randomly select some examples. These serve to express emotion to some greater or lesser degree, but more importantly serve as an evaluative attitude on the part of the speaker/author toward a given social understanding held with respect to the given attributes so expressively mentioned. (Wuellner, 1987[2]: 15)

Spatial deixis can be used with respect to geographical names and space (Wuellner, 1987[2]: 15): Paul speaks of having 'come' to Corinth in 2: 1 (as distinct from having 'gone'? The implications are quite different.). He also speaks of being absent, and yet present in spirit (5: 3); of the question of being absent, and yet present in spirit (5: 3); of the question of coming or not coming (4: 18); of 'staying' in Ephesus, 'passing through' Macedonia, 'going' to Jerusalem. But also, a spatial reference is made in 5: 12 to 'outsiders' and in 5: 13 to 'driving out' the evil one from among you; it is also found in reference to the body as temple of 'holy spirit within you all' (6: 19).

Temporal deixis is present, for example, in 13: 8-13, where the tension between current experience and future fulfillment is highlighted by die distinction 'then'/'now'. Set against cultural codes of what is believed, known and valued, Paul devalues present experience when viewing future promise. Other examples may be found in chapter 15, as Paul argues for the future manifestation of fulfillment in life in the spirit (15: 46) as distinct from both experience and the attempt to make manifest a new cultural code 'here and now.'

2.2.3 Methods of Argumentation

Perhaps the most effective way of applying this next step would be to provide a broad perspective of the argumentative direction. Therefore, I will endeavour to do a general study of all four major arguments as I've outlined above.

After the introductory section, in which the 'call' status of the Corinthians and Paul is established (as rhetorical 'fact'), thereby becoming the mutual basis (pathos in 1: 4-9: secures the audience's goodwill; (Kennedy, 1984: 24) upon which further argumentation develops, Paul's stasis statement, the appeal to unity (1: 10), helps him to set up the first argumentative unit. It begins with a 'shaming' (Wuellner, 1979[1]: 185f.) narrative explaining Paul's view of exigency of his writing (1: 11-17). This leads him to the proposition (1: 18 'For the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God') of this first argument.

In order both to amplify the proposition and to set up the basis of the following argument, Paul inserts a lengthy digression here. He begins with a separation of worldly wisdom from God's wisdom, by ironically defining God's wisdom as folly to those who do not believe, and referring to the Corinthian's own call as an example (1: 20-31). His next step is dissociative, where he explains that his appearance of weakness and foolishness was intended (2: 1-6), but in reality there is more to it: He is wise, but his wisdom comes from the spirit (2: 6-16). In this latter move Paul separates the wisdom

imparted to the mature by the spirit from the spiritually immature, thus allowing him to separate the Corinthians from the spiritually mature, since they are still of the flesh, full of jealousy and strife (rhetorical 'fact' of 1: 12). They simply did not understand the nature of his ministry.

Separation allows him now to define in positive terms the nature of the relationship which he seeks to reestablish between himself and the Corinthians. Appealing to a hierarchical structure of rhetorical 'reality', he now sets up his position within the framework God (grower) - field worker (Apollos/Paul) - field (congregation) (3: 5-9), or in terms of master building (Paul, according to God's grace) - foundation (Jesus Christ) - other builders (apostles) - building (congregation (3: 10-17). This serves to put Paul on equal authority, if not higher priority, to other co-workers, sets all workers under God's authority and the ministry of the 'word of the cross', and limits the role of the congregation to passive recipient. Paul is now able to circle around and re-emphasize his proposition, for within such a hierarchy, no one can boast and think himself wise, unless he becomes a fool (accepts the hierarchy) that he may become wise (3: 18-20).

He now picks up where he left off, only he is in a position where the audience is aware of Paul's concept of the situation and has been introduced to the basis upon which his argument is founded. That is, he can turn to the question of the attitude the congregation has towards the 'servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God' (4: 1) and put them in their place: It is not the congregation to whom Paul is answerable (4: 1-5); nor can they boast of their spiritual superiority and thereby judge in favour of one apostle against another (4: 6-13). The irony that follows is thick and is intended to shame them thoroughly.

So admonished, they are now in the position to see their faults, and Paul can turn to them and appeal to them to come to order. Thus he continues with a defining appeal to his authority (4: 16, 'I urge you, then, be imitators of me') which is based on the unique relationship he holds to the Corinthians: 'I became your father in Christ Jesus through the gospel' (4: 15). This image attempts to argue that the unity appealed to in 1: 10 will be found in faithful adherence to Paul's gospel and submission to his authority. (Humphries, 1979: 109, 129)

That they are in need of his gospel he goes on to show in the final paraenesis of chapters 5-6: Immortality (5: 1-12) is condemned and the congregation is to caste out the one committing such immoral acts. Lawsuits (6: 1-11) among the community are also shameful, because they are taken before the unrighteous, from whom, again, the community is to separate itself.

The second argumentative unit is a ring composition based on the distinction of 'lawful' from 'helpful,' a concrete application of the theme of Paul's 'unity' within the life of the community. In this and the next unit, the amount of separation, re-definition, appeal to *status quo*, is overwhelming, indicating that Paul is having to wrestle with concepts familiar to and share between himself and the Corinthians, but seen by him to have been misrepresented or misunderstood by the community. Nevertheless, in this second unit, Paul's direction is to allow the Corinthians, once they understand the basic message Paul is attempting to communicate, to judge for themselves. At no point in this section does he 'shame' them, but through his instruction and using himself as example he allows them to judge what is practical and helpful.

The two major headings are marital relations (of varying sorts) (7: 1-40) and food to idols (7: 1-10: 22). Under the first major heading, various issues are discussed: 'It is well for a man not to touch a woman' (7: 1) is immediately separated into a new logical relation of reciprocity ('each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband' (7: 2), with certain concessions, even though admitted not to be Paul's ideal case (7: 6). Each of the following cases are handled by means of establishing a maxim by some authority, or based on some concept of the structure of reality, and then granting the possibility of certain concessions, even if they run counter to Paul's ideas/ideals (7: 8-9; 10-11; 12-16; 25-31; 32-33; 35; 36-38; 39-40).

In the middle of the discussion, at 7: 17-24, the basic premise is outlined. It is placed to explain his previous discussion, and to provide the basis in which the following topics may be understood: Referring back to the call status of the Corinthians, he appeals to the structure of reality in an argument supporting the status quo position of any member of the congregation (an appeal to the authority based upon an argument of justice, 'This is my rule in all the churches.' 7: 17). Even the pre-Pauline baptismal formula, implicitly structuring the argument here, has been subsumed under the greater rubric 'what is helpful.'

The next heading, food to idols, continues the argument, the separation now being transformed to the discussion of the distinction between what one may 'know' and what is 'helpful' to others. The digression in 9: 1-23, followed by a metaphor with application to Paul in 9: 24-27 and a scriptural proof with application to 'us' in 10: 1-11, and concluding with a brief peroration (Wuellner, 1979[1]: 186f.), helps us to understand the issue as being one of freedom: The believer who thinks him/herself free in knowledge (8: 4-6) is bound in his/her freedom to respect the weakness of the believer whose conscience would be destroyed by the actions of the other. (8: 7-13. Note here how Paul argues against the dangers of dissociation: You may *know* better, but *appearances* are more important!) As an epideictic apology (Wuellner, 1987[3]: 459), 9: 1-23 functions, again through separation and establishment of authority (Paul as example), to emphasize ('defend') one concept over against another (in this case, giving up freedom, rights and privileges in order to defend against immorality). As a digression, 9: 1-23 allows Paul both to instruct the congregation to avoid certain behavior, and to amplify this instruction with explicit examples and applications, putting the Corinthians in a position to 'judge for themselves.' Furthermore, it also adds to the appeal to unity, and establishes Paul as the model character to follow. (Wuellner, 1979[1]: 187) He is now able to circle around and restate his position as he did in 6: 12, and appeal to them again to 'be imitators of me, as I am of Christ' (11: 1)

The third argument is also a ring composition, beginning and ending with arguments concerning the control and eventual suppression of women's role in prophecy and prayer in the congregation (11: 2-16; 14: 26-40), enclosing discussions concerning the Eucharistic meal (11: 17-34) and spiritual gifts (12: 1-31, 14: 1-25). In this argument he has defined 'helpful' as 'order' (hierarchical), again within a pattern of separation (private/public, shame/honor, chaos/order, self benefit/community). He further supports this both by an appeal to rhetorically assumed reality (authority, whether his own, or scriptural authority, or what is done in other churches; hierarchy, social order and position; natural order), and by quasi-logical arguments based on Paul's assessment of the situation as compared to that reality (status quo). As

opposed to the previous section, here again appears 'shaming' sections (11: 17-34; 12: 1-3), indicating that what Paul sees as 'excesses' generated by eagerness for manifestations of the spirit are in fact going way beyond his understanding of the gospel which he shared with them. Here again also appears a lengthy digression (chapter 13) serving to intensify adherence to those values based upon which Paul has been arguing for his concept of order: Avoid prophecy, tongues, knowledge that are done without love, which in this context is defined as that which unites and maintains order (builds up).

In the final argumentative structure to be considered here, there is a radical change of strategy (the implications of which we will explore in **2.2.4 Shifts in Argumentative Situation)**, for in this argument is very little separation, albeit Paul and the Corinthians do not agree on the concepts of the resurrection of the dead. Paul's tactic here, more than anywhere else, is to educate/remind them 'in what terms (he) preached to (them) the gospel, which (they) received, in which (they) stand, by which (they) are saved, if (they) hold it fast' (15: 1f.) He begins with a simple confessional statement of Christ's death, burial, and limited resurrection appearances, reminding them that in spite of the origin of such preaching (a unifying principle reverting back to the first argument), they believed. He takes up the question of whether there is a resurrection of the dead (15: 12-34), and drawing from his rhetorical definition of the matter, elaborates the consequences of the lack of such a belief, namely 'your faith is futile' (15: 18) because Christ has not been raised (15: 13-19). His strategy is not separation, but definition and quasi-logical outcome. On the other hand, if Christ has been raised, then he is the first fruits of the resurrection, which will take place in a certain order (15: 20-28). His strategy here is quasi-logical and hierarchical definition (re-emphasizing the order stressed in the third argument). To emphasize his point, he ends with an example from experience (baptism of the dead) and a quasi-logical appeal to scripture (15: 29-34) which shames the Corinthians for not holding firm to the message they received and believed.

Under the next heading, 'how are the dead raised?' (15: 35-58), he chidingly reminds 'the fool' (15: 36) of the difference between the seed, which must die to germinate, and the plant which arises from the seed, equating body with seed. This allows him to stretch the concept of body into a series of different examples from 'nature' (15: 38-41), and forces the audience to accept the separation of earthly/dead body from the one to come (15: 42-45). But when he reverses his earlier conclusion (if plant, then seed) by suggesting that 'If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body' (15: 44b) (if seed, then plant), he has taken a different argumentative turn, and relies on a exegesis of Genesis (appeal to authority) to show that scripture anticipates two types of humanity: a mortal body and a spiritual body. (Wire, 1989: 313) The crux of the argument, however, comes in 15: 49, when Paul equates the current position of the Corinthians with the mortality he has been separating from spirituality, thus allowing him to set into the future the experience of spiritual transformation, in 15: 51-58.

2.2.4 Shifts in Argumentative Situation

The shifts evidenced in the argumentative situation throughout the performance of the letter are now clarified by the previous discussion. In the first major argumentative unit, Paul is seeking to reestablish both his own

authority and the authority of the gospel he preached to the Corinthians, in an attempt to address the exigency of 'divisions' as understood by Paul. Then comes a major shift between the first and second argumentative units: It is only when Paul feels that he has successfully united the audience under him/his gospel ('word of the cross') that he can then turn to the various headings (questions? or interpretations/points of view?) which were addressed to him. This he does throughout the second and third argumentative units. Once the issues have been variously explored, another major shift in argumentation is made in the fourth argumentative unit. Here, Paul finds himself and his audience finally in the position to address what he sees as the major interpretive division between himself and the community: the spiritual transformation of the members of the community does not take place in the here-and-now, but in the future. This is the culmination and basis of all previous matters discussed, and Paul achieves this climax ('be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord') in such a way as to allow him then to address practical concerns of importance to him.

2.2.5 Classification of Argument

We are now in a position to assess the greater rhetorical intention of the letter Paul has written to the Corinthians. All the methodological moves so far have led us to this point, where only now we can most effectively classify the genre/function of the various parts of the letter (in our case, the larger units), the genre of the letter as a whole, and define the stasis. However, it is important for us to keep in mind the discussion above (**2.1 (5)**) concerning the 'names' given these classifications: I will use the three traditional (Aristotelian) classifications (forensic, deliberative, epideictic (see Kennedy, 1984: 20, for definitions)), but will clarify their meaning according to what I see as the function of the argument so classified.

It is my opinion that the first argument functions 'apologetically', if and only if we understand that term as functional. I believe what Paul conceives to be the exigence here is a claim that his gospel and preaching were weak, and that wavering loyalties to his gospel (in the guise of claims to following other leaders) were affecting the unity of the church. What he has to do is defend his gospel message as 'the word of the cross' (not affiliated with any of the rhetorically perceived groups), equate his ministry with those of other leaders, then hierarchically establish himself (along with other leaders) over the congregation, and all under God. Thus, the Corinthians are in need of his gospel; he should not have to defend himself to them.

However, by apologetic I do not intend to mean what Dahl and Chance have indicated concerning the rhetorical function of this argument. It is my position that ultimately this argument serves to *censure* and to *educate*, to re-align loyalty to a gospel received and believed by the Corinthians. Paul is here indicating that he feels the need to reestablish his ethos with this group, to combat understandings of the gospel which are undermining adherence to it, but not necessarily because he has opponents, or because his apostolic status was under question. By 'apology' here, I am intending to emphasize the argumentative focus upon Paul's ethos, a focus which however is carried out through primarily *epideictic* rhetorical strategies.

The next two argumentative sections I will call deliberative, but again without all the implications that Fiorenza has described in her historical reconstruction

of the situation: Paul is not arguing before a body politic to establish his authority and to win the debate concerning certain topics, a debate in which many missionaries are taking part. He is also not attempting to secure allegiance to his position by directing his remarks to the socially superior. In these sections he is arguing for adherence to a gospel which the Corinthians are seen to have misunderstood and misinterpreted. The situation is obviously tension-filled, and Paul often feels the need to refer to his authority, the authority of certain scripture references, and the authority of general church practice. He furthermore feels the need to refer to the status quo, as well as to a hierarchical definition of social/spiritual reality. He may also be speaking of future action, action in terms of what he perceives to be 'self-interest.' He is dissuading them from certain practices and exhorting them to other action/belief. It is to these features that I am attempting to refer when using the label 'deliberative'. However, again, his ultimate purpose is to *instruct* the community, to censure them for not adhering to his gospel, to praise them when they keep his traditions, to intensify loyalty to his message. Therefore, again, by 'deliberative' I am emphasizing a certain pathos, a certain instructional-but-debating situation which the audience brings to bear (in Paul's mind) upon the argument, but which he in fact addresses primarily through *epideictic* argumentative strategies which seek to educate and reinforce values.

The final argument has also been termed deliberative (Mack 1990: 56-59), and if one emphasizes the argument in terms of debating a thesis concerning the resurrection of the dead, this would be reasonable. However, the emphasis provided by the introduction in 15: 1-2, the references to community practices in 15: 29, the move towards instruction in 15: 51ff, and the final exhortation in 15: 58 suggests a speech intended not to debate, but to inform and remind (even shame in 15: 34) the audience as to its constitutional values. This is the function of the genre epideictic: although Paul and the audience do not agree as to the implications of those values, it is assumed in the argument that they both know them and adhere to them.

We are now in a position to classify the letter and to suggest its stasis. From the analysis above, it is obvious that, after all is said and done, I perceive of the letter to the Corinthians as primarily educational in nature, seeking to secure adherence to shared and accepted values: These are the concerns of epideictic discourse. Its stasis, or major point, is found in 1: 10: Quality of unity. (The stasis of quality was used when there was agreement on what had been done but disagreement on the interpretation of that action. (cf. Hester, 1984: 226)) Paul sees himself as wrestling with a community who knows and has accepted his gospel, but who is at odds with him concerning its message and implications. He is struggling to unite that community back under his understanding of the message.

The clarification I wish to make at this point is that by classifying the letter as epideictic under the stasis of quality, the category may become too vague. The problem is, by such a classification, often scholars don't consider the implications of the reduction of the many argumentative strategies to one genre classification. Many understand 'epideictic' purely as increasing adherence to a value system (cf. Hester, 1987: 14). Included in this understanding, however, is that 'epideictic' may also refer to an attempt to *change* an 'altered' value system, as when the audience has abandoned an assumed system or so interpreted it as to transform it. This would take place

when an author/orator feels the need to defend those 'earlier' values. He would feel compelled to blame, censure, authoritatively demand that they be taken up again, and spell out the practical implications of doing so. In short, epideictic is more than panegyric, more than praise and blame: It is education, attempt to remain persuasive, universally, forever.

2.2.6 Contextual reading

The point of this important methodological step is to indicate how historical (time and space), social, and even textual contexts could influence the interpretation of a given rhetorical unit. In our case, the most dramatic example of this is found in the historical reconstructions of Dahl and Fiorenza: Each different point of view concerning the historical exigence shapes their view of the rhetorical function of the letter. The problem has been, as I indicated above in my assessment of their arguments, that they have confused argumentative with historical situation. It is my opinion that historical reconstruction cannot occur through a rhetorical unit; rather, that unit shapes the point of view of the audience and reflects the point of view of the author concerning the historical exigence. What would be methodologically more accurate (and in some respects more interesting) is to place the rhetorical unit, once analyzed, against several different contexts to note the differences various reader/listeners would make. Again, as noted above, the different historical reconstructions highlight several aspects of the text, and shed new light and new interpretations. *This* is how reader-response criticism, and feminist analysis, lends a hand to interpretation.

Another point I wish to make is that the effectiveness of the argument, that is, whether it has accurately assessed the situation and whether it has persuaded the audience, should not reflect upon the understanding of what the argument tries to do. By categorizing the letter as epideictic, I am not saying that the audience agrees with Paul concerning whether he should instruct them, chastise them, etc. I am not saying that the audience isn't perhaps expecting an apology, or considering his advice while they deliberate. What I am saying is that Paul seems to have chosen one way of persuading them; perhaps he was strategically correct, perhaps he took a strategic 'chance' unexpected of him, and maybe he made a mistake. We don't get to find that out in this letter. What we do find out is the argumentative strategies applied by Paul, the various modalities employed in his effort to persuade the audience concerning his perspective, the means by which he relates to various groups, the values to which he assumes they and he share, and values which he assumes are universally accepted. What we see is an attempt at persuasion secured through the various strategies employed at what was for him significant points in the argumentative situation. We do not know whether his assessment was effective.

Finally, there are certainly many different analytical foci which may be brought to bear upon the text in this method. These, too, will help to bring to light many factors of the argumentation depending on the context the analyst proposes to bring to the text. By choosing to apply modern rhetorical theory to the text, I have discerned argumentative structures and strategies which are not within the purview of ancient rhetorical practices. This model is meant to highlight certain aspects of the text which help to bring to the fore 'contexts' it assumes and generates, 'contexts' which are not exhausted by a 'his/storical'

reading proposed by the exegetical paradigm. The persuasive nature of the text is not limited to its first reading to the virginal audience of the Corinthian congregation; that is evident by the fact of its placement within the canon of scripture, and by the continuing use of the text to nuture Christian spirituality today, throughout the globe. An analysis by means of a model such as the one proposed here allows for the awareness of the text's argumentative strategies and indices which continue to generate interactive contexts, which continue to persuade and impact the audience of any time and any place. The relevance of a strictly historical reading based upon ancient Greco-Roman rhetorical practices is questioned, insofar as such a reading seeks to secure a single, authoritative interpretation of the rhetorical situation and the meaning of the argumentation within such a context. No such objective situation can be discerned with certainty, since it is approached solely through the motivational discourse of the text. As an exploration into the discourse traditions of ancient cultures, historical rhetorical readings are vital. But even here, the interest of modern rhetorical theory on the *presumed, unstated* values underlying the text may also make a significant contribution.

Various models will lend varying results. That is the interactive nature of 'context' and 'text' throughout every and any rhetorical performance. It is to this fluidity that the model proposed herein is particularly attempting to address.

3.0 Conclusion

I have endeavoured to balance two major aspects of current rhetorical analysis: 'text' and 'contexts'. Each step of the method endeavors to analyze the generation of 'context' through textual argumentative strategies. The complexity of this fascinating communicative factor is apparent both in the method itself (with respect to the number of levels of rhetorical units available for analysis, the complex of relationship posturing available for exploration, the emphasis upon the discernment of shifts in argumentative strategy, an expansion of the definition of 'epideictic' which causes shifts in understanding the other traditional genres) and in its limitations (which include the need to consider the function of orality in generating analytical models of rhetoric, the need to explore in greater depth the presence and dominance of certain *loci* over others in the argumentative strategy, the implications of the extended notion of epideictic discourse). What it ultimately intends to provide is a means of awareness of the motivational and perspectival dimensions to rhetorical analysis of texts: the 'contextual' (institutional and ethical) and 'rhetorical' (persuasive) aspects of any interpretive approach.

Perhaps the most important contribution such a model makes to Pauline studies is not only the emphasis of the fluidity of discourse and its relationship to authoritative 'context' in interpretation, but also the dynamism of his discourse itself. By taking Pauline argumentation seriously, by stressing the development of the argumentative situation as it changes through discourse, Paul's letter to the Corinthians becomes less a systematic theological treatise, and much more a living document. This rhetorical model seeks to dispel reductionist interpretation, and emphasizes instead the very real, very active presence of attempts and failures, 'hits' and 'misses' throughout this letter, i.e., the workings out, compromises and interactions between the parties of this discussion.

It is especially the last methodological move in the model which becomes the most interesting. After allowing the text to 'speak for itself,' (something which can, in fact, never happen, since any interpretational enterprise does not allow the text to function without specific intervention of translational elements provided by models of interpretation), it both forces the analyst to consider his/her own context determining such a reading and allows the text to play among many different contexts: medium of communication, socio-historical, gender, political, literary, etc. Ultimately, this final step determine the effectiveness of the analysis: All interpretation is contextual. The appropriateness of the interpretive method and the interpretation itself is left in the hands of the audience to whom it is directed.

It is hoped by presenting this model more discussion and elaboration will take place, and be done so within the concerns the model has attempted to address. It is further hoped this model has contributed to the goals and promises of rhetorical criticism: the dynamic processes of interaction, of attempts made and tested, of learning and growing in the effort of instruction and persuasion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle. *Arts Rhetorica*.

Betz, Hans Dieter.[1] 2 *Corinthians 8 and 9. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.*

Betz, Hans Dieter.[2] *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Betz, Hans Dieter.[3] 'In Defense of the Spirit: Paul's Letter to the Galatians as a Document of Early Christian Apologetics,' in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976.

Betz, Hans Dieter.[4] 'The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians,' *New Testament Studies* vol. 21, no. 3 (1974/75): 353-379.

Bitzer, Lloyd. 'The Rhetorical Situation, '*Philosophy and Rhetoric* vol. 1 (1968): 1-14.

Chance, Bradley. 'Paul's Apology to the Corinthians,' *Perspectives in Religious Studies* vol. 9 no. 2 (Summer 1982): 145-155

Dahl, Nils A. 'Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1: 10-4: 21,' in *Studies in Paul*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1977.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troel. '1 Corinthians 11: 16 and the Character of Pauline Exhortation,' unpublished paper read at the Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Annual Meeting.

Fiorenza, Elizabeth S. 'Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians,' *New Testament Studies* vol. 33 (1987): 386-403.

Fitzgerald, J.T. 'Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardship in the Corinthian Correspondence,' Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1984.

Forbes, Christopher. 'Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony: Paul's Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric,' *NTS* 32 (1986), 1-30.

Hall, Robert G. 'The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians: A Reconsideration,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* vol. 106, no. 2 (1987): 277-87.

Hester, James.[1] 'Place the Blame: The Presence of the Epideictic Galatians One and Two,' unpublished manuscript, 1987.

Hester, James.[2] 'The Rhetorical Structure of Galatians 1: 11-2: 14,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* vol. 103/2 (1984): 223-233.

Humphries, Raymond. *Paul's Rhetoric or Argumentation in 1 Corinthians 1-4*. Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union: Berkeley, 1979.

Kennedy, George. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism.* Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Lyons, George. *Pauline Autobiography*. Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1985.

Mack, Burton. *Rhetoric and the New Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990.

Martin, Dale. 'Tongues of Angels and Other Status Indicators,' unpublished paper read at the Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Annual Meeting, an excerpt from 'Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition,' Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1989.

Mitchell, Margaret. 'Factionalism in 1 Corinthians 10,' unpublished paper read at the Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Annual Meeting. Monograph on 1 Corinthians from Yale University Press.

Perelman, C and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971.

Plank, Karl A. *Paul and the Irony of Affliction.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984.

Robbins, Vernon. *Jesus the Teacher.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria.*

Wire, *Antoinette. The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction Through Paul's Rhetoric.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

[1]Wuellner, Wilhelm. 'Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation,' in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition*, eds. WR Schoedel and R Wilken. Theologie Historique 53; Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1979.

[2]Wuellner, Wilhelm. 'Reading Romans in Context.'Unpublished essay distributed to the SNTS Semina on Reader Response Critism, 1987.

[3]Wuellner, Wilhelm. 'Where is Rhetorical Critism Taking Us?,' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* vol. 49. no.3 (July 1987): 448-463.