PLUNDERING GOLD FROM EGYPT TO CONTEXTUALLY COMMUNICATE THE GOSPEL OF JESUS:

A METHODOLOGICAL SURVEY FROM SOLOMON, AMENENOPE, CICERO, PAUL, AUGUSTINE, LUTHER, AND GRUNIG'S "FOUR MODELS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS"

ABSTRACT

In this paper I develop a theological framework for excellent and effective persuasive communication consistent with the message of the gospel of the crucified Lord Jesus in a particular socio-historical context.

To this end, I outline the development of communication mediums and methods relevant to the production of Biblical texts. This culminates with the rise of rhetoric with a particular emphasis on Aristotle's three proofs: *pathos, ethos,* and *logos*, especially as developed for the Roman context by Cicero. I outline a model of sublime rhetoric as described by Longinus in *On the Sublime*, suggesting that truly excellent and ethical communicative acts involve a "sublime" consistency between Aristotle's proofs. Next I provide an overview of relevant modern communication theory, including speech-act and public relations theory, engaging with influential Public Relations theorist James Grunig to assess current models for excellent and ethical communication with external publics.

At this point I turn to establish a theological framework for understanding the relationship between the communicative acts of the communicative God, and a proposed communicative praxis based on the incarnation as the paradigmatic act of contextual communication.

This framework emphasises the functional aspect of the *imago dei*, the link between the *imago dei* and the *imitatio Christi* in Pauline thought and praxis, and an understanding of creation as "gold" to be adapted and adorned for communication about the creator. I then assess this framework against communicative acts contained in the Bible – the Wisdom Literature, especially Proverbs, and Paul's Corinthian Correspondence, against contemporary communicative acts – the *Wisdom of Amenemope*, and Cicero's *De Oratore*. Finally, I turn to Luther's Reformation campaign as a model of an early modern Christian communicative praxis consistent with this framework. I conclude that Grunig's four models of public relations are inadequate for Christian communication, and propose a fifth model - an incarnational, self-renouncing cruciform communicative praxis - as the basis for sublime communication about the crucified Lord Jesus.

HYPOTHESIS, METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS

"In the beginning was the logos. And the logos was with God and the logos was God… the logos became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory..."[1]

In these words, John declares that communication is fundamental to the nature of God, and that his accommodating self-communication in the flesh is fundamental to our knowledge of God. How then, are we to understand the divine communicative praxis, and apply it to human communication?

The hypotheses I am seeking to demonstrate in what follows are:
- God, as a Trinitarian communicative being, guarantees the created order, and thus guarantees all "true communication," and is the communicative being par excellence.
- Human communicative practices are excellent when they are in harmony with the divine communicative praxis.
- The Incarnation is the Trinitarian communicative act par excellence, and that it, and especially its culmination in the self-renouncing act of the cross, is paradigmatic for excellent and ethical human communication.

While the divine communicative praxis is relevant for communicative acts to and within the church community,[2] I am particularly interested in its application to communicative acts from the church community aimed at persuading external "publics."

I hope to demonstrate that God communicates in a consistent way, to reveal himself incarnationally, accommodating his audience through human communicative agents who adopt and adapt common language and literary conventions, according to their message and audience, to present a persuasive case for faith in God.

---

[1] John 1:1, 14

[2] K.J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*, (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1998), Kindle Edition, and D.J Treier, *Virtue and the Voice of God: Towards Theology as Wisdom*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2006), serve as models primarily focusing on interpreting communicative acts from God in this framework (Vanhoozer), and using this as a framework for theological endeavours and education (Treier).

I will briefly summarise the development of communication mediums and their use in persuasion during the times in which the Biblical texts were produced, with a particular emphasis on the use of image, before turning to modern communication theory including speech-act philosophers John Austin and John Searle, media theorist Marshall McLuhan, and public relations theorist James Grunig to assess communication theory in the modern world.

I will then suggest a link between God's communication praxis and humanity's by tracing the development of the concepts of image and imitation through revelation, and the use of "golden" communication mediums. I suggest, with Augustine, that human communication mediums and methods are, as the "gold of Egypt," to be plundered, and adapted to the preaching of the gospel.[3] I hope to demonstrate that Augustine's model is the manner by which the message of God is "incarnated" by God's communicative agents, and accommodated to the "people of Egypt" – or Israel's external publics – and that this is the paradigmatic means of contextualising the Christian message. I will attempt to demonstrate that this model occurs in Scripture, particularly in persuasive texts. I will examine two case studies treated more fully as appendices – the plundered *Proverbs of Amenemope* in Proverbs (Appendix A), and Paul's plunder of Cicero's rhetorical ideals in the "Fool's Speech" in 2 Corinthians 10-13 (Appendix B). The framework through which these parallels have been identified is supplied in Appendix C.

The communication "medium" plays an essential role, and as such I will assess Luther's adaptation of the emerging mediums of his day as a model for contextual, or incarnational, communication.

Finally, I will draw these communication principles together in conversation with communication philosopher Calvin Schrag, and Public Relations theorist James Grunig to suggest a cruciform self-renouncing incarnational model of persuasion is the model for entering in persuasive discourse with publics ethically and excellently, or sublimely.

---

[3] Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 2.40.60, Trans. J.F. Shaw, (Edinburgh, T&T Clark), Kindle Edition.

I will, in seeking to demonstrate these related hypotheses, assume a high doctrine of Scripture, reading texts in their canonical form as though they are imprinted with the divine signature, while acknowledging the vital role human agency in time and space played in their production. I will assume Scripture, as God breathed, is sublime and eloquent communication, especially in the historical and literary context in which it was produced and received.[4] I will assume that canon interprets canon, and that the Bible presents one grand metanarrative of salvation history, which uses themes and communication methodologies in parallel with human history, climaxing at the cross of Jesus.

PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION: AN ETHICAL DILEMMA?

Communication is the transmission of data from a sender, usually to a receiver. This transmission occurs through a medium, and the data is given a form. The communicative act, when directed to a specific receiver, or audience, is generally an intentional act. The persuasive communicative act intends to change the receiver. Hester (2005) articulates a longstanding ethical dilemma for those who seek to communicate persuasively: *"No rhetorical theorist has been very successful in arguing that persuasive success and ethical obligation are two, necessarily integral aspects of rhetorical practice,"* this will continue *"until we find a way to speak of the ethics of rhetoric by reference to the communicative act itself.*[5]

It is this dilemma that I seek to address in what follows, as I attempt to articulate a communicative praxis that is both persuasive, and inherently ethical.

PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION: IN BIBLICAL TIMES & THE PRESENT

The Ancient Near East (ANE) was a visual culture. Low levels of literacy meant persuasion primarily happened through ritual and imagery, and the persuasive proclamation of the power of kings and gods through

---

[4] L. Poland, 'The Bible and the Rhetorical Sublime,' *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*, Ed. M. Warner, (Routledge, London, 1990), 37-40, it does not just "contain" sublime eloquence, but is sublime 43-45

[5] J.D. Hester, 'The Wuellnerian Sublime: Rhetorics, Power, and the Ethics of Commun(icat)ion,' *REMPBD*, (London, T&T Clark, 2005), 103-104

announcements of royal achievements, requirements, and sanctions.[6] The written word evolved from image to word - the hieroglyphics of Egypt, to the Cuneiform text of Sumeria, to various alphabets. With alphabets came the rise of literature and scribal cultures, and the evolution of new languages.[7] These were applied to changing mediums, from the walls of pyramids, to clay tablets, to papyrus. The rise of papyrus did not signal the end of communication with stone, just as the rise of the written word did not signal the end of visual communication. Communicative texts are produced on a space-time grid – durable media (eg stone inscriptions) emphasise time, while portable media (eg papyrus) emphasise space. This use of a medium is the choice of the communicator based on the situation and intention.[8]

Imperial communication within the ANE programs involved persuasion. The first cultic rituals, iconography, and inscriptions were designed to simultaneously legitimise the rule of kings and the gods who legitimised their rule.[9] The king controlled the state cult; the cult legitimised the king with a divine mandate, and the king was the "image of god."[10] Images and statues were persuasive tools, often carrying instructions as inscriptions.[11] Images of kings and cultic objects constructed by kings served as royal propaganda.[12] Sennacherib (704-681BC) described himself as *"he who made the image of his god."*[13] In Assyria in the 1st millennium, Assurnasirpal II created his own *"royal image with a likeness of his own countenance and placed it before the god Ninurtam,"* ritually linking god and king in cultic-political propaganda.[14]

---

[6] J. Watts, 'Story, List, Sanction: A Cross Cultural Strategy of Ancient Persuasion,' *Rhetoric Before and Beyond the Greeks,* ed. C. Lipson and R. Binkley (Albany, SUNY Press, 204), 197
[7] H.A. Innis, *Empire and Communications,* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1950), 46-49
[8] *ibid,* 8-28
[9] Watts, 'Story,' 197
[10] *ibid,* 199, P.A. Bird, 'Male and Female He Created Them: Genesis 1:27b in the Context of the Priestly Account of Creation,' *I Studied Inscriptions From Before The Flood: Ancient Near Eastern Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11,* ed. R.S Hess and D.T. Tsumura, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1994), 338, M.B Dick, 'Prophetic Parodies of Making the Cult Image,' *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of Cult Image in the Ancient Near East,* Ed. M.B. Dick, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1999), 8
[11] J.W. Watts, "Ritual Rhetoric in Ancient Near Eastern Texts," in *Ancient Non-Greek Rhetorics,* ed. C. Lipson and R. Binckley, (West Lafayette, Parlor Press, 2009), 41
[12] J.F. Kutsko, *Between Heaven And Earth: Divine Presence and Absence In The Book of Ezekiel,* (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2000), 22
[13] Watts, 'Ritual,' 56, J.M Miller, 'In the "Image" and "Likeness" of God,' *JBL,* 91.3 (S 1972), 289-304, 296
[14] I.J. Winter, 'Idols of the King: Royal Images as Recipients of Ritual Action In Ancient Mesopotamia,' *JORS,* 6.1, (Winter 1992), 13-42, 13-30, Miller, 'Image,' 294-295, V.P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1990), 135

Literacy was a path to the royal court. Scribes and sages had the ear of the king, and were able to influence their culture through the production and distribution of texts to be enacted throughout the kingdom.[15] These persuasive texts recorded rituals,[16] merged genres, and adapted ANE literary conventions according to the situation.[17] Persuasive texts take similar forms across time and space in the ANE, from 23rd century BC to the 2nd century BC.[18] These texts operated domestically, and internationally through diplomacy – so texts that shared such conventions implied an audience of other courts, scribes, or kings. Occasionally this audience is overt as texts were produced to accommodate growing empires and vassal states in the form of treaties, or law codes.[19] Such texts invoked the ruler's status as guarantor of the divine image and cult.[20] The texts of this period, though predating rhetorical theory, were persuasive.[21] The scribes who produced these texts were multi-lingual; persuasive genres crossed international boundaries,[22] and were employed to persuade foreign nations, especially in the case of vassal treaties. Persuasive communication across boundaries happened through messengers, and in the ANE all messengers were described in a single term, often cognates of the Hebrew *malacim.* The distinction between roles like ambassadors, prophets, or heralds, was not made until later.[23]

The spoken word has also, historically, been vital for persuasive communication, in the proclamation of royal texts, in cultic life, and later, through professional oratory.[24] Low levels of literacy meant the first audience for written texts was smaller than a visual or spoken communicative act, but the ease of transmission of a papyrus scroll, as compared to a stone stelae, or clay tablet, transformed the reach of the written word.[25] This reach depended on portability and repetition, or transmission of the message. The influence of

[15] Innis, *Empire,* 19-20
[16] Watts, 'Ritual,' 39
[17] Watts, 'Story,' 197-205
[18] *ibid,* 200-201
[19] *ibid,* 201
[20] *ibid,* 198
[21] *ibid,* 205
[22] *ibid,* 207
[23] A. Bash, *Ambassadors for Christ: an exploration of ambassadorial language in the New Testament,* (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 10
[24] Innis, *Empire,* 8-9
[25] *ibid,* 7

the literate on the temples and courts of the ANE also makes the written word an ideal medium for documents advocating social or religious change.

The importance of the written word exploded somewhat, and resulted in widespread social change, with the rise of the simple Greek alphabet, then Latin, and an associated increase in literacy, and the rise of formal training in rhetoric. [26]

Innis (1950) suggests the power of the Roman Empire was especially a result of its use of the written word.[27] However, his study vastly undervalues the communication power of visual imagery in fixed and ritual form. Imagery was central to both the cultic and political life of nations throughout the Biblical period, and arguably is still central to persuasion now. The use of imagery was equally, if not more important, to the communication campaigns of empires than the written word, especially in cultures where literacy was limited to the elite caste. It was, for example, essential to the spread and maintenance of the Roman Empire. The powerful image-based propaganda program led by Augustus was one of the defining aspects of his rule, and the establishment of the ruler cult, which circularly, established his rule.[28] The use of imagery in this manner is fairly universal in its scope, transcending language and culture – a citizen of ancient Babylon could walk the streets of Rome and recognise its gods, kings, and rituals such is the consistency in practice.

The success of any empire is proportionate to the success of its communication program.[29] McLuhan expanded Innis' insight to suggest the empires who coped best with change had the best chance of expansion and longevity because *"Any change in the forms or channels of communication, be it writing, roads, carts, ships, stone, papyrus, clay, or parchment, any change whatever has revolutionary social and political consequences."* The kingdoms that coped with this change were the kingdoms that thrived.[30]

---

[26] *ibid,* 52-101
[27] *ibid,* 12
[28] P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus,* trans. A. Shapiro, (Michigan, University of Michigan Press, 1990), 3-4, 159-160, 297, 336
[29] Innis, *Empire,* 11
[30] M. McLuhan, *The Medium and the Light: Reflections on Religion,* (Oregan, Wipf and Stock, 2010), 162

The New Testament emerged after significant developments in communication theory and practice. The rise of the Greek Academy, then the Roman Republic, and Empire, involved the systematic study of persuasive communication. The persuasive communicative act relies on certain proofs, first outlined by Aristotle in rhetoric, *pathos, ethos,* and *logos.* Aristotle believed these proofs occurred only within the speech. Cicero, in summing up the influence of rhetoric, said it *"transformed humans from a savage to a civil state,"* and the Romans had a right to make "*virtuous oratory their own rightful property.*"[31] Aristotle's *Rhetoric* would have disappeared into the ether had Cicero not championed it in his influential contributions to rhetorical theory.[32] He called eloquence, the "*marrow and quintessence of persuasion.*"[33] Cicero attempted to bring rhetoric (eloquence) and philosophy (wisdom) together in a system of oratory that relied heavily on the character and virtue of the speaker, their embodiment of their political philosophy, and ethic, being a persuasive proof. In this sense he elevated the importance of ethos, and broadened it beyond the boundaries of the speech. He fused the written and spoken with the visual. His model required the communicator to become an image of his message, embodying its ethos, displaying its virtues, and relying on those external aspects within the speech. Life was the ultimate medium, and communicative act for Cicero. He was concerned that young orators imitate the right examples,[34] constantly holding forth his own example in his speeches,[35] and even implicitly in his handbooks, where he is his own ideal orator.[36] Cicero deliberately fashioned himself into "*the symbol, even the literal*

---

[31] J. Connolly, 'Virile Tongues: Rhetoric and Masculinity,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 1580-1593 [Note: Numbers in Kindle Editions refer to Kindle Location]
[32] C. Poster, 'Ethos, Authority, and the New Testament Canon,' *REMPBD*, (London, T&T Clark, 2005), 119-120, J. Wisse, "The Intellectual Background of Cicero's Rhetorical Works," *BCCOR*, (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 385, R.D Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, (Leuven, Peeters, 1998), 49
[33] Cicero, *Brutus*, in *Cicero's Brutus or History of Famous Orators; also His Orator, or Accomplished Speaker*, Trans. E. Jones, Kindle Edition, 262
[34] Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.90-92, *De Optimo Genere Oratoum*, III, Translated C.D. Yonge, retrieved, http://www.classicpersuasion.org/pw/cicero/cicero-best-style.htm, May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' 4563
[35] J.M. May, 'Ciceronian Oratory in Context,' *BCCOR*, (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 60, J.M. May, *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*, (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 6, 69–79, 162-163, R.W. Cape, 'Cicero's Consular Speeches,' *BCCOR*, (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 140, Krauss, 'Ethos,' 84
[36] J.M. May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 4672

embodiment of the Republic," to the point of martyrdom as Republic faded into Empire.[37]

While Cicero embodied the Republic, the Emperor embodied the Empire, especially with the rise of the Imperial Cult, which sprang out of the Roman east,[38] and spread throughout the empire presenting Caesar as exemplar for all citizens from the top down.[39] As in the ANE, Religion and politics were synonymous.[40] The Imperial cult "constructed the reality of the Roman empire."[41] Even in Augustus' lifetime every city had temples and shrines where he was represented and worshipped with the gods.[42] These cult temples were communication hubs for the empire, and the point from which his "image" was disseminated through festivals and rituals.[43] The image of the emperor became the model for imitation, in fashion and hairstyle, but also in terms of modelling civic virtues and values.[44] Coins, with images of Caesar on front and back became a major way that Caesar asserted his divinity – depicting him as a god.[45] Like Cicero before him, Augustus offered himself as the exemplum of *mos maiorum*.[46]

After Cicero, *logos* refers to the "neat and clear" content of the text,[47] *ethos* refers to the virtuous character of the speaker, both within and outside the text,[48] and the character of the audience. The speaker's *ethos* also controls the use of *pathos* – the "warm and forcible" elements of the act intended to "fire and inflame" the emotions of, and secure a response from, the audience.[49] The gifted orator tailors the speech to the audience, accommodating them through knowledge of the context and through the use of understandable phrases and

---

[37] J.M. May, 'Cicero: His Life and Career,' *BCCOR*, (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 17-18
[38] B.W. Winter, 'The Imperial Cult,' *The Book of Acts in its First Century Settings: Vol 2: Graeco Roman Settings*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 93-103
[39] S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, (Cambridge, CUP, 1984), 65-72, 107-108
[40] *ibid*, 234
[41] *ibid* 239-248
[42] Zanker, *Images*, 235-236
[43] *ibid*, 134-135
[44] *ibid*, 129, 336
[45] *ibid*, 54-57, 161
[46] *ibid*, 159-160
[47] Cicero, *Brutus*, 403
[48] Krauss, 'Ethos,' 73
[49] Cicero, *Brutus*, 403

imagery. Each proof is equally important.[50] For a communicative act to be persuasive and excellent these three proofs control one another symbiotically, or, perhaps, perichoretically. One's argument (*logos*) is supported by one's character (*ethos*); one's ability to move the emotions (*pathos)* depends on both the content of the act (*logos)*, and the communicator being emotionally moved themselves (*ethos and pathos*).

Truly ethical persuasion is controlled by the ethos, virtue and intention of the communicator, and synergy between all the elements of the communicative act. Longinus, writing in the first century called this synergy "sublime." Sublime communication persuades because it is excellent in essence (that it is good and true),[51] character (that it and the sender are virtuous), reason, form (genre, structure, medium, and content), content (strong imagery and expression),[52] and thus stirs the right emotions.[53] The communicative act considers, and is matched to, the recipient.[54] Every element is consistent.[55] The communicator's wisdom is required so that the *logos* of the argument can steer the ship, preventing blind passions from taking control.[56] The communicator's ethos also controls their use of pathos.[57] The communicator's "*image of greatness of soul*,"[58] and their "*generous and aspiring*" spirit is the foundation for the sublime,[59] and this can be displayed through silence.[60] A lack of virtue is fatal, because it is fatal for the noble soul.[61]

Persuasive communication is both ethical and excellent (sublime) when there is no dissonance between intent and outcome, medium and message, between virtue and speech act, or between the pathos, ethos, and logos of the communicative act. In recent rhetorical theory, the sublime is a communicative act: "in which both the *"statement of the subject"* and the *"methods by which we*

---

[50] May, 'Rhetorician,' 4489

[51] Longinus, *On the Sublime,* I.3-4, Trans. H.L Havell, (London, MacMillan, 1890), retrieved, http://www.gutenberg.org/files/17957/17957-h/17957-h.htm, VII.1-3

[52] Longinus, *On the Sublime,* XV.1-2, 9, 10-11

[53] *ibid,* III.4-5

[54] *ibid,* XIV.2-3

[55] *ibid,* I.3-4, VIII.1-4, X.1

[56] *ibid,* II.2-3

[57] *ibid,* VIII.1-4

[58] *ibid,* IX.1-4

[59] *ibid,* IX.1-4

[60] *ibid,* IX.1-4

[61] *ibid,* XLIV.6-12

may attain our end" are *"the stated rhetorical goal."*[62] Medium and message, and sender and receiver, are brought together.[63]

Philosophers of language John Austin and John Searle pioneered "Speech-Act Theory," a recognition that spoken words (locutions) do something (illocutionary acts), and can be used to achieve a result (perlocutionary effect).[64] To speak is to act.[65] Rhetoric and persuasion are attempts to use illocutionary acts strategically, through an understanding of the communicative act, to produce a desired response. Paul Ricouer applied speech-act theory to actions to suggest that they too could operate as communicative acts,[66] or texts, to be "read and interpreted."[67] Texts – the substance of all communicative acts – operate as words, or language, within conventions dictated by their form (style, genre, medium), to serve a function, or achieve a purpose.[68]

A communicative act is a completed "illocutionary act" if transmission is successful and understanding is reached.[69] Most communicative acts, as actions of the sender, are produced for a purpose; this purpose may simply be to transmit the information, but usually the purpose is to produce a "perlocutionary effect" – such communication aims to bring sender and receiver to a common understanding of the information, and apply its implications.[70] At this point communication becomes an exercise in persuasion, and while the sender cannot dictate the recipient's response,[71] they can "strategically" consider the desired perlocutionary effect in the communicative act.[72] This consideration will affect the choice of content, genre, and form within certain "rules of the game," supplying a context such that both sender and receiver are aware of the implications of the act.[73]

---

[62] Hester, 'Sublime,' 107
[63] *ibid,* 107, 109-110, 113
[64] Vanhoozer, *Meaning,* 460, 5704, 5721-5790, also Treier, *Virtue,* 103-180
[65] *ibid,* 5702-5709
[66] *ibid,* 6652
[67] *ibid,* 5913, 6041-6052
[68] *ibid,* 5753, 5966, 6246
[69] *ibid,* 6237
[70] *ibid,* 6144, 6237, 7150, 7199
[71] *ibid,* 6987-6989
[72] *ibid,* 5712-5714, 5922-5925, 6090, 6126-6133, 6652, 6658
[73] *ibid,* 5935-5940, 6422, 6862 7148, 9445-9454, 9549

Some communication theorists, like Searle and Habermas, suggest all communicative acts that pursue a perlocutionary effect are manipulative.[74] However, I suggest that if a communicator is either open about their intentions, or if that is clear from the literary conventions they employ, then the accusation of manipulation or unethical communication cannot be upheld.[75] Schrag (2003) suggests persuasion is inherently more ethical than other forms of communication because it declares its intention and pays heed to the receiver.[76] He argues that persuasive communicative praxis involves forming word and deed through inscriptions and intentionalities, about something, for and toward someone.[77] It is about "making something manifest" in the community or *polis*, through communicative acts.[78] Schrag calls this an expressive narrative persuasive paradigm. The *logos* "*does not pre-exist in the world of communicative praxis but is fully incarnate in its embodied speech and action*."[79] The communicator is forced towards ethical conduct because the *logos* relies on *ethos*, and discrepancies between word and deed undermine the communicative act.[80] Schrag follows Heidegger, who believes *ethos* emerged from the language for "abode, or dwelling place," [81] so ethics are the practice of those within a kingdom or polis.[82] This definition would seem to concur with the treatment of Cicero's understanding of virtue and ethos outlined above, and as I will argue, is consistent with a view that the incarnation – the dwelling of God with man – provides a paradigm for ethical communication.

Media theorist Marshall McLuhan coined the axiom "the medium is the message" to describe the close relationship between form and content for both sender and receiver.[83] The sender's choice of a medium communicates something about their intent, and the audience interprets the data through the

---

[74] *ibid*, 6114-6123, 6234

[75] *ibid*, 6422

[76] C.O. Schrag, *Communicative Praxis and the Space of Subjectivity,* (West Lafayette, Purdue University Press, 2003), 180

[77] *ibid*

[78] *ibid*, 182, 184-185

[79] *ibid*, 193-195

[80] *ibid*, 195

[81] *ibid*, 200-201

[82] *ibid*, 204-206

[83] M. McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man,* (Cambridge, MIT Press, 1994) First edition 1964, 7

lens of its form. The medium is the means by which the communicator embodies or incarnates his, her, or their, self in the communicative act.[84]

One of the world's leading public relations theorists, James Grunig advocates an idealistic role for public relations where "public relations should be practiced to serve the public interest, to develop mutual understanding between organisations and their publics, and to contribute to informed debate about issues in society."[85] He says excellent public relations treats publics as equals, and listens to them,[86] but any public relations is subjective, and involves the public being assessed from the perspective of the communicator and his or her worldview.[87] The mark of excellent public relations is logically coherent, effective, and ethical – in building a loving relationship between communicator and recipient.[88]

Public relations, as distinct from marketing or promotion, is not simply the pursuit of publicity.[89] Grunig has assessed the four models of modern persuasion practiced by communicators. These models describe the posture adopted by the communicator towards the recipient, and thus provide another useful tool for assessing communication through history, without too much danger of introducing anachronistic categories. His models include press agency, public information, the two-way asymmetrical and two-way symmetrical model. While "press agency" may initially seem to introduce an anachronistic category to the communication of the Ancient Near East, I suggest this is a parallel to written persuasion in cultures featuring low levels of literacy, the press agency model relies on a third party for the broad dissemination of the communicative act, circulating texts to literate influencers achieved much the same impact. The public information model is akin to the widespread use of imagery and public proclamation. The symmetrical and asymmetrical models of communication describe the purpose of the

---

[84] Vanhoozer, *Meaning*, 6275

[85] J.E. Grunig, 'Communication, Public Relations and Effective Communications: An Overview of the Book,' *EPRCM*, (New York, Routledge, 2002), 9

[86] *ibid*, 15

[87] J.E. Grunig & J. White, 'The Effect of Worldviews On Public Relations Theory and Practice,' *EPRCM*, (New York, Routledge, 2002), 32

[88] *ibid*, 38

[89] W.P. Ehling, J. White, & J.E Grunig, 'Public Relations and Marketing Practices,' *EPRCM*, (New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992), 366-371.

communicative act, and the posture an organisation adopts to achieve that purpose. Agency and public information models are one-way, involving the dissemination of information, while two-way communication involves a dialogue. Asymmetrical two-way communication involves the communicator remaining unmoved and trying to move the public to a new position. Symmetrical two-way communication adjusts the relationship between communicator and recipient in both directions during the communicative act.[90] The two-way asymmetrical model involved using research to identify and communicate "*the messages most likely to produce attitudes and behaviours designed by an organisation*." There is no ethical control built in to the two-way asymmetrical model.[91] The two-way symmetrical (following Habermas),[92] involves presenting information and seeking understanding, rather than persuasion.[93] Professionals, following Grunig, tend to treat two-way symmetrical communicative acts as the normative paradigm for excellent and ethical communication.[94] This relies on a prior commitment to virtue from those responsible for the communication.[95] Grunig suggests asymmetrical models can be used to justify promoting any cause, while symmetrical models, because they rely on the distribution of information that is believed to be demonstrably true, is "*inherently consistent with the concept of social responsibility*." The symmetrical model assumes the "norm" of reciprocity, where the powerful party treats the weaker party fairly.[96] It aims to incorporate ethics into the process of public relations rather than the outcomes.[97]

I will use the "public relations" practices of Solomon,[98] Paul, and Luther, to suggest that none of these models are suitable for excellent, ethical, contextual and persuasive gospel communication, and that such communication requires an entirely new model that undoes the ethical conundrum. I will suggest this

---

[90] J.E. & L.A Grunig, 'Models of Public Relations and Communications,' *EPRCM*, (New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992), 285-289
[91] *ibid*, 288-289
[92] *ibid*, 308
[93] *ibid*, 289
[94] *ibid*, 308, Grunig & White, 'Worldviews,' 38
[95] Grunig & White, 'Worldviews,' 60, Grunig & Grunig, 'Models,' 291, 298-302.
[96] *ibid*, 47-48, 53, 60
[97] *ibid*, 53
[98] Solomon is the implied author for interpretative purposes of the canonical form of Proverbs, and hinted at in Ecclesiastes.

model is derived from a theology of God as communicator, with the incarnation and crucifixion of Jesus as his paradigmatic communicative act, and an anthropology that emphasises our *imago dei* function as communicative agents.

THE COMMUNICATIVE GOD

God creates, reveals, and incarnates himself via his word.[99] On the basis of these speech-acts alone, one may assume the premise that the God of the Bible is the ultimate communicative being. But can we speak of communication as being part of the essence of God? The immanent Trinity, the nature of God, is the basis for any theological endeavour,[100] and for those endeavours to be possible this nature must be revealed in divine actions (the economic Trinity).[101]

The names of the persons of the Godhead, revealed in Scripture, suggest that communication is part of the essence of God. Tertullian's *Against Praxeus*, the earliest work describing the nature of the Trinity, noted the significance of the names and descriptions of Father, Son/word/image, and Spirit/paraclete/breath, of the divine personas for understanding Trinitarian relationships within the Trinity (*ad intra)* and externally (*ad extra)*. These names describe both relationships and function.[102] Both *ad intra* and *ad extra* relationships involve communication.

It may also be that by seeing each economic communicative act of God as one act involving all three persons of the Trinity, we can speak of functions and roles within the Trinity, without creating a murky category of ontological subordination. As ethos, pathos, and logos, are necessary elements of persuasive act, so the "perichoretic" contribution of Father, Word, and Spirit is necessary in divine communicative acts.[103] There is no economic act of God that is not produced by the three divine persons, acting in concert, so it should be impossible to speak of any work of Father, Son, or Spirit separately, just as

---

[99] Genesis 1:3, John 1:1-5, 14, Hebrews 1:1-3
[100] S.J. Grenz, *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei*, (Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 2001), 23-31, 44
[101] *ibid*, 38-41
[102] Tertullian, *Against Praxeas*, Ch II.598, Ch XIII.603
[103] Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate,* 3.1

it is impossible to produce a spoken communicative act that doesn't inherently contain the three persuasive proofs: *ethos, logos,* and *pathos.*

Moon (2010) suggests the Triune God is a Divine "communicative system" that employs the perfect media – the Word and Spirit,[104] to produce communicative acts both *ad intra,* and *ad extra* through *"coupling with creaturely media."*[105] Moon suggests the primary part of *"the distinct form of divine operation is communication,"* because divine action is consistently depicted as speech, or alongside divine speech, and God is described as "word."[106] The divine communication system is the *"ground of communicative/meaning systems"* so that human communication is *"grounded in divine communication,"*[107] or, as O'Donovan describes it *"from God's true speech flows all possibility of true human speech."*[108]

Moon's understanding of divine communication *ad extra* is that it reflects the infinite *ad intra* communication based on self-giving, selfless love – agape – and that this is epitomised in the incarnation and the cross.[109] The persons of the Trinity, within this system, have communication functions – the Father sends, the Son "encodes," and the Spirit "decodes."[110] Jesus is the only person who knows the Father,[111] and embodies the message of God as perfect image, [112]so that "anyone who has seen me [Jesus] has seen the Father".[113] The Spirit decodes through his operations within the church – making the Father knowable and revelation understandable by lifting the veil, and equipping the church to imitate Christ as encoders.[114] The Spirit also arguably encodes our prayers as he intercedes for us.[115] Moon is concerned to avoid the tritheistic model he sees operating in the "social Trinity" which relies on "an appeal to relational ontology" and an attempt to establish the unity of three persons

---

[104] Y.B. Moon, 'God as a Communicative System *Sui Generis*: Beyond the Psychic, Social, Process Models of the Trinity,' *Zygon*, 45.1, (March 2010), 105-126, 106
[105] *ibid,* 113
[106] *ibid,* 112-113
[107] *ibid,* 114-115
[108] O. O'Donovan and J.L. O'Donovan, *Bonds of Imperfection: Christian Politics, Past and Present*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2004), Kindle Edition, 622-27
[109] Moon, 'System,' 117
[110] *ibid,* 119
[111] Matt 11:27
[112] Colossians 1:15
[113] Moon, 'System,' 119, John 14:9
[114] *ibid,* 1 Corinthians 11:1
[115] *ibid,* Romans 8:26

through a shared egalitarian and perichoretic platform. [116] Moon's system appears to move to a functional ontology, where the Trinity is understood first in terms of shared roles in divine actions both *ad intra* and *ad extra,* which he says avoids tritheism, and the potential modalism of the Barthian approach to revelation.[117] Moon suggests this model differs from Process theology because rather than pushing a relationship of interdependence between God and creation, it maintains divine transcendence by seeing the *ad extra* element of divine communication as a product of the *ad intra*, and creation as a medium to be coupled with the divine agape message in God's communication.[118]

Vanhoozer also suggests God's Trinitarian communication is the paradigm for all genuine communication,[119] because he is the paradigmatic communicator.[120] Speech-act theory then is patterned on God's communicative acts – the "Father is the locutor," "the son is his preeminent illocution" and the Holy Spirit is God the perlocutor, who guarantees his words achieve their purposes.[121]

I suggest that divine communicative acts are persuasive acts, containing the three proofs, analogously aligned to the persons of the Trinity. Each divine communicative act involves the inextricably perichoretic contributions of each divine person, yet one might describe those acts in terms of the *ethos* of the father, being demonstrated in the incarnate *logos*, with the Spirit moving the hearts and minds of the audience as divine *pathos*. So, as a communicative act of God, consistent with his character, the incarnation of the *logos*, and his death on a cross express the *ethos* of God, who also works in the hearts of the recipients of his communicative act to produce appropriate emotional responses (either hardness or softness of hearts) as divine *pathos.* In communicating through Scripture, to and through people in particular times and places, using appropriate and common mediums and genres, and through the incarnation itself, God "aptly" accommodates himself to his audience and situation. The unity of the Trinity is such that there is no possible dissonance

---

[116] *ibid,* 120-121
[117] *ibid,* 121
[118] *ibid,* 122
[119]Vanhoozer, *Meaning,* 13021
[120] *ibid,* 13027
[121]*ibid,* 13025, Isaiah 55:11

between the elements of the act and thus, every divine communicative act is a sublime communicative act.

THE CRUCIFORM ETHOS OF GOD

God demonstrates his ethos in the incarnation – by dwelling with man.[122] God's ethos is cruciform. This is especially clear at the cross.[123] The cross is the means by which God displays his character in the definitive sublime communicative act, where ethos, pathos, and logos meet. It forms the climactic centre of both Scripture and the Incarnation. Gorman (2001) suggests Jesus' actions on the cross were the ultimate *"act of family resemblance,"* revealing that God is a God of self-giving, self-sacrificing, love, or "agape."[124]

God's character is further demonstrated through what flows from the cross – the provision of the Holy Spirit,[125] and the adoption, justification, sanctification and glorification of sinful humans as his children,[126] through their union with Christ.[127]

The cross becomes the *"hermeneutical lens through which God is to be seen,"*[128]and the basis of a communication praxis. This cruciform ethos is the foundation of the Divine communication praxis, and has implications communication about God, one cannot speak about God without speaking of the cross, which also shapes the communicative agent's ethos, logos, and pathos.

THE CRUCIFORM LOGOS OF GOD

It is perhaps easiest to argue for this model of the Trinity participating perichoretically in every divine communicative act when it comes to Christ's communicative function as the *logos*. This case can be made simply with reference to John's prologue: *"in the beginning was the logos."*

---

[122] John 1:14, Schrag, *Praxis,* 200
[123] Luke 23:34, John 3:16, 1 John 4:9-10, Romans 5:8
[124] M.J. Gorman, *Cruciformity: Paul's Narrative Spirituality of the Cross*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2001), 16
[125] 1 John 4:13-16, Romans 8:1-14
[126] 1 John 4:7, Romans 8:14-17, 27-39
[127] 1 John 4:13-16, Philippians 2:1
[128] Gorman, *Cruciformity,* 17

However, that Jesus, the Word, is the content of divine communicative acts is demonstrated not just in the incarnation itself, but in the divinely inspired Scriptures, which testify about Jesus,[129] such that Luther describes Scripture as Jesus' "*swaddling cloth and manger.*"[130] Interpretation of Scripture begins and end with Christ;[131] salvation through faith in the incarnation and death of Christ is the Biblical meta-narrative.[132] Jesus guarantees, affirms, and concludes the truth revealed in Scripture. Departing from Christ in any interpretation of Scripture is theologically disastrous.[133]

The richness of the relationship between Scripture and Christ the incarnate *logos* cuts both ways, the significance of the incarnation of Christ is revealed through Scripture's account of the redemption history narrative that culminates in him.[134]

Jesus is at the centre of Scripture, at the centre of the Incarnation, and at the centre of Creation as he was involved in its creation, it is for him, and he sustains it.[135]

THE CRUCIFORM PATHOS OF GOD

The Spirit moves us to respond to God, through Jesus, enabling us to cry "abba, father," and interceding with "wordless groans" as we pray.[136] It decodes and encodes communicative acts across the ontological creature-creator barrier.

The Spirit, as God's breath, enables God's words to be projected with volume, and empowered and led Jesus during the incarnation.[137] The Spirit vindicated

---

[129] John 1:43-45, 5:39-47; 8:39-47, 56-58, 20:31, Acts 3:18, Acts 17:2-3, 2 Tim 3:14-15,1 Pet 1:10-12, Rom 1:1-3, 16:25-27, Luke 24:25-27 & 44-46
[130] A.J. Hultgren, 'Luther on Galatians,' *W&W,* 20.3, (Summer 2000), 232-238, 235, citing LW 26:210, 212, 279, 295, 456, 35:122.
[131] J. Calvin, 'The Argument,' *Commentary on Genesis, Volume 1, CCEL*, retrieved, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/comment3/comm_vol01/htm/TOC.htm no pages
[132] Hebrews 11, Hultgren, 'Luther,' 236, V.S. Poythress, 'Divine Meaning of Scripture,' *WTJ,* 48, (1986), 241-279, 277-9, S. Edmonson, 'Christ And History: Hermeneutical Convergence In Calvin And Its Challenge To Biblical Theology,' *MT,* 21.1, (January, 2005), 3-35,' 1-4
[133] Calvin, 'The Argument,' no pages
[134] Edmonson, 'History,' 25
[135] Col 1:17, Hebrews 1:3, John 1:1-5
[136] Romans 8:15-16, 26-27
[137] Luke 4:14-19, John 6:63, Matt 4:1, 12:18, 12:28

and glorified Jesus by raising him from the dead,[138] and is involved in producing testimony about him in Scripture, acting through human agents.[139] The Spirit works through faithful spokespeople in the Old Testament, enabling them to proclaim the glory of God,[140] and equips those who follow Christ to speak both before,[141] and after Pentecost, in order to glorify God.[142]

The Spirit now reveals Christ through the church,[143] speaking through Scripture, [144] the sacraments, and the preached word,[145] and supplying believers with the "*eyes of faith*" that make God visible behind the "*veil of Christ's human flesh.*"[146]

The Spirit seals and marks humanity, enabling humans to express faith, uniting us to Jesus and his body the church,[147] supplying the gifts necessary for its growth,[148] and enabling us to bear fruit.[149] The Spirit reveals God to us in Christ, as we are "cruciformed" into his image.[150] The Spirit allows an individual to both partake in, and participate in, God's cruciform love,[151] as communicative agents,[152] or prevents that by hardening hearts.[153]

Just as the achievement of the desired *pathos* is dependent on both the logos and ethos in a communicative act, so the Spirit is sent by Father and Son to

---

[138] Rom 1:4, 8:11; 1 Tim 3:16; 1 Pet 3:18, John 7:39, Acts 2:33
[139] 2 Timothy 3:16, Ephesians 3:4-5, 6:17, Hebrews 1:1-2, 1 Pet 1:11-12, 2 Pet 1:20-21
[140] Numbers 11:17, 25-26, 29, 27:18, Isaiah 59:21, 61:1, Judges 3:9-10, 6:34, 11:29, 14:6,19, 15:14, 1 Samuel 10:10, 16:13-14, 2 Peter 1:21, Micah 3:8, Ezekiel 2:2, 11:5, Neh 9:30
[141] Matt 10:19-20, Mark 13:11, Luke 4:8, 12:12, Acts 4:8-12, 1 Corinthians 2:4
[142] John 15:26-27, Acts 2:1-11
[143] B.L. McCormack, 'Karl Barth in Conversation with Open Theism,' *Engaging the Doctrine of God: Contemporary Protestant Perspectives*, ed. B.L. McCormack, (Grand Rapids, Rutherford House, 2008), 229, P.D. Molnar, *Divine Freedom and the Doctrine of the Immanent Trinity*, (T&T Clark, London, 2002), 65
[144] Molnar, *Divine Freedom*, 283
[145] B.L. McCormack, 'For Us and Our Salvation: Incarnation and Atonement in the Reformed Tradition,' *GOTR*, 43, 1.4, (Spr-Wint 1998), 281-316, 299
[146] B.L. McCormack, 'Revelation and History in Transfoundationalist Perspective: Karl Barth's Theological Epistemology in Conversation with a Schleiermacherian Tradition,' *JOR*, 78.1, (Jan 98), 18-37, 31
[147] Acts 10:44-48, 11:15-18, 1 Corinthians 3:16, 2 Corinthians 13:14, Eph 2:21-22, Phil 2:1
[148] John 16:14-15, Acts 1:8, 4:31, 1 Corinthians 1:7-8, 12:7-11, Eph 5:19-20, Col 3:16-17
[149] M.J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2009), 117
[150] *ibid*, 120, Romans 8:29-30
[151] Rom 5:5, Eph 3:16-19
[152] Gorman, *Inhabiting*, 7
[153] Calvin, *Inst.* 1.18.2, 2.4.3, 1.4.4, 3.3.21, 3.2.11

produce ensure the word and ethos of God are heard and applied through people.[154]

THE DIVINE COMMUNICATIVE PRAXIS: CRUCIFORM INCARNATION AS ACCOMMODATION AND SUBLIME PARADIGM

The triune God's ultimate communicative act is the ultimate act of accommodation to humanity, as humanity, in Jesus; the word made flesh. Barthian theologians see the incarnation as the sole basis of God's self-communication to us, such that for Torrance, *"everything hinges on the reality of God's self-communication to us in Jesus Christ…."*[155] and for Molnar *"the truth of God's self-communication is and remains grounded in God himself and not in the media through which God interacts with us."*[156] However, the incarnational and accommodating nature of God's communicative praxis is revealed precisely in his use of media. All divine communicative acts, even those presented as text, in Scripture can also be considered as "incarnational" communication – where God accommodates his human audience, revealing himself through texts, mediums, language, genres, and forms that are part of the creature's world.

God communicates with people, in the Old Testament, *"by his prophets and in various ways"*[157] creatively and freely accommodating himself to his audience, communicating through: covenant promises,[158] the calling of Israel as a nation of priests out of Egypt, the law,[159] the development of Israel's cultic apparatus including the ark of the covenant, the Tabernacle, the Temple, Israel's history, the Wisdom Literature, the Prophets. The New Testament continues to model this accommodation as writers describe the Christ event using mediums and terminology familiar to the first audience.

---

[154] John 14:16-17, 26, 15:26-27, Rom 15:18-19, 1 Thes 1:5, Heb 2:4
[155] P.D. Molnar, 'God's Self-Communication in Christ: A Comparison of Thomas F. Torrance and Karl Rahner,' *SJT*, 50.3, (August 1997), 288-320, 288-289, 297, P.D. Molnar, *Divine Freedom*, 65, Grenz, *The Social God*, 35, K.W Hector, 'God's Triunity and Self-Determination: A conversation with Karl Barth, Bruce McCormack, and Paul Molnar,' *IJST*, 7.3, (July 2005), 246-261, 247-251, B.L. McCormack, 'Why should theology be Christocentric? Christology and metaphysics in Paul Tillich and Karl Barth,' *WesTJ, l* 45.1 (Spr 2010), 42-80, 53,
[156] Molnar, 'Self-Communication,' 297
[157] Hebrews 1:3
[158] Genesis 9:1-17, 12:1-3, 17, Deuteronomy 4-6, 2 Samuel 7
[159] Exodus 20

Accommodation is the communicative praxis necessary to bridge the ontological creature-creator divide.[160]

According to Calvin, any attempt to understand God apart from his actions are "*presumptuous curiosity*" without an act "*by which he draws near, becomes familiar, and in a manner communicates himself to us.*"[161] For Calvin this happens in the written word,[162] and in the incarnation, which makes God knowable and describable.[163] Christ reveals how God operates: "*Christ is that image in which God presents to our view, not only his heart, but also his hands and his feet*"[164]

Accommodation is God's communicative modus operandi, and the incarnation is the epitome of this act.[165] Humanity can know something of who God is in, and through, Jesus – in his life, and especially his death on the cross.[166]

God is a sublime communicator, both in creation which demonstrates the creative power of his word, and in the incarnation, accommodating sublimity *par excellence*, where his powerful word enters creation as human in the person of Jesus, who adopts the form and communication conventions of a first century Israelite, to transform humans into children of God, bringing creation and creator together.[167]

Every action of the incarnate word was a Trinitarian act because the Father sent the Son, and the Spirit guided the son,[168] so as communicative actions of the Triune God, the actions of the incarnate word are a sublime balance of the contributions of each person of the Trinity, working in communicative unity. In the incarnation God's character is "*spoken, embodied and lived*" in the *logos*, made flesh, accommodated to a human audience, proclaiming a message of

---

[160] Calvin, 'Argument.' Molnar, 'Self-Communication,' 290, 301, 294
[161] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.5.9
[162] *ibid*, 'Method, Arrangement and Subject of the Whole Work.'
[163] John 1:1, 14, 14:9, Hebrews 1:3, 2 Corinthians 4:6. J. Balserek, *Divinity Compromised: A study of Divine Accommodation in the thought of John Calvin*, (Doerdrecht, Springer, 2006), 67-68, R. Williams, *On Christian Theology*, (Oxford, Blackwell, 2000), 131, 139, Vanhoozer, *Meaning*, 8676, 13021
[164] Calvin, 'Argument.'
[165] Balserek, *Compromised*, 65-66
[166] Grenz, *The Social God*, 42
[167] John 1:1, 11-14, Hester, 'Sublime,' 109-110
[168] Molnar, *Divine Freedom*, 295, C.E. Gunton, *The One, The Three, and the Many: God, Creation, and the Culture of Modernity*, (Cambridge, CUP, 1993), 215, 230

"grace and truth,"[169] as God's image made visible.[170] The incarnation is a communicative act of person, word, and action,[171] a perfect fusion of medium and message. McLuhan, who coined the phrase "the medium is the message" also said: *"In Jesus Christ, there is no distance or separation between the medium and the message: it is the one case where we can say that the medium and the message are fully one and the same."*[172]

The cross then fuses the sublimity of the Incarnation with the ridiculous.[173] God's self-giving agape ethos is perfectly demonstrated at the cross as Jesus humbles himself, becoming worthy of ridicule according to "human wisdom."[174] The cross displays the cruciform character of God, and is the defining act of both the incarnation, and God's communicative praxis. The incarnation becomes a paradigmatic sublime communicative act for creatures.

THE COMMUNICATIVE IMAGE AND CRUCIFORM ETHOS OF MAN

God speaks creation into being, bringing order out of chaos,[175] speaking creation into its good function as a cosmic temple, and finishes the creative act by speaking to himself as he says *"let us make man in our image."*[176]

God is a communicative being. Humans, likewise, made in God's image, are communicative beings. While aware of the myriad theological interpretations of the *imago dei*,[177] I will attempt an exegetically driven approach that outlines the development of the communication aspect of this image through salvation history, sensitive to the changing understanding of image according to the historical and literary context.[178] It has been popular to see the image in terms of structural, relational, or relationship terms.[179] I will suggest the *imago dei* is functional, and that this function underpins much of the Old Testament

---

[169] John 1:1, 14, Vanhoozer, *Meaning*, 6729, 8506
[170] Colossians 1:15
[171] Grenz, *The Social God*, 34-35
[172] McLuhan, *Light*, 103
[173] 1 Corinthians 1:18-25
[174] Philippians 2
[175] C. Hyers, 'The Narrative Form of Genesis One, Cosmogenic, Yes; Scientific, No,' *JASA*, 36.4 (1984) 208-15
[176] Genesis 1:26
[177] Grenz, *The Social God*, 23, C.L. Feinberg, 'The Image of God,' *BS*, 129, (1972), 235-246, 239-246
[178] Bird, 'Male and Female,' 330
[179] Grenz, *The Social God*, 140-182

narrative and the expectations applied to the conduct of the people of God, and who they worship.

The Genesis creation account is an account of the creation of a cosmological temple with a garden sanctuary.[180] It is an account of the function of creation, and the function of man. The description of earth and the garden sanctuary as a temple is consistent with theological accounts of creation in the ANE.[181] While Beale, and others, suggest the *imago dei* is related to ANE kings who would set up images around their kingdoms, and even in temples,[182] in these temple cosmogonies of the ANE, temples were not completed until the image of the god was installed in the sanctuary,[183] until its mouth was opened through a ritual to vivify the image and thus manifest the presence of the god so that it was represented, and could speak from, the temple.[184] The vivification ritual, called *mis pi* in Babylon, was attested to across the near east geographically and chronologically, spanning from the third to the first millennium BC.[185] It involved claiming a substance, usually from the ground, and reshaping it for a new function, placing it in the sanctuary,[186] and conducting the mouth opening ritual.[187] The ritual, fairly unchanged throughout the ANE over millennia, is described in an account of a statue of Gudea in 2200BC:

---

[180] G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2004), 29, 50-80, J.H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible,* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 114, J.D. Leveson, 'Temple,' 275-298, G.J. Wenham, 'Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,' *I Studied Inscriptions From Before The Flood: Ancient Near Eastern Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11,* ed. R.S. Hess and D.T. Tsumura, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1994), 400.
[181] Walton, *Thought,* 119-121, 130.
[182] Beale, *Temple,* 82
[183] Walton, *Thought,* 114, C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, 'The Worship Of Divine Humanity As God's Image And The Worship Of Jesus,' *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus,* ed. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis, (Leidin, Brill, 1999), 122
[184] Beale, *Temple,* 90-93, Winter, 'Idols,' 14, 22, 35, Walton, *Thought,* 114-115, 118, Fletcher-Louis, 'Humanity,' 122, C. Walker & M.B. Dick, 'The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Mesopotamian mis pi Ritual,' *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of Cult Image in the Ancient Near East,* Ed. M.B. Dick, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1999), 57
[185] Walker & Dick, 'Induction,' 58-63, Winter, 'Idols,' 17
[186] *ibid,* 68
[187] V.H. Matthews & D.C. Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East,* (New Jersey, Paulist Press, 2006), 36, Winter, 'Idols,' 18-21, Walker & Dick, 'Induction,' 64-66, 70, Fletcher-Louis, 'Humanity,' 122

"The statue is to be brought to an orchard next to a canal. The statue is to be purified with water from the holy-water basin, and its mouth is to be opened..."[188]

From then on the idol would be treated as a living being, fed, worshipped, communicated with, as though the god is really present.[189] This ritual separates the object from its existing status (preliminal), reshapes it for its new status (liminal), and reintroduces it as a changed object (postliminal).[190] This pattern is repeated over and over again as God recasts his people in his image after their failure.

"[The writer of Genesis 1-2] radically modified the basic concepts and motifs reflected in the Mesopotamian myths and substituted details from his own Hebrew heritage." [191]

This ANE parallel provides the context for the Genesis account of the communicative function of humanity as the image of god.[192] Clines (1968) suggests humans are not created in God's image, but as God's image,[193] while others, notably Beale, suggest that the Genesis account seems more interested in the function of man, as a vice-regent priest king who extends the boundaries of God's rule, seeing Genesis describing the function rather than the ontology of man.[194] This is something of a false dichotomy. In the ANE, *munus muneris ergo sum*, I function therefore I am. Ontology is functional.[195] To create something was to give it a function.[196] Humans were Yahweh's cultic image, situated in his temple, given his priestly mandate, in relationship with him.[197]

---

[188] Walker & Dick, 'Induction,' 70
[189] *ibid*, 57
[190] *ibid,* 68
[191] Miller, 'Image,' 303
[192] J.H. Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2009), Kindle Edition, 637
[193] D.J.A. Clines, 'The Image of God in Man,' *TB*, 19, (1968), 53-103, 101-103
[194] Beale, *Temple*, 81-87
[195] Bird, 'Male and Female,' 338, Walton, *Lost World,* 217, 321
[196] Walton, *Lost World,* 321
[197] Hamilton, *Genesis,* 48-49, Fletcher-Louis, 'Humanity,' 122, S. Bunta, 'The Likeness Of The Image: Adamic Motifs And צלם Anthropoly In Rabbinic Traditions About Jacob's Image Enthroned In Heaven,' *JSJPHRP,* 37.1 (2006), 55-84, 63-65

Then the LORD God formed a man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being.[198]

Humanity is given a divinely ordained communicative function – created as Yahweh's cultic images; his priests;[199] his kings;[200] to participate in divine communication acts, as agents.[201] Humanity is charged with exercising dominion, to multiply, and to work and keep his sanctuary, expanding its order over his good world, manifesting his presence, resting with him, as he dwells in and with them in the garden temple.[202]

The images of the God who communicates are made to communicate; this function forms the basis of comparisons between the people of God, and the people of mute idols throughout the Old Testament. Every human bears the image of the objects or gods they worship.[203] To be human is to communicate. To speak. To act. To "speech-act." Humanity's speech-act capacity, as a mirror of the divine capacity is demonstrated in his naming of the animals. Yahweh names day and night, sky and land – the creation he has dominion over;[204] Adam is given dominion over, and names the animals.[205] Humanity is tasked with being fruitful and expanding the garden's boundaries, and reflecting the glory of God as they do so. The heavens and the earth, creation itself, also declare the glory of Yahweh, echoing the nature of its creator.[206] Creation properly used, is creation used to glorify God. The created tools for glorifying gods in the ANE, and used later in Israel's Temple and priestly vestments, gold and precious stones, are there at Adam's disposal.[207]

But humanity failed to guard the garden.[208] An intruder with an alternative communication plan demonstrated the transmission threat noise poses signal;

---

[198] Genesis 2:7
[199] Beale, *Temple,* 82 G.J Wenham, 'Symbolism,' 401
[200] J.R. Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids, Brazos Press, 2005), 121.
[201] Moon, 'God as Communicative System,' 114-115, Vanhoozer, *Meaning,* 13027
[202] Genesis 1:15, the verbs here are used elsewhere for the priests, Num 3:7-8, 8:26, 18:5-6, Wenham, 'Symbolism,' 401
[203] Psalm 115:1-8
[204] Genesis 1:5, 8, 11
[205] Genesis 1:28, 2:19-20
[206] Psalm 19:1
[207] Genesis 2:11-14, Beale, *Temple,* 73
[208] Genesis 3:1

interfering with humanity's broadcast of the divine image, and in the process, shattering that image.[209] Cultic images removed from their temple context were broken and in need of restoration;[210] humanity is cast out of the temple-garden, out of the divine presence, out of rest.[211]

Being functionally distinct from the animals is part of being ontologically different from the animals and bearing God's image.[212] Adam and Eve, who had been like God, the children of God, become indistinguishable from the beasts they were called to rule over – clothes maketh the human.[213] While Wenham (1999) believes Adam's priestly role continues after the Fall as God dresses them in animal skins because priestly appointments involve the priests being clothed.[214] However, the priestly vestments for later tabernacle and temple service are not animal skins – but made of the gold and precious jewels that were already at hand.[215] Adam had been created as distinct from the animals. Adam and Eve had dressed like the plants of the garden,[216] but in dressing them in animal skins, God demonstrates their image-bearing function, is damaged, and their future is now the same as all the animals who receive life from God's breath.[217]

A remnant of the *imago dei*, or a capacity for its function, remains such that Seth shares Adam's image (not Yahweh's),[218] while human life is still sacred on the basis of the *imago dei*.[219] This suggests man's *imago dei* communicative function is frustrated, not lost, at the Fall.[220]

IMAGE IN ISRAEL

---

[209] Genesis 3:2-7
[210] Kutsko, *Heaven*, 56-58
[211] Genesis 3:16-24
[212] Genesis 1:28, Feinberg, 'Image,' 235-246, 238
[213] Genesis 3:21
[214] Wenham, 'Symbolism,' 401-402
[215] Exod 25:7, 28:9, 20
[216] Genesis 2:7
[217] Psalm 104:29-30, D. Green, 'Loss of Humanity, QTC August Lectures - True Humanity,' Lecture 2, (St. Lucia, Queensland Theological College, 2010)
[218] Genesis 5:1-3, Bird, 'Male and Female,' 340
[219] Genesis 9:6
[220] Feinberg, 'Image,' 245, M. Luther, *On The Creation: A Critical and Devotional Commentary on Genesis*, Trans. H.Cole, Ed. J.N. Lenker, (Minneapolis, Luther in All the Lands, 1904), 109-116, Calvin, *Genesis*, 1.26, Calvin, *Inst.* 1.3, 1.3.2-1.3.3, 1.4.1, 3.2.34

The God who speaks underpins the possibility of all true speech, so the natural capacity for such speech is lost in the relationship breakdown, signified by a loss of presence, at the fall. However, the image of God is still present in people, transforming them from clay when they speak his words faithfully,[221] while prophets who do not speak for God are presented as broken images with no spirit.[222]

The image was regained with the calling of the nation of Israel, who were placed in a land, to be a nation of priests, holy like God is holy, modelling God's image through keeping Torah.[223]

"But as for you, the LORD took you and brought you out of the iron-smelting furnace, out of Egypt, to be the people of his inheritance, as you now are."[224]

Israel is called, again in the language of the ANE vivification ritual, to function as God's image and not turn to created things or make images of them.[225] They do this by "*following God's laws and decrees*" demonstrating wisdom, so that the nations will "*hear about all these decrees*" and recognise Israel's wisdom and the difference between Yahweh and "their gods."[226] God claimed Israel from the furnace, put them in a place, and gave them a purpose. The elements of the vivification ritual are contained in these verses. The verb used to describe God forming humanity, יצר, is used throughout the Old Testament to reference the creation of God's image-bearing people, Israel,[227] or creation itself,[228] and to describe the production of idols.[229] יצר is used repeatedly in Isaiah 43-44 all three ways. In 43:1 it is paired with ברא, which was used in Genesis 1:26, bringing the actions of God in creation of humanity in Genesis 1 and 2 together, to remind Israel that God created and formed them. As Isaiah extrapolated from the created function of the *imago dei*, he said God's people were "called by God's name," and made for his glory, to proclaim his praise as

---

[221] Job 33:4-6, 14
[222] M.B. Dick, 'Prophetic Poiesis and the Verbal Icon,' *CBQ*, 46 no 2 Ap 1984, 226-246, 244.
[223] Genesis 12:1-3,7, Exodus 19:6, Leviticus 11:44-45, 19:2, 20:2, Deuteronomy 4:1-40
[224] Deuteronomy 4:20
[225] Deuteronomy 4:15-19
[226] Deuteronomy 4:5-7
[227] Psalm 103:14, Zech 12:1, Isaiah 49:5, 64:8
[228] Psalm 33:15, 94:9, 95:5, 104:26, Amos 4:13, Jeremiah 33:12, Isaiah 45:18
[229] Habakkuk 2:18, Isaiah 44

his witnesses.[230] Isaiah then parallels the creation of man and the heavens, against the creation of idols.[231] The noun, צֶלֶם (selem) is used, after Genesis, almost exclusively to describe idols,[232] as are its cognates around the ANE, which describe images of gods and kings.[233] Divine statues, images of god, were *salam ilani* in Mesopomtia, and *selem elohim* in Israel.[234]

Keeping both Torah and Sabbath replicates the presence of Yahweh in the community and restores the capacity for people to communicate the divine image through holiness, so long as they remember that Yahweh gives them the capacity to be Holy, as a kingdom of priests, and provides the model for imitation.[235] For a time in Israel's history, the priesthood becomes the model restoration of the image of God.[236] The priestly vestments use the gold and stones found in the Eden narrative.[237] Israel is a nation of priests, called to image God to the nations - called to a function as God's communicative agents. Israel's commitment to monotheism against the polytheism of her neighbours, when such commitment exists, is a function of their right understanding that they are to serve as Yahweh's cult image.[238] Israel was made holy, made imitators and images of Yahweh in their calling to obey the laws and the Sabbath;[239] their holiness was key to Yahweh's presence in their community, and made them images of Yahweh.[240] There is a close link between imitation and image in the creation account, and in Israel's calling.

Between Abraham and David, Israel's "image bearing" is depicted by the patriarchs claiming new sacred space, echoing temple construction, by erecting shrines and altars on mountains.[241] Solomon, finally, is the vice-regent image par excellence, building the temple, and sitting on the throne dispensing

---

[230] Isaiah 43:1, 4-7, 10, 21
[231] Isaiah 44:2,24 (humans), 24-26 (the heavens), 9-112 (idols)
[232] Numbers 33:52, 2 Kings 11:18 cf 2 Chronicles 23:17, Ezekiel 7:20, 16:17, Amos 5:26
[233] Fletcher-Louis, 'Humanity,' 122, Bird, 'Male and Female,' 342, Kutsko, *Heaven,* 59, 61
[234] Kutsko, *Heaven,* 58-59, Miller, 'Image,' 301-304
[235] Exodus 31:12-17, Leviticus 11:45, R.A. Simkins, 'Visual Ambiguity in the Biblical Tradition,' *Religion and the Visual*, JRS, (2012), 27-39, 36
[236] Fletcher-Louis, 'Humanity,' 126
[237] *ibid*, 127, Exodus 28,
[238] Dick, 'Parodies,' 9-11
[239] Leviticus 11:45
[240] Simkins, 'Ambiguity,' 36
[241] Beale, *Temple,* 96-108

Yahweh's wisdom to the nations.[242] Hamilton (2010) observes a close literary parallel between Solomon and Adam, where Solomon rules and expands a peaceful kingdom, names animals, builds the Temple with its Edenic parallels, and functions as a priest in the Temple where God dwells.[243] Like Adam, Solomon fails to continue carrying this image – turning instead, to idols.[244]

Those who worship idols end up resembling those idols, not Yahweh. Psalm 115 warns about the conforming power of idols. Rather than bearing the likeness of God, those who worship worthless and speechless idols of silver and gold made (עשׂה) by human hands become like their idols, unable to utter a sound with their throats. The nations may ask "where is Israel's God" because Israel has no idols, but the people of God were made (עשׂה) images of God; the implicit implication of the conforming power of idols is that Israel should be like the God who made them. Genesis 1:26-27 would appear to be at the front of the Psalmist's mind.[245]

But Israel ignores the warnings and ends up in exile. ANE warfare involved the destruction or capture of cultic imagery. The state of a nation's gods was linked to divine control and presence. Captured nations had captured gods. Captured gods were broken gods – the capture of the nation they belonged to indicated they lacked power. Captured idols required revivification, reimaging, if they were ever to function in temples again. [246]

Ezekiel is a prophetic voice in creative conversation with Israel's religious history and international religious ritual.[247] He presents a simultaneous rebuke of Israel and idolatry. The Mesopotamians believe man creates and restores God, but Israel should know it is the other way around.[248] Divine images that had been captured during conquest would be returned to conquered peoples, and then revivified. [249] Ezekiel chapters 36-37 contrast cult statues and humans,

---

[242] *ibid*, 108-109
[243] 1 Kings 4:24, 33-34, 6, 8:62-63, J.M. Hamilton, *God's Glory in Salvation Through Judgment: A Biblical Theology*, (Wheaton, Crossway, 2010), Kindle Edition, 3918-3941
[244] 1 Kings 11:1-14
[245] Psalm 115:4-7, 7-8, 14-18
[246] Kutsko, *Heaven*, 56-58
[247] *ibid*, 147
[248] *ibid*
[249] *ibid*, 113-117

or idols and images of God. It uses the rituals involved with the repatriation and revivification of idols after conquest to describe the promised restoration of humanity after the exile. This involves a reconstitution of their function such that they become images of God again through a new heart.[250] Israel became what it beheld. Israel cannot return from exile until God puts his Spirit within them;[251] they will be turned away from idols to become images again. They worship stones, their hearts have become stone, and they need restoration.[252] Their bones are revived and they will be repatriated to "a land like Eden,"[253] and God will make them fruitful and increase in number,[254] so they can bear his image again by keeping his laws.[255] This will happen for the sake of the nations as Israel again shows the holiness of his name, when the dry bones are brought to life by God's breath and Spirit.[256] This description plays with the imagery of the revivification of cult images after capture, and the creation narrative.[257]

Jeremiah links mandate for those made in God's image – to be fruitful and multiply – with the promise of the new covenant with God's re-tabernacling in Jerusalem, beyond the walls of the temple, but also with the provision of the Spirit and a "new heart."[258] They will be gathered from where they are (current form), brought past streams, "be filled with God's bounty," "woman will be brought back into man," they will be planted in the land, to manifest God's presence by his spirit, and given a function.[259] The elements of this revivification ritual are also present in Jeremiah.

AN IMAGE EXCHANGED

The prophetic promise of the indwelling of the Spirit and new hearts is fulfilled by the provision of the Spirit to the church.

---

[250] *ibid*, 134-142
[251] Ezekiel 36:25-27
[252] Kutsko, *Heaven,* 126-129
[253] Ezekiel 36:35
[254] Kutsko, *Heaven,* 129-131, Ezekiel 36:11, 37
[255] Ezekiel 36:24:38
[256] Ezekiel 36:22-24, 32, 36, 38, 37:9, 14
[257] Kutsko, *Heaven,* 124-125, 133-134
[258] Jeremiah 3:16-18, Beale, *Temple,* 112-113
[259] Jeremiah 31:7-9, 14, 22, 27-29, 31-34

The *imago dei* still exists as an ideal function for humanity, such that Paul can describe Jesus as *the* image of the invisible God,[260] and speak of the Spirit working in the lives of believers to conform them to the image of Christ.[261]

There is also a suggestion that Jesus makes an appeal to the image of God when questioned about paying taxes,[262] and this too, fits in a communication rubric for the function of the *imago dei*. Coinage in the Roman Empire was a propaganda tool; it bore the image of the emperor to proclaim his authority over every transaction, to guarantee the value of the coin, and the empire that stood behind it, and to celebrate the leader. This was a deliberate change to numismatic practice introduced by Augustus.[263] When Jesus said: "*So give back to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's*" after asking "*whose image is on it?*" He claims humanity belongs to God; in the same way coins belong to Caesar.[264]

Paul says humanity is condemned because we turned away from the creator God to worship created things, failing to be God's image bearers and exchanging "*the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like a mortal human being.*"[265] Still, God works to unite his people to the one who *is* the image of God,[266] and conform them to *his* image.[267] While some see only our created image restored in our union with Christ,[268] it is, rather, a renovation. The indwelling of the Spirit brings something *richer* than the life intended for all mankind at creation.[269]

This renovation of the image we bear also reinstitutes the functional nature of bearing God's image. The *imago Christi* underpins the *imitatio Christi*,[270] and

---

[260] Colossians 1:15
[261] Romans 8:29
[262] Grenz, *The Social God,* 203, Bunta, 'Likeness,' 79
[263] Zanker, *Images,* 14
[264] Matthew 22:15-22
[265] Romans 1:20-25, Gorman, *Cruciformity,* 335
[266] Colossians 1:15
[267] Romans 8:29
[268] D.B. Hart, *The Beauty of the Infinite: The Aesthetics of Christian Truth,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2003), 325- 327
[269] *Inst.* 1.15.4, 3.1.2, Gorman, *Cruciformity*, 45-48, 345
[270] S. Kim, 'Imitatio Christi (1 Corinthians 11:1): How Paul Imitates Jesus Christ in Dealing with Idol Food (1 Corinthians 8-10), *BBR*, 13.2 (2003) 193-226, 225-226

this, as argued below, is a category linked to Paul's presentation of a properly Christian communicative function and praxis.[271] In sum, for Paul, bearing the divine image is not just incarnational, but also is also cruciform.[272] As such, persuasively preaching the gospel of Jesus as his ambassador is a matter of embodying his message. He lives out the death of Jesus in his body, such that his sufferings and scars become part of his image and *ethos.*[273]

Christ also represents the embodiment of the "wisdom of God."[274] Wisdom was linked both to Israel's image bearing function,[275] and to Solomon's reign. This is one sense in which Jesus is "one greater than Solomon."[276] The Spirit enables those who recognise the gospel as wisdom to be wise through renewed minds.[277] This renewed mind, in Philippians 2:2, leads to unity through adopting and imitating the humility and mindset of Jesus.[278] The end goal of a renewed mind is a glory-promoting image bearer who sacrificially honours God by serving with their gifts.[279] Spirit-given Christian wisdom, through a renewed mind, involves not just incarnational, but cruciform wisdom.[280] This renewed mind, the mind of Christ, is the mind that, according to Philippians 2, led Jesus to the way of the cross. Such wisdom involves communicative action.[281]

The Christian communicative praxis involves pursuit of wisdom with new minds, and the incarnational self-renouncing, a "becoming other" and an embodying of the cruciform image to participate in the divine communicative program, recapturing one's created telos.[282]

IMAGE BEARING AND ACCOMMODATION: IMAGE BEARING, PLUNDERED GOLD, IDOLS AND AUGUSTINE

---

[271] Treier, *Virtue,* 60-61
[272] Gorman, *Cruciformity,* 56
[273] *ibid,* 30-31, 335, 2 Corinthians 4-5:20, 6, 11, Galatians 1:15-16, 6:17, Calvin, *Inst.* 3.2.34
[274] 1 Corinthians 1:18-25
[275] Deuteronomy 4
[276] Matthew 12:42
[277] 1 Corinthians 1-2, esp 2:6-16, Treier, *Virtue,* 48
[278] Philippians 2:5, Treier, *Virtue,* 51-52, 56-57, B. Fiore, 'Paul, Exemplification and Imitation,' *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook,* ed. J.P. Sampley, (Harrisburg, Trinity, 2003), 240
[279] Romans 12:1-7, Treier, *Virtue,* 58
[280] Treier, *Virtue,* 64-65
[281] *ibid,* 63
[282] Gorman, *Cruciformity,* 349, 360

When God accommodates humanity to reveal himself in Scripture he does it *"by the prophets and in various ways."*[283] If accommodation is part of the communicative praxis of God, and we are his communicative agents called to imitate Christ, with the incarnation as our paradigm, then our communication, too, should accommodate those we communicate to.

God accommodates humanity by adopting its communication conventions – languages, literary forms, cultures and concepts. He adopts pre-existing forms of communication and adapts them to his cruciform agenda.

The short survey of Israel's history above made brief mention of "gold" as the element in creation, notable in the Garden, that was later used to bring glory to God. The communicative acts of the people of God were literally adorned with this gold. Gold is a useful metaphor for assessing the place created communication mediums play in the communicative praxis of divine image bearers. In Israel's history gold could be used to dress the priests, or turned into an idol, in an inversion of its created purpose.[284] The way gold is used reflects the desires of the creature using it, and the god they worship.[285] Every human bears the image of his or her God. Israel's use of gold is an interesting measure of her heart.

When God calls Moses into his communicative service he tells him to be prepared to plunder golden jewellery from Egypt when he brings them out into the land.[286] Idols of the ANE world were adorned with such jewellery so it is possible given the construction above, that God is dressing them as his images.[287] Yet, seemingly moments after the Exodus, Israel has transformed this gold into a golden calf.[288]

The proper use of gold within the Biblical narrative was in the construction of the Ark of the Covenant, the fittings of the tabernacle, the priestly robes,[289] and

---

[283] Hebrews 1:1
[284] Job 31:24-28
[285] Ezekiel 16:16-27
[286] Exodus 3:15, 20-22, 11:2, 12:35, cf Psalm 105:37
[287] Walker & Dick, 'Induction,' 64-66, Winter, 'Idols,' 23, Kutsko, *Heaven,* 54-55, 118-120, Jer 10:1-9, Isa 40:19-20, 41:7, 44:9-20, 46:6, Hos 2:10, 8:4, Hab 2:18-19, Ezekiel 7:20, 16:17-19,
[288] Exodus 32:1-8
[289] Exodus 25:10-40, 26:1-6, 28:1-4

in the Temple.[290] Where it is part of the construction and stored in the Temple treasury as "devoted to God."[291] As the Solomonic historiography is about to descend from lofty heights to idolatrous destruction, the narrator notes what other trivial purposes he has used gold for.[292] There is some gold that cannot be reclaimed,[293] and gold can passively or actively tempt people away from covenant life.[294] Gold is a good creation of God's but it can be positively or wrongly used.[295] Gold, then, is a literal problem for Israel's covenant faithfulness, functions as something of a compass for her faithfulness, but also serves as a metaphor for establishing a doctrine of creation.

When advocating the plundering of communication mediums to adorn the gospel, one must take seriously the warning of the Psalmist,[296] and more recently, McLuhan, that media users are in danger of "*becoming what they behold*," that mediums, as arrangers of culture, have the capacity to transform the message and the messenger, in unwanted ways, and can also function, themselves, as idols.[297] McLuhan saw new media inventions as extensions of man that would "*affect the whole psychic and social complex*," conforming societies as "*whole populations imitate and play with them*."[298] He was concerned that use of media without due care would produce idolatry.[299]

His axiomatic proclamation was not that the medium overcomes the message, but rather, that one ignores the effect of the medium at their peril because the medium engraves its image on the soul of the consumer.[300]

In *On Christian Doctrine,* Augustine outlined his approach to oratory through the analogy of gold plundered from Egypt. This is a result of his conviction that communication mediums, like gold, have a created purpose, and that

---

[290] 1 Kings 6:19-28, 1 Chronicles 29:1-9
[291] 1 Kings 7:48-51
[292] 1 Kings 10:14-29
[293] Deuteronomy 7:5
[294] Deuteronomy 8:11-18, 29:16-18
[295] Judges 8:23-27, Ezekiel 16:8-22
[296] Psalm 115
[297] McLuhan *Understanding,* 21
[298] *ibid,* 4, M. McLuhan 'Roles, Masks, and Performances,' *NLH,* 2.3, (Spring, 1971), 517-531, retrieved http://www.mcluhanonmaui.com/2011/06/roles-masks-and-performances-by.html, no pages
[299] McLuhan *Understanding,* 46
[300] *ibid,* 7

wrong use does not negate right use. If the persuasive power of eloquence is divinely ordained, then it should be put in the service of the divine.[301] His belief that Christian teachers were called to speak clearly and persuasively about Jesus, and so, should be equipped to use oratory and eloquence, is the fruit of applying his "golden paradigm" to the communication mediums of his day.[302] All truth belongs to God.[303] We must, however, be careful not to plunder the gold of human mediums to simply construct our own golden calf.

I will now suggest that Augustine spoke truer than he knew – God's communicative agents have always "plundered the gold" of other nations in order to "preach of the gospel."[304]

ACCOMMODATION AS PARADIGMATIC FOR OUR COMMUNICATIVE PRAXIS: SOLOMON AND AMENEMOPE

Augustine's ideal Christian teacher had a Roman Liberal Arts education,[305] the kind he had received,[306] and presents as desirable in the autobiographical figure, Trygetius, in the *Cassiciacum Dialogues.*[307] Augustine saw the path to wisdom as a seven-step process involving fear, piety, knowledge, resolution, counsel, purification of heart, and finally wisdom.[308] An education was valuable for producing knowledge, but wisdom relied on understanding the natural world as general revelation, such that one's knowledge of the world could be used to speak truthfully of God.[309]

---

[301] Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 2.36.54, 2.40.60, 4.2.3
[302] *ibid*, Book 4.
[303] *ibid*, 2.18.28
[304] *ibid,* 4.Argument.
[305] Augustine, *The Retractions,* 3.3, Volumes of the Church, 60, (Washington, Catholic University Press, 1968), 14
[306] J.J. O'Donnell, 'De Doctrina Christiana,' *Augustine Through The Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. Fitzgerald & J.C. Cavadini, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 280, Augustine, 'Letter 104: Augustine to Nectarius,' in *Augustine: Political Writings*, ed. E.M. Atkins, & R.J. Dodaro, (Cambridge: CUP), 12-13.
[307] J. McWilliam, 'Cassiciacum Dialogues,' *Augustine Through The Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. Fitzgerald & J.C. Cavadini, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 140-142
[308] Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 2.7
[309] *ibid*, 2.18.28-2.19.29

Fittingly, there is no more obvious case of metaphorical gold plundered from Egypt than Israel's "natural theology," [310] the "golden" Wisdom Literature.[311] In this case study on Solomon's adaptation of the Egyptian *Proverbs of Amenemope*, I hope to outline how accommodation is being developed as a paradigm for communicative praxis; this, in part depends on the argument further developed in Appendix A, that the Wisdom Literature was produced as apologetic material for an international audience, especially presented to royals and their courts as part of an Old Testament "mission" to those who controlled the state cult. This communicative purpose, as the culmination of the Abrahamic covenant promise to bless the nations, would have continued had Solomon maintained covenant faithfulness and his calling to be a divine image bearer.

I suggest that Biblical Wisdom Literature is a strategic communicative act, and that the purpose of this act, tied specifically to Solomon's name, should be read in the light of the narrative of Solomon's reign, and its international communicative program. This interpretive key, and the unifying literary motif, that true wisdom begins with the fear of Israel's God, Yahweh,[312] raises an interesting prospect that the wisdom literature had an international persuasive function.

The aspects of Solomon's reign as described in the narrative of 1 Kings, that I suggest provide the interpretive framework for the identifying the communicative purpose of the wisdom literature are:

1. His interaction with international wisdom, and thus with international theology.[313]
2. His corrective of international theology based on the "fear of the Lord."[314]

---

[310] P. Beaulieu, 'The Social and Intellectual Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature,' *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed. R.J. Clifford, SBL Symposium Series 36, (Atlanta, SBL, 2006), 6-7, Walton, *Thought,* 309, D. Burdett, 'Wisdom Literature and the Promise Doctrine,' *TJ,* 3 (Spring 1974) 1-13.2

[311] Job 28:15-20

[312] D. Kidner, *Wisdom to Live By* (Leicester, IVP, 1985), 17, W.C. Kaiser, *Toward an Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1978), 170, R.E. Clements, *Wisdom in Theology,* (Carlisle, Paternoster, 1992), 60-62.

[313] 1 Kings 4:29-34, 1 Kings 10:23-24, J. Ruffle, 'The Teaching of Amenemope and Its Connection With the Book of Proverbs,' *TB,* 28, (1977), 29-68, 66

3. His desire to see the nations come before Yahweh, as they witness his rightful position as creator of the world and the basis of wisdom and righteousness.[315]

The pursuit of wisdom, and the production of wisdom literature, was an important intellectual and theological activity in the ANE.[316] It was a conversation that crossed international borders.[317] The account of Solomon's reign suggests this wisdom conversation was appealing enough that foreign royals travelled, or could be plausibly presented travelling, to participate in the dialogue.[318] The comparison between Solomon's wisdom and that of surrounding nations suggests Israel was part of the global conversation, and the reader is invited to compare Israel's wisdom with international wisdom.[319] Israel also employed foreign sages,[320] which adds to the sense that this was an international medium.

On a literary level, the Wisdom Literature shares genre conventions, tropes and images, theology, function, and in several cases content, with other wisdom literature from the ANE. Parallels have been made between the wisdom of Israel and the wisdom of Babylon, Egypt, and Sumer, Canaan, and the Akkadian empire.[321] Wisdom literature, as the literature of the elite, presented on a transportable medium, had the capacity to function as persuasive literature that could spread, and change cultures from the top down.

The Book of Proverbs shares much in common with other proverbial wisdom, including structure, and literary tropes such as a king instructing his son, and

---

[314] 1 Kings 8:43
[315] 1 Kings 8:41-43, 59-61, 1 Kings 10:9, Psalm 72, J. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and the Pauline Communities*, (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 60.
[316] Clements, *Wisdom*, 17, Ruffle, 'Amenemope,' 36, R.J. Clifford, *The Wisdom Literature*, (Nashville, Abington Press, 1998), 40
[317] N. Whybray, *Wisdom In Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9*, (London, SCM Press, 1965), 15-16
[318] 1 Kings 4, 10
[319] 1 Kings 4:30-31, B.K. Waltke, 'The Book of Proverbs and Ancient Wisdom Literature,' *BS*, 136 (July-Sept. 1979), 211-238, M.V. Fox, 'World Order and Ma'at: a crooked parallel,' *JANES* 23, 1995, 37-48, 37, C.J.H. Wright, *The Mission of God*, (Nottingham, IVP Academic, 2006), 441, 444.
[320] 2 Samuel 8:17; 15:37 20:25; 1 Kings 4:3; 2 Kings. 22:8-10, Ruffle, 'Amenemope,' 65-66, Hubbard, 'The Wisdom Movement,' 6
[321] See *Appendix A.*

the personification of wisdom.[322] The final form of Proverbs acknowledges that it is a composite work featuring international wisdom in the Proverbs of Agur, and Lemuel.[323] It is also widely recognised that two chapters are "plundered" from Egypt's *Wisdom of Amenemope*.[324]

ANE wisdom described the nature of nature, the nature of the gods, and the response these gods required.[325] Israel's wisdom plunders wise observations, and grounds any natural theology in the "fear of Yahweh."[326] Wisdom is not wisdom without Yahweh, because the created order is not guaranteed without the creator who stands apart from that order.[327] Israel's wisdom is not about the self-sufficiency produced by understanding, but a God dependency.[328] In Israel, wisdom becomes a subset of fearing God, and the life lived imaging God.[329]

The fear of the Lord is a touch point of Jewish orthodoxy synonymous with faithful obedience.[330] The theology of the wisdom literature is consistent with Deuteronomic theology,[331] and the prophetic call to faith in Yahweh,[332] but it is presented without the presupposition that the reader shares this theology.[333] This has some bearing on an understanding on its potential communicative function. Clements (1995) suggests this "*lack of covenantal presuppositions enabled [the wisdom literature] to serve as an internal apologetic to Jews and as a non-national basis for religiously motivated moral teaching of a high order.*"[334]

---

[322] J. Day, 'Foreign Semitic influence on the wisdom of Israel and its appropriation in the book of Proverbs,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed. J. Day, R.P. Gordon, & H.G.M. Williamson, (Cambridge, CUP, 1995), 60-69, also, A. Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom*, (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 44-45, Ruffle, 'Amenemope,' 36
[323] Proverbs 30:1, 31:1
[324] Proverbs 22:17-24:22, Ruffle, 'Amenemope,' 29-68, Crenshaw, *Wisdom*, 252-260, H. Ringgren, 'Israel's Place Among The Religions of the Ancient Near East,' *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel*, (Leiden, Brill, 1972), 3
[325] Walton, *Thought,* 309-310, citing *Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*
[326] J.G. Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs* (Sheffield, Almond, 1981), 53
[327] Walton, *Thought,* 309, Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 336
[328] J.S. Reitman, 'God's "Eye" for the *Imago Dei*: Wise Advocacy Amid Disillusionment in Job and Ecclesiastes,' *TJ,* 31NS, (2010), 115-134, 118
[329] *ibid,* 119
[330] Deuteronomy 4:10; 5:29; 6:2, 13, 24; 10:12, 20
[331] Walton, *Thought,* 309
[332] Wright, *Mission,* 444.
[333] Clements, *Wisdom,* 273
[334] *ibid*

Where Egyptian wisdom focuses its moral teaching on understanding the order in creation, Biblical wisdom, חכמה, focuses on the one who created and controls the order.[335] While the "fear of the Lord" occurs throughout Proverbs,[336] it occurs almost exclusively in the passages tied to Solomon,[337] and does not appear in those collected under Hezekiah.[338] Most interestingly, for our purposes, it frames the *Amenemope* passages that occur in sections of Proverbs attributed to Solomon.[339] The "plundered" Proverbs have been editorialised with this Israelite theology to be consistent with a view of the world that begins with Yahweh.[340] This "accommodation," and lack of Jewish presuppositions, raises interesting questions about the communicative function and intent of the Wisdom Literature. In an assessment of Ecclesiastes and its use of international vernacular, its global content, its genre (a speech), and its lack of theological presuppositions, Fredericks and Estes (2010) it could plausibly be an apologetic wisdom speech delivered to visiting dignitaries and sages in Solomon's reign.[341] I propose a similar international communicative function for the book of Proverbs, which shares the same characteristics. There is support for this view in the literary links to Solomon in Proverbs and the historiography of Solomon's reign, where Solomon's proverbial wisdom is compared to the nation's wisdom, and linked to the nations descending on Israel in 1 Kings 4:

"He [Solomon] was wiser than anyone else, including Ethan the Ezrahite—wiser than Heman, Kalkol and Darda, the sons of Mahol. And his fame spread to all the surrounding nations. He spoke three thousand proverbs and his songs numbered a thousand and five... From all nations people came to listen to Solomon's wisdom, sent by all the kings of the world, who had heard of his wisdom."

O'Dowd (2008) suggests the wisdom literature functions to *"show and display theological truths in persuasive, unitary, comforting and provocative ways in order to*

---

[335] Ruffle, 'Amenemope,' *37,*
[336] Proverbs 1:7, 2:5, 9:10, 10:27, 14:27, 15:16, 15:33, 16:6, 19:23; 22:4; 23:17, 31:30, and an injunction to "fear the Lord" occurs in Proverbs 1:29; 3:7; 8:13; and 24:21
[337] Proverbs 1-24
[338] Steinmann, 'Proverbs 1-9,' 666
[339] Proverbs 22:4, 24:21, 23:17
[340] Zimmerli, 'Hope,' 24
[341] D.C. Fredericks, and D.J. Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 64

engage the oral and literary traditions of the ANE and thereby display the superiority of the faith, worldview, and God of the OT over against the religions myths and ideologies of surrounding cultures."[342]

I suggest that through Solomon, Israel participated in an international wisdom dialogue, adopting its literary conventions, in order to advocate the fear of her God as the beginning of wisdom.[343] This communicative act failed, because Solomon ceased operating as the image of God when he turned to idols.[344] This caused dissonance between his words and deeds. However, in the Wisdom literature, Solomon accommodates his readers by incarnating himself in the wisdom conventions of his conversation partners to present the Fear of Yahweh.

This adaptation to the literary conventions of the wisdom medium, to present faith in Yahweh (*logos*) so as to move a global audience to fear him, with an appropriately creative portrayal of his image (*pathos*), and the literary link to Solomon, the image-bearing, wise king of Israel (*ethos*), makes the wisdom literature an example of sublime incarnational communication.

CRUCIFORMITY AS PARADIGMATIC FOR OUR COMMUNICATIVE PRAXIS: PAUL AND CICERO

The Apostle Paul, consciously or otherwise develops on the persuasive communication conventions of his time as he describes Jesus as the ideal Christian orator. While Augustine believed Paul was eloquent, he suggested the idea that he was a trained rhetor was risible.[345] However, I argue in Appendix B, that he is plausibly both trained as a rhetor, and consciously developing on, or plundering, Cicero's *De Oratore* in his correspondence with the church in Corinth. A potential relationship between Paul and Cicero, and Cicero's rhetorical handbooks has found support in the literature,[346] but with

---

[342] R. O'Dowd, 'Creation Imagery,' *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry & Writings*, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2008), 60-63

[343] R.S. Fyall, 'Job and the Canaanite myth,' *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job*, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2002), 194, Wright, *Mission*, 448

[344] 1 Kings 11

[345] Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 4.7.11

[346] J. Patrick, 'Insights from Cicero on Paul's Reasoning in 1 Corinthians 12-14: Love sandwich or five-course meal?' *TB*, 55.1, (2004), 43-64, 63-64, L.L. Welborn, 'Paul's Appeal to the Emotions in 2 Corinthians 1.1-2.13,7.5-16,' *JSNT*, 82, (2001), 21-60, 33-34, 40-45, 57-59, L.L. Welborn, 'The Identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13 with the "Letter of Tears",' *NovT*, 37.2 April (1995), 138-153, 148-149, B.J. Tucker, 'The role of civic identity on the Pauline mission in

little rationale, I attempt to supply an historical reconstruction that accounts for this link in Appendix B. In short, Cicero was a popular governor of Tarsus soon after he completed *De Oratore*.[347] Tarsus, according to Roman historian Strabo was a city characterised by its provision of rhetorical training for citizens who left its shores,[348] and rhetorical training in Tarsus is the best explanation for the account of Paul's ministry in Acts, and his letters.[349]

While there are significant overlaps in content between Corinthians and Cicero's rhetorical handbooks, I am seeking to assess Paul's communication theory and praxis against Cicero's presentation of the ideal orator both in *De Oratore* and in his own life, to demonstrate that while Paul is capable of rhetorical sublimity consistent with Cicero's conventions, he fuses this with the ridiculous, or foolish, message of the cross – deliberately undermining his persuasive power in a presentation of persuasive weakness. I will particularly assess Paul's "Fool's Speech" in 2 Corinthians 10-13 against Cicero's framework, and Paul's cruciform communicative praxis, suggesting that this speech outlines and demonstrates Paul's praxis, and provides the basis for ethical persuasion.

Cicero, as outlined above, embodied the virtues of the Roman Republic to the point of martyrdom.[350] He also reinvigorated and redefined Aristotle's persuasive proofs of ethos, logos, and pathos.[351] Ethos, as embodied virtue and an external rhetorical proof that could be implicitly or explicitly used during a communicative act,[352] was especially important for Cicero,[353] and sets him apart from rhetorical theorists who went before him. In *De Oratore*, Cicero

Corinth,' *Didaskalia*, (Winter 2008), 71-91 86-87, compares Cicero, *De Finibus*, 3.35 to 1 Corinthians 6:5-11.

[347] Cicero, Letters to Atticus, 114.V.21.7, *Letters to Atticus: Volume 3*, (Cambridge, CUP, 1968), 69

[348] Strabo, *The Geography of Strabo*, (London, Harvard University Press, 1924), retrieved online, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Strab.+14.5.13&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0198

[349] C.J. Roetzel, *Paul: The Man and the Myth*, (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1997), 11-16, *pace* W.C Van Unnik, *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth*, Trans. G. Ogg, (London, The Epworth Press, 1962), M. Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul*, (Michigan, SCM Press, 1991), also Patrick, 'Insights,' 48-50, suggests it is likely that Paul is familiar with one of Cicero's rhetorical handbooks. J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996), 50-52

[350] Corbeil, 'Education,' 1380, 1424

[351] Wisse, 'Background,' 385, Anderson, *Theory*, 89

[352] May, *Trials*, 6

[353] Cicero, *De Oratore, II.182-184*, May, *Trials*, 4-5, 'Oratory,' 60, Wisse, 'Background,' 385, Krauss, 'Ethos,' 85

sought to bring wisdom, eloquence, and virtue together for the benefit of the Republic as his answer to the ethical dilemma inherent in persuasive acts.[354]

Cicero's communicative praxis emphasised flexibility – his ideal orator was well educated so that he might read his audience and adapt his speech to their preferred style, serving up their preferred content, and appealing to their collective ethos in order to emotionally move them. His use of pathos was also controlled by ethos.[355]

His ideal orator is autobiographical,[356] so as a *novus homo*, it was virtue, wisdom and eloquence, not birth, which established *dignitas*.[357] Cicero's ideal orator was the ideal statesman,[358] who balanced wisdom with eloquence.[359] He was healthy in body and mind.[360] He carefully displayed his character in life, speech and written rhetoric, because, *"nothing is more difficult than to maintain a propriety of character."*[361] He had a complete classical education to both provide a wide variety of content and imagery, and help him understand the ethos of the audience.[362] He was so competent in the plain, middle, and grand styles he could seamlessly switch between them in a *"free, diffusive, and variegated style."*[363] Such flexibility relied on selecting the best style to inform, please, and move a particular audience with the proofs they required, according to the form of the speech and circumstances.[364] Above all, Cicero's ideal orator was

---

[354] May, 'Rhetorician,' 4503, 4510, 4442, Fantham, *Roman World,* 53-54, Alexander, 'Oratory, Rhetoric, and Politics,' 1816.

[355] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.189-190, Cicero, *Orator,* in *Cicero's Brutus, Or History of Famous Orators: Also His Orator, Or Accomplished Speaker,* Trans. E. Jones, Kindle Edition, 2429, 2431, J. Hall, 'Oratorical Delivery and the Emotions: Theory and Practice,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 4136-4159

[356] May, 'Rhetorician,' 4672

[357] Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.6, May, *Trials,* 49-51, 56-58, Craig, 'Orator,' 4709-4718

[358] Fantham, *Roman World,* 20

[359] Cicero, *De Oratore,* I.115, *De Inventione,* I.1, in Cicero, *De Inventione, The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero,* (London, George Bell and Sons, 1888), Trans. C.D. Yonge, retrieved, http://classicpersuasion.org/pw/cicero/dnvindex.htm, Anderson, *Theory,* 90

[360] Cicero, *The Academic Questions,* in *The Academic Questions, Treatise De Finibus, and Tusculan Disputations, of M.T. Cicero, With a Sketch of the Greek Philosophers Mentioned by Cicero,* Trans. C.D. Yonge, (London, George Bell and Sons, 1875), Kindle Edition, 695-699

[361] Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2.XL, *Orator*, 2085

[362] Cicero, *De Oratore* I.18, I.20, I.48, I.61-67, I.247, II.348-349, May, *Trials*, 2-4, R.N. Gaines, 'Roman Rhetorical Handbooks,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 3219, Fantham, *Roman World,* 21, May, 'Rhetorician,' 4420-4431, 4462

[363] Cicero, *Brutus*, 546

[364] Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.83, *Brutus* 864, *Orator*, 1973, 2078, 2385, Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 358, May, 'Rhetorician,' 4576, J.T. Ramsey, 'Roman Senatorial Oratory,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 2255-2459, J. Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 358, Anderson, *Theory,* 91, T.H. Olbricht, 'The Foundations of the Ethos in Paul

virtuous.[365] His communication praxis was consistent with his moral and ethical philosophy. He thoroughly inhabited the image of the Republic.[366] Cicero used his own image, his embodiment of the empire, and his communicative acts, to argue for Republican values.

"Indeed I would gladly offer my body, if by my death the liberty of the state can be immediately recovered, so that finally the suffering of the Roman People may bring to birth what it has long since labored to produce!" Cicero, *Orationes Philippicae*, 2.118-19[367]

Paul is similarly shaped by the virtuous paradigm of his ideal orator, Jesus, and his political system, the Kingdom of God. His approach to persuasive speech, his communication praxis, and calls for others to imitate the same, is shaped by the self-renouncing act of Jesus on the cross, this can be demonstrated by a comparison between Philippians 2 and 1 Corinthians 9.[368]

"Christ Jesus: Who, being in very nature God… made himself nothing... And being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to death— even death on a cross!... that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow."[369]

Paul adopted the cross as the defining aspect of his communicative praxis, he, like Cicero, embodied his gospel. His incarnational, contextual, self-renouncing flexibility was an embodiment of his message.[370]

"Though I am free and belong to no one, I have made myself a slave to everyone, to win as many as possible… I have become all things to all people so that by all possible means I might save some."[371]

He calls others to do imitate this model:

---

and in the Classical Rhetoricians,' *REMPBD*, (London, T&T Clark, 2005), 138-141, 146, R. Kirchner, 'Elocutio: Latin Prose Style,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition,' 3424
[365] Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.182-184, May, *Trials, 165-167,* Olbricht, 'Ethos,' 147-148
[366] Craig, 'Orator,' 5054
[367] *ibid,* 5050
[368] Philippians 3:17, 1 Corinthians 11:1, Gorman, *Cruciformity,* 186-187, 191
[369] Philippians 2:5-11
[370] Gorman, *Cruciformity,* 191
[371] 1 Corinthians 9:19-23

"…make my joy complete by being like-minded, having the same love, being one in spirit and of one mind… in humility value others above yourselves."[372]

"Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ."[373]

Paul's calls to imitation are linked to his communicative praxis, and to the image of Jesus:

"…the gospel that displays the glory of Christ, who is the image of God. For what we preach is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord… We always carry around in our body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be revealed in our body.[374]

Paul's cruciformity becomes the basis of his defence of criticism of his lack of rhetorical prowess in 2 Corinthians. As for Cicero, Paul's embodiment of his message was not simply a rhetorical strategy; his rhetorical strategy was a product of his service of his kingdom. His renouncing of self is what he believes is the virtuous practice of one who would serve Jesus.[375] While many have argued that Paul eschews oratory in favour of heraldry, or avoids perlocution and limits himself to elocution for the sake of achieving understanding,[376] Paul, in his own words, adapts himself in a manner designed to "win some," and sees himself as an ambassador who carries the death of Jesus in his body as he attempts to persuade people of the truth of his message.[377] 2 Cor 10-13 is Paul's exposition on what it means to be an ambassador of Christ.[378]

Cicero moved concerns about ethos beyond the boundaries of the persuasive outcomes of a speech and into the pursuit of a virtuous life, his concern was

---

[372] Philippians 2:2-4
[373] 1 Corinthians 11:1
[374] 2 Corinthians 4:4-12
[375] Gorman, *Cruciformity*, 191
[376] D. Litfin, 'Swallowing Our Pride: An Essay on the Foolishness of Preaching,' *Preach The Word: Essays on Expository Preaching: In Honor of R. Kent Hughes,* Ed. L. Ryken, T. Wilson, (Wheaton, Crossway, 2007), 110-122
[377] 1 Corinthians 9:18-23, 2 Corinthians 5:11, 5:20, 2 Corinthians 11:30, Gal 6:17, J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology of Second Letter to the Corinthians*, (Cambridge, CUP, 1991), 100, M. Strom, *Reforming Paul: Conversations in Grace & Community*, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2000), 168, Bash, *Ambassadors*, 21, 78
[378] *pace.* Bash, *Ambassadors,* 104-116, 157-158

that students would imitate the right parts of the right people.[379] Paul shares a similar concern, but a conviction that in Jesus he has the right person to imitate, he does not call the church to find myriad orators to mimic, but calls them to pursue the persona of Christ, such that when they speak they speak as his ambassadors, who bear the scars of a life lived in sacrificial devotion to Christ and his message.[380] This is his desire for the Corinthian community (2 Cor 13:5-9). As Olbricht (2005) says:

"Paul does not search out conventional contemporary visions of the ideal person as do Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintillian... In his perception the ideal person is found in Christ, and he, Paul, has attempted to imitate him (1 Cor 11:1)… Paul's vision, therefore, of the ethos of a speaker is not that they project the attributes of the typical ideal contemporary, but that they possess the special attributes found in Christ… The ethos he believed the speaker/writer should manifest therefore, is the fundamental action of Christ in his death and resurrection."[381]

This is at the heart of his contrast with the super-apostles.[382] The ethos and logos of the cross shape the medium, because in preaching, the medium is the person carrying the message as much as the message itself. Paul's message and the events behind it supplies his rhetorical modus operandi, and there is little wonder that in a status-seeking culture like that of 1st century Corinth, his audience are tempted to side with the glorious and impressive super-apostles.[383]

The flexibility in his persuasive communicative acts is not in his ability to change the content of the message, but in how much he, the medium, can become the message of the cross in any context. In this sense, as in Christ, the medium is the message. Image and ethos are the ultimate persuasive truths. Paul's willingness to renounce himself and take up his cross is where his perlocutionary strategy is executed.[384] This means being prepared to humbly put off his formal rhetorical training for the sake of presenting the gospel to

---

[379] Olbricht, 'Ethos,' 150
[380] 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10
[381] Olbricht, 'Ethos,' 150
[382] *ibid* 145-147
[383] *ibid*, 151
[384] Gorman, *Cruciformity*, 191

the Corinthians as he defies their worldly standards,[385] so that the persuasive power of his words rests on the cross, not his impressive skill.[386]

It is his rhetorical weakness that he is called to defend, against the impressive oratorical standards of the Super-Apostles, in the sublime Fool's Speech.[387] When read against Cicero's conception of the ideal orator this speech not only suggests that Paul was familiar with rhetoric, but that he is employing Cicero's framework while embodying the self-renouncing virtues of his king, Jesus to proclaim the good news of the crucifixion. There are necessary differences between Paul's ideal, and Cicero's. While Cicero embodied his own political convictions and draws on this as proof, he would never have envisaged his principles being used to promote a crucified king, or cruciform life. He famously said:

"The very word 'cross' should be far removed, not only from the Roman citizen, but from his thoughts, his eyes and his ears… the mere mention of such a thing is shameful to a Roman citizen and a free man." Cicero, *Pro Rabiro*[388]

Second Corinthians is a response to a specific situation, and Paul's *apologia* in 2 Corinthians 10-13 appears to respond to specific criticism, that:

1. He is timid and unimpressive when present but his letters are bold and weighty (2 Cor 10:1, 10);
2. He comes with no letters of recommendation, and does not commend himself as visiting orators would upon entering a new city (2 Cor 10:12-18);
3. He is inferior to the super-apostles (2 Cor 11:5);

---

[385] *ibid*, 282-283, 1 Corinthians 1-4, See Appendix B.
[386] *ibid*, 282-283
[387] Hester, 'Sublime,' 112
[388] Cicero, *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, 16, retrieved online, http://perseus.uchicago.edu/perseus-cgi/citequery3.pl?dbname=PerseusLatinTexts&query=Cic.%20Rab.%20Perd.&getid=2, S.A. Adams, 'Paul The Roman Citizen: Roman Citizenship in the Ancient World and its importance for understanding Acts 22:22-29,' *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman,* Ed. S.E Porter, (Leiden, Brill, 2008), 315

4. He has been financially duplicitous (2 Cor 12:16-17).[389]

When describing how one might make an argument in response to circumstances like those Paul finds himself in, Cicero believed one's case shouldn't be stated, or narrated, at the outset, but the audience should be engaged,[390] such that the *"precise point at issue must be envisaged."*[391] The winning of love, and securing of the audience's compassion, and emotions, are vital to success, and must be built up to, rather than expected from the outset. Compassion can be secured through descriptions of adversity and one's adversaries. If one has become "unpopular" as a result of harsh words, or personal dislike that arises from slander, this can be addressed by reproof, admonition, a promise that if one is heard out the other will agree, or an *apologia*.[392]

Paul responds to these complaints in a demonstration of his rhetorical prowess. His argument, in 1-9, which is repeated and intensified in 10-13, employs Cicero's rhetorical proofs. He describes his character, makes appeals to his emotions, integrity, and the virtues of the cross, then describes the ethos of his recipients,[393] before turning to an impassioned *apologia*.[394]

He opens his *apologia* with a military description of his rhetorical approach (such metaphors were common in Cicero's speeches), and a warning that he is capable of delivering the impressive presence they believe they want.[395] He favourably compares himself to the super-apostles, and declares himself "not inferior" on two occasions, on the basis of their rhetorical capability, then on the completeness of his apostolic ministry.[396] His ironic self-commendation confirms his "weak" approach is a deliberate decision. In commending himself by "boasting" of his qualifications, he presents as an orator of the second

---

[389] B.W. Winter, *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997), 2002 Edition, 204, F.J. Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians*, (Cambridge, CUP, 2004), 123, 134
[390] Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.326
[391] *ibid,* II.321
[392] Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.XX, *De Oratore,* II.200-214, 326-31, 338-340
[393] 2 Corinthians 1:12-14, 1-2, esp 2:12-17, 3-5, esp 4:7-12, 6:3-10, 7, 9
[394] 2 Corinthians 12:19
[395] *De Oratore,* 1.143, 2 Corinthians 10:4-6, 11 *pace.* B. Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1995), 433
[396] 2 Corinthians 11:5, 12:11-13

sophistic.[397] He counters the superficial persona focused sophistry of super-apostles through a parody of their own spiritual boasts,[398] and describes himself as a composite of popular theatrical "fools,"[399] as he boasts in weakness.[400] This weakness is informed by the content of his message, while the conduct of the super-apostles undermines the Gospel.[401] Weakness Christology is at the heart of Paul's authority and message.[402] Any other gospel is false.[403]

His cruciformity also explains his weak bodily presence, which must surely be a result of carrying the death of Jesus around in his body, and can be explained by his list of sufferings for the gospel.[404] An impressive physique was important for Cicero as he embodied the strength of the Republic,[405] and in the Corinthian second sophistic,[406] but was impossible for one seeking to bear the scars of Jesus as a proof.[407]

While he admits he is an ἰδιώτης,[408] this was not necessarily an admission of incompetence;[409] it is also a technical term relating to one's non-professional status as an orator.[410] Paul happily portrays himself as an amateur because he refuses to participate in the self-aggrandizing form of oratory which will inevitably damage the gospel.[411] Self-promotion is inconsistent with the self-renouncing nature of the gospel, creating a dissonance between ethos and

---

[397] 2 Corinthians 11:1-33, J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 107-115
[398] 2 Corinthians 12:1-6, V.H.T. Nguyen, *Christian Identity in Corinth: A Comparative Study of 2 Corinthians*, (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 145-146, J.W. Barrier, 'Visions of weakness: apocalyptic genre and the identification of Paul's opponents in 2 Corinthians 12:1-6,' *RQ*, 47.1, 2005, 33-42, *pace.* J.B. Hood, 'The temple and the thorn: 2 Corinthians 12 and Paul's heavenly ecclesiology,' *BBR*, 21.3 (2011), 357-370.
[399] L.L. Welborn, 'The Runaway Paul,' *HTR*, 92.2, (1999), 115-163, 137,
[400] C.J. Roetzel, 'The language of war (2 Cor. 10:1-6) and the language of weakness (2 Cor. 11:21b-13:10),' *BI*, 17.1-2 (2009), 77-99, 92-95, Winter, *Philo*, 235, Welborn, 'Runaway,' 156-158
[401] 2 Corinthians 13:4
[402] Winter, *Philo*, 237, D.L. Akin, 'Triumphalism, Suffering, and Spiritual Maturity: An exposition of 2 Corinthians 12:1-10 in its Literal, Theological, and Historical Context,' *CrisTR*, 4.1, (1989), 119-144, 127, Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 122-123
[403] 2 Corinthians 11:4, Akin, 'Triumphalism,' 136
[404] 2 Corinthians 4:10, 11:21-29
[405] Cicero, *De Oratore*, I.342-344, I.115, *Brutus*, 1591-1630
[406] Winter, *Philo*, 222
[407] Nguyen, *Identity*, 148
[408] 2 Corinthians 11:6, P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997), 508-509, C. Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship And Paul's Stance Toward Graeco-Roman Rhetoric*, (London, T&T Clark, 2009), 86
[409] *pace.* Witherington, *Conflict*, 435
[410] Long, *Rhetoric*, 181, Winter, *Philo*, 224.
[411] Mihaila, *Paul-Apollos*, 127, Nguyen, *Identity*, 149, Long, *Rhetoric*, 181, Barnett, *Corinthians*, 510

logos, undermining the communicative act. His response that knowledge is more important than eloquence does not deny his capacity for eloquence, but instead suggests knowledge and plain speech are equally important.[412] This puts him firmly in Cicero's camp.[413]

Paul masterfully and ironically employs the rhetorical model of his opponents within his piece of rhetorical argument in his own style, to mimic and disavow the type of status-seeking rhetoric preferred by his audience.[414] Paul adopts Cicero's own criticism of oratory without virtue, such that it appears his disdain for their rhetoric of the second sophistic is a product of both his rhetorical training, and his theology.[415] In "boasting" of his suffering,[416] Paul puts forward his own model of virtuous rhetoric; the Christian speaker will live their message as they imitate Christ, and preach his gospel.[417]

Paul's rhetorical flexibility, like Cicero's, was constrained by his virtue and his politics. He embodied the message of the cross and its renunciation of status.[418] Paul pursues strength in weakness and the message of the cross; the rhetorical sublime meets the ridiculous "foolish" sublimity of the cross.[419] His plundering and inversion of Cicero's principles of oratory serve to magnify his message. Paul uses the super-apostles as a foil, raising the comparison between their ethos, his ethos, and the ethos of the cross. The cross is the standard of virtue to be applied when assessing all character claims from Christian preachers.[420]

MATCHING THE MEDIUM, MESSAGE, AND METHOD: LUTHER AS A MEDIA MODEL

---

[412] 2 Corinthians 1:13, 4:1-2, 11:6
[413] W. Englert, 'The Philosophy of Cicero,' *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome,* Ed. M. Gagarin, E. Fantham, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010), 139, Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratoum,* III, Cicero, *De Inventione, 1.I,* Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.6
[414] Winter, *Philo,* 204-212, Long, *Ancient Rhetoric,* 216
[415] Gaines, 'Handbooks,' 3195.
[416] 2 Corinthians 11:21-30 2 Corinthians 6:3-10
[417] Winter, *Philo,* 211
[418] Gorman, *Cruciformity,* 191, 1 Corinthians 2:1-5,
[419] *ibid,* 282-283, 1 Corinthians 1:17-2:2,
[420] Olbricht, 'Ethos,' 151, 154

If Paul's connection to Cicero is speculative, Augustine's is explicit, he pursued a career in rhetoric after reading Cicero,[421] and *On Christian Doctrine* while not a manual for rhetoric, draws on Cicero, to depict the ideal Christian teacher.[422] *De Doctrina Christiana* serves as a Christian *De Oratore*.[423]

In *De Doctrina Chrstiana* Augustine presents a framework for Christian communication in an oral culture; his intellectual descendant, Martin Luther provides something of a model for Christian communicators in an early modern multimedia culture. In his biographic eulogy of Luther, Phillip Melancthon describes Luther's formation as involving reading Cicero's works "*not as boys do, picking out the words only, but, as it were, the teaching of human life,*" and his subsequent discovery of Augustine.[424]

Luther's theology of the cross and the priesthood, and his statement "*I was born for my Germans*" are the foundations of his communicative praxis,[425] his communicative acts, as they demonstrate his "irascible nature,"[426] are theologically consistent in that they demonstrate the truth humanity in Christ is *simul iustus et peccator*.[427]

Luther's campaign, though popularly understood as a text-based harnessing of the printing press, was a masterful multi-media campaign designed for the sort of virality that only a serious commitment to a theology of the priesthood of all believers could produce. His texts, produced for the layman, embodied his central argument that any individual had the capacity to interpret the written word, while Catholic responses in the vernacular undermined their position. Catholic apologists also produced pamphlets in Latin – aimed at

---

[421] Augustine, Confessions, Book III, Chapter Four, New Advent Church Fathers, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/110103.htm.
[422] Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 4.1.1, 4.12.27
[423] J.O. Ward, 'Roman Rhetoric and Its Afterlife,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 6325
[424] P. Melancthon, *The history of the life and acts of Luther,* Trans. T. Frazel, (1548), retrieved online, http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/melan/lifec-01.txt, no pages
[425] M. Brecht, *Martin Luther 1521-1532: Shaping and Defining the Reformation,* Trans. J.L. Schaaf, (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1990), Kindle Edition, 341
[426] Melancthon, *Luther*.
[427] M. Luther, *The Disputation Concerning Justification*, LW 34, (Philadelphia, Muhlenberg, 1960), 151-152, 167

people of influence. Luther produced four German texts for every Latin work, the Catholics produced three Latin works for every two German. [428]

Luther's commitment to accommodation is demonstrated in both his emphasis on the vernacular, and his use of a variety of mediums based on a study of not just high culture, but popular culture as well. His approach was incarnational in his commitment, as an educated cleric, to speaking the language of the common man. It is estimated in the first three years of the Reformation, 300,000 of Luther's 30 most popular pamphlets were circulating,[429] and by the tenth year, two million copies of Luther's 400 plus pamphlets were circulating throughout Europe.[430] It is estimated that 6.6 million Reformation pamphlets were circulated in the Reformation period.[431] The Reformation led to a sixfold increase in output from German printers.[432] These *flugschriften*, "flying writings," took a variety of forms, containing prose, poetry, ridicule, dialogue and drama in pictures and text, or open letters.[433] The pamphlet was a medium designed to reach the widest audience possible, as quickly as possible.[434]

The secret to the virality of the Reformation was not simply that these pamphlets called for circulation,[435] or that they were produced for the literate to share orally with bigger groups,[436] but that they invited imitation. From as early as 1518, lay people, clergy, and royalty, published their own pro-reformation fliers.[437] These were often as popular as Luther's.[438] They were produced and circulated rapidly.[439] Many Reformation lay preachers were

---

[428] M.U. Edwards, *Printing, Propaganda, And Martin Luther*, (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1994), 2005 reprint, 7, 11, 58, 75, 81, 40
[429] L.W. Holborn, 'Printing and the Growth of a Protestant Movement in Germany from 1517 to 1524,' *CH*, 123-137, 129-130
[430] P. Smith, *The Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, (Boston, Riverside Press, 1911) 76-77, T. Standage, 'How Luther Went Viral,' *Economist*, 401.8764 (12/17/2011), 93-96,
[431] Edwards, *Printing*, 21
[432] Smith, *Life and Letters*, 75
[433] Edwards, *Printing*, 15, K.A. Strand, 'A Note on Reformation-Era Flugschriften,' *AUSS*, 24 (Summer 1986), 178-180, 179
[434] M.U. Edwards, 'Luther on his Opponents,' *LQ,* 16, (2002), 329-348, 330-331
[435] R.W. Scribner, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany*, (London, Hambledon Press, 1987), 277
[436] Edwards, *Printing,* xi
[437] M.U. Chrisman, *Conflicting Views of Reform: German Lay Propaganda Pamphlets 1519-1530,* (Boston, Humanities Press, 1996), 53, 229, Holborn, 'Printing,' 132
[438] Chrisman, *Views*, 115-116
[439] R.H. Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther,* (New York, Abbington, 1950), 191

printers by trade.[440] Luther's reliance on this medium to spread his message is clear from the care he took in their production. In a letter from Wartburg, in 1521, he bemoans the quality of the printing and typography in a recent batch of pamphlets, *"I cannot say how sorry and disgusted I am with the printing… they print it so poorly, carelessly, and confusedly, to say nothing of bad types and paper. John the printer is always the same old Johnny."*[441]

The Catholics struggled to compete in this conversation,[442] thanks in part to seemingly universal support for the Reformation amongst printers,[443] but also because engaging in the discussion, in the vernacular, served to undermine the theological position Luther was fighting against.

Publishing took the Reformation to the mainstream.[444] But Luther was not restricted by genre, or even medium, producing songs, theatre, and other forms of literature to ensure the gospel reached the masses.[445] Woodcut images, and comic strips were increasingly popular, both with Luther and the public, especially those produced by his friend Cranach.[446]

Luther had long been a student of popular culture, especially music.[447] In an extant letter, sent to his friend Lord Wenzel (1535), Luther requests all the popular German works he could lay his hands on, because he wanted to make German publications that pleased the masses:

"Have some boy collect all the German pictures, rimes, songs, books, lays of the Meistersinger, which have this year been painted, composed, made, and printed by your German poets, publishers, and printers. I have a reason for wanting them. We

---

[440] R.G. Cole, 'Reformation Printers: Unsung Heroes,' *TSCJ,* 15.3 (Autumn, 1984), 327-339, 330, 334-335.
[441] Smith, *Letters*, 124, Cole, 'Printers,' 328
[442] Edwards, 'Opponents,' 334
[443] Cole, 'Printers,' 330-338, Holborn, 'Printing,' 134-136
[444] Edwards, 'Opponents,' 333
[445] R. Kolb, 'Martin Luther: The Man and His Mind,' *R&R*, 8.1 (Winter, 1999), 11-33
24, G.K. Waite, *Reformers on Stage: Popular Drama and Religious Propaganda in the Low Countries*, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2000), 135, M.U Edwards, *Luther's Last Battles: Politics and Polemics 1531-1546*, (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1983), 2005 reprint, 158.
[446] Scribner, *Culture*, 277, C. Weimer, 'Luther and Cranach on Justification in Word and Image,' *LQ,* 18, (2004), 387-405, 397-404.
[447] Smith, *Letters*, 347-350

can make Latin books for ourselves, but we wish to learn how to make German ones, as we have hitherto made none that please anybody." [448]

He used music to spread his reforms, recognising the communicative power of a catchy tune, and the ability for songs to circulate amongst the illiterate. He introduced a German Liturgy, featuring the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, hymn singing, the reading of Scripture and a sermon,[449] and produced two hymnals for use in this context (1524, 1528).[450] His criteria for the translations of the Psalms into Hymns was that their language and idiom was not novel, but comprehensible for the average man.[451] Brecht (1990) suggests that for Luther, *"the gospel does not destroy the arts – meaning secular subjects in the schools – but music should instead be incorporated in the service of God,"*[452] while "poetry and rhetoric could assist in understanding and interpreting the Bible,"[453] culture is gold to be plundered.

His New Testament, a "best-seller,"[454] was the first step towards moving church services into the vernacular, which occurred in 1524.[455] In 1529 he published his *Catechisms*, which were designed to teach Christian doctrine in easy form, as a *"Bible for the laity."*[456] The catechisms were the fruit of Luther's desire to put Protestant theology in the hands and hearts of the people, using the language of the people.[457] They were followed by his German Old Testament, which was published in full in 1532.[458] The complete Bible was available by 1534.[459] He aimed to use the German language spoken *"in the market-place."*[460] His familiarity with peasant, scholarly, and religious forms of the language,[461] and with the written and spoken word,[462] helped him launch a

---

[448] *ibid*, 344-345, Edwards, *Battles*, 158
[449] *ibid*, 230
[450] *ibid*, 231
[451] Brecht, *Luther*, 2203-2205
[452] *ibid*, 2245
[453] *ibid*, 2311
[454] Edwards, *Printing,* 123
[455] Smith, *Letters*, 230
[456] *ibid*, 234-236
[457] J.A. Nestigen, 'Luther's Cultural Translation of the Catechism,' *LQ,* 15, (2001), 440-452, 443, G.G. Krodel, 'Luther's Work on the Catechism in the Context of Late Medieval Catechetical Literature,' *CJ,* (October 1999), 364-404, 372-376.
[458] Smith, *Letters*, 264
[459] M.J. Haemig, 'Luther on Translating the Bible,' *W&W*, 31.3 (Summer 2011), 255-262, 256
[460] Smith, *Letters*, 266, Haemig, 'Translating,' 255-262, M.S Krause, 'Martin Luther's Theory of Bible Translation,' *S-CJ*, 2 (Spring, 1999) 57-73, 60-63
[461] Krause, 'Translation,' 60

new literary style of German.[463] His translation was to the German language what the King James is for English.[464]

Luther's commitment to the vernacular and use of a vast array of mediums is an example of the application of a paradigm of accommodation as incarnation.

He was, for all his cantankerous faults and his self-understanding as something like an arbiter of the true reformed faith, also a model of imperfect cruciformity, which was ultimately also demonstration of his theology *simul Justus et peccator,* and man's total reliance on grace for salvation.[465] This serves to explain, in part, but not excuse problems with Luther's conduct. This conduct did not undermine his message, but rather, demonstrated its necessity.

There are clear examples of the "*peccator*" aspect of Luther's life – from his *Treatise on the Jews*, to his scatological depictions of the papacy, to his vigorous attacks on fellow protestants who questioned his theological positions on the sacraments. Brecht characterises Luther's later writings as a struggle between being willing to be humble for the sake of the gospel, and responding to criticism.[466] Paul's cruciform approach in the Fool's Speech presents a useful corrective to Luther's insistence that he would be humble before his friends but not when doctrinal purity was at stake.[467]

Luther's trial before the Emperor at the *Diet of Worms* is an example of his cruciformity, while the "here I stand" aspect of his speech may be apocryphal, he refused to back down from honouring the Lord of Scripture in the face of persecution, saying *"I am bound by the texts of the Bible, my conscience is captive to the Word of God, I neither can nor will recant anything, since it is neither right nor safe to act against conscience."[468]* In describing his approach to persuasion, Melanchton shows that Luther's praxis is consistent with the ethos driven,

---

[462] Holborn, 'Printing,' 128-129
[463] *ibid*, 128
[464] Nestigen, 'Translation,' 440-441
[465] M. Luther, *The Bondage of the Will, CCEL,* retrieved http://www.ccel.org/ccel/luther/bondage.pdf, 260
[466] Brecht, *Luther*, 5510-5523
[467] *ibid*, 5517
[468] Smith, *Letters*, 115-118, Bainton, *Here I Stand*, 185.

image bearing praxis outlined above: *"His speech seemed born not on his lips, but in his heart. This admiration of his life produced great changes in the minds of his audience, so that as even the Ancients said, His character was, almost, so to speak, the strongest proof."*[469]

OTHER-WAY ASYMMETRICAL COMMUNICATION: DEVELOPING A CRUCIFORM AND INCARNATIONAL COMMUNICATION AND MEDIA PRAXIS

How might theological and historical data be brought together to both answer the ethical dilemma posed at the outset, and provide the framework of a communicative praxis for the church?

If, as Innis and McLuhan suggest, communication and adopting and adapting new mediums is vital for empire building, and the church is an implement in the building of God's kingdom, centred on the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus, then how should Christians communicate? What mediums should the church use? What is sublime Christian communication? Can Christians employ persuasive communication techniques with our global public in an ethical way? Can we provide an answer to Hester's ethical dilemma by speaking of *"the ethics of rhetoric by reference to the communicative act itself"*?

Grunig, like Habermas, and myriad rhetorical theorists through the ages see persuasion as an exercise of power, with little distinction between persuasion and manipulation. Christians must take this dilemma seriously and not simply conform, engaging in a communication paradigm based on the exercise of power.[470] Grunig's two-way symmetrical model for ethical public relations relies on seeing the other party in the communicative act as equal and assumes a *"do unto others"* reciprocity as the norm. Interestingly, when highlighting the problems of two-way symmetrical model, Brown (2003) applied Grunig's

---

[469] Melancthon, *Luther*.
[470] Treier, *Virtue*, 90

system to Paul's ministry, concluding that according to this model Paul *"was less than an ethical communicator."*[471]

Schrag looks to the persuasive act's "directedness to" and connection with "the other" as the basis for ethos becoming the "*arena for moral discourse and action,*"[472] Or, rather, for the communicative act and result to be brought together in an ethical *"fitting response"* to the circumstances that bring two parties together in discourse.[473] He, like Grunig, sees the "other" broken down through something like reciprocity; a common commitment to a *polis* and a model of rhetorical discourse. But how does one, or a group, persuasively communicate to people who share differing views on obligations, or come from a different *polis*?[474] How do the people of the Lord Jesus, citizens of the kingdom of God, communicate to our external public?

I suggest a *via media* that takes Schrag's observations about persuasion and the other, Grunig's models of symmetry and asymmetry, and the incarnational, accommodating and cruciform communicative praxis outlined above to produce a model for promoting the kingdom of God in a manner that is ethical and does not preclude the sublime.

According to Dykstra and Bass (2002), a Christian praxis is "*a way of life that becomes incarnate when human beings live in the light of and in response to God's gift of life…"* and involves "*concrete human acts joined inextricably to substantive convictions about how things really are*" where "*people cooperate with God in addressing the needs of one another and creation.*"[475] Treier (2006) is particularly interested in a Christian communication praxis within the church in its internal communication, he seeks a "*communicative praxis that conforms to Jesus,*"[476] this must also characterise the external communications of people bearing the image of Jesus through union with him, who are called to imitate him.

---

[471] R.E. Brown, 'Paul as a Public Relations Practitioner: a metatheoretical speculation on messianic community and symmetry,' *PRR,* 29, 1-12
[472] Schrag, *Praxis,* 202
[473] *ibid,* 202, 214
[474] Ephesians 2:19
[475] C. Dykstra, & D.C. Bass, 'A Theological Understanding of Christian Practice,' *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in the Christian Life,* Ed. M. Volf, and D.C. Bass, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2002), Kindle Edition, 221-240
[476] Treier, *Virtue,* 97-99

Communication that is truly Christian, that reflects the God who underpins true speech, and who incarnated himself in Christ – his cruciform image – will be marked by these three qualities of the communication praxis of the triune God. They will present the *logos* of God, the crucified Christ, in an incarnational manner – seeking to accommodate the hearer, and they will be cruciform – involving a self-renouncing ethos, shaped by the cross, that leads the communicator to truly forsake power and status for the sake of the hearer. Communicative acts that are truly accommodating and truly cruciform break down the self-other barrier;[477] and, simultaneously, the power dynamic identified as ethically problematic for persuasive communication.[478] There is no human power in renouncing power, but there may well be *persuasion* without power.

I suggest the cruciform and incarnational model, as epitomised by Jesus, involves a deliberate lowering of self, an expectation that one will be required to "take up their cross," "turn the other cheek,"[479] and become *other*, through communicative acts of self-giving love, such that not only is power no longer in play, but the barrier between communicator and receiver is overcome. The communicator becomes "in but not of" the world they communicate to.[480] In Grunig's terminology this is something of an "*other-way asymmetrical*" model where all the power is given to the receiver, while the communicator is metaphorically and literally prepared to take up his or her cross. For Schrag, this model grounds the communicative act in an ethos that might not be shared, but is consistent with the deeds and acts of the communicator. This inverted model, as it imitates Paul's approach to persuasion, removes the objection that Christian communication is about locution, not perlocution,[481] because it removes any perlocutionary power from the hands of the human agent and puts it in the hands of God, and the recipient. In this rhetoric of irony, which fuses the sublime with the ridiculous, the communicator's only means of sublimely and persuasively presenting the gospel of Jesus is through self-emptying communicative acts that are intentionally incarnational and

---

[477] Jasper, 'Aristotle,' 147-148
[478] *ibid,* 135
[479] Matthew 5:39, 16:24, Luke 9:23
[480] John 15:19, 17:6-16, Romans 12:2
[481] *ibid,* 136

cruciform.[482] Communicative acts that lack these qualifications will necessarily involve dissonance between the logos, ethos, and pathos inherent to the gospel message.

In this cruciform incarnational model the communicator becomes the ultimate medium – the communicator's ethos is paramount as it reflects and imitates the ethos of God. The communicator, in incarnating or accommodating, then incarnates his or her self in the communicative act by selecting, or plundering, a form for the communicative act. Innis and McLuhan provide interesting conversation partners when assessing the forms of communication used within our case studies, and within the communicative praxis demonstrated in Scripture. The Biblical account of human communication through redemption history narrates God's communication to people, through people, typically people who are understood to be bearing his image – for example, Moses as he provides the law, Solomon as he provides wisdom, the prophets as they speak against idols and call people back to their image bearing role. The Bible is also the product of a series of communicative acts. From this one can suggest that while the image-imitation-ethos connection operates to establish the virtue of the communicator so that God's people are communicative acts, or mediums, by *being*, the communicative acts of God's people in the production of texts tend to, especially since the supersession of Israel's cultic imagery and its transfer to the people of the church, emphasise mediums that are small in space, and long in time – forms that both will be circulated, and long lasting. Apt forms and genres to carry the *logos* of the gospel message within particular mediums will be those that allow a presentation of the message and communicator that does not force them to conform to conventions that are contrary to the message. The Christian communicator must take the threat of "becoming what they behold" seriously while finding gold to plunder, but is given great creative freedom to find ways to use different mediums to present themselves as cruciform images of Jesus as they share the gospel in communicative acts that glorify God, bringing every thought captive to him.[483] This freedom is not in finding new ways and means to persuade with power,

---

[482] *ibid*, 146, 148-149, 151
[483] 2 Corinthians 10:5

but new ways and means to present the *Via Dolorosa* in self-renouncing cruciform acts; in our weakness he is strong.[484]

Some genres or mediums, like the wisdom literature, are more apt than others for plundering because Christian contributions are a welcome contribution, or response, to an existing conversation.[485] However, the radically different assumptions the Christian communicator brings to the table mean that while truth is communicable through these conversations such communication will not necessarily produce understanding, let alone application.[486]

Both the case studies assessed above, and this *"other-way asymmetrical model,"* have implications for how the Christian approaches those who wield power, including the state. The Wisdom Literature – as a self-renouncing contribution to a conversation first occurring amongst the governing elite, and Paul's self-renouncing determination to persuasively present the message of Jesus up the Roman imperial chain all the way to Caesar, [487] are paradigmatic for Christian engagement with powerful publics. The communication praxis of self-renouncing cruciform incarnation applies in every relational context, from interpreting communicative acts, to communicative acts for an internal audience, to public communicative acts. In the political sphere, or the mainstream media, this will be characterised by a desire to creatively glorify God as his image bearers. Humbly fearing of the Lord, and adopting a position of cruciform, Christ-focused, weakness would seem to preclude Christians from engaging in traditional lobbying processes on the basis of the "power" or size of the Christian constituency, or any form of power, but would lend itself to the church advocating for wise and self-sacrificial "agape" solutions such that the advocacy itself is potentially a sublime communicative act presenting the *logos* of Christ crucified.

Today's Christian lives in exciting times. Even before the rise of the Internet, Marshall McLuhan said: *"Today, thanks to electric information, the speed of communication, satellites, Christianity is available to every human being. For the first*

---

[484] 2 Corinthians 12:9
[485] Treier, *Virtue*, 95
[486] *ibid*, 96
[487] Acts 23-26, S. Kim, *Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2008), 49

time in history, the entire population of the planet can instantly and simultaneously have access to the Christian faith." [488] The Internet transforms the concept of time and space, and democratises publication, especially through social media. The web turns every participant into a publisher, online acts are communicative acts, social media users present an image to a global audience opening up a new platform for cruciform demonstrations of ethos. Luther's multimedia publication campaign is a natural paradigm for modern multimedia presentations of the Christian faith. The priesthood of believers has new opportunities to carry the image of God to new corners of the globe. Conversely, the Internet has the potential to be a new Tower of Babel, a monument to human ingenuity that sets the user up in idolatrous opposition to God, a temple to our own knowledge.

In this, Luther's Reformation communication campaign becomes a paradigmatic of an incarnational approach to a multimedia world. Luther modelled and equipped others to carry the message of Jesus in the vernacular, at the pop culture level, and within the academic and political spheres. Luther's example is also useful in that it demonstrates the dissonance that will occur in all persuasive communication, however cruciform; while the communicator is still in the process of being conformed to the image of Jesus,[489] completely true and sublime speech, made possible by Jesus,[490] will not be possible until the throne room of God when the church gathers, glorified, to sing '*Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God Almighty*."[491]

[488] McLuhan, *Light,* 209
[489] Romans 8:29
[490] Philippians 2:11
[491] Revelation 4:8

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

AUSS - *Andrews University Seminary Studies*
BAS - *Bible And Spade*
BCCOR - *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*
BBR - *Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BI - *Biblical Interpretation*
BS - *Bibliotheca Sacra*
CBQ - *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CCEL – *Christian Classics Ethereal Library*
CH - *Church History*
CJ - *Concordia Journal*
CristTR - *Criswell Theological Review*
CRR – *Companion to Roman Rhetoric*
CUP - *Cambridge University Press*
EPRCM - *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*
GOTR - *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*
HTR - *Harvard Theological Review*
IJST - *International Journal of Systematic Theology*
JANES – *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies*
JASA - *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*
JBL - *Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS - *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JOR – *Journal of Religion*
JORS – *Journal of Ritual Studies*
JRS – *Journal of Religion and Society*
JSJPHRP - *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*
JSNT - *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
LW – *Luther's Works*
LQ - *Lutheran Quarterly*
MT - *Modern Theology*
NLH - *New Literary History*
NovT - *Novum testamentum*
PRR - *Public Relations Review*
REMPBD - *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion: in Biblical Discourse*
R&R - *Reformation and Revival*
RQ - *Restoration Quarterly*
SBL - *Society of Biblical Literature*
S-CJ - *Stone-Campbell Journal*
SJT - *Scottish Journal of Theology*
TB - *Tyndale Bulletin*
TJ - *Trinity Journal*
TSCJ - *The Sixteenth Century Journal*
TT - *Theology Today*
W&W - *Word and World*
WesTJ - *Wesleyan Theological Journa*
WTJ - *Westminster Theological Journal*

ANCIENT TEXTS

Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, Trans. W.R. Roberts (Dover, Dover Thrift, 2004), Kindle Edition

Augustine, Confessions, Book III, Chapter Four, New Advent Church Fathers, retrieved 1 May 2013, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/110103.htm

Augustine, 'Letter 104: Augustine to Nectarius,' in *Augustine: Political Writings*, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought, ed. E.M Atkins, & R.J Dodaro, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Augustine, *The Retractions,* Volumes of the Church, 60, (Washington, Catholic University Press, 1968)

Cicero, *De Oratore,* Trans. H. Rackham, E.W. Sutton, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1942), Electronic Copy, retrieved online, 1 May 2013, http://archive.org/details/cicerodeoratore01ciceuoft

Cicero, *On The Ideal Orator (De Oratore)*, Trans. J.M. May & J. Wisse, (New York, Oxford University Press, 2001)

Cicero, *The Academic Questions, Treatise De Finibus, and Tusculan Disputations, of M.T. Cicero, With a Sketch of the Greek Philosophers Mentioned by Cicero,* Trans. C.D Yonge, (London, George Bell and Sons, 1875), Kindle Edition

Cicero, *Cicero's Brutus, Or History of Famous Orators: Also His Orator, Or Accomplished Speaker,* Trans. E. Jones, Kindle Edition

Cicero, *The Cicero Anthology (Texts From Ancient Rome),* (Bybliotech.org, 2012), Kindle Edition

Cicero, *De Inventione, The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero,* (London, George Bell and Sons, 1888), Trans. C.D. Yonge, retrieved, May 1 2013, http://classicpersuasion.org/pw/cicero/dnvindex.htm

Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratoum*, III, Translated C.D Yonge, retrieved, May 1 2013, http://www.classicpersuasion.org/pw/cicero/cicero-best-style.htm

Cicero, *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo,* 16, retrieved May 1, 2013 http://perseus.uchicago.edu/perseus-cgi/citequery3.pl?dbname=PerseusLatinTexts&query=Cic.%20Rab.%20Perd.&getid=2

Cicero, Letters to Atticus, 114.V.21.7, *Letters to Atticus: Volume 3*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1968)

Demosthenes, *Demosthenes*, Trans. C.A, M.A, and J Vince, (London, Harvard University Press, 1926), retrieved May 1, 2013, online http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0072%3Aspeech%3D12%3Asection%3D5

Strabo, *The Geography of Strabo*, Trans. H.C Hamilton, W. Falconer, (London, Harvard University Press, 1924), retrieved online, May 1, 2013, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Strab.+14.5.13&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0198

Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate,,* Trans. E.W Watson, L. Pullan, retrieved May 1, 2013, New Advent, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/330203.htm

Letter of Aristeas, 226, Trans. R.H. Charles, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913), retrieved May 1, 2013, online, http://www.ccel.org/c/charles/otpseudepig/aristeas.htm

Longinus, *On the Sublime,* 3-4, Trans. H.L Havell, (London, MacMillan, 1890), retrieved May 1, 2013, Project Gutenberg, http://www.gutenberg.org/files/17957/17957-h/17957-h.htm

Tacitus, *Annales*, in *Complete Works of Tacitus,* Trans A.J Church. W.J Brodribb, S. Bryant. (New York, Random House, reprinted 1942), retrieved May 1, 2013, http://perseus.uchicago.edu/perseus-cgi/citequery3.pl?dbname=LatinAugust2012&query=Tac.%20Ann.&getid=1

Tertullian, *Against Praxeas,* Trans, P. Holmes, retrieved May 1, 2013, New Advent, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0317.htm

MODERN TEXTS

S.A. Adams, 'Paul The Roman Citizen: Roman Citizenship in the Ancient World and its importance for understanding Acts 22:22-29,' *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman,* Ed. S.E. Porter, (Leiden, Brill, 2008)

D.L. Akin, 'Triumphalism, Suffering, and Spiritual Maturity: An exposition of 2 Corinthians 12:1-10 in its Literal, Theological, and Historical Context,' *Criswell Theological Review,* 4.1, (1989), 119-144

W.F. Albright, *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, (Leiden, V. T. Stipp, 1960)

M.C. Alexander, 'Oratory, Rhetoric, and Politics in the Republic,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

R.D. Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, (Leuven, Peeters, 1998)

F.I. Andersen, *Job: An Introduction and Commentary*, (Leicester, IVP, 1974)

V. Arena, 'Roman Oratorical Invective,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

R.H. Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther,* (New York, Abbington, 1950)

J. Balserek, *Divinity Compromised: A study of Divine Accommodation in the thought of John Calvin,* (Doerdrecht, Springer, 2006)

J.W. Barrier, 'Visions of weakness: apocalyptic genre and the identification of Paul's opponents in 2 Corinthians 12:1-6,' *Restoration Quarterly*, 47.1, 2005, 33-42

P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, New International Commentary on the New Testament, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997)

J. Barton, 'History and Rhetoric in the Prophets,' *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*, Ed. M. Warner, (London, Routledge, 1990)

A. Bartor, *Reading Law as Narrative* (Atlanta, SBL, 2010)

A. Bash, *Ambassadors for Christ: an exploration of ambassadorial language in the New Testament,* (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1997)

G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2004)

P. Beaulieu, 'The Social and Intellectual Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature,' *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed R.J. Clifford, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series No 36, (Atlanta, SBL, 2006)

B.D. Bibb, 'Nadab and Abihu Attempt to Fill a Gap: Law and Narrative in Leviticus 10.1-7,' *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament,* 96 (2001), 83-99

M.F. Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period,* (Peabody, Hendrickson, 2010)

P.A. Bird, 'Male and Female He Created Them: Genesis 1:27b in the Context of the Priestly Account of Creation,' *I Studied Inscriptions From Before The Flood: Ancient Near Eastern Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11,* ed. R.S. Hess and D.T. Tsumura, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study, Volume 4, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1994)

J. Blenkinsopp, *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

D.J. Bosch, *Believing in the Future: Toward a Missiology of Western Culture,* (Valley Forge, Trinity Press International, 1995)

D.J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, (Maryknoll, Orbis Books, 1991)

M. Brecht, *Martin Luther 1521-1532: Shaping and Defining the Reformation,* Trans. J.L. Schaaf, (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1990), Kindle Edition

R.E. Brown, 'Paul as a public relations practitioner: a metatheoretical speculation on messianic community and symmetry,' *Public Relations Review,* 29, 1-12

F.F. Bruce, "The Wisdom Literature of the Bible: Introduction," *The Bible Student*, 22.1 (Jan. 1951), 5-8

W. Brueggemann, *Solomon: Israel's ironic icon of human achievement,* (Columbia, University of Southern Carolina Press, 2005)

W. Brueggemann, *Genesis*, Interpretation Commentary, (Atlanta, John Knox Press, 1982)

W. Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy,* (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1997)

S. Bunta, 'The Likeness Of The Image: Adamic Motifs And צלם Anthropoly In Rabbinic Traditions About Jacob's Image Enthroned In Heaven,' *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 37.1 (2006), 55-84

D. Burdett, 'Wisdom Literature and the Promise Doctrine,' *Trinity Journal* 3 (Spring 1974), 1-13

J.P. Burnside, *God, Justice, and Society: Aspects of Law and Legality in the Bible*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011)

J. Calvin, 'The Argument,' *Commentary on Genesis, Volume 1*, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, retrieved, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/comment3/comm_vol01/htm/TOC.htm no pages

R.W. Cape, Jr., 'Cicero's Consular Speeches,' in *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, Ed. J.M. May (Leiden, Brill, 2002)

E.A. Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*, (Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 1991)

M.U. Chrisman, *Conflicting Views of Reform: German Lay Propaganda Pamphlets 1519-1530,* (Boston, Humanities Press, 1996)

C.G. Christians, 'McLuhan and the Communication of the Gospel,' *The Reformed Journal,* 23.6, (July-August, 1973), 10-12

A.D. Clarke, *Secular & Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical & Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 6*, (Leiden, Brill, 1993)

R.G. Cole, 'Reformation Printers: Unsung Heroes,' *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* 15.3 (Autumn, 1984), 327-339

R.E. Clements, *Wisdom in Theology*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992), 2002 Edition

R.E. Clements, 'Wisdom and Old Testament Theology,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed J. Day, R.P Gordon, & H.G.M Williamson, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995)

R.J. Clifford, *The Wisdom Literature*, (Nashville, Abington Press, 1998)

D.J.A. Clines, 'The Image of God in Man,' *Tyndale Bulletin,* 19, (1968), 53-103

J. Connolly, 'Virile Tongues: Rhetoric and Masculinity,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

A. Corbeill, 'Ciceronian Invective,' in *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, ed. J.M. May (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 198-199

A. Corbeill, 'Rhetorical Education and Social Reproduction in the Republic and Early Empire,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010)

C.P. Craig, 'Cicero as Orator,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

J.L. Crenshaw, *Ecclesiastes: A Commentary,* (Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1987)

J.L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction,* (Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 1981), 2010 Edition

J. Day, 'Foreign Semitic influence on the wisdom of Israel and its appropriation in the book of Proverbs,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed. J. Day, R.P. Gordon, & H.G.M. Williamson, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995)

K.J. Dell, *The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature,* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1991)

M.B. Dick, 'Prophetic Parodies of Making the Cult Image,' *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of Cult Image in the Ancient Near East*, Ed. M.B. Dick, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1999)

M.B. Dick, 'Prophetic Poiesis and the Verbal Icon,' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* 46.2 (Ap 1984), 226-246

J.P. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and the Pauline Communities*, (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2003)

W.J. Dumbrell, *The Faith of Israel*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 2nd Edition

J. Dugan, 'Modern Critical Approaches to Roman Rhetoric,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), kindle edition

C. Dykstra, & D.C. Bass, 'A Theological Understanding of Christian Practice,' *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in the Christian Life,* Ed. M. Volf, and D.C. Bass, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2002), Kindle Edition

S. Edmonson, 'Christ And History: Hermeneutical Convergence In Calvin And Its Challenge To Biblical Theology,' *Modern Theology* 21.1, (January, 2005), 3-35

M.U. Edwards, 'Luther on his Opponents,' *Lutheran Quarterly,* 16, (2002), 329-348

M.U. Edwards, *Luther's Last Battles: Politics and Polemics 1531-1546*, (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1983)

M.U. Edwards, *Printing, Propaganda, And Martin Luther*, (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1994), 2005 reprint

W.P. Ehling, J. White, & J.E. Grunig, 'Public Relations and Marketing Practices,' *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, (New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992)

W. Englert, 'The Philosophy of Cicero,' *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome,* Ed. M. Gagarin, E. Fantham, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010)

P. Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2005)

C.A. Evans, 'Paul and the Pagans,' *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman,* Ed. S.E. Porter, (Leiden, Brill, 2008)

E. Fantham, *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004)

C.L. Feinberg, 'The Image of God,' *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 129, (1972), 235-246

B. Fiore, 'Paul, Exemplification and Imitation,' *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook,* ed. J.P. Sampley, (Harrisburg, Trinity, 2003)

C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, 'The Worship Of Divine Humanity As God's Image And The Worship Of Jesus,' *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus,* ed. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis, (Leidin, Brill, 1999)

M.V. Fox, 'World Order and Ma'at: a crooked parallel,' *JANES* 23, 1995, 37-48

D.C. Fredericks, and D.J. Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010)

T.A. Fudge, 'Saints, sinners, and stupid asses: the place of faith in Luther's doctrine of salvation,' *Communio viatorum* 50 no 3 2008, 231-256

R.N. Gaines, 'Roman Rhetorical Handbooks,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

D.E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2003)

M.D. Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric: Ambiguity, Cunning and Deception in Greece and Rome*, (Harrisburg, Trinity International, 2001)

M.J. Gorman, *Cruciformity: Paul's Narrative Spirituality of the Cross*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2001)

M.J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2009)

D. Green, 'Loss of Humanity, QTC August Lectures - True Humanity,' Lecture 2 of 3 (St. Lucia, Queensland Theological College, 2010)

E.L. Greenstein, 'Sages With a Sense of Humor: The Babylonian Dialogue Between a Master and His Servant and the Book of Qohelet,' *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed Clifford, R.J, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series No 36, (Atlanta, SBL, 2006)

S.J. Grenz, *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei*, (Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 2001)

J.E. Grunig, J. White, 'The Effect of Worldviews On Public Relations Theory and Practice,' *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, Ed. J.E Grunig (New York, Routledge, 2002)

J.E. Grunig, 'Communication, Public Relations and Effective Communications: An Overview of the Book,' *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, Ed. J.E Grunig (New York, Routledge, 2002)

J.E. & L.A. Grunig, 'Models of Public Relations and Communications,' *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, (New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992)

C.E Gunton, *The One, The Three, and the Many: God, Creation, and the Culture of Modernity*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993)

C.E. Gunton, *The Christian Faith: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine*, (Oxford, Blackwell, 2002)

M.J. Haemig, 'Luther on Translating the Bible,' *Word and World,* 31.3 (Summer 2011), 255-262

J. Hall, 'Oratorical Delivery and the Emotions: Theory and Practice,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition,

J.M. Hamilton, *God's Glory in Salvation Through Judgment: A Biblical Theology,* (Wheaton, Crossway, 2010), Kindle Edition

V.P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1990)

J. Harrison, 'Paul's House Churches and the Cultic Associations', *The Reformed Theological Review,* 58.1, (April 1999), 31-47

D.B. Hart, *The Beauty of the Infinite: The Aesthetics of Christian Truth,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2003)

M.J. Haemig, 'Luther on Translating the Bible,' *Word and World,* 31.3 (Summer 2011), 255-262

K.W. Hector, 'God's Triunity and Self-Determination: A conversation with Karl Barth, Bruce McCormack, and Paul Molnar,' *International Journal of Systematic Theology,* 7.3, (July 2005), 246-261

I. Henderson, 'The Second Sophistic and Non Elite Speakers,' *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and its Times,* ed. T. Schmidt and P. Fleury, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2011)

M. Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul*, (Michigan, SCM Press, 1991)

J.D. Hester, 'The Wuellnerian Sublime: Rhetorics, Power, and the Ethics of Commun(icat)ion,' *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion: in Biblical Discourse,* Emory Studies in Early Christianity, ed. T.H. Olbricht, & A. Eriksson, (London, T&T Clark, 2005)

J.B. Hood, 'The temple and the thorn: 2 Corinthians 12 and Paul's heavenly ecclesiology,' *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, 21.3 (2011), 357-370

L.W. Holborn, 'Printing and the Growth of a Protestant Movement in Germany from 1517 to 1524,' *Church History*, 123-137

D.G. Horrell, and E. Adams, *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*, (Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2004)

D.A. Hubbard, 'The Wisdom Movement and Israel's Covenant Faith,' *Tyndale Bulletin*, 17 (1966), 3-33

A.J. Hultgren, 'Luther on Galatians,' *Word and World*, 20.3, (Summer 2000), 232-238

V.A. Hurowitz, 'The Wisdom of Supe-Ameli,' *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed R.J Clifford, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series No 36, (Atlanta, SBL, 2006),

C. Hyers, 'The Narrative Form of Genesis One, Cosmogenic, Yes; Scientific, No,' *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 36.4 (1984) 208-15

H.A. Innis, *Empire and Communications,* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1950)

D. Jasper, 'In the Sermon Which I Have Just Completed, Wherever I Said Aristotle, I Meant Saint Paul,' *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*, Ed. M. Warner, (London, Routledge, 1990)

D.L. Jeffery, 'The Pearl of Great Wisdom: The Deep and Abiding Biblical Roots of Western Liberal Education,' *Touchstone,* October 2007, 25-30

M.A. Jennings, 'Patronage and Rebuke in Paul's Persuasion in 2 Corinthians 8-9,' *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism,* 6.5, (2009), 107-127

E.A. Judge, 'The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century,' *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century. Pivotal essays by E.A. Judge,* ed. D.M. Scholer, (Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2008)

E.A. Judge, *The social pattern of the Christian groups in the first century: some prolegomena to the study of New Testament ideas of social obligation,* (London, Tyndale Press, 1960)

O. Kaiser, 'Qoheleth,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed J. Day, R.P. Gordon, H.G.M. Williamson, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995)

W.C. Kaiser, *Toward an Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978)

W.C. Kaiser, *Ecclesiastes: Total Life,* (Chicago, Moody Press, 1979)

W.C. Kaiser, 'True Marital Love in Proverbs 5:15-23,' *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K Waltke*, ed J.I. Packer and S.K. Soderlund, (Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing, 2000)

W.C. Kaiser, *Missions in the Old Testament: Israel as a Light to the Nations*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000)

D.J. Kapust, 'Acting the Princely Style: Ethos and Pathos in Cicero's On the Ideal Orator and Machiavelli's The Prince,' *Political Studies,* 58, (2010), 590-608

D. Kidner, *Wisdom to Live By* (Leicester, IVP, 1985)

D. Kidner, *The Wisdom of Proverbs, Job & Ecclesiastes,* (Leicester, IVP-Academic, 1985)

S. Kim, 'Imitatio Christi (1 Corinthians 11:1): How Paul Imitates Jesus Christ in Dealing with Idol Food (1 Corinthians 8-10), *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, 13.2 (2003) 193-226

S. Kim, *Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2008)

R. Kirchner, 'Elocutio: Latin Prose Style,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

K.A. Kitchen, 'Proverbs and Wisdom Books of the Ancient Near East: The Factual History of a Literary Form,' *Tyndale Bulletin,* 28, (1977), 69-114

R. Kolb, 'Martin Luther: The Man and His Mind,' *Reformation and Revival: A Quarterly Journal for Christian Leadership*, Vol 8, 1 (Winter, 1999), 11-33

A.J. Kostenberger, 'John's Trinitarian Mission Theology,' *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*, 9/4 (Winter 2005), 14-33

M. Kraus, 'Ethos as a Technical Means of Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory,' *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion: in Biblical Discourse*, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, ed. T.H. Olbricht, & A. Eriksson, (London, T&T Clark, 2005)

M.S. Krause, 'Martin Luther's Theory of Bible Translation,' *Stone-Campbell Journal,* 2 (Spring, 1999) 57-73

G.G. Krodel, 'Luther's Work on the Catechism in the Context of Late Medieval Catechetical Literature,' *Concordia Journal,* October (1999), 364-404

C.G. Kruse, 'The Relationship between the Opposition to Paul Reflected in 2 Corinthians 1-7 and 10-13,' *Evangelical Quarterly*, 61.3, (1989), 195-202

J.F. Kutsko, *Between Heaven And Earth: Divine Presence and Absence In The Book of Ezekiel*, Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, Vol 7. Ed. W.H. Propp, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2000)

A. Lemaire, 'Wisdom in Solomonic Historiography,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed J. Day, R.P. Gordon, H.G.M. Williamson, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995),

J.D. Leveson, 'The Temple and the World,' *The Journal of Religion,* 64.3, (1984), 275-298

D. Litfin, 'Swallowing Our Pride: An Essay on the Foolishness of Preaching,' *Preach The Word: Essays on Expository Preaching: In Honor of R. Kent Hughes,* Ed. L. Ryken, T. Wilson, (Wheaton, Crossway, 2007)

F.J. Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians,* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004)

T. Longman III, *How To Read Proverbs,* (Downers Grove, IVP Academic, 2002)

J.F. Lopez, 'Quintilian as Rhetorician and Teacher,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

E. Lucas, *Proverbs: The Act-Consequence Nexus,* forthcoming.

M. Luther, *On The Creation: A Critical and Devotional Commentary on Genesis,* Trans. H.Cole, Ed. J.N Lenker, (Minneapolis, Luther in All the Lands, 1904)

M. Luther, *The Disputation Concerning Justification,* Luthers Works Vol 34, (Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1960)

M. Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio "On the Enslaved Will" or The Bondage of the Will,* (Grand Rapids, Christian Classics Ethereal Library), retrieved online, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/luther/bondage.pdf

M. MacDonald, 'Empire and Communication: the Media Wars of Marshall McLuhan,' *Media, Culture, and Society,* 28.4, 505-520

P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians,* (Tubingen, Mohrs Siebeck, 1987)

V.H. Matthews & D.C. Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East,* (New Jersey, Paulist Press, 2006)

J.M. May, *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric,* ed. by J.M. May (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2002)

J.M. May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

J.M. May, *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos,* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1988)

B.L. McCormack, 'Let's speak plainly: a response to Paul Molnar,' *Theology Today,* 67.1 (Ap 2010), 57-65

B.L. McCormack, 'For Us and Our Salvation : Incarnation and Atonement in the Reformed Tradition,' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review,* 43, 1.4, (Spr-Wint 1998), 281-316

B.L. McCormack, 'Karl Barth in Conversation with Open Theism,' *Engaging the Doctrine of God: Contemporary Protestant Perspectives,* ed. B.L McCormack, (Grand Rapids, Rutherford House, 2008)

B.L. McCormack, 'Why should theology be Christocentric? Christology and metaphysics in Paul Tillich and Karl Barth,' *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 45 no 1 Spr 2010, 42-80

B.L. McCormack, 'Revelation and History in Transfoundationalist Perspective: Karl Barth's Theological Epistemology in Conversation with a Schleiermacherian Tradition,' *Journal of Religion*, 78.1, (Jan 98), 18-37

S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period,* (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1991)

M. McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man,* (Cambridge, MIT Press, 1994) First edition 1964

M. McLuhan, *The Medium and the Light*: *Reflections on Religion,* (Oregan, Wipf and Stock, 2010)

M. McLuhan 'Roles, Masks, and Performances,' *New Literary History*, 2.3, Performances in Drama, the Arts, and Society (Spring, 1971), 517-531, retrieved http://www.mcluhanonmaui.com/2011/06/roles-masks-and-performances-by.html, no pages

C. McNelis, 'Grammarians and Rhetoricians,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

J. McWilliam, *'Cassiciacum Dialogues' Augustine Through The Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. Fitzgerald & J.C. Cavadini, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999)

E.H. Merrill, 'Covenant And The Kingdom: Genesis 1-3 As Foundation For Biblical Theology,' *Criswell Theological Review* 1.2 (1987) 295-308

P. Melancthon, *The history of the life and acts of Luther,* Trans. T Frazel, (1548), retrieved online 31 May, 2012, http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/melan/lifec-01.txt

J.R. Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids, Brazos Press, 2005)

C. Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship And Paul's Stance Toward Graeco-Roman Rhetoric*, (London, T&T Clark, 2009)

A. Millard, 'In Praise of Ancient Scribes,' *Bible And Spade,* 2 (Spring-Summer-Autumn 1982), 33-46

J.M. Miller, 'In the "Image" and "Likeness" of God,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91.3 (S 1972), 289-304

P.D. Molnar, 'God's Self-Communication in Christ: A Comparison of Thomas F. Torrance and Karl Rahner,' *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 50.3, (August 1997), 288-320

P.D. Molnar, 'The Eucharist and the Mind of Christ,' *Trinitarian Soundings in Systematic Theology,* Ed. P.L Metzger, (T&T Clark, London, 2005)

P.D. Molnar, *Divine Freedom and the Doctrine of the Immanent Trinity,* (T&T Clark, London, 2002)

J. Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit: A Contribution to Messianic Ecclesiology*, (London, SCM Press, 1977)

Y.B. Moon, 'God as a Communicative System *Sui Generis*: Beyond the Psychic, Social, Process Models of the Trinity,' *Zygon*, 45.1, (March 2010), 105-126

S.K. Moroney, *The Noetic Effects of Sin: A Historical and Contemporary Exploration of How Sin Effects Our Thinking*, (Lanham, Lexington Books, 2000)

W.S. Morrow, *Protest Against God: The Eclipse of a Biblical Tradition,* (Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2007)

J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996)

J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology of Second Letter to the Corinthians*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991)

J. Murphy O'Connor, *St Paul's Corinth: Text and Archaeology,* (Wilmington, M. Glazier Liturgical Press, 1983), 2002 reprint

J.A. Nestigen, 'Luther's Cultural Translation of the Catechism,' *Lutheran Quarterly,* 15, (2001), 440-452

V.H.T. Nguyen, *Christian Identity in Corinth: A Comparative Study of 2 Corinthians,* (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2008)

J.J. O'Donnell, 'De Doctrina Christiana,' *Augustine Through The Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. Fitzgerald & J.C. Cavadini, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999)

O. O'Donovan and J.L. O'Donovan, *Bonds of Imperfection: Christian Politics, Past and Present*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2004), Kindle Edition

T.H. Olbricht, 'The Foundations of the Ethos in Paul and in the Classical Rhetoricians,' *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion: in Biblical Discourse*, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, ed. T.H. Olbricht, & A. Eriksson, (London, T&T Clark, 2005)

W. Pannenberg, *Toward a Theology of Nature: Essays on Science and Faith* (Louisville, WJKP, 1993)

J. Patrick, 'Insights from Cicero on Paul's Reasoning in 1 Corinthians 12-14: Love sandwich or five course meal?' *Tyndale Bulletin,* 55.1, (2004), 43-64

L. Poland, 'The Bible and the Rhetorical Sublime,' *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*, Ed. M. Warner, (Routledge, London, 1990)

S.E. Porter, 'Did Paul Speak Latin,' *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman,* Ed. S.E Porter, (Leiden, Brill, 2008)

V.S. Poythress, 'Divine Meaning of Scripture,' *Westminster Theological Journal,* 48, (1986), 241-279

S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984)

J.T. Ramsey, 'Roman Senatorial Oratory,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

J. Cardinal. Ratzinger, *Introduction To Christianity*, English Translation by Burns and Oates Ltd, (Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1969, 2000 edition)

J.S. Reitman, 'God's "Eye" for the *Imago Dei*: Wise Advocacy Amid Disillusionment in Job and Ecclesiastes,' *Trinity Journal,* 31NS, (2010), 115-134

H. Ringgren, 'Israel's Place Among The Religions of the Ancient Near East,' *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel,* (Leiden, Brill, 1972)

C.J. Roetzel, 'The language of war (2 Cor. 10:1-6) and the language of weakness (2 Cor. 11:21b-13:10),' *Biblical Interpretation*, 17 no 1-2 2009, 77-99

C.J. Roetzel, *Paul: The Man and the Myth,* (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1997)
J. Ruffle, 'The Teaching of Amenemope and Its Connection With the Book of Proverbs,' *Tyndale Bulletin* 28, (1977), 29-68

S.H. Rutledge, 'Oratory and Politics in the Empire,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

J.H. Sailhamer, 'The Mosaic Law and the Theology of the Pentateuch,' *Westminster Theological Journal*, 53, (1991), 241-261

C.O. Schrag, *Communicative Praxis and the Space of Subjectivity*, (West Lafayette, Purdue University Press, 2003)

R.M. Schuchardt, 'The Medium is the Messiah: McLuhan's Religion and its Relationship to his Media Theory,' *Renascence*, 64.1 (Fall 2011), 43-53

C.H.H. Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An integrated approach to Biblical Theology,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2003)

R.W. Scribner, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany*, (London, Hambledon Press, 1987)

A.G. Shead, 'Reading Ecclesiastes 'Epilogically'' Tyndale Bulletin 48.1 (1997) 67-91.

M.A. Shields, *The End of Wisdom: A reappraisal of the historical and canonical function of Ecclesiastes,* (Warsaw, Eisenbrauns, 2006)

R.A. Simkins, 'Visual Ambiguity in the Biblical Tradition,' *Religion and the Visual*: *Journal* of *Religion and Society Supplement*, Supplement 8 (2012), 27-39

A. Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom*, (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2005)

P. Smith, *The Life and Letters of Martin Luther,* (Boston, Riverside Press, 1911)

T. Standage, 'How Luther Went Viral,' *Economist*, 12/17/2011, Vol. 401 Issue 8764, 93-96

D. Starling, *Not My People: Gentiles as exiles in Pauline Hermeneutics*, (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2011)

A.E. Steinmann, 'Proverbs 1-9 as A Solomonic Composition,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 43.4 (December 2000), 659-674

K.A. Strand, "A Note on Reformation-Era Flugschriften." Andrews University Seminary Studies, 24 (Summer 1986), 178- 180

M. Strom, *Reforming Paul: Conversations in Grace & Community,* (Downers Grove, IVP, 2000)

D.J. Treier, *Virtue and the Voice of God: Towards Theology as Wisdom*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2006)

B.J. Tucker, 'The role of civic identity on the Pauline mission in Corinth,' *Didaskalia*, Winter 2008, 71-91

K.J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge,* (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1998), Kindle Edition

W.C. Van Unnik, *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth*, Trans. G. Ogg, (London, The Epworth Press, 1962)

G. Von Rad, 'Job 38 and Egyptian Wisdom,' *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, (London, Oliver and Boyd, 1965)

G.K. Waite, *Reformers on Stage: Popular Drama and Religious Propaganda in the Low Countries*, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2000)

C. Walker & M.B Dick, 'The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Mesopotamian mis pi Ritual,' *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of Cult Image in the Ancient Near East*, Ed. M.B. Dick, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1999)

R.Wallace, and W. Williams, *The Three Worlds of Paul of Tarsus,* (London, Routledge, 1998)

B.K. Waltke, 'The Book of Proverbs and Ancient Wisdom Literature,' *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136 (July-Sept. 1979), 211-238

J.H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible,* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000)

J.H. Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2009), Kindle Edition

J.O. Ward, 'Roman Rhetoric and Its Afterlife,' *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) by W. Dominik & J. Hall, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition

J.W. Watts, 'Story, List, Sanction: A Cross Cultural Strategy of Ancient Persuasion,' *Rhetoric Before and Beyond the Greeks,* ed. C. Lipson and R. Binkley (Albany, SUNY Press, 204)

J.W. Watts, "Ritual Rhetoric in Ancient Near Eastern Texts," in *Ancient Non-Greek Rhetorics*, ed. C. Lipson and R. Binckley, (West Lafayette, Parlor Press, 2009)

C. Weimer, 'Luther and Cranach on Justification in Word and Image,' *Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol 18, (2004), 387-405

L.L. Welborn, *An End to Enmity: Paul and the Wrongdoer of Second Corinthians*, (Berlin, Walter De Gruyter, 2011)

L.L. Welborn, 'Paul's Caricature of His Chief Rival as a Pompous Parasite in 2 Corinthians 11.20,' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament,* 32.1 (2009), 39-56

L.L. Welborn, 'The Runaway Paul,' *Harvard Theological Review*, 92.2, (1999), 115-163

L.L. Welborn, 'Paul's Appeal to the Emotions in 2 Corinthians 1.1-2.13,7.5-16,' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 82, (2001), 21-60

L.L. Welborn, 'The Identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13 with the "Letter of Tears",' *Novum testamentum*, 37.2 April (1995), 138-153

L.L Welborn, 'On the Discord in Corinth, 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Ancient Politics,' *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 106.1, (1987), 85-111

G.J. Wenham, 'Law and the Legal System in the Old Testament,' *Law, Morality and the Bible*, edited by B. Kaye and G. Wenham (InterVarsity Press: Downers Grove, 1978), retrieved, http://www.the-highway.com/law2a_Wenham.html, no pages

G.J. Wenham, 'Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,' *I Studied Inscriptions From Before The Flood: Ancient Near Eastern Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11,* ed. R.S. Hess and D.T. Tsumura, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study, Volume 4, (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1994)

N. Whybray, *Wisdom In Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9*, (London, SCM Press, 1965)

N. Whybray, 'Two Jewish Theologies: Job and Ecclesiastes.' *Wisdom: The Collected Works of Norman Whybray*, ed. R.N Whybray, K.J. Dell, M. Barker, (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005)

N. Whybray, 'Thoughts on the Composition of Proverbs 10-29,' *Wisdom: The Collected Works of Norman Whybray*, ed. R.N Whybray, K.J. Dell, M. Barker, (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005)

N. Whybray, 'The Social World of the Wisdom Writers,' *Wisdom: The Collected Works of Norman Whybray*, ed. R.N Whybray, K.J. Dell, M. Barker, (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2005)

J.G. Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs* (Sheffield, Almond, 1981)

R. Williams, *On Christian Theology*, (Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2000)

L. Wilson, 'The Book of Job and the Fear of God,' *Tyndale Bulletin* 46.1 (1995) 59-79

B.W. Winter, 'On Introducing New Gods To Athens: An Alternative Reading of Acts 17:18-20,' Tyndale Bulletin, 47.1 (1996), 71-90

B.W. Winter, *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997), 2002 Edition

B.W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2001)

B.W. Winter, 'Official Proceedings and the Forensic Speeches in Acts 24-26,' *The Book Of Acts In Its First Century Setting: Volume 1: Ancient Literary Setting,* ed. B.W Winter, A.D Clarke, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1993), 305-336

J. Wisse, 'The Intellectual Background of Cicero's Rhetorical Works,' in *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric,* ed. J.M. May (Leiden, Brill, 2002)

B. Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1995)

C.J.H. Wright, *The Mission of God*, (Nottingham, IVP, 2006)

G.E. Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment,* Studies in Biblical Theology, (London: SCM Press, 1950)

W. Zimmerli, 'Expressions of Hope in Proverbs and The Book of Job,' *Man and His Hope in the Old Testament*, Studies in Biblical Theology, (London, SCM Press, 1971)

T. Ziolkowski, 'Literature and Law,' *Sewanee Review* 99.1 (1991), 122-132

APPENDIX A

THE WISDOM LITERATURE & THE PROPHETS ISAIAH AND EZEKIEL: SUBLIME COMMUNICATION AND ISRAEL'S MISSION TO THE NATIONS

The Wisdom Literature exhibits clear parallels to the wisdom literature of the Ancient Near East – it shares genre conventions, tropes and images, theology, function, and in several cases content, with other extant wisdom literature. The Wisdom Literature has been devalued by Biblical scholars because of the extent of this overlap, and because it contains no immediately obvious link to "redemption history."[492] I will argue that if the Bible's Wisdom Literature is treated as a communicative act within redemption history, that calls its readers fear Yahweh, and provides suitable apologetic material for Israel should she function ideally as a priestly nation of divine image bearers.

THE COMMUNICATOR AND AUDIENCE: CANONICAL, HISTORICAL, AND LITERARY SETTING

Kings played a role in the international wisdom scene,[493] and Solomon plays a role – historically or literarily – in Israelite wisdom. Some scholars suggest Solomon's authorship of Proverbs, and implied authorship of Ecclesiastes, is simply a literary fiction,[494] in part because the account of his reign (1 Kings 3-11), which firmly establishes wisdom as a defining theme of Solomon's reign,[495] is comparable to ANE historiographic royal propaganda.[496] However, even if the authorial claim is fictional, and the account of Solomon's reign is fictional, the canonical form of the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes (Proverbs 1:1-7,

---

[492] W. Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy,* (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1997), 334, R.E. Clements, 'Wisdom and Old Testament Theology,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed J. Day, R.P. Gordon, & H.G.M. Williamson, (Cambridge, CUP, 1995), 271, also R.E. Clements, *Wisdom in Theology,* (Carlisle, Paternoster, 1992), 2002 Edition, 20-22, D.A. Hubbard, 'The Wisdom Movement and Israel's Covenant Faith,' *Tyndale Bulletin,* 17 (1966), 3-33,

[493] D. Burdett, 'Wisdom Literature and the Promise Doctrine,' *Trinity Journal* 3 (Spring 1974), 1-13, 3, R.E Clements, *Wisdom in Theology,* 104-109 W. Brueggemann, *Solomon: Israel's ironic icon of human achievement,* (Columbia, University of Southern Carolina Press, 2005), 116-117, L. Wilson, 'The Place of Wisdom in Old Testament Theology,' *The Reformed Theological Review,* vol 49, 1990, 60-69, 62

[494] O. Kaiser, 'Qoheleth,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed J. Day, R.P Gordon, H.G.M. Williamson, (Cambridge, CUP, 1995), 83, N. Whybray, 'The Social World of the Wisdom Writers,' *Wisdom: The Collected Works of Norman Whybray*, ed. R.N Whybray, K.J. Dell, M. Barker, (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 238 puts Ecclesiastes in the Hellenistic Age, R.E. Clements, *Wisdom in Theology,* 19

[495] The vast majority of occurances of   in the so called Deuteronomic History occur in this passage – see A. Lemaire, 'Wisdom in Solomonic Historiography,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed J. Day, R.P Gordon, H.G.M. Williamson, (Cambridge, CUP, 1995), 107

[496] A. Lemaire, 'Wisdom in Solomonic Historiography,' 113, J.L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction,* (Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 1981), 2010 Edition, 44-46

Ecclesiastes 1:1), invite the reader to read the Wisdom texts in the light of Solomon's reign, while the account of Solomon's reign describes the production of wisdom literature (1 Kings 3-11, and especially 1 Kings 4:29-34).[497] The rhetorical purpose of these pieces of literature can arguably be deduced from this connection, because it is the interpretive key supplied by the text itself. This investigation of the wisdom literature as a communicative act does not rely on Solomonic authorship, but a good case can be made for the authenticity of such a claim,[498] and an emerging wisdom tradition in Israel during Solomon's reign.[499] Job, though not literarily linked to Solomon, can also plausibly be dated in his time,[500] so will also be considered as a case study of a communicative act that adheres to the literary conventions of the wisdom genre.

---

[497]W.J Dumbrell, *The Faith of Israel*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 2nd Edition, 263 The final form of Proverbs even pays homage to Solomon with a numeric link – it contains 375 lines, the numeric value of his name. M.A. Shields, *The End of Wisdom: A reappraisal of the historical and canonical function of Ecclesiastes*, (Warsaw, Eisenbrauns, 2006), 24-25 suggests that the allusions to Solomon can not be used for dating the work in a pre-exilic setting, but served to legitimise the works, at 26-27 he argues for such a dating on the basis of Qoheleth providing advice on life in a royal court.

[498] W.C Kaiser, 'True Marital Love in Proverbs 5:15-23,' *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K Waltke*, ed J.I Packer and S. K Soderlund, (Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing, 2000), 111, and W.C Kaiser, *Ecclesiastes: Total Life*, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1979), 25-29 , a lexical study suggests a common author of the passages in Proverbs attributed to Solomon, A.E Steinmann, 'Proverbs 1-9,' 662-673.

[499] R.E Clements, *Wisdom in Theology*, 18, J. Ruffle, 'The Teaching of Amenemope and Its Connection With the Book of Proverbs,' *Tyndale Bulletin* 28, (1977), 35, Ruffle dates Proverbs in the reign of Solomon, suggesting the scribes and counselors mentioned throughout Samuel and Kings (2 Sa. 8:17; 15:37 20:25; 1 Ki. 4:3; 2 Ki. 22:8-10) were more than capable of producing the work, N. Whybray, *Wisdom In Proverbs*, 19-21 suggests the wisdom movement may have originated under Solomon even if the claims of 1 Kings are hyperbolic. Those arguing for a late dating of Proverbs assume that Jewish wisdom evolved from short and incoherent to long and integrated, A.E. Steinmann, Proverbs 1-9, 660, Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 334, R.E Clements, *Wisdom in Theology*, 24 describes the process of evolution with Ecclesiastes posited as a third century BC product, and a post-exilic date for Job and Proverbs 1-9, a study of the structure of comparable wisdom literature from the ANE in around 1,000 BC established similarities, in length and form, to Proverbs 1-9, W.J Dumbrell, *The Faith of Israel*, 284 argues for an early dating of Ecclesiastes on the absence of certain Hebrew constructions that developed later. K.A. Kitchen, 'Proverbs and Wisdom Books of the ANE: The Factual History of a Literary Form,' *Tyndale Bulletin,* 28, (1977), 69-114, 106-107, Ecclesiastes is often dated late because it is said to contain Persian loan words, but these loan words had their roots in ancient Semitic languages that pre-existed Hebrew, 69-114,This study also found that wisdom literature from the period often included an epilogue. Further examinations established stylistic and linguistic parallels with Canaanite and Ugaritic literature, J. Ruffle, 'The Teaching of Amenemope and Its Connection With the Book of Proverbs,' *Tyndale Bulletin* 28, (1977), 29-68, 35, citing W.F Albright, *Wisdom in Israel and in the ANE*, Leiden (V. T. Stipp. 3) (1960), 1-15. Chapters 10-29 were also found to be of the same ANE vintage as the rest of the book, N. Whybray, 'Thoughts on the Composition of Proverbs 10-29,' *Wisdom: The Collected Works of Norman Whybray*, ed. R.N Whybray, K.J Dell, M. Barker, (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005), 71

[500] D. Kidner, *The Wisdom of Proverbs, Job & Ecclesiastes,* (Leicester: IVP-Academic, 1985), 74-75

The aspects of his reign that I would suggest provide the interpretive framework for the communicative act of involved in the production of Biblical wisdom are as follows:

1. An interaction with international wisdom, and thus with the religious beliefs of the nations (1 Kings 4:29-34, 1 Kings 10:23-24).[501]
2. A theological focus, and corrective of international wisdom, based on the "fear of the Lord" (1 Kings 8:43).
3. A desire to see the nations come before Yahweh, as they witness his rightful position as creator of the world and the basis of wisdom and righteousness (1 Kings 8:41-43, 59-61, 1 Kings 10:9, Psalm 72).[502]

The pursuit of wisdom, and the production of wisdom literature, was an important intellectual and theological pursuit in the ANE.[503] It crossed international borders.[504] Israel was no exception. The comparison between Solomon's wisdom and that of surrounding nations suggests Israel was part of the global conversation (1 Kings 4:30-31),[505] and the reader is invited to compare Israel's wisdom with international wisdom (1 Kings 4:30).[506] Parallels have been recognised or suggested between the wisdom of Israel and the wisdom of Babylon, Egypt, and Sumer, Canaan, and the Akkadian empire.[507] If

---

[501] Ruffle, 'Teaching of Amenemope,' 66

[502] J.Dickson, *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and the Pauline Communities*, (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2003), Solomon's prayer that the people of the nations would come to know Yahweh through the Gentiles who come to Israel would suggest a centrifugal aspec

[503] R.E Clements, *Wisdom in Theology*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992), 2002 Edition, 17, Ruffle, *op. cit*, 36, R.J Clifford, *The Wisdom Literature*, (Nashville, Abington Press), 1998, 40 "*Biblical wisdom literature is thus truly international, being found in the great empires that dominated Israel's world as well as in the geographically closer cities of the Levant.*"

[504] See, for example, N. Whybray, *Wisdom In Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9*, (London, SCM Press, 1965), 15-16 on the international conversation taking place between scribes and sages across international borders.

[505] B.K. Waltke, 'The Book of Proverbs and Ancient Wisdom Literature,' *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136 (July-Sept. 1979), 211-238, "*that his proverbs were a part of an international, pan-oriental, wisdom literature.*" M.V Fox, 'World Order and Ma'at,' 37, Fox suggests Proverbs borrowing from Amenemope "*proves communication was open for this most international of genres.*" C.J. Wright, *Mission of God*, 444, proposes "*a lot of contact between Israel's wisdom thinkers and writers and those of surrounding nations.* Hubbard, 'The Wisdom Movement,' 6 also comments on a dialogue between Israel and Egypt as part of an international wisdom movement.

[506] C.J. Wright, *The Mission of God,'* 441 suggests Israel's wisdom thinkers and writers took part in an international dialogue "*with an openness to discern the wisdom of God in cultures other than their own*, also T. Longman III, *How To Read Proverbs*, (Downers Grove, IVP Academic, 2002), 62.

[507] W. Zimmerli, 'Expressions of Hope in Proverbs and The Book of Job,' *Man and His Hope in the Old Testament*, Studies in Biblical Theology, (London, SCM Press, 1971), 13, "*We know too that it [Old Testament wisdom] stands in international relationship to equivalents in Egypt as well as in Babylonia, and before that in ancient Sumer,*" on Egyptian wisdom see P-A. Beaulieu, 'The

Proverbs existed in some form around the time of Solomon, then these parallels may run in both directions with the Aramaic *Wisdom of Ahiqar*, dated between the 7th and 5th centuries BC, borrowing from Proverbs.[508]

There is potential objection to this historical construction on the basis of a language barrier. While some vocabulary in Israel's wisdom corpus is unique to Israel, the themes, genre, and concepts are drawn from the same pool.[509] The language barrier appears to have been overturned by the discovery of a multi-lingual library of wisdom literature at Ugarit.[510] This discovery of documents from geographically disparate locations in a city close to Israel, written in Akkadian, Sumerian, Hittite and Egyptian languages suggests ANE scribes and sages were engaged in an international wisdom conversation.[511] It is plausible that such foreign scribes and sages worked with Jewish scribes and sages in Israel's Royal courts,[512] and that Jewish sages worked in foreign courts.[513]

THE MEDIUM: GENRE, AND THEMES

Social and Intellectual Setting,' 3-19, N. Whybray, 'The Social World,' 242 suggests Israel was never totally isolated from the mainstream of ANE culture, on Canaan, see Ruffle, 'The Teaching of Amenemope,' *Tyndale Bulletin,* 28, (1977), 35, citing W.F. Albright, *Wisdom in Israel and in the ANE*, (Leiden, V. T. Stipp, 1960), 1-15. On Akkadian influence see F.F. Bruce, "The Wisdom Literature of the Bible: Introduction," *The Bible Student*, 22.1 (Jan. 1951), 5-8, On the comparison with Babylonian wisdom see V.A Hurowitz, 'The Wisdom of Supe-Ameli,' *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed R.J Clifford, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series No 36, SBL: Atlanta, 2006, 44-45, Ruffle, *op. cit*, 36*The Bible Student* ns 22.1 (Jan. 1951), 7

[508] A. Millard, 'In Praise of Ancient Scribes,' *Bible And Spade*, 2 (Spring-Summer-Autumn 1982), 33-46, 40, J. Day, 'Foreign Semitic influence on the wisdom of Israel and its appropriation in the book of Proverbs,' *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed. J. Day, R.P Gordon, & H.G.M Williamson, (Cambridge, CUP, 1995), 55-71 – Day establishes a comparison, and the presence of a direct quote in Proverbs 23:13-14, but suggests *Ahiqar* has priority, arguing for a later than 1000BC composition of that passage in Proverbs, A.E Steinmann, 'Proverbs 1-9,' 666 suggests a dating around that time is feasible, however, N. Whybray, 'Thoughts on the Composition of Proverbs 10-29,' 71 suggests *Ahiqar* is an Assyrian document contemporary with the Israelite monarchy.

[509] M.A Shields, *The End of Wisdom*, 40.

[510] R.S. Fyall, 'Job and the Canaanite myth,' *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job,* New Studies in Biblical Theology 12, (Downers Grove, IVP), 191-194

[511] R.J Clifford, *The Wisdom Literature*, 38

[512] 2 Sa. 8:17; 15:37 20:25; 1 Ki. 4:3; 2 Ki. 22:8-10, J. Ruffle, 'The Teaching of Amenemope and Its Connection With the Book of Proverbs,' *Tyndale Bulletin* 28, (1977), 65-66, his evidence includes specific mentions of foreigners holding senior positions at the Israelite court, and the suggestion that some of Solomon's officials have Egyptian names. The suggestion of Egyptian sages being employed in Israel's court also surfaces in Hubbard, 'The Wisdom Movement,' 6

[513] Regardless of the genre applied to the book of Daniel, it demonstrates that the idea of a Hebrew serving in a foreign court is plausible. As does the story of Joseph.

The Book of Proverbs shares much in common with other proverbial wisdom from the near east, including structure, and literary tropes such as a king instructing his son, and the personification of wisdom.[514] Proverbs seems entirely consistent with contemporary wisdom – it is even literarily dependent on that wisdom in certain cases, both acknowledged in the Proverbs of Agur (Proverbs 30:1), and Lemuel (Provebrs 31:1), and in the widely recognised borrowing from Egypt's *Wisdom of Amenemope* (Proverbs 22:17-24:22).[515]

Job has been strongly linked with Egyptian texts including the *Onomasticon of Amenemope,* and the *Papyrus Anastasi I,*[516] and several Mesopotamian documents, including the *Dialogue of Pessimism,* the *Babylonian Theodicy*, the poem *Keret*, the Sumerian texts *A Man and His God,* and *"I will Praise the Lord of Wisdom,"* and Baal sagas from Ugarit. Each of these texts presents something like the theology that the book of Job corrects.[517]

Ecclesiastes also embraces common ANE wisdom structures.[518] Hurowitz (2006), in a survey of the theological content of a Babylonian wisdom piece *The Wisdom of Supe-Ameli* concluded that the critique of wisdom contained in Ecclesiastes *"criticises accepted and widely held didactic wisdom"* from the ANE.[519] Similar connections have been made between Ecclesiastes and the Gilgamesh Epic,[520] a specific example of dependency comes in the form of the "cord of

---

[514] J. Day, 'Foreign Semitic Influence,' 60-69, also, A. Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom*, (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 44-45, T. Longman, *How To Read Proverbs*, 70-77, Ruffle, 'Teaching of Amenemope,' 36

[515] These chapters fall in a "Solomonic" section, Early academic discussion surrounding the issue is summarised at length in J. Ruffle, 'The Teaching of Amenemope and Its Connection With the Book of Proverbs,' *Tyndale Bulletin* 28, (1977), 29-68, J.L Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, 252-260, H. Ringgren, 'Israel's Place Among The Religions of the ANE,' *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel*, (Leiden, Brill, 1972), 3

[516] G. Von Rad, 'Job 38 and Egyptian Wisdom,' *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, (London, Oliver and Boyd, 1965), 281-291

[517] Clifford, *The Wisdom Literature*, 70-72, F.I. Andersen, *Job: An Introduction and Commentary*, (Leicester, IVP, 1974), 24-27, identifies a Ugaritic story called *Keret,* and an older Sumerian poem, as grounds for comparison, J. Blenkinsopp, *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 69, mentions those works and the *Dialogue of Pessimism* as possible comparisons, D. Kidner, *The Wisdom of Proverbs, Job & Ecclesiastes,* (Leicester, IVP-Academic, 1985), 125-141 covers the same documents. R.S. Fyall,' Job and the Canaanite myth,' *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job,* New Studies in Biblical Theology 12, (Downers Grove, IVP), 191-194, also, L.G Perdue, *Wisdom Literature: A Theological History*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 85-89

[518] J.L Crenshaw, *Ecclesiastes: A Commentary*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 28-31

[519] Hurowitz, V.A, 'The Wisdom of Supe-Ameli,' *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed Clifford, R.J, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series No 36, SBL: Atlanta, 2006, p 45

[520] Bruce, *op. cit,* 8, W.C. Kaiser, *Ecclesiastes: Total Life,* (Chicago, Moody Press, 1979), 38-41

three strands" image employed in Ecclesiastes (Ecc 4:9-12) and Gilgamesh (lines 106-110) *"Two men will not die; the towed rope will not sink, a towrope of three strands cannot be cut. You help me and I will help you, (and) what of ours can anyone carry off?"*[521] Other similarities have been noted with the Babylonian *The Dialogue of Pessimism,*[522] and Egyptian texts *The Songs of the Harper, The Dispute of a Man with His Ba,* and the *Instruction of Ptah-hotep.*[523] Ecclesiastes appears to be a speech in both content and form.[524] It employs colloquial vernacular with an international flavour,[525] the sort of language of the type a trader in the pre-exilic period might be familiar with, not late Biblical Hebrew,[526] which makes an exact date based on linguistics impossible. [527] If הֶבֶל is translated as transient breath, rather than "meaningless," the speech contributes to international wisdom discussions about the nature of humanity and brevity of life. [528]

The wisdom literature deals primarily with understanding the world, but this understanding occurs through a religious lens. Much ANE literature discusses the link between cause and effect, the so-called acts-consequences nexus, and provides a path to wisdom and life within that framework.[529] So, for example,

---

[521] For a more detailed comparison see Day, 'Foreign Semetic influence,' pp 59-62

[522] E.L. Greenstein, 'Sages With a Sense of Humor: The Babylonian Dialogue Between a Master and His Servant and the Book of Qohelet,' *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel,* ed Clifford, R.J, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series No 36, (Atlanta, SBL, 2006), originally published in *Beth Mikra,* 44 (1999), pp 97-106

[523] M.A Shields, *The End of Wisdom: A reappraisal of the historical and canonical function of Ecclesiastes,* (Warsaw, Eisenbrauns, 2006), 29-31 draws comparisons with the *Babylonian Theology, Ludlul bel nemeqi,* and the *Instructions of Ahiqar,* also D. Kidner, *The Wisdom of Proverbs, Job & Ecclesiastes,* (Leicester, IVP-Academic, 1985), 138-139, also J.L Crenshaw, *Ecclesiastes: A Commentary,* (Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1987), 51-52

[524] D.C Fredericks, and D.J Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 56

[525] D.C Fredericks, and D.J Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 57

[526] D.C Fredericks, and D.J Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 57, 60-61, Israel's far-reaching trade in the pre-exilic area would surely have brought the country's leaders and traders to a knowledge and absorption of some Persian words. The later OT books use 26 Persian words 109 times. Ecclesiastes uses 2.

[527] D.C Fredericks, and D.J Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 58

[528] P-A. Beaulieu, 'The Social and Intellectual Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature,' 6-7 a survey of Mesopotamian wisdom literature summarised the concerns of the "traditionally defined" wisdom books as *the rejection of hubris, the acceptance of human mortality, and ultimately on the submission to fate and to the order created by the gods."* D.C Fredericks, and D.J Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 24, 44-45, 54-55, Interpreting hebel as "transience" dramatically changes the understanding of the book and brings it into this global conversation. 46-54, This is the best argument from the evidence – and makes the most sense as a consistent meaning for the word.

[529] P-A. Beaulieu, 'The Social and Intellectual Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature,' *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel,* ed R.J Clifford, Society of Biblical Literature

Egypt's wisdom schools were called "Schools of Life,"[530] and were interested in *ma'at*, the controlling order that ruled the gods,[531] provided the gateway to the afterlife,[532] underpinned truth and justice,[533] and was protected by both gods and king.[534] Critical scholars suggest Proverbs affirms this nexus,[535] while Job and Ecclesiastes both deny it, and protest against God on the basis that reality does not deliver on promise.[536] The evidence for "protest" against conventional wisdom is strong in Job and Ecclesiastes,[537] but it is plausible to suggest Proverbs was not the target.[538] None of the characters in Job are presented as Hebrews,[539] and the advice from Job's "wise" friends sits so comfortably in international wisdom traditions that some have identified them as ANE sages.[540] While this theme is there, the content, argument, and use of international source material is a slightly more complex issue, so a simple

Symposium Series No 36, (Atlanta, SBL, 2006), 7 suggests that "every important Mesopotamian text" presupposes that individual misfortune flows from failure to meet the prescribed actions of the gods, N. Whybray, 'Two Jewish Theologies: Job and Ecclesiastes.' *Wisdom: The Collected Works of Norman Whybray*, ed. R.N Whybray, K.J Dell, M. Barker, (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005), 180 – suggests the Old Testament shares the "*naïve assumption that virtue brings its own reward*" with the ANE world. M.V Fox, 'World Order and Ma'at: a crooked parallel,' *JANES* 23, 1995 37-48 urges caution with applying the Egyptian concept of Ma'at to this notion or a retributive order.
[530] Waltke, 'Does Proverbs Promise Too Much?', 328 citing W. Crosser, "The Meaning of 'Life' (Hayyim) in Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes," *Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions*, 15 (1955), 51-52
[531] G.E. Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment*, Studies in Biblical Theology, (London: SCM Press, 1950), 44
[532] A. Sinnott, 'The Personification of Wisdom,' 41, Ma'at is important for personal immorality and the "*entire basis for the Egyptian understanding of the world*"
[533] Fox, 'World Order,' 41
[534] W. Zimmerli, 'Expressions of Hope in Proverbs and The Book of Job,' *Man and His Hope in the Old Testament*, Studies in Biblical Theology, SCM Press, London, 1971, 15, however M.V. Fox, 'World Order and Ma'at: a crooked parallel,' *JANES* 23, 1995, 37-48, 38, 41, Ma'at, like Yahweh, was understood as the "creator of order." R.E Clements, *Wisdom in Theology*, 45-46
[535] The suggestion is that Proverbs establishes this nexus, but life doesn't match up. B. Waltke, 'Does Proverbs Promise Too Much?,' *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 34.2, (Autumn 1996), 333-334 and E. Lucas, *Proverbs: The Act-Consequence Nexus*, forthcoming.
[536] K.J. Dell, *The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature,* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1991), W.S Morrow, *Protest Against God: The Eclipse of a Biblical Tradition,* (Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2007), 129-146
[537] Shields, M.A, *The End of Wisdom,* 35 suggests that the "apparent distinctive thoughts of Qoheleth" have common ground with ANE wisdom well before the exile.
[538] Shields, M.A, *The End of Wisdom,* p 16 suggests the wisdom movement is Job's target, and that the story of Job demonstrates that God is not subject to the retributive system that had been "established by the sage."
[539] J. Day, 'Foreign Semitic Influence on the wisdom of Israel and its appropriation in the book of Proverbs, *Wisdom in Ancient Israel,* ed Day, J, Gordon, R.P & Williamson, H.G.M, (Cambridge, CUP), 1995, 55-56, Day suggests this international flavour means Israel's "wise men" were more internationally minded than others within Israel.
[540] On the retributive theology of Job's friends see W. Zimmerli, 'Expressions of Hope in Proverbs and The Book of Job,' *Man and His Hope in the Old Testament*, Studies in Biblical Theology, (London, SCM Press, 1971), 16-19, M.A. Shields, *The End of Wisdom: A reappraisal of the historical and canonical function of Ecclesiastes,* (Warsaw, Eisenbrauns, 2006), 15, also on Job's friends as ANE sages see J.H Walton, *ANE Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible,* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 23

reductionism of Israel's wisdom literature into an internal optimism/pessimism conflict will not suffice.[541]

THE MESSAGE: CONTENT, THEOLOGY, DISTINCTIVES

All ANE wisdom was religious, in that it drew observations about the relationship between the created order and the gods behind that order, often functioning as natural theology.[542] While this natural theology was idolatrous theology,[543] such wisdom was clearly gold to be plundered for Israel's wisdom writers. International wisdom ignored Yahweh, so was subject to Yahweh's judgment.[544] The nations based their wisdom on the nature of their gods, and the response these gods required.[545] Israel's wisdom plunders wise observations, and grounds any natural theology in the "fear of Yahweh."[546] Wisdom is not wisdom without Yahweh, because the created order is not guaranteed without the creator, who stands apart from that order.[547] Israel's wisdom is not about the self-sufficiency produced by understanding, but a God dependency.[548] In Israel, wisdom becomes a subset of fearing God, and the life lived imaging God.[549]

---

[541] B. Waltke, 'Does Proverbs Promise Too Much?,' 323

[542] P-A. Beaulieu, 'The Social and Intellectual Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature,' 6-7, J.H Walton, *ANE Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 309, with the exception of some proverbial wisdom which does not always specifically relate the acts-consequences connection to a deity. D. Burdett, 'Wisdom Literature and the Promise Doctrine,' *Trinity Journal* 3 (Spring 1974), 2

[543] J.H Walton, *ANE Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 309-310

[544] Isaiah 19:11; 44:25; Ezekiel 28:12ff; and Obadiah 1:8, also G. Von Rad, G, *Wisdom in Israel*, 319

[545] J.H Walton, *ANE Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 309-310, the *Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*, links wisdom to "fearing God."

[546] J.G. Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs* (Sheffield, Almond, 1981), 53, as an analogous point – scholars have long considered the Genesis account of creation as a corrective of creation narratives from surrounding cultures including the *Enuma Elish* a view that has reached broad acceptance with varying nuance. P. Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the problem of the Old Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 26-27 notes the comparisons with the Enuma Elish and suggests the contrast in theology was a deliberate contrast with the reigning Babylonian authority.

[547] J.H Walton, *ANE Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 309, Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 336

[548] J.S Reitman, 'God's "Eye" for the *Imago Dei*: Wise Advocacy Amid Disillusionment in Job and Ecclesiastes,' *Trinity Journal*, 31NS, (2010), 115-134, 118

[549] J.S Reitman, 'God's "Eye" for the *Imago Dei*: Wise Advocacy Amid Disillusionment in Job and Ecclesiastes,' *Trinity Journal*, 31NS, (2010), 115-134, 119

The Fear of the Lord has been identified as a unifying theme in the wisdom corpus.[550] It is a touch point of Jewish orthodoxy synonymous with faithful obedience,[551] and it is a point of contrast with international wisdom, when the concept of "fear" is discussed in ANE literature it is usually to be directed towards the king.[552] Biblical wisdom, חכמה, focuses on fearing not one who controls created order, but the one who created and controls the order.[553] The phrase occurs throughout Proverbs,[554] it occurs almost exclusively in the passages tied to Solomon (Chapters 1-24), and does not appear in those collected under Hezekiah.[555] It also brackets, either before or after, passages linked to *Amenemope* and *Ahiqar*, which occur in passages attributed to Solomon (Proverbs 22:4, Proverbs 24:21, and Proverbs 23:17). Proverbs presents the view that any wisdom, any understanding of the order in creation is only possible if one starts with the fear of Yahweh. Proverbs holds that Yahweh created, and controls this order,[556] and man's hope for life is found in fearing him.[557]

The "fear of the Lord" is present in Qoheleth's exploration of wisdom,[558] and most importantly is the interpretative guide to his work supplied in the epilogue (12:13).[559] The epilogist sees the "fear of the Lord" as a fitting

---

[550] D. Kidner, *Wisdom to Live By* (Leicester, IVP, 1985), 17 sees it as salvaging the wisdom corpus from self-interest, mutiny and despair, W.C. Kaiser, *Toward an Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 170 suggests that it is the "*organising theological principle*" of the OT wisdom, L. Wilson, 'The Book of Job and the Fear of God,' *Tyndale Bulletin* 46.1 (1995) 59-79 provides an overview of its use in Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes, W.J. Dumbrell, *The Faith of Israel*, 264, 285 identifies it as the theme of Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. R.E. Clements, *Wisdom in Theology,* 60-62, posits a post-exilic compilation of Proverbs, and thus a different purpose, suggesting that the Fear of The Lord is to help post-exilic Jews realign their faith after the loss of land and temple.
[551] Deuteronomy 4:10; 5:29; 6:2, 13, 24; 10:12, 20
[552] L. Wilson, 'The Book of Job and the Fear of God,' 62, cites Derousseaux, *La crainte de Dieu*, 21-66 who studied the occurance of 'fear' in Egyptian, Akkadian, Aramaic and Ugaritic texts. Interestingly the king, in Egypt and Mesopotamia, mediated between the gods and society "*maintaining the social order in harmony with nature and the divine*" see G.E Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment,* Studies in Biblical Theology, (London: SCM Press, 1950), 63
[553] On its uniqueness in Wisdom literature see Ruffle, *op. cit, 37,*
[554] Proverbs 1:7, 2:5, 9:10, 10:27, 14:27, 15:16, 15:33, 16:6, 19:23; 22:4; 23:17, 31:30, and an injunction to "fear the Lord" occurs in Proverbs 1:29; 3:7; 8:13; and 24:21
[555] A.E Steinmann, 'Proverbs 1-9 as A Solomonic Composition,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 43.4 (December 2000), 659-674, 666
[556] Waltke, 'Does Proverbs Promise Too Much?,' 333
[557] Zimmerli, 'Expressions of Hope in Proverbs and The Book of Job,' 24
[558] Ecc 3:14; 5:7; 7:18; 8:12-13
[559] While some dismiss this insertion as a late intrusion that radically alters the message of Ecclesiastes, A.G Shead, 'Reading Ecclesiastes 'Epilogically'' Tyndale Bulletin 48.1 (1997) 67-91.conducts a semantic comparison with the rest of the book to argue for a common author, and thus for the epilogue's centrality in interpreting the text

summary of Qoheleth's quest.[560] On this basis, Qoheleth is criticising the wisdom movement – a group of professional sages operating in Israel, and throughout the ANE.[561] A position best summed up in the teacher's own words *"No one can comprehend what goes on under the sun… Even if a wise man claims he knows, he cannot really comprehend it."* (Ecc 8:16-17).[562] Qoheleth's objection to the wisdom movement must then be understood as a rejection of the wisdom movement as it exists in the ANE, not in Proverbs (Proverbs 1:6, 4:7).[563] The writer of Ecclesiastes, a master of wisdom, concludes that life in this broken world is a vanishing mist, a vapor, but his conclusion is that as a result, man should turn to Yahweh and fear him (8:17).[564]

Job does not use the same Hebrew construction for "fear of the Lord," preferring alternatives like ראתי אדני to ראתי יהוה.[565] A thematic link between fear, God, and wisdom is drawn several times.[566] The wisdom poem of Job 28 is a rhetorical pivot point in the book, culminating in the fear of the Lord (28:28). It contains deliberate correctives against ideas of divine wisdom, and the location of wisdom, from the ANE.[567] Wisdom was understood as originating from a distant God located either in the heights or depths of creation,[568] Job

---

[560] M.A Shields, 'Ecclesiastes And The End Of Wisdom,' *Tyndale Bulletin* 50.1 (1999), 121-124, L. Wilson, 'The Book of Job and the Fear of God,' 63 agrees - suggesting that the epilogue both affirms the questioning nature of the book and provides a foundational principle for daily living.

[561] Shields, 'Ecclesiastes And The End Of Wisdom,' 125-129 – regarding the presence of similar ideas in the ANE: "*Qoheleth's words have always (so far as we can determine) troubled those who have read them and tried to understand them against the background of the faith of Israel. They do not fit easily with the wisdom of other sages as recorded in Proverbs (or, for that matter, from other sources in the ANE), and the wisdom of Qoheleth's contemporaries could probably also be included. Consequently, it would be tempting to dismiss Qoheleth's words and adhere to the more traditional conclusions of the sages (which could perhaps best be described as 'pleasing words'). The epilogist here makes clear that the words of Qoheleth are true. Where other sages may have offered different advice, they are the ones who should be considered to be incorrect—not Qoheleth.*"

[562] Shead, *'Reading Ecclesiasties Epilogically.'*

[563] Not, contra Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation,* 78, protesting against the naivity of Proverbs. J.L Crenshaw, *Ecclesiastes: A Commentary*, 24 suggests Qoheleth's rejection of observing signs is a rejection of Mesopotamian wisdom, and 26 suggests his embrace of life as opposed to suicide contrasts with Egyptian and Mesopotamian skepticism.

[564] D.C Fredericks, and D.J Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 249

[565] Wilson, 'The Book of Job and the Fear of God,' pp 66-67 suggests this is consistent with the Fear of Yahweh employed elsewhere.

[566] Job 1:1, 8, 9; 2:3; 4:6; 6:14; 15:4; 22:4; 28:28; 37:24

[567] E.L Greenstein, 'The Poem on Wisdom in Job 28 in its conceptual and literary contexts, *Job 28: Cognition in Context*, ed. E.J Van Wolde, (Leiden,Brill, 2003), 253-281, suggests comparisons between Mesopotamian, Babylonian, Canaanite, Akkadian, Ugaratic, Sumerian and Syrian poetic expressions of wisdom

[568] According to the second model, wisdom is hidden from human view and is hidden in the depths of the earth. According to the first model, a solar-like divine power can bring the

locates wisdom not in the deep or the sea, but in the fear of the Lord. The closing chapters establish Yahweh's case for being feared (38-42 especially).

Rather than simply borrowing from, and representing ANE wisdom, the Biblical Wisdom literature plunders, engages with, and critiques the natural theology of the international wisdom movement, and presents knowing Yahweh as the missing ingredient for true wisdom.

PROPOSED PERLOCUTIONARY PURPOSE

What are we to make of these similarities? Some deny any grounds for comparison,[569] others note significant similarities but see divergent theological views as evidence of little or no influence,[570] and minimalists raise questions about the nature of revelation,[571] and see an opportunity for source criticism.[572] All agree that Hebrew wisdom deliberately creates a monotheistic distinction from conventional ANE thought.[573] This deliberate distinction, not the similarities, should provide the most fruit for understanding the relationship

---

hidden to light and illuminate its details. Both models underlie the poem on wisdom in Job 28. Greenstein, E.L, 'The Poem on Wisdom in Job 28 in its conceptual and literary contexts, *Job 28: Cognition in Context*, ed. Van Wolde, E.J, (Leiden:Brill, 2003), p 263, he later identifies a favourable comparison between Yahweh and a Babylonian Sun God, because Yahweh, in Job 28 *"sees and penetrates into all that is hidden, can see to the bottom of the earth as well, and it is therefore he alone who knows where wisdom is located."[568]*

[569] F.I. Andersen, *Job: An Introduction and Commentary*, (Leicester, IVP, 1974), 24 identifies, two extremes to avoid when examining comparisons between Job and ANE literature. The first is to contend enthusiastically for the uniqueness of revelation, the second is to suggest that Israel invented nothing themselves.

[570] M.A Shields, *The End of Wisdom: A reappraisal of the historical and canonical function of Ecclesiastes,* (Eisenbrauns, 2006), 33, after a lengthy list of comparable documents Shields concludes that the similarities are vague enough to rule out dependency, though they place the books in an ANE context. Whybray, 'Social World,' 246 quotes McKane (1970) suggesting the theological correctives (specifically mentions of Yahweh) in Proverbs 10-29 are embellishments of "old wisdom" that was secular in nature, Ruffle, *op. cit,* pp 63-66 suggests that the pursuit of wisdom was so common that such similarities were inevitable.

[571] P. Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the problem of the Old Testament,* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2005), 39 – while not advocating the position, Enns suggests that foreign influence on scripture raises questions about the nature of revelation.

[572] A question articulated by G.S Ogden, *Qoheleth,* (Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007), 236-237

[573] F.F. Bruce, *op cit,* 8, *"These distinctive features belong to the unique revelatory character of Hebrew religion, with its emphasis on the one living and true God…"* Wright, *The Mission of God,* 446 *"They approached the wisdom of other nations with the religious and moral disinfectant provided by Yahwistic monotheism."* Clements, *Wisdom in Theology,* 152-153 describes the 'Yahweh-isation' of ANE wisdom ideas, Longman III, T, *How To Read Proverbs,* 77 calls it a process of "adaptation of ideas" into a broader Jewish understanding of the world. Whybray, *Wisdom In Proverbs,* 24-25 suggests that the presence of Yahweh in Hebrew literature isn't enough to show that the wisdom teachings are religious in nature, but that this is consistent with borrowing from ANE wisdom – he calls references to Yahweh "superficial."

between similar works.[574] What are the communication implications of this deliberate interaction? I suggest that the borrowing is part of the perlocutionary agenda of the writers and editors of Israel's wisdom literature, and that it may be indicative of an agenda to accommodate, and communicate to an audience both within Israel, and throughout the ANE.

The theology of the wisdom literature is consistent with Deuteronomic theology,[575] and the prophetic call to faith in Yahweh,[576] but it is presented without the presupposition that the reader shares this theology.[577] Ecclesiastes in particular intentionally avoids ethnocentric terminology, examining universals of human nature without cultic baggage, and treating them in the international vernacular.[578] Fredericks and Estes (2010) suggest the cosmopolitan nature of Qohelet's speech means it could plausibly be an apologetic wisdom speech delivered to visiting dignitaries and sages in Solomon's reign.[579] Israel participated in an international wisdom dialogue, adopting its literary conventions, in order to advocate the fear of her God as the beginning of wisdom.[580] O'Dowd (2008) suggests the wisdom literature functions to *"show and display theological truths in persuasive, unitary, comforting and provocative ways in order to engage the oral and literary traditions of the ANE*

---

[574] P. Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*, 39 criticises the assumption that the more a biblical text looks like its ANE equivalents the less inspired it is.

[575] J.H Walton, *ANE Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible,* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 309

[576] Wright, *Mission,* 444, suggests wisdom literature warns against foreign gods as seriously as the law and the prophets.

[577] Clements, *Wisdom and Old Testament Theology*, 273, a *"lack of covenantal presuppositions enabled [the wisdom literature] to serve as an internal apologetic to Jews and as a non-national basis for religiously motivated moral teaching of a high order"* which in turn linked the fear of the Lord with the way of wisdom

[578] D.C Fredericks, and D.J Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 55, The only specific references to Israel are the narrative markers tying the speech to time and place, the reference to the "son of David" and Jerusalem. God is called Elohim, not Yahweh, Qohelet speaks of Adam, not Israel, W. Kaiser, *Ecclesiastes: Total Life,* 32-33 suggests an international audience for Ecclesiastes. Also, Hubbard, 'The Wisdom Movement,' 30-31, Wright, *Mission*, 442-455, The wisdom literature is seen as useful for modern apologetics because it presents universal truths, from nature, unrestricted by culture or religious structures.

[579] D.C Fredericks, and D.J Estes, *Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs,* Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham, Apollos, 2010), 64

[580] R.S. Fyall, 'Job and the Canaanite myth,' *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job,* New Studies in Biblical Theology 12, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2002), 194, Wright, *Mission*, 448, *"Wisdom points us to Yahweh, the God who is the only hope of that salvation and indirectly to the story of Yahweh's revealing and redeeming acts in which the world's salvation is to be found."*

and thereby display the superiority of the faith, worldview, and God of the OT over against the religions myths and ideologies of surrounding cultures."[581]

This adaptation to the literary conventions of the wisdom medium, to present faith in Yahweh (*logos*) to move a global audience to fear him, with an appropriately creative portrayal of his image (*pathos*), and the literary link to Solomon, the image-bearing, wise king of Israel (*ethos*), makes the wisdom literature an example of sublime communication.

The elements of a perlocutionary strategy to convince both Israel and the nations to fear Yahweh are present, and the lack of demonstrable perlocutionary effect beyond the narrative depiction of nations coming to Israel during Solomon's reign, can be readily explained by Solomon's fall into idolatrous worship, and the resultant loss of Israel's distinctives. Any period of mission to the nations as a fulfilment of Genesis 12 under a Davidic monarch disappeared into the clouds as Israel went into free fall towards exile and destruction.

THE PROPHETS AS SUBLIME COMMUNICATORS

We now turn to two prophetic case studies – Isaiah,[582] and Ezekiel. The written records of their communication indicates they too were *sublime* communicators whose recorded words and deeds present a fusion of their ethos, pathos, and logos, with the divine communication agenda they participated in.

The written records are significant because they emerge in a time where written compositions were not simply the records of an oral culture, but were produced to be read as literature,[583] this, like the Wisdom Literature, allowed prophetic compositions to deliberately engage with the recorded claims of other nations.[584] The written accounts of prophetic ministries are related to the spoken ministries of the prophets, and in many cases are designed to mimic

[581] R. O'Dowd, 'Creation Imagery,' *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry & Writings: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship,* (Downers Grove, IVP, 2008), 60-63
[582] Whether Isaiah is a united work by one individual or not is beyond the scope of this discussion, however, the methodology in "first Isaiah" and "second Isaiah" is startlingly similar, and for our purposes the canonical form of the book of Isaiah will be treated as a unity.
[583] M.B Dick, 'Prophetic Poiesis, 226-246, 230, Kutsko, *Heaven,* 8-9
[584] *ibid,* 231

the oral style,[585] much like the relationship between oratory and rhetoric in the Greco-Roman period.

The earlier chapters of Isaiah, commonly identified as "First Isaiah" demonstrate a similar familiarity with Assyrian culture and ideas, echoing official Assyrian propaganda in descriptions of the threatening might of the empire,[586] demonstrating a familiarity with Assyrian geography and technical terminology,[587] and employing deftly deploying idioms and concepts found in Assyrian writings and inscriptions.[588] Isaiah paints a picture of Assyria as an overwhelming military force, with specific reference to previous Assyrian conquests,[589] the pattern of Assyrian dominance.[590] Isaiah quotes the Assyrian king as saying "I cut down its tallest cedars…" (Isaiah 37:24), a claim that is attested to in Assyrian inscriptions.[591] Isaiah also displays intimate knowledge of Rabshakeh's embassy to Israel on behalf of Sennacherib (36:1-12), and the state of affairs in the Assyrian monarchy (Isaiah 37:38), so it is reasonable to assume that he had some contact with the Assyrian empire, and indeed was conversant with Assyrian life.[592] While some of this was no doubt due to personal interaction with Assyrians, he also reflects the image Assyria presents to the world in its official literature and propaganda.[593]

This sort of cultural familiarity seems to be a two-way street, provided the speeches from the Assyrians to Israel presented in Israelite literature are accurate (2 Kings 18-19, Isaiah 36:4-10) – and there is little reason to suspect they are not, Assyrian kings habitually parodied their enemy's ideologies in their embassies made during war, so for example in Tiglath-Pileser III's siege of Babylon in 729BC,[594] and engaged in a propaganda campaign to the people of the nations they besieged and conquered – these campaigns commonly included the installation of inscribed rock stelae and imagery within the

---

[585] *ibid,* 232
[586] Kutsko, *Heaven,* 21
[587] P. Machinist, 'Assyria and Its Image in the First Isaiah,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society,* 103.4 (Oct-Dec, 1983), 719-737, 736
[588] *ibid,* 730
[589] *ibid,* 722
[590] *ibid,* 722
[591] *ibid,* 722
[592] *ibid,* 730
[593] *ibid,* 729
[594] *ibid,* 729

borders of the conquered nation (though none of these have been discovered in Judah),[595] this is consistent with Rabshakeh's desire to speak of the Assyrian threat in Hebrew so that the Israelite people would hear his message, and presumably circulate it at the equivalent of the ANE water-cooler (Isaiah 36:11-22).

If Isaiah is conversant with Assyrian literature and idiom, and Rabshakeh, the Assyrian king's messenger, is both bilingual (Isaiah 36:11), and conversant with Israelite religion both with Israelite's theological hopes (Isaiah 36:7, 15, 18), and the recent iconoclastic religious reforms driven by Hezekiah (Isaiah 36:7). This suggests the language gap between Israel and her neighbours is not the insurmountable obstacle that has been assumed in certain quarters. The ruling elites in Assyria were almost certainly bilingual, or polyglots, in order to expand their empire's boundaries and conduct the work of diplomacy required for maintaining imperial outposts. [596] Regional dialects loosely based on Akkadian developed in certain quarters of the empire, most official Assyrian inscriptions were composed in a literary dialect of Babylonian, and Aramaic was the lingua franca of the Assyrian empire, [597] was used in some official documentation from the empire, and rapidly overtook Akkadian.[598] Administrators or members of the elite in Judah would have required some knowledge of some of these regional dialects, especially Aramaic, in order to conduct their duties – which is supported by their request to Rabshakeh to conduct his speech in Aramaic (Isaiah 36:11), while the borrowing of foreign literature in the Hebrew Scriptures, including the Wisdom Literature, suggests a long established practice of Israelite engagement with foreign texts and ideas. The Old Testament narrative is replete with interactions between Israel's dignitaries and representatives from foreign lands from the time of Abraham to the prophets. Isaiah demonstrates a familiarity with Assyrian propaganda and idiom that could only have come from an Assyrian channel.[599] The language gap presumed by modern scholars who argue for minimal "missional" activity from Israel, or that the religious borders of Israel were only permeable on the way into the nation – as indicated by her lifelong

---

[595] *ibid*, 731, also Kutsko, *Heaven*, 21

[596] *ibid*, 732-733

[597] *ibid*, 732-733, also J.F Kutsko, *Heaven*, 21

[598] *ibid*,733

[599] Kutsko, *Heaven*, 21

struggle with idolatry, rather than flowing in both directions - appears vastly overstated, all the evidence suggests that at least at the administrative or scribal level, and probably above, there is no impediment to communication, and the account of Rabshakeh's interaction with Israel suggests the ability to be able to speak directly to the masses was politically useful. Though the ability to cross the language barrier was probably limited to the cultural elite (Isaiah 36:11). We will discuss the implication of this faculty in the elite level of ANE society for how we conceive of Old Testament mission, or evangelism, below.

Isaiah reworks his Assyrian source material to say something quite different,[600] to present the folly of foreign powers claims to superiority over Yahweh, and in the second half of the book, to repudiate idolatry, like Ezekiel, demonstrating familiarity and contempt for the idea that gods can be formed from blocks of wood. The second half of Isaiah engages in a sustained polemic against the idolatrous polytheism of the ANE – which nation is in the crosshairs depends on one's reconstruction of the composition history of Isaiah, but the rituals and practices associated with idolatry and idol-building, that Isaiah is demonstrably conversant with, were relatively stable and consistent in Mesopotamia for thousands of years, these religio-political entities breathed the same air and developed from the same cultural gene pool, sharing the same religious memes with each other and, to an extent, with Israel.[601] Whichever Mesopotamian nation is in focus in so-called "Second Isaiah" – Assyria or Babylon – Isaiah launches an assault on the religio-political and cultural structure of the foreign power. [602] He is conversant enough with this background for his polemic to be effective, in fact, he displays a similar precision when describing Mesopotamian religion and religious literature to Ezekiel.[603] The methodology of cultural engagement established in "First Isaiah" continues seamlessly in the second half of the book, as our writer turns from the political to the religious. He playfully

[600] Machinst, 'Assyria,' 734
[601] E.H Merrill, 'Isaiah 40-55 As Anti-Babylonian Polemic,' *Grace Theological Journal*, 8.1 (I987) 3-I8, 6-7
[602] *ibid*, 3
[603] *ibid*, 7

reworks Mesopotamian mythology, literature, prayer and hymn formulas,[604] for example the "I am" participial predications (Isaiah 44:24-28), which both reflected traditional Israelite theology, and mimicked a structure attested to from the Akkadian to Neo-Babylonian periods,[605] and accurately describes the idol building ritual in a biting parody, his treatment of gods other than Yahweh decisively confronts Mesopotamian theology, though his polemic, like Ezekiel's has been understood as being directed at Israel in exile,[606] who risked losing their identity in a Near Eastern version of Stockholm Syndrome,[607] as they experienced the siren call of the visually rich imagery, ritual, and idolatry of the Mesopotamian cult.[608] Isaiah must promote Yahweh above all alternatives, and this is doubtless the primary communication objective, however, given Isaiah's familiarity with the Mesopotamian cultus, and his use of Mesopotamian concepts and terminology,[609] and Rabshakeh's familiarity with Israel's theological hopes, one wonders if Isaiah considered the international reception as he penned his prophetic missive.

Merrill (1987) assessed Isaiah using the rhetorical principles later developed in Greece,[610] and suggested his literary dependence on the royal propaganda of the ANE is a result of his mastery of "ancient eloquence," and a sign of his ability to accommodate his communicative act to the audience by employing the "authentic resources of the pagan milieu" to "use in the "service of the good news concerning the Creator and Saviour."[611]

The period of Israel's exile was not her first contact with ANE cultures, but it was a much more intense experience of Mesopotamian culture and religion.

---

[604] *ibid*, 9, cites Whybray, "Isaiah is particularly dependent upon the language and literature of the Babylonian hymns, prayers, and royal inscriptions."
[605] *ibid*, 7, 10-13, "The assumption is, then, that the expanded form of self-predication characteristic of Isaiah is an adaptation of the Sumerian-Akkadian style with which the prophet would have been familiar. This seems almost certain given the virtual absence of this hymn type in other Hebrew literature and its prevalence throughout cuneiform hymnic and other genres of literature."
[606] *ibid*, 18
[607] *ibid*, 9, cites Mihelic who says Isaiah must overcome the "tendency of a conquered people slavishly to ape their victors."
[608] *ibid*, 8
[609] *ibid*, 9, cites Gressmann: "Isaiah wishes to show that Yahweh is infinitely superior to the Babylonian gods, and proceeds to do so by using the terminology of their mythological literature to deny the very gods celebrated in that literature."
[610] *ibid*, 4
[611] *ibid*, 18

This immersion into Mesopotamian culture would have brought an appreciation of the military power of the king, an understanding of Mesopotamian religions, an opportunity to learn the language, and a chance to reflect on events leading up to exile.[612] Ezekiel reflects this context in his sustained engagement with the Babylonian culture and religion.[613] The book of Ezekiel is a complex work of literary art,[614] with a sustained persuasive argument about the future of Israel should they turn away from lifeless idols, and back to Yahweh, and a sustained polemic against the weakness of the lifeless idols of Babylon. Ezekiel composed a text that condemned and mocked idolatry in all its forms, while also condemning Israel for her failure to live as God's image bearers,[615] and offering the hope of ritual restoration through divine intervention.

Most scholars assume that Ezekiel the prophet is an educated and highly literate member of the priesthood (Ezekiel 1:3),[616] whose counsel was valued (Ezekiel 8:1, 14:1, 20:1).[617] Ezekiel demonstrates a familiarity not just with the existing Old Testament corpus,[618] but with the cultural literature of Mesopotamia, including for example, the *Poem of Erra*,[619] and with Mesopotamian religious rituals, especially, as noted above, regarding the repatriation and re-activation of cult idols after they have been exiled or desecrated by foreign powers.[620] Ezekiel does not just parrot or parody these foreign sources and ideas, he reinvents them and adapts them with creative freedom in order to serve his own divine communication agenda.[621] The

---

[612] J.M Miller, 'In the "Image" and "Likeness" of God,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91.3 (S 1972), 289-304, 290-291

[613] Ezekiel's critique of Israel's idolatry in the light of their role as divine images has been discussed in some detail above, as has his understanding of the religious, literary and political culture of the Babylonian empire.

[614] J.F Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 7

[615] *ibid*, 76

[616] R.A Simkins, 'Visual Ambiguity in the Biblical Tradition,' *Religion and the Visual*: *Journal* of *Religion and Society Supplement*, Supplement 8 (2012), 27-39, 35, J.F Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 20

[617] J.F Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 153

[618] *ibid*, 13-14

[619] *ibid*, 18-23

[620] *ibid*, 134-142

[621] *ibid*, 153

prophets demonstrate a grasp of Israel's theology, and the theology of the nations they lampoon in their ironic portrayals of idol production.[622]

The Prophets took the accounts of history and theology presented in ANE propaganda, texts and rituals, and used them to offer social commentary that pointed to Yahweh's hand behind the scenes. [623] Israel rarely borrowed any literary genre, trope, or concept without creatively modifying if for her own, often polemical purposes. The practice was a result of creatively seeking to communicate the distinctive aspects of Yahweh worship, not because Israel was a nation of derivative cultic plagiarists.[624]

PLUNDERING GOLD FROM THE NATIONS TO PRESENT THE WISDOM OF GOD

Israel's covenantal blessing of the nations (Gen 12:3) is widely understood to exclusively functioned centripetally,[625] participating in international wisdom and diplomatic conversations, through the production of texts for a global audience, suggests a centrifugal component of Israel's mission. While scholars now simply assume no centrifugal mission occurred in Israel,[626] The definition of Israel's mission as exclusively centripetal is a communication category error and an anachronistic misunderstanding of the nature of mission and conversion.

ISRAEL'S CENTRIPITAL+CENTRIFUGAL MISSION

---

[622] J.H Walton, *ANE Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible,* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 117, Dick, 'Prophetic Poiesis,' 237-240 J.F Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 54-55, Prophetic literature contains accounts of the building of idols… especially to deny their effectiveness – Craftsmen make idols from wood and stone, adorn them with precious metals and Gems, and array them in fine fabric (Jer 10:1-9, Isa 40:19-20, 41:7, 44:9-20, 46:6, Hos 2:10, 8:4, Hab 2:18-19)… Ezekiel, too, is well aware of the effort that goes into the construction of idols. He mentions the use of ornaments to make images (7:20, 16:17-19)

[623] J. Barton, 'History and Rhetoric in the Prophets,' *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*, Ed. M. Warner, (London, Routledge, 1990), 52-53

[624] G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2004), 29-30, Israel intentionally alluded to facets of pagan religion in order to affirm that what the pagans thought was true of their gods was only true of Israel's God.

[625] W.C. Kaiser, *Missions in the Old Testament: Israel as a Light to the Nations*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000), 37, C.H.H Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An integrated approach to Biblical Theology,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2003) 520

[626] So, for example, C.H.H Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An integrated approach to Biblical Theology,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2003), 520

Israel's obedience to Yahweh was part of her priestly role (Exodus 19:5-6) it was to be a demonstration to the nations,[627] who were to respond "*Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people*" (Deuteronomy 4:6). These passages are conceptually linked by Yahweh's references to his past actions against people groups, Egypt (Exodus 19:4), and Baal worshippers within Israel (Deut 4:3-4). Solomon's participation in the wisdom conversation is presented as a culmination of the covenant promise to bless the nations (Genesis 12:3),[628] by being wise and obedient to Yahweh (Deut 4:6). The nations were to be drawn to fear Yahweh, through Israel, as she presented a compelling alternative worldview (1 Kings 8:41-43, Psalm 72, Micah 4:2-5,). The centripetal movement to Israel, by the nations, depicted in the "missionary Psalm" (Psalm 96),"[629] requires centrifugal declarations of Yahweh's glory and authority among the nations (96:3, 10), calling them to fear Yahweh above all gods (96:4).[630] The proposed international interaction in the communicative act of producing the wisdom literature, and the thematic importance of the "fear of the Lord" suggests the wisdom literature functioned as a centrifugal declaration from Israel to the nations, the polemics against idolatry in Isaiah and Ezekiel could also function in this manner.

Many attempts to locate "mission" in the Old Testament involve anachronistic categories either imported from the modern era, or from other periods in Israel's history. ANE nations had state religions, mediated by kings, while individual households had their own family religions. Religious conversion typically occurred at a state level or within the family structure.

At the state level, conversion occurred as a result of military conquest where gods were destroyed in defeat, or in Israel's case at least, when kings were persuaded to turn to foreign gods (eg 1 Kings 11). There is evidence for the relationship between conquest and the destruction or subjugation of state gods in the Biblical tradition, with the emphasis on destroying the religious infrastructure of Canaan (Deut 7:4-7), and with the Philistine capture and return of the Ark (1 Sam 4:5-11, 21-22, 5:1-12, 6:1-21). Literacy within ANE

---

[627] Wright, *The Mission of God*, 504
[628] Wright, *Mission of God,* 448, "*any wisdom that is associated with Solomon must be connected with the Solomonic tradition that God should bless the nations in their interaction with Israel.*"
[629] Kaiser, *Missions in the Old Testament,* pp 34-36.
[630] Kaiser, *Missions in the Old Testament,* p 35

nations was limited to the elite, so persuasive literature targeted at kings and decision makers is a plausible method of state-based mission. The fate of nations was perceived to be linked to the gods who stood behind them.[631]

Polytheism meant households could pick and choose their own mix of gods, so "conversion" at the family level consisted of the addition of new divinities to the mix at the family level.[632] Israel's monotheism, operating at the state and family level, was unique in its context, so Judaism was unique, until the rise of Christianity, in calling for exclusivity rather than simply adherence.[633] Conversion to Judaism from polytheism involved changed beliefs, ethical transformation, and incorporation into the nation of Israel.[634]

For widespread conversion to Yahweh worship to take place, nations would need to be converted from ruler down. Individual conversion, sociologically speaking, is more likely to happen through relationships, not simply intellectually.[635] One would expect, then, missionary activity to be directed both at the state level, targeting the literate government officials including royals, advisors, and sages, and at individual level through relationships with those who might shift their national alliance. The Old Testament narrative presents both models.

The Torah anticipates and provides for Gentile sojourners who are drawn to the people of God.[636] Rahab and Ruth are the archetypal canonical examples of individuals who are moved to join Israel. Rahab seeks refuge in Yahweh, and membership of his people *having heard* what God had done (Joshua 2:8-14). Ruth chooses to follow God based on her relationship with Naomi (Ruth 1:16-18).

[631] J. Barton, 'History and Rhetoric in the Prophets,' *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*, Ed. M. Warner, (London, Routledge, 1990), 56

[632] M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period,* (Peabody, Hendrickson, 2010), 22

[633] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period,* (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1991), 6

[634] M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land,* 21-22, 4does not mention an exception to this rule, but Naaman would appear to be one, as discussed below.

[635] M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land*, 22-23, "Conversion occurs when people develop stronger attachments to the group than other groups."

[636] Exodus 12:19, 20:10, 22:21, 23:9, Leviticus 17:15, 19:10, 22:18, 23:22, 24:16, 22, 25:6, Numbers 9:14, 15:30, 35:15, Deuteronomy 10:18-19, 14:21, 29, 16:11, 14, 24:14, 17, 19-20, 26:11-13, 27:19, 29:11, 31:12, Joshua 8:33-35

The story of Namaan (2 Kings 5) presents an interesting case study where an authority figure, the commander of the army of Aram, was persuaded by an Israelite member of his household to seek Yahweh (2 Kings 5:1-5). The potential implications of his conversion to Yahweh worship at a household level, for his position in the religio-political state infrastructure are interesting, and accounted for in the narrative (2 Kings 5:15-18).

There is further evidence that blessing, proclamations of judgment, or attempts at religious persuasion at the state level happened through diplomatic conversations. These conversations are either explicitly described in the narrative, or alluded to when foreigners come to Israel *"having heard."* These include, for example, Joseph and Pharaoh (Genesis 41, esp 39-45, 47:1-31), Moses and Pharaoh (Exodus 3:18-22, 4:21-23, 5-12), Joshua and the Gibeonites (Joshua 9:9-16), the Philistines as they returned the Ark (1 Sam 6:4-6), Solomon and the nations via royal delegations (1 Kings 4:29-34), and with the Queen of Sheba (1 Kings 10:1-13, 23-25) who come "having heard" of Solomon's wisdom, Jonah and the "King of Nineveh," and Daniel and the kings of Babylon (Daniel 1:18-19, 2:27-28, 46-49, 3:23-29, 4:29, 34-37, 5:18-31).[637] The proposed functions of the wisdom literature, and prophetic literature, above, suggests these texts can be added to that mix, as persuasive texts produced to expand Yahweh worship beyond the boundaries of Israel.

The 'fear of God' falls on foreign nations (2 Chronicles 20:29), and cities (Jonah 3), when they *hear* of God's actions, or coming judgment, and serves to prevent nations waging war against Israel (Joshua 5:1, 2 Chronicles 17:10), while at times this testimony is coming from other nations (Numbers 14:13-16), it presumably also comes from Israel fulfilling its priestly role. The messianic anticipation of a drawing in of the nations involves a centripetal movement of gentiles who *have heard* from the "root of Jesse" that God is with Israel (Zech 8:20-23, Isaiah 11:1-3, 10-12).

---

[637] Regardless of the genre or date of Daniel – be it late satire, or early apocalyptic prophetic history, the events described in terms of a foreign ruler being humbled before Yahweh, must represent a plausible or imaginable theological ideal situation for the intended perlocutionary effect to be likely to be achieved. The contrast between Daniel's proclamation to Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzer is an interesting demonstration that this proclamation can be a message of either salvation, or judgment.

The evidence from the intertestamental period for Jewish mission continuing in this vain is mixed. It is clear that while most Jews before Jesus believed the drawing in of the nations was an eschatological function of the Messiah,[638] the link between Israelite and internation wisdom and mission continues in Sirach, where the "wise scribe" of Israel is described as searching the wisdom of the ancients, works for "princes and rulers," and visits foreign courts, such that as he displays his instruction, nations will "proclaim his wisdom." (Sirach 39:1, 4, 8, 10). In the second century BC, the *Letter of Aristeas* provides a guide to religious persuasion from a Jewish perspective.[639] It takes the form of a dialogue between a king and his wise men. The wise men advise that generosity, kindness and large-hearted grace are the key to maintaining great renown,[640] people are won over by generosity shown to opponents,[641] winning all men to friendship, and keeping them as friends, makes persuasion easier.[642] The goal of speech is to convince opponents, through well-ordered argument and through "bestowing praise" on your opponent "with a view to persuading" them – "it is by the power of God that persuasion is accomplished."[643] One can live amicably with different races by "acting the proper part towards each" and being righteous.[644] Virtue "creates good deeds" and destroys evil while one "exhibits nobility of character towards all" – this maintains gratitude and honour.[645] These texts were not apologetic, but do speak of the same hope that gentiles will be persuaded by Jewish wisdom.

The rise of the written word and education in the Greek, then Roman Empires, broadened the audience for such works, and arguably changed the nature of mission and conversion from something that was purely relational at the family level, and directed to rulers and their counsel at a state level.

---

[638] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 53
[639] J.P. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and the Pauline Communities*, (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 55
[640] Letter of Aristeas, 226, Trans. R.H. Charles, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913), retrieved online, http://www.ccel.org/c/charles/otpseudepig/aristeas.htm
[641] Letter of Aristeas, 227
[642] Letter of Aristeas, 228, 230, 231
[643] Letter of Aristeas, 266
[644] Letter of Aristeas, 267
[645] Letter of Aristeas, 272

Israel did produce deliberately apologetic literature through antiquity,[646] though the evidence that this was distributed beyond Judaism is contested.[647] The Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, likely had a missionary function.[648] Jews adopted rhetoric in their apologetics against polytheism.[649] There is some suggestion that the Jews were expelled from Rome in 139BC and 19BC for missionary activity.[650] Philo, a Hellenised Jewish rhetor educated in Alexandria, started a movement, that continued through to the Rabbinic tradition.[651] He described virtue and philanthropy as aids for converting proselytes, reading that back into Israel's history to suggest Israel's leaders functioned as orators.[652] He also saw the magnificence of the temple as a drawcard for foreigners.[653] Philo criticises the Sophists for lacking virtue and wisdom.[654] While both Philo and Josephus were positively disposed towards Gentiles[655], and involved in the production of apologetic literature,[656] this literature seems to be addressed to a Jewish audience.[657]

McKnight (1991), Dickson (2003) and Bird (2010) have contributed to the discussion of the nature of mission in Judaism. While these studies generally

---

[646] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*, (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1991), 57-58, cites Fergus Millar, "At any rate… a varied literature came into being, the direct aim of which was to convince pagans of the folly of idolatry, to win them over to belief in the one true God, and at the same time to convert them to a more serious and moral way of life by pointing toward a future reward," though this is disputed by McKnight and others.

[647] Dickson, *Mission Commitment*, 51-60, assesses various texts and suggests insider-outsider distinctions are difficult to maintain

[648] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*, (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1991), 60-62

[649] E.H Merrill, 'Isaiah 40-55,' 5-6, M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land*, 11

[650] M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*, (Peabody, Hendrickson, 2010), 11, J. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and the Pauline Communities*, (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 25-31

[651] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 18

[652] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 16, 67-70, Philo reworked Israel's history to emphasise mission, calling Abraham a paradigmatic proselyte, suggesting Moses was a king, philosopher, legislator, priest and prophet, suggesting both Moses, and Joseph, received liberal educations in Egypt, and that Joseph was a virtuous persuader

[653] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 69

[654] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 70, cites examples in Her 125, Conf 14, 34-35, Mut 10, Fug 209, Prob 80, Post 86, Agr 12-16, 136, 143-144, 159, Congr 18, 53, 67, Migr 76

[655] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 13-14, Josephus: Jews are open to all men and we have a code that urges friendly relations with each other and humanity towards the world at large (Against Apion. 2.146), Philo: Jews are "peacefully inclined to all (Flacc 94).

[656] M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land*, 11

[657] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 70, Philo is skilled in apologetics, polemics, and propaganda. "Proselytisation orientation." But the absence of evidence for direct speech to Gentiles reveals that Philo's work is essentially intended to bolster Jewish self-identification.

focus on the Judaism of late antiquity, they are useful for assessing the trajectory of mission from Judaism to Christianity. McKnight (1991) rejects theories that suggest Judaism was a "missionary religion" because there is no indication that Israel defined itself as being on mission to convert outsiders.[658] He defines conversion as the complete reorientation of the soul, the mind, religious piety, becoming part of a new social group, and restructuring one's narrative.[659] Dickson supplies a framework for assessing the mission commitment of Israel in the period between Old and New Testaments. He suggests that while there was a widespread hope amongst Israel that gentiles would be converted en masse, this hope largely rested in hopes of divine intervention,[660] that they expected this to be a centripetal pilgrimage of the nations to Israel,[661] and that at least some individuals believed the invitation to make this pilgrimage came through human agency at the divine initiative. He reads Isaiah 2:3 as providing a framework for understanding human agency in this process.[662] Dickson adopts a broader definition of mission that incorporates acts designed to promote Judaism to the nations through mission as prayer and promoting of Torah.[663] Bird rejects this definition,[664] and like McKnight, finds no wide scale attempt to convert people to Judaism in antiquity.[665] McKnight uses a lack of evidence for converts to suggest that Judaism was not a missionary religion.[666] However, a lack of converts can simply be an indicator that Israel failed to succeed, not that they failed to try. A communicator cannot control the perlocutionary outcome of their communicative act. One can maintain the suggestion that Israel was a missionary religion with the suggestion that they were not very good at their job, especially given the complicated nature of mission at a state level. The question that must be answered is: could Israel have been a blessing to the nations, in a theologically consistent way, without converting them to

---

[658] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 4-5
[659] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 5-7
[660] J.P Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 13-19
[661] Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 21-23
[662] Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 23
[663] Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 8-10, M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period,* (Peabody, Hendrickson, 2010), 20
[664] M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land*, 20, J. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 84-85
[665] M.F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land*, 11, "promotion and prosyletism, though closely linked, are not on the same trajectory or seeking the same outcomes."
[666] S. McKnight, *A Light Among The Gentiles*, 74

worshipping Yahweh? And is a better explanation for the lack of converts a lack of sublime, image-bearing, communication on Israel's part?

God spoke to Israel through the prophets and in various ways (Heb 1:1), in doing so he provided an example by which Israel could speak to her neighbours in contextually appropriate ways. Israel's failure to do so was a failure from the top, beginning with Solomon, who at the apex of Israel's international position modelled sublime international communication, but through his failure to heed his own advice, turned to idols (1 Kings 11), and also provided the impetus for a rapid decline such that the intended communication campaign and blessing of the nations through Israel was over before it began, sporadic attempts to apply the paradigm in the intertestamental period through the production of apologetic texts suggests at least some individuals in Israel understood her priestly function as a call to represent Yahweh to the nations. The impact of Solomon's fall on the fate of this communication agenda and the fate of Israel in the Old Testament narrative supports the hypothesis that persuasive mission in the Ancient Near East was possible, and if targeted correctly could change the course of nations as national and cultural distinctives were lost through syncretistic polytheism. At the very least, Israel's prophets in their production of paradigmatic sublime literature engaging with the theology, propaganda and thought world of her neighbours are providing a basis for cultural engagement with the people of those nations.

APPENDIX B

CICERO, PAUL AND SUBLIMLY RIDICULOUS ORATORY OF THE CROSS:

A SPECULATIVE HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF PAUL'S IDEAL ORATOR IN THE LIGHT OF 1-2 CORINTHIANS

What is the relationship between persuasion and virtue? Can we speak of persuasion as a morally neutral act? How should Christian preachers think of their preaching, are we out to proclaim? Or persuade?

I will suggest that the Apostle Paul does not see the distinction between proclaiming and persuading relied upon so heavily in modern debates about the nature of preaching. In what follows I will attempt to demonstrate that Paul stands in a long line of rhetorical theorists who have attempted to link virtue and character with the practice of rhetoric, that he consciously draws on and adapts the work of Rome's most influential communication's theorist, Marcus Tullius Cicero, to present his own view of rhetoric, the rhetoric of the cruciform ambassador of the cruciform God, and in 1 and 2 Corinthians Paul deliberately presents his own "ideal orator" in conversation with Cicero's *De Oratore*, to address what he thinks is a problematic and self-defeating self-seeking approach to Christian preaching. For Paul, the idea of seeking status while speaking of the crucified messiah is not just theologically anathemic, it is rhetorically futile.

Cicero was a sublime communicator of the ideals of the Roman Empire, both in life and word, who embodied died for his convictions, Paul calls the church to be sublimely ridiculous – taking on the self-denunciating foolishness of the cross. As such, the Fool's Speech in 2 Corinthians 10-13 is a piece of sublime rhetoric, demonstrating Paul's mastery of rhetorical conventions, and through irony, his understanding of the *imago dei imitatio Christi*.

While Cicero held himself up, though often under a veneer of talking about and praising those who influenced him, as the standard of oratory par excellence who should be imitated, Paul held Christ up as the ideal orator, the incarnation and crucifixion as oratory par excellence, and called the church to imitate him in their approach to persuasion (1 Cor 11:1). In doing so, Paul

necessarily subverts Cicero's system while drawing heavily upon its concepts and precepts.

A HISTORY OF VIRTUOUS PERSUASION

Plato believed rhetoric was purely a tool for persuasion, and the rhetorical teacher had no responsibility to teach his pupil virtue.[667] The immoral use of persuasion – to manipulate – was a concern for Aristotle, who produced *Rhetoric* because he wanted the moral communicator to have access to the same neutral persuasive tools as the immoral.[668] Aristotle suggested the elements of communication that lead to persuasion are *ethos* (ηθος), *pathos (παθος), and logos (λογος)*: *"The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself."*[669] The three divisions of persuasion correspond to the three elements of speech making – speaker, subject, and hearer, and it is the hearer that determines the speech's "end and object."[670]

The description of *ethos* in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was an evolution, of sorts, of Anaximenes' previously influential concept of the speaker's *doxa* (δοξα), which was the presentation of one's intelligence with regard to the subject,[671] and Isocrates' use of character.[672] It emerged at a time when professional speechwriters were writing speeches for other speakers that included references to the speaker's character – conveying ethos was a skill. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* acknowledged that ethos is the "most effective means of persuasion" the rhetorician possesses,[673] but also positioned *logos* – the content of the speech – as the controlling agent for *ethos*.[674] Aristotle saw ethos as related to a demonstration of the speaker's virtuous nature and their goodwill, which

---

[667] E. Fantham, *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004), 57-61
[668] Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, Trans. W.R. Roberts (Dover, Dover Thrift, 2004), Kindle Edition, Kindle Location 117, 126-130
[669] Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* 164, M. Kraus, 'Ethos as a Technical Means of Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory,' *REMPBD,* (London, T&T Clark, 2005), 79
[670] Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* 275-279
[671] Krauss, 'Ethos,' 75
[672] Krauss, 'Ethos,' 76
[673] Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* 165-167, Krauss, 'Ethos,' 80
[674] Krauss, 'Ethos,' 78

could be faked by a less than virtuous speaker.[675] The ideal speaker must have the capacity for logic, must understand human goodness, and understand the emotions.[676]

While Aristotle attempted to counter the abuse of rhetoric by unscrupulous speakers by making the nuts and bolts of persuasion available to all,[677] he provided no convincing link between virtue and persuasion. Philosophers dismissed rhetoric, and didn't want rhetoricians teaching students.[678]

In the early first century BC the Romans banned rhetorical schools because they threatened *mos maiorum*.[679] Rhetoric was still a necessary part of politics in the Republic, and individual tutors were protected by the *mos maiorum,* so a Roman style developed from Greek sources.[680] In this style ethos and pathos were combined, and were the aspect of the speech used to produce an emotional response in the audience.[681] Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was not a widely read, or particularly influential publication for rhetors in the period between its composition in the 4th century BC and the 1st century BC.[682]

However, it became significant from the mid-1st century when Marcus Tullius Cicero sought to codify a new approach to oratory, philosophy, and rhetoric in *De Oratore* (55BC),[683] which extensively drew on Aristotle.[684] Cicero moved

---

[675] Krauss, 'Ethos,' 80-81
[676] Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* 174
[677] Fantham, *Roman World of Cicero,* 61
[678] R.N Gaines, 'Roman Rhetorical Handbooks,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 3071
[679] Both through equipping unscrupulous men, Krauss, 'Ethos,' 83-84, and because it overturned the social order, M.C Alexander, 'Oratory, Rhetoric, and Politics in the Republic,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, A. Corbeill, 'Rhetorical Education and Social Reproduction in the Republic and Early Empire,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 1325, schools were threatening the social order by opening rhetorical training up to the common man.
[680] Corbeil, 'Rhetorical Education,' Location 1340, J. Connolly, 'Virile Tongues: Rhetoric and Masculinity,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, Location 1558, Alexander, 'Oratory, Rhetoric, and Politics,' Location 1949-1969
[681] Krauss, 'Ethos,' 82-84
[682] C. Poster, 'Ethos, Authority, and the New Testament Canon,' *REMPBD,* (London, T&T Clark, 2005), 119-120, J. Wisse, "The Intellectual Background of Cicero's Rhetorical Works," *BCCOR,* (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 385, R.D Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, (Leuven, Peeters, 1998), 49
[683] J.M May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 4503, 4510, Fantham, *Roman World of Cicero,* 53-54, Cicero sought to enlist Greek scholarship for the benefit of *mos maiorum,* Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 65, Until ten years after *De Oratore's* publication in 55BC, rhetoric and philosophy were schools at war, operating at opposite ends of the spectrum in the empire.

beyond his low birth in a geographically obscure town to climb the Republican political ladder solely on oratorical ability. [685] He produced *De Inventione,* an eclectic theory of rhetoric using Aristotle and Isocrates as sources, as a youth in around 90BC,[686] it suggested "wisdom without eloquence is of little benefit to the state, but eloquence without wisdom is generally a great hindrance."(*Inv.* 1.1).[687] That suggestion aside, he sought to distance himself from what he considered a rudimentary work with the publication of the sophisticated *De Oratore.* [688] He followed with a shorter treatise summing up the academy's approach to Greek rhetorical training, *Partitiones Oratorie.*[689] Cicero's fusion of the rhetoric, philosophy, and virtue, was quite unique. He believed rhetoric "transformed humans from a savage to a civil state,"[690] and that Roman culture had a right to make "virtuous oratory their own rightful property."[691] He called eloquence, the "marrow and quintessence of persuasion."[692] According to Cicero, this came from Athens,[693] but Socrates opposed eloquence and gave birth to philosophy,[694] Isocrates developed the structure of language,[695] before Aristotle wrote down the precepts of the art of speaking.[696]

Cicero saved Aristotle's three proofs from the rhetorical scrapheap.[697] The popular schools of Cicero's day had relegated ethos and pathos to the opening and closing words of speeches.[698] In a bid for reform, Cicero rejected the

---

[684] *De Oratore* I.XIII.55, II.X.43, 2.XXXVI.150-160, Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 45-47, May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4492, Cicero was unique in his embrace of Aristotle.
[685] Alexander, 'Oratory, Rhetoric, and Politics,' Location 1934
[686] May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4420-4431, 4462, Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 70-71, R.N Gaines, 'Rhetorical Handbooks,' Location 2978, 3012, 3031
[687] May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4442
[688] Alexander, 'Oratory, Rhetoric, and Politics,' Location 1816. May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4442
[689] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 57
[690] Connolly, 'Virile Tongues,' Location 1593
[691] Connolly, 'Virile Tongues,' Location 1580
[692] Cicero, *Brutus,* in *Cicero's Brutus or History of Famous Orators; also His Orator, or Accomplished Speaker,* 262
[693] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 121, 212
[694] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 135, Cicero, *The Academic Questions, Treatise De Finibus, and Tusculan Disputations, of M.T. Cicero, With a Sketch of the Greek Philosophers Mentioned by Cicero,* Trans. C.D Yonge, (London, George Bell and Sons, 1875), Kindle Edition, 664, he blamed Socrates for the division between philosophy and rhetoric, especially when it came to identifying virtue and vice. May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4503, 4510
[695] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 143
[696] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 200
[697] Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 385, Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory,* 89
[698] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory,* 89

schools' models,[699] and modified Aristotle's concepts.[700] Cicero's ethos is more far reaching than Aristotle's, and is more closely linked to the evoking of positive emotions from the audience through painting an image of the character of the speaker. Wisse (2002) believes that had the parallel effect of diminishing the place of pathos, because they overlap.[701]

Cicero was a master of stirring the emotions, and saw this as vital for moving and persuading audiences, his emotional appeals were so strong he often moved himself to tears.[702] Securing the early sympathy of the audience was of paramount importance.[703] The case shouldn't be stated, or narrated, at the outset,[704] but the audience should be engaged,[705] with the *"precise point of issue must be envisaged."*[706] The winning of love,[707] and securing of the audience's compassion, and emotions,[708] are vital to success, and must be built up to, rather than expected from the outset.[709] Compassion can be secured through descriptions of adversity and one's adversaries.[710] If one has become "unpopular" as a result of harsh words, or personal dislike that arises from slander, this can be addressed by reproof, admonition, a promise that if one is heard out the other will agree, or an apologia.[711]

Cicero claimed never to have pursued an emotional response he did not feel first, ethos then, was a control for the use of pathos:

---

[699] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 91, J. Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 358, especially Attic and Sophistic rhetoric which championed style and pleasing the audience over substance (the plain style), but also modified the Asianic approach, Kirchner, 'Elocutio,' Location 3447
[700] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory,* 89
[701] Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 385, J.M. May, *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric,* ed. by J.M. May (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2002)61
[702] May, *Companion to Cicero,* 61
[703] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.LXXVII.313- II.LXXVIII.321, the goal of the exordium is to secure the goodwill and compassion of the audience via a statement of the whole of the matter and a demonstration of character, Cicero, *De Inventione,* 1.XVI, Goodwill can be established through four topics: the individual's character, or the character of the accusers, the judge, or the audience. Refuting charges and demonstrating the damage caused by an accuser who acts with malicious intent will serve these purposes.
[704] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.LXXXI.330, Cicero, *De Inventione,* 1.XX
[705] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.LXXX.326
[706] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.LXXXI.331
[707] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.L.206-207
[708] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.XLIX.200-202, "what an opening you made! How nervous, how irresolute you seemed! How stammering and halting was your delivery."
[709] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.LIII.213-214
[710] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.LII.211
[711] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.LXXXIII.338-340

"I give you my word that I never tried, by means of a speech, to arouse either indignation or compassion, either ill-will or hatred, in the minds of a tribunal, without being really stirred myself, as I worked upon their minds, by the very feelings to which I was seeking to prompt them."[712]

One must therefore experience these feelings first by the "real fervor of the heart," for pragmatic reasons because "no language will inflame the mind of the hearer unless the Speaker first captures the ardor.[713]

Ethos and pathos could be faked, but virtue could not, so for Cicero, the ideal orator was the ideal honourable and virtuous person.[714] Great oratorical ability required proportionally great virtue.[715] This was an evolution of the "Old Academy's" devaluing of virtue as a mediocrity.[716] Cicero's ideal orator was able to " engage in philosophy and advance towards virtue."[717] Cicero's definition of virtue, as "a habit accompanied by, or arising out of, deliberate choice, and based upon free and conscious action,"[718] was quite different to that of the Roman elite. He held that one cannot be praised for wealth, looks, or the *"gifts of fortune,"* but rather how they employed the gifts they have been given.[719] Such fortune provided opportunities for beneficence and temperance, rather than pride.[720]

His ideal orator is autobiographical,[721] so it was virtue, wisdom and eloquence, not birth, that established *dignitas*.[722] Cicero's ideal orator was the ideal

---

[712] Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.XLV.189-190, J. Hall, 'Oratorical Delivery and the Emotions: Theory and Practice,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 4136-4159
[713] Cicero, *Orator*, in *Cicero's Brutus, Or History of Famous Orators: Also His Orator, Or Accomplished Speaker*, Trans. E. Jones, Kindle Edition, 2429, 2431
[714] J.M May, *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*, (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 165-167, Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.XLIII.182-184, T.H Olbricht, 'The Foundations of the Ethos in Paul and in the Classical Rhetoricians,' *REMPBD*, (London, T&T Clark, 2005), 147-148, "Cicero's understanding of the ideal person exhibited many of the traits proposed by Aristotle (practical wisdom, virtue, and goodwill. The virtues consist of liberality, justice, courage, temperance, magnanimity, magnificence, friendliness, truthfulness, prudence, gentleness, and wisdom or the contemplative life)."
[715] D.J Kapust, 'Acting the Princely Style,' 605, cites Cicero, *De Oratore*, III.LV, *"For if we put the full resources of speech at the disposal of those who lack these virtues, we will certainly not make orators of them, but will put weapons into the hands of madmen"*
[716] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 685
[717] Cicero, *The Academic Questions,* 699
[718] Cicero, *The Academic Questions,* 360
[719] Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.LXXXIV.342-344
[720] Cicero, *De Oratore*, LXXXIV.342-344
[721] May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4672

statesman, [723] who balanced wisdom with eloquence. [724] He was healthy in body and mind. [725] He carefully displayed his character in life, speech and written rhetoric, because, *"nothing is more difficult than to maintain a propriety of character."* [726] He had a complete classical education to both provide a wide variety of content and imagery, and help him understand the ethos of the audience. [727] He was so competent in the plain, middle, and grand styles, his necessary "*free, diffusive, and variegated style*" could seamlessly switch between them, [728] in order to inform, please, and move, [729] discerning the best style for the setting [730] In *Orator*, Cicero appeared to fuse these styles with ethos, logos, and pathos. [731] He was familiar with the three genres of rhetoric – forensic, deliberative, and epideictic, and the different conventions and proofs the audiences in these genres expected. [732] Choice of style was influenced by the

---

[722] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.II.6, *"Yet I maintain that such eloquence as Crassus and Antonius attained could never have been realized without a knowledge of every matter."* May, *Trials,* 49-51, 56-58, Craig, 'Cicero as Orator,' Location 4709-4718

[723] Fantham, *Roman World of Cicero,* 20

[724] Cicero, *De Oratore,* I.XXV.115, Cicero, *De Inventione,* I.1, in Cicero, *De Inventione, The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero,* (London, George Bell and Sons, 1888), Trans. C.D Yonge, retrieved, http://classicpersuasion.org/pw/cicero/dnvindex.htm, while considering eloquent presentation important, Cicero said eloquence without wisdom is "*most mischievous*" and "*never of advantage,"* without the fetters of duty and virtue, it could *"overturn cities and undermine the principles of human life.* Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory,* 90

[725] Cicero, *The Academic Questions,* 695-699, *"A healthy, and beautiful body, exhibited "a certain excellence of the individual parts," including clearness in the voice, and the ability to articulate words, excellent minds could "reason" – which included the ability to comprehend virtue, learn, and memorise,"*

[726] Cicero, *De Inventione,* 2.XL, Cicero, *Orator,* 2085

[727] Cicero, *De Oratore* I.V.18, I.VI.20, I.IX.48, I.XV.61-67, I.IVIII.247, II.IXXXV.348-349, his list includes knowledge of geography, history, warfare, mathematics, science, philosophy, human nature, and morality, virtue and vice. May, *Trials,* 2-4 *Gaines,* 'Rhetorical Handbooks,' Location 3219, Fantham, *Roman World of Cicero,* 21, May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4420-4431, 4462

[728] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 546

[729] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 864, or Cicero, *Orator,* 2078 "Prove, delight, force the passions"

[730] Cicero, *Orator,* 1973, 2385 Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.XIX.83 prefers a "neat though unscientific" structure of argument that can be easily modified, Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 358, May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4576, D.J Kapust, 'Acting the Princely Style: Ethos and Pathos in Cicero's On the Ideal Orator and Machiavelli's The Prince,' *Political Studies,* 58, (2010), 590-608, 596, J.T Ramsey, 'Roman Senatorial Oratory,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 2255-2459, the educated nature of the senate meant it required a less ornamented presentation, while a speech for the public needed to employ all of the orator's toolbox. His adaptability extended to the length of his speeches, the choice of vocabulary, including the use of adjectives and diminutives, and the length of his sentences. But he did not speak down to, or patronise, the public. J. Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 358, Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory,* 91, In *The Orator,* 46BC, Cicero's presentation of the ideal orator Cicero links logos, ethos, and pathos, with three types of style (plain, middle, and grand), and the gifted orator, as opposed to the Attic school (middle only), could transition between styles.

[731] Though one deals with style while the other deals with substance, Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 358

[732] Olbricht, 'Ethos in Paul,' 138-141, 146, Cicero and Aristotle both treated three different genres of rhetoric – forensic, which was used to examine past actions in the courtroom and aimed at the judge, deliberative, which was used in political debate and aimed at the political

genre of speech, the audience, the persona of the speech, and the circumstances.[733]

The Republic valued ancient traditions (the *mos maiorum)*, and individual character was at the heart of Imperial social conventions,[734] including the patron-client relationship, and the honour-shame culture.[735] Cicero was the champion of traditional republican values, so his application of character to the communicative task matched his environment and message.[736] Character was an inherited quality, and largely immutable,[737] and was closely linked to image. This emphasis on character led to a development of the use of imagery, where in the past, and throughout the Ancient Near East, images of gods were important icons, Romans began making images of family members associated with gods, and then simply images of their family members, then images of themselves.[738] The number of family statues or images displayed in a home determined the value of the patron's character.[739] The persuasive power of character was so great that a prosecutor or defendant's appeal to their personal character often decided Roman judicial proceedings.[740] Cicero moved the understanding of ethos from something the communicator described to an action of the communicator.[741] Aristotle had argued the speaker's ethos outside of its presentation in the speech was irrelevant,[742] Cicero inverted this position, while ethos could be created in the speech, it was much easier to employ for persuasive purposes if the speaker was actually a person of character. This context supplies the background for Cicero's emphasis on ethos in *De Oratore*:

---

assembly, epideictic which was the rhetoric used in ceremonial or religious settings and aimed to persuade the spectator. Each setting involved a different balance of the rhetorical proofs, so ethos and pathos was more important in the Epideictic setting as the speaker was required to present a trustworthy authority, show that they understood the culture of the audience, and demonstrate how their message applied to the context.

[733] R. Kirchner, 'Elocutio: Latin Prose Style,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition,' Location 3424

[734] May, *Trials*, 6, 163

[735] May, *Companion to Cicero*, 60

[736] May, *Trials*, 168-169, May, *Companion to Cicero*, 60

[737] May, *Trials*, 6, 16

[738] P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro, (University of Michigan Press, 1990), 12-14, 44-46

[739] May, *Trials*, 6, 163

[740] May, *Trials*, 6

[741] May, *Trials*, 6

[742] May, *Trials*, 9

"Well then, the character, the customs, the deeds, and the life, both of those who do the pleading and of those on whose behalf they plead, make a very important contribution to winning a case… Now people's minds are won over by a man's dignity, his accomplishments, and the reputation he has acquired by his way of life… Indications of flexibility, on the part of the orator and the client, are also quite useful, as well as signs of generosity, mildness, dutifulness, gratitude, and of not being desirous or greedy… Moreover so much is done by good taste and style in speaking, that the speech seems to depict the speaker's character. For by means of particular types of thought and diction, and the employment besides of a delivery that is unruffled and eloquent of good-nature, the speakers are made to appear upright, well-bred and virtuous men." (*De Oratore*, II.XLIII.182-184)[743]

Throughout his career, his own speeches relied heavily on either demonstrations of his character,[744] or as he grappled with the implications of his non-aristocratic background, demolishing the character of his opponents.[745] He deliberately constructed a new ethos at each stage in his career, showing that his public persona matched the needs of the Republic.[746] The written script of *Pro Milone* is regarded as an example of a sublime mix of *logos, ethos,* and *pathos* drawing on his character.[747]

When Cicero was exiled from his beloved Rome for a time he lost his freedom of speech, so produced written works that celebrated republican ideals, outlining his views on the Republic (*De Republica*), the law (*De Legibus*), and the ideal participant in legal and political life (*De Oratore*).[748] These writings set the stage for his return to Rome as champion of Republican values.[749] When Brutus assassinated Caesar, he dedicated his knifework to Cicero and the hope that the republic had been recovered. Cicero gave a speech to the senate urging

---

[743] Cicero, *De Oratore, II.XLIII.182-184*, May, *Trials*, 4-5, May, *Companion to Cicero*, 60, Wisse, 'Intellectual Background,' 385, Krauss, 'Ethos,' 85

[744] May, *Companion to Cicero*, 60, May, *Trials*, 6, 69–79, 162-163 R.W. Cape, Jr, 'Cicero's Consular Speeches,' *BCCOR*, (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 140, Krauss, 'Ethos,' 84

[745] May, *Trials*, 13-21,164-165 this continued through his career when his opponents had great inherited auctoritas than he did, so even in his pro-consular treatment of Cato, who had unimpeachable inherited credentials, 64-69, V. Arena, 'Roman Oratorical Invective,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 2784-2801

[746] A. Corbeill, 'Ciceronian Invective,' *BCCOR*, (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 198-199

[747] May, *Companion to Cicero*, 13

[748] May, *Companion to Cicero*, 13, Fantham, *Roman World of Cicero*, 9-15, 17

[749] Fantham, *Roman World of Cicero,* 8, *De Oratore*, in part, seeks to establish Cicero's legacy as one prepared to risk his life to prevent "stormy political seas from causing universal ruin" (*De Oratore,* 1.3).

amnesty for those involved in the conspiracy against Caesar, and initially felt hopeful about the recovery of the Republic, though became quickly disillusioned as it became evident that Caesar's tyranny was simply being replaced with another tyrant, Mark Antony.[750] Cicero spoke against Antony's character – Antony epitomised all things un-Roman, while Cicero, by contrast depicts himself as "the patriot, true and unfailing, ready and willing to put his life on the line for the survival of the state—in fact, he is in a way the symbol, even the literal embodiment of the Republic."[751] As his political fortunes waned again, Cicero again turned to writing, presenting a critique of Imperial rule in *Brutus*, *Orator*, and a range of moral, social, and religious works.[752] His communication praxis was consistent with his moral and ethical philosophy. Cicero used his being, and his communicative acts, to embody, and argue for Republican values.

For the novice orator this also meant choosing the right orators to imitate, and carefully imitating only the *"most excellent qualities"* of those orators.[753]
"They are fond, they tell us, of the Attic style of Eloquence: and their choice is certainly judicious, provided they borrow the blood and the healthy juices, as well as the bones and membranes. What they recommend, however, is, to do it justice, an agreeable quality."[754]

For Cicero, somewhat presciently given the development of the second sophistic, the passing of generations of orators, and the trend of imitating the superficial, was leading to the bankruptcy of oratory.[755] His proposed solution

[750] May, *Companion to Cicero*, 15
[751] May, *Companion to Cicero*, 17-18
[752] Cicero, *The Academic Questions*, 642-646, May, *Companion to Cicero*, 13, May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4597
[753] Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratoum*, III, Translated C.D Yonge, retrieved, http://www.classicpersuasion.org/pw/cicero/cicero-best-style.htm, May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4563 Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.XXII.90-92, *"For nothing is easier than to imitate a man*'s style of dress, pose or gait. Moreover, if there is a fault, it is not much trouble to appropriate that and to copy it ostentatiously… he did not know how to choose the model whom he would most willingly resemble, and it was positively the faults in his chosen pattern that he elected to copy. But he who is to proceed aright must first be watchful in making his choice, and afterwards extremely careful in striving to attain the most excellent qualities of the model he has approved...* "* he speaks again about the importance of imitating people of substance in Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratoum*, III,
[754] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 298
[755] Cicero, *De Oratore,* II.XXII. 94-95, *"Afterwards, when these men were dead and all remembrance of them gradually grew dim and then vanished away, certain other less spirited and lazier styles of speaking flourished."*

was for the student to read widely and model themselves on as many orators as possible, though especially those who speak plainly.[756]

Aristotle's persuasive elements, were thus developed by Cicero, such that *logos* refers to the "neat and clear" content of the text,[757] *ethos* refers to the character of the speaker, both within and outside the text,[758] and the character of the audience. The gifted orator tailors the speech to the audience, accommodating them through knowledge of the context and through the use of understandable phrases and imagery. The speaker's *ethos* also controls the use of *pathos* – the "warm and forcible" elements of the act intended to "fires and inflame" the emotions of, and secure a response from, the audience.[759] Each proof is equally important,[760] but in Cicero's ideal, they are nothing without virtue.

Cicero's legacy is not so simply due to the power of his oratory, and the practicality of his writings. He is lauded because he embodied the values of the Republic, to the point of martyrdom, for the sake of the Republic.[761] When Cicero was executed the head that had spoken and the hands that had written against Marc Antony, in the *Philippics*, were put on display.[762]

"I defended the republic as a young man; I will not desert it as an old one. I despised the swords of Catiline; I will not fear yours. Indeed I would gladly offer my body, if by my death the liberty of the state can be immediately recovered, so that finally the suffering of the Roman People may bring to birth what it has long since labored to produce. For if twenty years ago in this very temple I said that death could not be too early for a consular, how much more truly will I now say, for an old man!" Cicero, *Orationes Philippicae*, 2.118-19[763]

---

[756] Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratoum*, III
[757] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 403
[758] Krauss, 'Ethos,' 73
[759] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 403
[760] May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4489
[761] Corbeil, 'Rhetorical Education,' Location 1380, 1424
[762] Craig, 'Cicero as Orator,' Location 5032
[763] Craig, 'Cicero as Orator,' Location 5050

His death demonstrates his character. He thoroughly inhabited the image of the Republic.[764]

Cicero was the last great rhetorical theorist before the New Testament period. How influential Cicero was on the rhetorical composition of the New Testament, and preaching of the early church, especially on Paul, is the subject of a case study below.

After Cicero and the Republic, oratorical skill remained politically important, even for emperors, who were celebrated for their rhetorical skills, even if they didn't have them.[765] According to Tacitus, Augustus was eloquent, Tiberius was capable but deliberately obscure, Caligula was "disturbed of mind" but a strong speaker, Claudius required practice, and Nero had no rhetorical ability but relied on speechwriters.[766]

 Cicero's 1st century AD successor Quintilian was born in Spain in the 30s AD was a contemporary of Paul's, he was educated in Rome, and came back to Rome in 68AD as an influential teacher of rhetoric whose students included Pliny and Tacitus.[767] He retired from teaching to write *Institutio Oratoria,* which drew heavily on *De Oratore*, and *Orator*, was published in 95AD.[768] Like Cicero, Quintilian depicted the ideal orator as a well-educated and virtuous man.[769] He pushes ethos and pathos to the epilogue of speeches, abandoning Aristotle's threefold means of persuasion.[770] Quintilian and Cicero produced their works in Latin – Romanising Greek rhetorical theory.[771] Quintilian is of no value as a source for Paul, but his development of Cicero's work serves as an example of the sort of rhetorical evolution occurring around the time Paul was establishing the patterns of preaching in the Christian church. I will suggest that a view of Quintilian and Paul as contemporary heirs of the Ciceronian

---

[764] Craig, 'Cicero as Orator,' Location 5054
[765] S.H Rutledge, 'Oratory and Politics in the Empire,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 2038
[766] Rutledge, 'Oratory and Politics,' Location 2038
[767] J.F Lopez, 'Quintilian as Rhetorician and Teacher,' *CRR,* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 5477-5480
[768] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 92-93
[769] Lopez, 'Quintilian,' Location 5492, His ideal orator was skilled in rhetoric, philosophy, and literature, with a high moral sense, who serves the community in public life, Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 92-93, 95
[770] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 94
[771] Poster, 'Ethos, Authority,' 119-120

tradition who reshape Cicero differently according to their own context and rhetorical ends, fits well with the historical data, and makes Cicero's concept of ethos worth considering in the formation of the New Testament, and Paul's understanding of the relationship between character and persuasion.

JOINING THE DOTS: PAUL, CICERO, AND TARSUS

I will now offer a reconstruction of Paul's background so far as his rhetorical development is concerned, before assessing the Corinthian correspondence as a case of Paul employing rhetoric, and creating his own handbook for Christian rhetoric, appropriate to the church setting. I will assume, and attempt to demonstrate, the hypothesis that Paul is a paradigmatic communicative agent of the communicative God, so conforms to the pattern described above, and as such will also make two further related assumptions that are disputed amongst Pauline scholarship – firstly, that Paul spent a substantial amount of time in his formative years in Tarsus,[772] where he enjoyed a relatively privileged education as a Roman citizen, before relocating to Jerusalem to advance his career through further training with the Pharisees under Gamaliel, and secondly, that Paul is an educated and deliberate communicator with significant acumen especially in classical rhetoric, and oratory. I hope to demonstrate how this hypothesis, and these assumptions, driven by prior assumptions about the nature of Scripture, the Scriptural evidence, and the historical data provide an account that is consistent with the methodology and theological framework provided above, historically plausible, and of some value for establishing a paradigm for communicative acts in a modern context.

The model adopted above for assessing literary parallels is applicable to assessing the possible use of rhetoric in Paul. It considered models proposed by Kennedy (1984), and Mitchell (1991), for avoiding anachronistic rhetorical assessments of literature,[773] by assessing a unit of rhetoric according to the

---

[772] *pace* W.C Van Unnik, *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth*, Trans. G. Ogg, (London, The Epworth Press, 1962), M. Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul*, (Michigan, SCM Press, 1991)
[773] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 27, Many people conducting rhetorical studies of the NT are doing so with "new rhetoric" rather than considering NT Rhetoric a product of its time, at 255, cites M.M Mitchell's *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation* (1991), 6, which outlines five mandates for rhetorical criticism: 1. Rhetorical Criticism is an historical undertaking 2. Actual speeches, letters, and handbooks from antiquity must be consulted. 3. The designation of the

historical situation of the argument, the arrangement of material, the models of rhetoric available, the situation of the audience, and the success or otherwise of perlocutionary goal of the communicator, in the light of rhetorical manuals and speeches from the period.[774] Kennedy, like Vanhoozer, suggests *"the ultimate goal of rhetorical analysis… is the discovery of the author's intent and of how that is transmitted to a text to an audience."*[775] Before we can argue for a deliberate parallel between Paul's communicative praxis, and Cicero's communication theory, we must demonstrate a plausible, though speculative, connection between the two. Even if this connection does not stand, the exercise will establish Paul's theologically driven approach to persuasive communication as an image-bearing ambassador for Christ.

RHETORICAL QUESTIONS: IS THERE ANY VALUE STUDYING PAUL'S COMMUNICATIVE ACTS AS RHETORIC?

The relationship between Paul and the rhetorical schools of the New Testament period has been the subject of debate since Augustine suggested that the authors of Scripture, including Paul, combined wisdom and eloquence.[776] Augustine suggests that while Paul is eloquent, "nobody could claim Paul knew rhetorical theory."[777] Later Christian rhetoricians, like Philip Melancthon, applied rhetorical theory to Paul's writings.[778] Scholarly interest in Paul's rhetorical prowess has more or less mirrored academic interest in rhetoric, so has waxed and waned, such treatments were popular at the Reformation, and again in the 19th century, was not a huge emphasis in the early 20th century, and are on the rise today thanks to the advent of rhetorical criticism,[779] Dugan (2010) attributes the rise of rhetorical criticism to the

---

rhetorical species of a text… cannot be begged in the analysis. 4. The appropriateness of rhetorical form or genre must be demonstrated. 5. The rhetorical unit to be examined should be a compositional unit, which can be substantiated by further analysis.
[774] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 24-25, 28, citing Kennedy, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 33-38
[775] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 31, citing Kennedy, *Rhetorical Criticism,* 5, 12, and the aim of rhetorical criticism is "reading the Bible as it would be read by an early Christian, ed. an inhabitant of the Greek-speaking world in which rhetoric was the core subject of formal education and in which even those without formal education necessarily developed cultural preconceptions about appropriate discourse."
[776] Augustine, *On Christian Teaching,* 4.6.9, 4.7.11 Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 17
[777] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 17-18
[778] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 18-19
[779] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 19, 22-23

"recuperation of rhetoric in the wake of Romantic condemnation of it as an art of deception and a cobweb-cluttered warehouse of dusty tropes."[780]

Rhetorical criticism of Paul's writing is relatively common, the question now is what rhetorical model should be applied to Paul. Some suggest his writings show the hallmarks of Greek rhetoric one might expect in a Hellenised Jew.[781] Norden (1898) suggests Paul's rhetoric is similar to the Asianic style.[782] This style closely resembles Cicero's style, particularly in its rejection of Attic rhetoric and sophistry, this found some support from Duncan's (1926), who suggested Paul received training in an Asianic school.[783] Some scholars are still hesitant to suggest Paul received formal rhetorical schooling,[784][785] mostly because they emphasise his Pharisaic Jewish background at the expense of any Greek or Roman influence, any educated Hellenic Jew was likely to have been trained in rhetoric.[786] Philo of Alexandria was something of a pinup boy in Judaism for his ability to articulate Jewish truths using Greek mediums. As suggested below, there is a good case to be made that Paul is a product of Tarsus and Jerusalem, not simply Jerusalem. Rhetorical training in a centre like Tarsus may explain Paul's career trajectory within the Pharisaic movement.

Anderson (1998) and Poster (2005) surveyed possible options in a bid to find a "suitable rhetorical theory… for a writer of Greek in the mid first century AD.[787] Both reject the widespread use of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as a model because of its relative obscurity in the period.[788] Poster suggests the Latin handbooks of

---

[780] J. Dugan, 'Modern Critical Approaches to Roman Rhetoric,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), kindle edition, 379

[781] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 20

[782] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 21

[783] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 20-21, citing Duncan, 'The Style and Language of Saint Paul in his First Letter to the Corinthians,' 143

[784] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 20, 277, *"it would seem unlikely that Paul enjoyed a formal rhetorical training" even if Acts 22:3 is interpreted to allow for an education in Tarsus, Paul probably attended a strict Jewish school. Even if they incorporated a Greek form of grammatical education, he "at the most" will have become acquainted with certain progymnasmata. His Pharasaical upbringing in Jerusalem under Gamaliel may also have had Greek influences, It seems highly unlikely that Paul received any formal training in rhetorical theory."*

[785] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,*

[786] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 30, citing Kennedy, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 8-10, rhetoric was universally taught, several important rhetoricians came from Palestine, Paul must have had some exposure, even if no education, NT documents were orally, and thus rhetorically, conceived.

[787] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 36

[788] Poster, 'Ethos, Authority, and the New Testament,' 119-120, Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 41-42

Cicero and Quintilian would be more promising based on their conception of ethos, but suggests they are of little value because they were written in Latin and *"there is little evidence that in the Greek east rhetoricians or students, much less those without advanced rhetorical training would have paid significant attention to Latin literary or technical works,"*[789] he identifies the Greek works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus as a possible source.[790] Anderson does not think Cicero is directly relevant to Paul,[791] and is initially optimistic about Quintilian's value as a source,[792] but concludes that Paul is not sophisticated enough to be employing Greek rhetoric, let alone Latin.[793] I suggest that while Dionysius may be chronologically plausible, his pragmatic emphasis on "effective persuasion" over character based persuasion makes him an unlikely source for Paul's rhetorical model,[794] while there is a plausible link between Cicero and Paul both historically, and in their writings.

A potential relationship between Paul and Cicero, and Cicero's rhetorical handbooks has found support in the literature,[795] but with little rationale. There is however, a plausible historical reconstruction that would account for this relationship and go some way to explaining Paul's reception in Corinth,

---

[789] Poster, 'Ethos, Authority, and the New Testament,' 119-120

[790] Poster, 'Ethos, Authority, and the New Testament,' 119-120, 131, "Chronology alone suggests that early Christian rhetorical practice is likely to be of the sort described by Hellenistic handbooks such as those of Dionysisus of Halicarnassus rather than modelled on a work composed by Aristotle some three centuries earlier."

[791] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 70-71, he rules out *De Inventione* because its Judicial emphasis is not that applicable to Paul, however, Paul's court speeches adhere to judicial conventions.

[792] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 91, he suggests Cicero is relevant only in that he is a source for Quintilian, and Quintilian is relevant only because he is a contemporary of Paul and thus, in their differences, shows that Paul is not rhetorically capable.

[793] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 277-282, takes an exceptionally low view of Paul's abilities, including his ability to write Greek. Anderson adopts the polar opposite reconstruction of Paul to that advocated here, rejecting any rhetorical training in Tarsus, while conceding he may have been educated in a strict Jewish context in the city. He suggests Paul is obscure, unclear, and unoriginal in expression.

[794] Poster, 'Ethos, Authority, and the New Testament,' 122

[795] So, for example, J. Patrick, 'Insights from Cicero on Paul's Reasoning in 1 Corinthians 12-14: Love sandwich or five course meal?' *Tyndale Bulletin,* 55.1, (2004), 43-64, 63-64, suggests that Paul's argumentation in 1 Corinthians can be loosely conformed to Cicero's guidelines for correct rhetorical speech, L.L Welborn, 'Paul's Appeal to the Emotions in 2 Corinthians 1.1-2.13,7.5-16,' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament,* 82, 2001, 21-60, 33-34, 40-45, 57-59 suggests Paul's use of emotive language and mentions of his own emotional state as a rhetorical tool is influenced by Cicero, L.L Welborn, 'The Identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13 with the "Letter of Tears",' *Novum testamentum,* 37.2 April (1995), 138-153 148-149, treats 2 Corinthians 1-7 as a "conciliatory letter" based on comparisons with extant letters of Cicero's. B.J Tucker, 'The role of civic identity on the Pauline mission in Corinth,' *Didaskalia,* (Winter 2008), 71-91, 86-87, cites Cicero, *De Finibus,* 3.35, as a similar example where vice lists are included in attempts to change behaviour through shame ala 1 Corinthians 6:5-11.

his response, and his understanding of his communicative praxis. Other scholars dismiss any link between Cicero and the Greek speaking world on the basis of the language barrier,[796] a rhetorical and literary education was expensive,[797] but highly desirable for Roman citizens in Hellenistic settings, from the first century BC, through the first century AD,[798] and Cicero's works were important sources for first century rhetorical schools in the Roman rhetorical tradition (though most schools preferred *De Inventione* to *De Oratore*).[799] Such important works were doubtless translated into Greek by keen students of oratory, and the lack of manuscript evidence is not too problematic when one considers that *De Oratore*, an important source for Quintilian, would have been lost if a single Latin copy had not been discovered in Italy in 1421. [800] Regardless, it is possible, from the evidence, that Paul knew Latin.[801] Only wealthy parents who desired a status upgrade for their children, could afford to send them abroad for a tertiary education[802] Paul's citizenship, and "tertiary education" under Gamaliel in Jerusalem, are indicators that his parents were wealthy enough to seek to advance his career through education, and suggests a relative degree of wealth. His upbringing in Tarsus, with its rhetorical schools, provides a setting for his early training in rhetoric.

PAUL'S BACKGROUND

From his own account of his heritage, Paul is a "Hebrew of Hebrews" (Philippians 3:5-11), born a citizen, in Tarsus (Acts 21:39, 22:3, 8), and "brought up at the feet of Gamaliel" (Acts 22:3). He is known as a "man of Tarsus" and was sent back to the city when there was a plot to kill him in Jerusalem (Acts 9:11). Paul makes an apparent distinction between Jerusalem and "his own country" (Acts 26:4-5) that would seem to run counter to theories that Paul

---

[796] Poster, 'Ethos, Authority,' 119-120
[797] C. McNelis, 'Grammarians and Rhetoricians,' *CRR*, (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Kindle Edition, 5133-5164
[798] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 64-65
[799] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 86-87
[800] Fantham, *Roman World of Cicero,* 49
[801] S.E Porter, 'Did Paul Speak Latin,' *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman,* Ed. S.E Porter, (Leiden, Brill, 2008), 289-308
[802] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 64-65, "Only wealthy Greeks could have afforded to send their youth out of town to any of the famous schools for a more dedicated "tertiary" education (eg philosophy, rhetoric, or medicine), or perhaps to a finishing school like *Epheby* at Athens."

spent all or most of his childhood in Jerusalem.[803] The popular reconstruction of Paul in critical circles is to assume that Paul is something of a literary bumpkin who cobbles together unclear letters in mangled Greek, to take his statements about his oratory prowess at face value, rather than in the context of the Corinthian correspondence, and to simultaneously ignore the impact his communicative acts had on human history, his accounts of his ability to move flexibly between cultures according to his communication agenda for the sake of securing a perlocutionary end (1 Cor 9:19-23), the impressive pre-conversion trajectory Paul was on within the Pharisaic community (Galatians 1:14, Philippians 3:5-8, Acts 7:58, Acts 22:1-5), and any sense that his communicative acts were works of a communicative God.

Paul is at least bilingual, as he is capable of addressing an audience in Aramaic (Acts 22:2), and we would suggest that his speeches throughout Greece (typified by his address to the Areopagus (Acts 17), his reliance on Septuagint Greek, his conversance with a wide range of Roman literature (Evans (2008) identifies more than 200 parallels),[804] Cilician Stoic poetry (Acts 17:28), the Imperial political system, and the nuanced philosophical positions of his audience (Acts 17:24-28), and his ready ability to engage in word play with the Roman administration, suggest that Paul had a more than reasonable grasp of both Greek, and Latin, likely the product of a Roman education. His written Greek is occasionally "menial," but this can be explained as a deliberate decision to present the conversational tone he adopts in his letters, this tone is matched with literary artistry like the fool's speech that suggest that Paul is adapting his writing to his audience.[805]

This perhaps laid the foundation for his ambitious progression within the Pharisaic community where he was, it would seem, a protégé of Gamaliel, on a significant career trajectory such that crowds of supporters "laid their coats at his feet" (Acts 7:58), and the high priest was prepared to hand him a license to

---

[803] R.Wallace, and W. Williams, *The Three Worlds of Paul of Tarsus,* (London, Routledge, 1998), 180-182

[804] C.A Evans, 'Paul and the Pagans,' *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman,* Ed. S.E Porter, (Leiden, Brill, 2008), 117-126

[805] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 282, citing Fairweather who adopts the position described, Anderson believes Fairweather is "inclined to give Paul too much credit."

kill (Acts 8:1, 9:1-4, 22:3-5). When Paul suggests he was capable of being "all things to all men" (1 Cor 9:22). It seems odd to doubt him, especially in the light of descriptions of his ministry of proclamation in the book of Acts. Paul is comfortable before crowds, and the Jewish religious establishment before conversion (Acts 7-8), and immediately afterwards (Acts 9:29). He is able to manipulate the Roman legal system to his own ends, securing passage to Rome and an audience with various courts and kings. He adapts his presentation of the gospel of Jesus to a variety of settings, including these courts, the Areopagus, his trial before Gallio, and a hearing before a Jewish religious council (Acts 17, Acts 18, 23:1-9, 24, 25:1-12, 25:13-26:32).[806] One might suggest that Luke's summary account of Paul's appearance before the Areopagus, where Paul both models an understanding of the Athenian context, the ceremonial function of the Areopagus in introducing new gods to the city, and a familiarity with the poets and theology of the audience, is a sublime example of an epideictic speech.[807] Paul is also arguably capable of forensic rhetoric, as demonstrated in the accounts of his trials.[808] His "weighty" letters (2 Cor 10:10) would seem to indicate rhetorical prowess,[809] especially the deeply ironic and "sublime" "Fool's Speech" in 2 Corinthians.[810] His interaction with contemporary literature proposed allusions to Cicero's moral and political works including four references in the Corinthian correspondence (1 Cor 11:1 (*Fam 1.7*), 13:12 (*Fin 5.15*), 2 Cor 4:6 (*Tusc* 1:26), 11:26 (*Acad 2.8*).[811] Evans suggests *"Paul made use of philosophical idiom and imagery to advance his apologetic and to communicate his ideas, especially when addressing non-Jewish converts. His quotations of and allusions to Greco-Roman literature established a*

---

[806] B.W Winter, *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997), 2002 Edition, 225-227

[807] Cicero's account of flexibility based on setting and audience would seem to come into play here if Paul is obeying the Areopagus conventions for introducing new gods to Athens at short notice. On the context of the speech see, B.W. Winter, 'On Introducing New Gods To Athens: An Alternative Reading of Acts 17:18-20,' Tyndale Bulletin, 47.1 (1996), 71-90

[808] B.W Winter, 'Official Proceedings and the Forensic Speeches in Acts 24-26,' *The Book Of Acts In Its First Century Setting: Volume 1: Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. B.W Winter, A.D Clarke, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1993), 305-336, 333, the Speeches recorded in Acts appear to follow the conventions from Cicero and Quintilian's handbooks.

[809] F.J Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians*, (Cambridge, CUP, 2004), 181, contra P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 18 who suggests rhetorical structure was so popular any first century citizen could pick it up.

[810] Hester, 'Sublime,' 112

[811] Evans, 'Pagans,' 121-123

precedent followed by the church's major theologians."[812] This evidence suggests Paul has a level of mastery of oratory that suggests some formal training.[813]

Much effort has been dedicated to explaining away suggestions of Paul's rhetorical skill,[814] when according to the evidence the better question may be why, given the evidence, is Paul's presentation weak (2 Cor 10:10).

Tarsus was, according to Strabo's *Geography*, an educational centre famed for its schools of rhetoric: "… *Further, the city of Tarsus has all kinds of schools of rhetoric; and in general it not only has a flourishing population but also is most powerful, thus keeping up the reputation of the mother-city. But it is so different from other cities that there the men who are fond of learning, are all natives, and foreigners are not inclined to sojourn there; neither do these natives stay there, but they complete their education abroad; and when they have completed it they are pleased to live abroad, and but few go back home."* [815]

Cicero was the reluctant governor of Cilicia in 51 B.C, four years after he produced *De Oratore*. The region was falling apart, and faced invasion from the Parthians. Cicero restored order – he fought corruption and fixed interest rates, bolstered the military, and launched a successful military campaign against neighbouring enemies of the empire. His military actions were awarded by the senate with a public thanksgiving.[816] While one might look for statues in Tarsus as evidence of the sort of admiration that might lead to his oratorical works being significant for students from the city, the paucity of such evidence actually lends credence to our hypothesis, because it is consistent with his expressed wishes. Cicero was, in his own words, greatly admired and appreciated in Tarsus. He writes to Atticus: "I left Tarsus for Asia on the Nones of January, amid really indescribable enthusiasm among the Cilician communities, especially the people of Tarsus."[817] In the same letter he claims that the six months of his governorship, thus far, was characterised by a lack of

---

[812] *ibid*, 139

[813] M. Strom, *Reforming Paul: Conversations in Grace & Community*, (Downers Grove, IVP, 2000), 74, suggests this training probably occurred in Tarsus.

[814] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 20, for example, is sceptical about Paul's use of rhetoric in 2 Corinthians 10-12, because he is sceptical about Paul's capacity for employing rhetoric.

[815] Strabo, 'Tarsus,' *Geography*.

[816] May, *Companion to Cicero*, 14

[817] Cicero, Letters to Atticus, 114.V.21.7, *Letters to Atticus: Volume 3*, (Cambridge, CUP, 1968), 69

the customary profiteering levied by governors, and that this will remain the case. He says that "In return for these benefits, which dumbfound the provincials, I allow none but verbal honours to be decreed on me, I forbid statues, temples, chariots. Nor do I impose myself upon the communities in any way."[818] In an earlier letter, discussing the sort of legacy he would like to leave in Athens after a period there en route to Tarsus, he says: "I hear that Appius is making a gateway at Eleusis. Would it be out of the way if I did the same for the Academy?... I am really very fond of Athens, the actual city. I want to have some memorial there, and I hate false inscriptions on other people's statues."[819] It is plausible that Cicero's refusal of certain civic honours in the province, and love for the academy, translated to a certain level of commitment to his rhetorical manual in the city of Tarsus. *De Oratore* featured another former proconsul of Cilicia, Marcus Antonius, as an interlocutor. The use of Cicero's works in rhetorical schools around the empire and this link to Tarsus, provides a plausible setting for Paul to encounter and select *De Oratore* as his rhetorical handbook.[820] Cicero's emphasis on combining rhetorical training with a broad knowledge,[821] may account for Paul's abilities as described in Acts, and demonstrated in his writings.

Roman citizenship in Tarsus did not come cheap. Dio Chrysostom describes residents of Tarsus purchasing their citizenship for five hundred drachmas.[822] While Paul was born a citizen, and did not purchase citizenship (Acts 22:28), if his ancestors did, that transaction would suggest Paul's family had significant financial resources, and some ambition. If Paul is the ambitious child of a *novus homus* Roman-Jewish family without inherited image or *dignitas* it is quite possible that he looked to Cicero for inspiration. It is also possible that Paul's family were awarded citizenship by a Roman general, thanks to their participation in Roman military campaigns, the best options at this point are

---

[818] Cicero, Letter to Atticus, 114.V.21.7, 69
[819] Cicero, Letter to Atticus, 115.VI.2.2, 101-103
[820] Without making a connection between Tarsus and Cicero, J. Patrick, 'Insights from Cicero on Paul's Reasoning in 1 Corinthians 12-14: Love sandwich or five course meal?' *Tyndale Bulletin,* 55.1, (2004), 43-64, 48-50, suggests it is likely that Paul came across one of Cicero's other works *De Partitione Oratore* either in Tarsus or Jerusalem. I am simply suggesting that the work Paul is familiar with is the more substantial *De Oratore*, though at that point it becomes likely that Paul is familiar with a variety of Cicero's well circulated rhetorical works.
[821] W. Englert, 'The Philosophy of Cicero,' 137
[822] Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses*, 34.23, Loeb Classic Library, 1940, retrieved online 9 May 2012, http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/34*.html

Pompey who defeated marauding pirates from Tarsus in 67BC, or Cicero, who ran a military campaign from Tarsus in 51BC.[823] If Paul's family were "tentmakers" in Tarsus they were likely involved in the production of a particular sort of fabric that was traded around the empire, which would involve some wealth. In any case, it is likely that as a citizen, Paul's indoctrination into Judaism, and learning of the family business, was coupled with access to an education in the city,[824] which included the study of rhetoric in one of Tarsus' famous schools, which featured Cicero's texts as handbooks.[825] Then, perhaps because a career as an orator in the public life of a colonial city was unavailable to him as a Jewish youth, and as Strabo reports was customary for rhetors trained in Tarsus, he left the city to pursue public life as a Jew, and to further his education under Gamaliel (Acts 22:3). [826]

RHETORICAL OBSERVATIONS OF 1-2 CORINTHIANS AND CICERO'S *DE ORATORE*

THE COMMUNICATOR AND AUDIENCE: CANONICAL, HISTORICAL, AND LITERARY SETTING

Paul's communication to the Corinthians takes the form of an epistle. Outside of their purpose as divine revelation, epistles were typically produced in response to events in a specific time and place. The events that prompted Paul to write to Corinth seem to involve the Corinthian church's dalliance with the high-flying rhetoric of the Second Sophistic movement, popular in the city,[827] and their application of those standards to gospel preaching.[828] This style was obsessed with competition and the superficial persona,[829] and its popularity with the elite in Corinth meant it permeated all forms of rhetoric in the city, as

---

[823] S.A. Adams, 'Paul The Roman Citizen: Roman Citizenship in the Ancient World and its importance for understanding Acts 22:22-29,' *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman,* Ed. S.E Porter, (Leiden, Brill, 2008), 309-326, especially 310, 320, suggests Pompey is the most likely. His logic could be applied to Cicero.

[824] J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996), 46, 49, according to Philo, diasporan Jews took full advantage of learning in Greek Gymnasiums.

[825] J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life,* 50-52, suggests Paul was likely a master of rhetoric, and that it was deeply ingrained in him on the back of practice and study. C. Mihaila, The Paul-Apollos Relationship And Paul's Stance Toward Graeco-Roman Rhetoric,' (London, T&T Clark, 2009), 128

[826] J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul,* 46,52-53, Strabo, *Geography.*

[827] B.W Winter, *Philo and Paul,* 144-238

[828] On the first century prominence of the second sophistic, especially in Corinth, see B.W Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 144-238.

[829] V.H.T Nguyen, *Christian Identity in Corinth: A Comparative Study of 2 Corinthians,* (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 47-48

the rhetorical culture of a city reflected the preferences of the elite.[830] Dio Chrysostom's *Corinthian Speech* would suggest a flavour of rhetoric was popular in Corinth, presenting the sophist as philosopher, linking eloquence and wisdom.[831] The relationship between eloquence and wisdom had been settled in Rome, at least for those who followed Cicero, from the late first century BC. Quintilian had affirmed Cicero's conclusions. Eloquence and Wisdom worked in concert. Paul is not taking a side in a continuing debate as he rejects "wisdom and eloquence," he is, with Cicero, seeing them as two important and related concerns. He simply sees them as inadequate human categories for understanding the wisdom of God revealed in the foolishness of the cross. He stands with Cicero, but inverts the place of wisdom and eloquence for the Christian orator. It is God's wisdom that counts (1 Cor 1:18-25). The application of the oratory of the second sophistic to the church led to members forming socio-political factions around their chosen "orators," declaring allegiance to these figureheads (1 Cor 1:12, 3:4).[832] Paul's deliberate rejection of this style of oratory was perceived as an inadequacy.[833] The introductory chapters of 1 Corinthians (1-4) are full of rhetorical terminology, as Paul addresses this situation.

Paul's oratorical inadequacy, his pointed critique of conformity to culture in First Corinthians,[834] his failure to end the factions,[835] and his ongoing refusal to act as a status-enhancing sophistic client for the churches by providing benefactions to the city through the financial support of wealthy patrons,[836]

---

[830] Nguyen, *Christian Identity in Corinth,* 47. I. Henderson, 'The Second Sophistic and Non Elite Speakers,' *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and its Times,* ed. T. Schmidt and P. Fleury, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2011), 23-24

[831] contra Betz, cited in Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 266

[832] L.L Welborn, 'On the Discord in Corinth, 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Ancient Politics,' 92, 110, M.D Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric*, 91

[833] Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul,* 51, Also M.D Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric: Ambiguity, Cunning and Deception in Greece and Rome*, (Harrisburg, Trinity International, 2001), 97

[834] Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 15, suggests the powerful were alienated by this critique and sought revenge.

[835] F.J Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology*, 181

[836] B.W Winter, *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists,* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997), 2002 Edition, 164-165, C. Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship*, 86-88, Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 97, It should be noted that Paul was not against civic benefactions per se, and likely encouraged them, there is good evidence to suggest that the extant inscription on a public footpath in Corinth marks such a benefaction delivered to the city by the Erastus whom Paul mentions as treasurer of the whole city of Corinth (Rom 16:23), see A.D Clarke, *Secular & Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical & Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 6*, (Leiden, Brill, 1993), 47-56, even if Erastus wasn't the man behind the pavement, though he probably

turned an opponent from First Corinthians into an enemy.[837] Second

Corinthians follows the first letter thematically, "super apostles" have emerged

on the scene, modelling the sort of eloquence Paul refuses to exhibit, so Paul is

forced to defend his ministry against the criticisms of a powerful individual

within the congregation, over and against the ministry of these super apostles.

Paul responds to this situation not by rejecting persuasive speech, but by

properly grounding it in the nature of the *logos* of Christ crucified, and *ethos*

messengers of the cross. Paul uses the principles in *De Oratore,* and Cicero's

criticisms of derivative attic oratory and its downward spiral due to poor

choice of role models for imitation, as a critique of Corinth's fascination with

the Second Sophistic. In doing so the two letters articulate his conception of the

ideal orator, Jesus Christ, and what it looks like to imitate him (1 Cor 11:1).

The Corinthian church contained members from various social strata,

including "not many" powerful members of Corinthian society (1 Cor 1:26,

Romans 16:23).[838] It met in various houses (Romans 16:23), it is possible the

hosts of these gatherings acted, and were perceived as patrons.[839] It seems

there was factional division, possibly between various house churches,[840] over

leadership and identification and that there was factional division over

leadership or identification (1 Cor 1:10-14), which expressed itself identically to

how one expressed affiliation to an orator, or sophistic school.[841] From Paul's

opening salvo it seems the powerful or ambitious members of the church in

was, he was clearly important and powerful because Paul does not mention the civic position
of any other supporter.
[837] P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*,
(Tubingen, Mohrs Siebeck, 1987), 397, L. Welborn, *An End to Enmity: Paul and the Wrongdoer of
Second Corinthians*, (Berlin, Walter De Gruyter, 2011), 368, Clarke, *Secular & Christian Leadership*,
34, turning down a financial gift was grounds for enmity.
[838] Contra Deissman, Meeks and others, Paul does not say "not any," see A.D Clarke, *Secular &
Christian Leadership*, 45
[839] J. Harrison, 'Paul's House Churches and the Cultic Associations', *The Reformed Theological
Review*, 58.1, (April 1999), 31-47, 45-46
[840] It would be culturally unusual, if any in the gathering were identifying their host as a
patron, for the patron's preference not to become normative in the group. E.A Judge, 'The
Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century,' *Social Distinctives of the Christians in
the First Century. Pivotal essays by E. A. Judge*, ed. D.M. Scholer, (Massachusetts: Hendrickson,
2008), 27, E.A Judge, *The social pattern of the Christian groups in the first century: some prolegomena
to the study of New Testament ideas of social obligation*, (London, Tyndale Press, 1960), 35-36, so,
for example, if the patron of a household changed religious affiliation the entire household
would change, see, for example, Acts 10 (Cornelius), and Acts 16 (Lydia).
[841] B.W Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 38-41

Corinth remained committed to the Graeco-Roman concern for power and status,[842] and were seeking to advance their status, potentially through membership in the church, and association with their chosen preacher.[843] From the issues addressed in 1 Corinthians, we can assume that members of the church remained active in civic life, taking part in the courts (1 Cor 6), sexual immorality (1 Cor 6), cultic activities (1 Cor 8), and being hosted at meals by unbelievers (1 Cor 10). Their conversion has apparently not resulted in changed behaviour or standards.[844]

As he responds to his influential opponent,[845] Paul obeys social conventions regarding enemies and reconciliation.[846] This opponent appears to value Hellenistic oratory,[847] and identifying with the Apollos faction.[848] His rejection caused Paul apostle personal anguish (2 Cor 2:5-10, 7:12), so it seems they were initially friends.[849] However, this opponent invited and endorsed a group of

---

[842] A.D Clarke, *Secular & Christian Leadership*, 39-45, participation in public life was expensive, so it is likely that the few people who were wealthy, wise, and of noble birth, were very wealthy.

[843] D. Starling, *Not My People: Gentiles as exiles in Pauline Hermeneutics*, (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 74, B.J Tucker, 'The role of civic identity,' 77-78, C. Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos*, 89, 96-102

[844] Tucker, 'The role of civic identity,' 73-75

[845] Many have tried to identify this enemy, Wellborn suggests it is Gaius, L. Welborn, *An End to Enmity,* 239-244, 357-366, who is wealthy and influential, and was named as a friend of Paul's (1 Corinthians 1:14, Romans 16:23)

[846] P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth, 347*

[847] L. Welborn, *An End to Enmity,* 372-375 suggests there are really only two factions – the Paul faction and the Apollos faction. While it has been popular, since Baur, to post two factions, a Cephas following circumcision party, and the Paul-Apollos faction, it seems the Corinthians are more interested in playing Paul's rhetorical ability off against that of Apollos, especially because of what we know of Apollos from Acts 18, B.W. Winter, *Philo,* 178, suggests the language used of Apollos in Acts are rhetorically charged, J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A critical life*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 275, suggests Apollos was likely influenced by Philo, and thus emphasised spiritual experience, and other Hellenic traits that would have been popular with Corinthian movers and shakers, in J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology of Second Letter to the Corinthians*, 13-14, he argues that Paul's opponents are the wisdom lovers of 1 Corinthians 2:6-12, who had preferences for a Philo styled spirituality, and saw Apollos as a Christian Philo, this conclusion was supported by C. Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship*, 76-78, M.D Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric*, 93

[848] On the link between the factions of 1 Corinthians and the opposition in 2 Corinthians see L.L Welborn, 'On the Discord in Corinth, 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Ancient Politics,' *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 106.1, (1987), 85-111, 110, P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* New International Commentary on the New Testament, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997), 38, suggests they may have been Jewish followers of Cephas.

[849] L. Welborn, *An End to Enmity,* 23-24, 39-40, 46-59, 228, these criteria for Paul's opponent, established by Welborn, seem a more legitimate reconstruction than his conclusion, and the assumption at 228 that Paul's enemy must have been named as one of his friends, why Paul must have named all his friends in Corinth in his correspondence is never truly established. Paul, ed. not naming his enemy, is conforming to social conventions, the P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth*, 347, Welborn, *An End to Enmity,* acknowledges this at 211-213, that Paul has previously named this enemy is a curious presupposition, and as such, attempts to identify

Jewish, possibly Hellenised, "super-apostles,"[850] whose abilities were commended by themselves,[851] and others.[852] These super-apostles entered the patronage relationship Paul had avoided, by taking money from members of the church,[853] and, according to convention, became joint enemies of Paul.[854] They taught a hyper-spiritualised message, employing the sort of eloquence that involves denigrating opponents for personal gain.[855]

Paul writes Second Corinthians in response to this situation, and his apologia in 2 Corinthians 10-13 appears to respond to specific criticism, that:

1. He is timid and unimpressive when present but his letters are bold and weighty (2 Cor 10:1, 10);

---

this opponent are purely speculative, Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 343, the presumably influential incestuous man is also a candidate by Wellborn's logic, B.W Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 57, If this man were not a man of status it is unlikely that he would be enjoying the support of the church family, given our reconstruction, while if his status is significant this provides a motive for the Corinthian Church's lax attitude regarding his behaviour. On the possibility of this reconstruction see C.G Kruse, 'The Relationship between the Opposition to Paul Reflected in 2 Corinthians 1-7 and 10-13,' *Evangelical Quarterly*, 61.3, (1989), 195-202, 196-198. Specific suggestions for his identity beyond this evidence are purely speculative and of little value. Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 343, who suggests all identification of Paul's opponents will be driven by assumptions about the construction of the letter, It is quite possible that the church at this stage was quite small, J. Murphy O'Connor, *St Paul's Corinth: Text and Archaeology,* (Wilmington, M. Glazier Liturgical Press, 1983), 2002 reprint, 182, also D.G Horrell, and E. Adams, *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church,* (Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 10-11, speculates that it was probably no more than 50 members at the time of 1 Corinthians. If this is the case then the odds that Gaius is the adversary improve sharply, but again this is speculation based on some questionable reconstructions. D.G Horrell, and E. Adams, *Christianity at Corinth*, 11, and Welborn, *End to Emnity,* 93, Gaius is able to host the whole church in his house on occasions (1 Corinthians 11:20, Romans 16:23), which speaks both to his relative wealth, and the size of the church. But the church also gathers in other houses in the region, including Phoebe's at Cenchreae (Romans 16:1), and presumably the house of Titius Justus, where Paul based his preaching while in the city (Acts 18:7), though at 299, Welborn suggests that Titius Justus is an alternative name for Gaius.

[850] Welborn, 'The Identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13,' 143, demonstrates that the issue at the heart of 2 Corinthians 10-13 (though he treats it as a separate letter) is the questioning of Paul's apostolic legitimacy, spurred on by these apostolic intruders. Also, P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth,* 397

[851] Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth,* 399, C.G Kruse, 'The Relationship between the Opposition to Paul Reflected in 2 Corinthians 1-7 and 10-13,' 199, suggests the opponent may have latched on to the teachings of the super-apostles.

[852] Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, 345-346

[853] Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, 418, accepting a financial gift established such a relationship, L.L Welborn, 'Paul's Caricature of His Chief Rival as a Pompous Parasite in 2 Corinthians 11.20,' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament,* 32.1 (2009), 39-56, 52, suggests the super-apostles were invited by one of Paul's rivals, and that they entered the conventional type of relationship between an intellectual and the social elite.

[854] Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth,* 397

[855] Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth,* 348, Nguyen, *Christian Identity in Corinth: A Comparative Study of 2 Corinthians,* (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 149, also F.J Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology,* 181, Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric,* 94

2. He comes with no letters of recommendation, and does not commend himself as visiting orators would upon entering a new city (2 Cor 10:12-18);
3. He is inferior to the super-apostles (2 Cor 11:5);
4. He has been financially duplicitous (2 Cor 12:16-17).[856]

Paul responds to these complaints forcefully, mustering his rhetorical prowess, starting with a military description of his rhetorical approach and warning them that he is capable of delivering the impressive presence they believe they want (2 Cor 10:2-5, 11).[857]

He favourably compares himself to the super-apostles, and declares himself "not inferior" on two occasions (2 Cor 11:5, 12:11), on the basis of their rhetorical capability, then on the completeness of his apostolic ministry (2 Cor 12:11-13). While he admits to being an ἰδιώτης when it comes to his speaking (2 Cor 11:6) in response to an apparent criticism,[858] this was a technical term relating to one's non-professional status as an orator,[859] rather than simply an admission of incompetence.[860] Paul happily portrays himself as an amateur because he refuses to participate in their childish form of oratory that will ultimately lead to a false gospel.[861] Paul is committed to the oratory of the cross.

Paul's ironic self-commendation in the "Fool's Speech" (2 Cor 11-12) again confirms that his "weak" approach was a deliberate decision. He presents as an orator of the second sophistic, ironically "commending" himself (2 Cor 11:1-

---

[856] Winter, *Philo,* 204, F.J Long, *Ancient Rhetoric*, 123, 134 suggests Paul is being examined on his poor oratorical abilities, his lowly status, his refusal to accept patronage, his absence, and financial mismanagement.
[857] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 433, Paul seems confident in his ability to be strong in presence if required.
[858] Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* 508-509, or perhaps a self characterization, Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship*, 86
[859] Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology*, 181, Winter, *Philo,* 224, shows that this term can be applied to speakers who are trained but not professional orators.
[860] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 435, suggests Paul is simply admitting he isn't a great speaker. We will argue below that this is not consistent with the accounts of his ministry in Acts, his pre-conversion career trajectory, or the likely training he received in Tarsus.
[861] C. Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship*, 127, Nguyen, *Christian Identity in Corinth,* 149, he also refuses to be judged by their criteria, F.J Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology,* 181, P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* 510

33),[862] but choosing to counter the superficial persona focused,[863] sophistry of super-apostles, by parodying his opponents super-spirituality,[864] and presenting as a composite of popular theatrical "fools",[865] boasting in weakness.[866]

The substance of his message is Christ crucified (13:4). He is not really interested in making an apologia for himself, but rather presenting Christ (12:19),[867] so that they might be reconciled to him (2 Cor 13:9,11). Weakness Christology is at the heart of Paul's authority and message.[868] Any other gospel is false (2 Cor 11:4).[869]

PARALLELS WITH CICERO

I have now described Cicero's embodied virtue approach to oratory, suggested a possible connection between Paul and Cicero, sketched out the rhetorical situation of the Corinthian correspondence and Paul's approach, where he embodies the virtue of the cross, and presents a cruciform ethos as the rationale behind his attempts to persuade. Other evidence for this connection occurs at a literary level. Certain aspects of Paul's descriptions of his approach to preaching, and his analysis and critique of the situation in Corinth seem to draw conceptually from Cicero's approach to oratory, while it can be argued that these pieces of evidence are circumstantial and the product of relatively similar time, place, and content, the absence of these parallels would be fatal to

---

[862] Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 107-115

[863] Nguyen, *Christian Identity in Corinth*, 145-146

[864] J.W Barrier, 'Visions of weakness: apocalyptic genre and the identification of Paul's opponents in 2 Corinthians 12:1-6,' *Restoration Quarterly*, 47.1, 2005, 33-42, especially 34, where he argues that Paul mocks his opponents spiritual claims in 12:1-6, rather than referring to his own experience, employing parody, rather than irony, this is a Graeco-Roman rhetorical convention, though Hood, 'The temple and the thorn,' 357-370, argues that Paul describes his own spiritual experience in a way that may, at least, be theologically coherent.

[865] Welborn, 'The Runaway Paul,' 137, Paul adopts the persona of several popular theatre fools in his presentation of his ministry.

[866] Roetzel, 'The language of war,' 92-95, suggests Paul's use of military terminology in a combative rhetorical sense is coupled with his image of strength in weakness, parodied as it is with his basket driven escape down the walls, which, following EA Judge and others is possibly a contrast with the celebration of the first centurion over the wall, Winter, *Philo*, 235, suggests it is a reference to the acclaim and welcome a sophist would receive when arriving at a city, though it is more likely a particular, and popular, in keeping with the fool motif, see Welborn, 'The Runaway Paul, 156-158

[867] Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 134

[868] Winter, *Philo*, 237, Akin, 'Triumphalism,' 122-123

[869] Akin, 'Triumphalism,' 136

the argument for a connection. There are differences that are perhaps greater than the parallels, but I will suggest that Paul subverted rhetorical conventions for the sake of his sublimely ridiculous message of the crucified king.

Paul's descriptions of factionalism in 1 Corinthians 1 resonate with Cicero's critique of inexperience orators who seek to imitate the wrong aspects of the wrong models. It is possible that Paul's corrective (1 Cor 1:10, 13), and later call for imitation (1 Cor 11:1), is his suggestion that in a culture desiring affiliation with worthy speakers, it is the crucified Jesus whom Christian orators should belong to. As outlined above, Cicero saw poor choices for who to imitate as damaging to the purity of Republican oratory.[870] He also condemned narrow-minded factionalism as part of the problem.

"But in every accomplishment which may become the object of pursuit, it is excessively difficult to delineate the form (or, as the Greeks call it, the character of what is best; because some suppose it to consist in one thing, and some in another. Thus, for instance, "I am for Ennius," says one; "because he confines himself to the style of conversation:"—"and I," says another, "give the preference to Pacuvius, because his verses are embellished and well- wrought; whereas Ennius is rather too "negligent." In the same manner we may suppose a third to be an admirer of Attius; for, as among the Greeks, so it happens with us, "different men have different opinions;"—nor is it easy to determine which is best."[871]

Paul's description of his weak rhetorical entrance (1 Cor 2:3), possibly a description of his refusal to obey sophistic conventions for an orator entering a new city,[872] also suggests a connection to Cicero's claims that important speeches should move an orator to nervous fear:

"… For the better the orator, the more profoundly is he frightened of the difficulty of speaking, and of the doubtful fate of a speech, and of the anticipations of an audience… While as for him who is un-ashamed — as I see is the case with most speakers, — I

---

[870] Also, for example, Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratoum*, III, Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.XXII.90-92, 94-95,
[871] Cicero, *Orator*, 1893
[872] Winter, *Philo*, 163

hold him deserving not merely of reprimand, but of punishment as well… I turn pale at the outset of a speech, and quake in every limb and in all my soul.[873]

Paul's claim that knowledge is more important eloquence (2 Cor 11:6), in response to the Corinthian accusation that he is an ἰδιώτης, does not deny his capacity for eloquence, but rather suggests knowledge is at least as important, and that plain speech is necessary (2 Cor 1:13, 4:1-2, 11:6). This puts him firmly in Cicero's camp.[874]

Both employ similar metaphors, that of military demolition when it comes to argument (2 Cor 10:2-6),[875] and boxing to describe their communicative acts (1 Corinthians 9:26-27, 2 Tim 4:7).[876] Both are critical of the pursuit of power and status rather than virtue.[877] Both are critical of approaches that champion style over substance.[878] Both are heavily reliant on presentations of their ethos within speeches (1 Cor 9, 2 Cor 6, 2 Cor 11-12).[879]

The structure of Paul's argument in 2 Corinthians seems to conform to Cicero's preferred rhetorical arrangement, but also demonstrate the situational flexibility he desires. Critical scholars see a sharp change in tone between the

---

[873] Cicero, *De Oratore*, I.XXVI.120-122

[874] Cicero emphasised the need to make "plain," see W. Englert, 'The Philosophy of Cicero,' *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*, Ed. M. Gagarin, E. Fantham, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010), 139, eloquence without wisdom is dangerous, Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratoum*, III, Cicero, *De Inventione, 1.I*, Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.II.6, *"Yet I maintain that such eloquence as Crassus and Antonius attained could never have been realized without a knowledge of every matter."*

[875] Cicero, *De Oratore*, 1.XXXI.143, *"I had also been taught that, before speaking on the issue, we must first secure the goodwill of our audience; that next we must state our case ; afterwards define the dispute ; then establish our own allegations ; subsequently disprove those of the other side ; and in our peroration expand and reinforce all that was in our favour, while we weakened and demolished whatever went to support our opponents."* Cicero, *De Oratore*, 1.XXXI.143, *" The weapons we fight with are not the weapons of the world. On the contrary, they have divine power to demolish strongholds. We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ."* Paul, *2 Corinthians 10:4-6*

[876] Connolly, 'Virile Tongues,' Location 1773, Cicero compares giving speeches to competing in wrestling and fighting on the battlefield in (De Or. 1.81, 3.220, Orat. 229), May, 'Cicero as Rhetorician,' Location 4597, Again, the Orator is likened to a boxer delivering blows with grace, and an awareness of what is fitting.

[877] As argued by P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth,* 403

[878] *Gaines*, 'Rhetorical Handbooks,' Location 3195, Cicero characterised the first Sophists as speakers who were more interested in pleasing than plausibility.

[879] On Cicero, see above.

---

letter (1-9), and its conclusion (10-13),[880] and suggest reconstructions involving the compilation of up to five letters.[881] Rhetorical criticism of the work as a unity has been more fruitful than the critical approach,[882] suggesting change in tone is more plausibly the result of rhetorical conventions.[883] The problem is settling on what conventions. Some suggest the change in tone is Paul moving to peroration in a formal forensic apology.[884] Paul describes the content of this section as an apologia (2 Cor 12:19), but the formal similarities are not exact.[885]

One might conclude that Paul is adopting Cicero's "loose form" of argument, but he is almost certainly adopting Cicero's principle of matching the presentation of the argument to the situation. 2 Corinthians is a single letter, to be read in all the churches in the region (2 Cor 1:1), as a plea for unity (2 Cor 13:11),[886] this already puts it outside the norms of rhetoric and letter writing. One might expect Paul to address his supporters, the factions, and his opponents, directly. His argument, in 1-9, which is repeated and intensified in 10-13, employs Cicero's rhetorical proofs. He describes his character (2 Cor 1, 3-5), makes appeals to his emotions (2 Cor 1-2, 7), integrity (2 Cor 1:12-14),

---

[880] Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 10-11, suggests it is "psychologically impossible" to switch tones like Paul did in a coherent presentation.

[881] Horrell, and Adams, *Christianity at Corinth, 12* This assumption is exegetically, rhetorically, and socio-historically unnecessary and untenable, So, for example, the argument in Welborn, 'The Identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13 with the "Letter of Tears",' 148-153, posits a reconstruction based on the assumption that a 'conciliatory letter' which avoided naming names and detailing issues could not sit easily alongside a letter of rebuke which dealt specifically with the issue, Welborn's reconstruction is an exegetical convenience, that splits 2 Corinthians into an anthology of letters with no sense of internal chronology, that posits an editor who has no real sense of why he sticks a series of letters together an alternative reconstruction where Paul receives bad news half way through writing is equally implausible, Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 11-12, and others, support this version of events. However, if this were the case one must convincingly account for Paul's decision not to trash what he had previously written in favour of a completely new missive, on the problems with this approach see Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 23

[882] So, Witherington *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, 333-339, suggests the book takes the form of a quasi-legal defense, D. Starling, *Not My People,* 61, suggests 1-7 are an apologia for Paul's sufferings written in the context of an attack on his ministry, M.A Jennings, 'Patronage and Rebuke in Paul's Persuasion in 2 Corinthians 8-9,' *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism,* 6.5, (2009), 107-127, 114, 123, agrees and suggests Paul presents as a patron in 8-9, after establishing that the Corinthian's relationship with God depends on a continued relationship with Paul as their apostle. Alternatively, some see 1-9 as a cohesive rhetorical unit that lays the foundation for Paul's polemic in 10-13. Olbricht, 'Ethos in Paul,' 156

[883] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 350-351, 431, Long, *Ancient*, 1-2

[884] Long, *Ancient Rhetoric,* 6, a conclusion supported by P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2, 18, Witherington, *Conflict and Community, 338*

[885] Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 11, dismisses rhetorical reconstructions that operate using any form other than "epistle"

[886] Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* 17, suggests the letter has been written to be read aloud.

virtues of the cross (2 Cor 2:12-17, 4, 6), describes the ethos of his recipients (2 Cor 7, 9), before turning to an impassioned apologia of his ministry in response to specific accusations.

DISTINCTIONS FROM CICERO

"The very word 'cross' should be far removed, not only from the Roman citizen, but from his thoughts, his eyes and his ears… the mere mention of such a thing is shameful to a Roman citizen and a free man." Cicero, *Pro Rabiro*[887]

While Paul learned from Cicero, he clearly departed from the master of Republican oratory because the nature of the kingdom he served, and the message he embodied and proclaimed, demanded it. Paul is not ashamed of the cross – he does not want to push it to the margins of thought for citizens, he makes it the centre of his life and preaching. It is his message. [888] In this sense Paul is applying the adaptability Cicero calls for to a message and purpose that Cicero could not have conceived of – the proclamation of a crucified emperor.

Bodily presence was essential in the second sophistic,[889] so also in Corinth (2 Cor 10:10).[890] It was highly prized by Cicero, who had worked to develop his "weak body" alongside his rhetorical ability. [891] Paul's list of physical sufferings as a result of his commitment to the cause of would seem to address the criticism that he is "weak" in the flesh, accounting for his physical presentation.[892] Cicero emphasised the important of a "vigorous and manly posture" developed in the army or the wrestling grounds not through "humble labour," as an artisan, such work was degrading and its wages and

---

[887] Cicero, *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, 16, retrieved online, http://perseus.uchicago.edu/perseus-cgi/citequery3.pl?dbname=PerseusLatinTexts&query=Cic.%20Rab.%20Perd.&getid=2, also cited in S.A. Adams, 'Paul The Roman Citizen,' 315

[888] D.E Garland, *1 Corinthians*, (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2003), 61

[889] Winter, *Philo,* 222, suggests Paul's unimpressive bodily presence all but guaranteed his failure as an orator

[890] M.J Gorman, *Cruciformity: Paul's Narrative Spirituality of the Cross*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2001), 190

[891] Cicero, *Brutus* Location 1591-1630, Cicero, *De Oratore,* I.LXXXIV.342-344, I.XXV.115, a cultivated, non-rustic appearance was also important.

[892] Nguyen, *Christian Identity in Corinth,* 148

marks were "badges of slavery."[893] The Corinthian audience shared Cicero's views at this point. Working as a slave to support one's oratory, as Paul did (1 Cor 9:1-20), but for Paul it supports the substance of his message.[894] Paul's rhetorical flexibility, like Cicero's, was constrained by his virtue and his politics. He embodied the message of the cross and its renunciation of status (1 Cor 2:1-5).[895] Paul pursues strength in weakness (1 Cor 1:25) and the message of the cross (1 Cor 1:17-18, 2:2),[896] Cicero pursues strength in power and eloquence.[897] Cicero uses credibility to secure his own definition of dignity,[898] Paul's persuasive credibility, as he calls others to the way of the cross, is displayed in the scars he bears (2 Cor 11:30, Gal 6:17).[899] In Paul the rhetorical sublime meets the ridiculous foolishness sublimity of the cross (1 Cor 1:18-30). His plundering and inversion of Cicero's principles of oratory serve to magnify his message.

A POSSIBLE OBJECTION

Many theologians rule out any rhetorical criticism of Paul on the basis that he claims to reject eloquent wisdom (1 Cor 1:17), fine sounding arguments (Col 2:4), and "deception" (2 Cor 4:2).

There are three possible alternative understandings of this data. Either Paul is completely ignorant of rhetoric and interested apodeisis alone (persuasion through logos),[900] or he rejects rhetoric to adopt a plain "placarding of the gospel" as a herald who simply announced God's actions in Christ,[901] or Paul uses rhetoric but is rejecting a particular form of rhetoric in the Corinthian

---

[893] Hall, 'Oratorical Delivery,' Location 4075-4082, Pro Flacco, 18, Pro Flacco is of particular interest as Cicero is defending a client who is alleged to have mistreated the Jews in the province of Asia, De Officiis, 1.50
[894] Gorman, *Cruciformity*, 186-187, 1 Corinthians 9 mirrors Paul's account of Jesus in Philippians 2.
[895] *ibid*, 191
[896] *ibid*, 282-283, No one can attribute the effects of Paul's preaching and teaching to successful marketing techniques – ancient or modern – but only the inherent power of the cross as the revelation of God.
[897] D.J Kapust, 'Acting the Princely Style, 593-596, and above.
[898] *ibid*, 596
[899] Or, Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 100, Strom, *Reforming Paul*, 168
[900] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 265
[901] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 273, Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 62, both citing Litfin (1994), 192, "Paul feared that operating according to the rhetor's dynamic would hinder the working of the Gospel, effectively voiding the cross's own power to create belief."

situation. This view is consistent with the evidence as described above, and supported by Paul's use of rhetoric in the Corinthian correspondence and elsewhere,[902] but these criticisms should be acknowledged.

Anderson does not believe Paul's treatment of eloquence and wisdom, or any of the rhetorical terminology in 1 Corinthians 1 relates to rhetoric,[903] so suggests any reading of 1 Corinthians 1-4 in rhetorical terms is invalid.[904] He dismisses Winter's rhetorical account of these verses on the basis that Winter employs Aristotle's pathos, ethos, and logos, and these categories were unavailable to Paul, because *Rhetoric* was an obscure work. Though he admits Paul uses ἀπόδειξις (proof) in its technical sense in 1 Cor 2, he suggests this was the rustic equivalent of formal rhetoric, that an untrained person could counter rhetoric with a proof of the facts.[905] He also sees Paul's background as entirely Jewish, and this fusion as belonging to the high-minded intelligence of Roman men like Cicero and Quintilian, not Paul's rusticism or anyone in the Greek world.[906] However, if Paul is standing in the tradition of Cicero, all of Anderson's assumptions are invalid, and one can read the entirety of 1 Cor 1-4 as engaging in rhetorical questions.

A more serious objection is presented by Liftin, who suggests that the largely imperially derived terminology used to describe proclamation and the proclaimer of Jesus: herald (κηρυξ), evangelist (ευαγγελίζω), and witness (μαρτυρέω), are "*decidedly non-rhetorical terms and play no role in rhetorical literature. No self-respecting orator could have used such terms.*"[907] He believes preaching is simply the transmission of the divine message on its own terms, such that Paul conceives of himself as simply a herald.[908] Heralds had limited power and no ability to do anything but speak the message of the sender.[909]

---

[902] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 260-270, citing Pogoloff 119-120
[903] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 266
[904] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 275
[905] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 266-269, 272, 276
[906] Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 272-273, "The idealistic synthesis of a Cicero never really caught on in the Greek world." Such a criticism may explain the context in Corinth if Corinth were not heavily influenced by Roman culture, but also assumes Paul was raised and educated in Jerusalem and was incredibly unsophisticated.
[907] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 68
[908] *ibid*
[909] A. Bash, *Ambassadors for Christ: an exploration of ambassadorial language in the New Testament,* (Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1997),8

There are four objections to this view that attempts to rule out Paul understanding himself as an orator of Christ.

First, Paul's language in the Corinthian correspondence, as above, employs rhetorical terminology describing his entrance, content, substance and intention, while his Fool's Speech is a rhetorical masterpiece. His writings, though centred on the gospel, are not limited to the presentation of the gospel, and his preaching in Acts varies from location to location with creative freedom. He is not simply announcing the gospel like a herald, or gospel writer, but is applying the gospel to specific situations. He calls others to imitate his example (1 Cor 11:1).

Second, one can achieve the same outcome – where Paul limits himself to proclaiming the divine message, as a divine agent, by seeing him as an orator seeking to imitate Christ, and embody the virtues of his political realm, such that this binds his message and conduct.

Thirdly, there is a potential anachronism in judging rhetorical handbooks, outside of Quintilian, against the communication terminology of the Roman Empire, the Roman Empire and Paul's presentation of Jesus as an alternative king certainly influences his terminology, and the terminology of the early church, however, this does not rule out Paul's conception of his ministry in rhetorical terms as well. The church is different to any other social or political institution, Paul is breaking new ground in any direction. Liftin's assessment of what Paul rejects of first century oratory are correct – his oratory of the cross is not simply "carrying a placard announcing the crucified Messiah as the glory of God in simple words" (Gal 3:1, 2 Cor 4:6), which would be the limit of the herald analogy.[910] Paul is instead embodying his message, creatively seeking out ways to demonstrate self-renunciation and his cruciform ethos to persuade others (1 Cor 9), imitating Jesus. In this, the orators provide a better account of his communicative freedom than Imperial heraldry, though both describe aspects of Christian proclamation.

---

[910] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 68

Fourth, and finally, while Paul certainly conceives himself, in some sense, playing the role of preacher, evangelist, and herald, he also engages in persuasion of others (πείθομεν) others (2 Cor 5:11), and conceives of this in terms of his position as an ambassador (πρεσβεύομεν) (2 Cor 5:20).[911]

Ambassadors were the medium for communication between emperors and governors, and were vital to the life of the empire.[912] Communication in the Roman world – use of ambassadors was a long established practice.[913] Ambassadors were protected by *mos maiorum*, they were extensions of the sender mistreatment of ambassadors and heralds was "an act of impiety"[914] They operated in an ad hoc manner, appointed for particular projects promoting the interest of the one who sent them and returning home upon completion.[915] They were appointed for their ability to promote the sender's interests.[916]

The more general αγγελος is a term for any messenger who carried oral or written communication to another party, with no authority to do anything but transmit a message verbatim.[917] Ambassadors were limited in what they could say, unless they were "αυτοκρατορες," but the limits were not as restrictive as limits on heralds.[918] Ambassadors were chosen based on character,[919] and oratorical skill.[920] Epigraphic evidence suggests sophists from the second sophistic period often functioned as ambassadors.[921] They made speeches in their ambassadorial capacity.[922] While called to represent the sender, they had more creative freedom in how their message was delivered than a messenger. Bash (1997) suggests that though proclamation was part of the role, the central

---

[911] Bash, *Ambassadors*, 14-15, suggests Paul most likely means this in the Greek provincial sense, rather than the Roman ambassdor, who functioned more like a herald.
[912] *ibid*, 6
[913] Bash, *Ambassadors*, 3
[914] Demosthenes, *Demosthenes*, Trans. C.A, M.A, and J Vince, (London, Harvard University Press, 1926), retrieved online http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0072%3Aspeech%3D12%3Asection%3D5
[915] *ibid*, 4
[916] *ibid*, 4, 54
[917] *ibid*, 6
[918] *ibid*, 52
[919] *ibid*, 65
[920] *ibid*, 78
[921] *ibid*, 60
[922] *ibid*, 21

aspects of being an ambassador were travel to represent the sender.[923] He does not account for Paul suggesting that part of the role of being an ambassador is trying to "persuade." For various reasons he believes Paul regrets using the metaphor and has to write a second letter (2 Cor 10-13), to explain himself. The rhetorical unity of the letter modifies his conclusions, such that 2 Cor 10-13 is Paul's exposition on what it means to be an ambassador of Christ.[924]

Ambassadors wore jewellery (chains) to signify the dignity of the government they represented, Paul's chains are more consistent with the kingdom of the cross.[925] An ambassador for Christ would have some freedom to act persuasively, so long as his message represented the message of the sender.

None of these verses suggest that Paul was incapable of eloquent wisdom or oratory, but that rather that his approach to speaking was bound by his message. Neither does Paul disavow all rhetoric and persuasion, Paul employs rhetoric to mimic and disavow the type of status-seeking rhetoric preferred by his audience.[926] His ironic "fool's speech" is a paradigmatic example of the adaptability Cicero championed. As Paul adopts Cicero's criticism of oratory without substance it appears his disdain for the rhetoric of the second sophistic is a product of his rhetorical training, and his theology. In his rejection of the hollow rhetoric of the super-apostles, and his "boasting" of his suffering (2 Cor 11:21-30, also 2 Cor 6:3-10), Paul puts forward his own new model of preaching as rhetoric, the Christian speaker will live their message as they imitate Christ, and preach his gospel.[927]

PAUL'S "IDEAL ORATOR"

CRUCIFORM VIRTUE AND ETHOS

---

[923] *ibid*, 27

[924] *ibid*, 104-116, 157-158, Bash ultimately unhelpfully concludes that Paul's use of ambassador in 2 Corinthians 5 was a mistake incompatible with the "scandal of the cross" that led him to clarify the term and defend his ministry in a second letter (10-13). However, it was precisely Paul's understanding of the sender that led to him describing his ambassadorial practice in the same terms and events in 2 Corinthians 6, and 11. Paul subverts the concept of ambassador as represntatives of the cross subverted all manner of communicative constructs. If the letter is a unity, Bash's understanding that Paul returns to define what an ambassador of the cross looks like as they imitate Jesus is of some value.

[925] *ibid*, 132

[926] Winter, *Philo*, 204-212, also, F.J Long, *Ancient Rhetoric*, 216

[927] Winter, *Philo*, 211

Cicero moved concerns about ethos beyond the boundaries of the persuasive outcomes of a speech and into the pursuit of a virtuous life, his concern was that students would imitate the right parts of the right people.[928] Paul shares a similar concern, but a conviction that in Jesus he has the right person to imitate, he does not call the church to find myriad orators to mimic, but calls them to pursue the persona of Christ, such that when they speak they speak as his ambassadors, who bear the scars of a life lived in sacrificial devotion to Christ and his message (2 Cor 5:11-6:10). This is his desire for the Corinthian community (2 Cor 13:5-9). As Olbricht (2005) says, *"Paul does not search out conventional contemporary visions of the ideal person as do Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintillian, each in his own way. In his perception the ideal person is found in Christ, and he, Paul, has attempted to imitate him (1 Cor 11:1)…Paul's vision, therefore, of the ethos of a speaker is not that they project the attributes of the typical ideal contemporary, but that they possess the special attributes found in Christ. Paul did not, however, proceed to describe Christ's characteristics in detail, but reflected upon those traits desirable for the specific problems addressed in his letters. The ethos he believed the speaker/writer should manifest therefore, is the fundamental action of Christ in his death and resurrection."*[929]

Paul models his ethos on the ethos of Jesus, displayed at the cross. His appeals to character are appeals to his weakness before God, and in front of men as he takes up his cross and pours himself out as a sacrifice for others (Phil 2:17). This is at the heart of his contrast with the super-apostles.[930] The ethos and logos of the cross shape the medium, in preaching, the medium is the person carrying the message as much as the message itself. Paul's message and the events behind it supplies his rhetorical modus operandi, and there is little wonder that in a status-seeking culture like that of 1st century Corinth, his audience are tempted to side with the glorious and impressive super-apostles.[931] Paul uses these superapostles as a foil, raising the comparison between their ethos, his ethos, and the ethos of the cross.[932] The cross is the

---

[928] Olbricht, 'Ethos in Paul,' 150
[929] *ibid,* 150
[930] *ibid,*145-147
[931] *ibid,* 151
[932] *ibid,* 154

standard of virtue to be applied when assessing all character claims from Christian preachers.[933]

Cicero often provided a list of virtues that would accompany the orator into his speech, ideal traits to be drawn upon within the speech, and pursued out of it. Paul provides his own set of ideals in his accounts of his suffering (2 Cor 6, 2 Cor 11), and also in the fruits of the Spirit (Gal 5:22-23), which share some commonality with Cicero's virtues, but are aspirational characteristics that are supplied as a work of God.[934] Paul's ethos depends on his understanding that he participates in the divine communicative act and is equipped to do so, and supplied with an ethos, externally to his own through his union with Christ, and through the work of the Father and Spirit in his life.[935] When he speaks of his scars in Galatians, he calls them signs he belongs to Jesus. Paul is, in a sense, conceiving of his acts of persuasion as acts of incarnation.

CRUCIFORM IMITATION, PATHOS AND ACCOMMODATION

Like Cicero, Paul's ideal orator is based on a biography – only rather than his own, it is the incarnation of Jesus that serves as the paradigm. Paul is setting out to create an approach to oratory, or preaching, for the emerging Christian communities, communities he hoped would be corporately reformed into united bodies of Christ (1 Corinthians 12:12-31). Prepared to display their cruciform ethic and sacrificial adaptability to accommodate one another, and to those around them (1 Cor 9:21-24, 10:27-11:1). This is the approach he calls people to imitate, as he in turn imitates Christ.

I have become all things to all people so that by all possible means I might save some. I do all this for the sake of the gospel, that I may share in its blessings…

So whether you eat or drink or whatever you do, do it all for the glory of God… I try to please everyone in every way. For I am not seeking my own good but the good of many, so that they may be saved. Imitate me, as I imitate Christ.

---

[933] *ibid*, 151
[934] *ibid*, 153
[935] *ibid*, 154

Paul was not interested in spectator rhetoric (epideictic), he was interested in shaping a community around the cruciform life of Jesus. A community that expressed itself corporately as the body of Christ, for the persuasive purpose of adding to the body (1 Cor 14:25), calling people to the way of the cross.[936]

CRUCIFORM LOGOS

Cicero spoke in the senate and the courtroom, Paul spoke in house churches,[937] his rhetoric within the church, that we read in his letters to the churches, occupies its own space, with its own distinct flavour, and is its own genre. [938] However, Paul was also an orator of the cross – presenting the message of the crucified messiah in courtrooms, before councils, in synagogues, and in city centres around Roman Empire. This public rhetoric, his evangelistic preaching, is his rhetorical norm, he adapts this to his letters as situations call for it, but when he speaks of how a Christian should speak, or understand preaching, it is this model of preaching he has in mind, that which adapts to a situation and calls the audience to faith in the crucified Lord.

Paul's rhetoric emphasises the cruciform outcomes of his message, and the future for those who submit to the Lord Jesus, in this sense it is related to deliberative rhetoric. This emphasis influences the modes of communication he rejects and adopts.[939]

The Christian orator draws on the work of God in history, in the person of Christ, and the foolishness of the cross,[940] not "powerful logos," as his proofs – Paul models this in his correspondence, and in his evangelistic sermons in Acts, he states it explicitly when explaining his unimpressive entrance to Corinth.

For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel — not with wisdom and eloquence, lest the cross of Christ be emptied of its power… we preach Christ crucified: a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles. And so it was with me,

---

[936] *ibid*,142
[937] *ibid,* 138-139, Church rhetoric therefore is a genre of its own that awaits the description and analysis of its unique features instead of simply being cropped upon a procrustean bed of classical rhetoric"
[938] *ibid,* 141
[939] *ibid,* 146
[940] *ibid,* 144-145

brothers and sisters. When I came to you, I did not come with eloquence or human wisdom as I proclaimed to you the testimony about God. For I resolved to know nothing while I was with you except Jesus Christ and him crucified. I came to you in weakness with great fear and trembling. My message and my preaching were not with wise and persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit's power."

The Christian orator's *logos* relies heavily on a knowledge of the Gospel, and of Scripture as it supports Jesus' messianic claims and describes the ethical and cruciform norms of the Christian community.[941]

These are the criterion Paul gives for assessing oratory when it comes to the selection of "factions" and who to imitate (1 Cor 1-4, 11:1), and when it comes to who to listen to (2 Cor 10-13). But his own model provides a framework for communicative excellence – if he is indeed drawing on Cicero in his rebuke of the Corinthian situation and the nature of rhetoric the Corinthian church is so interested in pursuing, and deliberately modifying Cicero's ideal orator – the virtuous man who embodies their message whose presentation is adaptable to any situation – what implications does that have for excellent communication? Paul is the pre-Augustinian Christian teacher, plundering gold from Egypt to faithfully present the message of the cross with appropriate cruciform wisdom and eloquence. The eloquence of weakness. The wisdom of God. Displayed in Christ.

The implications of the Pauline model are spelled out more overtly in Augustine, though he does not believe Paul was trained in eloquence. Christians should seek out "golden" in communication mediums and platforms, and plunder them in order to present the good news of Jesus. All truth is God's truth. All true and neutral communication methodologies are tools that can be taken up by Christians to present the good news of Jesus in a cruciform and incarnational manner to the people around them.

---

[941] *ibid,*147

APPENDIX C: ASSESSING LITERARY PARALLELS AS STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIVE ACTS: A FRAMEWORK

Israel did not live in a cultural vacuum, she was profoundly influenced by the cultures and religious practices of the Ancient Near East,[942] which explains her ongoing dalliance with idol worship throughout the Old Testament. Israel interacted with the ideas and ideals of her neighbours, and her neighbours are depicted interacting with the ideas and ideals of Israel.

This interaction was particularly strong while Israel was in exile.[943] This interaction and common geographic and social location means there are apparent parallels between Biblical texts, and the extant literature of the Ancient Near East. These parallels provide interesting fodder for Biblical studies. Critical scholars use comparison hunting as an opportunity to locate the traditions behind Jewish cultic practices,[944] traditional scholars must either wrestle with the possibility of religious plagiarism in Israel, or emphasise distinctions between texts, rather than similarities.[945]

Approaching the texts as communicative acts with a strategic purpose opens up new possibilities, where both parallels and distinctions are important. The parallels are important because they demonstrate that Israel breathes the air of her neighbours or is in conversation with them,[946] and the distinctions because they show the corrective to ANE religious beliefs.[947] Whether literary parallels are the result of common cultural background, or a deliberate polemic,

---

[942] H. Ringgren, 'Israel's Place Among The Religions of the Ancient Near East,' *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel,* (Leiden, Brill, 1972), 8, Israel is influenced conceptually by Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Canaan.
[943] J.M Miller, 'In the "Image" and "Likeness" of God,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91.3 (S 1972), 289-304, 290-291
[944] J.H Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible,* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 25, suggests some parallel hunting is overdone, especially by critical scholars who "*Once it has been established that a certain biblical expression or custom has a parallel outside the Bible, the whole problem is regarded as solved.*"
[945] Ringgren, 'Israel's Place,' 1
[946] Ringgren, 'Israel's Place,' 6, "*In a limited geographical area such as the Near East, it is probable that the presence of a certain mythical element in two or more religions is due to some kind of historical connection.*"
[947] Ringgren, 'Israel's Place,' 8

identifying them provides an opportunity to better interpret texts in context,[948] and consider the strategic purpose behind their production. This methodology has proved useful when assessing the relationship between the Genesis creation account and the related accounts of her neighbours (see above). The Bible's law codes also share much in common with ANE codes, including content,[949] form,[950] and administration.[951] While parallels have led some to suggest a lack of creativity on Israel's part,[952] the communicative agenda of these law codes sheds light on the communicative agenda of Israel's laws. ANE laws like Hammurabi's Code, and more relevantly, ANE treaties,[953] were designed to promote the lawgiver.[954] Where ANE laws are supplied by kings, Israel's law is presented as divine revelation.[955]

Parallels can be valuable interpretive tools, but to avoid "parallelomania," I will adopt the following criterion for assessing these parallels as strategic communicative acts, in the case studies below.[956]

1. That there is a plausible rhetorical situation, moment, or setting.
2. That there is a plausible implied audience.

---

[948] J.H Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible,* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2000), 24

[949] J.P Burnside, *God, Justice, and Society: Aspects of Law and Legality in the Bible,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011), 5-6 summarises the points of similarity; Watts, *Reading the Law,* 49, A. Bartor, *Reading Law as Narrative* (Atlanta, SBL, 2010), 5.

[950] G.J Wenham, 'Law and the Legal System in the Old Testament,' *Law, Morality and the Bible,* edited by B. Kaye and G. Wenham (InterVarsity Press: Downers Grove, 1978), retrieved, http://www.the-highway.com/law2a_Wenham.html, no pages. It is presented as case law, not statutes. The mix of narrative, divine sanctions, and lists of prohibitions is not uncommon in the ANE. The story-list-sanction format is also common in the ANE, see J.W Watts, *Reading the Law,* 49, T. Ziolkowski, 'Literature and Law,' *Sewanee Review* 99.1 (1991), 122-132, 123

[951] J.P. Burnside, *God, Justice and Society,* 5-6, on the non-comprehensive scope of both the law and the narrative, see B.D Bibb, 'Nadab and Abihu Attempt to Fill a Gap: Law and Narrative in Leviticus 10.1-7,' *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament,* 96 (2001), 83-99, 97-98

[952] Either solely understanding them as ANE laws, see discussion in C. Halberstam, 'The Art of Biblical Law,' *Prooftexts* 27.2 (2007), 346, or dismissing their significance altogether, see discussion in G. Wenham, *A Guide to the Pentateuch,* 172

[953] J.P Burnside, *God, Justice, and Society,* 8-10

[954] J.H Sailhamer, 'The Mosaic Law and the Theology of the Pentateuch,' *Westminster Theological Journal,* 53, (1991), 241-261, 246-247

[955] J.P Burnside, *God, Justice, and Society,* 8-10

[956] This model is developed with reference to Vanhoozer's interpretive model as outlined in *Meaning,* and two proposed models for rhetorical criticism proposed by Mitchell, and Kennedy as described in Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 27, 255. These models will be discussed more fully below.

3. That the meaning of a text does not depend on recognising a parallel is occurring, unless the parallel is explicitly acknowledged, but significance for particular readers may rest on recognising the parallel.

4. That meaning and significance is more likely to lie in the difference represented in the parallel than in the similarities, and framing of the parallel is more important than the parallel itself for understanding intent.

5. That the Biblical account of history, while history with a persuasive agenda, is strategically competent so is consistent with the plausibility structures of its implied reader. Details that are ancillary to the perlocuationary intent are more likely to be free of the perlocutionary agenda.[957]

6. That the texts conform to the literary conventions of a genre and contain similar content, imagery, and form.

7. That there is a plausible cultural or historical connection between texts.

8. That there is a plausible rhetorical purpose for the parallel.

9. That there is a plausible historical case to be made from similar texts for that purpose.

10. That there is a plausible case to be made from Scripture for the proposed purpose and historical reconstruction.[958]

11. That there is a good and consistent theological case to be made from the presentation of God within the text, and within Scripture, and in the light of the incarnation of Jesus as the model of the communicative praxis of the triune God.[959]

12. That the communicative act involved in the production of the text, and the form or genre of the text, is consistent with the message of the text and the theology and ethos of the communicator, or the parallel is clearly for a polemic purpose.[960]

---

[957] So, for example, the Old Testament, is a reliable guide as it describes the social situation of the Ancient Near East, especially in cases where the theological purpose, or bias, is far removed from the detail described, or when the portrayal offered in the text is negative.

[958] So the reading is synchronically, not anachronistically, consistent with redemption history, as outlined elsewhere in the canon, and consistent with reconstructions of Israel's theology and practice, or the ideal practice as outlined in Torah

[959] This may seem to beg the question somewhat, but while circular reasoning alone is an argumentative fallacy, a lack of circularity in related truth claims is equally problematic.

[960] so, for example, an Israelite could not build an idol of Yahweh to faithfully communicate Yahweh to the nations).

13. That the proposed perlocutionary effect, or lack thereof, can be plausibly demonstrated or accounted for historically.[961]

I am assuming the theological hypothesis, at this point, in the light of the theological position outlined where God is a communicative God who produces sublime communicative acts, according to the paradigm supplied by the incarnation, through human communicative agents, that the human agents involved in the production of divine texts are chosen and equipped by the communicative God to be sublime communicators. On this basis I will assume a high degree of communicative intelligence and creativity on their part, but no higher than can be plausibly accounted for given their historical location and the information we have about their socio-cultural location.

---

[961] Following the definition of communicative acts above, when assessing texts as intentional communicative acts one must acknowledge that the author had a strategic perlocutionary purpose, but no control over the response of the audience.