

# New Testament Studies

<http://journals.cambridge.org/NTS>

Additional services for ***New Testament Studies***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: a Deliberative Speech

Joop Smit

New Testament Studies / Volume 35 / Issue 01 / January 1989, pp 1 - 26

DOI: 10.1017/S0028688500024474, Published online: 05 February 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0028688500024474](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0028688500024474)

### How to cite this article:

Joop Smit (1989). The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: a Deliberative Speech. *New Testament Studies*, 35, pp 1-26 doi:10.1017/S0028688500024474

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

JOOP SMIT

**THE LETTER OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS:  
A DELIBERATIVE SPEECH**

This study's point of departure is the important article of H. D. Betz, 'The literary composition and function of Paul's letter to the Galatians', published in this journal in 1975.<sup>1</sup> In that article the author suggests a new approach to the letter to the Galatians, by using the generative rules of Graeco-Roman rhetoric to analyse the structure of the letter. A rigorous examination leads him to the conclusion that the form of the various parts and the order in which they are arranged completely conform to the classical rules of rhetoric for a judicial speech (*genus iudiciale*). Paul is under accusation by opponents. The Galatians play the role of judges. The letter contains a speech in which Paul, following all the rules of the art, defends himself before the jury.<sup>2</sup>

Betz's article has convinced me that classical rhetoric is an important instrument for the analysis of the letter to the Galatians and leads to a better understanding of its character and coherence. I am less enthusiastic about the actual analysis he provides. The inherent difficulties are so numerous and incisive that, after a number of preliminary studies, I dare to submit a new proposal.<sup>3</sup>

In this study a critical discussion of Betz's analysis and its results is followed by an elucidation of some presuppositions which appear to undermine seriously the validity of his analysis and which should therefore be replaced by more adequate ones. The whole

<sup>1</sup> *NTS* 21 (1975) 353–79. This article served as the basis for the commentary on the letter which the same author published some years later (Philadelphia 1979). It is incorporated in the commentary, divided in parts but otherwise almost unaltered.

<sup>2</sup> Betz, 'Composition' 377: 'In the case of Galatians, the addressees are identical with the jury, with Paul being the defendant and his opponents the accusers . . . Serving as a substitute the letter carries the defence speech to the jury.'

<sup>3</sup> This study incorporates the results of four articles which I published earlier viz. J. Smit, 'Naar een nieuwe benadering van Paulus' brieven. De historische bewijsvoering in Gal. 3,1–4,11', *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 24 (1984) 207–34; 'Hoe kun je de heidenen verplichten als joden te leven? Paulus en de torah in Galaten 2,11–21', *Bijdragen* 46 (1985) 118–40; 'Paulus, de Galaten en het jodisme: een narratieve analyse van Galaten 1–2', *TvT* 25 (1985) 337–62; 'Redactie in de brief aan de Galaten: retorische analyse van Gal. 4,12–6,18', *TvT* 26 (1986) 113–14.

letter is then analysed anew in terms of classical rhetoric and in accordance with the new perspectives we have gained. By way of conclusion we return to two of the presuppositions from which we started.

#### I CRITICAL REMARKS ABOUT THE ANALYSIS OF H. D. BETZ

In his article Betz offers a rather detailed analysis of each part of the letter. Within the bounds of this study it is impossible and also unnecessary to go into all the details. I will therefore give only the most important objections to his analysis of each part of the text.

(a) Gal 1. 6–11 is defined by Betz as an *exordium*, the introduction of a speech, in which the speaker tries to make his audience well-disposed, attentive and receptive. To elucidate the curse of v. 8–9 he appeals to Quintilian who states that the prejudice of a judge can be effectively countered by frightening him with threats.<sup>1</sup> This appeal, however, is misplaced because here Paul is not threatening the judges i.e. the Galatians but the accusers i.e. his opponents.

The delimitation of this part is also problematic. Betz characterises v. 10–11 as a transition and has the next part, the narration, start at v. 12. Later on however he designates v. 13 as the beginning of the narration proper.<sup>2</sup> This later designation seems to me to be the correct one. It is evident that with the words, 'You have heard of my former way of life in Judaism that I . . .' Paul shifts from addressing his audience to telling them his life-story and thereby begins the narration.

(b) Betz considers Gal 1. 12–2. 14 to be the narration, the part of a speech in which the facts relevant for the case are being stated. He demonstrates that Paul's narration conforms to the precepts by being brief, clear and plausible. The analysis of this part of the letter also gives rise to several objections.

Betz suggests that it is a normal construction for a *narratio* like this one to begin with a thesis or *propositio* (v. 12). The texts of Quintilian to which he refers do not corroborate this view. They treat the issue of whether or not, in case the facts are well-known, the *narratio* can be left out and be replaced by a *propositio*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quint. 4.1.20–22.

<sup>2</sup> Betz, 'Composition' 362: 'The *narratio* proper begins in v. 13 . . .'

<sup>3</sup> Betz, 'Composition' 364: 'Quintilian recommends beginning the *narratio* with a statement, the *propositio*, which will influence the judge in some way, though he may be well informed about the case.' For this he refers to Quint. 3.9.5; 4.2.7,30. The said recommendation, however, cannot be found there, nor elsewhere.

Furthermore, the *narratio*, as Betz delimitates it, has a very abrupt ending. The conflict in Antioch cannot be solved by a single rhetorical question addressed by Paul to Cephas. That is not compatible with the demand for plausibility to which a *narratio* should respond.

Finally it can be asked whether this narration is presenting facts about which the Galatians as a judicial body have to pronounce judgement. The story does not confront them with a precise legal question, but rather proposes two courses of action from which they should choose. Paul recounts the facts from the past to recommend his own course of conduct and to discourage them from introducing the changes his opponents are urging upon them. This would mean that the speech Paul sent to the Galatians more probably belongs to the *genus deliberativum* than to the *genus iudiciale*.<sup>1</sup>

(c) Gal 2. 15–21 forms, according to Betz, the *propositio*. In rhetorical theory this refers to a passage following the *narratio* in which the points of agreement and disagreement between the parties are first summed up and then followed by an enumeration and brief explanation of the points to be dealt with in the argumentation. The purpose of such a *propositio* is to make the organisation of the entire speech transparent.<sup>2</sup> Here Betz's interpretation is forced. Gal. 2. 15–21 misses the formal characteristics proper to a *propositio*. It is not at all a point by point summary giving a survey of the whole speech.

(d) According to Betz Gal. 3. 1–4. 31 is the *probatio*, the part of a speech in which a speaker strengthens his position with arguments. In his opinion the letter belongs to the *genus iudiciale* and in analysing its argumentation he consequently uses the instruments a lawyer has at his disposal to compose a judicial speech. It is my conviction that these instruments are poorly suited for the text. The beginning of the *probatio* offers a good opportunity to corroborate this assertion.

Paul begins his argumentation with a series of rhetorical

<sup>1</sup> G. A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill and London, 1984) 145 reaches the same conclusion, though with a different argumentation: 'All species of rhetoric make use of narrative, but they use it for different purposes and in different ways. The function of judicial narrative is to set forth the facts at issue from the point of view of the speaker. Quintilian (4.2.66–68) clearly recognizes this. But the narrative of the first and second chapters of Galatians is not an account of facts at issue. It is supporting evidence for Paul's claim in 1. 11 that the gospel he preached was not from man, but from God, a topic which had been enunciated in the first verse of the salutation. Galatians is probably best viewed as deliberative rhetoric, a point to which we will return.'

<sup>2</sup> Cicero, *De inventione* 1.22.31, writes on the *propositio*, which he calls *partitio*: 'Recte habita in causa partitio illustrem et perspicuam totam efficit orationem.'

questions. Betz interprets this as the interrogation of the witnesses and refers to the passage of Quintilian on this subject. It is more probable, however, to interpret the questions as a rhetorical device Paul is using to strengthen his assertions to the Galatians.<sup>1</sup>

Besides, Paul does not confront the Galatians here with the question whether a certain course of action is legitimate or not, but he makes the reproach that they would be acting foolishly and harming themselves if they change their behaviour. Honour and advantage, or shame and disadvantage, however, are at stake in the *genus deliberativum*. An argumentation starting with the exclamation, 'O foolish Galatians' almost certainly belongs to that genre.<sup>2</sup>

Although Betz himself notes that Gal 3. 1–5 and Gal 4. 8–11 form an inclusion, he tries very hard to show that Gal 4. 12–20 and 4. 21–31 are parts of the *probatio*. In neither of these cases are his arguments, in my view, convincing.

In discussing Gal 4. 12–20 he remarks that the theme of friendship was customary in the argumentation of speeches. Quintilian quotes the proverb, 'Ubi amici, ibi opes', but that is not enough by far to prove this assertion. The emotional appeal which Paul addresses to the Galatians here, according to the standards of the same Quintilian, is better suited to the *peroratio*.<sup>3</sup>

For Gal 4. 21–31 Betz offers a very ingenious solution.<sup>4</sup> This, however, does not overcome the difficulty he himself mentions that in the general opinion of the rhetoricians, a *probatio* should never end with such a weak argument.<sup>5</sup>

(e) Gal 5. 1–6. 10 is considered by Betz as the *paraenesis*. This part creates, as he himself remarks, a serious problem for his rhetorical analysis. In classical rhetoric an exhortative passage such as this is completely unknown as a separate part of a normal speech.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quint. 5.7 has a detailed discussion of the interrogation of witnesses in court. Quint. 9.2.6–32 consists entirely of a treatment of the rhetorical question as a figure of speech.

<sup>2</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 3.3.4 remarks in discussing the *genus deliberativum*: 'Prudentiae partibus utemur in dicendo si commoda cum incommodis conferemus, cum alterum sequi, vitare alterum cohortemur.' We will return to this point at length later on.

<sup>3</sup> For the proverb see Quint. 5.11.41. On the *peroratio* as the place where all floodgates of eloquence should be opened and all emotions should be unchained see Quint. 6.1.51–52; 4.1.27–28; 6.1.9–11.

<sup>4</sup> Betz, referring to Pseudo-Demetrius, argues that Paul in using the allegory leaves something for his listeners to figure out and that they regard this as proof of their intelligence.

<sup>5</sup> Quint. 5.12.14; *Rhet ad Her* 3.10.18.

<sup>6</sup> Betz, 'Composition' 375: 'It is rather puzzling to see that *paraenesis* plays only a marginal role in the ancient rhetorical handbooks, if not in rhetoric itself.' Cf. also note 9 where he remarks that even Quintilian has no special treatment of the *paraenesis*.

(f) Gal 6. 11–18 is in Betz's opinion the *peroratio* of the speech. According to rhetorical theory this part serves two purposes. It refreshes the memory of the audience and it appeals to their emotions. Normally the *peroratio* consisted of three parts: the *recapitulatio* or summing-up, the *indignatio* or arousal of anger and hostility and the *conquestio* or appeal to pity. Betz argues that Gal 6. 12–17 is primarily a *recapitulatio*, while the *indignatio* and the *conquestio* in v. 12–13 and v. 17 are only present in principle. This analysis is doubtful for two reasons.

According to the prevailing rules, a *recapitulatio* should sum up once again the main points of the *probatio*. It is evident however that Gal 6. 12–17 does not conform to this rule.

It is also a fact that *indignatio* and *conquestio* as separate parts are missing. To explain this Betz gives an extensive quotation of Quintilian. This author reports that especially the philosophers objected to an appeal to the emotions at the end of a speech. Paul could have been moved by a similar restraint in the name of truth.<sup>1</sup> However the manner in which earlier in his letter Paul appealed to the emotions of his audience makes such philosophical restraint on his part at the end of the letter highly improbable.<sup>2</sup>

## II. POINTS OF VIEW

The problems raised by a critical examination of Betz's analysis do not form a set of arbitrary incidents. They can be reduced to four general points of view or assumptions from which they spring. To solve the problems these points of view should be revised. We shall now first determine what these four points of view are and why and in what sense they should be revised. In that way the points of view for a fresh analysis of the letter will simultaneously become visible.

### (a) Witnesses.

Graeco-Roman rhetoric has a long history, running approximately from 475 BCE to 275 CE.<sup>3</sup> Although especially the views on

<sup>1</sup> Betz, 'Composition' 358: 'Paul's restraint at this point with regard to the emotional appeal may reflect the same kind of caution which, according to Quintilian, was characteristic of philosophers.'

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gal 1. 6–12; 2. 4, 12–13; 3. 1–5; 4. 12–20; 5. 7–12.

<sup>3</sup> In *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, 1963) and in *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton, 1972) G. A. Kennedy gives a comprehensive survey of the history of classical rhetoric. He begins with Corax and Tisias in the second quarter of the fifth century BCE and ends with Cassius Longinus, who died about 273 CE.

the organisation of a speech were very stable, naturally a considerable development took place in this period of time. Therefore it is incorrect to relate to Paul indiscriminately every publication on rhetorical theory originating in antiquity. We have to decide which authors are closest to rhetorical practice as Paul presumably knew it.

Betz chooses as his main witness Quintilian who wrote about 90 CE in Rome the twelve books of his *Institutio oratoria*. This choice, however, involves two difficulties. Rhetoric which was introduced from Greece into Rome from the second century BCE onwards had at the time of Quintilian already undergone a particular Roman development.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the work of Quintilian is encyclopedic in character, so that some view relating to Paul can always be found. Eclecticism is therefore a threatening danger. In my opinion Betz has succumbed to that danger. The problems which arise during his analysis are regularly solved by means of incidental remarks by Quintilian which in more than one case are also interpreted in a strange way.

Cicero's *De inventione* and the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium* do not involve these inconveniences. Both works, which are very similar to each other, were written about 85 BCE. They are handbooks without much personal input, are close to a Greek source and, because of that, reflect Hellenistic rhetoric in a reliable way.<sup>2</sup> For a rhetorical analysis of the letter to the Galatians it is therefore preferable to give up the use of Quintilian and to start first of all from *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.

(b) The genre.

Classical rhetoric distinguishes three kinds of speeches: the judicial plea which belongs in the court-room (*genus iudiciale*), the political speech which has its place in parliament (*genus deliberativum*) and the speech of praise and censure which is held at

<sup>1</sup> The *declamationes*, school-exercises which became very popular in the first century CE, played an important role in this development, Cf. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* 312–29.

<sup>2</sup> Current opinion holds that Cicero and the author of *Rhet ad Herennium* had the same teacher and had both been using their college notes. This teacher is seen as a representative of the school of Rhodes, an important centre of rhetorical studies at the time. See Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* 103–48; H. Caplan, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (London, <sup>5</sup>1981) VII–XXXIV. Other opinions in J. Adamietz, *Ciceros De inventione und die Rhetorik ad Herennium* (Marburg, 1960). On the points relevant for us there exists a general consensus. It is also significant for the traditional character of *De inventione* that later on in *De oratore* 1.2.5 Cicero distances himself from this juvenile work. He reviews it there as 'inchoata ac rudia' and not in accordance with the dignity and experience he had meanwhile obtained.

special occasions (*genus demonstrativum*). In the handbooks each of these three genres receives separate treatment.<sup>1</sup>

According to Betz, the speech Paul addresses by letter to the Galatians belongs to the *genus iudiciale*. It is a defence-speech and is analysed following the model of such a speech. The discussion of Betz's article, however, has shown that such important parts as the *narratio* and the *probatio* are assigned more appropriately to the *genus deliberativum*. Therefore it is better to analyse Paul's speech according to the rules designed for that genre.<sup>2</sup>

In the Hellenistic period the *genus iudiciale* obtained a dominant position in the handbooks. In the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, an anonymous Greek handbook from about 300 BCE, that is not yet the case. Therefore it is probably a good thing not to lose sight of this work when analysing Paul's speech.

(c) The theological perspective.

In the commentaries the letter to the Galatians is, as if this were self-evident, placed within a Lutheran framework and read in answer to the question, 'How does man find a gracious God?' This interpretation exhibits a fixed pattern. The emphasis on Paul's declaration of independence (1. 12), the special status of justification by faith (2. 15–21), the ahistorical interpretation of the law as legalism (3–4) and the problem of the relation between the indicative and the imperative of faith (5–6) are part of this pattern. Although Betz is using a new method, his analysis of the letter remains fully within this dogmatic perspective.<sup>3</sup>

At present the conviction is growing that Paul's main concern was the position of Christians with a Gentile background.<sup>4</sup> When

<sup>1</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 1.2.2 e.g. defines the three genres thus: 'Tria genera sunt causarum quae recipere debet orator: demonstrativum, deliberativum, iudiciale. Demonstrativum est quod tribuitur in alicuius certae personae laudem vel vituperationem. Deliberativum est in consultatione, quo habet in se suasionem et dissuasionem. Iudiciale est quod positum est in controversia, et quod habet accusationem aut petitionem cum defensione.' Cf. *De Inv* 1.5.7; *Rhet ad Alex* 1.

<sup>2</sup> In his brief analysis of the letter to the Galatians Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation* 146, reaches the same point of view: 'The basic argument of deliberative oratory is that an action is in the self-interest of the audience . . . That is the pervasive argument of Galatians . . . The letter looks to the immediate future, not to judgment of the past, and the question to be decided by the Galatians was not whether Paul had been right in what he had said or done, but what they themselves were going to believe and to do.'

<sup>3</sup> In this respect it is significant that Betz began his commentary with the following maxim of Luther: 'Nec de politica libertate agimus, sed de alia quadam, quam diabolus maxime odit et impugnat. Ea est, qua Christus nos liberavit, non e servitute aliqua humana aut vi tyrannorum, sed ira dei aeterna. Ubi? in conscientia.'

<sup>4</sup> A seminal work on this issue is K. Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles* (London, 1977). Also important are E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia, 1983); F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles* (Cambridge University, 1986).

the letter is read in answer to the question, 'On what conditions do Christians from the Gentiles partake together with the Christians from the Jews in the promises of Israel?', the customary pattern gives way to very different accents. Previous research had convinced me that it is not justification by faith but the fact that in Christ the Jews are called to unity with the Gentiles which is the real issue of the letter. The following analysis, then, builds further on that foundation.<sup>1</sup>

(d) The unity of the letter.

The unity of the letter to the Galatians is not in dispute.<sup>2</sup> Betz does not question it either, although he is faced with an unsolvable problem; namely, his *paraenesis* (Gal 5. 1–6. 10) has no place within the compass of classical rhetoric.<sup>3</sup> From the rhetorical perspective the question arises whether this exhortation could be a later addition to the letter. Once that question has been admitted, more positive indications in that direction become visible.<sup>4</sup>

Gal 5. 13–6. 10 forms a coherent unit (*sarx* vs. *pneuma*), breaking the unmistakable connection between Gal 5. 7–12 and 6. 11–18. While elsewhere in the letter the relation in Christ between the Jews and the Gentiles is at stake, in this passage it is shown how Christians in general should behave towards each other. While in the other parts of the letter Christ and the law exclude each other, here they are brought together in 'fulfilling the law of Christ'. Moreover, the aggressive tone, which Paul uses before and after, is here suddenly interrupted by a plea for mutual affection and meekness and for an all-encompassing respect. These oppositions in the statement of the problem, in outlook and in tone reflect the same motive that plays an important role in the redaction of other pauline letters: the original particularity of the letters had to be adapted in view of their more general use.<sup>5</sup> Therefore it is probable

<sup>1</sup> See the articles mentioned above in note 3, page 1.

<sup>2</sup> To my knowledge the only exception to this is the extreme proposal of J. C. O'Neill, *The recovery of Paul's letter to the Galatians* (London, 1972). This work has rightly received little attention.

<sup>3</sup> In his commentary Betz somewhat conceals this under the notion of 'exhortatio' which, however, is nowhere used in classical rhetoric to denote a distinct part of the speech. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation* 146, who regards the *exhortatio* of Gal 5–6 as the goal the entire letter is aiming at, does not solve this problem either.

<sup>4</sup> I am summarising here the conclusions of my article 'Redactie in de brief aan de Galaten', see note 3, page 1.

<sup>5</sup> See N. A. Dahl, 'The particularity of the pauline epistles as a problem in the ancient church', *Neotestamentica et patristica. Festschrift O. Cullmann*, *NovTestSuppl* 6 (1962) 261–71; J. Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1968) 5–18; H. M. Schenke, 'Das Weiterwirken des Paulus und die Pflege seines Erbe durch die Paulus-Schule', *NTS* 21 (1974–5) 505–18; A. Sand, 'Überlieferung und Sammlung der Paulusbrieve', *Paulus in*

that Gal 5. 13–6. 10 was added at a somewhat later time to the letter. In the rhetorical analysis that follows we will pass by this passage without discussing it as a kind of test of this hypothesis.<sup>1</sup>

### III RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S SPEECH

#### a. *Exordium* (Gal 1. 6–12)

For the first part of a speech, the *exordium*, Cicero's *De inventione*, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* give the following rules.<sup>2</sup>

The purpose of the *exordium* is to make the listeners well-disposed, attentive and receptive.<sup>3</sup> If the case is honourable and is certain to meet with the sympathy of the audience, then a direct approach is appropriate. A difficult case, provoking the aversion of the public, should be introduced indirectly by way of *insinuatio*.<sup>4</sup>

A speaker can win the goodwill of his listeners by referring to his own acts and services without arrogance. He can also arouse hostility against his opponents by accusing them of criminal activities. Further he can praise the wisdom and courage of his audience without excessive flattery.<sup>5</sup> The attention of the audience is raised by emphasising the great weight of the case. The willingness to listen is won by briefly and clearly explaining the essence of the case.

An *exordium* should not be too general, but should be adapted to the occasion and be clearly connected with the other parts of the speech, first of all with the *narratio*, which immediately follows.

*den neutestamentlichen Spätschriften* (ed. K. Kertelge, Freiburg, 1981) 11–24. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation* 147, has correctly sensed this when he writes: 'As Paul's defence, Galatians would be chiefly of historical interest for its picture of the early church filled with acrimonious dissension and of his personal insecurities and apprehensions; as Paul's exhortation it continues to speak to christians who are tempted to substitute the form of religious observance for its essence.'

<sup>1</sup> With this I do not intend to deny that Gal 5. 13–6. 10 was written by Paul and that we should read the letter in its present form as a unity. The question, however, how this should be done is focused more sharply and clearly by my proposal.

<sup>2</sup> *De inv* 1.15.20–1.18.26; *Rhet ad Her* 1.3.5–1.7.11; *Rhet ad Alex* 29.

<sup>3</sup> *De inv* 1.15.20: 'Exordium est oratio animi idonee comparans ad reliquam dictionem, quod eveniet si eum benivolum, attentum, docilem confecerit.'

<sup>4</sup> *De inv* 1.15.20: 'Insinuatio est oratio quadam dissimulatione et circumitione obscure subiens auditoris animum.'

<sup>5</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 1.4.8: 'Benivolos auditores facere quattuor modis possumus: ab nostra, ab adversariorum nostrorum, ab auditorum persona, et ab rebus ipsis.'

Gal 1.6–12 consists of three parts which comply precisely with the rules prescribed for the *exordium*.

In v. 6–7a Paul first brings his audience in a state of alarm by informing them that they are deserting God. At the same time he states his subject, the gospel, and underlines this by the use of a *correctio*.

In v. 7b–9 Paul arouses hostility against his opponents by accusing them of subverting the gospel of Christ. He further specifies his subject in a negative way by saying that their preaching runs counter to the true gospel and underlines the importance of this with a double curse.<sup>1</sup>

In v. 10–12 Paul tries to win sympathy for himself by presenting himself as a servant of God and Christ. Thereafter he specifies his subject in a positive way by stating that he is preaching a gospel which he has received from God. He underlines this by explicitly addressing his audience again.<sup>2</sup>

The introduction of Paul's speech ties in very well with the actual situation. Without knowing it the Galatians are moving in the wrong direction. Paul immediately puts an end to this confusion. This introduction also shows a close connection with the following parts of the speech. The *narratio*, which comes next, further develops the theme 'gospel'. The question of the origin of Paul's gospel, which is the subject of 1. 10–12 reappears in Gal 1. 15–24, while the thesis that his opponents are countering the true gospel which is put forward in 1. 7–9 comes back in 2. 1–10 and 2. 11–21.<sup>3</sup> This *exordium* is further taken up again by way of inclusion in Gal 5. 7–12 at the end of the speech. There, however, Paul is less direct and chooses the *insinuatio*.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, it should be noted that this *exordium* contains some evidence that the speech belongs to the *genus deliberativum*. Significant in this respect is the fact that immediately at the start of this speech Paul uses such political terms as 'deserting', 'disturbing' and 'subverting'.<sup>5</sup> Also the way in which he lines up the parties points in that direction. The Galatians are departing from the

<sup>1</sup> Parallelism, hyperbole and epiphora are the figures supporting this. For the figures of speech and thought see *Rhet ad Her 4*; H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (München, 2<sup>1973</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> *Figura etymologica (derivatio)*, *inversio* and *antithesis* further strengthen this.

<sup>3</sup> Gal 1. 10–12 and 1. 15–24 have the opposition, men vs. God, in common. Gal 1. 7b–9; 2.1–10, 11–21 hinge on 'the truth of the gospel' (2. 5, 14).

<sup>4</sup> It is remarkable that Paul, unlike in the *exordium*, does address the Galatians in 5. 7–12 with a captivating *concessio*: 'You were running so well.'

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Betz, *Galatians* 47–50.

religious practice they learned from Paul. Paul advises them not to follow his opponents and the changes they are promoting and urgently advises the Galatians to remain true to him and the course of action for which he stands.

*b. Narratio (Gal 1. 13–2.21)*

The *exordium* is usually followed by a *narratio*, an exposition of the facts.<sup>1</sup> The three rhetorical handbooks which we are using as our guides sketch something like the following picture of this part of the speech.<sup>2</sup>

The statement of the facts should be brief, clear and plausible.<sup>3</sup> A narration is brief if it mentions just the facts that are indispensable for the case, not more and not less. The speaker should not go back further in the past than the case requires, he should eliminate everything not related to the question and he should not carry his story further on than needed. So the *narratio* should be first of all to the point. Clarity of statement is gained by preserving the chronological sequence in which the events happened. Plausibility of statement is gained by presenting the course of time, the location of the events and the characters of the actors in a realistic way.

In addition the speaker should bend everything to the advantage of his case by omitting everything to his disadvantage which can be omitted, by touching lightly on what must be mentioned and by telling his own side of the story carefully and clearly.<sup>4</sup>

Paul tells a rather detailed story. Nevertheless it is brief in the sense that he limits himself to the events which in the actual situation are important for the decision the Galatians have to take. First he brings up the subject of Judaism, the point on which his listeners have to define their position (1. 13–14). Next he positively indicates the direction they should choose: God himself has sent him to preach the gospel among the Gentiles (1. 15–24). After that he recounts two incidents which clarify in an exemplary way which direction they should reject: Christians from the Jews

<sup>1</sup> *De inv* 1.19.27: 'Narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut gestarum expositio.'

<sup>2</sup> *De inv* 1.19.27–1.21.30; *Rhet ad Her* 1.8.12–1.9.16; *Rhet ad Alex* 30–31.

<sup>3</sup> *De inv* 1.20.28: 'Oportet igitur eam tres habere res: ut brevis, ut aperta, ut probabilis sit.' *Rhet ad Her* 1.9.14: 'Tres res convenit habere narrationem: ut brevis, ut dilucida, ut verisimilis sit.'

<sup>4</sup> *De inv* 1.21.30: 'Quare, ut hoc vitium vitetur, omnia torquenda sunt ad commodum suae causae, contraria quae praeteriri poterunt praetereundo, quae dicenda erunt leviter attingendo sua diligenter et enodate narrando.'

cannot force their non-Jewish fellow-Christians to accept circumcision and to observe the torah (2. 1–10, 11–21). Thereby the whole question is clear. Precisely as prescribed in the rhetorical handbooks the story is not carried on any further.

Because Paul is telling the events from the past only as far as they are relevant to the actual discussion, his story shows several gaps if regarded as autobiography. His stay in Arabia (1. 17), his long sojourn in Syria and Cilicia (1. 21–24) and the time between the agreement in Jerusalem and the quarrel in Antioch (2. 10–11) are hardly filled in at all.

The story has a clear design. The sequence of events is divided into four episodes; they are clearly distinguished from one another and follow one another chronologically.<sup>1</sup> Paul also paid due attention to the plausibility of his story. In each of the four episodes he underlined the reality of the events in a particular way. His zeal for Judaism becomes more true to life because he mentions his activity as a persecutor of the church (1. 13–14). That God and not the apostles in Jerusalem has sent him to preach the gospel is documented with numerous chronological and topographical data (1. 15–24). The plausibility of the agreement in Jerusalem is strengthened by enlarging on the role of the ‘men of eminence’ (2. 1–10), while the behaviour of Paul in Antioch gets a more realistic character by presenting his words as direct speech (2. 11–21).

Finally Paul unmistakably reports the events as advantageously as he can. His story is prejudiced. His all-surpassing zeal for Judaism (1. 14), the negative picture of the pseudo-brothers who give occasion to the consultation in Jerusalem (2. 4–5) and the equally negative presentation of Cephas, the other Jews and Barnabas in Antioch (2. 12–13) are clear evidence of that. The way in which he on oath belittles his first visit to Jerusalem (1. 18–20) and his complete silence about the outcome of the conflict in Antioch strikingly illustrate that Paul’s presentation of the facts is as advantageous as possible. The entire story is told in view of the situation in Galatia and all its parts are designed to persuade the Galatians to take the decision Paul wishes.

<sup>1</sup> The division in episodes is mainly determined by topographical and semantic data. Gal 1. 13–14; place: Judaism; opposition: Jews vs. Gentiles. Gal 1. 15–24; place: not-Jerusalem; opposition: God vs. men. Gal 2. 1–10, place: Jerusalem; opposition: Jews vs. Gentiles viz. the circumcised vs. the uncircumcised. Gal 2. 11–21, place: Antioch; opposition: Jews vs. Gentiles viz. the righteous observing the torah vs. the lawless sinners.

c. *Confirmatio* (Gal 3. 1–4. 11)

According to the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, in a deliberative speech the *narratio* is followed by the confirmation by proof.<sup>1</sup> In *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, more interested as they are in the judicial plea, a *partitio* or *divisio* is placed between the *narratio* and the *confirmatio*. This part renders an account of the earlier stated facts by first defining the points of agreement between the parties and by subsequently stating the exact point on which judgment is asked.<sup>2</sup> But as we have seen Paul's *narratio* is marked by recommending and dissuading and thus does not lend itself to such a legal definition. It is therefore understandable that a *divisio* or *partitio* is missing in Paul's speech and that he passes on directly from the *narratio* to the *confirmatio*, the part in which a speaker supports his position with arguments.<sup>3</sup>

A deliberative speech deals with the issue of what course of action should be followed.<sup>4</sup> To persuade his audience to follow or not to follow a certain course of action the speaker bases his argumentation on honour and advantage or on baseness and disadvantage.<sup>5</sup> To 'honour' belong considerations of wisdom, justice, courage and temperance.<sup>6</sup> By means of these virtues or their opposites the speaker tries to persuade his audience to choose the course of action he advocates.

The purpose of a deliberative speech is to induce acceptance of a certain course of action. To reach that goal it relies on the following arguments: a sign (*signum*) i.e. something perceived by one of the

<sup>1</sup> *Rhet ad Alex* 31–32.

<sup>2</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 1.10.17: 'Primum perorata narratione debemus aperire quid nobis conveniat cum adversariis, si ea quae utilia sunt nobis convenient, quid in controversia relictum sit, hoc modo: "Interfectam esse ab Oreste matrem convenit mihi cum adversariis. Iure fecerit et licueritne facere, id est in controversia."' *Rhet ad Her* 1.10.17 is dealing with the *divisio*. Cicero speaks of *partitio* and discusses this *De inv* 1.22.31–1.23.34.

<sup>3</sup> *De Inv* 1.24.34: 'Confirmatio est per quam argumentando nostrae causae fidem et auctoritatem et firmamentum adiungit oratio.' Cf. *Rhet ad Her* 1.10.18; *Rhet ad Alex* 32.

<sup>4</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 3.2.2: 'Deliberationes partim sunt eiusmodi ut quaeratur utrum potius faciendum sit, partim eiusmodi ut quid potissimum faciendum sit consideretur.' Idem 1.2.2: 'Deliberativum est in consultatione, quod habet in se suasionem et dissuasionem.' Specifically dealing with the genus deliberativum are *De inv* 2.51.155–2.58.176; *Rhet ad Her* 3.2.2–3.5.9; *Rhet ad Alex* 1. 29–34.

<sup>5</sup> *De inv* 2.52.158: 'Ex his illud conficitur ut petendarum rerum partes sint honestas et utilitas, vitandarum turpitudine et inutilitas.'

<sup>6</sup> *De inv* 2.53.159: 'Nam virtus est animi habitus naturae modo atque rationi consentaneus. Quamobrem omnibus eius partibus cognitis tota vis erit simplicis honestatis considerata. Habet igitur partes quattuor: prudentiam, iustitiam, fortitudinem, temperantiam.' Cf. *Rhet ad Her* 3.2.3; *Rhet ad Alex* 1.

senses that points to something else that the sign seems logically to imply; an accepted premise (*credibile*) i.e. a conviction which is shared by the audience and which does not need corroborating evidence; a judgment (*iudicatum*) i.e. the approval of an act by the assent or authority or judicial decision of some person or persons; comparison (*comparabile*) i.e. a certain principle of similarity exhibited in diverse material.<sup>1</sup>

It is not sufficient to discover arguments. They should also be elaborated in an attractive and orderly manner.<sup>2</sup> In particular *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* notes that the *confirmatio* preferably ought to be set up in different rounds of argument which are clearly distinguished from one another. The beginning as well as the end of each round ought to be specially marked; the last by means of recapitulation or conclusion. After having gone in an orderly manner through all the considerations supporting the recommended course of action, it is once again stated briefly and with due pathos, that it is unjust, inexpedient, disgraceful and unpleasant not to follow the advocated course of action and that it is just, expedient, honourable and pleasant to do so.<sup>3</sup>

Gal 3. 1–4.11 exhibits a clear articulation. An introduction (3. 1–5) is followed by three rounds of argument (3. 6–14; 3. 15–29; 4. 1–7), after which this passage is rounded off by a conclusion (4. 8–11). This division is further confirmed and elaborated by the following analysis.

The considerations in this passage are unmistakably founded on the characteristic virtues of the deliberative genre. In the opening (3. 1–5) and conclusion (4. 8–11) Paul states negatively that the Galatians are acting foolishly and contrary to their self-interest if they change their present religious practice. In the intermediate rounds of argument Paul demonstrates positively that the Galatians should cling to the practice he taught them. At the beginning of each of the three rounds he suggests that his version of the matter is ‘according to the law’ (3. 6; 3. 15; 4. 1–2). At the end of them he mentions the honour and advantage acquired by the Galatians in the manner he describes: they have received the blessing of Abraham (3. 14); they belong to the seed of Abraham and partake in the inheritance (3. 29); they are sons of God and heirs (4. 7).

<sup>1</sup> *De inv* 1.30.47: ‘Omne autem . . . probabile quod sumitur ad argumentationem aut signum est aut credibile aut iudicatum aut comparabile.’ Cf. *Rhet ad Alex* 7–12; 32.

<sup>2</sup> *De inv* 1.30.50: ‘Atque inveniri quidem omnis ex his locis argumentatio poterit; inventa exornari et certas in partes distingui et suavissimum est et summe necessarium et ab artis scriptoribus maxime neglectum.’ Cf. *Rhet ad Her* 2.18.27.

<sup>3</sup> *Rhet ad Alex* 32.1439a, 10–40.

The nature of the arguments also conforms to the rules of rhetoric. In the introduction (3. 1–5) Paul states the fact that the Galatians have received the Spirit as a sign (*signum*) that they should not start observing the torah. Each of the three rounds of argument begins with a comparison (*comparabile*, 3. 6; 3. 15; 4. 1–2) and ends with the receiving of the Spirit as a sign confirming the correctness of Paul's version of the matter (3. 14; 3. 26–28; 4. 6). In addition, the three rounds of argument are clearly distinguished from one another while each of them is supported by a particular argument. The first round is founded on an argument of authority (*iudicatum*) consisting almost completely of quotations from Scripture (3. 6–14). The second round is founded on the confession of the oneness of God, a conviction Paul shares with his Jewish and Christian audience (*credibile*, 3. 15–29). The third round, finally, is founded on the faith that God, by sending his Son, has achieved the eschatological revolution; a conviction Paul shares with his Christian audience (*credibile*, 4. 1–7).

Paul elaborated his argumentation in an attractive and orderly way. Because of the *exclamatio*, the rhetorical questions and the *amplificatio*, the introduction has a very emotional character (*pathos*). The three rounds of argument are based on history and demonstrate great formal similarity. The first round (3. 6–14) starts with a comparison; three periods of time follow: Abraham (6–9), the Torah (10–12) and Christ (13–14); it ends with a summarising conclusion (14). The second round (3. 15–29) is clearly separated from the preceding one by the renewed address to the audience and the appearance of the speaker through the first person singular. This round also starts with a comparison; once again three periods of time follow: Abraham (15–18), the Torah (19–25) and Christ (26–29); it also ends with a summarising conclusion (29). The third round (4. 1–7) is, in its turn, clearly separated from the preceding one by the appearance of the speaker through the first person singular. The beginning again consists of a comparison; this time history has been divided in two periods: the former time (1–3) and the fullness of time (4–6); once again a summarising conclusion comes at the end (7). Like the introduction the conclusion of the entire passage (4. 8–11) has a very emotional character (*pathos*) because of the *correctio*, the rhetorical question and the *dubitatio*, the more so because it is also marked by biting sarcasm.

Just as in the *narratio* Paul is dealing in this *confirmatio* with the question of whether the Galatians should submit to Judaism. On the one hand he adjures them to abandon the idea. On the other

hand, on the basis of convictions collectively held among Christians, he tries to make plausible to them that, even without observing the torah, by their faith in Christ they belong to the offspring of Abraham and partake in his inheritance.

*d. Conclusio, part 1: Conquestio (Gal 4. 12–20)*

According to the three handbooks guiding us, a speech should end with a *conclusio* consisting of three parts: *enumeratio*, *indignatio*, *conquestio*.<sup>1</sup>

For the *conquestio*, an appeal to pity, they note a number of commonplaces by which a speaker can arouse the pity of his audience.<sup>2</sup> Of the sixteen loci Cicero mentions in this regard the following are the most important in the present context.<sup>3</sup> First the power of fate and the weakness of the human race should be set forth.<sup>4</sup> Once the mood has been set in this way the following ideas may be useful.

- To show the prosperity and happiness once enjoyed and the misery of the present situation.
- To recount shameful, mean and ignoble acts and the unworthy treatment one has suffered.
- To ask the audience to think of their parents, children or someone else dear to them.
- To reveal helplessness, weakness and loneliness.
- To deplore the separation from a person one loves.
- To implore the audience in humble and submissive language to have mercy.

Paul begins this passage by openly begging the Galatians (12a). Subsequently he reminds them of the freak of fate which led him to preach the gospel to them 'because of the weakness of the flesh' (13). At the same time he ascribes the success of his mission completely to them. He gives a glowing account of the excellent relations of former times, but by means of two rhetorical questions he opposes this happy past to the miserable present, their friendship now being deeply disturbed (12b–16).

<sup>1</sup> *De inv* 1.52.98: 'Conclusio est exitus et determinatio totius orationis. Haec habet partes tres: enumerationem, indignationem, conquestionem.' Cf. *Rhet ad Her* 2.30.47.

<sup>2</sup> *De inv* 1.55.106: 'Conquestio est oratio auditoris misericordiam captans.' See for more information, *De inv* 1.55.106–1.56.109; *Rhet ad Her* 2.31.50; *Rhet ad Alex* 34; 36.

<sup>3</sup> The loci enumerated here are in Cicero the numbers 1, 4, 7, 10, 12 and 14.

<sup>4</sup> *De inv* 1.55.106: 'In hac primum animum auditoris mitem et misericordem conficere oportet, quo facilius conquestione commoveri possit. Id locis communibus efficere oportebit, per quos fortunae vis in omnes et hominum infirmitas ostenditur.'

Paul mentions next the shameless behaviour of his opponents and the unworthy treatment he has suffered because of them (17–18).<sup>1</sup> Then he addresses his audience as ‘my children’ and attributes to himself the role of their mother going through the pain of giving birth to them all over again (19). Having expressed his wish to be with them, Paul ends this passage by openly avowing his helplessness.

This passage, starting with a supplication and ending with a confession of helplessness, undoubtedly forms the *conquestio* of the speech Paul is addressing by letter to the Galatians.

*e. Conclusio, part 2: Enumeratio (Gal 4. 21–5. 6)*

Regarding the *enumeratio* the three handbooks give (among others) the following precepts.<sup>2</sup> An *enumeratio* is a summing-up at the end of the speech meant to refresh the memory of the listeners. This summing-up must be brief and should not extend to the *exordium* and *narratio* but limit itself to a recapitulation of the *divisio* and *confirmatio*.

The *enumeratio* may be constructed in different ways. The most obvious and usual one consists of the speaker running over his arguments in the order in which he previously discussed them.<sup>3</sup> Cicero indicates in particular two possibilities for the presentation. The speaker can pronounce the recapitulation in his own person. By means of personification however he can also put it in the mouth of another person or thing, as for instance the lawgiver, the law, a place, a city, a monument.<sup>4</sup> Personification moreover is the obvious means to enliven the conclusion of a speech.<sup>5</sup>

The *enumeratio* of Paul’s speech consists of two parts, which we

<sup>1</sup> The threefold καλός in v. 17–18 is significant.

<sup>2</sup> *De inv* 1.52.98–100; *Rhet ad Her* 2.30.47; *Rhet ad Alex* 36.1444b.

<sup>3</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 2.30.47: ‘Enumeratio est per quam colligimus et commonemus quibus de rebus verba fecerimus, breviter, ut renovatur, non redintegretur oratio; et ordine ut quicquid erit dictum referemus, ut auditor, si memoriae mandaverit, ad idem quod ipse meminerit reducatur. Item curandum est ne aut ab exordio aut narratione repetatur orationis enumeratio.’

<sup>4</sup> *De inv* 1.52.99–100: ‘Nam tum ex tua persona enumerare possis, ut quid et quo quidque loco dixeris admoneas; tum vero personam aut rem aliquam inducere et enumerationem ei totam attribuere . . . Res autem inducetur, si alicui rei huiusmodi legi, loco, urbi, monumento oratio attribuetur per enumerationem, hoc modo: “Quid si leges loqui possent? Nonne haec apud vos quererentur? Quidnam amplius desideratis, iudices, cum vobis hoc et hoc planum factum sit?”’

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Rhet ad Her* 4.53.66.

shall discuss separately. First Gal 4. 21–5. 1 contains a summary of the *confirmatio* that was elaborated in Gal 3. 1–4. 11. Its line of thought is closely followed.

Gal 4. 21 corresponds with Gal 3. 1–5, the beginning of the argumentation. In both instances the Galatians are being addressed as people planning to fulfil the law. An apparently informative question, but actually a reproach, urges them to abandon the observance of the law (νόμος).

Gal 4. 22–23 is in accordance with Gal 3. 6–14. Paul suddenly introduces Abraham and reproduces the text of Scripture in a particular way (γέγραπται). Both passages end with a reference to the promise (ἐπαγγελία) regarding the Spirit.

Gal 4. 24–28 concurs with Gal 3. 15–29. In both instances Paul explains the Scripture passages he reproduced a moment ago and opposes the covenant God made with Abraham to the Sinai-covenant (διαθήκη). The conclusion he subsequently draws in the *enumeratio*: ‘But you, brothers, are like Isaac children of the promise’ (4. 28) practically coincides with the previous conclusion in the *confirmatio*: ‘If however you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s offspring, heirs according to the promise’ (3. 29).

Gal 4. 29–31 conforms with Gal 4. 1–7. In both instances the point is that, not the slave, but the free son is the heir (κληρονόμος). The conclusions drawn coincide with each other: ‘Therefore, brothers, we are not children of a slave woman, but of the free woman’ (4. 31) is a variation of ‘Therefore, you are no longer a slave but a son, and if a son then also heir through God’ (4. 7).

Gal 5. 1 finally clearly echoes Gal 4. 8–11. Just as at the end of the *confirmatio* Paul here also adjures the Galatians with biting sarcasm not to submit themselves again to the slavery of the law (πάλιν δουλεύειν).

Paul has given this part of his summing-up a lively and attractive character by personifying a number of data. To begin with he personifies the law (4. 21) and at the end he introduces Scripture as speaking in person (4. 30). The allegorical interpretation of Scripture also includes a series of personifications. Hagar, the Sinai-covenant and the present Jerusalem depicted as three slave women with their children, are opposed to Sara, the Abraham-covenant and Jerusalem from above depicted as free mothers with their children. The choice Paul previously describes in conceptual language in the *confirmatio* is now put before the eyes of his audience in the form of a tableau-vivant. The three slave women impersonate the practice to be rejected, whereas the three free women stand for the course of action to be followed.

This pictorial summing-up of the *confirmatio* is followed in Gal 5. 2–6 by a second summing-up in which Paul undisguisedly and very emphatically clarifies what is at stake. To this end he briefly enumerates the most important conclusions of his entire argument. In doing so he understandably refers back to the *narratio*, because it is characterized by recommending and dissuading and is not primarily a statement of the facts for a judicial case. Again, in this summing-up, the order of the previous argument is kept.

That the Galatians should not have themselves circumcised (5. 2) is a message stated earlier in Gal 2. 1–10. That they should not start observing the law (5. 3) was made clear earlier in Gal 2. 11–21. That Christ and grace on the one hand and the law on the other hand exclude each other as far as justification is concerned (5. 4) is a conclusion reached earlier in Gal 2. 21. That ‘we’ Christians, through faith partake in the Spirit and the promise (5. 5) was met earlier as a conclusion in Gal 3. 14. That in Christ the Jews are called to unite with the Gentiles (5. 6) takes up a conclusion expressed earlier in Gal 3. 26–28.

It is typical for the entire speech that this last summing-up so clearly shows the imprint of the *genus deliberativum*. Paul is weighing advantage and disadvantage against each other (*utilitas*). The Galatians have derived benefit from Christ now. If however they join Judaism by having themselves circumcised and by adopting the observance of the law, they annul that advantage.

### *f. Conclusio, part 3: Indignatio (Gal 5. 7–12)*

According to the rhetorical handbooks, the *indignatio*, a regular part of the *conclusio*, is intended to incite the listeners to great hatred of some persons.<sup>1</sup> Cicero sums up fifteen loci and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* ten which can be of help to reach this goal. The first seven, appearing in both works, are relevant in the present context. To incite indignation the following data may be successfully used.

– The gravity of the crime, as it appears from the attention that authorities like the gods, ancestors, the state and the law have given to the matter under discussion.

– The victims of the crime.

<sup>1</sup> *De inv* 1.53.100: ‘Indignatio est oratio per quam conficitur ut in aliquem hominem magnum odium aut in rem gravis offensio concitetur.’ For the indignatio see: *De inv* 1.53.100–1.54.105; *Rhet ad Her* 2.30.48–49; *Rhet ad Alex* 34.1440a.

- The rejection of tolerance and indifference because in this case that amounts to a dangerous precedent.
- The danger that the crime will spread if not checked now.
- The irrevocability of the impending decision. It cannot be revised later on and the harm done cannot be remedied.
- The intention of the guilty person or persons. The crime was committed on purpose and with premeditation.
- The cruel and sacrilegious character of the crime.

In Gal 5. 7–12 Paul seemingly touches on each of these typical points of the *indignatio*, lightly and in the indicated order.

First Paul represents the Galatians as victims of deceivers who are leading them away from the true gospel (7). Subsequently he stresses the gravity of the crime, because it annuls God's call (8). By means of a proverb he then calls attention to the danger that the evil will spread if it is not checked now (9). Thereafter he states that God is certain to condemn the trouble makers and that the only thing the Galatians should do is to join in this condemnation (11).<sup>1</sup> Paul obliquely remarks next that his opponents advocate circumcision in order to avoid persecution and that in so doing they commit an offence against the cross of Christ (11). With a sacrilegious sneer Paul stresses their scandalous behaviour and there-with rounds off this part (12).

It is noteworthy that Gal 5. 7–12 shows many points of contact with the *exordium* (Gal 1. 6–12). In both passages the Galatians are depicted as people abandoning the true gospel; God is described as the one calling them; the opponents are represented as trouble-makers certain to be struck by God's condemnation and Paul himself appears as the pre-eminent servant of Christ. The *indignatio* and *exordium* were adapted to one another and clearly form an *inclusio*.

A comparison of both passages further shows that the overt reproaches and accusations of the beginning were replaced at the end by the oblique terms of *insinuatio*. According to the handbooks, this suggestive approach should be followed primarily when the opposition seems to have won the favour of the public.<sup>2</sup> Paul is clearly taking some care not to alienate the Galatians by too much vehemence.

<sup>1</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 2.30.48: 'Quintus locus est cum ostendimus, si semel aliter iudicatum sit, nullam rem fore quae incommodo mederi aut erratum iudicium corrigere possit.' The similarity between 'si semel aliter iudicatum sit' and 'οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονεῖν' is striking.

<sup>2</sup> *De inv* 1.17.23–25; *Rhet ad Her* 1.6.9–1.7.11. Paul is using here at the end of his speech a form which according to the theory is designed for its beginning. The close connection which links *exordium* and *indignatio* suggests the transfer here.

Within the *conclusio* this *indignatio* is the counterpart of the *conquestio* (Gal 4. 12–20). Together they clearly state the choice Paul is asking his listeners to make: they should cling to the practice they learned from him and not adopt the changes proposed by his opponents.

*g. Amplificatio (Gal 6. 11–18)*

The end of Paul's letter confronts us with a difficulty. According to the handbooks we follow, the *conclusio* of a speech consists of three parts: *enumeratio*, *indignatio*, *conquestio*. At Gal 5. 12, thus, we have apparently reached the end of the speech and consequently Gal 6. 11–18 has to be considered as a transgression of the generally accepted pattern. This transgression calls for an explanation.

The motive for this transgression of the approved pattern is the fact that Paul sent his speech in the form of a letter, for this obliged him to add the usual subscription in his own handwriting.<sup>1</sup> The ideas Paul introduced in this addition are drawn from the remark he had just made in the *indignatio*. For it is evident that he largely elaborated the line of thought of Gal 5. 11 in Gal 6. 12–16 by means of antithesis (*amplificatio*).<sup>2</sup> That in both cases a reference to bodily marks resulted, is a further confirmation of this (5. 12; 6. 17).

That Paul with Gal 6. 11–18 transgresses the prescribed pattern does not mean that he is now working fully outside of the framework set by the handbooks. The way in which he shaped this extra passage fits in nicely with the *genus deliberativum* which he had, until now, closely followed. The following data confirm this.<sup>3</sup>

The *genus deliberativum* consists of the consideration of what course of action should be followed. In this process advantage (*utilitas*) and honour (*honestas*) carry the most weight. With regard to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 16. 21; Col 4. 18; 2 Thess 3. 17; Phlm 19.

<sup>2</sup> *Amplificatio* (αὐξήσις) designates an increase, which comprehends an horizontal enlargement as well as a vertical heightening. The last part of a speech was the regular place for this, cf. Cicero, *De part orat* 15.52–17.58; *Quint* 8.4. The term can have a lot of different meanings. *Rhet ad Her* 2.30.47 uses it to indicate the *indignatio*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. especially *Rhet ad Her* 3.4.7; *De inv* 2.55.166. I suspect that a passage like Gal 6. 12–17 was considered to be a normal part of the *conclusio*. Aristotle, *Rhet* 3.10 mentions praise and censure as a regular part of the *peroratio*. *Rhet ad Her* 3.8.15 notices that praise and censure should not be confined to the *genus demonstrativum*, but can be useful also in the other genres. My point of departure however is the rhetorical theory as it is presented in *De inv*, *Rhet ad Her* and *Rhet ad Alex* and viewed in that light Gal 6. 12–18 must be described as a transgression of the normal pattern.

honour a distinction is made between the right (*rectum*) viz. wisdom, justice, courage and temperance and the praiseworthy (*laudabile*). These two aspects however are not isolated from each other. The desire to strive after the right is intensified if praise accrues. Therefore a speaker should not omit to mention that the right way he is describing is also highly esteemed.

In Gal 6. 12–16 Paul elaborates a sharp antithesis between the opponents and himself. The main point of comparison for the two parties is courage and the consequent reputation. First he ascribes cowardice and half-heartedness to his opponents (12–13). They are not really choosing Christ, because they do not fully accept their uncircumcised fellow-believers for fear of persecution. They are however not really choosing Judaism either, because they are still making demands on their uncircumcised fellow-Christians. Their boasting is nothing more than a pretence to conceal their cowardice and self-interest. Subsequently Paul ascribes unselfish courage to himself, sacrificing everything for the highest values and true gain: the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, the new creation, peace, mercy and the Israel of God, which unites Jews and Gentiles within itself. This courage truly merits praise.<sup>1</sup> He then also mentions the scars which bear witness to his courage and thereby rounds off his argument in style.<sup>2</sup>

In this way, fully in terms of the *genus deliberativum*, and for the last time, Paul clearly tells the Galatians which decision they should take. The practice of his opponents is undesirable and should be rejected. The way advocated by Paul himself leads to the greatest values, the highest dignity and the real glory. They should continue to follow that attractive and promising path. In this way Paul provides his speech, which he is sending by letter to the Galatians, with a fitting end.

#### IV A DELIBERATIVE SPEECH

The speech contained in the letter to the Galatians follows an approved pattern. *Exordium*, *narratio*, *confirmatio* and *conclusio*

<sup>1</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 3.2.3: 'Fortitudo est rerum magnarum appetitio et rerum humilium contemptio et laboris cum utilitatis ratione perpressio.' *De inv* 2.54.163: 'Fortitudo est considerata periculorum susceptio et laborum perpressio. Eius partes magnificentia, fidentia, patientia, perseverantia.'

<sup>2</sup> Showing wounds and scars was a well-known device, readily used at the end of a speech. See Cicero, *De oratore* 2.28.124; Fl. Josephus, *De bello judaico* 1.197; Quint. 6.1.21, 30.

succeed each other just as prescribed by the handbooks.<sup>1</sup> It is true that a *divisio* is missing and an *amplificatio* has been added, but in view of the circumstances that is easily understood. The theory for that matter allows room for such adaptation.<sup>2</sup>

Force of habit was not the only reason for Paul to conform to the familiar model. Everything shows that he thoroughly understood its intention. The model is devised to marshal the support of the listeners and thereby to win them over to the point of view of the speaker.<sup>3</sup> That is also the way it functions here with Paul. After an alarming start he first vividly recounts a number of personal memories which throw light on the question under discussion but which are not directly connected to it. In that way the listeners become informed about the question but not directly involved in it themselves. Then Paul directly discusses the problem at hand in a matter-of-fact tone. The listeners are now led to reflect on their own situation. Finally Paul introduces the human side of the question in an emotional tone: the relations that link the parties, the motives that inspire them, the ideals they hold before themselves. The listeners now become emotionally involved in the issue and are put under pressure to remain true to Paul and to share his convictions.<sup>4</sup>

Paul's speech further responds entirely to the norms the handbooks of rhetoric set for the deliberative genre. The question whether rites of religion should be changed or not, is explicitly listed by the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* among the subjects proper for the deliberative genre and, in that context, amply discussed.<sup>5</sup> It is precisely with that question that Paul's speech deals. The Galatians must decide whether they should cling to the religious practice they learned from Paul or whether they should make the changes advocated by the opponents.

By means of recommending and dissuading Paul tries to make the Galatians decide this question to his advantage. In each part of

<sup>1</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 1.3.4: 'Inventio in sex partes orationis consumitur: in exordium, narrationem, divisionem, confirmationem, refutationem, conclusionem.'

<sup>2</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 3.9.17: 'Est autem alia dispositio quae, cum ab ordine artificioso recedendum est, oratoris iudicio ad tempus adcommodatur.'

<sup>3</sup> *Rhet ad Her* 1.2.2: 'Oratoris officium est de iis rebus posse dicere quae res ad usum civilem moribus et legibus constitutae sunt, cum adsensione auditorum quoad eius fieri poterit.' *De inv* 1.5.6: 'Officium autem eius facultatis videtur esse dicere apposite ad persuasionem; finis persuadere dictione.'

<sup>4</sup> According to *Rhet ad Her* 3.13.23, in delivering his speech the speaker has the disposal of three keys: *sermo*, *contentio*, *amplificatio*.

<sup>5</sup> *Rhet ad Alex* 2.

the letter, starting with the *exordium* and up to, and including, the *amplificatio* he contrasts his opponents and their practice on the one hand, and himself and his practice on the other hand in sharp antithesis, black and white. In this manner, each part of the letter repeatedly dissuades the Galatians to adopt the changes advocated by the opponents and positively advises them to remain true to Paul and not to deviate from the way he had shown them.

This recommending and dissuading which determines and pervades Paul's entire speech is based, as is customary in the *genus deliberativum*, on two values: advantage (*utilitas*) and honour (*honestas*). It is noteworthy that in important moments in the speech these values are explicitly mentioned. The foolishness at the beginning of the *confirmatio* (3. 1), the advantage dominating the brief summing-up of the entire speech (5. 2) and the glory in the centre of the *amplificatio* at the end (6. 12–13) indicate that in this speech the attraction of advantage and honour and the repulsion of detriment and shame are constantly being used to influence the listeners.

The conclusion of all this is obvious: the letter Paul sent to the churches of Galatia contains a speech that exactly corresponds to the model which Hellenistic rhetoric drew up for the *genus deliberativum*.

#### V RHETORIC AT THE SERVICE OF UNITY

The speech Paul addressed to the Galatians bears witness to his professional skill as a rhetorician. Above we have primarily examined how the game of recommending and dissuading is played by him and have given less attention to what is at stake. Now that we have analysed the technical aspect of his rhetoric we will briefly entertain the question for what purpose he actually employed his eloquence.

In the *narratio* we can conclude from Paul's personal history how he visualizes his own vocation. At first he was completely devoted to Judaism, zealously championing the ancestral traditions of circumcision and torah, and in doing so carefully maintained the separation between Jews and Gentiles. God, however, called him to preach his Son among the Gentiles. For him this meant that he crossed the bounds of Judaism by, in the name of Christ, freely associating with Titus, an uncircumcised Greek and by eating together with non-Jewish fellow-Christians who did not observe the torah. Paul, in imitation of Isaiah and Jeremiah, is convinced

that he has been called for this union of Jews and Gentiles in Christ.<sup>1</sup>

In the *confirmatio* we can conclude from the history of the Jewish people how Paul conceived the call of Israel. God already promised Abraham that the Gentiles would also partake by faith in his blessing. The torah has been a hindrance to the realisation of this promise for some time by separating the Jews, on penalty of sin and curse, from the Gentiles. Christ opens up the possibility for the Jews to leave the hedge of the torah and to make non-Jews participants in the blessing of Abraham. The one God has realised the oneness of Jews and Gentiles that he already had in mind with Abraham in the one Christ. The Jews, the preferred sons and heirs of the father, are called in Christ to make the Gentiles share in the sonship and the inheritance. If Paul therefore devotes himself to uniting Jews and Gentiles in Christ, he is thereby according to his own conviction fulfilling the calling of Israel.

The *enumeratio* and the *amplificatio* both lead to the conclusion that in Christ the Jews are called to unity with the Gentiles (5. 6; 6. 15). The unity of the Christian community twice forms the end and goal of Paul's entire line of thought. In the end the highest ideal he aims at is 'the Israel of God' (6. 16). God's purpose with his people has now been realised in Christ as 'the Israel of God' uniting Jews and Gentiles within itself.<sup>2</sup> Paul's eloquence is at the service of that goal.

#### CONCLUSION

At the end of this study it is worth returning for a moment to the hypothesis that Gal 5. 13–6. 10 contains a rounded off fragment of Paul added to the letter at a somewhat later time. The clear structure and line of thought shown by the text without this passage support the legitimacy of this hypothesis. Nevertheless, because of the presence of Gal 5. 13–6. 10 the structure that we discovered has a provisional character, for the addition of this passage has created a new centre of gravity within the letter and makes it necessary to reorient the proposed structure and line of thought. In its present form the letter should ultimately be read within the more general perspective that Gal 5. 13–6. 10 introduces. Generations of readers

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gal 1.15–16 with Isa 49. 1–6; Jer 1. 4–5.

<sup>2</sup> See N. A. Dahl, 'Die Name Israel I: Zur Auslegung von Gal. 6,16', *Judaica* 6 (1959) 161–70.

of the letter have been wrestling with this difficult problem. Much has already been gained if this study has succeeded in improving our understanding of the nature and content of this problem.