THE HELLENISTIC LETTER-FORMULA
AND THE PAULINE LETTER-SCHEME

DETLEV DORMEYER

1. The Form of Letters in Antiquity

Letter literature is more closely related to speech than narrative literature. The letter substitutes for the physical presence of the writer, as it has been expressed in the popular paradox *apon-paron* (absent-present): "For though absent in body I am present in spirit (I Cor 5:3)".[1] Cicero writes to his friend Curio: "That there are many kinds of letters you are well aware; there one kind, however, about which there can be no mistake, for indeed letter writing was invented just in order that we might inform those at a distance if there were anything which it was important for them or for ourselves that they should know" (Cic. *Ep. Fam.* 2:4.1).

The first reflection on letter writing was made by a certain "Demetrios" (erroneously identified in the manuscript tradition as Demetrios of Phalerum) who made an insertion about letters (Dem. 223-235)[2] in a handbook on style entitled *De elocutione* (Gk. *Peri Hermeneias*, Eng. *About Style*). The exact date of the treatise is in dispute (with suggestions ranging from the third century B.C.E to the first century C.E.), but the treatise or its sources appear to go back to the second century, and at the latest, to the first century B.C.E. According to Demetrios the absent writer uses the letter to make a fictitious speech. He says that Artemon, the editor of Aristotle's *Letters* indicated that "a letter ought to be written in the same manner as a dialogue, a letter being regarded by him as one of the two sides of a dialogue" (Dem. 223). Demetrios disagrees with this position. Because of its fictionality the letter is not merely the second half of an oral rhetorical dialogue, but rather it already belongs to the realm of independent written literature: "There is perhaps some truth in what he says, but not the whole truth. The letter should be a little more studied than the dialogue, since the latter reproduces an extemporary utterance, while the former is committed to writing and is (in a way) sent as a gift" (Dem. 224).

Cicero defines similar:

> "I have no doubt my daily letter must bore you, especially as I have no fresh news, nor can I find any excuse for a letter. If I should employ special messengers to convey my chatter to you without reason, I should be a fool but I cannot refrain from entrusting letters to folk who are bound for Rome, especially when they are members of my household. Believe me, too, when I seem to talk with you, I have some little relief from sorrow, and, when, I read a letter from you, far greater relief." (Cic. *Ad. Att.* 8:14.1).

He varies his reflection about the autonomy of writing-act:

> "I have nothing to write. There is no news that I have heard, and all your letters I answered yesterday. But as a sick heart not only robs me of sleep, but will not allow me even to keep awake without the greatest pain, I have begun to write to you something or other without a definite subject, that I may have a sort of talk with you the only thing that gives me relief." (Cic. *Ad. Att.* 9:10.1)

The daily letters of Cicero do not transport "fresh news" (nova de re aliqua), but serve to console and maintain a personal relationship. Because the writer has no "definite subject" (nullo argumento proposito) he composes a literary form of talk (ut quasi tecum loquor). Does the letter as fictitious speech underlie the Aristotelian division of speech genres*?*

Two trends are apparent in the current exegesis of New Testament letters. One trend favours a direct classification of each letter into one of the speech genres of Aristotle;[3] the other prefers to distance the 'letter' genre somewhat from speech genres.[4] The question can be answered adequately only in the context of the whole of the letter literature of antiquity.

As fictitious written literature, letters are fundamentally different from oral speech. Moreover, the Aristotelian division classifies each genre of oral speech depending on its *Sitz im Leben:* trials are *genus iudicale,* council meetings are *genus deliberativum,* ceremonial addresses are *genus laudativum* or *demonstrativum* (Aristotle *Rhet.* 1:3.1; 1358a-b)*.* But the *Sitz im Leben* of letters are not precisely these clearly sociologically-defined situations, for it is not possible to substitute a letter for the central oral speeches in these situations. No trial, no council meeting, no public honouring can manage without a rhetorically shaped oral speech even today.[5] The fiction of a rhetorical *Sitz im Leben* like a trial creates a specific literary framework for a letter but not a real trial situation.[6]

Letters have an influence on other, more complex situations in writing: they can include legal questions, advice and honouring all at once. One aspect might dominate. But the fictitious form of the letter does not take on the features of an oral speech genre. As with narrative literature, Aristotle's genres only represent a basis upon which the new genre, letter, is constructed.[7] The 'letter' genre often mixes the *genera dicendi* and creates multiple subgenres.[8] That is why Deissmann suggested it would be worthwhile to distinguish between letter and epistle: a letter is private and written to an individual congregation or an individual person, whereas epistles are tractates with fictitious addressees.[9] However, an objection could still be raised to the effect that private writing is also fictitiously shaped, and, depending on the actual situation, can deliberately be designed that way (I Thess 5:27). By the same token, epistles can have specific congregations as addressees (Eph 1:1–2).[10]

Therefore, with Cicero, it makes more sense to contrast the *literary letter* from other possible genres, for example, from purely *private* letters or from *official* letters from authorities (the *epistula principum* and the *rescriptum*) or from recommendation-letters.[11] In a remark about the distances between sender and receiver in a letter to Curio, Cicero maintains a distinction between letter-types:

> "A letter of this kind you will of course not expect from me; for as regards your own affairs you have your correspondents und messengers at home, while as regards mine there is absolutely no news to tell you. There remain two kinds of letters which have a great charm for me, the one intimate and humorous, the other austere and serious. Which of the two it least beseems me to employ, I do not quite see. Am I to jest with you by letter? On my oath, I don't think there is a citizen in existence who can laugh in these days. Or am I to write something more serious? What is there that can possibly be written by Cicero to Curio, in the serious style, except on public affairs? Ah! but in this regard my case is just this, that I dare not write what I feel, and I am not inclined to write what I don't feel". (Cic. *Ep. Fam.* 2:4.1).

Cicero delineates clearly three types of letters: the non-literary, purely private letter, the literary letter and the public letter. The recommendation-letter must be added to this list, because recommendation is fundamental for social life.[12] Cicero uses also the recommendation-letter in the "Epistulae ad Familiares", especially in book 13. Pseudo-Demetrius (so named because his manual *Typoi Epistolikoi* [Eng. *Epistolary Types*] was falsely attributed to Demetrios of Phalerum) proposes a formular for this type of letter:

> "The commendatory type, which we write on behalf of one person to another, mixing in praise, at the same time also speaking of those who had previously been unacquainted as though they were (now) acquainted. In the following manner:

So-and-so, who is conveying this letter to you, has been tested by us and is loved on account of his trustworthiness. You will do well if you deem him worthy of hospitality both for my sake and his, and indeed for your own. For you will not be sorry if you entrust to him, in any matter you wish, either words or deeds of a confidential nature. Indeed, you, too, will praise him to others when you see how useful he can be in everything." (Ps.-Dem. 2).

The many reasons for writing letters brought about the production of various standard manuals advising how to write literary and private letters according to good form. The manual by Pseudo-Demetrius, for example, introduces 21 subgenres.[13] But these subgenres merely offer 21 stylistic patterns for specific themes, and turn out to be only stylistic exercises on individual *topoi*.[14] The title of Pseudo-Demetrius work is Týpoi Epistolikoí (Epistolary Types). The last edition must have been in the third century C.E. But some formulars are going back to the second century B.C.E.

Pseudo-Demetrius begins with the literary friendship letter (Ps.-Dem. 1). In antiquity, the *topos* 'cultivated friendship letter' was considered 'the epitome of epistolography'.[15] For the New Testament letters, therefore, the literary friendship letter type that was specifically cultivated by Cicero became dominant (Cic. *Ep. Fam.*).[16] Pseudo-Demetrius's definition of friendship letters could be seen as a pattern for the Pauline letters:

> The friendship letter 'type' [*typos*] is one which appears to be written by one friend to another. But they are not only written by friends. Quite often some people expect the powerful to write something friendly to less worthy or similarly ranked people, to generals, to war leaders, to administrators. There are also letters of the friendship type attested between people who did not know each other when they wrote. They did not behave this way because they were close friends or because they only knew how to write one way, but because they believed if they wrote in a friendly way they would not be refused and the addressee would tolerate and do what they wrote. This 'type' of letter is called a friendship letter as though it were written to a friend. Here is an example:
> "When I am accidentally separated from you for a long time I only suffer physically. I can never forget you and our growing up together, inseparable as we were. I know that I can really put myself in your shoes, that you have the same opinion of me and that you would refuse me nothing. I know you will try your best to see to it that the lodgers (friends) lack nothing, that you will prepare for them something they have missed out on, and that you will write to us about what you want to do" (Ps.-Dem. 1).

The first main part of I Thessalonians is composed unmistakably according to this format: full of friendly memories of the beginning of preaching the gospel together (I Thess 1:2-3:10).[17] The other early Pauline letters clearly show similar friendly memories of the beginning of the preaching of the gospel, as well as requests for friendly service (I Cor 1:10-4:21; 2 Cor 1:12-3:3; Gal 1:6-11; 3:1-5; Phil 1:18b-2:4; Phlm 8-20). In Romans, on the other hand, reminiscences on the friendly association through the preaching of their common belief in Christ are rare because Paul did not establish that congregation and had not yet met the congregation personally (Rom 1:8-17). The special friendship could only be established through the preaching of Paul's own gospel (Rom 1:15).

2. Literary and rhetorical structure

Systematic thought on literature began with Aristotle. It was no longer the poet who explained, like Homer, his understanding of poetry; rather it was the philosopher who put himself on the metalevel of theory over the poet. The philosopher analysed in metalanguage the function and nature of linguistic works of art; he did not stop at poetry, but examined, at the same time, elaborate speech. Aristotle placed 'poetics' next

to 'rhetoric'. Plato and Augustin constructed a similar relation between rhetorical language and poetical expression. McKnight characterizes this connection as follows:

> In this poetic stage, subjekt and object are not clearly seperated but are linked by a common power or energy, which may be brought into being by the articulating of words. The stage of language that was operative in the ancient and medieval church began with Plato and continued to the sixteenth century. In this stage words become essentially the outward expression of inner ideas or thoughts.[18]

In his *Poetics*, Aristotle limited himself to the analysis of genres in poetics. Book I deals with tragedy (chs. 6-22) and epic poems (chs. 23-26); book 2, which is missing, described comedy.[19] The prose genres like historiography, biography, letters and the other minor forms, all of which constitute the genres that are comparable to the New Testament, are not dealt with under the poetic genres; they are not strictly poetry. Horace, in his *Ars Poetica,* also left them out. The work On *the Sublime* (Pseudo-Longinius) touched on them briefly. Exceptionally, Lucian devoted a whole book, his How to *Write History,* to historiography; but this work was limited to practical suggestions and did not venture to offer a theory of literature.[20]

'Rhetoric', on the other hand, gave points of reference for an artistic shaping of literary prose genres.[21] In the narrow sense, rhetoric is the art *(techné,* Latin *ars)* of public speaking at legal proceedings, and in the broader sense it is what is taught at school; so antiquity could describe itself as a 'rhetorical culture'.[22]

The Sophists in classical Greek times developed a reflective rhetoric from the rules experienced from public speeches. 'A catalytic effect.. ´ came over them, 'something like Latin lessons to the educated these days, where the decisive value equally does not depend on direct applicability'.[23] In the time of Hellenism and the principate, rhetoric spread from the area of speechmaking into all literature.[24] But, just as rhetoric did not directly define speechmaking, but rather organized the skills of speechmaking over a long process of training, literature too was not influenced by rhetoric as by a textbook.[25] It was more a question of literary prose coming closer to the rules of rhetoric, preserving, at the same time, its own characteristics.[26]

Since poetics and rhetoric beginning with Aristotle included different instructions on the individual elements, on *inventio, dispositio* and *elocutio* or in Greek *heuresis, taxis* and *lexis,* the literary forms were not laid down unambiguously. They gave individual instructions and were, simultaneously, analyses on the metalevel.[27] They justified the canon of classical works after the fact, legitimated the prevailing norms of literary taste and led current feuds with literary rivals. So there was a wide range of possible variations inside and outside the textbooks. Barthes rightly warned against 'assuming one single canonic introduction' and analysing literature schematically according to it.[28]

Rhetoric proves itself to be a practical art through *memoria* and *actio,* 'whereas *inventio, dispositio* and *elocutio* are a poetic preparation for the practical delivery', so Lausberg emphasized with reference to Quintilian:[29]

> (12) For although the orator's task is to speak well, rhetoric is the science of speaking well. Or if we adopt another view, the task of the artist is to persuade, while the power of persuasion resides in the art. Consequently, while it is the duty of the orator to invent and arrange, *invention* and *arrangement* may be regarded as belonging to rhetoric. (13) At this point there has been much disagreement, as to whether these are parts or *duties of* rhetoric, or as Athenaeus believes, *elements* of rhetoric which the Greeks call *stoicheia.* But they cannot correctly be called *elements.* For in that case we should have to regard them merely as first principles, like the moisture, fire, matter or atoms of which the universe is said to be composed. Nor is it correct to call them duties, since they are not performed by others, but perform something themselves. We must therefore conclude that they are parts. (14) For since rhetoric is composed of them, it follows that, since a whole consists of parts, these must be

parts of the whole which they compose. Those who have called them *duties* seem to me to have been further influenced by the fact that they wished to reserve the name of parts for another division of rhetoric: for they asserted that the parts of rhetoric were, *panegyric, deliberative* and *forensic* oratory. But if these are parts, they are parts rather of the material than of the art. (15) For each of them contains the whole of rhetoric, since each of them requires *invention, arrangement, expression, memory* and *delivery.* Consequently, some writers have thought it better to say that there are three *kinds* of oratory; those whom Cicero has followed seem to me to have taken the wisest course in terming them *kinds of causes* (Quint. *Inst.* 3:3.12-15).

Rhetoric is the science of good speechmaking with the pragmatic function of persuasion, *persuasio*.[30] As poetics emphasizes for the poet that he has with the *inventio* and the *dispositio* to produce the pragmatic function of purifying the passions of the listener with the help of compassion and fear (Aristotle *Poet.* 6*),* rhetoric has the analogous function of making the speaker capable of rousing the *persuasio* of the listener with *inventio* and *dispositio.* Therefore *inventio* and *dispositio* are parts of rhetoric and not functions *(opera),* which can be added or omitted. Due to the subject matter of the speech, since Cicero and Quintilian three genera of speeches have been differentiated: those of praise, those of advice and those given at legal proceedings. Aristotle's differentiation into epideictic, forensic and deliberative speech remained binding for the whole of antiquity (Aristotle *Rhet.* 1:3.1-3; 1358b).[31] Within these genres the speaker had to shape the *inventio, dispositio* and *lexis.* Through memoria (learning by heart) and *pronuntiatio* (delivery), the preparation of the speech became a practical art. Rhetoric and literature have the same but differently expressed pragmatic function: to edify and persuade the listener.

Therefore the ancient letter has a variable structure determined by literary, rhetorical and communicative rules. Within the rhetoric *inventio, dispositio* and *lexis* construct a hierarchy with different levels. The inventio disclaims the highest level. The idea and the topoi of the argumentation are collected and sorted. On the second level the dispositio elaborates the inventio and develops the arrangement. According to Aristoteles (R*het.* 3:13-19; 1414a-1420b) four parts became normative for the judicial speech:

1. *prooímion*, Lat. *exordium*;
2. *diégesis*, Lat. *narratio*;
3. *pístis*, Lat. *argumentatio*
4. *epílogos*, Lat. *peroratio*[32]

The *exordium* introduces the themes and motifes; the *narratio* tells the special case; the *argumentatio* discusses reasons and develops solutions; the *peroratio* admonishes the hearers to the right judgement.

In the laudatory and deliberate speech, the narration (Part 2) can be omitted (Aristotle *Rhet.* 3:16; 1416b-17b).

The letter should have such rhetorical arrangement:

1. Preskript
2. *Exordium*
3. *Narratio* (necessary in the judicial speech)
4. *Argumentatio*
5. *Peroratio*
6. Postskript

The adress (prescript) and the greetings (postscript) shape a new framework.

Because the letter is a fictional literary dialogue, the speech-genres are not strictly distinguished from each other but mixed. Within the letter they can be altered. Parts of dialogues or original letters can be collected and combined to form new letters. This results in formations of multiple literary types that do not follow classical speech-genres exactly. Pseudo-Demetrius accordingly included twenty-one "Epistolary Types" in his short theory of letters. Now these letter-types are not imitations of public speeches, but differ from another in respect of literary normes and thematic motifs like friendship.

A rhetorical analysis cannot totally explain the letter-arrangement and needs the literary analysis of special letter-types. Deissmann had compared the letters of the New Testament with private letters.[33] Klauck followed him seeking the basic structure of all kinds of ancient letters.[34] He devised a three step pattern (Introduction, Body, Closing) with usual subdivisions combined with usual motifs:

I. Preface (Briefeingang)
    A. Prescript (Das Briefpräskript)
        1. *superscriptio* (Nominativ)
        2. *adscriptio* (Dativ)
        3. *salutatio* (Infinitiv)
    B. Prooimion (Das Briefproömium)
        - health-wishes (Wohlergehens- bzw. Gesundheitswunsch)
        - words of thanks (Danksagung)
        - memory, prayer (Gedenken, Fürbitte)
        - joy (Freudensäußerung)
II. Body (Das Briefkorpus)
    A. Opening (Korpuseröffnung)
        - memory, joy etc. (Gedenken, Freudensäußerung)
        - information-formulae; petition-formulae (Kundgabeformel; Ersuchensformel o.ä.)
        - self-recommendation; recommendation (Selbstempfehlung; Fremdempfehlung)
    B. Middle
        - Information (Information)
        - Commandment, Admonition (Appell, Anweisung)
        - Admonition, Recommendation (Mahnung, Empfehlung)
        - request (variable placed) (Bitte (verschieden plaziert))
        - diverse clichés (stereotyped ideas) (diverse Klischees (stehende Wendungen))
    C. End
        - possibly request, admonition (evtl. Bitte, Mahnung)
        - plans of visiting and travelling (Besucher- und Reisepläne)
III. Closing
    A. Epilogue (Epilog)
        - end-admonitions (Schlußmahnungen)
        - reflection of writing-act (Reflexion auf den Schreibakt)
        - wish of visiting (Besuchswunsch)
    B. Postscript (Postskript)
        - greetings (Grüße)
            direct (1. Pers.)
            order of greetings (2. Pers.)
            transfer of greetings (3. Pers.)
        - wishes: "Fare well" etc.
        - remark of personal signature (Eigenständigkeitsvermerk)
        - Date[35]

Analysis of ancient letters leads to the recognition of common basic rules of writing. Instruction in writing allowed standards to be maintained from Egyptian time to Greco-Roman epochs and culture. The Old Testament participated on this process. The letters of the Old Testament had the basic letter arrangement of the Egyptian private papyri used in Greco-Roman time. In the Greco-Roman culture every educated writer was

competent in the system of rhetorical speech and the autonomous system of letter-writing. Analysis should look to both systems and correlate them. Every letter is a construction of ist own, combining basic rules of content-organisation and rhetoric rules of speech -particulary of personal friendship-speech.

3. Rhetoric and Style of the Pauline Letters

Paul strove to attain a sophisticated rhetorical and literary level of Koine, but not the level of artistic prose, since he rejected the philosophical educational goals of the Greek paideia (I Cor 1:18-31). Hence in II Corinthians (10-13), a fighting letter, he contrasts the 'weight and strength' of his letters with what the Corinthians thought was the 'contemptibility of his speech' (II Cor 10:1.9-11). One should not, however, take such Socratic self-stylization for granted.[36] Paul's intention was obviously to imbue his letters with the power to convince and to persuade through the use of rhetorical rules, but without taking on the role of a sophist or a philosopher. The rhetorical quality of the letters was not at issue in the quotation from the Corinthians just cited. Since Paul meant his letters to be read aloud at congregational meetings (I Thess 5:27) he was forced to choose the public literary speech style. Contrary to the opinion of Deissmann, who classified the letters as being in the unliterary language of private papyrus letters,[37] it must be assumed that Paul had a Hellenistic education, consisting of more than the second stage of grammar school, which included the beginning of rhetorical studies.[38] Paul had no quarrel with the formal goals of education in antiquity, but with their contents. So in 2 Peter (3:15-16), quite rightly, a warning is given that people with no formal education *(amatheís)* might find Pauline letters difficult to understand and might twist the meaning. The reason is that Paul often employed the popular rhetorical modes of imagery, antithesis, diatribe, admonition, applied ethics, apology, self-recommendation, reproach and textual proof in his letters.[39]
Paul knew very well the rules of rhetorical speech, but like Cicero and the rhetorical handbooks he was interested in creating a personal friendly tone of friendship with his communities. A new form should develop the new christian message. Therefore Paul accepted that some letters (I Kor; 2 Kor; Rom) became longer than usual. The special situation of the community could need new complexity of content and rhetoric form.

4. The Form of the Pauline Letters

   Like the other letters of antiquity, the New Testament letters not only go beyond Aristotelian speech divisions and mix them as the other letters of antiquity also do, but they also do not strictly adhere to the standards of' literary letters of antiquity. Since Pseudo-Demetrius allowed various types of literary letters (Group 1), the New Testament letter writer saw no fundamental problem in creating new types by mixing the main types of literary letter and setting his own specific focuses. Thus it is again typical Christian style to lay out a literary letter according to the rules of literary Koine and artistic prose, and combine it with the stereotypical parts of a private letter, which would be laid out according to the rules of oral Koine. The content-arrangement of private letters influenced the new christian writing. An original type was now created by the christian writers: the Christian literary letter.[40] Pure private letters (Group 2) still are absent.
   'Official correspondence' from the government, the third group of letters in antiquity, is also not present in the corpus of letters in the New Testament, because Paul and the other pseudepigraphical writers did not consider themselves to be hierarchically

superior administrators. However, it is true that the letter containing the decisions made at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:23-29), which is embedded in the New Testament history book Acts, does have the characteristics of an official edict: an *epistula principum*.[41]

The recommendation-letter, the fourth group of letters in antiquity, has an equivalent in Philemon. But the letter to Philemon contains more than recommendation. Philemon was adressed to a house-community. The letter was dealing with the fundamental problem of slavery. How should the Christian community handle this unjust differentation within the Greco-Roman society? Recommendation became the outer form of this smallest Pauline letter. In the other Pauline letter recommendation remains an important motif.

In the meantime, examinations of the rhetorical structure of most New Testament letters have become available. The genuine Pauline letters, the proto-Paulines, have been examined with special thoroughness. They all belong to the new Christian genre of literary letters that contain parts of oral speech like *pistis* formulae, homologies, prayers, songs, paranesis patterns, dialogues, especially diatribes, and lists of woes.[42] Even the unusually long thanksgiving in the *exordium* owes its existence to oral Christian prayer language.[43] Specific terms and metaphors from the Christian community characterize the *narratio, argumentatio* and *exhortatio*.[44]

a. The Proto-Paulines

According the scholary consensus Paul himself wrote at least seven letters: I Thessalonions; I-2 Corinthians; Philippians; Galatians; Philemon and Romans.

The oldest letter is I Thessalonians (c. 50 CE). Stylistically it is an advisory, deliberative friendship letter.[45] It deviates from the friendship letters of antiquity in that it has a long paranthetic concluding section (4:1-5:22).

The typical Pauline letter form is developed in this first letter:

Prescript	1:1
Exordium	1:2-10
(*Propositio*)	(1:8-10)
Argumentatio	2:1-3:13
Exhortatio	4:1-5:22
Postscript with *salutatio*	5:23-28

The prescript contains the usual three elements: the name of the sender (*superscriptio*), the name of the addressee (*adscriptio*) and the greeting (*salutatio*): 'Paul, Silvanus and Timothy to the congregation in Thessalonica in God the father and the Lord Jesus Christ, grace and peace to you!' (I Thess 1:1). Deviating from the single element basic sentence of Western antiquity, which consisted of the sender (subject), greeting (verb), and addressee (object), here we find the two-element basic-sentence letter introduction of Eastern antiquity. The salutation is no longer linked to the greeting; it follows the separate double greeting corresponding to the usual Jewish double wish 'Greetings and good health' (2 Macc 1:10).[46] With the exception of the untypical letter of James and the two letters in Acts (Acts 15:23; 23:26), all the New Testament letters stick to the oriental form of greeting.[47]

Differing and contradictory suggestions for the subdivision of the main part 1:1-3:13 have been tendered: 1:1-5 *exordium* and 1:6-3:13 *narratio;*[48] 1:2-3:13 'Predominant Expressive Function',[49] that is, a long 'thanksgiving'.[50]

Hughes refines this arrangement: *exordium* 1:1-10; *narratio* 2:1-3:10; *partitio* 3:11-13; *probatio* 4:1-5:5; *peroratio* 5:4-11; *exhortatio* 5:12-22; *conclusio* 5:23-28.[51] Jewett and

Hughes are interested to determine one part as narration. But the *narratio*, which usually follows the *exordium* and the *propositio* does not always exist as a separate section. According Aristotle the narrative is a necessary part of the judicial speech (Aristotle *Rhet.* 3:13; 1414a). In the laudatory and deliberate speech the narration can be disconnected or selective or totally absent (Aristotle *Rhet.* 3:16; 1416b-17b). Olbricht considers Aristotle's approval of the shortening of the narration in his arrangement: preskript 1:1; *exordium* 1:2-3; *narratio* 1:4-10; *argumentatio* 2:1-5:11; epilogue 5:12-25; postscript 5:25-28. But the *argumentatio* must be subdivided in *argumentatio* and *exhortatio*. According the majority view the postscript starts with I Thess 5:23. The preceeding epilogue (I Thess 5:15-25) is an superfluous doubling of the postscript. The short narration has been set in the wrong place. Content-analysis clarifies, that the *exordium* is not limited to the small section I Thess 1:2-3, but includes the motifs "apostolic team-work in Thessalonich", "imitation" as reaction of the community, "setting an example" for other believers in other regions, "reputation", "passing over with supplement", "memory of conversion", "faith formula" (I Thess 1:4-10).[52] This section belongs to the *exordium* and does not constitute a narration. The *exordium* has the function of indicating the main motifs of the speech or the letter or other literary works. Today this sort of function can be experienced effectively in overtures of operas, because the old operas are styled according the ancient rhetoric. The overtures cite briefly the main motifs of the opera.

The motif of the dynamic preaching of the gospel (I Thess 1:5) dominates the section I Thess 2:1-3:13. The mention of the imitation of Paul and the example-function of the community (I Thess 1:6-7) prepares the antijewish polemic I Thess 2:13-16. Therefore this polemic should not be cut out as deuteroPauline addition. The notice of reputation and memory of conversion (I Thess 1:2-3; 1:8-9a) point forward to the discussion in I Thess 3:1-5 of the consolation Paul experienced during and after his crisis in Athens. The faith formula (I Thess 1:9b-10) focuses the apocalyptic theme that is explained in I Thess 4:13-18; 5:1-11.

The direct transition from the orientalized prescript and *exordium* through prayer and memories to the *argumentatio* in I Thessalonians again corresponds to the usual letter form of antiquity. On the other hand, appending an *exhortatio* is uncommon. This is a typically Christian sort of addition. *Exhortationes* are usually dealt with in the *argumentatio*. Wuellner, therefore, sees in this first letter of Paul a time when *exhortatio* and *argumentatio* were still a single unit, but the later division of the unit into two was already emerging.[53] The division in the case of I Thessalonians into a main part and an *exhortatio* is generally accepted.

Paul does not stick strictly to the pattern of speech divisions of antiquity. According to the content-analysis differing divisions of the first main part with the central theme of preaching the gospel are possible. Prescript 1:1; Prooimion 1:2-10; Body 2:1-5:22 (Opening 2:1-12; Middle I 2:13-3:13; Middle II 4:1-5:11; End 5:12-22); Closing 5:23-28.[54] This content-division corresponds exactly to the proposal above following rhetorical rules. Rhetoric explains the outline of the letter and guides the reader-expectation. The content-analysis comment the special arrangement of the motifs. Paul calls to memory the dynamic begin of the gospel (I Thess 1.2-10). He was its preacher and he remained its apostolic interpreter. So the mainpart is going to be about the relationship between Paul and his community. The Opening brings the self-recommendation, Middle I, the visitation-wishes and messenger-sending, Middle II, the admonitions and advices for the daily life before the apocalypse, and the End, the admonitions concerning the present problems.

With the addition of the *exhortatio* as the second main part Paul became the creator of the new Christian letter form in which the *argumentatio* is followed by the Christian *paranesis* in the form of an *exhortatio.*

2 Thessalonians, which is deutero-Pauline, follows the rhetorical structure of I Thessalonians.[55]

Prescript	1:1-2
Exordium	1:3-12
Propositio	2:1-2
Probatio	2:3-3:5
Exhortatio	3:6-13
Postscript with Epilogue	3:14-18[56]

Instead of *propositio* Klauck substitutes partitio. But the *partitio* explains the *propositio* and does not replaces it.[57] Klauck took over Jewett´s rhetorical outline: *exordium* with prescript: 1:1-12; *partitio* (?): 2:1-2; *probatio* 2:3-3:5; *exhortatio* 3:6-15; *peroratio* 3:16-18,[58] but he correctly critizes the extension of the *exhortatio* to 3:14-15 and the setting of the *peroratio* 3:16-18 instead of the postscript with epilogue 3:14-18.[59]

The fact that 2 Thessalonians parallels the rhetorical arrangement of I Thessalonians should illuminate the readers. The letter wants to be recognized as authentic Pauline scripture. The sections propositio (2 Thess 2:1-2) and postscript with epilogue (2 Thess 3:14-18) emphazise the personal writing-act of Paul. The writer supplements the apocalyptic theme and the exhortations. In contrast to the positive memory of I Thessalonians the second letter exaggaretes warnings and dangers. The fact that Christians in the late first century were no longer more expecting the end of the world determines the atmosphere.

I and 2 Corinthians do not stick exactly to this new form. They are unique, extensive compositions. It can be shown, however, that 2 Corinthians is a composite of many letters originally written by Paul where each individual letter does correspond to the original Pauline pattern.[60]

1. 2 Cor. 10-13 is 'the sorrowful letter' about conflicts with tile congregation about apostolic authority.
2. 2 Cor. 1:1-6:14; 7:2-16 is a 'letter of reconciliation'.
3. 2 Cor. 8 is a 'collection' letter.
4. 2 Cor. 9 is another 'collection' letter.
5. 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1 is a post-Pauline addition.

The 'sorrowful letter' (10-13) is written in the tradition of a Socratic, ironic, judicial apology.[61] It imagines a court situation and employs the judicial style, but without giving up the 'friendship' deliberative relationship with the Corinthians. It is a deliberative letter spiced up with judicial language. The letter of reconciliation that came later (1:1-6:14; 7:2-16) is in the deliberative style of the friendship letter all the way through. The two short letters (8; 9) asking for money (the 'collection' letters) are also written in the deliberative style and are attached to the letter of reconciliation by Paul himself.

The post-Pauline collector put the 'sorrowful letter' at the end in order to give the most weight to the apology in the newly created composition. However, with the redefinition of the emphasis he concealed the historical sequence of Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians.[62] The rhetorical outline of the unit formed by the letter of reconciliation and the letter of sorrow are difficult to determine. The content-analysis is more accessible:

Prescript	1:1-2
Prooimion	1:3-11
Body I	1:12-9:15
Body II	10:1-13:10
Closing	13:11-13[63]

The rhetorical arrangement corresponds:

Prescript	1:1-2
Exordium	1:3-11
Narratio	1:12-2:13
Propositio	2:14-17
Partitio	3:1-3
Probatio I	3:4-6:13; 7:2-16
Exhortatio	8:1-9:15
Probatio II	10:1-13:10
Postscript with Epilogue	13:11-13

Two self-apologies dominate the *probationes*. The narration (2 Cor 1:12-2:13) shows the case wich demands the self-apologie. The *propositio* is so openly formulated, that not only the letter of reconciliation but also the sorrowful letter can be subordinated. Christ´ triumph and Paul´s fragrance from death to death and from life to life (2 Cor 2:14-16) comprise the apologies of both letters. The *partitio* (2 Cor 3:1-3) explains the theme of recommendation in the acts of writing, preaching and christological faith. The introduction of the letter of reconciliation (2 Cor 1:1-3:3) allows the supplement of analogous letters. But the collector had difficulty in finding an appropriate ending. The postscript 2 Cor 13:11-13 remains a fragment. Greetings ('finally, brethren, farewell') introduce final admonitions and instructions (v 11) and constitute a short epilogue. Then begins the postscript with a second series of greetings: admonition to greet each other and transmission of greetings from of all the saints of the fictitious community in which Paul is writing (v 12). The phrase "Greet one another with a holy kiss" is repeated from the postscript in 1 Corinthians (16:20). The last wish is overloaded with three members.[64] Remarks of personal signature or direct greetings are omitted. The postscript does not really summarize the letter. The epilogue is a dry standard-formula.

I Corinthians also consists of many letter sections on current questions in the congregations, but these were deliberately put together into a large composition by Paul himself.[65] It exceeds the usual bounds of a literary letter of antiquity, but the repetitive letter structure of the individual sections corresponds to letter collections of antiquity.[66] Paul chooses the unusual composite form again for the last letter to the Romans. He deliberately goes against literary conventions and thereby transmits to the later collectors an example of how to edit together a collection of his own originally separate letters.

The content-analysis of Paul´s redaction in 1 Corinthians results in the following scheme:

Prescript	1:1-3
Prooimion	1:4-9
Body	1:10-16:12
Closing	16:13-24[67]

The rhetorical outline corresponds:

Prescript	1:1-3
Exordium	1:4-9

Propositio	1:10
Narratio	1:11-17
Argumentatio	1:8-15:58
Exhortatio	16:1-16:18
Postscript	16:19-24[68]

The *exordium* collects the main motifs of this letter: grace, speech, spritual gift (I Cor 12-14), knowledge (I Cor 1:18-4:21), testimony (I Cor 5-11), waiting for the day of Christ (I Cor 15). The *propositio* leads to the narration and anew to the speech of the spiritual gifts (I Cor 12-14). *Propositio* and *narratio* introduce the whole argumentation.

The *argumentatio* can be divided in several units with rhetorical speech-structure: 1:1-4:21; 5:1-13; 6:1-20; 7:1-40; 8:1-11:1; 11:2-34; 12:1-14:40; 15:1-58. These parts are rhetorical-formed answers to questions of the community and constitute a long catalogue of answers.[69]

The *exhortatio* summarizes the letter and creates a real end. Unity or agreement and concern for leaders (1 Cor 16:13-19) is the counterpart of splits (schísmata I Cor 1:10). The travel plans (1 Cor 16:5-12) go back to the narration I Cor 1:11-17 and reniew the friendship between Paul and the Corinthians. The postscript is very concrete and personal (1 Cor 16:19-24). The master gave the letter-collection the final polish.

The letter to the Philippians is, like I-2 Corinthians, a composition, but has the length of a usual ancient letter. For this reason the unity is controversial. Two parts can be distinguished:

1:1-3:1a; 4:2-7:10-23 letter from prison
3:1b-4:1.8-9 letter warning about false teachers.[70]

This letter from prison with its intense Christian mysticism has the typical structure of a deliberative-friendship letter:[71]

Prescript	1:1-2
Exordium	1:3-11
Narratio	1:12-18a
Argumentatio	1:18b-2:11
Exhortatio	2:12-30
Postscript	3:1a; 4:2-7:10-23

Even the autobiographical-narrative and argumentative-warning letter has the structure of a deliberative-friendship letter:[72]

Exordium	3:2-3
Narratio	3:4-11
Argumentatio	3:12-21
Exhortatio	4:1-3:8-9

Because the collector embedded the warning-letter into the friendship letter, a genuine rhetorical and literary unity was reestablished:

Prescript	1:1-2
Exordium	1:3-11
Narratio	1:12-18a
Probatio	1:18b-3:21
Peroratio	4:1-20

Watson first claimed the rhetorical unity of Philippians; but he made the *exordium* to long (Phil 1:3-26); he divides rightly two parts: "thangsgiving and prayer (vv. 3-11) and personal narrative (vv. 12-26)".[74] But the narrative must end with v 18a and must be separated from the *exordium*; for vv 18b-26 belong to the *probatio*. Watson however has the probatio begin with 2:1 and conclude with 3:21. For Watson, the brief passage 1:27-37 constitutes the narrative.[75] This construction is not convincing. But the proposal of Watson established the basis of the rhetorical reconstruction of the outline of Philippians without the late double narration: Prescript 1:1-2; *Exordium* I 1:3-11; *Exordium* II (narratio) 1:12-26; *Probatio* 2:1-3:21; *Peroratio* 4:1-20; Postscript 4:21-23.

The *exordium* emphasizes the motifs of friendship: memory, prayer, partnership in the gospel, completion of the good work, holding in the heart, partaking of grace in imprisonment and defense, abonding of love, knowledge and discernment; approval of the excellent things and righteousness (Phil 1:3-11). Hints about struggle with opponents are hidden, but can be recognized. Friendship and faith are always threatened by imprisonment, accusations, trials and possible splits. The *narratio* explains the relationship between imprisonment and splits within the community. Preparation is made for the warning-section Phil 3:2-4.3. The admonitions in Phil 2:12-30 lose their independence as *exhortatio*. Now they must be read as part of the long *probatio*. The rhetorical rules and the literary content allow the permanent alternating between argumentation and admonition. The *probatio* gets two climaxes: first the christologian hymn Phil 2:5-11, second the struggle with the opponents Phil 3:2-21. The *peroratio* now formes a meaningful unity: Phil 4:1-20. For the division-hypothesis this segment was very unclear and controversial. Indeed Paul shaped a rhetorical and literary coherence putting together two different parts. Probable the warning-letter was historically the first with the prison-letter following.

   The letter to Philemon is the shortest independent letter of Paul. It shows even more clearly than the other short letters in 2 Corinthians the rhetorical elegance of a short literary letter that was written for publication; Philemon functioned as leader of a house church (Phlm 1-2):

Prescript	vv. 1-3
Exordium	vv. 4-7
Argumentatio	vv. 8-16
Peroratio (Exhortatio)	vv. 17-22
Postscript	vv. 23-25[76]

Paul discusses the case of the runaway Onesimus, who is looking for protection, in a friendship-deliberative request letter to his master, as was usual in such cases in antiquity.

Pliny wrote a letter about the conflict of a freedman with his master Sabinianus. The freedman had fled to Pliny and obtained his recommendation to Sabinianus.

1   "To Sabinianus.
2   Your freedman, whom you lately mentioned as
3   having displeased you, has been with me; he threw
4   himself at my feet and clung there with as much
5   submission as he could have done at yours. He
6   earnestly requested me with many tears, and even
7   with the eloquence of silent sorrow, to intercede for
8   him; in short, he convinced me by his whole be-
9   haviour, that he sincerely repents of his fault. And
10   I am persuaded he is thoroughly reformed, because

11   he seems entirely sensible of his delinquency.
12   I know you are angry with him, and I know too, it
13   is not without reason; but clemency can never exert
14   itself with more applause, than when there is the
15   justest cause for resentment.
16   You once had an
17   affection for this man, and, I hope, will have again:
18   in the meanwhile, let me only prevail with you to
19   pardon him. If he should incur your displeasure
20   hereafter, you will have so much the stronger plea
21   in excuse for your anger, as you shew yourself more
22   exorable to him now. Allow something to his youth,
23   to his tears, and to your own natural mildness of
24   temper: do not make him uneasy any longer, and I
25   will add too, do not make yourself so; for a man of
26   your benevolence of heart cannot be angry without
27   feeling great uneasiness.
28   I am afraid, where I to join my entreaties with his,
29   I should seem rather to compel, than request you to
30   forgive him. Yet I will not scruple to do it; and so
31   much the more fully and freely as I have very
32   sharply and severely reproved him, positively threat-
33   ening never to interpose again in his behalf. But
34   though it was proper to say this to him, in order to
35   make him more fearful of offending, I do not say it
36   to you. I may, perhaps, again have occasion to
37   intreat you upon his account, and again obtain your
38   forgiveness; supposing, I mean, his error should be
39   such as may become me to intercede for, and you to
40   pardon.
41   Farewell" (Plin. *Ep*. 9:21).

The letter shows a similar rhetorical outline and content like Philemon:

Prescript	Line 1
Exordium	Line 2-11
Propositio	Line 12-15
Argumentatio	Line 16-40
with Exhoratio	
Postscript	Line 41

The *exordium* tells the plea for help and the impressions of Pliny. The *propositio* respects the feelings of Sabinianus and introduces the norm (clemency) which rules the argumentatio: "sed tunc praecipua mansuetudinis laus, cum irae causa iustissima est". The *argumentatio* is always alternating between affirmations, admonitions and self-reflections. The relations within the triangel writer – adressee – freedman are discused in a very personal and homorous way, like in Philemon.

More rigorously than Pliny, Paul appeals to the Christian house-church leader Philemon to forgive the slave and to give him to Paul as his assistant. The apostle leaves the decision with Philemon as to whether Onesimus should serve him with the legal status of a house-slave or of a freedman; but Paul hints that he would prefer Onesimus to be freed (vv. 13-20).[77]

The case of the fugitive slave demands the recommendation-motif. The letter picks up elements of the recommendation-letter type (*argumentatio* Phlm 8-17). Paul also uses the self-recommendation in his other letters (2 Cor 3:1-3 etc.). With the position of apostle and community-founder Paul needs regular self-recommendation as friend and authority. Therefore all Pauline letters carry a touch of recommendation, but especially the letter to Philemon.

Galatians is a unity in which the form of the deliberative letter has been perfected.[78] According to Betz this letter shows most clearly the structure of a Pauline letter that has been orientated to the pattern of a letter in antiquity:[79]

Prescript	1:1-5
Exordium	1:6-11
Narratio	1:12-2:14
Propositio	2:15-2:21
Probatio (Argumentatio)	3:1-4:31
Exhortatio	5:1-6:10
Postscript	6:11-18

The *argumentatio* is in the style of a diatribe and discusses the repealing of the Old Testament Laws. The *narratio,* in contrast to the narratives in other Pauline letters, contains the most detailed autobiographical section. Paul puts himself forward as an example of the accurate liberal understanding of the Law.

Romans, Paul's last letter, leaves behind the friendship-deliberative letter genre. For the development of the gospel he orientates himself more strongly towards laudatory admonitory speech, but he also retains some deliberative elements, especially in the closing *exhortatio* (12:1-15:13).[80] The structure of the laudatory letter corresponds to the usual Pauline letter pattern:[81]

Prescript	1:1-7
Exordium	1:8-17
Argumentatio	1:18-11:36
Exhortatio	12:1-15:13
Postscript	15:14-16:23

Even more clearly than in Gal 3:1-4:31 the diatribe shapes the extended *argumentatio* section which is on the subject of courts and justice (1:18-11:36).[82] The prescript is also unusually long because Paul has to recommend himself to the Christians in Rome, whom he did not know personally.

Doubtless without intending it, in Romans Paul composed his theological legacy, since his plan to preach the gospel in Spain after his first visit to Rome (Rom 15:24*)* fell through due to his arrest in Jerusalem (Acts 21:27-40*).* He finally arrived in Rome as a prisoner (Acts 28:16-31) and suffered the death of a martyr there (Acts 20:23-25; I Clem 5:2*).*

The deutero-Pauline letters to the Colossians and to the Ephesians exhibit the typical Pauline structure of a deliberative-friendship letter with an added *exhortatio.*

The authorship of Colossians is controversial. Consensus exist that this letter was written very late by Paul himself[83] or by his secretary[84] or by the Pauline school as early as 70 C.E.[85]

In imitation of Galatians the rhetorical structure shines clear with the specific christian appendix of *exhortatio*:

Prescript	1:1-2
Exordium	1:3-23
(Propositio)	(1:21-23)
Narratio	1:24-2:5
Argumentatio	2:6-23
Exhortatio	3:1-4:6
Postscript	4:7-18[86]

The letter to Ephesians depends from Colossians. It varies the rhetorical outline omitting the argumentatio:

Prescript	1:1-2
Exordium	1:3-23
Narratio	2:1-3:21
Exhortatio	4:1-6:20
Postscript	6:21-24[87]

The deutero-Pauline pastoral letters go new ways with the letter genre. The rhetorical outline of 1 Timothy follows the Pauline scheme but departs from the type of friendship-letter:

Prescript	1:1-2
Exordium	1:3-20
Argumentatio	2:1-6:2
Exhortatio	6:3-19
Postscript	6:20-21[88]

The narration is omitted, the *probatio* is a collection of instructions. Arrangement and stile indicate the type "official letter". The *rescripta* of emperor Trajan to Pliny show this official stile very well, e.g. the well-known answer to Pliny´s question about the judicial intercourse with Christians (Plin. *Ep.* 10:96-97).[89]

2 Timothy goes back to the friendship-letter:

Prescript	1:1-2
Exordium	1:3-5
Argumentatio	1:6-3:17
Exhortatio	4:1-8
Postscript	4:9-22[90]

The long postscript expresses the tone of the last will. 2 Timothy should close the small collection of the three 'pastoral letters'[91].

Titus develops a third form of pastoral letter:

Prescript	1:1-4
Propositio	1:5
Argumentatio	1:6-3:7
Exhortatio	3:8-11
Postscript	3:12-15[92]

Narration is missed like in the other pastoral letters. The *exhortatio* is short like in those letters. But the omitting of the *exordium* indicates a failure. Maybe the contrast of long prescript and abrupt jump into the propositio of the argumentation makes that the whole letter becomes an introduction to the small pastoral collection.[93]

All deutero-Pauline letters conserved the specific Pauline sequence from teaching to admonition. They varied the rhetorical and content arrangement. Like some proto-Pauline letters they established singular forms. 2 Thessalonians imitated I Thessalonians, the first Christian and thoroughly classical friendship-letter. Colossians with the dependent Ephesians imitated I Thessalonians, Galatians and Philemon in a free way. Two pastoral letters introduced the official letter type and created singular forms adapted to the fictitious communication. The Pauline and deutero-Pauline letters played upon the expectations of their audience. In respect of the real and fictitious

situations of communication they established singular forms. The literary and theological shaping of vivid friendly relationship led to a rich reservoir of creative letters.

The anonymous letter to the Hebrews has a special role. It is an epideictic and deliberative sermon in letter form.[94] The author shows most clearly the knowledge of Greco-Roman rhetoric. The outline observes the rules of written speech:

Exordium	1:1-4
Narratio	1:5–2:18
(Propositio)	2:17-18
Argumentatio	3:1–10:18
Peroratio	10:19–13:21
Postscript	13:22-25[95]

Admonitions are regularly inserted giving the speech deliberative moments; in the last part these admonitions dominate and create the *peroratio*. The written sermon therefore is made of deliberative parts as well as epideictic parts. The closing is an appendix converting the written sermon into a letter. The writing already had a Pauline colouring[96], and this explains the addition of the Pauline-type greeting. This greeting makes the completed work fit for the Pauline-letter formula and strengthens the Pauline style. The Pauline letter-scheme can also be recognized from the view of the end (Hebr 10:19–13:25). The prescript is omitted, but *narratio*, *argumentatio*, *peroratio* and postscript are contained.

In contrast to the proto- and deutero-Pauline letters, the seven socalled catholic letters use various genres. The pseudepigraphical letters of I and 2 John are literary deliberative letters written to specific people and congregations. They do not use the rhetorical outline.[97] The pseudepigraphical I John and I Peter are again deliberative paranetic sermons.[98] More clearly than in the case of I John, I Peter takes up the traditions of congregational worship. And moreover it retains the Pauline form of a Christian letter through the division into two parts of the *argumentatio* and *exhoratio,* and through the addition of a postscript and the inclusion of a prescript, whereas I John merely has a short paranetic ending.[99] The pseudepigraphical 2 Peter and the letter of Jude, upon which 2 Peter depends, once more exhibit the Pauline letter form.

In the taking up of the oral apostolic traditions with their forms, themes and innovations and in the shaping of the letter forms of antiquity for his own purposes, Paul and the pseudepigraphical authors after him managed to develop their own theology, which became fundamental to nascent Christianity.

---

[1] Koskenniemi 1956: 38-42; Thraede 1970: 97-99.

[2] Text with translation in Malherbe 1977: 19-23; Demetrius: On Stile ed. and transl. By W. Rhys Roberts (LCL rev. ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1932).

[3] Betz 1988: 69-71.

[4] Berger 1984: 1326-28; Classen 1991: 7-9.

[5] Eisenhut 1982: 4-6.

[6] Contra Betz 1988: 69-70.

[7] Dormeyer 1989b: 153.

[8] Deismann 1923: 160; with research report Strecker 1992: 89-95.

[9] Deissmann 1923: 157-72; Deissmann 1923: 193-208.

[10] Wendland 1912: 344-46; Schneider RAC 2 [1954]: 574-75; Vielhauer 1975: 58-62.

[11] Schneider RAC 2 [1954]: 568-70; Aune 1987: 162-69; Berger 1984: 1326-28, Klauck 1998: 71-148.

[12] Klauck 1998: 75-80.

[13] Malherbe 1977: 3-5.

[14] Malherbe 1977: 8-9.

<hr>

[15] Koskenniemi 1956: 115-128; Thraede 1970: 3.

[16] Malherbe 1977: 6; Vielhauer 1975: 61-62; Bünker 1984: 47; 152-165 Schoon-Janssen 1991: 39-41; Klauck 1998; cautiously Thraede 1970: 95.

[17] Malherbe 1987: 72-74.

[18] McKnight 1988: 36.

[19] Fuhrmann 1973: 4.

[20] Hengel 1979: 19-20; Winkelmann RAC 15 [1991]: 732.

[21] Fuhrmann 1990: 8.

[22] Eisenhut 1982: 93.

[23] Hommel 1970: 128.

[24] Lausberg 1960: parag. 32-41; Hommel 1970: 138.

[25] Barthes 1988: 30-32.

[26] Eisenhut 1982: 93-94.

[27] Barthes 1988: 16-17.

[28] Barthes 1988: 50; Eisenhut 1982: 82-84; Classen 1991: 1-34.

[29] Lausberg 1960: parag. 34.

[30] Martin 1974: 2-4.

[31] Martin 1974: 9-10.

[32] Dormeyer 1998: 208-213; Klauck 1998: 174-176.

[33] Deißmann 1923: 119-208.

[34] Klauck 1998: 29-55: he analyzed especially 2-3 John and the Egyptian private papyri-letters.

[35] Klauck 1998: 54.

[36] Betz 1972: 57-69.

[37] Deissmann 1923: 198-205.

[38] Becker 1989: 53-55; contra Dihle 1989: 219: a lack of rhetorical and philosophical education.

[39] Berger 1984: 1340-63.

[40] Wendland 1912: 344ff.; Vielhauer 1975: 62-63; Huebner 1992: 175-77; contra Dihle 1989: 217: non-literary continuation of sermon and spiritual welfare.

[41] Aune 1987: 128, 164-65.

[42] Strecker 1992: 82-84.

[43] Vielhauer 1975: 65-66.

[44] Kitzberger 1986: 304-305.

[45] Schoon-Janssen 1991: 45ff.

[46] Vielhauer 1975: 65.

[47] Schnider and Stenger 1987: 3-5.

[48] Jewett 1986: 72-74.

[49] Johanson 1987: 67-79.

[50] Strecker 1992: 78.

[51] Hughes 1990.

[52] Klauck 1998, 271-72.

[53] Wuellner 1990: 130-32.

[54] Klauck 1998: 267-282.

[55] Trilling 1980: 23-25; Hughes 1989: 80-82.

[56] cf. Klauck 1998: 297-98.

[57] Lausberg 1984: 25.

[58] Jewett 1986, 82-85.

[59] Klauck 1998: 297-98.

[60] Lang 1986: 13-15.

[61] Betz 1972: 13-14.

[62] Klauck considers that parts of the older letter of tears (II Cor 2:4) could be reserved in the sorrowful letter 2 Cor 10-13 so as to be immediately put together with the letter of reconciliation by Paul himself; but Klauck seems to prefer the mainstream-solution of a deuteroPauline redaction of both letters (Klauck 1998: 234-35).

[63] Klauck 1998: 234-35.

[64] Bultmann 1995: 253.

[65] Lang 1986: 6-7.

[66] Probst 1991: 369.

[67] Klauck 1998: 232.

[68] cf. Mitchell 1991: 192-290; the last parts 1 Cor 16:1-24 are combined and named „Epistolary Closing" (Mitchell 1991: 291-296). Mitchell leaves unnecessary the rhetoric analysis for the end.

[69] Probst 1991: 295-359; Bünker for 1 Cor 1:1-4:21; 15:1-58 (Bünker 1984: 51-73); the hypothesis of autonomy of several letters A (lost), B and more is problematic and superfluous (contra Bünker 1984: 52; Probst 1991: 361-368).

[70] Gnilka 1968: 10-11; contra Schenk 1984: 334-36 and Aune 1987: 210: 4.10-23 is a personal thank-you letter.

[71] similar to Schenk 1984: 29-248.

[72] Dormeyer 1989b: 152-53; Schenk differs in 1984: 277-80: judicial apology.

[73] Klauck 1998: 240f; cf. Strecker 1992: 65; similar Bloomquist 1993: 118-138: 1:3-11 *Exordium*; 1:12-14 *Narratio*; 1:15-18a *Partitio*; 1:18b-4:7 *Argumentatio*; 4:8-20 *Peroratio*; 4:21-23 Postscript; but the *Peroratio* should begin with 4:1.

[74] Watson 1988: 61.

[75] Watson 1988: 65-67.

[76] Gnilka 1982: 7-10; Aune 1987: 206-208; Wolter 1993: 236-237; but Wolter's addition of V22 to the epilogue is not convincing.

[77] Dormeyer 1983: 223-24.

[78] Hübner 1984: 249-50; Aune 1987: 206-208; contra Betz 1988: 55-72; Berger 1984: 128-30: judicial apology.

[79] Betz 1975; 1988: 57-68; Betz introduced first the rhetorical analysis for the letters of New Testament and proposed a convincing structure for Galatians.

[80] Wuellner 1976: 34-36; Aune 1987: 219; Botha 1991: 142-43.

[81] Zeller 1985: 8-9; Aune 1987: 219; Hübner 1992: 169.

[82] Bultmann 1984: 103.

[83] Kümmel 1973: 305-306 (Lit.).

[84] Timothy Col 1:1: Schweizer 1976: 20-28.

[85] Schenk 1987: 3335; Hoppe 1994: 1-4.

[86] Wolter 1993: 47-49. 98-99. 114-116. 214.

[87] Gnilka 1971: 29-31; Gnilka emphasized, that the typical Pauline distinction between teaching and admonition is preserved (Gnilka 1971: 29-30); Klauck describes the postscript as peroratio (Klauck 1998: 238-39).

[88] Roloff 1988: 48-50.

[89] Klauck 1998: 244 with a parallel content-structure.

[90] Klauck organizes similar according the content-analysis: Prescript 1:1-2; Prooimion 1:3-5; Mainpart 1:6-4:8; End 4:9-22 (Klauck 1998: 245-46).

[91] Oberlinner 1995: 1-5.

[92] cf. the theme-analysis of Brox 1969: 14-15.

[93] Klauck 1998: 246.

[94] Aune 1987: 212-13.

[95] Klauck 1998: 252-254; but according to Klauck the distinction between narratio and argumentatio is not exact; therefore the *narratio* varies between 2:18 and 4:13 with *argumentatio* 4:14–10:18.

[96] Backhaus 1993.

[97] Klauck 1998: 41-55.

[98] Klauck 1991: 74ff.

[99] Strecker 1992: 67-71.

Andresen, C.
    1965   'Zum Formular frühchristlicher Gemeindebriefe', *ZNW* 56: 233-59.

Aune, D.E.
    1987   *The New Testament in its Literary Environment*. Library of Early Christianity, 8; Philaldelphia: Westminster Press.

Backhaus,
    1993   ‚Der Hebräerbrief und die Paulus-Schule', BZ NF 37: 183-208.

Baeck, L.
    1961   *Paulus, die Pharisäer und das Neue Testament*. München/Frankfurt: Nev Tamid.

Barthes, R.
    1988   ‚Die alte Rhetorik', in: R. Barthes, *Das semiologische Abenteuer.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp: 15-102.

Becker, J.
    1989   *Paulus: Der Apostel der Völker.* Tübingen: Mohr.

Berger, K.
    1984   ‚Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament', ANRW 2.25.2. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Betz, H. D.
    1972   *Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Tradition.* Tübingen: Mohr.
    1975   ‚The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians' *NTS* 21: 353-79.
    1985   *2. Korinther 8 und 9. Ein Kommentar zu zwei Verwaltungsbriefen des Apostels Paulus* (*2 Corinthians 8 and 9)* Philadelphia 1985. Gütersloh 1993.
    1988   *Der Galaterbrief*: *Ein Kommentar zum Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Gemeinden in Galatien* (engl. 1979). München: Kaiser.

Bloomquist, L.G.
    1993   *The Function of Suffering in Philippians.* JSNT.SS78. Sheffield JSOT Press.

Bornkamm, G.
    1969   *Paulus*. UB, 119; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Botha, J.
    1991   *Reading Romans 13*: *Aspects of the Ethics of Interpretation in an controversial Text.* Dissertation Stellenbosch/Südafrika.

Bouwman, G.
    1980   *Paulus und die anderen*: *Porträt eines Apostels*. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

Brox, N.
    1969   *Die Pastoralbriefe*. RNT, 7.2; Regensburg: Pustet, 4th edn.

Bruce, F. F.
    1975   *Zeitgeschichte des Neuen Testaments.* 2 vols.; Wuppertal: Brockhaus.

Bünker, M.
    1984   *Briefformular und rhetorische Disposition im 1. Korintherbrief.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.

Bultmann, R.
    1995/1972 *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 10th edn. (ET: *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.)
    1984   *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.

Classen, C. J.
    1991   'Paulus und die antike Rhetorik', *ZNW* 82: 1-34.

Conzelmann, H.

1983   *Der erste Brief an die Korinther.* KEK, V; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 2nd edn.

Deissmann, A.
    1923   *Licht vom Osten: Das neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt.* Tübingen: Mohr, 4th. edn.
    1925   *Paulus*: *Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze.* Tübingen: Mohr, 2nd edn.

Delling, G.
    1969a   'Zum neueren Paulus-Verständnis', *NovT* 4: 95-121.

Dibelius, M./Kümmel, W. G.
    1970   *Paulus.* Sammlung Göschen, 1160; Berlin: de Gruyter.

Dihle, A.
    1989   *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur der Kaiserzeit: Von Augustus bis Justimian*. München: Beck.

Dormeyer, D.
    1983   'Flucht, Bekehrung und Rückkehr des Sklaven Onesimos. Interaktionale Auslegung des Philemonbriefes', *EvErz* 35: 214-28.
    1989b   'The Implicit and Explicit Readers and the Genre of Philippians 3:2-4:3,8-9: Response to the Commentary of Wolfgang Schenk', *Semeia* 48: 147-59.
    1993   *Das Neue Testament im Rahmen der antiken Literaturgeschichte. Eine Einführung.* Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft.
    1998   *The New Testament among the Writings of Antiquity*. Sheffield: Academic Press

Eisenhut, W.
    1982   *Einführung in die antike Rhetorik und ihre Geschichte.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 3rd edn.

Elliger, W.
    1978   *Paulus in Griechenland*: *Philippi, Thessaloniki, Athen, Korinth.* SBS, 92/93; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Filson, F. V.
    1967   *Geschichte des Christentums in neutestamentlicher Zeit.* Düsseldorf: Patmos.

Frankemölle, H.
    1990   'Das semantische Netz des Jakobusbriefes. Zur Einheit eines umstrittenen Briefes', *BZ* 34: 161-97.

Fuhrmann, M.
    1973   *Einführung in die antike Dichtungstheorie.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
    1990   *Die antike Rhetorik. Eine Einführung.* München; Zürich: Artemis.

Gnilka, J.
    1968   *Der Philipperbrief.* HThKNT 10,3; Freiburg: Herder.
    1971   *Der Epheserbrief.* HThKNT 10,2; Freiburg: Herder.
    1982   *Der Philemonbrief.* HThKNT 10,4; Freiburg: Herder.

Grant, M.
    1978   *Paulus*: *Apostel der Völker*. Bergisch Gladbach: Lübbe.

Haenchen, E.
    1968   *Die Apostelgeschichte.* KEK, 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 14th edn.

Hengel, M.
    1979   *Zur urchristlichen Geschichtsschreibung.* Stuttgart: Mohr.

Hester, J. D.
    1986   'The Use and Influence of Rhetoric in Galatians 2:1-4', *ThZ* 42: 386-408.

Holtz, T.

| | 1986 | *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher.* EKKNT, 13; Zürich/Neukirchen: Benziger/Neukirchner Verlag. |

Hommel, H.
  1970   ‚Rhetorik', *dtv-Lexikon der Antike: Literatur 4.* München: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag: 127-43.

Hoppe, R.
  1994   *Der Triumph des Kreuzes. Studien zum Verhältnis des Kolosserbriefes zur paulinischen Kreuzestheologie.* SBB 28, Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk.

Hübner, H.
  1984   'Der Galaterbrief und das Verhältnis von antiker Rhetorik und Epistolographie', *ThLZ* 109: 241-50.
  1992   'Die Rhetorik und die Theologie: Der Römerbrief und die rhetorische Kompetenz des Paulus', in C. J. Classen/H. J. Müllenbrock (ed.), *Die Macht des Wortes*: *Aspekte gegenwärtiger Rhetorikforschung.* Ars Rhetorika, 4; Marburg: Koch: 165-79.

Hughes, F. W.
  1989   *Early Christian Rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians.* Journal for the Study of the NT, Suppl. 30; Sheffield: JSOT Press.
  1990   `The Rhetoric of I Thessalonians`, in R.F.Collins (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence.* BEThL 87. Leuven 1990: 94-116.

Jewett, R.
  1986   *The Thessalonian Correspondence*: *Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Johanson, B. C.
  1987   *To all the Brethren*: *A Text-Linguistic and Rhetoric Approach to I Thessalonians.* Conjectanea Biblica, New Testament Series, 16; Uppsala: Almqvist + Wiksell.

Käsemann, E.
  1973   *An die Römer.* HNT 8a; Tübingen: Mohr.

Kasting, H.
  1969   *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission.* BevTh, 55; München: Kaiser.

Kitzberger, I.
  1986   *Bau der Gemeinde*: *Das paulinische Wortfeld oikodome/(ep)oikodomein*. FzB, 53; Würzburg: Echter.

Klauck, H. J.
  1981   *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum.* SBS, 103; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
  1991   *Die Johannesbriefe.* EdF, 276; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
  1998   *Die antike Briefliteratur und das Neue Testament*. UTB 2022; Paderborn u.a.: Schöningh.

Koskenniemi, H.
  1956   *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* Helsinki: Academiae Scientarum Fennicae.

Kümmel, W. G.
  1969   *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments nach seinen Hauptzeugen Jesus, Paulus, Johannes.* NTD E, 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.
  1973   *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.

Kuss, O.
  1971   *Paulus*: *Die Rolle des Apostels in der theologischen Entwicklung der Urkirche*. Auslegung und Verkündigung, 3; Regensburg: Pustet.

Lang, F.
  1986   *Die Briefe an die Korinther.* NTD, 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.

Laub, F.
1973   *Eschatologische Verkündigung und Lebensgestaltung nach Paulus*: *Eine Untersuchung zum Wirken des Apostels beim Aufbau der Gemeinde in Thessalonike*. BU, 10; Regensburg: Pustet.

Lausberg, H.
1960   *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft.* 2 vols.; München: Huber.
1984   *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik.* München: Huber, 8th edn..

Lüdemann, G.
1980   *Paulus, der Heidenapostel*: Bd. I. *Studien zur Chronologie.* FRLANT 123,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.

Malherbe, A. J.
1977   'Ancient Epistolary Theory', *Ohio Journal. Rel. Stud.* 5: 3-77.
1987   *Paul and the Thessalonians*: *The Philosophical Tradition of Pastoral Care*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
Martin, J.
1974   *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode.* München: Beck.

Marxsen, W.
1979   *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher.* Zürcher Bibelkommentare 11,1; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

McKnight. E.V.
1988   *Post-Modern Use of the Bible: The Emergence of Reader-Oriented Criticism.* Nashville: Abingdon Press

Merkel, H.
1978   *Bibelkunde des Neuen Testaments*: *Ein Arbeitsbuch*. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Michaelis, W.
1925   *Die Gefangenschaft des Paulus in Ephesus und das Itinerar des Timotheus*: *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Paulusbriefe.* NTF 1 Reihe Paulusstudien, 3; Gütersloh: Mohn.

Mitchell, M. M.
1991   *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians.* HUTh, 28; Tübingen: Mohr.

Mußner, F.
1974   *Der Galaterbrief.* HThKNT, 9; Freiburg: Herder.

Oberlinner, L
1995   *Die Pastoralbriefe. Kommentar zum zweiten Timotheusbrief.* HThKNT 11,2,2; Freiburg u.a.

Olbricht, T.H.
1990   'An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians', *in: Greeks, Romans and Christians* (FS A.J. Malherbe), Philadelphia: , 216-236.

Ollrog, W. H.
1979   *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter*: *Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis der paulinischen Mission*. WMANT, 50; Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag.

Pedersen, S. (ed.)
1980   *Die Paulinische Literatur und Theologie.* Theol. Studien, 7; Aarhuis/Göttingen: Forlaget Aros/Vandenhoeck.

Petersen, N. R.
  1985a   *Rediscovering Paul*: *Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Probst, H.
  1991   *Paulus und der Brief*: *Die Rhetorik des antiken Briefes als Form der paulinischen Korintherkorrespondenz* (1 Kor 8-10). WUNT 2,45; Tübingen: Mohr.

Reed, J.T.
  1996   *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Unity.* JSNT. S 136, Sheffield.

Rengstorf, K. H.
  1965   *Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung.* WdF, 24; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2nd edn.

Riesner, R.
  1994   *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus. Studien zur Chronologie, Missionsstrategie und Theologie.* WUNT 71, Tübingen.

Rigaux, B.
  1964   *Paulus und seine Briefe*: *Der Stand der Forschung*. BH, 2; München: Kösel.

Roller, O.
  1933   *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe.* BWANT 58, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Roloff, J.
  1965   *Apostolat - Verkündigung – Kirche.* Gütersloh: Mohn.
  1988   *Der erste Brief an Timotheus.* EKK 15, Zürich/Neukirchen: Benziger.

Schelkle, K. H.
  1981   *Paulus. Leben, Briefe, Theologie.* EdF, 152; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schenk, W.
  1984   *Die Philipperbriefe des Paulus*: Kommentar. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
  1987   'Der Kolosserbrief in der neueren Forschung (1945-1985)'. ANRW II 25.4, 3327-3365, de Gruyter.

Schille, G.
  1966   *Anfänge der Kirche*: *Erwägungen zur apostolischen Frühgeschichte*. München: Kaiser.

Schmithals, W.
  1963   *Paulus und Jakobus.* FRLANT, 85; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.

Schnider, F./Stenger, W.
  1987   *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Briefformular.* NTTS, 11; Leiden: Brill.

Schoon-Janßen, J.
  1991   *Umstrittene "Apologien" in den Paulusbriefen: Studien zur rhetorischen Situation des 1. Thessalonicherbriefes, des Galaterbriefes und des Philipperbriefes*. Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten, 45; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.

Schweizer, E.
  1959   *Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament.* AThANT, 35; Zürich: Zwingli.
  1976   *Der Brief an die Kolosser.* EKK, Neukirchen: Benziger.

Stendahl, K.
  1076   *Der Jude Paulus und wir Heiden*: *Anfragen an das abendländische Christentum.* München: Kaiser.

Stowers, S. K.
1986   *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity.* LEC, 5; Philadelphia: Westminster.

Strecker, G.
1992/1997 *Literaturgeschichte des Neuen Testaments.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (ET: *History of New Testament Literature.* Trinity Press).

Suhl, A.
1975   *Paulus und seine Briefe*: *Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen Chronologie.* StNT, 11; Gütersloh: Mohn.

Taatz, I.
1991   *Frühjüdische Briefe.* NTOA, 16; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck.

Theißen, G.
1974   'Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde. Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie des hellenistischen Urchristentums', *ZNW* 65: 232-72.

Thraede, K.
1970   *Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Brieftopik.* Zetemata, 43; München: Beck.

Tresmontant, C.
1959   *Paulus in Selbstzeugnissen und Dokumenten.* Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Trilling, W.
1980   *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher.* EKK, 14; Zürich/Neukirchen: Benziger/- Neukirchner Verlag.

Trobisch, D.
1989   *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung*: *Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik.* NTOA, 10; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag; Vandenhoeck.

Vielhauer, P.
1975   *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur.* New York: W. de Gruyter.

Watson, D.F.
1988   'A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and Its Implications for the Unity Question'. NT 30, 57-88.
1991   *Persuasive Artistry. For G.A. Kennedy.* JSNTS 50, Sheffield: Academic Press.

Wendland, P.
1912   *Die urchristlichen Literaturformen.* Tübingen: Mohn, 2nd and 3rd edn.

White, J.L.
1988   'Ancient Greek Letters: in E.D. Aune: *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament.* Atlanta: Scholars Press: 85-107.

Wilckens, U.
1978-82 *Der Brief an die Römer.* EKK VI; 3 vols.; Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchner Verlag.

Wolter, M.
1993   *Der Brief an die Kolosser. Der Brief an Philemon.* ÖTK 12, Gütersloh: Mohn; Würzburg: Echter.

Wuellner, W.
1976   'Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans', *CBQ* 38: 330-51.
1990   'The Argumentative Structure of 1 Thessalonians as Paradoxial Encomium', in R. F. Collins (ed.), *The Thessalonien Correspondence.* BETh, 87; Leuven: Peeters: 117-37.

Zeller, D.
1985   *Der Brief an die Römer.* RNT; Regensburg: Pustet.