Hans Dieter Betz: Ur-ancestor of New Testament Rhetorical Criticism

Troy W. Martin

I am honored to write this chapter describing the rhetorical legacy of my *Doktorvater*, Prof. Hans Dieter Betz. I came to the University of Chicago in 1981 to study with him and discovered a New Testament scholar and teacher of the first order. As far as I could tell, he knew everything there was to know about the New Testament and its world. In class, he taught as if he had been there when the New Testament was being written and was personally acquainted with its authors, especially Paul. Prof. Betz inspired me and my fellow classmates to place ourselves in the New Testament world as much as possible and to read its text against the background of the first

century. Postmodernism has of course deemed our quest impossible, and Peter Lampe therefore asks "why New Testament exegesis should still work on the basis of *ancient* rhetorical text theory at all."[1] He quickly responds, however, "From the *historical-critical* point of view, the answer is that it still makes sense to confront the then-speaking and then-writing people with the then-current theories of text and language—no matter how adequate or inadequate from today's philosophical perspective these ancient theories might have been."[2] I along with the majority of Betz's other students concur with Lampe. We learned so much that it is difficult for us to deem our quest to have been in vain. We gained new insights not only about the New Testament text but about ourselves as well, and all of us owe a great debt to Prof. Betz. I hope this chapter I write in his honor will in some small way be an installment on that debt.

Exordium

My impossible mission is to describe in a single chapter the influence of Prof. Betz on the method of rhetorical criticism. My mission would be daunting enough even if he had only written his landmark commentary on Galatians. However, he has also written a massive commentary on 2 Corinthians 8–9, and an even more massive commentary on the Sermon on the Mount.[3] All of these works plus his many articles and especially his seminal essay on Galatians significantly influenced the method of rhetorical criticism, and in the

---

1. Peter Lampe, "Rhetorical Analysis of Pauline Texts—Quo Vadit?" in *Paul and Rhetoric*, ed. J. Paul Sampley and Peter Lampe (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 7.
2. Ibid.
3. Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches of Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); idem, *Second Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985); idem, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995). These commentaries have all been translated and published in German as well.

short space that I have, I cannot even begin to list his numerous and important contributions to this method.[4]

I cannot imagine that the other contributors to this volume on rhetorical genealogies do not also feel the daunting task of an impossible mission. After all, we each share a similar challenge to describe in a single volume the diverse contributions of the rhetorical ancestors who developed and shaped the method of rhetorical criticism.

Propositio

Given the theme of this volume and my need for a manageable mission, please consider with me a single issue, namely Betz's position in the genealogy of New Testament rhetorical criticism. Genealogies are usually represented by lists of ancestors and descendants. Ancestors include those progenitors who are responsible for the descendants who follow them. The earlier an ancestor occurs in a genealogical list, the greater number of descendants that ancestor usually has. In any genealogical list of New Testament rhetorical criticism, Betz belongs at or near the very beginning. In this chapter, let us consider the proposition that he belongs at the very beginning of the genealogical list of New Testament rhetorical criticism and that his position in this list is that of Ur-ancestor or progenitor.

To be sure, this proposition designating Betz as the Ur-ancestor of New Testament chetorical criticism has its opponents. The most vocal is of course Carl Joachim Classen, who raises the question, "As Betz stresses the novelty of his method, it seems obvious to ask: why was it not discovered and used before?"[5] In particular,

---

4. Hans Dieter Betz, "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *New Testament Studies* 21, no. 3 (1975): 353–79; repr. *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark D. Nanos (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 3–28. Citations are from the original publication.

Classen addresses "to what extent ancient rhetoric was made use of for the interpretation of the Bible before 1974," the year of Betz's seminal rhetorical-critical lecture and subsequent essay on Galatians.[6] Classen then cites a number of exegetes who use rhetoric for the interpretation of the Bible before Betz. Specifically, Classen describes Philip Melanchthon's use of rhetorical species, arrangement, and argumentation in his notes on Galatians.[7] Classen indeed makes a persuasive case that rhetoric was used in biblical interpretation before Betz, but Classen raises and argues a different proposition than the one we are considering in this chapter.

If the question is "was rhetoric used for biblical interpretation before Betz," then the answer must be a resounding "Yes." Even Betz himself recognizes many of his rhetorical predecessors who were rhetoricians and teachers of rhetoric as well as biblical interpreters.[8] Augustine, for example, initially rejects the Scriptures "on account of their unrefined style."[9] Reading the Scriptures again during his

---

5. Carl Joachim Classen, "St. Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric," in Nanos, *The Galatians Debate*, 97. Classen's article appears in a number of his publications sometimes with only slight changes or in translation. See Carl Joachim Classen, "Paulus und die antike Rhetorik," *ZNW* 82, nos. 1–2 (1991): 15–27; idem, "St. Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric," *Rhetorica* 10, no. 4 (1992): 319–44; and idem, "St. Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric,"in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (JSNTSup 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 265–91. See also the first chapter of his book *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 1–28.

6. Classen, "St. Paul's Epistles," 98. Classen is referring to Betz, "Literary Composition," 352–79.

7. Classen, "St. Paul's Epistles," 101–3.

8. Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 14; idem, *Second Corinthians 8 and 9*, 129 n. 2; idem, "The Problem of Rhetoric and Theology According to the Apostle Paul," in *L'apôtre Paul: Personnalité, style et conception du ministère*, ed. A. Vanhoye (BETL 73; Leuven: Leuven University, 1986): 16–23. For the references, see Classen, "St. Paul's Epistles," 96 n. 6. Also see Troy W. Martin, "Invention and Arrangement in Recent Pauline Rhetorical Studies: A Survey of the Practices and the Problems," in Sampley and Lampe, *Paul and Rhetoric*, 50 n. 6; and Janet Fairweather, "The Epistle to the Galatians and Classical Rhetoric: Parts 1 & 2," *TynBul* 45 (1994): 2–22. There may even have been some rhetorical discussions prior to Betz in the Paul Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature. See Wilhelm Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried–Karris Debate over Romans," in *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition*, ed. Karl P. Donfried (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 130–31.

spiritual crisis, however, Augustine changes his mind and concludes that Paul in particular was an "eloquent teacher because of his ability to apply all three [rhetorical] styles judiciously."[10] Examples of those who use rhetoric before Betz could be multiplied, but they only answer questions we are not considering in this chapter.

We are not asking Classen's question of whether or not Betz is the first to use rhetoric for biblical interpretation. We also are not asking if Betz is the first to apply rhetorical criticism to biblical studies in general. That honor arguably goes to James Muilenberg for his 1968 SBL Presidential Address.[11] At least, Muilenberg is credited with naming the method *rhetorical criticism*, and, according to David E. Aune, Old Testament scholars used rhetorical rriticism as a method of interpretation before New Testament scholars, including Prof. Betz, extend this method to the interpretation of the New Testament.[12] No, the question we are considering is this: Does Betz belong at the beginning of a genealogical list of *New Testament rhetorical criticism*? Our proposition is that he does belong at the head of this list as Ur-ancestor of this method and hence the present volume begins with him.

Ratio

Now there are many reasons we should accept our proposition, but we shall consider only three. First, Betz belongs at the very beginning of this genealogical list because numerous notable New Testament scholars in 1974 recognize his method as initiating a new approach

9. Augustine, *Confessionum libri xiii*, ed. L. Verheijen (CCSL 27; Turnholti: Brepols, 1981), 3.5.9. For this reference and an analysis, see Aaron Canty, "Saint Paul in Augustine," in *A Companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages*, ed. Steven R. Cartwright (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 115–42.

10. Ibid.

11. James Muilenberg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *JBL* 88(1969): 1–18.

12. Ibid, 8. See David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 416. Aune credits Muilenberg with introducing the name for the method.

to the interpretation of the New Testament. Second, Betz belongs at the head of this genealogical list because he develops this method in the 1970s as a way of moving beyond the impasses of epistolographic studies. Third, Betz deserves the designation of "progenitor" because his application of this method establishes distinct foci in the subsequent application of rhetorical criticism to the New Testament. These three reasons, among others, demonstrate our proposition that Betz deserves the designation of Ur-ancestor of New Testament rhetorical criticism.

Argumentatio

First Proof: Betz as the Initiator of New Testament Rhetorical Criticism

As Betz teaches us, let us begin with an ethos proof. Consider the numerous outstanding New Testament scholars who hail Betz's rhetorical-critical interpretation of Galatians as initiating a new era in New Testament scholarship. These notable and well-respected scholars include Jean-Noel Aletti, David E. Aune, Charles K. Barrett, W. D. Davies, Hans Hübner, Wayne A. Meeks, and Paul W. Meyer, to name just a few.[13] All these scholars know the field of New Testament studies inside and out, and yet in their reviews of Betz's Galatians commentary, they all see Betz's rhetorical method as initiating something new and different.

Aune's review of Betz's Galatians commentary is representative of the reviews of these other scholars. Aune comments:

---

13. Jean-Noel Aletti, "Review of H. D. Betz, *Galatians*," *RSR* 69 (1981): 601–2; Charles K. Barrett, "Review of H. D. Betz, *Galatians*," *Int* 34 (1980): 414–17; W. D. Davies, Paul W. Meyer, and David E. Aune, "Review of H. D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches of Galatia*," *RelSRev* 7 (1981): 310–28; Hans Hübner, "Review of H. D. Betz, *Galatians*," *TLZ* 109 (1984): 341–50; Wayne A. Meeks, "Review of H. D. Betz, *Galatians*," *JBL* 100, no. 2 (1981): 304–7.

> The single most innovative feature of this commentary is, I would judge, the author's proposed analysis of the surface structure of Paul's letter to the Galatians in terms of Greco-Roman rhetorical theory. … In several respects this commentary of Galatians is a groundbreaking enterprise which sets the direction of future investigation.[14]

Aune further comments, "It is clear that this must be regarded as a groundbreaking commentary which will doubtless dominate the discussion of Galatians for the next generation."[15] Aune and these other scholars repeatedly use words such as *innovative* and *groundbreaking* to describe Betz's new rhetorical approach. They further realize that his commentary "sets the direction" for future investigations of Galatians by the use of rhetorical theory.

All of these prominent scholars thus realize that Betz's rhetorical-critical interpretation of Galatians initiates a new era in New Testament scholarship, and the method of this new era will be rhetorical criticism. Thirty years after the publication of Betz's seminal essay and commentary on Galatians, Peter Lampe observes:

> What has been new in the last three decades is the attempt rhetorically to analyze a Pauline letter in its *entirety* and to understand the flow of thoughts and arguments within the framework of the entire structure of the letter. In 1975 (1974), Hans Dieter Betz discovered that the disposition of an ancient speech and the structure of the main part of Galatians are alike, thus laying the cornerstone for his groundbreaking commentary on Galatians.[16]

Lampe further notes that Betz's "method became popular" and initiated a new "school of research."[17]

Considering their reputations, what more trustworthy group of New Testament scholars could we assemble than these who all affirm

---

14. Aune, "Review of H. D. Betz, *Galatians*," 323–24.
15. Ibid., 328.
16. Lampe, "Rhetorical Analysis," 4.
17. Ibid., 4–5.

that New Testament rhetorical criticism begins with Betz? This ethos proof therefore establishes Betz as the initiator of New Testament rhetorical criticism and supports our claim that he is the Ur-ancestor of this method.

Second Proof: Betz as the Discoverer of New Testament Rhetorical Criticism

Again as Betz teaches us, let us next continue with a logos proof that he is the first to discover the method of New Testament rhetorical criticism in the 1970s. Now, necessity is indeed the mother of invention and discovery. What necessity prompts him to discover this method in the 1970s? Betz himself answers this question in his seminal lecture at the 29th General Meeting of the *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* in Sigtuna, Sweden on August 13, 1974. Betz states, "In the process of my studies I also found that the letter of the Galatians can be analyzed according to Graeco-Roman rhetoric and epistolography."[18] The necessity facing Betz and indeed other New Testament exegetes in 1974 is the failure of epistolography to answer two key interpretive questions related to New Testament epistles.

The method of epistolography began early in the twentieth-century when scholars such as Ferdinandus Ziemann and Francis Xavier Exler turned their attention to letter formulae and conventions.[19] The method flourished, and by mid-century Heikki Koskenniemi produced his influential work on the idea and phraseology of the Greek letter.[20] This method is very productive

---

18. Betz, "Literary Composition," 353.
19. Ferdinandus Ziemann, *De Epistularum Graecarum Formulis Sollemnibus Quaestiones Selectae* (Berlin: Haas, 1912), passim; and Francis Xavier Exler, *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1923), passim.
20. Heikki Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki: Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, 1956), passim.

and informs numerous studies that increase our understanding of epistolary salutations, thanksgiving and health-giving sections, greetings, and farewells. However, this method has its limitations.[21]

By the 1970s, two limitations become glaringly obvious as demonstrated by the works of John L. White and Abraham J. Malherbe. In 1972, White published a book entitled *The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter*.[22] White's book provides scholars with the three analytical categories of body-opening, body-middle, and body-closing. Although these categories are somewhat helpful, they do not provide for an analysis of large sections of the letter body.[23] White's book thus demonstrates that the method of epistolography does not supply sufficient analytical categories for an analysis of the entire letter body. In 1974, two years after the publication of White's book, Hendrikus Boers commented, "The *formal* characteristics of the central section of the Pauline letter remain unclear."[24] In that very year, Betz "discovered" and developed rhetorical criticism as a way of moving beyond this impasse in the epistolary analysis of New Testament letters.

In contrast to the analysis of form, Malherbe's article entitled *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* addresses epistolary genres and translates some early epistolary handbooks that type and classify ancient letters.[25] From the beginning, epistolary theorists recognize the

---

21. For some of the extensive bibliography in epistolary studies, see Lampe, "Rhetorical Analysis," 12 n. 31.

22. John L. White, *The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter: A Study of the Letter-Body in Non-Literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle* (SBLDS 2; Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), passim. See also White's other works including idem, "Introductory Formulae in the Body of the Pauline Letter," *JBL* 90, no. 1 (1971): 91–97; idem, "Epistolary Formulas and Cliches in Greek Papyrus Letters," *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers* 2 (1978): 289–319; and idem, *Light from Ancient Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), passim.

23. Troy W. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition in First Peter* (SBLDS 131; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 74–75.

24. Hendrikus Boers, "The Form Critical Study of Paul's Letters: 1 Thessalonians as a Case Study," *NTS* 22, no. 2 (1974): 145.

importance of identifying the genre of ancient letters. Of course, the designation *letter* is a genre itself with characteristic form and function.[26] The great diversity of letters, however, demonstrates that the letter genre is only a framing genre that presses other genres into its service.[27]

Exler distinguished familiar letters from business letters, petitions, and official letters.[28] Other epistolary theorists propose even more types of letters but need a taxonomy that avoids the criticisms that it is arbitrary, contrived, or imposed.[29] Malherbe's article appears to meet that need. It translates Pseudo-Demetrius's *Epistolary Types*, which describes and illustrates 21 types of letters, and Pseudo-Libanius's *Epistolary Styles*, which contains 41 styles of letters. These types and styles initially hold great promise for classifying New Testament letters.

Several scholars apply these types and styles to New Testament epistles but with mixed results. The New Testament epistles are just too long, and each contains material that can be classified as any number of genres or types. Aune comments, "Early Christian letters tend to resist rigid classification…in terms of the many categories listed by the epistolary theorists. Most early Christian letters are multifunctional and have a 'mixed' character, combining elements from two or more epistolary types."[30] Although initially viewed with great optimism, Malherbe's article clearly documents the difficulty

25. Abraham J. Malherbe, "Ancient Epistolary Theorists," *Ohio Journal of Religious Studies* 5 (1977): 3–77; repr. *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (SBLSBS 19; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988).

26. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition*, 81.

27. Klaus Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament," *ANRW* 25, no. 2 (1884): 1338.

28. Exler, *Form of the Ancient Greek Letter*, 24–60.

29. For example, see Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Library of Early Christianity; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 49–173.

30. David E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Library of Early Christianity; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 203.

encountered by epistolography in classifying the specific genre of New Testament letters.

By the 1970s, therefore, epistolography leaves Betz and other New Testament scholars without an adequate method for analyzing the letter-body or for identifying the specific genre of New Testament letters. Betz's important discovery in 1974 that Galatians can "be analyzed according to Graeco-Roman rhetoric and epistolography" thus provides a new and different method for addressing the two key interpretive questions left open by epistolography. Betz's method enables him to analyze Galatians according to the parts of a speech that are explained in the rhetorical handbooks and to identify the genre of Galatians as judicial or forensic rhetoric, which is one of the three species of rhetoric along with deliberative and epideictic. This "new and different" method comes to be known as rhetorical criticism, and Betz is the first to discover this method as a way for moving beyond the limitations of epistolography.

In his 1974 seminal paper, Betz notes, "At the outset I would like to acknowledge my great indebtedness to the members of the S.B.L. Seminar on 'The Form and Function of the Pauline Letters.'"[31] He then explains, "Although in the present paper I take a somewhat different approach, I would never have been able to do so without their continuous stimulation and gracious sharing of ideas."[32] Thus, Betz admits his dependence on epistolary studies but then takes a "somewhat different approach" by using rhetorical criticism to address the deficiencies of epistolary studies in regard to the analysis and genre of New Testament letters. As a method, therefore, New Testament rhetorical criticism originates in the 1970s from epistolography but moves beyond it by providing for analysis of the

31. Betz, "Literary Composition," 354 n. 4.
32. Ibid.

letter-body and for identification of the genre of New Testament letters.

During the decade of the 70s, the only scholar we can identify as the *discoverer* of this method is Betz. Although others before him may have used rhetoric for interpreting the Bible, they were not utilizing the method of rhetorical criticism as we designate it since this method only arose in the 1970s as a response to the limitations of epistolography. Still others, such as Amos N. Wilder, Wilhelm Wuellner, and George A. Kennedy, were working with rhetoric before Betz; but their approach to rhetoric either falls outside the method of rhetorical criticism, as is the case with Wilder, or is applied to the New Testament after Betz, as is the case with Kennedy and Wuellner.[33] Hence, our argument from logos demonstrates that Betz belongs at the very beginning of the genealogical list of New Testament rhetorical criticism because he "discovered" this method as a way of moving beyond the interpretive limitations of epistolography.

Third Proof: Betz as First Practitioner of New Testament Rhetorical Criticism

As Betz further teaches us, let us consider yet another logos proof. As initiator and discoverer, Betz becomes the first practitioner of New Testament rhetorical criticism and thus anticipates and shapes

---

33. Amos N. Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), passim. Wuellner's first article applying rhetorical criticism to a New Testament text postdates Betz by two years. See Wilhelm Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans," *CBQ* 38, no. 2 (1976): 330–51. He published an earlier form critical article that does not employ the method of rhetorical criticism. See idem, "Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Cor. 1–3," *JBL* 89, no. 2 (1970): 199–204. For Kennedy's extensive work in classical rhetoric before Betz, see the chapter on Kennedy in this volume. However, Kennedy's specific application of classical rhetoric to the New Testament postdates Betz. See George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), passim; and idem, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), passim.

the subsequent application of this method in New Testament interpretation. Since the 1980s, three distinct foci have characterized New Testament rhetorical criticism. First is the focus on rhetorical species as numerous scholars attempt to identify the genre of New Testament letters to be one of the three species of ancient rhetoric. Second is the focus on rhetorical arrangement as several more scholars try to analyze the structure of New Testament letters according to the rhetorical arrangement of an ancient speech. Third is the focus on rhetorical invention as even more scholars investigate the arguments of New Testament letters according to ancient rhetorical recommendations for discovering and inventing arguments. Each of these three foci are clearly represented in Betz's pioneering work, and he is indeed the first practitioner who has brought all three of these foci together to provide answers to interpretive questions not answered by epistolographic studies.

Focus on Rhetorical Species

In his seminal 1974 lecture, Betz states, "It is my thesis that Paul's letter to the Galatians is an example of the 'apologetic letter' genre."[34] He explains, "The 'apologetic letter' presupposes the real or fictitious situation of the court of law, with the jury, the accuser and the defendant."[35] In this legal context according to Betz, the addresses are the jury, Paul is the defendant, and his opponents are the accusers. Since Paul cannot appear in person, his letter carries his "defense speech to the jury."[36] Betz further explains, "The 'apologetic letter' is

---

34. Betz, "Literary Composition," 354. See also idem, "In Defense of the Spirit: Paul's Letter to the Galatians as a Document of Early Christian Apologetics," in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), 99–114. See also idem, *Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Trdition* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1972), passim.
35. Betz, "Literary Composition," 377.
36. Ibid.

by definition a part of rhetoric and, for that reason, limits its writer to the devices of the 'art of persuasion.'"[37] Betz states, "The 'art of persuasion' has its proper place in the courts of law," and he thus classifies Galatians as an example of forensic or judicial rhetoric.[38]

Betz's classification of Galatians as judicial or forensic rhetoric initiates an intense interest in classifying all New Testament letters as one of the three species of rhetoric.[39] In 1987, Robert G. Hall writes:

> Ancient rhetoricians, following Aristotle, divided speeches into three species: judicial, epideictic, and deliberative. Since these species differed in time reference, goal, mode of argument, and form, any analysis of a document by the categories of ancient rhetoric must begin by determining the species of rhetoric to be applied.[40]

Hall credits Betz as the first to apply the judicial designation to Galatians, and New Testament scholars quickly realized that assigning any of the New Testament letters to one of the species of rhetoric informs the social location as well as the argumentative strategy and form of that letter.

Duane F. Watson writes, "Species or genre classification is one more important tool for interpretation. It is a window on the social situation of Paul and his addressees."[41] Watson then quotes Karl Paul Donfried, who states, "To recognize…which of the three types (*genera*) of rhetoric—deliberative, judicial or epideictic—a document is employing already gives important clues to its social situation as well as its intention."[42] These advantages offered by the species of rhetoric

---

37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., 378.
39. For an overview, see Duane F. Watson, "The Three Species of Rhetoric and the Study of the Pauline Epistles," in Sampley and Lampe, *Paul and Rhetoric*, 25–47.
40. Robert G. Hall, "The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians: A Reconsideration," *JBL* 106, no. 2 (1987): 277; repr. Nanos, *The Galatians Debate*, 29.
41. Watson, "The Three Species of Rhetoric," 27.
42. Karl Paul Donfried, "The Theology of 1 Thessalonians," in *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters*, ed. idem and I. Howard Marshall (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 3–4. Quoted in Watson, "The Three Species of Rhetoric," 27.

to move beyond the genre impasse of epistolographic studies have elevated the scholarly interest in rhetorical criticism.

A number of scholars including Hall would eventually disagree with Betz's designation of Galatians as forensic, and they designate the letter as deliberative or epideictic. Nevertheless, they clearly take their point of departure from Betz. Hall explicitly contrasts his own identification of Galatians as deliberative rhetoric with Betz's forensic designation.[43] Likewise, Joop Smit begins his study of Galatians as epideictic rhetoric by writing, "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.'"[44] These and other scholars therefore recognize Betz as the first to use rhetorical criticism to identify the rhetorical species of a New Testament letter, and he is thus the first practitioner of the rhetorical-critical focus on rhetorical species.

This interest in rhetorical species eventually extends beyond Galatians to each of the New Testament letters as representative of one or the other of the three species of rhetoric. Just as with Galatians, various scholars would eventually assign each of the letters to all three of the species. This diversity of opinion leads Watson to comment, "Trying to assign one of Paul's epistles rigidly to a particular rhetorical species is a venture fraught with pitfalls…. Paul's epistles are typically not a single rhetorical species, but rather a mix of species."[45] In spite of the difficulties, however, Watson concludes, "Determination of the rhetorical species of portions of a Pauline epistle and an epistle as a whole is an important enterprise."[46] Watson cites Betz as the pioneer who initiated this enterprise. We therefore

---

43. Hall, The Rhetorical Outline," 277; repr. Nanos, *The Galatians Debate*, 29.
44. Joop Smit, "The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech," New Testament Studies 35, no. 1 (1989): 1; repr. Nanos, *The Galatians Debate*, 39.
45. Watson, "The Three Species of Rhetoric," 42.
46. Ibid., 46.

appropriately designate Betz as the first practitioner who inspires subsequent studies designating the rhetorical species of New Testament letters. His influence as the first practitioner, however, extends beyond rhetorical species and also includes rhetorical arrangement.[47]

<div align="center">Focus on Rhetorical Arrangement</div>

Again in his seminal 1974 lecture, Betz states, "In the process of my studies I also found that the letter of the Galatians can be analysed (analyzed) according to Graeco-Roman rhetoric and epistolography."[48] Betz then uses epistolary analysis to identify the epistolary prescript as Gal 1:1–5 and the epistolary postscript as 6:11–18. He describes these epistolary conventions as "a kind of external bracket for the body of the letter."[49] Betz next uses rhetorical analytical categories to identify the *exordium* (Gal 1:6–11), *narratio* (1:12–2:14), *propositio* (2:15–21), *probatio* (3:1–4:31), *exhortatio* (5:1–6:10), and *peroratio* (6:11–18). Betz's initial blending of epistolary and rhetorical categories has dominated the subsequent application of New Testament rhetorical criticism as scholars have attempted to specify the relationship between the parts of speech and letter conventions, the criteria used to identify the parts of a speech, and the place of paraenesis in rhetorical arrangement.

Parts of Speech and Letter Conventions

Betz's blending of epistolary and rhetorical analytical categories does not specify the precise relationship between these two types of analysis.[50] In his explanation of the epistolary postscript and *peroratio* of Galatians, for example, Betz writes:

47. Ibid., 36.
48. Betz, "Literary Composition," 353.
49. Ibid., 355.

> In vi.11–18 Paul adds a postscript in his own handwriting. This conforms to the epistolary convention of the time. . . . The postscript must be examined not only as an epistolographic convention but also as a rhetorical feature. As a rhetorical feature, the postscript of the letter to the Galatians serves as the *peroratio* or *conclusio*, that is, the end and conclusion of the apologetic speech forming the body of the letter. … When we look at Paul's postscript (vi.11–18) as a *peroratio*, some very interesting structures emerge, all confirming that we do, in fact, have this part of a speech before us.[51]

Commenting on Betz's work, Hans Hübner states, "What scholarship must further investigate is the relationship of rhetoric and epistolography in reference to the Pauline letters."[52]

In this further investigation, many scholars agree with Betz that the parts of a letter "must be examined" as both epistolographic conventions and rhetorical features. Others, however, do not.[53] Watson and Hauser explain this polarity:

> Interpreters find themselves either embracing one of the following positions, or standing between them: 1) the New Testament epistles are just that—epistles—and rhetoric has only a secondary influence. Rhetorical influence is mostly limited to matters of style and some invention, and 2) the epistles of the New Testament are speeches in epistolary form and can be analyzed using Greco-Roman rhetorical theory in its three main parts: invention, arrangement, and style.[54]

---

50. Classen complains that Betz does "not pay attention sufficiently" to the precise relationship between rhetoric and epistolography. See Classen, "St. Paul's Epistles," in Nanos, *The Galatians Debate*, 98; idem, "St Paul's Epistles," in Porter and Olbricht, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 269.

51. Betz, "Literary Composition," 357.

52. Hans Hübner, "Der Galaterbrief und das Verhältnis von antiker Rhetorik und Epistolographie," *TLZ* 109 (1984): 249 (translation mine).

53. For summaries of the various proposals, see Porter, "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 bc–ad 400*, ed. idem (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 541–567; and Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1995), 77–79.

54. Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method* (Biblical Interpretation Series 4; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 120–21.

In this further investigation relating epistolary conventions and rhetorical arrangement, Betz is the first practitioner of New Testament rhetorical criticism and clearly provides the catalyst.

Those who disagree with Betz argue that a letter is not a speech and should not be analyzed as such.[55] Jeffrey T. Reed explains, "In part, the reason epistolary theorists do not prescribe rhetorical arrangements to epistolary structures is due to the formulaic traditions long established in letter writing…. There is no necessary connection between the basic theory of epistolary structure and the technical teachings about rhetorical arrangement."[56] Reed and a few others thus deny the "must" in Betz's use of rhetorical arrangement to analyze New Testament letters.

Many others, however, accept Betz's "must" and proceed to analyze all of the epistles in the New Testament according to the parts of an ancient speech.[57] In 1992, Stanley E. Porter noted that Betz "has been so influential that one of the newest sub-genres of commentary

---

55. Representatives of those who disagree with Betz include Classen, "St. Paul's Epistles," 106, 109; Philip H. Kern, "Rhetoric, Scholarship and Galatians: Assessing an Approach to Paul's Epistle," *TynBul* 46 (1995): 202; idem, *Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an Approach to Paul's Epistle* (SNTSMS 101; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 119; Stanley E. Porter, "Paul as Epistolographer and Rhetorician?" in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. idem and Dennis L. Stamps (JSNTSup 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 232, and idem, "The Theoretical Justification," in idem and Olbricht, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 115–16; and Jeffrey T. Reed, "Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul's Letters: A Question of Genre," in Porter and Olbricht, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 304, 308.

56. Ibid., 304, 308.

57. Representatives include Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Sacra Pagina Series 7; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 17–20; Frank W. Hughes, "The Rhetoric of Letters," in *The Thessalonians Debate: Methodological Discord or Methodological Synthesis?*, ed. Karl P. Donfried and Johannes Beutler (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 236; Robert Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 72–76; idem, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), vii–x, 29–30; Fredrick J. Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians* (SNTSMS 131; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), passim; Gerd Lüdemann, *Paul Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 48; and Charles A. Wanamaker, *Commentary on 1 & 2 Thessalonians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 48–52.

writing is the rhetorical analysis of a Pauline epistle."[58] Even though these scholars do not always agree with Betz on the number or even the names of the parts of an ancient speech, they nevertheless name Betz as the first to practice this type of arrangement in New Testament letters, and the influence of Betz's initial practice of New Testament Rhetorical Criticism is clearly seen in the work of these scholars.

Analyzing Gal 6:11–18, Betz states that the epistolary postscript "serves as" the *peroratio* and that it "in fact" is the *peroratio*.[59] In the subsequent practice of New Testament rhetorical criticism, some understand that epistolographic conventions only "serve as" or functionally resemble the parts of a speech while others hold that they "in fact" are these parts.[60] A consensus about whether letter conventions "are," in Betz's terminology, formally parts of a speech or only to some degree functionally "serve as" parts of a speech is never reached by New Testament rhetorical critics. Regardless of how they understand the relationship between epistolary conventions and the parts of a speech, however, these critics nevertheless take their cue from Betz's initial practice of New Testament rhetorical criticism. The necessity of relating epistolary and rhetorical analysis therefore definitely points to Betz as the first practitioner and hence the Ur-ancestor of New Testament rhetorical criticism.

Identifying Parts of a Speech

Betz's influence as the first practitioner is further seen in the criteria subsequent rhetorical critics use to identify the parts of speech. Kieran O'Mahony observes, "Betz presents no theory of rhetorical methodology in regard to *dispositio* [arrangement]. However, it

---

58. Porter, "The Theoretical Justification," 102.
59. Betz, "Literary Composition," 357.
60. For representatives of both sides of this issue, see Martin, "Invention and Arrangement," 52–62.

would be unfair to say that he simply asserts this outline."[61] Indeed, Betz establishes in his seminal 1974 lecture three essential criteria drawn from the rhetorical handbooks for identifying the parts of speech in Galatians. Identifying the *propositio* of Galatians, Betz comments, "Gal. ii. 15–21 conforms to the form, function, and requirements of the *propositio*."[62] Earlier Betz states that a requirement of the *propositio* is its position between the *narratio* and the *probatio*. Position, form, and function are thus three essential criteria upon which Betz bases his rhetorical arrangement of Galatians.

Frequently, Betz appeals to position as substantiation for his identification of a part of speech. Identifying the *exordium*, Betz comments, "Generally speaking this first part of the body of the Galatian letter [1:6–11] conforms to the customary *exordium*, which is otherwise known as the *prooemium* or *principium*."[63] He makes a similar comment about the epistolary postscript's (6:11–18) serving as the *peroratio* or *conclusio* of the speech.[64] According to Betz, the beginning and ending of the letter correspond to the beginning and ending of a speech. Betz argues similarly on the basis of position for identifying the *narratio* (1:12–2:14), *propositio* (2:15–21), and *probatio* (3:1–4:31) of Galatians. Thus, position is an essential criterion Betz introduces for identifying the parts of speech.

No less frequently, however, Betz appeals to form and function. After identifying *enumeratio* (*recapitulatio*), *indignatio*, and *conquestio* as the three conventional parts of the *peroratio*, Betz states, "When

---

61. Kieran J. O'Mahony, *Pauline Persuasion: A Sounding in 2 Corinthians 8–9* (JSNTSup 199; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000) 64. Of course, O'Mahony's observation pertains to Betz's rhetorical analysis of 2 Corinthians 8–9 rather than of Galatians, but Betz uses similar criteria in both analyses. On pp. 64–69, O'Mahony presents an epitome of Betz's rationale. The unfairness O'Mahony mentions may refer to Classen's assessment that Betz applied labels without providing supporting argumentation. See Classen, "St. Paul's Epistles," 109–110.
62. Betz, "Literary Composition," 368.
63. Ibid., 359.
64. Ibid., 368.

we look at Paul's postscript (vi. 11–18) as a *peroratio*, some very interesting structures emerge, all confirming that we do, in fact, have this part of a speech before us."[65] Betz concludes, "The final section of Galatians conforms to the *enumeratio* [vi. 12-17], *indignatio* [vi. 12-13], and *conquestio* [vi. 17]."[66] Betz explains that this tripartite form performs the twofold function of the *peroratio* to remind the listeners of the case and to make a strong emotional appeal upon them. Betz concludes that Gal 6:11–18 is the *peroratio* because it conforms to the form and performs the function of a *peroratio*. In addition to position, therefore, form and function are essential criteria Betz introduces to identify the parts of speech in Galatians.

Rhetorical critics after Betz have continued utilizing these same three criteria in their identifications of the parts of speech. Regarding position, for example, Hughes notes, "What is important is that the section of a letter designated as an *exordium* be at the beginning of the letter."[67] Similarly, Watson and Hauser explain, "The body opening, middle, and closing roughly parallel *exordium*, *narratio-confirmatio*, and *peroratio* respectively."[68] Thus, rhetorical critics rely heavily on Betz's criterion of position as determined by the arrangement of a speech as an essential indicator of where to find a particular part of speech in Paul's letters.

The rhetorical critics that follow Betz use his criteria of position as well as form but eventually come to rely more heavily on his criterion of function to identify the parts of speech.[69] In his rhetorical arrangement of 1 Cor 12:1–3, for example, Johan S. Vos explains,

---

65. Ibid., 357.
66. Ibid., 357 n. 7.
67. Hughes, "The Rhetoric of Letters," 198.
68. Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*, 122.
69. See for example Hermann Probst, *Paulus und der Brief: Die Rhetorik des antiken Briefes als Form der paulinischen Korintherkorrespondenz (1 Kor 8–10)* (WUNT 2.45; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 99–107.

"Verse 1 should be designated as a *praefatio*. In a speech that treats more than a single subject, there can be according to Quintilian several introductory beginnings, which often only have a transitional function. Verse 2 has the function of a short *narratio*. . . . Verse 3 has the function of a *propositio*."[70] Vos clearly relies on function to determine these parts of speech.

Another example is Church's identification of the *exordium* in Philemon. He states, "Three things appropriate to the exordium in deliberative rhetoric are accomplished here by Paul. . . . If, as Quintilian writes, 'the sole purpose of the exordium is to prepare our audience in such a way that they will be disposed to lend a ready ear to the rest of our speech,' Paul accomplishes this with economy and tact."[71] An additional example is Robert Jewett's defense of his rhetorical analysis of 1 Thessalonians by a sustained appeal to the function of the parts of speech.[72]

Similar examples could be multiplied, but these are sufficient to demonstrate rhetorical critics' heavy reliance upon Betz's criterion of function for identification of the parts of speech.[73] Thus, these three criteria of position, form, and function that are used by subsequent rhetorical critics to determine the parts of a speech also point to Betz as the first practitioner of New Testament Rhetorical Criticism, and his position as the progenitor of this method is further demonstrated by his inclusion of paraenesis in rhetorical arrangement.

---

70. Johan S. Vos, "Das Rätsel von 1 Kor 12:1–3," *NovT* 35 (1993): 268 (translation mine).
71. F. Forrester Church, "Rhetorical Structure and Design in Paul's Letter to Philemon," *HTR* 71 (1978): 22.
72. Jewett, *Thessalonian Correspondence*, 76–78.
73. For other examples, see ibid.; and David A. DeSilva, "Meeting the Exigency of a Complex Rhetorical Situation: Paul's Strategy in 2 Corinthians 1 through 7," *AUSS* 34 (1996): 16.

Paraenesis in Rhetorical Arrangement

In his 1974 seminal lecture, Betz himself recognizes the difficulty of including paraenesis in the rhetorical arrangement by saying, "It is rather puzzling to see that *paraenesis* plays only a marginal role in the ancient rhetorical handbooks, if not in rhetoric itself. Consequently, modern studies of ancient rhetoric also do not pay much attention to it."[74] He designates Gal 5:1–6:10 by the Latin term *exhortatio*, which is consistent with the other Latin labels of arrangement that he uses, but this Latin term does not resolve the difficulty.[75]

Aletti writes, "A ticklish question, that of the pertinence of exhortations to a rhetorical model, is not addressed…. The difficulty arises therefore from the long sections of exhortations in Romans 12–15 and Galatians 5–6, for if one relies on the rhetorical manuals, these sections do not appear to pertain to the *dispositio* of ancient discourse."[76] Smit describes the issue similarly: "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."[77]

Subsequent rhetorical critics propose numerous solutions to resolve this difficulty. Betz himself appeals to the philosophical letters that end with a paraenetic section.[78] Several, however, consider such parallels as inconclusive proof that the rhetorical categories are applicable to paraenesis, and some propose excluding paraenesis from

---

74. Betz, "Literary Composition," 375–76.
75. See Hübner, "Der Galaterbrief," 244; and François Vouga, "Zur rhetorischen Gattung des Galaterbriefes," *ZNW* 79, no. 4 (1988): 291.
76. Jean-Noël Aletti, "La Dispositio Rhétorique dans les Épitres Pauliniennes," *NTS* 38, no. 3 (1992): 400 (translation mine).
77. Joop Smit, "The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech," repr. Nanos, *The Galatians Debate*, 42.
78. Betz, "Literary Composition," 376.

rhetorical arrangement altogether.[79] Aletti further writes, "The discourse models of ancient rhetoric did not have long exhortations like those of Galatians and Romans. In other words, one should not see in these exhortations elements belonging to the *dispositio* of the speech, but they should rather be seen as *epistolary* components, surely inherited from the *typos nouthetètikos*."[80] Smit even suggests that the paraenetical section could be a later addition to the letter.[81] Hughes excludes paraenesis from the parts of speech but nevertheless thinks it is compatible with the function of deliberative discourses.[82]

Others also perceive a functional connection between paraenesis and deliberative speeches that attempt to persuade and dissuade regarding some proposed course of action.[83] Neil Elliott explains, "Attention is thus shifted from formal characteristics of text segments, treated in isolation, to the rhetorical function of argumentative parts…within a purposeful whole. This new perspective on rhetorical and social aspects of paraenesis alerts us to the importance of the social world in which the paraenetic activity makes cognitive and affective sense."[84] Attempting to specify the "cognitive and affective sense" that paraenesis makes, Aune sees the paraenetic section of Romans

---

79. Wolfgang Harnisch, "Einübung des neuen Seins: Paulinische Paränese am Beispiel des Galaterbriefs," *ZTK* 84 (1987): 286. Harnisch comments, "If one follows the rudiments of the rhetorical form of Galatians, the paraenetic part appears strange. As Betz must also take into account, the Pauline *exhortatio* has no fitting equivalent in the structure of a forensic speech and his reference to known analogies in the ancient tradition of philosophical letters is scarcely able to compensate for that deficit" (translation mine). See also Porter, "Paul of Tarsus," in idem, *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric*, 562–563, and idem, "Rhetorical Categories," in idem and Olbricht, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 104.

80. Jean-Noël Aletti, "Rhetoric of Romans 5–8," in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (JSNTSup 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 295.

81. Joop Smit, "Redactie in de brief aan de Galaten: Retorische analyze van Gal. 4,12–6,18," *TvT* 26 (1986): 113–114. For a summary, see Smit, "The Letter of Paul to the Galatians," repr. Nanos, *The Galatians Debate*, 45.

82. Hughes, "The Rhetoric of Letters," in Donfried and Beutler, 237, and idem, "Rhetoric of 1 Thessalonians," in *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, ed. Raymond F. Collins (BETL 87; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 106.

83. Harnisch, "Einübung des neuen Seins," 286.

as a fitting conclusion to a *logos protreptikos*, and Hellholm integrates paraenesis into rhetorical arrangement as a practical–nonlogical argument related to *ethos*.[85] Betz himself considers but rejects the possibility of solving the difficulty of paraenesis by an appeal to deliberative speeches, which in his opinion have "no apparent connection to paraenesis."[86] Several agree with Betz and assign paraenesis to epideictic rhetoric.[87]

In spite of the numerous suggested solutions, integrating paraenesis into rhetorical arrangement remains a ticklish question, and this difficulty once again emphasizes Betz's foundational role. His initial introduction of this difficulty in his 1974 seminal lecture presents a problem that subsequent rhetorical critics must address. This problem of the place of paraenesis in rhetorical arrangement as well as his focus on rhetorical arrangement in general thus demonstrates that Betz is the first practitioner of New Testament rhetorical criticism.

84. Neil Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans* (JSNTSup 45; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990), 101. Elliott (p. 66) comments, "These parts of the epistolary 'frame', we will argue, correspond functionally to the rhetorical *exordium* and *peroratio*." See also Probst, *Paulus und der Brief*, 99–107; Wiard Popkes, "Paraenesis in the New Testament: An Exercise in Conceptuality," in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, ed. James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen (BZNW 125; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 13–46; Troels Engberg-Pedersen, "The Concept of Paraenesis," in Starr and Engberg-Pedersen, *Early Christian Paraenesis*, 47–72; and especially James Starr, "Was Paraenesis for Beginners?" in Starr and Engberg-Pedersen, *Early Christian Paraenesis*, 73–111.

85. David E. Aune, "Romans as a Logos Protreptikos in the Context of Ancient Religious and Philosophical Propaganda," in *Paulus und das antike Judentum: Tübingen-Durham-Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters (†19.Mai 1938)*, ed. Martin Hengel and Ulrich Heckel (WUNT 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 119; David Hellholm, "Enthymemic Argumentation in Paul: The Case of Romans 6," in *Paul and His Hellenistic Context*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 135–138, and idem, "Amplificatio," in Porter and Olbricht, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 141.

86. Betz, " Literary Composition," 375 n. 9.

87. Lauri Thurén, "Motivation as the Core of Paraenesis: Remarks on Peter and Paul as Persuaders," in Starr and Engberg-Pedersen, *Early Christian Paraenesis*, 354–356.

Focus on Invention

New Testament Rhetorical Critics eventually turn their attention from arrangement to invention. In 1996, Anders Eriksson observes, "This interest in the text's power to persuade is distinctive for the present-day phase of rhetorical criticism. Interest in the *dispositio* of the text has given way to an interest in the *inventio* that is, the rhetorical situation, the rhetorical strategy and the argumentation in the text."[88] Once again, these critics rely on Betz's pioneering efforts, and this third focus on invention points to him as the first practitioner of New Testament rhetorical criticism.[89]

In his lecture, Betz states that invention or the selection and marshaling of proofs is "the most decisive part of the speech."[90] He further states that Paul's letter to the Galatians has a coherent flow of thought that responds persuasively to the *causa* of the case. Betz then explores the means of argumentation as outlined in the rhetorical handbooks that respond to the *causa*. Although he concentrates on the logical means of argument, he also mentions ethical and pathetic as well as topical argumentation. Subsequent rhetorical critics explore all of these aspects of invention. Thus, the "new" *inventio* phase of

88. Anders Eriksson, "Special Topics in 1 Corinthians 8–10," in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (JSNTSup 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 272-273. On p. 277, Eriksson explains this new development: "During the era of form-critical investigation of the pre-Pauline traditions in the Pauline text, attention was focused on the pre-history of the text. . . . In the new *inventio* phase of rhetorical criticism, attention is focused upon how these traditions function as rhetorical proofs in Paul's argumentation." See also idem, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (ConBNT 29; Stockholm: Amqvist & Wiksell International, 1998), 10. For examples of this shift of emphasis, see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 41–52; Dieter Sänger, "'Vergeblich bemüht' (Gal 4.11)?: Zur paulinischen Argumentationsstrategie im Galaterbrief," *NTS* 48, no. 3 (2002): 377–399; and Hans-Josef Klauck, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis* (Waco: Baylor University, 2006), 225.
89. For a survey of the numerous studies on rhetorical invention since Betz, see Martin, "Invention and Arrangement," 75–117.
90. Betz, "Literary Composition," 368.

Pauline rhetorical studies takes its direction from Betz as the first practitioner of this focus in New Testament rhetorical criticism.

Determining the *Causa*

In his lecture, Betz comments on Gal 1:6, "This statement of the *causa* of the case, the reason why the letter was written, contains the 'facts' that occasioned the letter." Apart from this brief comment, Betz proposes no method for identifying the *causa* even though such identification is crucial for understanding the argumentation.[91] Subsequent rhetorical critics are therefore left to devise their own means. Some find the *causa* in the parts of speech and especially in the *partitio* or the *propositio*.[92] Others find the *causa* in the stasis or issue addressed in a speech.[93] Due to the influence of Kennedy's programmatic book, however, the majority find the *causa* in the rhetorical situation.[94] Regardless of where they find the *causa*, subsequent rhetorical critics nevertheless follow Betz's lead as the first practitioner to recognize the importance of the *causa* for understanding argumentation in New Testament documents.

---

91. Hellholm, "Enthymemic Argumentation," 139. Hellholm explains, "In argumentation analyses one must first establish the thesis of the proponent. Only then is it meaningful to relate the pro- and counter-arguments of the disputing parties to each other."

92. Watson, "Contributions and Limitations of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Theory," in Porter and Stamps, *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture*, 144; Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 65-66; and Hellholm, "Enthymemic Argumentation," 139. For additional examples, see Martin, "Invention and Arrangement," 78–79.

93. For a description of stasis theory, see Troy W. Martin, "Apostasy to Paganism: The Rhetorical Stasis of the Galatian Controversy," in Nanos, *The Galatians Debate*, 74–75. For a discussion and examples of those who use stasis theory to find the *causa*, see Martin, "Invention and Arrangement," 87–92.

94. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 34–35. For a discussion of the rhetorical situation and examples of those who use it to find the *causa*, see Martin, "Invention and Arrangement," 79–87.

Means of Argumentation

In his 1974 lecture, Betz uses the Aristotelian categories of *logos*, *ethos*, *pathos*, and *topos* as well as the theories of other ancient rhetoricians to describe the means of argumentation in Paul's letter to the Galatians. Following Betz's lead, subsequent rhetorical critics principally rely on these four categories. Again, following Betz's lead, these critics initially concentrate on the logical means of argumentation by exploring the enthymeme and the paradigm. In his keynote address to the 1995 London Conference on Rhetorical Criticism, Vernon Robbins outlines an agenda for rhetorical critics and states, "The first place I see us working together is with assertions and rationales—the components of the rhetorical enthymeme."[95] Both the enthymeme and the paradigm become important tools to analyze New Testament logical argumentation, but this concentration on logical argumentation begins with Betz.

Betz's lesser emphasis on the other means of argumentation probably contributes to the delay of investigating them as a means of argumentation in New Testament texts. Regarding *ethos*, John Marshall observes, "Though ethos is almost universally praised as an extremely powerful means of persuasion, it has received only cursory treatment in both ancient and modern theories and applications of rhetoric, and what treatment it has received is confused and confusing."[96] Watson's survey of rhetorical studies from 1975 to 1995 cites Marshall's article on Philippians as "one of the few discussions of ethos in biblical argumentation."[97]

95. Vernon K. Robbins, "The Present and Future of Rhetorical Analysis," in Porter and Olbricht, *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture*, 33.

96. John W. Marshall, "Paul's Ethical Appeal in Philippians," in Porter and Olbricht, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 358.

97. Duane F. Watson, "Rhetorical Criticism of the Pauline Epistles since 1975," *CurBS* 3 (1995): 235. See also David E. Aune, "Ethos," in idem, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 169–73.

Regarding *pathos*, Thomas Olbricht comments in his 2001 volume entitled *Paul and Pathos*, "This volume undertakes to address a neglected aspect of the rhetorical analysis of the Scriptures, that is, emotional appeal, or as designated by the Greek rhetoricians *pathos*."[98] Although slow to investigate *ethos* and *pathos*, rhetorical critics would eventually explore these means of argumentation far beyond what Betz did in his 1974 lecture.[99] Even here, however, Betz's influence as the first practitioner is evident.[100]

Wilhelm Wuellner certainly recognizes Betz as the first practitioner of topical argumentation in New Testament studies. In his classic article addressing topical argumentation, Wuellner writes:

> What H. D. Betz introduced at the S.N.T.S. Meeting in Sigtuna, Sweden in 1974 in regard to the method of exegeting Galatians in general and of interpreting the Pauline view of the law in particular shall here be expanded and in part corrected. The correction refers to what was said there about rhetorical topos in particular and about rhetoric in general.[101]

In this article, Wuellner neither explicitly engages Betz nor specifically states his criticisms of Betz's analysis of the topical

---

Aune only mentions Mario M. DiCicco as a Pauline rhetorical critic that has investigated ethos in a Pauline letter. See Mario M. DiCicco, *Paul's Use of Ethos, Pathos, and Logos in 2 Corinthians 10–13* (MBP Series 31; Lewiston: Mellen, 1995), passim. However, Aune overlooks George Lyons, *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding* (SBLDS 73; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985), 191–201. Lyons is one of the first to examine ethos as a proof in 1 Thessalonians.

98. Thomas H. Olbricht, "Introduction," in *Paul and Pathos*, ed. idem and Jerry L. Sumney (SBLSymS 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 1. For a summary of pathos in early Christian literature, see Aune, "Ethos," 339–42.

99. For a survey of these studies, see Martin, "Invention and Arrangement," 103–13.

100. For examples of this influence, see Troy W. Martin, "Veiled Exhortations Regarding the Veil: Ethos as the Controlling Proof in Moral Persuasion (1 Cor 11:2–16)," in *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion in Biblical Discourse: Essays from the 2002 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Thomas H. Olbricht and Anders Eriksson (ESEC 11; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 255–273; and idem, "The Voice of Emotion: Paul's Pathetic Persuasion (Gal 4:12–20)," in Olbricht and Sumney, *Paul and Pathos*, 189–201.

101. Wilhelm H. Wuellner, "Toposforschung und Torahinterpretation bei Paulus und Jesus," *NTS* 24, no. 4 (1978): 463 (translation mine).

argumentation in Galatians. Instead, he simply presents his own topical analysis and leaves the reader of his article to supply the necessary corrections to Betz's analysis. Although he disagrees with Betz, Wuellner nevertheless recognizes him as the one who introduces topical argumentation into New Testament rhetorical criticism.

In this "new *inventio* phase," therefore, rhetorical critics follow Betz's lead and investigate the New Testament according to classical invention, which includes the logical, ethical, pathetic, and topical means of arguing the *causa* or rhetorical argumentative issue. Betz is thus the first practitioner of this third rhetorical-critical focus on *inventio* just as much as he is the initial practitioner of the first focus on rhetorical species and of the second on rhetorical arrangement. As the first practitioner of these three foci, Betz is therefore the Ur-ancestor or progenitor of the method of New Testament rhetorical criticism, as prominent New Testament scholars recognized as early as the 1970s.

Peroratio

Although our mission in this chapter appeared impossible, the demonstration of our proposition was not. Betz indeed belongs at the very beginning of the genealogical list of New Testament rhetorical criticism. He is the Ur–ancestor and progenitor because he initiates, discovers, and first practices this method in the 1970s before anyone else. The massive number of rhetorical-critical studies produced from that time until now only confirms our proposition.

By calling Betz the "Ur-ancestor" or "progenitor" as the initiator, discoverer, and first practitioner of this method, we are not claiming that the method of rhetorical criticism has not developed beyond him, for indeed it has. His seminal rhetorical insights give rise to a

rich diversity in the application and use of rhetorical criticism for interpreting and understanding the New Testament. In the chapters that follow, the other contributors to this volume will describe some of the other early important mothers and fathers who also belong in the genealogical list of New Testament rhetorical criticism. These other rhetorical ancestors contribute significantly to the new and diverse directions taken by this method first introduced, discovered, and practiced in 1974 by Betz as the Ur–ancestor of New Testament rhetorical criticism.