

# THE FOUNDATIONS OF ETHOS IN PAUL AND IN THE CLASSICAL RHETORICIANS

Thomas H. Olbricht

Pepperdine University

My basic argument in this paper is that the insights of the classical rhetoricians cast limited light upon the foundations and power of Paul's rhetorical ethos located in his letters. This is the case, I believe, first because of the difference in social location of the people to whom Paul wrote. In addition, major differences exist in the manner in which Paul and the rhetoricians envisioned the ideal person. Because of these two differences, the means by which Paul, as author, achieved rhetorical ethos proceeded along discrete lines, neither perceived nor delineated by the rhetoricians.

## Social Location

The classical rhetoricians characterized the genre of rhetoric according to three social locations. The location most universal in the Greco-Roman world was that of the law court, or in other words, forensic rhetoric. Cicero wrote, "...the judicial is at home in a court of law and involves accusation and defense or a claim and counter-plea."<sup>1</sup> The deliberative speech, in contrast, "...is at home in a political debate and involves the expression of an opinion."<sup>2</sup> Epideictic, he declared, "...is devoted to the praise or censure of a particular individual..." but he did not offer a location for this third genre.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, I. v. 7. [Cicero, *De Inventione*, trans. H. M. Hubbell (Cambridge: Harvard University Press (LCL), 1993).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

Quintilian recognized that epideictic might be a genre in either a court of law or a general assembly<sup>4</sup>, but its basic social location was wherever ceremonial addresses were made, for example, in public buildings, theatres and stadiums.

The social location for Paul's letters, written for reading aloud, is the assemblies of house churches. Numerous ancient voluntary associations provide the closest comparable social setting. Obviously other groups offer analogies, for example, the synagogue, the philosophical schools, and the ancient mysteries.<sup>5</sup> In fact, extant documents are far more numerous from the philosophical schools, and therefore, the most suggestive for comparison.<sup>6</sup> Another important location, especially in terms of language employed is the household, especially in regard to language.<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of this essay I need not work through the complicated ways in which each of these entities may have provided similarities. The ancient rhetoricians scrutinized none of these five locations as a place where communication took place. The communication in each, may, in effect, constitute a genre or at least a sub-genre. In a sense I am employing "voluntary association" as an umbrella term to include the synagogue, the philosophical school, the mystery cult and the early Christian communities. The communication in each of these

---

<sup>4</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, III, 7. [Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. H. E. Butler (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, (LCL), 1989).

<sup>5</sup> Ascough does an excellent job of detailing the various claims of each. Richard S. Ascough, *What are they Saying about the Formation of Pauline Churches* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998)

<sup>6</sup> The works of Abraham J. Malherbe highlight similarities and differences. See especially, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989); *Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986); and *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (New York: The Anchor Doubleday, 2000).

<sup>7</sup> Malherbe wrote: "Paul describes himself in emotive language that is designed to foster a warm personal relationship between himself and his readers. He begins with a reminder that he had been willing to forgo a right. That he chooses a harsh, demanding demeanor as the right he right he was willing not to insist on is important for two reasons: it sets the tone for the rest of the self-description, and he eliminates ecclesiastical status, that of apostle, from consideration. The image of the nurse provides a dramatic contrast and is the first signal that Paul will use images from the household to describe his relationship with the Thessalonians. He uses the language of kingship throughout the letter but does so without presenting a domestic hierarchy." *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 159-160.

“associations” would have had more similarities with each other than with the rhetoric of the three classical genre.

The more narrowly defined voluntary associations differed in purpose and requirements. According to Robert Wilken:

The associations can be divided into three main types: (1) professional corporations, as for example, a guild of shipowners, fruit merchants, wool-workers, or plasterers; (2) funerary societies whose chief purpose was to provide burial expenses for deceased members and to insure that each member received a decent burial; (3) religious societies composed of the worshipers of a particular deity, such as the devotees of Bacchus or Isis. Seldom, however, were the activities of an association limited to one of these functions. Most combined several, if not all, of them.<sup>8</sup>

It is with the third group, according to Wilken, that the closest parallel to the Christian house churches may be found.<sup>9</sup> It was the contention of Celsus that the early Christians refused to join in with the public religious rites in the cities, but proceeded according to the manner of an “obscure and secret association”<sup>10</sup> further identifying them with the voluntary associations in the eyes of the ancients.

Considerable is known about such associations in the ancient world, their social locations and the topics of discussions that took place in their meetings.<sup>11</sup> For the most part, however, the discussions themselves were not recorded, the remaining data being mostly inscriptional, so that very little is recoverable regarding the mode of discourse that took place.<sup>12</sup> The classical rhetoricians did not scrutinize in any manner association discourse nor offer observations regarding the communications within these groups. I

---

<sup>8</sup> Robert L. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984) 36.

<sup>9</sup> Robert L. Wilken, *The Christians*, 41.

<sup>10</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1.1; 8. 17. 47. Quoted by Wilken, *The Christians*, 45.

<sup>11</sup> John E. Stambaugh and David L. Balch, *The New Testament in Its Social Environment* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986) 107-167.

<sup>12</sup> In addition to Wilken, 31-47, see: *Voluntary Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, eds. J. L. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson, (New York: Routledge, 1996); E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century: some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960).

therefore conclude that because the social location of Paul's letters differs from that of forensic, deliberative, and epideictic discourse, that from the standpoint of the contributions of the ancient rhetoricians, the literary mode of the letters is an unmapped territory. "Church" rhetoric therefore is a genre of its own which awaits the description and analysis of its unique features instead of simply being cropped upon a procrustean bed of classical rhetoric.

What is there about the social location of Paul's letters that creates a distinctive rhetorical configuration? Let us first discuss Aristotle's view as to the differences in the three classical genre that are, in part, the result of location. Aristotle argued that the hearer to whom a speech is addressed is a judge of the past (forensic, that is, the court) or of the future (deliberative, the assembly [ecclesia]) or a spectator (epideictic).<sup>13</sup> As the result each has distinctive rhetorical features.

Forensic speech is either accusatory or defensive and has to do with the past because it pertains to things that have been done. The focus of courtroom speaking is justice or injustice.<sup>14</sup> Enthymemes are the most suitable to the courtroom since the past is somewhat obscure. The speaker therefore investigates causes and outcomes.<sup>15</sup> It is a setting forth of "...the motives and character of those who do wrong and those who suffer from it."<sup>16</sup> The "inartificial proofs" advanced in the court are laws, witnesses, contracts, torture, oaths.<sup>17</sup> In terms of ethos the speaker must be perceived as favorably disposed toward the person he is defending, but antagonistic toward the other litigants.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 3, 3. [Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric*, trans. John Henry Freese (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (LCL) 1959)].

<sup>14</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 3, 5.

<sup>15</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 9, 40.

<sup>16</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 10, 6.

<sup>17</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 15, 2-3.

<sup>18</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, II, 1, 4.

The style of the forensic speaker is more finished or polished, and narrative is an appropriate mode.<sup>19</sup>

The deliberative speech focuses on anticipated future courses of action for the city or the state. It is either hortatory or dissuasive.<sup>20</sup> The aim of deliberative speaking is to persuade the hearers to embrace the expedient and avoid the harmful.<sup>21</sup> People deliberate on ways and means, war and peace, the defense of the country, imports and exports, and legislation.<sup>22</sup> Examples are the most suitable form of evidence for deliberative speakers since they normally explicate past instances and outcomes in order to predict the future effects of proposed actions.<sup>23</sup> In the deliberative speeches it is important that speakers make themselves appear to be of a certain character which includes good sense, virtue and good will.<sup>24</sup> The style of the deliberative speech should be less polished, like a rough sketch.<sup>25</sup>

The epideictic speech is not focused upon immediate decision making, and therefore Aristotle identifies the auditor as a spectator. The focus of epideictic is praise or blame and is centered upon the present, but sometimes reflecting on the past so as to anticipate the future.<sup>26</sup> The end of epideictic speaking is to enlist the auditors in support of the honorable, and in the avoidance of the disgraceful.<sup>27</sup> It is a focus on virtue and vice, the former by the one who praises and the latter by the one who blames.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, III, 12, 5; 13, 3.

<sup>20</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 3,3.

<sup>21</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 3,5.

<sup>22</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 4, 7.

<sup>23</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 9, 40.

<sup>24</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, II, 1, 4.

<sup>25</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, III, 12, 5.

<sup>26</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 3, 4.

<sup>27</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 3, 5.

<sup>28</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 9, 1.

Amplification is the form of proof most suitable for the one who praises and blames.<sup>29</sup>

The epideictic style is the most polished and therefore lends itself to written composition.<sup>30</sup>

We are now in a position to comment on how the rhetoric located in a voluntary association or an early synagogue or church differs from the three genres of the classical rhetoricians. These associations or religious groups are limited to such persons who voluntarily cast their lot with a particular coterie of persons. The end of the group is the sharing of benefits, which, if religious, have to do with divine bestowal and entitlements. Especially as envisioned by Paul, persons within these conventicles were mutually responsible to each other both in assembly and one on one in order to create a Christ-like community and persons within it (1 Thes. 5:11). The nature of communication in the Pauline communities was certainly not spectator rhetoric, the term Aristotle employed for epideictic. A difference in the Pauline communities from other voluntary associations was an emphasis on being remade in the image of Christ by participating in the life of the community. Wayne Meeks, commenting on this difference, wrote: "Being or becoming religious in the Greco-Roman world did not entail either moral transformation or sectarian resocialization."<sup>31</sup> Another difference was that whereas most ancient voluntary groups were of local import, Paul envisioned his communities as part of a divine effort to transform persons throughout the world (Rom. 15:17-24). Stambaugh and Balch concluded in regard to ancient associations:

On the other hand, there were important differences. The Christian groups were totalistic in a way paralleled only in Judaism; other loyalties became secondary. Further, the Christian groups were more inclusive socially than were the voluntary associations.

---

<sup>29</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, I, 9, 40.

<sup>30</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, III, 12, 6

<sup>31</sup> Wayne Meeks, *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993) 28.

Some of the latter did include slaves and freeborn persons, both man and women, but usually they were associations of socially homogeneous people. In addition, the Christian groups were more conscious of a dynamic connection with a worldwide society of like-minded believers, to a much greater degree than the pagan collegia.<sup>32</sup>

Christological and moral exhortation because a focal point in these church settings. Rhetorically, therefore, the approach was direct and personal. Meeks wrote of the similarities between the associations and the communities embracing faith in Christ, “Both were small groups in which intensive face-to-face interactions were possible and encouraged.”<sup>33</sup> Though sometimes authorial in tone under the mandate of God, nevertheless in a manner becoming to Christ-like servanthood, Paul declared, “...though we might have made demands as apostles of Christ. But we were gentle among you, like a nurse tenderly caring for her own children” (1 Thes. 2:7). For the most part, unlike the forensic genre, Paul was not out to force a once only judgment in regard to justice and injustice. The result is that various letters of Paul, and other New Testament epistles, result in sub-genre. Galatians, for example, may be characterized as confrontational.<sup>34</sup> In it Paul clearly delineates the truth of the gospel and opposes those who undermine it. His purpose is not so much to “penalize or incarcerate” the guilty, but to strengthen *koinonia* in the believing community. Colossians, whether Paul or Paulinist, may be characterized as continuational.<sup>35</sup> It is an encouragement for those have entered into the community to continue to develop according to values from which they began. “As you therefore have received Christ Jesus the Lord, continue to live your lives in him, rooted and built up in him and established in the faith...” (Col. 2:6-7). Hebrews is a word of exhortation.

---

<sup>32</sup> John E. Stambaugh and David L. Balch, *The New Testament in Its Social Environment*, 141.

<sup>33</sup> Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983) 78.

<sup>34</sup> Thomas H. Olbricht, "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians," *Greeks, Romans, and Christians, Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, eds. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, Wayne A. Meeks, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 216-136.

Structurally, it is modeled upon the ancient eulogy and funeral sermon.<sup>36</sup> In terms of proof it utilizes the amplification recommended by Aristotle for the epideictic speech. But otherwise the Hebrews features are those of “church” rhetoric in terms of topics, Scripture use and exhortations relevant to a close knit association.<sup>37</sup> Instances of these sub-genre may be found elsewhere in ancient letters and discourses that circulated among other philosophical, religious and other voluntary groups.<sup>38</sup> These additional letters are suitable grist for extrapolating upon the parameters of the sub-genre.

The focus of “church” rhetoric is on the present, but as informed by the past mighty acts of God (Rom. 9:1-5); for Paul, more specifically on the salvific actions in Christ (Rom. 5:6-11). The future is also of importance to Paul for the ongoing well being of the house church. But the future also especially has an eschatological dimension, since present actions have ramifications beyond death, “...and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead—Jesus, who rescues us from the wrath that is coming” (1Thes. 1:9-10). In this the genre differs from deliberative rhetoric in which the immediate and longer range well being of the auditors is the primary concern.

The proofs available are the past actions of God, especially as culminated in Christ. These may be utilized as primary data or examples from which to reason, but the

---

<sup>35</sup> Thomas H. Olbricht, "The Rhetoric of Colossians," *Rhetoric, Scripture & Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*, Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, eds (Sheffield: The University of Sheffield Press, 1995) 308-328.

<sup>36</sup> Thomas H. Olbricht, "Amplification in Hebrews," *Rhetoric and the New Testament Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1993), 375-387.

<sup>37</sup> Thomas H. Olbricht, “Anticipating and Presenting the Case for Christ as High Priest in Hebrews,” *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*, Lund Conference 2002, eds., Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter G. Übelacker, , Trinity Press, 2002.

<sup>38</sup> Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986); Abraham J. Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986); Paul A. Holloway has argued that the focus of Philippians is consolation. *Consolation in Philippians: Philosophical Sources and Rhetorical Strategy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

emphasis, as in the forensic genre is more upon the reasoning, that is, the enthymemes, rather than upon the examples. Paul spelled out many ramifications of the death and resurrection of Christ. The Scriptures and the oral declarations in regard to Jesus provide the sources for these examples. The Scriptures not only provide examples; they are a primary source for the premises utilized in enthymemes. Other types of Scripture, however, for example, the narratives as found in the Gospels may utilize concrete details in order to advance the proofs.

Vernon K. Robbins, because of a similar conviction, has proposed an approach to Biblical literature that focuses upon genres unique to its discourse rather than those proposed by the rhetoricians. He brings to bear insights from the rhetoricians at apropos places, but as subsumed within his own categories. The categories he proposes, are: wisdom, miracle, prophetic, suffering-death, apocalyptic and pre-creation.<sup>39</sup> Robbins offers a few observations upon the social locations of the analyzed six genre, but he does not, to my knowledge, base each genre specifically upon the distinct locations. Neither does he offer general observations upon the social location of early Christian discourse. His proposal is a significant one and we can anticipate future delineations of consequence. Whereas Robbins focuses upon the rhetorical features of content materials within documents, my approach is more in line with an Aristotelian approach, in that I center upon the rhetorical features of communications within a specific social context. I then offer comments upon the unique rhetorical features that result from such a social location and Biblical topoi as well as that of sub-genre that grow out of and reflect the attributes of the larger genre. I have taken a somewhat different tack than Robbins by

focusing on categories, not so much centered upon types of content, but varieties of rhetorical tasks.

Dale L. Sullivan in his “the Ethos of Epideictic Encounter” has laid the groundwork for reflecting upon ethos and genre in the context of different social locations.

We might, for instance, say that the forensic rhetor should display command of the law and of the facts, should be able to create a powerful narrative to make the case believable, and should demonstrate a strong enthymatic form of reasoning (Aristotle 1954, I.ix-xv). The deliberative rhetor should embody a practical wisdom leading to a clear understanding of expediency, should display good will, and should be able to draw heavily from history to show precedents pertinent to the proposed action (Aristotle 1954, I.iv—vii).<sup>40</sup>

In regard to epideictic he believes its ethos is related to purpose. Epideictic, he declares, is a “constellation of purposes: preservation, education, celebration, and aesthetic creation.”<sup>41</sup> Epideictic is therefore most importantly linked with ethos and pathos. It requires that the speaker models an acceptable reputation, offers a convincing vision of the audience’s culture, exhibits the rhetor’s timeless orthodoxy so as to enhance his authority, sets forth good reasons, and reflects the consubstantiality of values as recognized by the audience.<sup>42</sup>

Before we can present the contours of what hqoz is from a Pauline perspective we must consider what for him is a good person as contrasted with the vision of the ancient rhetoricians, in this paper specifically, Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. Nevertheless, at this stage we can set forth the character of ethos in church rhetoric as compared and contrasted with forensic, deliberative, and epideictic.

---

<sup>39</sup> Vernon K. Robbins, “Argumentative Textures in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation,” in, Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, Walter Übelacker, *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts, Lund Conference 2002* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002) 28-66).

<sup>40</sup> Dale L. Sullivan, “The Ethos of Epideictic Encounter,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 26 (1993) 114.

<sup>41</sup> Dale L. Sullivan, “The Ethos of Epideictic, 116.

In church rhetoric the *hōzōs* of the speaker is derived from his exhibiting an exceptional understanding of God and Christ, their ways and expectations. In substance therefore the *topoi* differ from that of *ethos* in any of the classical genre. The wisdom is practical as in deliberative, but different again in that recommendations for future action, especially for Paul, focus, not so much on what the great people of God did in the past, but the present and future ramifications of the cross, resurrection and coming again (1 Cor. 5, 6). Actions particularly emulate the ministry and servanthood of the crucified Lord. The modes of ministry and preaching are in turn influenced. Paul himself highlighted the differences especially in 2 Corinthians as he contrasted the ministries of the “false apostles” with that of his own. *Ethos* depended not upon heralding victorious accomplishments, but even in the trumpeting of weakness and defeat (2 Cor. 12). For Paul, a Christ-like character is crucial along with knowledge of the Christ events and the Scriptures written in former days (Rom. 15:4). Strong enthymematic reasoning, often employing premises from Scripture, is required along with a cruxiform manner of community management and discourse. The end of the discourse is to advance nurture and *koinonia* in the house churches.

Narratives are of consequence in the Gospels and Acts. On occasion speeches in Acts, for example, Stephen setting forth the history of the descendants of Abraham (Acts 7:2-53), or Paul speaking in his own defense (Acts 22:3-21) reflect forensic narration. Sometimes too, specific historical narratives are transported from the Old Testament. But except for the speeches, the narrative mode in the New Testament is not that described by the rhetoricians. In the epistles the approach is like the forensic in that the writers draw upon enthymemes, with few exceptions, rather than historical precedents as in

---

<sup>42</sup> Dale L. Sullivan, “The Ethos of Epideictic, 118-127.

deliberative oratory. The enthymemes begin with the normative virtues grounded both in the Old Testament and in the Christ event. As the result of social location and a different set of presuppositions in respect to fundamental reality, the genre of “church” rhetoric is different from the classical three much as these three are similar, yet different from each other. Ethos in the “church” results from the common commitment of speaker and audience to normative Christian outlooks.

### A Vision of the Idea Person

What remains now is to set forth the similarities and differences between the ideal person as perceived by the rhetoricians and by Paul. We may assume that ethos in each case is heightened in proportion to the manner in which the speaker reflects the ideal.

We obtain a view of Aristotle’s perspective of the ideal person from the *Rhetoric* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The ideal person exhibits practical wisdom, virtue and good will.<sup>43</sup> The virtues consist of liberality, justice, courage, temperance, magnanimity, magnificence, friendliness, truthfulness, prudence, gentleness and wisdom or the contemplative life. For Aristotle the goal of ideal existence is happiness, defined as long range fulfillment seeking pleasure and avoiding pain.<sup>44</sup> Contemplation is the height of happiness for it characterizes deity.<sup>45</sup> The good life results from a balanced commitment to the traits above in the avoidance of the extremes on either side. While the ideal life is theologically oriented, an eschatological dimension is absent except insofar as the

---

<sup>43</sup> Aristotle, *The Rhetoric*, 2.1.5. See Jacob Wisse, *Ethos and Pathos From Aristotle to Cicero* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert Publisher, 1989) and Jerry Harvill, “Aristotle’s Concept of Ethos as Ground for a Modern Ethics of Communication” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1990).

<sup>44</sup> Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1, 4, 7. See T. H. Irwin, “Ethics in the *Rhetoric* and in the *Ethics*,” in *Essays on Aristotle’s Rhetoric*, ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996) 142-174.

<sup>45</sup> Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 10.8.

individual raises up progeny. The soul at death is merged into the transcendental pool of soulness, since immortality resides in humankind, not in the individual.

Cicero considers the idea person one who exhibits many of the traits proposed by Aristotle. In essence such a person is honorable, by which is meant “anything that is sought wholly or partly for its own sake.”<sup>46</sup> What is honorable in its simple form falls into the category of virtue, defined “as a habit of mind in harmony with reason and the order of nature.”<sup>47</sup> Virtue has four aspects: wisdom, justice, courage and temperance. Wisdom is focused on knowledge of what is good and bad. Its component parts are: memory, intelligence and foresight. Justice is focused upon giving each individual what they deserve and is based on the laws of nature approved by custom, implanted by an innate instinct.<sup>48</sup> Justice incorporates religion, duty, gratitude, revenge, reverence and truth. Courage is manifested in the undertaking of dangerous tasks and enduring hardships.<sup>49</sup> It is exhibited in highmindedness, confidence, patience, and perseverance. Temperance results from the control of reason over lust and improper impulses of the mind, exhibited in continence, clemency and modesty.<sup>50</sup>

Other traits are to be sought after not only for their intrinsic worth, but also because of the advantage obtained. These include glory, rank, influence, and friendship.<sup>51</sup> Glory is derived from a widely recognized commendatory reputation; rank from holding

---

<sup>46</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2, 159. See W. L. Grant, “Vir Bonus,” *Classical Journal*, 38 (1941-42) 472-478.

<sup>47</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2, 159. See James M. May, *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

<sup>48</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2, 160. Though Cicero was interested in Stoicism his epistemology was basically that of middle Platonism. P. H. DeLacy, “Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106-43 B. C., ) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1967) 1, 113-114.

<sup>49</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2, 163.

<sup>50</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2, 164.

<sup>51</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2, 166.

significant positions; influence from power and resources; and mutual benefits from friendship. The body has admirable traits in health, beauty, strength and speed. Other extraneous virtues are public office, money, marriage connections, high birth, friends, country, and power.<sup>52</sup>

Quintilian declared that the ideal orator is “a good man, skilled in speaking” a phrase he attributed to Marcus Cato.<sup>53</sup> This means that the orator must “above all things devote his attention to the formation of moral character and must acquire a complete knowledge of all that is just and honourable.”<sup>54</sup> Virtue is achieved through the knowledge of what is good and right and their opposites. The ideal orator will have much to say about justice, fortitude, abstinence, self-control and piety and will exhibit these characteristics on his own.<sup>55</sup> Quintilian charged that the ideal speaker should also be able to discourse upon religious matters.

If the origin of our souls be divine, we must win our way towards virtue and abjure the service of the lusts of our earthly body. Are not these themes which the orator will frequently be called upon to handle? Again there are questions concerned with auguries and oracles or any other religious topic (all of them subjects that have often given rise to the most important debates in the senate) on which the orator will have to discourse, if he is also to be the statesman we would have him be.<sup>56</sup>

The topics discussed by the orator should be those of the most sublime nature such as “virtue, politics, providence, the origin of the sound and friendship.”<sup>57</sup>

The themes which tend to elevate mind and language alike are questions such as what things are truly good, what means there are of assuaging fear, restraining the passions and lifting us and the soul that came from heaven clear of the delusions of the common herd.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2, 177.  
<sup>53</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12, 1, 1. See George A. Kennedy, *Quintilian* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969).

<sup>54</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12, 2, 1.

<sup>55</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12, 2, 17.

<sup>56</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12, 2, 21.

<sup>57</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12, 2, 28.

<sup>58</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12, 2, 28.

Good men are those who exhibit courage, justice, loyalty, self-control, simplicity, and contempt of grief and pain.<sup>59</sup> An orator must also exhibit knowledge of civil law, and of the customs and religion of the state.<sup>60</sup>

Aristotle clearly has the most theologically grounded vision of the ideal person. Virtuous characteristics are all in harmony with long range pleasures and the avoidance of pain. Happiness is achieved through moderation in all things, from giving to others to courage on the battlefield. The highest form of happiness is contemplation. It is possible for humans to arrive at this insight on their own, though the fact that deity is given to contemplation further confirms the conclusion. Cicero is not so concerned with the ideal person fulfilling a desired end as he is constructing a life in keeping with conventional perspectives on virtues and vice. In a sense he embraces the old proverb that “man is the measure of all things.” Quintilian too, mostly proceeds from conventional views as to those traits that characterize a good man. But he is sensitive to the importance of traits that comply with heavenly standards of goodness and action.

### Paul on the Ideal Person

I will look at Galatians and 2 Corinthians to flesh out Paul’s ideal person. Paul does not search out conventional contemporary visions of the ideal person as do Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, each in their own way. In his perception, the ideal person is found in Christ and he, Paul has attempted to emulate him. “Be imitators of me, as I am of

---

<sup>59</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12, 2, 30.

<sup>60</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12, 3, 1.

Christ” (1 Cor. 11:1). Paul’s vision, therefore, of the ethos of a speaker committed to Christ is not that they project the attributes of the typical ideal contemporary, but that they possess the special attributes found in Christ. Paul did not, however, proceed to describe Christ’s characteristics in detail, but reflected upon those traits desirable for the specific problems addressed in his letters. The ethos he believed the speaker/writer should manifest therefore is the fundamental action of Christ in his death and resurrection.<sup>61</sup> These characteristics may not necessarily be preferred by the auditors/readers as is obvious in the case of 2 Corinthians. In 2 Corinthians Paul sought to persuade the Corinthian believers by setting forth the ideal ethos, then encouraging them to live and act accordingly. These ideals underpinned his own *modus operandi* and set forth a contrast with those they prized. Paul therefore took on a double burden by arguing for a mindset considerably different from that of the classical rhetoricians, though not unknown among the philosophical groups of the time. André Resner designated Paul’s view of ethos, in contrast with that of the classical rhetoricians “Reverse-*ethos*.”

Paul’s *ethos* is unusual in that he attempts to reframe his reader’s expectations for what makes any orator/leaders credible within the Christian community. Rather than implicitly approving of their own *ethos* standards, which were conditioned by their classical rhetorical heritage, Paul questions them from the standpoint of a countervailing Christ perspective. For Paul, the only context within which to know what to expect of a

---

<sup>61</sup> Wayne Meeks, *The Origins of Christian Morality* wrote: The Christians’ lists of virtues and vices were not much different from those common in popular morality, though they used them to mark boundaries, to insist upon difference. Their leaders borrowed from the topics of philosophical and rhetorical moralizing, though sometimes they twisted them in peculiar ways or set them into unusual contexts. For example, the narrative of crucifixion and resurrection of God’s Son, the myth of Logos incarnate, the pervasive notion of the single will of the one God, the image of a final, universal judgment for all humanity—all these colored and sometimes dramatically transformed the common rhetoric of admonition. Perhaps, however, it was in certain of their social practices that the Christian groups most effectively distinguished themselves from other cult associations, clubs, or philosophical schools—their special rituals of initiation and communion, their practice of communal admonition and discipline, the organization of aid for widows, orphans, prisoners, and other weaker members of the movement.” 212-213.

community orator is that entailed by the message of the gospel—the cross-event-proclaimed.<sup>62</sup>

## Galatians

It is clear as Paul began his letter to the Galatians that he professed an ethos, so he declared, not derived from the mass of humankind, but from God. More specifically he went on to highlight his commission from Jesus Christ raised from the dead by the father (Gal. 1:1). Furthermore, he referred to the support of the members of God's family with him. Not only he, but also the Galatians were recipients of the forgiving power of Christ through his death (Gal. 1:4). The gospel he proclaimed stood the test because it was not of human origin, but from God (Gal. 1:11-12). Paul declared that Christ-like ethos has a higher source than simply human inasmuch as it comes from God himself (Gal. 1:10).<sup>63</sup>

As to the first specific attribute Paul touted zeal (Gal. 1:14). Paul obviously rejected Aristotle's location of the proper intensity of action on a point between the extremes. He alleged that when it came to being God's person, the ideal was to be as extreme in zealousness as is humanly possible. Paul was zealous beyond those of his acquaintances before confronted by the risen Christ. Afterward he declared his convictions regarding Jesus Christ with all his might (Gal. 1:15-24). His message was from God but he set forth what he proclaimed to the respected leaders in Jerusalem and they gave Barnabus and him the right hand of fellowship (Gal. 1:9). They also emphasized the need to be concerned for those less fortunate. "They asked only one

---

<sup>62</sup> André Resner, Jr., *The Preacher and the Cross: Person and Message in Theology and Rhetoric* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Press, 1999) 106.

<sup>63</sup> Richard B. Hayes, "The Letter to the Galatians" *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Leader E Keck (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000) has an excellent summary of theological themes (Vol. XI, p. 187).

thing, that we remember the poor, which was actually what I was eager to do” (Gal. 1:10).

Paul also featured the ideal person as standing for the truth in respect to the Gospel, even when it was not favorable to do so and chiding those who failed (Gal. 2:5, 14). Peter and Barnabus wavered when challenged (Gal. 2:11-14). The truth of the Gospel is that acceptance by God depends upon faith in Christ and not upon any fleshly attribute such as circumcision (Gal. 2:16). The ideal person for Paul was only superficially conventional. A better description than conventional is conversional. “I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who lives, but it is Christ who lives in me (Gal. 2:19-20).

In the next section Paul declared that receiving God in faith results in the work of the Holy Spirit in the body (Gal. 3:1-3). The correct insight is that the faith of Christ and of Abraham is the route to acceptance for both Jews and Gentiles, rather than the keeping of the law (3:1-4:11, 4:21-31).

Paul then argued that he has treated the Galatians appropriately as friends and they have in turn reciprocated. He shared with them the word and work of God even despite a handicap and they responded in kind. In the past they had a closeness which provided mutual benefits (Gal. 4:12-19). In 5:1 he drew upon his ethos to appeal to them once again to stand firm in the freedom which comes from Jesus Christ. He also cited persecution for his position on circumcision to establish his integrity against those who claimed that he himself in other contexts preached circumcision (5:7-12).

In a major section Paul develops the ideal vision for humanity in which the fruits of the Spirit are embraced while those of the flesh are rejected. In this manner he used

the ancient list approach in characterizing the ideal person.<sup>64</sup> Freedom in Christ is basis for loving one another, and not the grounds for self indulgence (Gal. 5:1). This is the case even if the readers take up the vision of the Torah, for the law declares, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself” (Gal. 5:14). The traits to be avoided, that is, the works of the flesh, are: fornication, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, quarrels, dissensions, factions, envy, drunkenness, and carousing. Items on this list certainly may be found in Greco-Roman writings, however, the negative mention of idolatry and sorcery are infrequent, indicating Judeo-Christian predilections.

The Holy Spirit produces the ideal traits in the believer. The fruit of the Spirit is: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. These items too are mentioned by other ancient moralists and philosophers, but with less emphasis on love and joy.<sup>65</sup>

These are the traits of the ideal person that empower Christian ethos. Paul sets forth the attributes of the ideal believer and at the same time proceeds rhetorically in such a manner so that these attributes empower discourse by way of encouraging believers to live up to these standards. The negative traits are crucified in accepting the gift of Christ

---

<sup>64</sup> Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979, has an excursus on a catalogue of vices and virtues, 281-283; also Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 403-407.

<sup>65</sup> J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians* (The Anchor Bible: Doubleday: New York, 1997) argues that neither list is “an example of nomistic, moral discourse focused on ‘vices’ and ‘virtues’”. By concentrating on the matter of community life, and by speaking of the Flesh and the Spirit as supra-human, apocalyptic powers, Paul transforms what had traditionally be a form of moral discourse—vices and virtues attributable to individuals—into marks left on communities by these two apocalyptic powers.” (p. 484).

Jesus by his death (Gal. 5:24). The positive traits are empowered by the Holy Spirit (Gal. 5:25) and Paul sometimes collapses the Lord and the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:18).<sup>66</sup>

Paul now applies the ideal traits provided by the Spirit to life in the Galatian congregations. They should bear one another's burdens (Gal. 6:2, 10). They should at the same time carry their own load (Gal. 6:5). God expects those who are his to embrace his ethos and those who fail will be condemned (Gal. 6: 7). Paul shows his concern for these churches since he signs off in his own handwriting (Gal. 6:11). The proper course of action is accepting persecution if necessary even as Paul and Christ suffered and Paul continues to suffer (6:12-16). Paul finally calls attention to his own ethos by mentioning that "I carry the marks of Jesus branded on my body" (Gal. 6:17).

Paul has attempted to bring much personal ethos to bear in persuade the Galatians to believe and live according to the "truth of the gospel." His ethos, however, is grounded in the work of God in Christ and therefore draws much more upon transcendent forces than on the human ones identified by the rhetoricians. His ethos resided not only in his knowledge of the Scriptures, but more in the father of the Lord Jesus Christ revealed in the Scriptures, neither of which are discussed by the ancient rhetoricians. His ethos is a "two-edged sword" in that he feels compelled and no doubt correctly, that not only must he appeal to the Christian ethos, he must set it out in such a manner before his hearers/readers that they will recognized their failures. He appealed not so much to

---

<sup>66</sup> Wolfgang Schrage, *The Ethics of the New Testament*, trans. David E. Green (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988) discusses as the bases of Pauline ethics, Christological, Sacramental, Pneumatologic-Charismatic, and Eschatological, 163-186.

common values as did the rhetoricians, but to uncommon Christ prompted values that should impel their lives.<sup>67</sup>

## 2 Corinthians

In 2 Corinthians, because of the circumstances, that is, opponents who question Paul's ethos, he is focused upon the nature of genuine Christian character in contrast with the model provided by the "super-apostles" who arrived after he left. He is insistent that the believer has received a new ethos, a new creation from God.

So if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new! All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting the message of reconciliation to us (2 Cor. 5:17-19).<sup>68</sup>

Paul's ministry (apostleship) is from Christ by the will of God, assisted by Timothy (2 Cor. 1:1). The readers in turn comprise the church of God. His intentions toward them are as a caregiver. He wants to console them as he has been consoled by God (2 Cor. 1:4). He likewise suffers as Christ suffered and it is in their behalf.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, Paul was convinced that they shared in his suffering and consolation (2 Cor. 1:7). He reminded them of various afflictions from which God rescued him in Asia (2 Cor. 1:8-11). They themselves were supportive through prayers on his behalf. The trait

---

<sup>67</sup> Philip H. Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an Approach to Paul's Epistle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998 (p. 260) wrote of a different approach to Paul's rhetoric with which I agree. "...it would be valuable to isolate the premises on which Paul constructs his syllogisms or ask whether he displays a discernible consistency when basing arguments on weakness, power, dependence and independence, examples, Scriptural authority, tradition, and so on.

<sup>68</sup> J. Paul Sampley, *Walking between the Times : Paul's Moral Reasoning* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991). See also Abraham J. Malherbe, "Conversion to Paul's Gospel" *The Early Church in Its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson*, eds. Abraham J. Malherbe, Frederick W. Norris & James W. Thompson (Leiden, Brill, 1998) 230-244).

<sup>69</sup> J. Paul Sampley, "The Second Letter to the Corinthians," *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000) wrote: "Finally, the Jesus whom Paul proclaims is 'Christ Jesus as Lord, with ourselves as your slaves for Jesus' sake" (2 Cor. 4:5). Paul's humble, weak

of suffering as an attribute of the ideal life is different from the conventional views unless comparable to suffering in warfare.

Paul has behaved with frankness and godly sincerity, two additional ideal traits, but not with “earthly wisdom” (2 Cor. 1:12). He has written so that they can comprehend his viewpoints. He is their boast and they are his. He desired to visit Corinth, but he hoped for favorable circumstances as the result of their turn around. He did not want to make another painful visit (2 Cor. 2:1). His standards for deciding the matter were not human standards, but divine ones (2 Cor. 1:17). He was a worker with them and commended them for their faith (1:24). He wrote out of much distress, anguish of heart, and tears so as to not to cause them pain for he loved them (2 Cor. 2:4). He forgave them and the offender in the presence of Christ (Cor. 2:10). He persevered as the aroma of Christ. He was not a peddler of the word, but a person of sincerity. The rhetoricians did not mention frankness and sincerity as traits of the ideal person.

Rather than needing letters of recommendation to or from them, Paul commended them for being a letter of Christ prepared by him written with the Spirit of the living God (2 Cor. 3:3). His own competence is from God (2 Cor. 3:5). Paul is involved in ministry because of God’s mercy. He refused to practice cunning or falsify God’s word, but presented an open statement of the truth (2 Cor. 4:2). He proclaimed not himself, but Jesus Christ as Lord and “ourselves as your slaves for Jesus’ sake (2 Cor. 4:5). He carried in his body the death of Jesus, that is emulating him in lifestyle (2 Cor. 4:10). His motivation for persuading others came about as the result of his fear of the Lord (2 Cor. 5:11). He and they are ambassadors for Christ by what God accomplished in the death of

---

demeanor is ground in the Jesus he preachers, the Jesus who is Lord. So his comportment is, as always, fundamentally christologically based (e.g., 1 Cor. 11:1).” (Vol. 10, p. 18).

Christ (2 Cor. 5:19-20).<sup>70</sup> Paul's suffering specifically declared that he was a servant of God (2 Cor. 6:4-10). He mentioned once again that he has spoken frankly (2 Cor. 6:11).

Paul now turns to solicit acceptance from the believers. He asks them to make room in their hearts for him (2 Cor. 7:2). He has great pride in them because of the consolation and affliction they both share. Timothy reported that they were concerned about him as indicated by their longing, grieving and zeal on his behalf (2 Cor. 7:7).

In regard to the collection for Jerusalem Paul held up to the Corinthians the example of the Macedonians. The Macedonians exhibited the ideal attributes because they first gave themselves to Christ, then gave of their means (2 Cor. 8:3-5). Jesus Christ himself provided the example of giving in that "though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor" (2 Cor. 8:9). Paul expressed confidence that the Corinthians would rise to the challenge, and he had even boasted about them to the people of Macedonia (2 Cor. 9:2).

In 2 Corinthians 10-13, commonly thought to be a letter in its own right—though the unity of the whole is currently acclaimed from a rhetorical standpoint<sup>71</sup>--Paul contrasts the ethos he prizes with that of the "super apostles" who arrived in Corinth after he left. The traits manifested by Christ were meekness and gentleness. It was by these characteristics that Paul appealed to his readers (2 Cor. 10:1)<sup>72</sup>. He argued that the attributes of the believer are different from conventional human standards. The standards for the one saved by Christ come from God in Christ and are to be adopted accordingly.

---

<sup>70</sup> The comments of Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (Anchor Bible) Garden City: Doubleday, 1984) on the rule of love, the new creation, and the ministry of reconciliation are especially helpful. (pp. 325-337).

<sup>71</sup> Most recently J. David Hester (Amador), "Re-reading 2 Corinthians: A Rhetorical Approach", *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*, eds. Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002) 276-295.

Others may judge by different standards and compare themselves with those of their own kind, but Paul looks to God for his commendation and he hopes his hearers will do likewise (2 Cor. 10:12-18). He charges that those who set up different standards than the Christ ideal have embraced a different gospel (2 Cor. 11:4). He further contends that he comes off well when compared with the “super-apostles”, for though he may not be trained in speech, he is by no means insufficient in knowledge as he demonstrated while with them (2 Cor. 11:5). Paul did not depend on the new believers to supply his needs while in Corinth, but rather upon friends who came from Macedonia (2 Cor. 11:9). He boasted of his ethos over against that of later arriving super apostles though it was foolish by Christian standards to do so. He was a Hebrew and a descendant of Abraham. He was a far better minister of Christ because of his lengthy and widely spread labors and because he had suffered in so many ways just as Christ suffered (2 Cor. 11:22-33).<sup>72</sup> Furthermore, he himself has experienced visions and revelations. But because of a thorn in the flesh he has learned to trust God and accept his own weaknesses (2 Cor. 12:7-10). He also performed signs and wonders among them (2 Cor. 12:12).

When Paul returns he hopes to find the Corinthians exhibiting the loving qualities of Christ—not quarreling, nor exhibiting jealousy, anger, selfishness, slander, gossip, conceit, disorder, impurity, sexual immorality and licentiousness (2 Cor. 12:20-21). When he arrives those who fail to measure up will be dealt with in power since Christ “was crucified in weakness, but lives by the power of God.” (2 Cor. 13:4). Paul ended the letter by charging the believers to strive for perfection and to take his appeal

---

<sup>72</sup> Mario DiCicco, *Paul's Use of Ethos, Pathos, and Logos in 2 Corinthians 10—13* (Lewiston: Mellon Biblical Press, 1995).

<sup>73</sup> John T. Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthians Correspondence* (SBLDS 99. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

seriously. They are to exhibit the qualities of agreeing with one another, living in peace, and manifesting the love and peace of God (2 Cor. 13:11). And he hopes that their lives will continue to be infused with the grace of Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit.<sup>74</sup>

It will help to look at the views of the ideal person in tabular form. Of course, such a table can be misleading. One needs to know the perspectives of each of the four. Below, however, these items are placed in terms of what seems to be the emphasis or ranking. Such may be more the case with the top ten than those on down.

<b>Aristotle</b>	<b>Cicero</b>	<b>Quintilian</b>	<b>Paul</b>
1. Wisdom	Virtue	Wisdom	Christlike
2. Virtue	Wisdom	Justice	Suffering servanthood
3. Good will	Justice	Fortitude	New life
4. Liberality	Courage	Abstinence	Spirit directed
5. Justice	Temperance	Self control	Knowing God, Script
6. Courage	Religion	Piety	Love
7. Magnanimity	Duty	Religion	Forgiveness
8. Friendliness	Gratitude	Virtue	Zeal
9. Truthfulness	Reverence	Friendship	Joy
10. Prudence	Truth	Courage	Peace
11. Gentleness	Highmindedness	Loyalty	Patience
12. Contemplative	Confidence	Simplicity	Kindness
13. Balanced	Patience	Contempt of grief	Generosity
14. Happiness	Perseverance		Faithfulness
15. Theological	Continenence		Gentleness
16.			Self control
17.			Grace
18.			Consolation
19.			Frankness
20.			Sincerity
21.			Meekness
22.			Hard working
23.			Communion

---

<sup>74</sup> For an excellent summary of Paul's "theology-anthropology" in 2 Corinthians, see J. Paul Sampley, "The Second Letter to the Corinthians", pp. 22-29.

Some of the terms that characterize the ideal traits of the rhetoricians, but not Paul are virtue, justice and courage. Some traits Paul gives emphasis to, but not the rhetoricians are Christlike, servanthood, Spirit filled, love, joy, peace, forgiveness, frankness, and meekness.<sup>75</sup> These traits for Paul are not only ideal, but the also impact the very manner in which communication proceeds.<sup>76</sup> If these are the ideal attributes of personhood, then the persuasive communicator should in turn appeal to and exhibit these traits.

## **Conclusion**

Pauline ethos can be systematized as a different genre within the larger “church or Biblical” genre. This essay is meant to be more suggestive than definitive. It is clear, however, that Pauline ethos begins with different presuppositions than those of the classical rhetoricians that in turn influence not only the content, but also procedural aspects of the ethos manifested in his letters.

---

<sup>75</sup> Abraham J. Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986) wrote (p. 15): “Yet the philosophers retained their stress on reason and reliance on the self in striving for virtue. Christians, on the other hand, stressed reliance on God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, and considered the moral life a corollary to their knowledge of God and the divine will. They therefore very seldom spoke of virtue, did not share the Greek notion of character development, and did not define happiness as their goal. The major differences between the philosophers and Christians therefore reside in the way religion was thought to be related to ethics and in the different views of human nature that they held.

<sup>76</sup> Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (Waco: Word, 1986) lx-lxi; Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth* (SBLDS, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 164-168.