ABSTRACT

Hearing Between the Lines:
The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu

Kathy Reiko Maxwell, Ph.D.

Mentor: Mikeal C. Parsons, Ph.D.

The audience, and its varying levels of participation, is a vital element for the communication of a story. The stories of Jesus Christ as told in the gospels, and of the early Church as found in Acts, rely on the audience members and their participation as do all others. In fact, without audience participation, the narrative fails. Audience-oriented criticism, while named only recently, is an ancient phenomenon as old as story telling itself.

This dissertation explores ancient rhetoricians' comments about the audience, as well as the kinds of audience participation expected and the tools used to encourage such participation. In the course of this project, it becomes clear that these tools were used in ancient pagan, Jewish, and Christian literature. Ancient rhetors and authors were quite concerned with engaging the audience—an engaged audience at the very least paid attention and in many cases helped the author create the story, making the audience more inclined toward moral formation.

Modern rhetoricians, such as Meir Sternberg and Wolfgang Iser, deal with this phenomenon under the category of literary gap theory. Long before the modern novel

and post-Enlightenment story-telling strategies, however, ancient speakers and writers left holes or gaps in their narratives, encouraging the audience to become "fellow-workers" (*Mor*. 48:14) with the speaker. Identifying ancient roots for such modern theories helps guard against anachronistic methodological missteps, while simultaneously preventing the same theories from being dismissed out of hand.

The conclusions reached by this project impact not only the way biblical scholars view the rhetorical abilities of the Evangelists, but also the way in which modern readers "hear" the biblical narrative. The responsibility of audience participation did not end with the ancient audience. The modern audience also bears the responsibility of hearing between the lines, of creating the story with the ancient author. In our particular context as the people of God reading the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, we are all the more likely to be persuaded by the argument we help complete, astonished by the pictures we help draw, and formed by the story we help create.

Hearing Between the Lines:
The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu

by

Kathy Reiko Maxwell, B.A., M.Div.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Religion

_____
W. H. Bellinger, Jr., Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

_____
Mikeal C. Parsons, Ph.D., Chairperson

_____
Sharyn E. Dowd, Ph.D.

_____
Jeffrey S. Hamilton, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
December 2007

_____
J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

*Page bearing signatures is kept on file in the Graduate School.*

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES viii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

DEDICATION x

CHAPTER

1. Introduction 1

Purpose and Significance 1

History of Research 3

The Study of Ancient Greco-Roman Rhetoric 3

Literary and Rhetorical Criticism in Biblical Studies 6

Conclusion 10

Methodology 11

Reader-Response Criticism 11

Literary Gap Theory 19

Justification for Methodologies 26

Justification for Studying Luke-Acts in Light of Hellenistic Rhetoric 27

Justification for Studying Luke-Acts in Light of Modern Literary Gap Theory 31

2. The Audience in Ancient Rhetoric 33

Ancient Authors' Perception of the Audience 33

Aristotle 35

Cicero 40

*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 41

Quintilian 43

Theon 46

*On the Sublime* 47

Ancient Perception of Audience Participation 49

Desired Results of Audience Participation 50

Tools Used to Encourage Audience Participation 58

Conclusion 92

3. Audience Participation in Pagan Hellenistic Literature 95

Examples from the Rhetoricians 96

Aristotle 96

Cicero 99

The Author of *On the Sublime* 100

Conclusion 100

Examples from Historians 101

Herodotus 101

Livy 108

Conclusion 117

Examples from Novelists 118

Chariton 118

Xenophon 123

Conclusion 126

Example of Plutarch the Biographer 127

Conclusion 141

4. Audience Participation in Hebrew and Jewish Literature 142

Examples from Hebrew and Jewish Scripture 147

Judges 148

Succession Narrative 152

Esther 159

Conclusion 168

Examples from Non-Canonical Jewish Texts 169

Judith 169

Tobit 175

*Joseph and Aseneth* 179

Conclusion 189

Conclusion 190

5. Audience Participation in New Testament Narrative 191

The Gospel According to Mark 191

Conclusion 218

The Gospel According to Matthew 219

Conclusion 231

The Gospel According to John 231

Conclusion 245

Conclusion 245

6. Audience Participation in Lucan Material 246

Lucan Introductory Material 246

The Question of Luke's Ability as a Rhetorician 246

The Question of Luke's Audience 253

Conclusion 258

The Gospel According to Luke 259

Conclusion 282

The Acts of the Apostles 283

Conclusion 312

Conclusion 313

7. Conclusion 314

8. Bibliography 322

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of the Greek Additions to Esther 167

Table 2: Deliberative Speeches in Judith 170

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

While such a list can never be complete, I wish to thank some whose influence and kindness have been particularly instrumental in the completion of this project.

First, I must acknowledge the heritage passed on to me in the diligent research by scholars represented in this dissertation. Two of these scholars I am privileged to know: I am most grateful to Dr. Mikeal Parsons and Dr. Sharyn Dowd, who with their scholarship and mentorship acted as trusted guides through the Ph.D. program. Thanks also to Dr. Charles Talbert, whose knowledge of Hellenistic literature challenged me to read further; Dr. Jeffrey Hamilton, whose lectures inspired an even greater interest in ancient history; and Dr. James Kennedy, whose seminar began my fascination with returning to the Bible as story. I am deeply indebted to many at Baylor who eased the strain of study with conversation and laughter, and to the Church at DaySpring, a sacred people of rest and renewal. Warm thanks to Dr. Doug and Becky Jackson, who acted as able, attentive proof readers—any remaining errors are mine. Thanks also to the South Texas School of Christian Studies for the time and means that assisted this project's completion.

I have been blessed by two friends, sisters to me, Bethany and Christy, who buoyed my spirit every step of this long way. Finally, my incomparable family—my brothers, Matt and Nathan, and my parents, Gary and Kay Muramoto—have formed a firm basis of faith and unflagging support. I hope I am building well on that foundation.

Above all others, I want to thank my husband, Nathan, with whom I have shared these years of educational expedition. Without your encouragement, humor, intellect, and love this project, and so many other things in life, would not have been possible.

To Mom and Dad,
through whose lives I first heard
the Greatest Story Ever Told,
and who taught me to love puzzles.

# CHAPTER ONE

## Introduction

For 2,000 years authors and orators have told the story of Jesus Christ, son of God. The story has been told in different ways and languages to different people in different times and settings. Two elements, however, have not changed. The purpose of the story has remained the same: that those who hear might know the truth about what they have been taught (Luke 1:4) and come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God so that through believing they might have life (John 20:31). The second constant aspect is the audience—always there is a listener to receive the story. Audience-oriented criticism, while named only recently, is an ancient phenomenon as old as story telling itself. The study of these listeners and the ways that story tellers have tried to reach them throughout the centuries are the focus of this dissertation.

Remarkably, at times authors use silence to speak to their audience. A gap, an unexpected hole in the presentation, impels the audience to do more than merely receive the story. If not provided in the narrative, the missing information must come from elsewhere. The silence of intentional gaps invites the audience to speak, to engage the unfolding rhetoric, and to become part of the story themselves.

### *Purpose and Significance*

In this dissertation I propose that narrative gaps in Luke and Acts are examples of an ancient, intentional, sophisticated rhetorical tool intended to encourage audience participation in the narrative. I will seek evidence from ancient handbooks and literature

to confirm or refute this thesis. The degree of involvement varies by audience member. Some members benefit from a higher level of education; some members pay closer attention. Regardless of the level of involvement, I propose that ancient writers shaped rhetoric in ways that capitalized on the expectation of audience participation.

Authors encourage audience participation by leaving gaps in narratives. Narrative gaps appear in various texts[1] and in various forms. Rhetorical elements may be omitted, allusions to other texts or events may be incomplete, and solutions to puzzles may be left unwritten.[2] I intend to demonstrate that the practice of intentionally creating gaps to encourage audience participation is ancient, at the same time vindicating ancient authors sometimes faulted for poor structure and execution.

Rhetoricians, biblical and non-biblical, have studied gaps left in narratives and the nature of ancient audiences. By setting these considerations together as a backdrop for this study, I hope to contribute to related conversations already begun and highlight the role of the ancient audience of Luke and Acts.

I will first search for evidence that rhetors recognized the usefulness of narrative gaps as a means to audience participation.[3] After gathering and categorizing this

---

[1]See Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 165-169; and Emil Towner, "Beneath the Tip of the Iceberg: A Semiotic and Rhetorical Examination of Textual Gaps" (M.A. thesis, St. Cloud State University, 2004).

[2]Towner, "Beneath the Tip of the Iceberg," 40-51.

[3]Included are the progymnasmata of Theon (*The Exercises of Aelius Theon*), Hermogenes (*The* Preliminary Exercises *Attributed to Hermogenes*), and Nicolaus (*The Preliminary Exercises of Nicolaus the Sophist*) all contained in *Progymnasmata Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (trans. George A. Kennedy; Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003); and works by Aristotle, (*Rhetorica* [trans. John Henry Freese; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939]; and *Poetica* [trans. W. Hamilton Fyfe; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973]); Cicero (*De Oratore* [trans. H. Rackham; 3 vols. LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942]); Pseudo-Cicero (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* [trans. Harry Caplan; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999]); Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria* [trans. H. E. Butler; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995]); Demetrius (*On Style* [trans. W. Rhys Roberts; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973]); Isocrates ("To Philip" in *Isocrates* [ed. and trans. George Norlin; 3 vols. LCL; Cambridge: Harvard

evidence, I will move from theory to practice by seeking examples of this phenomenon in ancient pagan, Jewish, and early Christian material. Finally, I will attempt to locate examples from the narratives of Luke and Acts, demonstrating that this author used narrative gaps to encourage audience participation as well. I hope to add to a growing body of evidence that suggests that the audience, lamented by Robert Fowler as being sorely underrepresented, is in fact a vital component in the communication of the biblical text.[4] Far from being a passive recipient, the audience is "a participant in the discourse and a fellow-worker with the speaker" (*Mor*. 48:14). The responsibility of filling gaps to form a coherent whole draws the audience to participate in the narrative.

## *History of Research*

To set the background for this project, we must consider the history of research in two major areas of study: the study of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric and literary and rhetorical criticism in biblical studies.

### *The Study of Ancient Greco-Roman Rhetoric*

The art of rhetoric has been discussed for millennia. Primary sources for this topic include the rhetorical handbooks of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintillian, and other rhetoricians, such as pseudo-Cicero's *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; and the rhetorical school books referred to collectively as the *progymnasmata*.

The rhetorical handbooks contain instructions on how to build appropriate and persuasive works of rhetoric by using appropriate and persuasive rhetorical units as

---

University Press, 1966-1968]); and Plutarch (*Moralia* [trans. Frank Cole Babbitt; 16 vols. LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969]).

[4]Robert Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 9.

building blocks. Eventually, these rhetorical building blocks can become interchangeable with the whole: whole rhetorical pieces can be made up of rhetorical units, which in turn may be made up of entire, although smaller, rhetorical pieces. Demetrius, while discussing the construction of "members" or clauses in a sentence, points out that

> sometimes . . . the member constitutes not a complete thought, but a part of it, yet a complete part. For just as the arm, which is a whole of a certain kind, has parts such as fingers and forearm which themselves again are wholes, inasmuch as each of them has its own limits and its own parts; so also a complete thought, when it is extensive, may very well comprise within itself parts which themselves are integral (*Eloc*. i.2).

General experience with ancient rhetoric also indicates that this is so. An entire narrative may be proof of a claim, but may include declamations, fables, and smaller narratives, each of which may include smaller versions of the same elements.

For instance, larger narratives may include speeches, as in the case of Acts. Those speeches, however, often include smaller narratives, as does Stephen's speech to his accusers (Acts 7). *Rhet. Her.* alludes to this possibility by indicating that both the entire speech and the parts of the speech should be arranged according to the guidelines of the handbooks—the task of arrangement, the author teaches, is twofold (*Rhet. Her.* 3.9.17). When referring to the figure of Dwelling on the Point, ps-Cicero says that in addition to being a single rhetorical unit, this figure pervades the entire rhetorical piece, just like "blood is spread through the whole body of the discourse" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.45.38). Quintilian writes that in forensic speeches, the "duty of the defence consists wholly in refutation" (*Inst.* 5.13.1). Refutation, then, is a *part* of a forensic speech and is the duty

of the same speech *in its entirety*. Theon provides further evidence in his section on narrative when he comments that "it is possible to weave narration into narration."[5]

Acts provides an example of this principle as well. The whole of Acts is encomiastic:[6] the book presents an encomium on Jesus as the Christ, the apostles, and the Christian church. Acts also includes smaller encomiums that serve various purposes in the narrative.[7] The fifth-century Sophist Nicolaus refers to encomium as progymnasmata that "are parts and wholes."[8]

From this evidence we see that rhetorical elements may fulfill a variety of purposes. These practical and more advanced possibilities are not explicit in the handbooks, but that is not surprising. The exercises described in the handbooks do not tell the whole story. For instance, Theon wrote that encomiums should not be written as narratives. Evidence from extant texts, however, shows that encomiums were in fact often written as narratives.[9] Interweaving elements requires more skill than simply

---

[5]Theon, *Exercises*, 4.92 [Kennedy, 39]. For ease of reference to Kennedy's translation, citations from Theon will include Spengel's paragraph numbering, followed by the Kennedy page number in brackets.

[6]With this statement, I am not claiming that Acts *is* an encomium; Acts is more than an encomium. I am simply saying that Acts exhibits encomiastic qualities. The question of genre is not addressed directly in this study, because I believe that this discussion can occur regardless of disagreements over the genre of Acts. Thomas Philips' recent article surveying the genre options for the Book of Acts concludes that "Acts is ancient history of various kinds and the mixture of genres within Acts [biography, novel, epic, etc.] makes further narrowing of the categories unwarranted" ("The Genre of Acts: Moving Toward a Consensus?," *Currents in Biblical Research* 4 (2006): 384-385). On this basis we will consider several different types of ancient literature based on the similarities their genres share with the New Testament gospels and the Book of Acts.

[7]See for example Acts 1:1-5, Stephen's speech in Acts 7, and the encomium of Jesus in Acts 13:26ff.

[8]Nicolaus, *Preliminary Exercises*, 8.48 [Kennedy, 155]. Although Nicolaus writes significantly later than Luke, we recognize again with Quintilian that the rhetorical practices described in the handbooks are compilations of methods already in practice (*Inst.*, 5.10.120).

[9]See for example Plutarch, *Lives* (trans. Bernadotte Perrin; 11 vols.; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967-1975).

creating the elements one by one. Developing more complex arrangements of the elements may be seen as a natural progression for the advanced student of rhetoric. Therefore, though not mentioned specifically in the handbooks, implication and experience indicate that rhetorical elements may be the whole of parts or parts of a whole. This point will be important as the discussion continues.

The *progymnasmata* are preliminary exercises used by schoolmasters training their charges. Education in the Hellenistic world began with a study of grammar, language, and literature. After completing this "elementary" level of education, students who were able (both intellectually and financially) and willing continued with the study of rhetoric. These preliminary exercises led students toward the goal of composing persuasive speeches.[10]

Extant progymnasmata include exercises by Theon (1st century CE), Hermogenes of Tarsus (2nd century CE), Aphthonius of Antioch (4th century CE), and Nicolaus of Myra (5th century CE).[11] This project is primarily concerned with Theon's progymnasmata since it is the most contemporary with the biblical material. Progymnasmatic guidelines will come into play later in the project.

*Literary and Rhetorical Criticism in Biblical Studies*

Literary-critical analyses are not new to scholars, and the application to biblical texts has grown steadily. Joseph Tyson notes that "literary-critical studies of the New

---

[10]Martin Lowther Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* (London: Cohen & West, 1953), 7.

[11]Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, xii.

Testament have burgeoned in recent years, and critics have produced a library of books from which we can learn a great deal."[12]

Until the mid-20th century, the traditional method of biblical criticism was generally assumed to be historical criticism,[13] and the shift toward literary methodologies is significant in that they do not focus on purely historical matters. Many biblical literary critics emphasize, however, that the previous methodologies should not be rejected, and changes in the critical current have not left historical matters behind. Instead, newer literary methodologies tend to build upon their predecessors. Fowler perceives "that the results of source, form, and especially, redaction criticism impel one to move on to literary criticism."[14]

Norman Perrin clarifies that he is urging not an abandonment of the "time honored and proven methods" of biblical criticism, but that "we add to these things the insight and concerns which stem naturally from the realization that the evangelists are authors."[15] Literary critic Bas van Iersel asserts that approaching biblical texts as historical texts "values a literary work as a historical source and so does not read it in the

---

[12]Joseph B. Tyson, "From History to Rhetoric and Back: Assessing New Trends in Acts Studies" in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (SBLSymS 20; eds. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 30.

[13]Tyson, "From History to Rhetoric and Back," 23.

[14]Robert Fowler, "Using Literary Criticism on the Gospels," *ChrCent* 99 (1982): 628. Fowler's article contains a helpful history of biblical criticism, tracing the discipline from historical to more literary-based methodologies.

[15]Norman Perrin, "The Evangelist as Author: Reflections on Method in the Study and Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts," *BR* 17 (1972): 10. Cf. Stephen Moore who writes that in biblical studies "each new [critical] stage has tended less to displace the previous one than simply to be superimposed on it" (Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1989), 73).

way it is meant to be read."[16] Simply said, "if we wish to understand what the Gospels say, we should study how stories are told."[17]

Not only are biblical literary critics focusing more on the authorial role undertaken by the evangelists, but they have also begun to study the rhetorical structure of the authors' works and the characteristics of the works' audience. The study of the authorial role of the evangelist, the rhetorical nature of the texts, and the context of the first audience is key to literary methodologies because all stories

> possess specific formal structures that will determine, in part, a given reader's response; likewise, every reader has a set of preconceived notions about aesthetics, culture, and gender that will determine how the formal structure of a text is read and comes to evoke particular kinds of meaning.[18]

Perrin outlined the issues to which literary critics of the gospels and Acts should attend, including text, source, historical, form, and redaction criticism. He added to these traditional methodologies a concern for structure of the work, the protagonists and plot, and the themes that surface as the work unfolds.[19] To Perrin's list, I would add consideration of the audience.

Literary criticism, even when limited to the scope of biblical texts, is a multivalent label that includes many methodologies. In general, the literary critic

---

[16]Bas M.F. van Iersel, *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary* (trans. W.H. Bisscheroux; JSNTSup 164; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 15.

[17]Fowler, "Using Literary Criticism," 629.

[18]Todd F. Davis and Kenneth Womack, *Formalist Criticism and Reader-Response Theory* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 156.

[19]Perrin, "Evangelist as Author," 11-17.

examines the permanent values of a text without taking into account historical circumstance or context and so "speaks as the spectator of all time and all existence."[20]

For this study, however, we will focus in on a particular type of literary criticism: rhetorical criticism. A basic search for "rhetoric" and "Bible" in the ATLA database returns only 28 hits before 1976, compared to 1136 hits for the years 1976-2005.[21] While the idea that the biblical text is rhetorical, in other words, a persuasive text,[22] is not a

---

[20]Herbert A. Wichelns, "Some Differences between Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Criticism" in *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians* (ed. Raymond F. Howes; Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1961), 221.

[21]See Duane F. Watson's bibliography: "The New Testament and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: A Bibliographical Update," *JETS* 33 (1990): 513-524. Since 1990, cf. Jan P. Fokkelman, L. J. de Regt, and Jan de Waard eds., *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible* (Winona Lake, In.: Eisenbrauns, 1996); Craig Evans, "'Speeches' in Luke-Acts" in *Melanges Bibliques en homage au R. P. Beda Rigaux* (ed. Albert Descamps and R. P. Andre de Halleux; Gembloux: Duculot, 1970); Danna Fewell and David M. Gunn, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 1993); Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty: A Story of Stories in Daniel 1-6* (Sheffield, Eng.: Almond, 1988); Fewell, *Reading between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992); Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (JSNTSupS 109; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994); Dale Patrick, *The Rhetoric of Revelation in the Hebrew Bible* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999); Dale Patrick and Allen Scult, *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation* (Bible and Literature 26; JSOTSup 82; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990); Todd Penner, "Civilizing Discourse: Acts, Declamation, and the Rhetoric of the *Polis*" in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (SBLSymS 20; ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003); Stanley Porter and Dennis L. Stamps, *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Martin Warner, *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility* (London: Routledge, 1990); Duane Watson, "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders (Acts 20.17-38): Epideictic Rhetoric of Farewell" in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy* (ed. Duane F. Watson; JSNTSupS 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); Bruce Winter "The Importance of the *captatio benevolentiae* in the Speeches of Tertullus and Paul in Luke-Acts 24:1-21," *JTS* 42 (1991): 505-531; and Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, eds., *The Book of Luke-Acts in its First Century Setting* (2 vols; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993). A search of Dissertation Abstracts revealed that while several recent dissertations apply ancient rhetorical conventions to the biblical text, none address the presence of blanks or gaps in biblical rhetoric.

[22]Kennedy defines rhetoric as "that quality in discourse by which a speaker or writer seeks to accomplish his purpose. Choice and arrangement of words are one of the techniques employed, but what is known in rhetorical theory as 'invention'—the treatment of the subject matter, the use of evidence, the argumentation, and the control of emotion—is often of greater importance and is central to rhetorical theory as understood by Greeks and Romans" (George Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 3). Cf. Clifton Black who notes that "rhetorical criticism reckons seriously with the fact that many, if not most, of these documents [biblical and intertestamental literature] were addressed not just to the eye but to the ear, and all

recent one, it is a relatively new phenomenon for biblical exegetes to apply rhetorical criticism methodologically.[23]

Rhetorical critics consider the historical period of the text, as well as the situation of the author and audience.[24] Turning our attention to these aspects acknowledges the nature of the material: "the writer of rhetorical discourse has his eye upon the audience and occasion; his task is persuasion; his form and style are organic with the occasion."[25] George Kennedy distinguishes between the broader field of literary criticism and the more specialized rhetorical criticism. Literary criticism studies biblical texts as they are understood by the modern audience. Rhetorical criticism seeks to understand the literature as it would have been understood by Hellenists in the first century.[26]

*Conclusion*

We have briefly considered the history of research in two areas that are tangentially related: the study of ancient rhetoric, and literary and rhetorical criticism in biblical studies. In this project, I will bring these areas of study together in an attempt to answer two questions. Did the ancient rhetor consider his audience? Did he use an intentional, sophisticated rhetorical method to encourage audience participation in the narrative? The following section addresses methodologies of reader-response theory,

---

were written with the intent to persuade" ("The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Response to Lawrence Wills," *HTR* 81 (1988): 17).

[23]Wilhelm Weullner, "Biblical Exegesis in the Light of the History and Historicity of Rhetoric and the Nature of the Rhetoric of Religion" in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (JSNTSup 90; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 495.

[24]Wichelns, "Some Differences," 221.

[25]Hoyt H. Hudson, "The Field of Rhetoric" in *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians* (ed. Raymond F. Howes; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961), 6.

[26]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 3.

applications of this theory to the authorial audience, and literary gap theory, all of which will be useful as this project seeks to uncover, or perhaps simply rediscover, ancient methods of encouraging audience participation.

## *Methodology*

Methodologically speaking, the reader or audience was an "observer in the wings or at best a minor participant" in literary studies until the 1960s and 1970s.[27] Since that time, however, a growing amount of attention has been focused on the receiver of the text's message. The three methodologies addressed in this section fall into this category.

### *Reader-Response Criticism*[28]

The field of reader-response criticism is dauntingly broad, including, as educator Richard Beach indicates, "critics who privilege the influence of the text on readers' responses" to those who "have come very close to insisting that the text is no more than an inkblot, whose meaning is created entirely by the reader" to those who "more recently . . . have argued that to focus exclusively on the reader/text transaction is to ignore the crucial influence of social, cultural, or situational contexts on the nature of this transaction."[29] This project is aligned most closely with the third group of reader-response critics.

---

[27]Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels*, 71.

[28]Incidentally, David Jeffrey traces the origin of reader-response criticism to the 14th century work of John Wyclif who introduced in his work the "pervasive notion that the 'text' is not between the covers of a book (*in libro*) but in Christ (*in Christo*). For the pursuit of responsible reading, Wyclif suggests that present text can only be brought into being with the active response of the reader" (David L. Jeffrey, "John Wyclif and the Hermeneutic of Reader-Response," *Int* 39 [1985]: 287).

[29]Richard Beach, *A Teacher's Introduction to Reader-Response Theories* (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1993), 2.

Reader-response criticism approaches the text synchronically; it "concentrates on the text as it now presents itself in written form and as a complex whole of text signals."[30] More specifically, this methodology "focuses on the act of reading and on the activity of readers as they read"[31] the text in its entirety, as opposed to other methodologies that focus mainly on the author or the text. As varied as reader-response critics may be, the core concern that links them under this moniker is consideration of the reader.[32] That said, Randolph Tate notes that responsible reader-response critics continue to "recognize the importance of the world behind the text, as well as the text itself."[33] The primary focus of such critics rests upon the reader, but they also "generally make extensive use of a range of background information, information that produces a more informed reading of the text."[34]

Reader-response critics assume that the reader is active. What the text says or shows is of less interest, wrote James Resseguie, than the interaction that occurs between reader and text.[35] All readers contribute to the texts they read: reading is a dialogical exercise, "even when the communication is taking place by means of a written text and

---

[30]Iersel, *Mark*, 17.

[31]Michael Cahill, "Reader-Response Criticism and the Allegorizing Reader," *TS* 57 (1996): 91.

[32]Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Whirl without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism" in *Contemporary Literary Theory* (ed. G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow; Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 82.

[33]William Randolph Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside: Eco and Iser Leave Their Marks* (San Francisco: International Scholars Publications, 1994), 14.

[34]Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside*, 7.

[35]James L. Resseguie, "Reader-Response Criticism and the Synoptic Gospels" *JAAR* 52/2 (1984): 307.

therefore seems to be completely one-sided."[36] Tate notes that "the basic presumption in Reader-response theory is that no work of art or act of communication is complete in and of itself. Without being received, responded to, and interpreted, a work lacks meaning."[37] Wolfgang Iser calls this cooperation between reader and text the "virtual dimension of the text which endows it with its reality . . . . it is the coming together of text and imagination."[38] As Iser's mention of imagination implies, reader-response critics view reading as a creative act: "as a reader engages the text and attempts to make sense of it, the individual enters into an exchange with the author, the author's world and the text itself."[39]

Gerald Prince delineates the levels of reader contribution: "first, and very generally speaking, [the reader] must be capable of perceiving visually presented symbols; he must have the capacity to store information, retrieve it and modify it as necessary; and he must possess the competence to make inferences and deductions."[40] The reader or audience of a piece of literature must "do part of the work of the text . . . . The reader participates in the text by putting it together."[41] At times, the reader must do even more. Some instances require the reader to contribute by "supply[ing] the portions

---

[36]Robert Fowler, "Who is 'The Reader' in Reader Response Criticism?" *Semeia* 31 (1985): 20.

[37]Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside*, 14. Elsewhere Tate remarks, "without an author, there is not a text; without a reader, a text does not communicate" (William Randolph Tate, *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach* (rev. ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 157-158).

[38]Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 279.

[39]Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside*, 15.

[40]Gerald Prince, *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative* (Janua Linguarum Series Maior 108; New York: Mouton Publishers, 1982), 131.

[41]Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside*, 15.

which are not written but are implied."[42] This type of contribution will be discussed in the section on literary gap theory.

While the reader actively contributes to the reading experience, classicist Niall Slater clarified that readers do not create something entirely new.[43] Multiple valid interpretations may exist, in the opinion of reader-response critics, but all valid interpretations "must be those allowed by the text as a cooperative event between text and reader."[44] Readers re-create an understanding of the text "along lines which are more or less clearly determined by the author's use of a particular medium in a particular historical context, and which are susceptible to rational definition."[45] Umberto Eco illustrates the point that a reader cannot simply interpret anything he or she wishes:

> [i]f Jack the Ripper told us that he did what he did on the ground of his interpretation of the Gospel according to Saint Luke, I suspect that many reader-oriented critics would be inclined to think that he read Saint Luke in a pretty preposterous way.[46]

Eco dryly remarks that not "every act of interpretation can have a happy end."[47] Legitimate or illegitimate interpretations, Eco wrote elsewhere, may often be determined by comparing the interpretation to the text as a whole.[48]

---

[42]Resseguie, "Reader-Response Criticism," 308.

[43]Niall W. Slater, *Reading Petronius* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 14-15.

[44]Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside*, 44.

[45]Tony Woodman and Jonathan Powell, *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 215.

[46]Umberto Eco, "Interpretation and History" in *Interpretation and Overinterpretation* (ed. Stefan Collini; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 24.

[47]Eco, "Interpretation," 24.

[48]Umberto Eco, *The Limits of Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 149.

Reader-response critics have drawn attention to the temporality of texts and the dynamic experience such temporality affords[49] by shifting away from the understanding of the text as an "object" to an "engagement with literature as an experience or activity."[50] Dorit Naaman's work in audience responses to film has led to the conclusion that "a narrative is constructed as perception occurs."[51] We have been taught to think of a reader gaining understanding once a text has been read in its entirety, and that the text can be experienced only after the reader is finished with the book. This perception is strengthened by the static nature of fixed words on the pages of a book that sits on a shelf. When reading biblical texts in particular, Fowler argues in favor of a "temporal model of reading, rather than a spatial one" so that we can return "to an understanding of language that has affinities with the language of oral culture."[52] Stephen Moore concurs:

> In reconceptualizing the gospel text as event rather than object, reader-oriented exegetes have latched onto something crucial . . . . They show us a time-bound exegetical method that is more adequate to the oral-aural situations that would have formed the original noetic and hermeneutic horizon of the Gospels.[53]

Reader-response criticism provides us with evidence that the reader is active, even creative, when receiving text. When we read, "we look forward, we look back, we decide, we change our decisions, we form expectations, we are shocked by their

---

[49]Fowler, "Who is 'The Reader'," 19.

[50]Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Whirl without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism" in *Comtemporary Literary Theory* (ed. G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow; Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 89.

[51]Dorit Naaman, "Minding the Gap: Visual Perception and Cinematic Gap Filling," *Style* 36 (2002): 132.

[52]Fowler, "Who is 'The Reader'," 19-20.

[53]Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels*, 88.

nonfulfillment, we question, we muse, we accept, we reject; this is the dynamic process of reading."[54]

*Focus on the authorial audience*. Stanley Porter described the term audience as "a floating, perhaps an empty signifier."[55] References to "audience" may point to the original audience, a modern audience, an audience within a text, or the audience imagined by the author, just to mention a few of the many possibilities.[56] For this project, we will focus our concern on the authorial audience. Peter Rabinowitz's theory provides our definition of the authorial audience: the author's hypothetical audience, the audience imagined by the author as those who would experience the text.[57] The subject of Rabinowitz's work is modern literature and modern readers, and so he equated the authorial audience with the "flesh-and-blood people who read the book."[58] As we deal with the texts of Luke and Acts, however, we will equate the authorial audience with the flesh-and-blood people who heard the narrative told.

Recovering details about the authorial audience is difficult for those studying modern readers and texts;[59] the task faced by biblical critics is compounded by the distance of both time and culture. Charles Talbert's observation that a text's structure

---

[54]Wolfgang Iser, "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach" *New Literary History* 3 (1972): 293.

[55]James E. Porter, *Audience and Rhetoric: An Archaeological Composition of the Discourse Community* (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1992), x.

[56]For other possible meanings categorized as hypothetical and real readers, see Rabinowitz, "Whirl without End," in which Rabinowitz surveys the multivalent terrain of developing audience criticism.

[57]Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences" in *Narrative Theory* (ed. David H. Richter; White Plains, N.Y.: Longman Publishers, 1996), 126.

[58]Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction," 126.

[59]Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction," 126, note 13.

emerges from specific social and cultural contexts,[60] however, has spurred biblical critics on in the face of this difficult task. Those pursuing the authorial audience have seen the lines blur between the disciplines of literary criticism and history, sociology, anthropology, and psychology.[61]

One aspect of the authorial audience that begins to ease this difficulty, at least in the way we shall study this audience, is that the audience in question is a composite audience, not an individual. The authorial audience of Luke and Acts is an abstraction, of course, but one that is reconstructed based on knowledge of first-century culture, especially rhetoric and education. Eco believes that the author expects a literary piece to be interpreted by a composite audience: "when a text is produced not for a single addressee but for a community of readers—the author knows that he or she will be interpreted not according to his or her intentions but according to a complex strategy of interactions."[62]

The authorial audience uses tools inherent to its identity in order to interpret texts: a network of social knowledge shared by the author and the authorial audience. Eco referred to the act of reading as a transaction between the reader and his or her world knowledge and the world knowledge contained in the text.[63] Literary critic Terry Engleton emphasizes the importance of understanding this network of social knowledge

---

[60]Charles H. Talbert, "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke," *Int* 30 (1976): 395.

[61]Rabinowitz, "Whirl without End," 85.

[62]Umberto Eco, "Between Author and Text" in *Interpretation and Overinterpretation* (ed. Stefan Collini; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 67.

[63]Eco, "Between Author and Text," 68.

and the rhetorical and literary context of the authorial audience: "we have to rely . . . upon certain social codes and contexts to understand [the text] properly."[64]

In chapter six we will survey scholars' attempts to become more familiar with Luke's audience's network of social knowledge, especially as it involves rhetorical understanding and abilities. The construct of the authorial audience is incomplete, as it always will be. Built, however, as it is from the growing body of available evidence from the ancient world, we will use the construct as a basis for our discussion of Luke's authorial audience as an active participant in the narratives of Luke and Acts.

Although our main focus will remain on the receiver of the narrative, we also briefly consider the effect that knowledge of the authorial audience had upon the author. By writing a narrative, the author invites the audience to "join him in contemplating it and evaluating it, and responding to it. His point is to produce in his hearers not only belief but also an imaginative and affective involvement in the state of affairs he is representing and an evaluative stance toward it."[65] The text and the reader will engage in dialogue, in a creative activity, and Tate believes that a good author understands the dialogical nature of communicating a story.[66] The author responds to this knowledge, then, by leaving clues in the narrative for the audience to retrieve. The audience responds to "various markers and signals in the text, discovers patterns, supplies what is felt to be missing, constructs plot, character and the like, and relates the world of the text to other

---

[64]Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), 78.

[65]Mary Louise Pratt, *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1977), 136.

[66]Tate, *Biblical Interpretation*, 160.

known or imagined worlds."[67] This response by the audience, particularly the response of supplying "what is felt to be missing," is addressed in the following section on literary gap theory.

*Literary Gap Theory*

Our final methodological discussion concerns literary gap theory. Emil Towner broadly defines a literary gap as "any place in a text where information is not explicitly stated."[68] Meir Sternberg observes that "from the viewpoint of what is directly given in the language, the literary work consists of bits and fragments to be linked and pieced together in the process of reading: it establishes a system of gaps that must be filled in."[69] All narratives contain gaps; no author can include all details of description or action. Not only is this system of gaps unavoidable, but authors find at least some gaps beneficial. William Kurz points out that "excessive detail . . . is boring . . . . [I]maginatively filling narrative gaps provides much interest for readers."[70] Ernest Hemingway writes that

> if a writer of prose knows enough about what he is writing about he may omit things that he knows and the reader, if the writer is writing truly enough, will have a feeling of those things as strongly as though the writer had stated them. The dignity of movement of an ice-berg is due to only one-eighth of it being above water.[71]

---

[67]Robert W. Funk, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1988), 36.

[68]Towner, *Tip of the Iceberg*, 35.

[69]Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 186.

[70]William S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 18.

[71]Ernest Hemingway, *Death in the Afternoon* (New York: P.F. Collier & Son Corporation, 1932), 192.

In addition to the interest gaps inspire in readers, carefully constructed gaps point to authorial competence.

In 1931, Roman Ingarden recognized that texts contained "places of indeterminacy" that needed to be concretized correctly by the reader.[72] Ingarden's theory, however, assumed that only one way to concretize narrative indeterminacies existed: the way of the author.[73] Later literary critics working with indeterminacies or gaps give readers more freedom to fill gaps in ways that are, while guided by the text and the information it contains, unique to the individual reader.[74]

Gaps are not all alike: they may be intentional or unintentional, necessary (a gap that must be filled to make the story cohere) or implied (a gap that is not essential to the coherence of the story[75]), but each requires filling.[76] Some gaps may be temporary—the information needed to fill the gaps is supplied later in the narrative; some gaps are permanent—no answer is ever provided by the narrative.[77] Also, not all gaps require the same amount of effort to fill. Towner points out that "some gaps may be understood quite easily without the reader consciously identifying or attempting to close them. In

---

[72]Roman Ingarden, *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art* (trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olsen; Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1973), especially 50-63. These indeterminacies, Ingarden pointed out, are not evidence of faulty composition, but rather are necessary parts of literature. Everything cannot be written (Ingarden, *Cognition*, 51).

[73]Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, 81.

[74]See for example, Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, Iser, *Act of Reading*, Rabinowitz, "Whirl Without End," Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, and Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside*.

[75]Naaman, "Minding the Gap," 135.

[76]Towner, *Tip of the Iceberg*, 35-37.

[77]Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 237-240.

contrast, other gaps may cause a moment of confusion when readers come across them."[78]

Leona Toker has classified four ways that information can be withheld to create a gap.[79] Two of these methods, diffusion of information and temporary suspension of information, are particularly useful for our discussion of literary gaps in Luke and Acts. Toker writes that diffusion of information occurs when "a great number of separate pieces of information are suppressed, thus creating numerous small gaps."[80] These small gaps can be processed together, according to Towner, to create "a series of implicit, although choppy, facts that reveal the meaning and significance of a text over time."[81] The second method of interest, temporary suspension of information, occurs when "a crucially important separate piece of information is first suppressed and later analeptically revealed."[82] The analeptic or invigorating nature of the missing piece's revelation is a tool that keeps audiences engaged. When the audience discovers the formerly suppressed piece of information and successfully fits it into the remembered narrative gap, the dormant storyteller nature of the audience is awakened.

---

[78]Towner, *Tip of the Iceberg*, 30. Cf. Ingarden, *Cognition*, who writes that "we overlook the places of indeterminacy [gaps] as such and involuntarily fill many of them out with determinacies which are not justified by the text. Thus in our reading we go beyond the text in various points without being clearly aware of it" (52).

[79]The four methods of suppressing narrative information are chronological displacement, diffusion of information, temporary suspension of information, and permanent suspension of information. See Leona Toker, *Eloquent Reticence: Withholding Information in Fictional Narrative* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1993) for full discussion.

[80]Toker, *Eloquent Reticence*, 15.

[81]Towner, *Tip of the Iceberg*, 38.

[82]Toker, *Eloquent Reticence*, 15.

*The benefit of literary gaps*. Iser assigned great significance to gaps in literature: the gaps between modern texts and readers are the grounds upon which the text communicates with the reader.[83] Delineation between text and reader was once an easy task, remembers Robert Detweiler, but now "we tend to think that texts must be more than an organized accumulation of words on a page, that they must consist of an interaction of printed words, reader, and context."[84] The interaction forced by gaps, at its most basic level, retains the audience's attention. Iser writes that "no author worth his salt will ever attempt to set the *whole* picture before his reader's eyes. If he does, he will very quickly lose his reader."[85] But when the audience commits to interacting with the words and movements of the narrative, the result is "a more personalized, engaging, and believable text."[86] The presence of gaps creates the desire to fill the gaps; according to Iser, in fact, the audience cannot help but attempt to supply the missing information.[87]

Motivation to fill narrative gaps is crucial to complete comprehension of the text.[88] When the audience fills the gaps, "the unsaid comes to life in the reader's imagination, [and] so the said 'expands' to take on greater significance than might have been supposed."[89] Art critics have also explored the significance of gaps or indeterminacies. Mary Stewart comments that "when a viewer completes the image in

---

[83]Iser, *Act of Reading*, 165-169.

[84]Robert Detweiler, "What is a Sacred Text?," *Semeia* 31 (1985): 226.

[85]Iser, *Implied Reader*, 282.

[86]Towner, *Tip of the Iceberg*, 1.

[87]Iser, *Act of Reading*, 186.

[88]Towner, *Tip of the Iceberg*, 8.

[89]Iser, *Act of Reading*, 168.

his or her mind, it is often more memorable than a more explicit image."[90] Likewise in a narrative, gaps cause the audience to "participate both in the production and the comprehension of the work's intention."[91] In his work on the gospel of Mark, Tate observed that narrative gaps are responsible for the dialogue between the story and the audience.[92] Iser identifies the inclusion of gaps in the narrative as an essential element for its purpose: "it is only by activating the reader's imagination [accomplished by leaving gaps to be filled] that the author can hope to involve him and so realize the intentions of his text."[93]

The reader experiences the text by filling textual gaps and by adjusting his or her point of view as the text unfolds. Iser's theory of literary gaps requires action by the reader: "what is concealed spurs the reader into action, but this action is also controlled by what is revealed; the explicit in its turn is transformed when the implicit has been brought to light."[94]

*Information used to fill gaps*. The audience fills gaps in different ways, but Sternberg lists five kinds of information that should be considered in all responsible gap-filling.[95] Two categories refer to the basic structure of the narrative: the work's language and poetics and the work's genre. An additional two categories concern material

---

[90]Mary Stewart, *Launching the Imagination* (New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2002), 3.6.

[91]Iser, *Act of Reading*, 24.

[92]Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside*, 86.

[93]Iser, *Implied Reader*, 282.

[94]Iser, *Act of Reading*, 169.

[95]This list is taken from Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 189.

contained within the work: different materials explicitly communicated by the text and "the special nature and laws and regularities of the world [the text] projects, as impressed on the reader starting from the first page." The final category is derived from the reader's context: "basic assumptions or general canons of probabilities derived from 'everyday life' and prevalent cultural conventions." Using these categories of information, the audience is "actively involved in reviewing what has preceded and speculating about what lies ahead."[96] Naaman identifies the process of gap-filling with abductive reasoning:

> the perceiver of a text, upon encountering a narratorial gap, is required to devise a strategy by which to fill the gap and make the text cohere. Such a strategy generally involves coming up with hypotheses as to what is likely to have happened.[97]

When an audience encounters a gap, its imagination is activated, and it begins to search for information that will fill the gap. The reader will "consciously evaluate what has been stated, what clues have been revealed, and how those clues help to close the gap."[98] Literary critic Michael Riffaterre emphasizes the constant nature of the audience's gap-filling task: "as he progresses through the text, the reader remembers what he has just read and modifies his understanding of it in the light of what he is now decoding. As he works from start to finish, he is reviewing, revising, comparing backwards."[99] Riffaterre is referring specifically to the second reading of a poem, but his

---

[96]Fowler, Who is 'The Reader'," 20.

[97]Naaman, "Minding the Gap," 132.

[98]Towner, *Tip of the Iceberg*, 30. Towner goes on to say that "the larger the gap, the more open the text is to the reader—which leads to both a higher risk of confusion *and* (oddly enough) a greater opportunity for engagement and enjoyment" (Towner, *Tip of the Iceberg*, 40, emphasis original).

[99]Michael Riffaterre, *Semiotics of Poetry* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 5-6.

comment applies also to an audience's first hearing, especially if we accept reader-response critics' attention to (even first) reading as a temporal exercise.

If information for filling gaps is not found within the narrative, the audience turns to its wider cultural context.[100] The audience may draw upon its long-term memory to supply knowledge of the world,[101] which may include knowledge of other literary works and its society's mythologies,[102] as well as social norms and rhetorical conventions.[103] Detweiler likened the filling of gaps to what occurs when one sees a human when only a stick figure is drawn.[104]

*Proposing ancient roots for literary gaps*. The impetus behind the technique of leaving narrative gaps is quite ancient. The Greco-Roman handbooks do not directly address leaving rhetorical gaps for the purpose of involving the audience, but they are concerned with gaps and the audience. Evidence from the handbooks and other ancient rhetoricians[105] infer such a purpose for missing rhetorical elements. Demetrius refers to the advice of Theophrastus, a third-century BCE rhetorician who, in his lost work Περὶ Λέξεως, recommends that

---

[100]I do not mean to imply a chronological necessity here—that the audience consistently first searches for clues within the narrative and only then searches for clues within its cultural context. The audience's imagination may very well search both indexes simultaneously.

[101]Naaman, "Minding the Gap," 137. Cf. the network of social knowledge referred to by Eco ("Between Author and Text," 68).

[102]Riffaterre, *Semiotics*, 5.

[103]Prince, *Narratology*, 37.

[104]Detweiler, "What is Sacred Text?," 224. Detweiler is referring to filling the necessary gaps that authors leave simply because everything cannot be said, but his observation reveals an innate need for the audience to participate in "completing" the story.

[105]I.e., Aristotle, *Rhetorica* and *Poetica*, Demetrius, *On Style*, Cicero, *De Oratore*, Plutarch, *Moralia*, and Theon, *Exercises*.

> not all possible points should be punctiliously and tediously elaborated, but some should be left to the comprehension and inference of the hearer, who when he perceives what you have left unsaid becomes not only your hearer but your witness, and a very friendly witness too. For he thinks himself intelligent because you have afforded him the means of showing his intelligence. It seems like a slur on your hearer to tell him everything as though he were a simpleton (*Eloc.* 222).

Theon's progymnasmata contains a section on "Listening to What is Read."[106] This section does not deal directly with gaps or this particular type of audience participation, but it does indicate that Theon expected his students to learn not only to be good speakers, but also to be good and active listeners. In his section on narrative, Theon implicitly addressed the expectations, however limited, that a rhetorician might have for the audience. He writes that "things that can be supplied (by the hearer) should be altogether eliminated by one who wants to compose concisely . . . . But there is need for care, lest from desire for conciseness one fall into an idiosyncrasy or obscurity without realizing it."[107] The rhetor must not expect too much from the audience, but as Theophrastus suggested, the audience may be relied upon to provide some information.

Ancient orators, like modern authors, drew listeners into stories by involving them. More attention will be paid to this important topic in the next chapter. At this point, I simply wish to suggest that intentional gaps may be a deliberate invitation, even to the ancient audience: invest in this story; make it your own.

### *Justification for Methodologies*

A few preemptive words must be said to defend the methodologies chosen for this project. While Luke and Acts originate in the cultural context of Hellenism, some

---

[106]Theon, *Exercises*, 106 in Patillon's translation [Kennedy, 69].

[107]Theon, *Exercises*, 5.84 [Kennedy, 33].

question the validity of studying the books through the lenses of Hellenistic rhetoric. Secondly, applying modern literary theories to ancient works can be a hazardous endeavor. Modern and ancient literature are different in many ways, and studying ancient literature using modern methodologies puts the critic at risk of reading modern sensibilities and concerns back into the ancient context. The following sections address these concerns.

*Justification for Studying Luke-Acts in Light of Hellenistic Rhetoric*

By the time that the New Testament documents were written, Hellenism had influenced thought and practice in the Near East for over 300 years. Rhetoric was considered an academic discipline and was included in secondary education. Several scholars have made the case that the permeating Hellenistic culture exercised its influence upon New Testament material.

Kennedy has studied the New Testament in light of classical rhetoric, and offers a helpful justification for this approach. He writes that "classical rhetoric was one of the constraints under which New Testament writers worked."[108] The rhetoric of the Greco-Roman schools so permeated the Mediterranean world that "the writings of early Christians beginning with the gospels and continuing through the patristic age, and of some Jewish writers as well, were molded by the habits of thinking and writing learned [in these schools]."[109] Furthermore, those living in the Hellenistic world in the first

---

[108]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 160.

[109]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, ix. I would broaden Kennedy's statement to include the New Testament epistles as well.

century were likely to absorb a working knowledge of rhetoric even if they did not attend a formal rhetorical school. Kennedy points out that

> the rhetorical theory of the schools found its immediate application in almost every form of oral and written communication: in official documents and public letters, in private correspondence, in the lawcourts and assemblies, in speeches at festivals and commemorations, and in literary composition in both prose and verse.[110]

Hellenistic rhetoric simply was in the air of the culture and, by the time the New Testament authors were writing, rhetoric had been put "in the service of culture."[111]

Middle Judaism felt the effects of Hellenism. Kennedy notes that "Jewish thought absorbed some features of Greek culture, of which the works of Josephus and Philo give striking evidence, and the books of the New Testament were written in Greek to be read by or to speakers of Greek."[112] Todd Penner points out, however, that despite the influence of Hellenistic culture, the worth of Judaism was not diminished, specifically in Luke and Acts. Penner finds,

> in the end, that such a shift in focus need not imply that the Jewish story meant less to Luke but rather that Luke infused the story of Israel with meaning precisely in and through his reconfiguration of it in a context steeped in the rhetorical training, language, literature, culture, and society of the Greek and Roman worlds.[113]

As early as Aristotle, Hellenistic rhetoricians systematized their art,[114] identifying and categorizing rhetorical figures and tools. This system of rhetoric, fluid as it may be

---

[110]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 10.

[111]Burton Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 29.

[112]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 9.

[113]Todd Penner, "Contextualizing Acts" in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (SBLSymS 20; ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 20.

[114]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 11.

for the next several centuries, provides biblical scholars with a defined discipline in which to study the New Testament texts. In order to explore the ancient audience's response to Luke and Acts in particular, we must understand the "meeting place between text and reader."[115] The audience interacts with a narrative according to the rhetorical conventions shared by both audience and narrative. There is an undeniable distance between a 21st-century reader and the biblical texts. One way to begin bridging that distance is to study how the original audience experienced the narrative.[116]

A final issue concerns the feasibility of studying written works in light of ancient rhetorical guidelines. The rhetorical treatises referred to in this project provide instruction on how to prepare and deliver declamations. Aristotle, however, considered different types of composition such as introductions and narration to be types of rhetoric. Moreover, he believes that drawing a definite distinction between the types betrayed a "lack of a clear conception of the essential functions of speech."[117] Theon writes that "training in exercises is absolutely useful not only to those who are going to practice rhetoric but also if one wishes to undertake the function of poets or historians or any other writers. These things are, as it were, the foundation of every kind of discourse."[118] Aristotle and Theon believed rhetorical training to be a broadly useful endeavor. Rhetorical guidelines were certainly applied to declamation, but their usefulness did not end there. Historians, poets, and other writers also benefited from the study of rhetoric.

---

[115]Resseguie, "Reader-Response Criticism," 309.

[116]Iersel, *Mark*, 24.

[117]Friedrich Solmsen, "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric" in *Landmark Essays on Aristotelian Rhetoric* (ed. Richard Leo Enos and Lois Peters Agnew; Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers, 1998), 216-217.

[118]Theon, *Exercises*, 70 [Kennedy, 13].

In the opinion of Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, "virtually all later narrative forms" are dependent upon Greek and Roman classical forms.[119]

While we may thus justify applying rhetorical guidelines to written texts, recognizing the oral/aural nature of the biblical texts is of even greater importance. Kennedy believes that the rhetorical qualities of the New Testament texts indicate that the texts were "originally intended to have an impact on first hearing and to be heard by a group."[120] For this reason, Kennedy urges biblical scholars to "keep in mind that intent and that original impact, and thus to read the Bible as speech."[121] Augustine Stock agrees with this intention, noting that "all ancient writing was meant to be read aloud, which brought it about that the rules of oratorical discourse invaded the world of texts."[122]

Granted, Christian writings, as well as other Greco-Roman literature, may not conform exactly to the rhetorical structure recommended in the handbooks. This reality, however, is in fact what the handbook authors had in mind. Rhetoric, as indicated by the title of Aristotle's treatise, is an art. The author of an anonymous rhetorical handbook reported that the Apollodoreans said that one must always include all parts of a speech because "a speech is composed of parts; but one not composed of all parts is neither complete nor sound."[123] The second-century rhetorician Alexander replied that this is not

---

[119]Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 57.

[120]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 8.

[121]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 8. Kennedy writes that "to a greater extent than any modern text, the Bible retained an oral and linear quality for its audience" (*New Testament Interpretation*, 6).

[122]Augustine Stock, "Chiastic Awareness and Education in Antiquity" *BTB* 14 (1984): 26.

[123]Mervin R. Dilts and George A. Kennedy, eds., *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire: Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara* (New York: Brill, 1997), 26.

the case. In his opinion, "scientific knowledge differs from art in that the former is characterized by infallible theorems that have a single nature, but the theorems of an art are changeable and sometimes take on a different nature."[124] On the basis of the flexibility enjoyed by an art form, we may study written compositions using the guidelines for spoken declamation.

After examining Luke and Acts and the progymnasmata, Mikeal Parsons concluded that biblical scholars are justified in using the preliminary exercises to study the rhetoric of Luke. He believes that we may do so "under the conviction that knowing more about how Luke told his stories will shed further light on what these stories are about."[125] The current project works under the same conviction.

*Justification for Studying Luke-Acts in Light of Modern Literary Gap Theory*

As mentioned above, I propose that literary gaps, while given their name by modern literary critics, are *ancient*, intentional, sophisticated rhetorical tools used for the purpose of encouraging audience participation in the narrative. This discussion will be continued in the next chapter.

This project will proceed with care, locating the ideas of narrative gaps and audience participation in ancient theories. I do not wish to borrow from modern literary criticism anything that is not found in ancient sources. I will, however, use modern names given to certain un-named rhetorical devices from antiquity.

---

[124]Dilts and Kennedy, Arts of Rhetoric, 31.

[125]Parsons, "Luke and the *Progymnasmata*" in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (SBLSymS 20; ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 62.

Modern literary critics conclude that communication and human relationships occur in a series of filled gaps. This situation is no less true of the ancient world; ancient and modern humans share this foundational phenomenon. Tate writes that

> because of this basic knowledge gap, we create our own conceptions of how others experience us and then substitute these conceptions for reality. Indeed we base our actions towards and reactions to others upon our projections . . . . It is exactly this process that ensures everyday instances of communication.[126]

This limitation of interpersonal relationships has remained the same over the centuries and is reflected in the interaction between audience and text. Ancient, as well as modern, texts must be interpreted—that much is clear. For this project we treat the idea of "interpreting and participating in a text" synonymously with "filling the gaps."

---

[126]Tate, *Reading Mark from the Outside*, 25.

# CHAPTER TWO

## The Audience in Ancient Rhetoric

Having established the modern literary interest in rhetoric and in the gaps left in texts, the second chapter will turn to the ancient version of this same interest. The texts addressed in this dissertation are ancient; therefore, the foundations that allow us to ask questions of these texts and their audiences must also be ancient.

### *Ancient Authors' Perception of the Audience*

Ancient authors' perception of the audience must be gleaned from the texts themselves, or from extant writings that only tangentially address the subject. Some Homeric acknowledgements of the audience, for instance, occur in the epics' narratives. The song of Phemius, sung unwillingly to Penelope's suitors and recalling the tragedy of Troy (*Il.* 1.325) and the song of Demodocus that move disguised Odysseus to tears (*Il.* 8.500-520), carry more significance for the actual audience than for the characters. The Homeric epics also avoid specific geographical references so that the same epic could be successfully performed in various locales,[1] another accommodation made for the audience.

Plato's attention to the practice of rhetoric largely stemmed from his intense dislike of it. Everett Hunt observes that Plato's "pictures of the rhetoricians are so

[1]Ruth Scodel, *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 180.

broadly satirical that at times they become caricatures."[2] Despite his distaste for the discipline, Plato recognized that rhetoric was useful for social control and education.[3] In order to achieve these goals, the rhetor must learn not only about the subject to be addressed, but also understand the psychology of the audience.[4] In *Phaedrus*, Plato's Socrates says that because "it is the function of speech to lead souls by persuasion, he who is to be a rhetorician must know the various forms of the soul" (*Phaedr*. 271C-271D). Plato considered rhetoric the combination of dialectic and psychology: "dialectic was Plato's general scientific method; rhetoric is a special psychological application of it."[5]

Although Plato questioned the moral nature of rhetoric, especially rhetoric as used by the sophists, he did acknowledge those who will invariably be exposed to rhetoric. *Phaedrus* addresses the subject of rhetoric through the dialogue between Socrates and Phaedrus. This young man may be Plato's paradigm of an audience.[6] Plato indicated in this dialogue that a hearer should pay close enough attention to be able to recount, at least in a general sense, a speech (*Phaedr.* 228). Later, Phaedrus is so attentive to Socrates' speech that he enters into prayer with Socrates as he ends his speech (*Phaedr.* 257). Socrates tells Phaedrus that "unless he pays proper attention to philosophy he will never

---

[2]Everett Lee Hunt, "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians" in *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians* (ed. Raymond F. Howes; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961), 19.

[3]Edwin Black, "Plato's View of Rhetoric" in *Exploring Rhetorical Theory: A Reader* (ed. Christine L. Harold and Stephen H. Browne; Euclid, Ohio: Williams Custom Publishing, 2002), 46. Hunt points out that aside from his dialogues, Plato simply did not say much about rhetoric: "he did not teach its practice, nor lecture upon its theory." Hunt, "Plato and Aristotle," 54.

[4]Donald Lemen Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1957), 38.

[5]Black, "Plato's View," 41.

[6]Black, "Plato's View," 43.

be able to speak properly about anything" (*Phaedr.* 261A). For the remainder of the dialogue, Socrates discusses with Phaedrus proper arrangement and style, notable rhetoricians, the necessity of knowing the whole man before attempting rhetoric, and a comparison between speaking and writing. Throughout, Phaedrus is an engaged and attentive listener.

While Homer and Plato had relatively little to say about audience participation, beginning with Aristotle more and more rhetoricians commented on the audience. As Douglas Kelly points out, "any references about [ancient authors'] audiences will need to be made largely from features of their works, although such inferences can be guided by what authors of . . . other works at this time reveal about audience and performance."[7] To this end, we turn to the poets, historians, and rhetoricians of the ancient world.

*Aristotle*

Plato's most famous student had much more to say on the subject of rhetoric than did his mentor. Aristotle opened a school of rhetoric while under Plato's tutelage, and he wrote extensively on the topic. Aristotle's entire philosophy of rhetoric is based on the idea that it is the hearer that determines a speech's end and object (*Rhet*. 1.1.10; 1.3.1). The audience plays a vital role in the field and practice of rhetoric. Aristotle writes that speeches are composed of three parts: the speaker, the subject, and the hearer (*Rhet*. 1.3.1). Furthermore, Aristotle's categories of speeches are divided according to the nature of those who hear them: deliberative, for the hearer who is the judge of things to come; forensic, for the hearer who is the judge of things past; and epideictic, for the

---

[7]Douglas Kelly, "Oral Xenophon" in *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* (ed. Ian Worthington; New York: Brill, 1996), 155.

hearer who is a spectator (*Rhet.* 1.3.1-3).[8] The beginning of a speech and the end of the speech should be crafted in a way that will appeal to the hearer.[9]

Unlike Plato, whose ideal rhetorician would adapt himself to each individual in the audience, Aristotle recognized that the audience was itself a type: "Rhetoric will not consider what seems probable in each individual case, for instance to Socrates or Hippias, but that which seems probable to this or that class of persons" (*Rhet*. 1.2.11). As he classified character traits for his students, Aristotle addressed general traits found in any given crowd. While Aristotle's efforts were neither an adequate "analysis of mental operations nor a science of human nature," he drew on experience that came from long adaptation to an audience's emotions.[10]

Aristotle did not have high expectations for the common audience: he assumed judges to be simple people (*Rhet*. 1.2.13) or untrained thinkers. He writes that the very function of rhetoric is to deal with subjects "in the presence of hearers [who are] unable to take a general view of many stages or to follow a lengthy chain of argument" (*Rhet.* 1.2.12). But while Plato dismissed rhetoric because its power rested upon the ignorance of the common crowd, Aristotle noted the problem and taught his students to overcome it. He writes that if when "dealing with certain persons, even if we possessed the most accurate scientific knowledge, we should not find it easy to persuade them," then "our prose and arguments must rest on generally accepted principles . . . when speaking . . . with the multitude" (*Rhet*. 1.1.12 ).

---

[8]Note that the hearer who is a spectator is still active: this hearer judges the ability of the speaker (*Rhet*. 1.3.1) and decides to praise or blame the topic under discussion (*Rhet*. 1.3.4).

[9]For discussion on exordium, see Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.14.4, 6, 7, 11; and for discussion on epilogue, see 3.19.1, 3.

[10]Charles Sears Baldwin, *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959), 19.

Aristotle also taught his students to capitalize on the audience's malleability. The speaker may use exaggeration to sway the audience for or against a proposition: "for the hearer falsely concludes that the accused is guilty or not, although neither has been proved" (*Rhet.* 2.24.4). Circumlocution is another tool that could be used to distract the audience from the matter at hand. Aristotle writes that "long circumlocution takes in the hearers, who find themselves affected like the majority of those who listen to the soothsayers" (*Rhet.* 3.5.4). Not all rhetorical devices at the speaker's command should be used at the same time:

> one ought not to make use of all kinds of correspondence together; for in this manner the hearer is deceived. I mean, for instance, if the language is harsh, the voice, features, and all things connected should not be equally harsh; otherwise what each really is becomes evident (*Rhet*. 3.7.10).

The speaker may cast his opponent in a negative light by posing paradoxical questions related to the opponent's case. The opponent can then answer only "by a sophistical solution; for he answers, 'Partly yes, and partly no,' . . . [and] the hearers cry out against him as being in difficulty" (*Rhet.* 3.18.4). Refuting one's opponent in this way, among others, makes "room in the hearer's mind for the speech one intends to make and for this purpose, you must destroy the impression made by the adversary" (*Rhet.* 3.17.15).

Several times Aristotle instructed his charges to adjust their rhetoric according to the identity of the audience. He remarks in *Poetics* that "the poets follow the wish of the spectators" (*Poet*. 8.10). James Porter rephrases Aristotle's comments by concluding that the "audience is an important consideration, influencing topic, style, point of view, development, and purpose—in other words, the entire discourse."[11] A rhetor should take into account the particular characteristics of his audience, adapting his speech

[11]Porter, *Audience and Rhetoric*, 4.

appropriately in order to sway the hearer to his view (*Rhet.* 2.1.4). For example, Aristotle writes that "as Socrates used to say, it is not difficult to praise Athenians among Athenians" (*Rhet*. 1.9.30).

The orator should also evaluate the generally held opinions of the audience as specifically as possible, because the audience will be most attentive to these things. As a guide, Aristotle offers a division of audience members according to age and social class. His categories and characteristics are conventional for his time: "the young are optimistic; the old, cautious; the rich and powerful, proud, with a tendency to insolence."[12] Different figures of speech and thought are also helpful for appealing to views already held by the audience: "maxims are of great assistance to speakers, first, because of the vulgarity of the hearers, who are pleased if an orator . . . hits upon opinions they specially hold" (*Rhet.* 2.21.15); and "hearers are also impressed in a certain way by a device employed *ad nauseum* . . . [that asks] 'Who does not know?' for the hearer agrees, because he is ashamed to appear not to share what is a matter of common knowledge" (*Rhet.* 3.7.7).

While Aristotle understood the need for rhetorical figures and flourishes, he traced the need for such ornaments to the deficiency of the audience. He writes:

> Hearers pay most attention to things that are important [to him], that concern their own interests, that are astonishing, that are agreeable. . . . But we must not lose sight of the fact that all such things are outside the question, for they are only addressed to a hearer whose judgement is poor (*Rhet.* 3.14.7-8).[13]

---

[12]Forbes I. Hill, "Aristotle's Rhetorical Theory. With a Synopsis of Aristotle's Rhetoric" in *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric* (2nd ed.; ed. James J. Murphy and Richard A. Katula; Davis, Calif.: Hermagoras Press, 1995), 68.

[13]Another translation by W. Rhys Roberts reads, "You may use any means you choose to make your hearer receptive . . . . [H]e will be ready to attend to anything that touches himself, and to anything that is important, surprising, or agreeable . . . . But observe, all this has nothing to do with the speech itself. It merely has to do with the weak-minded tendency of the hearer to listen to what is beside the point"

In an ideal situation, the rhetor could "be satisfied not to annoy [his] hearers, without trying to delight them" and could present his case using only the bare facts. Aristotle acknowledges, however, that in reality, other elements affect the result considerably, "owing to the corruption of the hearer . . . . It does make a difference, for the purpose of making a thing clear, to speak in this or that manner; still, the difference is not so very great, but all these things are mere outward show for pleasing the hearer" (*Rhet*. 3.1.6).[14] Despite the ignorance or laziness of an audience, the successful rhetor was obligated to modify his content to connect with the audience.

Indeed, in Aristotle's mind, the audience, weak-minded and untrained though it may have been, held the key to the power of rhetoric. If the audience objected to a play or speech, that play or speech was considered a failure (*Poet*. 17.4).[15] At the end of a performance, the rhetorician is judged by the audience, a judgment that is affected by the audience's emotions.[16] Even more importantly, the success of persuasion, rhetoric's ultimate goal, comes "by means of the hearers, when they are roused to emotion by [a] speech" (*Rhet*. 1.2.5). Affecting the emotions of the audience was an important skill for the rhetor, although this skill was at times used to deceive. Aristotle writes that "the hearer always sympathizes with one who speaks emotionally, even though he really says

("*Rhetoric*" in *Poetics and Rhetoric* by Aristotle [trans. S. H. Butcher and W. Rhys Roberts; New York: Barnes & Noble Classics, 2005], 1415a35 – 1415b).

[14]Isocrates, one of Aristotle's contemporaries and rivals, holds out hope for a competent audience. He counts his speech a success when his hearers did not think to applaud his oratory or the "finish and purity" (*Phil.* 4) of his style, but were moved to marvel at the truth of his arguments.

[15]Later Aristotle gives slightly more weight to the judgment of critics. When comparing the genres of tragedy and epic, Aristotle implies that "there is only a contingent link between a genre and the type of audience which at any particular time happens to go with it, a true judgement on the former cannot rest on considerations about the latter" (Stephen Halliwell, *The* Poetics *of Aristotle. Translation and Commentary* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 182.

[16]Keith V. Erickson, introduction to *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric* (ed. Keith V. Erickson; Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974), 4.

nothing. This is why speakers often confound their hearers by mere noise" (*Rhet*. 3.7.4-5). Thus, while audience members command much power in the art of rhetoric, a skilled rhetor possesses the tools to influence them and exert some control over the audience's power.

*Cicero*

Cicero writes that "a speaker can no more be eloquent without a large audience than a flute-player can perform without a flute" (*De Or*. 3.7.4-5). Like Aristotle, Cicero recognized the importance of assessing the audience. He likens the importance of gauging the identity of an audience to the task of "a careful physician who, before he attempts to administer a remedy to his patient, must investigate not only the malady of the man he wishes to cure, but also his habits when in health, and his physical constitution" (*De Or*. 2.44.186). A rhetor who delivers a speech to an audience without considering the audience's characteristics is as unlikely to succeed as a doctor who treats a patient without consulting the patient's medical history.

Even an audience predisposed against a speaker may be won over. The rhetor must detect this bias early so that the speech can be adjusted accordingly. Cicero writes, "So potent is that Eloquence, rightly styled, by an excellent poet, 'soulbending sovereign of all things,' that she can not only support the sinking and bend the upstanding, but, like a good and brave commander, can even make prisoner a resisting antagonist" (*De Or*. 2.44.187).

Cicero taught that at all costs, speakers should seek to secure audiences' good will, for he understood the extent of the power held by the audience. He suggested using wit and humor (*De Or*. 2.53.216-289), as well as a rhythmic, periodic style (*De Or*.

3.43.171-172) to please the audience. Like Aristotle, he mentioned the difference between a common audience and a critical audience. The common audience that hears "a real orator, will be affected and not know why. The critic, on the other hand, understands the principles involved in affecting an audience" (*Brut.* 185-195).[17] In the end, Cicero agreed that the audience decided the success of rhetoric. The hearer, whether common or critical, is the final judge of the rhetor, a reality that compels the rhetor to devote all his energy toward that audience. Cicero wrote that the perfect orator should be able to command an audience simply by his presence and to the extent that the audience laughs or cries at his will (*Brut.* 290).

*Rhetorica ad Herennium*[18]

The unknown author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* offered practical advice on influencing the audience. Early in the treatise, the author gives a helpful summary:

> Since, then, we wish to have our hearer receptive, well-disposed, and attentive, I shall disclose how each state can be brought about. We can have receptive hearers if we briefly summarise the cause and make them attentive; for the receptive hearer is one who is willing to listen attentively. We shall have attentive hearers by promising to discuss important, new, and unusual matters, or such as appertain to the commonwealth, or to the hearers themselves or to the worship of the immortal gods; by bidding them listen attentively; and by enumerating the points we are going to discuss. We can by four methods make our hearers well-disposed: by discussing our own person, the person of our adversaries, that of our hearers, and the facts themselves (*Rhet. Her.* 1.4.7-5.8).

---

[17]Note, however, that while the common audience will not understand why a speech is enjoyable, Cicero says that the common hearer naturally appreciates an excellent speaker. "But do not let anybody wonder how these things can possibly make any impression on the unlearned crowd when it forms the audience, because in this particular department as in every other nature has a vast and indeed incredible power. For everybody is able to discriminate between what is right and what is wrong in matters of art and proportion by a sort of subconscious instinct, without having any theory of art or proportion of their own . . . because these are rooted deep in the general sensibility, and nature has decreed that nobody shall be entirely devoid of these faculties. . . . It is remarkable how little difference there is between the expert and the plain man as critics, though there is a great gap between them as performers" (*De Or.* 3.50.195, 197).

[18]As the date and author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* are uncertain, we will treat its comments here, after Cicero's material.

At the very beginning of a speech, the rhetor may begin to influence the audience by drawing part of the introduction from the person of his hearers. The rhetor may emphasize the audience members' "courage, wisdom, humanity, and nobility of past judgements they have rendered" and reveal "what esteem they enjoy and with what interest their decision is awaited" (*Rhet. Her.* 1.5.8). If the rhetor fails to address the needs of the audience, i.e., fails "to make the hearer well-disposed or receptive or attentive," *Rhet. Her.* considers the speech faulty (*Rhet. Her.* 1.7.11). Likewise, even various elements of speeches are faulty if they are "said against the convictions of the judge or audience—if the part to which they are devoted, or men whom they hold dear, should be attacked, or the sentiments of the hearer outraged by some fault of this kind" (*Rhet. Her.* 2.27.43).

The author of *Rhet. Her.* ennumerates several rhetorical practices that help the orator connect with the audience. The speaker may successfully use body language to communicate with the audience: "we shall incline the body forward a little from the shoulders, since it is natural to bring the face as close as possible to our hearers when we wish to prove a point and arouse them vigorously" (*Rhet. Her.* 3.15.26). Maxims are useful tools when attempting to prove a point: "the hearer, when he hears [a maxim] perceives that an indisputable principle drawn from practical life is being applied to a cause [and] must give it his tacit approval" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.17.25 ). Transitions between speech elements are important, writes the author, because they "remind the hearer of what the speaker has said, and also prepare him for what is to come" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.26.35). Effective transitions may be prepared in advance but also require the orator to evaluate his audience's level of comprehension. Transitions are useful for clarifying material and

encouraging a flagging audience. Finally, the author of this treatise recommends using frank speech when appropriate, because it "is especially effective in keeping the hearers from error and in presenting us, the speakers, as friendly both to the hearers and to the truth" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.37.49).

Pseudo-Cicero also addresses the practice of repetition for the benefit of the audience. If an orator decides to repeat himself, ps-Cicero warns him not to "repeat the same thing precisely—for that, to be sure, would weary the hearer and not refine the idea—but [he should repeat the idea] with changes" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.42.54). Repetition, or reduplication, as ps-Cicero later labels the practice, can make a deep impression on a hearer. Reduplication may also damage the case of the opposition, "as if a weapon should repeatedly pierce the same part of the body" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.28.38). The rhetorician must, however, be careful when using this device; too much repetition has a negative effect—the audience becomes bored, inattentive, and might even be insulted.

Speaking to fellow rhetoricians, the author of this treatise urges that in order to ensure success, the orator must "engrave in the hearer's mind the points we are making" (*Rhet. Her.* 3.14.24). Bringing every possible tool to bear on this goal increases the orator's chance of winning the audience to his point of view.

*Quintilian*

A successful rhetor drew strength from two areas: diligent practice (even solitary practice, if need be) and inherent talent. Ideally, the rhetor "should speak daily before an audience whose good opinion [he] respects, but better to speak alone than not at all" (*Inst.* 10.7.24). Audiences provide the whetstones upon which the rhetor sharpens his skill. The rhetor also drew upon his own nature: he "must not merely teach [his

audience], he must charm and move his hearers by all the helps [his] nature has granted him. The more effective an orator is, the more does he speak according to nature" (*Inst.* 12.10.44).

The rhetor's practice and use of natural abilities allowed him to evoke emotions in the audience according to his rhetorical purposes. Quintilian devoted an entire section of *Institutio Oratoria* to The Division of the Emotions and How They May Be Aroused (*Inst.* 6.2). Presentation of a proof can be done by almost anyone, but Quintilian believes that "what really demonstrates eloquence is the rare power to induce some special frame of mind in the judge and lead him to tears or anger . . . [the orator's] finest achievement is a tear in the eye of a judge."[19] The power to elicit emotion, however, must be used with care, "for nothing dries more quickly than tears" (*Inst.* 6.1.27). Quintilian advises the orator that in order "to leave the emotion at its height, our eloquence must be pitched higher than usual and then return to natural argument" (*Inst.* 6.1.27-29 ).[20]

Sometimes, Quintilian writes, the entire case depends upon appealing to the judge's mercy so that the judge will hear the case (*Inst.* 7.4.19). The introduction or exordium element of a speech, especially of a judicial speech, should attempt to make the judge "well-disposed, attentive, ready to receive instruction" (*Inst.* 4.1.5). Appeals to the judge's emotions often accomplish this goal. A declamation, writes Quintilian, is presented "not merely to show off, but to please our hearers" (*Inst.* 2.10.10-11).

---

[19]George A. Kennedy, *Quintilian* (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1969), 74.

[20]Quintilian included this comment in the section immediately following the preface to Book VI in which he wrote candidly about his own personal grief. His wife and younger son had died years before, and recently, after an eight-month illness, his elder son died, leaving Quintilian childless. The *Institutio Oratoria* was to have been an inheritance for this promising son.

Once again, however, an ancient rhetorician observes that two aspects of the audience must be taken into account: the audience is never made up of ideal auditors and each audience must be assessed individually. If Quintilian could face a jury of wise men, he laments, he could have spoken one way, but his "juries, coming from the people, [are] sometimes quite uneducated, [and so] require artifices" (*Inst.* 12.10.53). These artifices include figures of speech and thought, both explored thoroughly in *Institutio Oratoria*. Because speeches are addressed to the public, speeches should consist of more than just logical arguments. An educated audience might follow the logical proofs alone, but the common audience "may be uneducated and must be impressed."[21] The value of figures, then, is not in their logical strength as proofs, but in that "they lend belief to what we say and creep into the hearts of the jurors; just as in a contest of weapons it is a work of art to feign a stroke and take one's adversary unawares" (*Inst.* 9.1.19-20). Quintilian considers this covert persuasion necessary, for if "hearers are fickle of mind and truth is exposed to a host of perils, we must call in art to help us in the fight" (*Inst.* 2.17.29). Artfully arranged and varied figures are among the rhetor's best tools for persuading the audience: "they will bewitch the hearer with every sound as we see is done by stringed instruments" (*Inst.* 9.2.5).

Quintilian agreed with his predecessors that convincing an audience required proper assessment. The mark of a successful orator is the ability to "discern by what the judge is moved, what he rejects." The orator must be able to "press good arguments, [and] retreat softly from worthless ones, just as doctors use remedies according to the way patients take or reject them" (*Inst.* 6.4.19). Quintilian identifies clues to help the

---

[21]Kennedy, *Quintilian*, 73.

orator: the judge's face is sometimes "an index to his thought and guides the speaker; and a shrewd lawyer even changed his pronunciation of Amphion to be understood by a witness" (*Inst.* 12.10.56-57). A good orator is constantly assessing and reassessing the audience in order to communicate as clearly as possible.

Physical elements should also affect the declamation: "time and place make a difference. Speaking before a larger audience or a smaller one, in our own city or in another, in camp or in forum—all these differences call for change in style" (*Inst.* 11.1.46, 47). Quintilian admitted that there are no general rules to be followed when deciding how best to address a particular audience. Human nature, however, tends to follow some common trends. Quintilian writes that "the minds of an audience are more easily moved by appeals to popular opinion or by the appalling consequences that may follow the opposite. I am afraid most men's minds are more easily influenced by fear of evil than by hope of good" (*Inst.* 3.8.38-40). In the end, the rhetor must rely on his own judgment to "determine how much the ears of the audience will stand" (*Inst.* 11.1.91 ).

The rhetor must practice, tap his inherent oratorical gifts, and accommodate and assess the audience masterfully in order to succeed at his craft. To be successful, the speaker must, above all, be clear so that his works might "be approved by the learned [and] understood by the uneducated" (*Inst.* 8.2.22). Without the ability to be eloquent—to "bring forth what the mind conceives and carry it over to one's hearers"—the study of rhetorical theory is "as useless as a sword in its scabbard" (*Inst.* 8.preface.15).

*Theon*

In his instructions to students of rhetoric, Theon exhibits a concern for the audience's comfort and memory. If a point distresses the audience, Theon recommends

narrating it briefly. On the other hand, if a point pleases the audience, the speaker should take advantage of the audience's good feeling by dwelling on it at greater length (*Exercises*, 80). When presenting a narration, Theon instructs his students to "keep to what is credible . . . for this is its most special feature. If it does not have credibility, the more clear and concise it is, all the more unconvincing it seems to the hearers" (*Exercises*, 79). Theon credited the audience with enough intelligence to distinguish between the plausible and the implausible.

Especially because he communicates orally, a rhetor may find repetition useful when proving a point. Theon warns, however, that the repeated idea should be paraphrased in such a way that the repetition "escapes the notice of the hearers because of the variation of the style" (*Exercises*, 64).[22] Because the audience must remain comfortable with the speech, repetition must be subtle and not annoying. Repetition is a useful tool, however, because it is often needed to strengthen the hearers' memories. Like Quintilian, Theon writes that above all, the orator's style "must be clear and vivid; for the need is not only to express a thought but also to make what is said dwell in the minds of the hearers" (*Exercises*, 71-72).

*On the Sublime*[23]

Longinus, alone of the rhetoricians we have examined, raised the orator's ultimate goal beyond that of persuasion. As the title of the treatise suggests, Longinus' concern is with the sublime. Accordingly, he writes that

---

[22]This idea was previously noted in *Rhet. Her.* 4.42.54.

[23]Another treatise of uncertain author and date, *On the Sublime* is treated here because it is thought to have been written sometime in the first century CE. For ease of reference, we will refer to the author of this treatise as Longinus.

> the effect of genius is not to persuade the audience but rather to transport them out of themselves. Invariably what inspires wonder casts a spell upon us and is always superior to what is merely convincing and pleasing. For our convictions are usually under our own control, while such passages exercise an irresistible power of mastery and get the upper hand with every member of the audience (*Subl.* 1.3).

In order to achieve mastery over the audience, Longinus offered suggestions involving syntax and diction. He recognized Demothenes as an orator who used syntax to influence the audience. Longinus writes that Demothenes "drags his audience along with him to share the peril of his long inversions" by leaving the main thought of the sentence, inserting one extraneous idea after another, "making the audience terrified for the total collapse of the sentence and compelling them from sheer excitement to share the speaker's risk: then unexpectedly, after a great interval, the long-lost phrase turns up pat at the end, so that he astounds them all the more" (*Subl.* 22.3-4).

Changing from first to second person and back again in a narration also has the effect of involving the audience. Longinus refers to Herodotus' habit of switching to the second person when he describes travel so that "he takes you along with him through the country and turns hearing into sight. All such passages with a direct personal application set the hearer in the centre of the action" (*Subl.* 26.2-3). Manipulating diction in this way is especially effective when the speaker wants the audience to feel fear: changing person to include the audience "gives an equally vivid effect, and often makes the audience feel themselves set in the thick of danger" (*Subl.* 26).[24]

In order to "carry the audience away with him" (*Subl*. 16.2), the rhetor should combine imagination, which produces energy and emotion in a speech, with argument.

---

[24]Aristotle comments similarly that words should "set things 'before the eyes', for we ought to see what is being done rather than what is going to be done" (*Rhet*. 3.10.6).

In this way, the speaker will not only convince the audience, but master them (*Subl.* 15.9). Longinus compares rhetorical composition to a melody that

> by the blending of its own manifold tones . . . brings into the hearts of the bystanders the speaker's actual emotion so that all who hear him share in it, and by piling phrase on phrase builds up one majestic whole—we hold, I say, that by these very means it casts a spell on us and always turns our thoughts towards what is majestic and dignified and sublime and all else that it embraces, winning a complete mastery over our minds (*Subl.* 39.3).

By activating the audience's imagination, an author moves toward the sublime. Longinus refers to the ancient poet Aratus who writes about sailors on the brink of destruction, as does Homer. Aratus, however, unlike Homer, clearly defines the danger the sailors faced: "'Tis but the tiniest plank that bars them from bitter destruction" (*Phaen.* 299). By directly stating the sailors' danger, Longinus believes Aratus "has demeaned the idea and made it elegant in stead of awe-inspiring" (*Subl*. 10.6). Homer, on the other hand, does not simply define the peril of the sailors, but describes "the sailors as being all the time, again and again, with every wave on the very brink of death" (*Subl*. 10.6). Homer did not state the danger outright; he left the details of danger to the imagination of the audience, a characteristic that Longinus considered admirable.

Rhetorical power, Longinus believed, rested in part in the rhetor who learned to master the audience. That power, however, was not fully realized until the audience was transported toward the "majestic and dignified and sublime." While this optimistic and lofty expectation for rhetor, audience, and rhetoric separates Longinus from many of his predecessors, focus on the nature of and concern for the audience remains constant.

### *Ancient Perception of Audience Participation*

Ancient theorists and practitioners clearly acknowledged that the presence and participation of the audience was important, perhaps even central, to the art of rhetoric.

Beyond mere existence, however, what participation did speakers expect from their audiences? Plutarch writes that while "there are others who think that the speaker has a function to perform, and the hearer none," they are incorrect; they act "as though they had come to dinner, to have a good time while others toil" (*Mor.* 1.45D-45E ). What results did orators hope to see in their audiences as a result of participation in rhetoric? What tools did speakers use to elicit audience participation? In this section, we will consider various ways rhetoricians hoped audiences would participate and tools that rhetoricians used to encourage such participation. These findings will establish a pattern by which we can discuss audience participation in ancient literature.

*Desired Results of Audience Participation*

What end results did the orator expect? Some expected results were almost negligible; others required more effort from the audience. Whatever the case, Cicero sought results based on comprehension of ideas, not merely on the showmanship of the rhetor.[25] With this general guideline in mind, we will examine several results of audience participation mentioned by the rhetoricians.

*Paying attention*. Not all audiences pay close attention. This most basic desired result of audience participation deserves to be mentioned, if only because it is so often absent. Aristotle instructed his students to develop skills to secure this result:

> engaging the hearers' attention is common to all parts of the speech, if necessary; for attention slackens everywhere else rather than at the beginning. . . . Wherefore, when the right moment comes, one must say, 'And give me your attention, for it concerns you as much as myself'; and 'I will tell you such a thing as you have never yet' heard of, so strange and wonderful. This is what Prodicus

[25]Cicero recalls a speech made by the tribune Gaius Carbo that brought a great shout of applause from the crowd simply because of the fancy ending (*Or*. 214).

> used to do; whenever his hearers began to nod, he would throw in a dash of his fifty-drachma lecture (*Rhet.* 3.14.9-10).

Commanding the audience's attention was part of delivering a speech. Rhetors were to be cognizant of audience members' reactions, and if need be, the rhetor should call their attention back to where it belongs. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* advocates using the figure of Reasoning by Question and Answer, which "is exceedingly well adapted to a conversational style, and both by its stylistic grace and the anticipation of the reasons, holds the hearer's attention" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.16.24).

Cicero knew that an attentive audience would be knowledgeable enough about what was *supposed* to happen in a speech (gestures, rhythms, etc.) that if a speaker made mistakes, the audience would react. Misspeaking or motioning out of rhythm elicited hisses and hoots from the audience (*Parad.* 3.26). Elsewhere, Cicero writes that the speaker must be careful of "falling foul of the public," a mistake that causes "disapproving outcries of the people, who are aroused . . . by some error in the speech" (*De Or.* 2.83.339). Cicero's warning reveals the expectation that the audience pay attention—sometimes to the peril of the speaker.

Quintilian underscores the importance of clarity when an orator is trying to hold the audience's attention. He notes that even a judge's attention is prone to wander: "he will have many other thoughts to distract him unless what we say is so clear that our words will thrust themselves into his mind even when he is not giving us his attention, just as the sunlight forces itself upon the eyes" (*Inst.* 8.2.23). Holding the attention of the audience was especially important in the case of forensic and deliberative speeches

because for these speeches, the audience was called upon to make a decision.[26] Losing the attention of the audience could cost a battle, an election, or someone's life.

Plutarch implies that at the very least, the audience should pay enough attention to know when to applaud and when not to applaud. For instance, applause for a philosopher's speech was often inappropriate, because they intended their words to "penetrate like a biting drug" (*Mor.* 46D ), not to amuse and entertain. Plutarch recalls an instance

> when Euripides the poet was going over for the members of his chorus a lyric passage set to music one of them burst out laughing; whereat Euripides remarked, "If you were not so stupid and ignorant, you would not have laughed while I was singing in most solemn measure" (*Mor.* 1.46B).

Theon saw fit to include a section on "Listening to What is Read" in his progymnasmata. In it, he instructs his students to pay close attention when listening to an orator, to be good and active listeners (*Exercises*, 106 in Pantillion's translation ).[27]

*Moral formation.* If the purpose of rhetoric is persuasion for or against an idea or action, an important goal for rhetoric is the moral and cultural formation of the audience. Along with general alterations in the audience's opinion or world view, such formation includes education and religious experiences.

At the end of an oration, the speaker hopes, somehow, to have effected a change in the audience. The extent and manner of change may vary. The poet Ovid offers an interesting example of effecting considerable change in an audience. Ovid wrote *Tristia*

---

[26]Forbes I. Hill, "The Rhetoric of Aristotle" in *Exploring Rhetorical Theory: A Reader* (ed. Christine L. Harold and Stephen H. Browne; Euclind, Ohio: Williams Custom Pubishing, 2002), 53.

[27]Plutarch goes into detail in this matter, teaching Nicander that "not only frowning, a sour face, a roving glance, twisting the body about, and crossing the legs are unbecoming, but even nodding, whispering to another, smiling, sleepy yawns, bowing down the head, and all like actions, are culpable and need to be carefully avoided" (*Mor.* 1.45D).

*2* after being exiled by Caesar Augustus for, in Ovid's words, "a poem and a blunder" (*Trist.* 2.207). The mistake made by Ovid remains unknown, but the poem in question was probably *Ars Amatoria*, a poem on the art of love. Apparently, Augustus believed that the poem had corrupted married women by inciting them to adultery. In the context of defending his poetry to Augustus, Ovid protests that it is possible for all poems to corrupt their readers. Even as great a work as Ennius' *Annales* can corrupt a reader because while at first "the reader is envisaged simply as passively reading the tale of Ilia and Mars," the text eventually "involves not mere acceptance of its contents but questions raised in response to it . . . producing [a] more involved and independent response from the reader."[28] Ovid's point is that the text itself does not cause corruption, but the audience's interaction with the text may effect change.

Ovid goes on to argue that even the audience of celebrated Homer could be corrupted, depending on the hearers' reaction to the story. Ovid asks, "The very *Iliad*—what is it but an adulteress about whom her lover and her husband fought? What occurs in it before the flaming passion for Briseis and the feud between the chiefs due to the seizure of a girl?" (*Trist.* 2.371-374). In this appeal to Augustus, Ovid liberates the reader or audience from the author by recognizing that "an author cannot tell his audience how to interpret a text."[29] Ovid believed that when the audience interacted with a text, its members might be changed in positive or negative ways, regardless of the intention of the author.

---

[28]Bruce Gibson, "Ovid on Reading: Reading Ovid. Reception in Ovid, *Trista 2*" in *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism* (ed. Andrew Laird; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 354-355.

[29]Gibson, "Ovid on Reading," 374-375.

Longinus' *On the Sublime* focuses on effecting a change on the audience, this time a positive change. He writes that

> the true sublime, by some virtue of its nature, elevates us: uplifted with a sense of proud possession, we are filled with joyful pride, as if we had ourselves produced the very thing we heard. If, then, a man of sense, well-versed in literature, after hearing a passage several times finds that it does not affect him with a sense of sublimity, and does not leave behind in his mind more food for thought than the mere words at first suggest, but rather that on careful consideration it sinks in his esteem, then it cannot really be the true sublime, if its effect does not outlast the moment of utterance. For what is truly great gives abundant food for thought: it is irksome, nay, impossible, to resist its effect: the memory of it is stubborn and indelible (*Subl.* 7.2-4).

Excellent rhetoric should not only engage the audience at the time of delivery but should leave them changed. Rhetoric should provide the audience with lasting and abundant food for thought. If the hearer is not engaged and changed by a speech, it is not sublime.

Education, a central element to Greco-Roman moral and cultural formation, was also achieved through rhetoric. Quintilian proposes that orators-in-training learn from hearing—from being a good audience themselves. He writes that the "discrimination [of words] can be attained by reading and hearing the best. . . . Listening is important, for we acquire all speech first through the ears" (*Inst.* 10.1.8, 10). In addition to the benefit of discrimination and a growing vocabulary, Quintilian predicts that "much reading and hearing will . . . stimulate the student to understand and to follow with his own powers" (*Inst.* 10.1.15). Theon's comments on Listening to What is Read also pertain to the desired result of audience education. His students are to listen carefully to a speaker so that they can recall the subject after the speech is completed. This practice strengthened the students' memories and taught proper construction of the introduction, narration, arguments, etc. (*Exercises*, 106 in Pantillion's translation ).

Finally, rhetoric at times facilitated religious experiences in which audience members took active roles. Speeches occurred not only in the realms of ancient politics and theater, but also religion. Carol Thomas suggests that as early as the oral culture of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE

> gestures, movements, and vocal intonations help to fix words and ideas into a pattern. Physical participation accompanies the recitation of oral tradition and is expected by the auditors who are not merely watching and listening but are themselves active. [30]

The hearers were expected to be active to the point that "the teller and public are creating the tale together."[31] Ancient Hebrew religion also involved rhetoric and an active audience. On the eve of their deliverance, God tells the Hebrew slaves how they will remember the day that death passed over the faithful Hebrew households. God says that

> this day shall be a day of remembrance for you. You shall celebrate it as a festival to the LORD; throughout your generations you shall observe it as a perpetual ordinance. Seven days you shall eat unleavened bread; on the first day you shall remove leaven from your houses, for whoever eats leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day shall be cut off from Israel. On the first day you shall hold a solemn assembly, and on the seventh day a solemn assembly; no work shall be done on those days; only what everyone must eat, that alone may be prepared by you. You shall observe the festival of unleavened bread, for on this very day I brought your companies out of the land of Egypt: you shall observe this day throughout your generations as a perpetual ordinance (Exod 12:14-17 [NRSV]).

The generations of Hebrews that lived after the years of Egyptian slavery would actively remember God's provision for their ancestors. Worshipers participated through special meetings and dietary restrictions in order to re-experience God's deliverance each year.

---

[30]Carol Thomas, "'Wingy' Mysteries in Divinity" in *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* (ed. Ian Worthington; New York: Brill, 1996), 188. Cf. Gregory S. Aldrete, *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), who applies this same idea to political rhetoric in ancient Rome.

[31]Jan Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 34.

Worship at the Temple in Jerusalem was also marked by audience participation. Atonement for sins required cleansing and the offering of sacrifices, both on the communal and individual level. Ancient Hebrews participated in their religion by being actively responsive.

By the time Greco-Roman culture permeated the Mediterranean, its pantheon of gods "required action, not contemplation, on the part of their worshipers."[32] Hellenic worship was made up of actions: "in a word, picnics, parades, and colourful tales define Greek religion."[33] The ancient world's religions often required audience participation in the story that was worship. This issue may have been a lesser concern for the rhetoricians we have discussed, but evidence indicates that moral formation through religious experience was an important result of audience participation in rhetoric.

*Creation of story*. Evidence from ancient treatises shows that an audience's activity may reach the degree of creativity—a final result of audience participation that will be the primary focus of this project. Jan Vasina comments in a study on oral tradition that

> in most cases the public is not just watching. The public is active. It interacts with the teller, and the teller provokes this interaction by asking questions, welcoming exclamations, and turning to a song sung by all at appropriate points of the action. The teller and the public are creating the tale together.[34]

For Aristotle, the audience was not simply an element to be discussed; the audience actually furnished the point of view of the speaker.[35] As mentioned above, in *On the*

---

[32]Thomas, "'Wingy' Mysteries in Divinity," 188.

[33]Thomas, "'Wingy' Mysteries in Divinity," 188.

[34]Vansina, *Oral Tradition*, 34.

[35]Baldwin, *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic*, 17.

*Sublime*, Longinus writes that sublime rhetoric fills the hearers with joyful pride, as if the hearers had themselves produced it (*Subl.* 7.2).

Cicero includes a long list of figures of speeches in book three of *De Oratore*. Among references to dwelling on the point, digressions, exaggeration, rhetorical questions, and irony, Cicero mentions "taking into partnership." He explains this figure as "a sort of consultation with one's audience" (*De Or.* 3.53.204). By the turn of the common era, Cicero considered the audience to be a partner in creating rhetoric. Cicero writes that "often it is better not to formulate expressly, but to make it plain, by affirming the underlying principle, what the formulation would have been" (*De Or.* 2.41.177). Sometimes it is best to leave a thing unsaid. The implied formulation or argument must, however, be understood. Gaps left by the speaker must be filled. This final step in communicating is left to the audience's creative ability.

Plutarch devoted a section of *Moralia* to instruction on listening to lectures. He compared the relationship between the rhetor and the audience to dinner guests and to ball players. A well-bred guest, when invited to dinner, is not completely passive. He interacts with his host and other guests, taking an active part in the dinner. Plutarch writes that the hearer of a speech is in the same position "for he is a participant in the discourse and a fellow-worker with the speaker" (*Mor.* 1.45E). When two people play catch with a ball, both the thrower and the catcher are necessary components of the game. The same is so with speeches: "there is a certain accord between the speaker and the hearer, if each is heedful of his obligation" (*Mor.* 1.45E). Unfortunately, the listeners Plutarch encountered were not always so attentive. He calls those who refuse to participate with the speaker lazy, and he urges them

> that, when their intelligence has comprehended the main points [of a speech], they put the rest together *by their own efforts*, and use their memory as a guide in thinking for themselves, and, taking the discourse of another as a germ and seed, develop and expand it. For the mind does not require filling like a bottle, but rather, like wood, it only requires kindling to create in it an impulse to think independently and an ardent desire for truth (*Mor*. 1.48B-48C ).[36]

Audience participation is as vital to rhetoric as the second player is to a game of catch. The creation of rhetoric is not complete until the audience fills its active role. Indeed, creative audience participation, as Aristotle, Cicero, and others suggest, lies at the root of rhetoric's power. By skillfully using tools to encourage that participation, which results in the creation of story, orators reveal their expectation of and dependence upon audience participation.

*Tools Used to Encourage Audience Participation*

Rhetoricians developed guidelines designed to produce the desired result of audience participation. Teachers of rhetoric in the ancient world allude to various tools speakers might use to encourage cooperation and co-workmanship between the rhetor and the audience. Successful rhetors cultivated these skills in order to better influence their hearers.

*Access to privileged information*. Speakers may give the audience privileged access to some part of the speech or story plot, often by making the audience members more omniscient than characters in the story or by breaking the dramatic illusion through narrative asides. Ruth Scodel's work on Homer's epics has led her to conclude that "the artificial dialect [of the Homeric epics] not only marks the performance as special but invites the audience to enlarge its imaginary temporal and spatial boundaries. Whoever

[36]Emphasis mine.

listens and is moved joins an imagined community."[37] In the case of these epics, the new community not only shares moral values[38] but also a greater omniscience than the epics' characters. Scodel observes that "the audience is nearly always wiser than the characters, since the omniscient Muse tells the hearer so much."[39]

In some cases, acquiring such omniscient knowledge from the narrative became more important as the story progressed. Pieces of knowledge given to the audience early in the narrative may have been omitted in later narrative accounts or speeches. Attentive audience members were then able to draw on their network of narrative knowledge to supply the missing information.

Authors also gave their audiences preferential treatment by addressing them from the stage and breaking the dramatic illusion of the world of the speech or play.[40] At the least disruptive level, actors acknowledged the audience from within the narrative monologue. Other times, actors went further outside the illusion by addressing the

---

[37]Scodel, *Listening to Homer*, 181.

[38]Scodel writes that Homer means to persuade his created community "about central moral concerns: no competent listener commends the suitors or fails to approve the ransom of Hector. . . . The *Odyssey* . . . exploits everyone's attachments to home and community to create sympathy for its hero" (Scodel, *Listening to Homer*, 181).

[39]Scodel, *Listening to Homer*, 187.

[40]While most of this discussion draws on examples from plays, basic elements of plays and speeches are linked together by ancient evidence. For example, Aristotle states that when the principles of delivering speeches have been delineated, they "will have the same effect as acting" (*Rhet.* 3.1.7). Thus, authors use similar tools to create either a speech or a play. Cicero claims that the rhetor must actually feel the emotions he wishes to incite in the audience. As the orator speaks, those emotions should stir "the speaker himself even more deelply than any of his hearers" (*De Or.* 2.46.191). To illustrate his point, Cicero refers to the actor whose "eyes seemed . . . to be blazing behind his mask" (*De Or.* 2.46.193), reflecting intense emotion. In practice, both the actor and the orator "live his part" (Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, 59). Quintlian teaches that the declaimer must above all "consider what best suits each character . . . . As a rule they impersonate sons, parents, rich men, old men, gentle or harsh of temper, misers, superstitious persons, cowards and mockers, so that hardly even comic actors have to assume more numerous roles in their performances on the stage than these in their declamations" (*Inst.* 3.8.51). Indeed, as Clarke writes, "a good declaimer was a virtuoso, with much of the actor about him" (Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, 96).

audience through dramatic asides. Although a character addressed the audience, which existed outside the world of the play, asides were not considered breaking character. An actor stayed "in character" while addressing the audience. Finally, at the most dramatic level of breaking the illusion, an actor could refer to himself as an actor, making comments, perhaps, about costumes or the stage mechanics. Each of these levels of breaking the dramatic illusion invited the audience to participate with the actors.[41]

The playwright Plautus reached out to his audiences by allowing his characters to address the audience indirectly and directly.[42] Nero's tutor, Seneca, also an accomplished playwright, used this method in two ways. Like Plautus, Seneca's audience "was not isolated from the world of his characters but comes close to being a participant, and . . . through the voice of the characters Seneca himself often speaks directly to his audience as if he were declaiming a case."[43] He also practiced the method in reverse. Seneca's characters would often become an audience themselves, witnessing events occurring on the stage. Mario Erasmo notes that sometimes Seneca's tactic worked; other times, however, it resulted in audience alienation. If the play's characters act as audience, the actual audience may feel disposable.[44]

Actors, and rhetors as they acted, made the audience an acknowledged part of the performance. This feeling of inclusion, properly used, further encouraged audience

---

[41]The discussion on breaking dramatic illusion comes from George E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A study in popular entertainment* (2d ed.; Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952), 134-135.

[42]Timothy J. Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 47.

[43]Woodman and Powell, *Author and Audience*, 206.

[44]Mario Erasmo, *Roman Tragedy: Theatre to Theatricality* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 137-138.

participation in creating the story of the play or other rhetorical piece. Audience members became caught up in the narrative as they became actors themselves.

Obviously, not all playwrights or rhetoricians gave audience members privileged knowledge all of the time. Sternberg points out that if hearers receive too much privileged information, they experience "a sense of detachment or exemption from the human ordeal below."[45] Better, Sternberg advises, that the author vary "his techniques of presentation—sometimes revealing, sometimes concealing, most often taking a middle course—in order to cast the [hearer] in the role of participant as well as spectator."[46] The audience, however, retains a privileged position of sorts regardless of information given by the narrator. By receiving communication—be it a play, a declamation, or a defense—the audience is already a vital component of the rhetorical work.

*Specific omissions.* All audience participation in co-creating a story is made possible by some sort of omission. Most simply, an omission occurs when a piece of information is missing. These omissions will be referred to merely as "omissions." Two kinds of omission, however, are addressed directly by rhetoricians and require further delineation: understood information and enthymeme.

Perhaps omitting understood information is a product of simple common sense, but ancient rhetoricians saw fit to comment on the practice. Theophrastus' advice, mentioned above bears repeating:

> not all possible points should be punctiliously and tediously elaborated, but some should be left to the comprehension and inference of the hearer, who when he perceives what you have left unsaid becomes not only your hearer but your

---

[45]Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 98.

[46]Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 98.

> witness, and a very friendly witness too. For he thinks himself intelligent because you have afforded him the means of showing his intelligence. It seems like a slur on your hearer to tell him everything as though he were a simpleton (*Eloc.* 222).

Aristotle taught that obvious arguments were not the most popular (*Rhet*. 3.10.4). In other words, audience members are most persuaded by arguments that require effort on their part. Aristotle goes on to say that omitted information must not be too obscure: the audience prefers arguments in which "the meaning, although not clear at first, comes a little later" (*Rhet*. 3.10.4).

In addition to drawing on a network of social knowledge about historical situations and events to supply omitted but understood information, audience members would have most recently acquired knowledge concerning the narrative. As the audience experienced the text, the story itself became part of the audience's network of knowledge, at times through the tool of privileged access. While ancient rhetoricians do not address this source of knowledge directly, we can infer that if indeed the audience drew from a common network of social knowledge in order to complete a rhetorical unit, we also might expect an audience to draw on a common network of narrative knowledge in order to supply omitted information. New material provided by the narrative became accessible to audiences working to fit the pieces of the narrative together into a coherent whole.

Cicero depended on his audience to pick up unspoken subtleties in his narratives. For instance, in the *Fifth Verrine*, Cicero reported that the negatively portrayed Verres returned to his praetorium after a party. Robin Nisbet believes that Cicero assumed that a

"right thinking Roman would understand what is not explicitly stated, that Government House required higher standards of behavior."[47]

Pseudo-Cicero writes that if a rhetor wished to shorten a statement of facts, he might "present an outcome in such a way that the facts that have preceded can also be known, although we have not spoken of them. For example, if I should say that I have returned from the province, it would also be understood that I had gone to the province" (*Rhet. Her.* 1.9.14). Understood facts that can be supplied by the audience's logic may be omitted.

Information may also be omitted in the form of an analogy.[48] Pseudo-Cicero writes that analogy is a useful figure: "this figure sometimes possesses liveliness and distinction in the highest degree; indeed it permits the hearer himself to guess what the speaker has not mentioned" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.54.67). The hearer becomes intrigued by the puzzle or gap left by the speaker. Curiosity urges the hearer to participate in creating the narrative.

One of Quintilian's references to omission involves a sense other than hearing: sight. In his discussion on realism in *De Oratoria*, he praises Cicero's ability to cause the audience to visualize or "picture things that were not explicitly in the text."[49]

> Cicero is supreme in this department, as in others. Is there anybody so incapable of forming a mental picture of a scene that, when he reads the following passage from the Verrines, he does not seem not merely to see the actors in the scene, the place itself and their very dress, but even to imagine to himself other details that the orator does not describe? "There on the shore stood the praetor, the representative of the Roman people, with slippered feet, robed in a purple cloak, a

---

[47]Robin G. M. Nisbet, "The Orator and the Reader" in *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (ed. Tony Woodman and Jonathan Powell; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 5.

[48]This sort of omission will be treated more fully under the heading of open-ended comparisons.

[49]Nisbet, "The Orator and the Reader," 5.

> tunic streaming to his heels, and leaning on the arm of this worthless woman." For my own part, I seem to see before my eyes his face, his eyes, the unseemly blandishments of himself and his paramour, the silent loathing and frightened shame of those who viewed this scene (*De or.* 8.3.64-65).

Audience members, and Quintilian in this instance, use their imagination to better understand and "see" the narrative.

Theon's progymnasmata assures students that "things that can be supplied (by the hearer) should be altogether eliminated by one who wants to compose concisely" (*Exercises*, 84). Information supplied by hearers may include material drawn from their network of social and narrative knowledge. In the same section, though, Theon warns that "there is need for care, lest from desire for conciseness one fall into an idiosyncrasy or obscurity without realizing it" (*Exercises*, 84).

Theon provides one of the clearest pieces of evidence that audiences were expected to fill gaps, creating a part of the story themselves. Theon teaches more advanced students to practice filling in gaps left by previous rhetoricians in an exercise called elaboration. Theon writes that "what is 'lacking' can be supplied by making clear what is obscure; by filling gaps in the language or content" (*Exercises*, 110 of Pantillon's text ). In this exercise, the students, as an audience of rhetorical pieces, learn to fill in gaps left in the narrative, making the story, at least in part, their own.

The enthymeme was quite important to Aristotle: he calls this figure "the strongest of rhetorical proofs" (*Rhet*. 1.1.11), but what exactly Aristotle meant by the term enthymeme remains a topic of much discussion.[50] A modern technical definition of

---

[50]Jeffrey Walker, *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 172. Cf. William D. Ross, *Aristotle's* Prior *and* Posterior Analytics (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), 499. Another question concerns the extent of knowledge and acceptance of Aristotle's understanding of enthymeme, a topic that was in flux. David Aune believes that knowledge of Aristotle's conclusions was limited to the narrow circle of the educated in Rome (David Aune, "The Use and Abuse of the Enthymeme

an enthymeme is "a syllogism from probabilities and signs,"[51] but Aristotle treats the figure as a συλλογισμός τις. If this Greek phrase is translated "*kind* of syllogism" (*Rhet*. 1.1.11), one might understand an enthymeme to be a syllogism, the defining characteristic of which is an unstated premise.[52] If, however, the phrase is translated "a syllogism of a kind," as David Aune suggests, the enthymeme may be "a certain type of deductive argument."[53] Quintilian describes enthymeme as "a proposition and a reason, but no formal conclusion: it is therefore the incomplete syllogism" (*Inst.* 5.14.1-2). Theon gave an example in his progymnasmata that assumes a similar definition of enthymeme:

> [w]hen his acquaintance, Apollodorus said to him, "The Athenians have unjustly condemned you to death," Socrates broke into a laugh and said, "Were you wanting them to do so justly?" We need to add a proposition that it is better to be condemned unjustly than justly, which seems to have been omitted . . . but is potentially clear (*Exercises*, 99-100).

Kennedy comments that Theon's use of enthymeme, like Quintilian's description, "reflects the view of an enthymeme as a statement in which one premise is omitted."[54]

---

in New Testament Scholarship," *NTS* 49 (2003): 308, 310, 320). William Kurz notes that requiring an enthymeme to have one implicit premise is a post-Artistotelian development. He concludes that "the abbreviation of form is not central to its meaning for Aristotle, nor even a necessary attribute" (William S. Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts," *CBQ* 42:2 (1980): 173, note 5). As discussed in the introductory chapter, all audience members may not have been able to label the rhetorical figure as an enthymeme. In the cases when a premise was left implicit, however, the rhetor may have at least hoped that the listeners would instinctively react to the deduction asked of them by the construction.

[51]Hill, "Rhetoric of Aristotle," 71.

[52]Cf. James H. McBurney, "The Place of the Enthymeme in Rhetorical Theory" in *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric* (ed. Keith V. Erickson; Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974), 132.

[53]Aune, "Use and Abuse of the Enthymeme, 303. This more inclusive understanding of an enthymeme may be too broad. A narrower definition, however, has raised some questions, as Aune's article points out. The deductive nature of an enthymeme in particular is what concerns this project, a characteristic included in both options, so we may leave the exact definition of enthymeme to those better equipped for the task.

[54]Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 18, note 74.

An enthymeme does not offer *conclusive* proof for an argument. Instead, by providing the audience with a few premises for thought, the enthymeme allows the audience to draw a *probable* proof for the argument.[55] The final test for the success of an enthymeme is whether or not the enthymeme is convincing to the audience.[56]

In *Rhetoric*, Aristotle writes that the enthymeme is "deduced from few premises, often from fewer than the regular syllogism" (*Rhet.* 1.2.13). An enthymeme has at times been regarded as an imperfect syllogism. Robert Price admits that "in a superficial way this is true since an enthymeme is by definition a syllogism with a premise (perhaps) supplied by the audience and so unexpressed (although not unthought) by the rhetorician."[57] That a premise is implied, however, does not connote imperfect construction, insisted Price. Aristotle would have agreed. He taught that together, example and enthymeme are the entire means of making a proof.[58] Arguing by enthymeme is preferable when possible, and examples should be used as supportive evidence:

> [i]f we have them [enthymemes], examples must be used as evidence and as a kind of epilogue to the enthymemes. . . . If they [examples] stand last they resemble evidence, and a witness is in every case likely to induce belief (*Rhet*. 2.20.9).

One purpose for using an enthymeme, according to Aristotle, is that of conciseness: "if any one of these is well known, there is no need to mention it, for the

---

[55]Myles F. Burnyeat, "Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Rationality of Rhetoric" in *Essays on Aristotle's* Rhetoric (ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), 93.

[56]Burnyeat, "Enthymeme," 109.

[57]Robert Price, "Some Antistrophes to the Rhetoric" in *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric* (ed. Keith V. Erickson. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974), 85.

[58]Cf. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.2.8: "Now all orators produce belief by employing as proofs either examples or enthymemes and nothing else."

hearer can add it himself" (*Rhet.* 1.2.13). The example Aristotle gives indicates that the audience might be expected to draw on facts from daily life—although this surely was not the only source of information—in order to fill in the missing premise:

> [t]o prove that Dorieus has been victor in a contest, for which the prize is a crown, it is enough to say that he has been victor in the Olympic games. It is needless to add that in the Olympic contests the prize is a crown; everyone is aware of that. (*Rhet.* 1.2.13).

Rhetorical declamation does not usually allow the speaker to interact with the audience by using a question and answer technique. To achieve the same interactive results, the speaker may use an enthymeme: "the speaker draws the premises for his proofs from propositions which members of the audience would supply if he were to proceed by question and answer."[59] The audience interacts by discovering the missing premise, which is usually the most important element of the argument.[60] Keith Erickson points out that while "the syllogism is the normal structure of dialectical arguments, the enthymeme's form is conducive to the purposes of rhetoric,"[61] that is, persuading the audience by encouraging its participation.

Audiences enjoyed the challenge of the enthymeme. Aristotle writes that

> of all syllogisms, whether refutative or demonstrative, those are specially applauded, the result of which the hearers foresee as soon as they are begun, and not because they are superficial (for as they listen they congratulate themselves on anticipating the conclusion) (*Rhet.* 2.23.30).[62]

---

[59]Lloyd F. Bitzer, "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited" in *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric* (ed. Keith V. Erickson; Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974), 151.

[60]Hill, "Rhetoric of Aristotle," 72.

[61]Erickson, introduction to *Aristotle*, 3.

[62]Aristotle also teaches that a refutative enthymeme is more popular than the demonstrative. By using the former, the speaker usurps part of the opposition's argument to prove a more persuasive argument for himself: "things in juxtaposition are always clearer to the audience" (*Rhet.* 2.23.30).

The most popular enthymemes are those that require a little enjoyable effort on the part of the audience. Rather than insulting the audience's intelligence by implying that they cannot reason on their own, Aristotle recommended leaving a premise, often the key premise, to the audience's powers of deduction.

Thomas Conely concluded that enthymemes are probably (but not conclusively) deductive arguments, sometimes (though not always) expressed as truncated syllogisms, that involve character, emotion, and reason. He points out, as is supported by Aristotle's comments above, that if the enthymeme is expressed as a truncated syllogism, the audience must supply the missing premise.[63] The enthymeme, then, is a cooperative effort between the speaker and the audience. The persuasive force of the enthymeme's argument relies upon the audience's perception of that argument.[64] Unless the audience supplies the unstated premise, the enthymeme fails. These acts of co-creation "intimately unite speaker and audience and provide the strongest possible proofs . . . . Owing to the skill of the speaker, *the audience itself helps construct the proofs by which it is persuaded*."[65] Lloyd Bitzer's final note on the implications of this conclusion directly relates to this project and is worth quoting in full:

> [i]t may be worthwhile to note that this interpretation of the enthymeme . . . provides a sound theoretical justification for that kind of speech criticism which studies the audience and relevant aspects of its context as carefully as it studies the speaker and his preserved speeches. According to this interpretation, a recorded speech is only partially a speech. The complete speech is the actual speech which occurs when speaker and audience interact, either cooperatively or not. Therefore, a sound speech criticism of past speeches must reconstruct the

---

[63]Thomas M. Conley, "The Enthymeme in Perspective," *QJS* 70 (1984): 168–9.

[64]Walker, *Rhetoric and Poetics*, 284.

[65]Bitzer, "Enthymeme Revisited," 151. Italics original. Cf. Walker, *Rhetoric and Poetics*, 170, and Hill, "Aristotle's Rhetorical Theory," 61. Hill agrees that this idea is implied by Aristotle even though it is not explicitly stated in *Rhetoric*.

> actual speech, and this requires detailed study of the particular audience to determine the premises it would or would not have supplied.[66]

The enthymeme clearly demonstrates rhetors intentionally using gaps to encourage audience participation. Thus the enthymeme requires cooperation from the audience—cooperation that is the beginning of self-persuasion.

*Open-ended comparisons.* Comparisons in the ancient world came in many forms. In this section, we will treat metaphor, riddle, fable, and parable.[67] While some comparisons explicitly connect the two subjects being compared, others remain open-ended, at least for a time, leaving the connective work to the audience. These categories naturally overlap in many cases, but each will be treated separately as a tool for encouraging the audience to help create the surrounding narrative.

Metaphor is the broadest category in the discussion of comparisons. Aristotle's discussion of metaphor has proven to be the most influential theory proposed by ancient rhetoricians.[68] A composite definition of metaphor may be gleaned from Aristotle's remarks on rhetoric: a metaphor is a type of noun (*Poet.* 21.4); is often a word or phrase unfamiliar with its context (*Poet.* 22.3); and has been "either transferred from the genus and applied to the species or from the species and applied to the genus, or from one

---

[66]Bitzer, "Enthymeme Revisited," 155, note 38.

[67]In the Greek rhetorical treatises, παραβολή is often translated as "comparison." I will use the transliterated term "parable" in order to distinguish between the general category "comparison" and the more specific comparison indicated by the term παραβολή.

[68]Michael Silk, "Metaphor and Metonymy: Aristotle, Jakobson, Ricouer, and Others" in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition. Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions* (ed. G. R. Boys-Stones; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 116.

species to another or else by analogy" (*Poet.* 21.7).[69] The metaphor works by connecting two otherwise disjointed words or ideas, which in turn causes the receiver of the metaphor to begin to search for parallels (*Poet.* 21.7-15). Aristotle's rather vague definition differs, of course, from modern theories of metaphor, but the idea that a metaphor is a "transfer of a word or name from its home context to another one" has been shared across the centuries.[70]

Metaphors, when applied correctly, contribute to the clarity of argument for the purpose of persuasion, which is the ultimate goal of rhetorical speech (*Rhet.* 3.2.6-7). In particular, metaphors allow the rhetor to make the audience "*see* one thing as another, or in light of another."[71] Aristotle uses Homer as an example of an author who uses

> proportional metaphor and expressions which set things before the eyes . . . Homer often, by making use of metaphor, speaks of inanimate things as if they were animate; and it is to creating actuality in all such cases that his popularity is due. . . . For in all these examples there is appearance of actuality, since the objects are represented as animate: "the shameless stone," "the eager spearpoint," and the rest express actuality. . . . In his popular similes[72] also he proceeds in the same manner with inanimate things: arched, foam-crested, some in front, others behind; for he gives movement and life to all, and actuality is movement (*Rhet.* 3.11.1-3).

---

[69]Quintilian presents the same idea: "Words are *proper* when they bear their original meaning; *metaphorical*, when they are used in a sense different from their natural meaning" (*Inst.* 1.5.71). Later, Theon observed that metaphors were used in chreia: "As a trope (i.e., metaphor), for example, 'Plato the philosopher used to say that the sprouts of virtue grow with sweat and toil'" (*Exercises* 100).

[70]Richard Moran, "Metaphor, Artifice, and Persuasion in the *Rhetoric*" in *Essays on Aristotle's* Rhetoric (ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), 385-386.

[71]Moran, "Metaphor, Artifice, and Persuasion," 396.

[72]Discussion of metaphors as similes will follow later in this section.

While some of Aristotle's comments about metaphor deal with its ornamental function,[73] he also considers the philosophical function of the figure—its ability to "enhance, to facilitate, and to systematically guide certain conceptual, ethical inquires."[74] Kenneth Burke writes that for Aristotle, one value of metaphor is that if a speaker successfully uses metaphor to convey a point, he not only communicates the "mother image" but also a "whole bundle of principles, even ones that would be mutually contradictory if reduced to their purely ideational equivalents."[75] Metaphors result in a "semantic clash"[76] that prompts the audience to reconcile two different ideas in order to arrive at the author's intended meaning. Thus a metaphor, a word or phrase that is out of place, allows for clearest communication. Aristotle understands metaphor to have an "'illuminary' function which operates generally to make particular or contingent matters more intelligible to the reader or listener."[77] Later, Cicero writes that "the explanation is that when something that can scarcely be conveyed by the proper term is expressed metaphorically, the meaning we desire to convey is made clear by the resemblance of the thing that we have expressed by the word that does not belong" (*De Or.* 3.38.155-156).

---

[73]For example, *Poet.* 22.7; 22.19; Cicero, *De Or.* 3.42.167; *Eloc.* 2.83. Cf. Cicero, *De Or.* 3.38.152-153: "There are then three things which the orator contributes in the matter of mere vocabulary towards the decoration and embellishment of his style—rare words, new coinages, and words used metaphorically;" and *De Or.* 3.4.161, in which Cicero says that metaphor brings brilliance to style. A later treatise, *On the Sublime*, says that "there is nothing so expressive as a sustained series of metaphors" and that "metaphors make for sublimity" (*Subl.*32.4-6). Another says that metaphors "import a special charm and grandeur to prose style" (*Eloc.* 2.77-78).

[74]Sara Joanne Newman, "Aristotle and Metaphor: His Theory and Its Practice" (Ph.D. diss.; University of Minnesota, 1998), 271.

[75]Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 87.

[76]Elizabeth E. Pender, "Plato on Metaphors and Models" in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition. Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions* (ed. G. R. Boys-Stones; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 56.

[77]Newman, "Aristotle and Metaphor," 265.

Cicero wrote that he found it curious that people tended to enjoy words used metaphorically rather than in their proper sense. He concluded that in the case of the speaker, this phenomenon might occur because speakers like to display their cleverness by using metaphor. Audience members, however, also share this pleasure of metaphor, and Cicero believes that this is because

> the hearer's thoughts are led to something else and yet without going astray, which is a very great pleasure; or because a single work in each case suggests the thing and a picture of the whole; or because every metaphor, provided it be a good one, has a direct appeal to the senses, especially the sense of sight, which is the keenest . . . metaphors drawn from the sense of sight are much more vivid, virtually placing within the range of our mental vision objects not actually visible to our sight. (*De Or.* 3.39.159-3.40.161)

Rhetoricians warn that metaphors should be used appropriately[78] and sparingly.[79] When used correctly metaphors clarify the speaker's meaning and have the additional benefit of brevity (*De Or.* 3.39.158). Aristotle believed that while it is a great accomplishment to make proper use of other figures, "the greatest thing is the use of metaphor. That alone cannot be learnt; it is the token of genius" (*Poet.* 24.9).

A simile is a type of metaphor, and according to Aristotle, there is very little difference between the two: "When the poet says of Achilles, he rushed on like a lion, it is a simile; if he says, 'a lion, he rushed on,' it is a metaphor . . . . Similes must be used like metaphors which only differ in the manner stated . . . similes . . . are metaphors without the details" (*Rhet.* 3.4.1-3). Later in the discussion, Aristotle reiterates that

---

[78]Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.2.8-13; 3.3.4; 3.4.3-4; *Poet.* 25.11-17, 21; Cicero, *De Or.* 3.40.162; 3.41.163; 3.49; *Eloc.* 2.84-85; 3.188. Cicero lists four disapproved metaphors: metaphors in which "there may be a likeness, but all the same in each case the resemblance contains an ugly idea"; "a metaphor that is on a bigger scale than the thing requires—'a hurricane of revelry'"; a metaphor that is on a smaller scale than the thing requires—'the reveling of the hurricane'"; 'the metaphorical term being narrower in scope than the literal and proper word would have been" (*De Or.* 3.41.164).

[79]*Poet.* 22.11-13; *Subl.* 32.1, 7.

"similes, as has been often said, are metaphors of a kind" (*Rhet.* 3.11.13). Like metaphors, similes encourage audience participation by presenting two different ideas that communicate through their point(s) of reference.

Metaphors provide ample opportunity for the audience to act as co-creator with the speaker. Richard Moran's study of ancient metaphorical theory highlights this characteristic. He writes that the aim of a metaphor is "to get one's audience to *do* various things, to imagine in a lively fashion that involves much associating, connecting, and emotional responding."[80] The speaker increases his persuasiveness without effort of his own, because the

> crucial advantage here is . . . the miraculous fact that shifting the imaginative labor onto the audience makes the ideas thereby produced infinitely *more* valuable rhetorically than they would be as products of the explicit assertations of the speaker. They are more valuable because the ideas derived from the image will be both more memorable and less subject to suspicion for having been worked out by the audience themselves.[81]

Paul Gordon understands Aristotle to say that a "metaphor leaves logic in abeyance."[82] It is this characteristic of metaphors in general that give the figure its value: "what is decisive is what metaphor shares with jokes, paradoxes, parables, and other species of wit (*ta asteiai*); namely a physiological release of pleasure that accompanies any sudden recognition."[83] Learning, at times by sudden recognition, is an element of smart or popular sayings described by Aristotle:

---

[80]Moran, "Metaphor, Artifice, and Persuasion," 396.

[81]Moran, "Metaphor, Artifice, and Persuasion," 396.

[82]Paul Gordon, *The Critical Double: Figurative Meaning in Aesthetic Discourse* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1995), 25.

[83]Gordan, *Critical Double*, 26.

> [e]asy learning is naturally pleasant to all, and words mean something, so that all words which make us learn something are most pleasant. Now we do not know the meaning of strange words, and proper terms we know already. It is metaphor, therefore, that above all produces this effect; for when Homer calls old age stubble, he teaches and informs us through the genus; for both have lost their bloom (*Rhet.* 3.10.1-3).

Metaphorical language allows the audience to make new connections, a pleasurable activity. Moran writes that "since this grasping of ideas is itself pleasurable, we can expect such a process to have a certain momentum, as pleasure induces learning something new, which in turn, is pleasurable, induces further responsiveness and ideational activity."[84] The speaker should leave some responsibility to the hearer, and he should not make the metaphorical connection too obvious. Aristotle advises that a metaphor should not be too strange, but neither should it be too "superficial, for then it does not impress the hearer" (*Rhet.* 3.10.6).[85] By involving the audience in the figure of metaphor, the rhetor causes pleasure, which will hopefully induce the audience to further participation.

The riddle or enigma encourages the same sort of audience participation. Aristotle writes that "generally speaking, clever enigmas furnish good metaphors; for metaphor is a kind of enigma, so that it is clear that the transference is clever" (*Rhet.* 3.2.12). Riddles are pleasing for two reasons: they are metaphorical and they cause the

---

[84]Moran, "Metaphor, Artifice, and Persuasion," 391. Cf. George A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 112: "Metaphor is a mean between the extremes of the unintelligible and the commonplace. We already know commonplace words, and we can learn nothing from completely unknown words; but from words with which we already associate some meaning we can get a new insight into the nature of some object or action. . . . This knowledge, in turn, like rhythm and like the sense of grammatical completion, produces a feeling of pleasure or satisfaction and is thus a characteristic of good style. Happiness is as much the object of Aristotle's theory of style as of his ethics."

[85] Some of Longinus' discussion of metaphors is missing, and the phrase before the lost section is tantalizing: "To return to metaphors. Closely akin to them are illustration and imagery. The only difference is . . ." [*Subl.* 37.1]); *Eloc*. 2.78-79.

audience to learn something (*Rhet.* 3.11.6). In order to succeed, the speaker's riddle must first "set up a certain expectation, only to defeat it . . . whatever pleasure we take in this depends on our not seeing through the trick at once."[86] The element of sudden recognition again plays a part in the figure's success.

Aristotle gives an example of a well-known riddle more than once: "I saw a man weld bronze upon a man with fire"[87] (*Poet.* 21.6; *Rhet.*3.2.12). He later explains that while there was no name for what the man did, the author of the enigma "called the application of the cupping-glass 'gluing'" (*Rhet.* 3.2.12). Another well-placed riddle comes from the wise sayings of the Spartans. Aristotle recalls that Stesichorus told the Locrians that "they ought not to be insolent, lest their cicadas should be forced to chirp from the ground" (*Rhet.* 2.21.8). The riddle delays the hearers' comprehension, and when the true meaning becomes clear—that if the Locrians persisted in their insolence, their land would be devastated and their trees razed to the ground—it is all the more powerful.

Riddles are not always referred to positively. Aristotle warns that "if a poet writes entirely in such words [unfamiliar words], the result will be either a riddle or jargon; if made up of metaphors, a riddle and if of rare words, jargon." (*Poet.* 21.4-6). Quintilian cautions his students along the same lines. Some riddles that successfully communicate in one time and culture may not communicate later or in a different setting. For instance, Quintilian writes that "the Greeks are fond of allegory; but often it is so

---

[86]Moran, "Metaphor, Artifice, and Persuasion," 389.

[87]The answer to the riddle, provided by Fyfe, is "a cupping-bowl. This was a bronze vessel which was applied to the body at the place at which a small incision had been made. Heated lint was placed in the bowl of it and the reduction of air-pressure thus caused a strong flow of blood." (W. Hamilton Fyfe, trans., *Poetics*, by Aristotle (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 85, note d.)

obscure as to become a riddle. Vergil is supposed to have written such a riddle. Caelius used a metaphor in a speech when he called Clodia a 'Clytemnestra.' We know the answers to these riddles, but they were better known at the time of Caelius" (*Inst.* 8.6.51-52). Demetrius teaches that "excess [of metaphorical language] must be avoided, lest language become a riddle in our hands" (*Eloc.* 2.102).

When used judiciously, however, the riddle is an effective rhetorical tool. One source of the riddle's value lies in the fact that "insofar as the intended audience is to 'get' what is unspoken, the poetry helps to intensify the exclusivist sense of inside/outside while reaffirming and intensifying the inside group's self-identification as a fellowship of like-minded comrades."[88] Riddles allow the audience an opportunity to participate in the speech by demonstrating cleverness or privileged knowledge—the opportunity to prove one's intelligence or insider status is powerful motivation. Secondly, as mentioned above, riddles delay comprehension, setting the stage for the pleasurable effect of sudden recognition.

The fable also shares characteristics with the general category of metaphor. Theon defines the fable as "a fictitious story giving an image of truth" (*Exercises* 72).[89] Ben Perry calls this definition "perfect and complete" as long as the full understandings of λόγος and ἀλήθειαν are considered. The λόγος or story, he writes may be as short as a very brief sentence, or it may be longer. The truth pictured by such a story is a picture

---

[88]Walker, *Rhetoric and Poetics*, 256.

[89]Cf. Gert-Jan Van Dijk, ΑΙΝΟΙ, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ *Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature, With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre* (Leide, Brill, 1997), 38-78, for a thorough survey of ancient fable theory. Van Dijk concludes that ancient theorists agree that "fables are fictitious . . . fables are metaphorical . . . [and] fables are stories" (72). There is some disagreement on the issues of the characters in fables, the functions of fables, formal considerations of fables and the appreciation of fables (73-77).

only, a "metaphor in the form of a past narrative."[90] Theon goes on to discuss some confusion about terminology:

> [s]ome of the ancient poets call fables *ainoi*, some *mythoi*. Prose writers most often call them *logoi* rather than *mythoi* . . . A *mythos* is said to be a certain kind of *logos* since the ancients said that 'to speak' was *mytheisthai*. It is called *ainos* because it also provides some *parainesis* ('advice') (*Exercises* 73).

Christos Zafiropoulos, a modern fable scholar, notes that ancient authors never reached a consensus regarding the terminology for fable. The same author might use two or more of the terms interchangeably, with no discernable reason for the variation.[91] Zafiropoulos attempted to categorize the fluid terms. He concludes that while these rules are not rigid, αἶνος "implies a fictitious story in verse with a message that refers to real circumstances but is hidden behind a metaphorical narration," and λόγος "appears mainly through the Classical and Hellenistic periods, while μῦθος dominates the terminology for fable in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine period."[92]

Because fables are usually told with the goal of communicating a truth or idea, authors "usually, though not always add a moral, even when the story itself does not invite one and the moral so given is plainly perfunctory or far-fetched."[93] Such moral after-thoughts were often attached to fables contained within collections since such fables do not have an immediate literary context.[94] While in such a setting, fables are told for

---

[90]Ben Edwin Perry, trans., *Babrius and Phaedrus* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), xx.

[91]Christos A. Zafiropoulos, *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The* Augustana *Collection* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2.

[92]Zafiropoulos, *Ethics in Aesop's Fables*, 2.

[93]Perry, trans., *Babrius and Phaedrus*, xxiv

[94]Perry, trans., *Babrius and Phaedrus*, xxv.

their own sake, fables set in a larger narrative serve a more precise purpose. The point or idea communicated by the fable in that particular narrative setting becomes the focus of the story.[95]

Fables were used in various contexts in the ancient world, including "public speeches,[96] philosophical texts, the courts, [and] the symposia."[97] When fables are inserted into these contexts, they illustrate actions that should or should not be taken by characters in situations provided by the immediate context. Theon gave instructions for using fables in a narrative. He recommends that fables be inflected, like the chreia (*Exercises* 74). When including a fable in a narrative, the author may insert it before or after the narration:

> for example, having imagined that a camel who longed for horns was deprived even of his ears, after stating this first, we go on to the narrative as follows: "Croesus the Lydian seems to me to have suffered something similar to this camel," followed by the whole story of him (*Exercises* 75).

According to Theon, wise sayings could be included at the end of fables if desired. He also indicates that a fable is not restricted to one conclusion: "there can be several conclusions (*epilogoi*) for one fable when we take a start from the contents of the fable, and conversely one conclusion when many fables reflect it (*Exercises* 75). Within a narrative setting "the fable is used as an *exemplum* or παράδειγμα, which illustrates and reinforces an argument."[98]

---

[95]Perry, trans., *Babrius and Phaedrus*, xxv.

[96]Cf. *Rhet.* 2.20.

[97]Zafiropoulos, *Ethics in Aesop's Fables*, 19.

[98]Zafiropoulos, *Ethics in Aesop's Fables*, 19.

It is here, within various narrative contexts, that the fable's usefulness as a tool to encourage audience participation comes to the fore. H. Blackham notes that giving a moral to a fable "is only an editor's privilege; it is exemplary, not restrictive. A history of editions of the fables would show that. There is no definitive 'moral'. The metaphor is open; *the comparison invites exploratory reflection*."[99] Blackham continues in his introduction to conclude that in the case of fables,

> last, not least, the medium is the message. The message is not delivered—certainly not in the "morals" tagged to the Aesopic fables: it is embodied. It is in this sense that fable is a conceptual artifact, which remains to be used. Interplay continues between the thought provoked and the representation that provokes and aids it.[100]

When audience members hear a fable, their imagination is provoked, and, as with other sorts of metaphors, they are responsible for completing and drawing conclusions from the comparison.

Aristotle describes a parable as "placing [things] side by side" or as a "comparison" (*Rhet.* 3.19.5) or "illustration" (*Rhet.* 2.20.4). In many ways, the parable, another type of metaphor,[101] is similar to the fable. In John Henry Freese's translation of *Rhetorica*, he notes that "the παραβολή as understood by Aristotle is a comparison and application of cases easily supposable and such as occur in real life, for the purpose of

---

[99]Blackham, *The Fable as Literature* (New Hampshire: Athlone Press, 1985), xiii. Emphasis mine.

[100]Blackham, *Fable as Literature*, xviii-xix.

[101]Longinus calls metaphors and parables "closely akin." Again this manuscript breaks off at an inconvenient point: "Closely akin to them [metaphors] are illustration [παραβολή] and imagery. The only difference is . . ." (*Subl.* 37.1.1).

illustrating the point in question; the fable, on the other hand, is pure fiction."[102] Aristotle offers a saying of Socrates as an example of a parable:

> if one were to say that magistrates should not be chosen by lot, for this would be the same as choosing as representative athletes not those competent to contend, but those on whom the lot falls or as choosing any of the sailors as the man who should take the helm, as if it were right that the choice should be decided by lot, not by a man's knowledge (*Rhet.* 2..20.4)

Socrates' parable illustrates his point by drawing a comparison between the action in question (choosing magistrates by lot) and common actions with which the audience would be familiar (how athletes and ship captains are, in this case, *not* chosen).

Quintilian considers such comparisons useful not only as embellishments, but also as proofs in an argument (*Inst.* 5.11.5-6). Allowing the audience to infer similarities and connections, the speaker may "persuade the audience of the truth of the point which we are trying to make" (*Inst.* 5.11.6). As with other metaphors, the parable calls images to the audience's mind, placing two ideas side-by-side. For the parable to be complete, the audience must take an active role by drawing connections between the objects of

---

[102]John Henry Freese, trans., *Rhetorica*, by Aristotle (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), 274, note a. Blackham proposes a different understanding of the distinction between parables and fables. He writes that the difference is not, as many suppose, between a story that could be real and one that could not be real, but "the distinction is between independence and generality in the one case, dependence confined to the particular in the other." He offers as an example the parable of the Prodigal Son, which belongs in the context of discussion of the kingdom of heaven—Blackham says that "the point of its telling is in that." The fable, on the other hand, "generates conceptual meanings [and] does not merely furnish an illustration in a particular instance" (Blackham, *Fable as Literature*, xv). Blackham's point is taken, but the above discussion on fable seems to indicate that fables may be general stories in a collection or may be stories with a particular point (or points) when inserted into a specific narrative context. The parable of the Prodigal Son could very well be knit into a different context and then might supply a different meaning. On the other hand, Quintilian seems to support Blackham's claim that the difference between fable and parable is not the plausibility of the story: "For παραβολή, which Cicero translates by 'comparison,' is often apt to compare things whose resemblance is far less obvious. Nor does it merely compare the actions of men. . . . On the contrary, similes of this kind are sometimes drawn from dumb animals and inanimate objects" (*Inst.* 5.11.23-24). The distinction between parable and fable seems to have been unclear in the minds of ancient rhetoricians, and it remains so today.

comparison. Again, the rhetor depends on audience participation to complete the point he is trying to communicate.

*Hidden meanings.* Innuendo provides our first example of hidden meanings. Nisbet points out yet another Ciceronian use of omission: "when Cicero is in a malicious mood, we must look not only at what he says but at what he stops short of saying: innuendo is recognized by the rhetorical theorists (they called it *emphasis* or *significatio*), and anybody who had followed the context could easily supply the unspoken thought."[103] Using innuendo first required that the audience pay attention to the speech, and second that the audience supply the hidden or double meaning of the innuendo material.

Like Cicero, Quintilian makes mention of innuendo, but in a different context. He refers to orators using words with secret meanings and to passages that are so unclear that they require commentators. In the context of this discussion, Quintilian warns that because the first essential quality of good style is clarity, such complexities are not desirable. He does, however, acknowledge that "there is . . . a class of hearer who finds a special pleasure in such passages; for the fact that they can provide an answer to the riddle fills them with an ecstasy of self-congratulation, as if they had not merely heard the phrase, but invented it" (*Inst.* 8.2.21-22). Quintilian speaks negatively of these self-congratulating hearers, but the comment does indicate the reality of, and rhetors' awareness of, audience participation in the area of innuendo.

Other ornaments of speech that involve double meaning require the audience to fill in information as well. Quintilian describes the *noema* as an ornament that

[103]Nisbet, "The Orator and the Reader," 7.

> is employed . . . in the special sense of things which they wish to be understood, though they are not actually said as in the declamation where the sister defends herself against the brother whom she had often bought out from the gladiatorial school, when he brought an action against her demanding the infliction of a similar mutilation because she had cut off his thumb while he slept: "You deserved," she cried, "to have all your fingers," meaning thereby, "You deserved to be a gladiator all your days" (*Inst.* 8.5.12).

Quintilian mentions another popular tactic by which speakers "excite some suspicion to indicate that our meaning is other than our words would seem to imply; . . . [our meaning is] a hidden meaning which is left to the hearer to discover" (*Inst.* 9.2.65). When using this method, the speaker should allow the judge the time to draw his own conclusions: "the judge will be led to seek out the secret which he would not perhaps believe if he heard it openly stated, and to believe in that which he thinks he has found out for himself" (*Inst.* 9.2.71).

Shandi Bartsch observes that by the first century CE, most ambiguity and allusion came in the form of literary performance, "especially the staged dramas of the theater and those works of history, tragedy, poetry, and declamation that were recited, if not necessarily in the theater, nonetheless before a gathered audience."[104] Richard Beacham writes that unlike Greek theater, which had served as a forum on political issues, Roman theater was "more a medium of sensation than of thought, its achievements dazzling or seductive to the eyes, delightful to listen to, and even profoundly moving, but rarely probing or provocative."[105] While Roman actors might not have addressed political realities as directly as did Greek actors, the Roman theater became a political arena

---

[104]Shadi Bartsch, *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994), 66.

[105]Richard C. Beacham, *The Roman Theater and Its Audience* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 150-151. Beacham does believe that the Roman theater served a political purpose, but he means here that the plays were not primarily meant to provide political commentary.

nonetheless. The presence of aristocrats, and sometimes even the emperor, forced politics into the realm of Roman theater.

The Roman stage was used as a political tool by rulers and patrons. Beacham writes that "inside Rome's imperial theatres the audience often was presented with dazzling spectacles calculated to impress and cast reflected glory upon the rulers and patrons (or their representatives) whose presence frequently added to the excitement and splendour of the occasion and ceremony."[106] Patrons financed dramatic productions that featured colorful and elaborate costumes, drawing the audience, for a moment, into the world of "imperial grandeur."[107] On the other hand, the audience also took advantage of the public forum. Roman theater, especially in the Republic, "provided an important opportunity . . . for the large mass of the Roman population to express its opinion if only at the most basic level of granting or withholding visible signs of its approval of the responsible public officials."[108] The Roman theater provided a ready arena for political innuendo, intentional or not. Common and aristocratic audience members alike searched for it fervently.

Early in the first book of Pliny the Younger's *Letters*, the legal judgment of Mettius Modestus, who had since been exiled by Domitian, is under discussion (*Ep.* 1.5). Pliny recounts how Regulus, whom he has called an "abject and mean-spirited creature" (*Ep.* 1.5), questioned him about his feelings of the exiled Modestus. Three times Pliny answered evasively, saying that the matter had already been settled and finally that he

---

[106]Beacham, *Roman Theater*, 169.

[107]Beacham, *Roman Theater*, 189.

[108]Beacham, *Roman Theater*, 191.

thought it "illegal even to ask a question concerning a person who stands convicted" (*Ep.* 1.5).

The conversation gave, on the surface, the "truth" about the disloyalty of exiled Modestus. At the same time, the Pliny's speech was ambiguous enough to avoid naming the supposed guilt of Modestus, allowing Pliny to avoid actively endorsing Domitian's decision. The surface meaning of the conversation arose from the identity, or possible identity, of the audience: Domitian's supporters or even the emperor himself. The ambiguity of the discussion targeted the common members of the audience, hearers who would have delighted in the insinuations against the artistocracy. Bartsch observed that Pliny shaped his words according to the political atmosphere and that the dialogue meant more than one thing. The conversation was "easily enough understandable as the 'right' answer that its element of nonconformity, in this case expressed as a shiftiness about giving a simple answer, could not be pinned down as a hostile or oppositional gesture on Pliny's part."[109]

Why include veiled political references? To send a message to the audience. That message, however, depended upon the audience's participation: unless the audience successfully interpreted the coded message, the doublespeak simply did not exist.[110] On

---

[109]Bartsch, *Actors in the Audience*, 64.

[110]In Bartsch's opinion, authorial intention has, at times, been given too much weight. She writes that "with some consistency, the comments of the sources themselves during the first and second centuries focus *not on the authorial intent behind instances of apparent innuendo but on audience reaction, on the evidence that an audience could make a performance, a recital, or a speech allusive*, thus expressing the sense that meaning was constructed in accordance with factors quite extraneous to the author" (*Actors in the Audience*, 69, italics original).

the surface, Pliny's dialogue supported Domitian's interpretation of events; on another level, however, Pliny calls into question the justice of exiling Modestus.[111]

Double meaning or innuendo allowed audience members to exhibit powers of intelligence and comprehension by detecting underlying meanings in apparently harmless rhetoric. This subtle tool of rhetoric used suggestion and gaps to draw the audience into creative participation.

The much discussed figure of irony, while not an ancient term, was "a widely recognized rhetorical device and a favorite literary technique of classical Greek drama."[112] Jerry Lynn Ray traces the first mention of irony to Aristophanes who used the word "pejoratively as an individual full of craftiness and guile, but who slyly pretended to be less than he was."[113] By the time of Cicero and Quintilian, irony was considered a method of argumentation. According to Cicero, irony occurs when a speaker says exactly the opposite of what is actually thought (*De Or.* 3.53.203). Quintilian's definition is similar: irony occurs when one means something other than what one says (*Inst.* 6.2.15-16).

Like innuendo, irony requires audience participation to exist. Ray writes that "the creation and appreciation of literary irony is a communal endeavor between the ironist and his audience."[114] Irony encourages the involvement of the audience members when they perceive that the orator has severely understated or misstated an idea. Cicero notes

---

[111]Bartsch, *Actors in the Audience*, 64.

[112]Jerry Lynn Ray, *Narrative Irony in Luke-Acts: The Paradoxical Interaction of Prophetic Fulfillment and Jewish Rejection* (Mellen Biblical Press Series 28; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996), 35.

[113]Ray, *Narrative Irony*, 35.

[114]Ray, *Narrative Irony*, 49.

that irony has "a very great influence on the minds of an audience . . . [and] is extremely entertaining if carried on in a conversational and not a declamatory tone" (*De Or.* 3.53.203). Unless the audience recognizes and participates in the irony, the speech is not completely communicated.

The element of surprise or misdirection is an effective tool for encouraging audience participation. Aristotle finds that intentionally leading audiences to false conclusions can be useful: "there is . . . a kind of fictitious discovery which depends on a false inference on the part of the audience" (*Poet.* 16.10). Translator Leon Golden calls this reference "a notoriously difficult concept [that is] defined in Chapter XXIV (ll.69-73) as a kind of reasoning according to which if A is false but its consequence B is true, then A appears to be true."[115] The difficulty is compounded by the fact that Aristotle's example comes from *Ulysses the False Messenger*, a lost play. W. Hamilton Fyfe notes that while scholars do not know exactly what Aristotle means by this statement, "the reference may be to the ruse, common in detective stories, of misleading the audience by false clues in order to make the final revelation more effective."[116] Audience members participate, only to have their conclusions prove false. The conclusion of the orator, then, becomes all the more persuasive.

In a similar manner, metaphor often surprised an audience, and often involved a bit of deception. When used correctly, the "hearer expects something different from what

---

[115]O. B. Hardison, Jr., Commentary in *Aristotle's* Poetics*: A Translation and Commentary for Students of Literature* (*Poetics* trans.Leon Golden; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), 213.

[116]Fyfe, trans., *Poetics*, 63, note c.

he finally understands, and the fact that he has learned is made plainer by the contrast with his false expectations."[117] Aristotle writes that

> most smart sayings are derived from metaphor, and also from misleading the hearer beforehand. For it becomes more evident to him that he has learnt something, when the conclusion turns out contrary to his expectation, and the mind seems to say, "How true it is! but I missed it" (*Rhet.* 3.11.6).

*Question and answer.* The method of question and answer, used extensively in classrooms today, encourages audience participation by forcing the audience to recall information or draw conclusions. Quintilian urges the teacher of rhetoric "not merely to teach these things, but to ask frequent questions as well, and test the critical powers of his class" (*Inst.* 2.513). Students of rhetoric are, after all, an audience themselves.

Philosophers' lectures were often punctuated with questions and answers, at times originating from the audience. Plutarch advised his student, Nicander, to instead listen respectfully to a lecture. He writes that "those persons who lead the speaker to digress to other topics, and interject questions, and raise new difficulties, are not pleasant or agreeable company at a lecture; they get no benefit from it, and they confuse both the speaker and the speech" (*Mor.* 1.42F ). That Plutarch saw fit to mention the unwelcome interjections, however, proves Whitney Shiner's claim that the audience "frequently proposed problems, interjected questions, and advanced difficulties, often sidetracking the speaker's lecture."[118] It seems that audience participation through question and answer occurred at times even without the speaker's initiation.

---

[117]Hill, "Rhetoric of Aristotle," 79-80.

[118]Whitney Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark* (New York: Trinity Press International, 2003), 145.

In the treatise *De elocutione* (*On Style*), Demetrius writes that when "speaking it is sometimes forcible to address questions to the audience without disclosing one's own view. . . . The orator forces his hearer into a sort of corner, so that he seems to be brought to task and to have no answer" (*Eloc.* 5.279). Once the hearer has considered the orator's question without resolving it, the orator can supply an answer that seems all the more convincing, or can leave the answer unstated.

*Allusion.* Allusion is a versatile tool, requiring the audience to draw upon their network of knowledge of social situations, personal experiences, and literary materials. Rhetors provided the audience with sufficient clues to trigger the recollection of a larger body of information. This skill allowed the rhetor to pursue the ideal of conciseness and required the audience to supply the information needed to compete the rhetorical idea.

Cultural (or social) allusions played an important role in declamation as well as the Greco-Roman stage, and required the audience to participate by drawing on a common network of social knowledge. For example, Plautus, a third-century BCE comedic playwright, counted on his audience to understand references to Greek culture.[119] The playwright alludes to the people of Praeneste in negative fashion by criticizing their manner of speech: "Right in front of this door, 'a little back,' as Praenestines say" (*Trin.* 609). In another play, Plautus scoffs at the Praenestines for truncating the woodpecker's name to simply "pecker" (*Truc.* 691). Without at least a

[119]Walter R. Chalmers, "Plautus and His Audience" in *Roman Drama* (ed. T. A. Dorey and Donald R. Dudley; New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965), 43-47. From this expectation, Chalmers concludes that Plautus' audience members were "intellectually awake and had a robust sense of humour and a keen zest for life" (47).

rudimentary knowledge of people of Praeneste, however, Plautus' allusive jabs do not make sense.[120]

Literary allusions, in particular, required skilled handling. For instance, Cicero included literary allusions in his speeches so that "the well-read reader would enjoy the pleasure of recognition, and feel well-disposed to an orator who took his culture for granted."[121] He did not, however, forget the audience members who did not have the privilege of being well-read. Cicero constructed his literary allusions in such a way that those who were not able to fill those gaps still understood his meaning. Nisbet writes that in these cases, "the less learned would not feel slighted as there would be no reason for puzzlement."[122] Cicero encouraged participation from the more educated audience members while retaining the attention of the less informed.

Allusions to the Homeric epics are, of course, so numerous that identifying true allusions can be difficult.[123] Perhaps more interesting are examples of the bard himself practicing allusion in his poetry. Laura Slatkin examines the *Iliad* character Thetis in order to show that allusions are "highly charged" in the poem, providing "the coordinates

---

[120]For example, most modern readers are not familiar with the speaking habits of the Praenestines. The paucity of meaning in the two quotes referenced above helps prove the case in point.

[121]Nisbet, "The Orator and the Reader," 13.

[122]Nisbet, "The Orator and the Reader," 13. Including the right amount of literary allusion can be tricky. C. W. Marshall notes that "a playwright could . . . disenfranchise himself by learned obscurities. For an audience . . . does know when it is being excluded from understanding the point. . . . The playwright is going to try to encompass as much as this audience as he can" (C.W. Marshall, "Literary Awareness in Euripides and His Audience" in *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* [ed. Ian Worthington; New York: Brill, 1996], 95.

[123]Although too tangential to to consider in this study, see Richard Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (New York: Routledge, 1990), for an illuminating look at Homeric allusions in Greek tragedy.

that locate the poem's action within a multidimensional mythological realm."[124] In some cases, allusions are made to material within the same narrative; these are examples of intratextual allusions. Homer provides an example of prospective allusions, those that look forward to events in the narrative. Slatkin finds an example of this type when

> Hera refuses to renounce her intention to destroy the Trojans and their city, and Zeus resignedly accepts her intransigence but promises that in the future he will in return unhesitatingly sack whichever of her favorite cities he chooses—remembering her savagery toward his beloved Troy (4.30ff). Here Zeus sets in motion a prospective allusion, anticipating an episode in the future that will allude to his present accommodation over Troy, and thus their history of conflict.[125]

In other cases, allusions are made to mythologies found in other narratives. In the opening speeches of the *Iliad*, Homer uses literary allusion to reference the role of Thetis related by Cycle's *Aethiopis*, evoking links between Thetis and the divine Dawn Eos.[126] Homer uses the mythology of his characters and sometimes the material contained in his poetry to create "a vehicle to introduce and frame mythological material valuable for its thematic impact."[127]

C. W. Marshall also explored an example of literary allusion to material found outside a narrative.[128] The fifth-century BCE playwright Euripides exhibited an awareness of this literary milieu, and he included references to many of these sources in his plays. In particular, Euripides often alluded to his near-contemporary, Aeschylus, and

---

[124]Laura M. Slatkin, *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the* Iliad (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 108.

[125]Slatkin, *Power of Thetis*, 110.

[126]See Slatkin's discussion, *Power of Thetis*, 21-28.

[127]Slatkin, *Power of Thetis*, 117.

[128]Much of the following discussion on Euripides is taken from Marshall, "Literary Awareness," 81-98.

his plays, the *Oresteia*.[129] Euripides wrote clues into his plays, "specific enough so as to recall the specific scene of the specific play that is being parodied."[130] Marshall observed that Euripides' *Electra* clearly alludes to the *Libation Bearers* through clues in vocabulary, context, and even non-verbal staging techniques.[131]

Thus, intratextual allusion, a type of literary allusion, invokes material within the same narrative. References to earlier events or statements may be necessary to complete such allusions, requiring the audience to store information from the story to use at a later time. Other intratextual allusions may be forward-looking. The author may present the audience members with a gap that will be filled later by information contained in the same work.

Literary allusions also leave informational gaps in a narrative. Key words and phrases direct the audience to other literary material that informs the narrative in various ways. The tool of allusion "elicits from its audience a particular kind of recognition that retrieves as full a context as possible for each fragmentary reference: [it is] a process of continuous recollection operating simultaneously with the audience's anticipation and apprehension of the developments of the poem's plot."[132] An uninformed or inattentive audience may let the gaps of allusion slip away unfilled, but educated and active audience members participate by recalling the desired material and integrating it into the current narrative.

---

[129]Aeschylus died in 456 BCE, and Euripides' plays began appearing in 455 BCE (Marshall, "Literary Awareness," 82).

[130]Marshall, "Literary Awareness," 84. Marshall calls this a "built-in footnote" to the referenced work.

[131]Marshall, "Literary Awareness," 97.

[132]Slatkin, *Power of Thetis*, 117-118.

Regardless of the manner in which speakers or playwrights attempted to connect with the audience, each recognized the absolute necessity of the audience. They cultivated tools of their trade that would encourage audience interaction, for without an audience, poetry, theater, and rhetoric were empty vessels.

### *Conclusion*

Evidence amassed from rhetorical handbooks indicates that ancient rhetoricians gave much consideration to their audiences. Not only did orators shape speeches according to audience identity and preference, but they also cultivated tools that would encourage audience participation in the rhetorical piece. The handbooks reveal various types of participation, ranging from merely paying attention to becoming one of the creators of the narrative. Audience participation does not receive extended treatment in ancient rhetorical treatises, but the topic is discussed often in tangential contexts.

Rhetorical handbooks refer to various results of audience participation. Of particular interest for this project is the creation of story, an activity that makes the audience member more inclined to moral formation. A participating audience necessarily paid attention, and hearers who helped create the story were more likely to be formed by the intended lessons. Thus, in an effort to better understand audience participation in ancient rhetoric, the remainder of this project will focus on the audience's role as co-creator in the art of rhetoric and the results that follow that creative act.

Ancient rhetoricians understood the value of encouraging the audience to become co-creators with them, and many used various tools to encourage such cooperation. Privileged access made the audience feel included in and important to the narrative, while

at the same time providing new information to the audience's network of narrative knowledge.

When audience members supply omitted material (sometimes from a recently acquired network of narrative knowledge), they finish the thought, so to speak, of the rhetor and begin to persuade themselves. While the audience creates the argument or narrative only in part, the most effective instances of co-creation occurrs when the speaker leaves the main point of a proof to be supplied by the audience. The figure of enthymeme often relies on audience participation for the crux of an argument. This level of cooperation and co-creation with the rhetor is a highly effective persuasive tool; a hearer is more likely to believe an argument he or she helps create.

Open-ended comparisons provide ample opportunity for audience members to demonstrate their cleverness. When included in a narrative context, metaphors, riddles, fables, and parables provide the audience with puzzles to complete. Contrasting or even impossible ideas are presented for comparison. If they accept the challenge of engaging the comparison, the clashing topics treat audience members to the pleasure of learning new things about old ideas.

Words and phrases with hidden meanings require audience participation in order to be successful. An innuendo (or a statement with a double meaning), ironic statement, or element of surprise that is not understood by the audience simply does not exist. Though rhetoricians warn against abusing this tactic, hearers' pleasure at detecting hidden meanings encourages careful and active listening.

Interchange between author or speaker and audience also takes place by means of question and answer. At times the speaker instigates this exchange; in other cases the

dialogue is initiated by the audience. The audience's interaction with the speaker through question and answer creates a part of rhetoric that did not exist before, making the audience a partner in the speaker's creative act.

Finally, the audience creates part of the mythological or social background of a narrative by following brief clues supplied by the speaker and expanding cultural and literary (including intratextual) allusions. A few words from the rhetor trigger a much larger flow of information provided by the audience members themselves. Rhetoricians urge caution when using this skill, especially because of different levels of audience social exposure and education.

The subsequent chapters will explore literature from the following areas: pagan Greco-Roman, Hebrew and Jewish, New Testament narrative, and Lucan material. Specifically, we will look for evidence that the authors used the following rhetorical tools: access to privileged information; omissions, general as well as specific omissions such as understood information and enthymeme; open-ended comparisons such as metaphor, riddle, fable, and parable; hidden or double meanings such as innuendo, irony, and surprise or misdirection; question and answer; and allusions such as cultural, literary, and intratextual allusions.[259] Literature from each category will be examined for evidence of these tools that encourage audience participation, specifically in the manner of paying attention, being morally formed, and ultimately co-creating the story with the author.

---

[259]Tools may appear in varying order, depending on their prevalence in the material in question.

# CHAPTER THREE

## Audience Participation in Pagan Literature

Pagan[1] literature from the Greco-Roman period provides students of ancient rhetoric with much fodder for investigations. A study of how ancient audiences participated in co-creating pagan literature could stretch into infinity, so this project limits literature for examination to several works that relate to the final works of interest: Luke and Acts.

Aristotle, Cicero, and the author of *On the Sublime* commented on the audience and tools for encouraging audience participation, as noted in the previous chapters. Before discussing narrative examples of tools encouraging audience participation, we will look briefly at these rhetoricians who used or at least referred to the use of techniques discussed in the last chapter.

In the sections following discussion of the rhetoricians, we will consider examples of three types of literature: history, novel, and biography.[2] Herodotus' work deserves treatment, if only for the sake of its author, the father of history. Livy's history of Rome, a work more contemporary with Luke and Acts, will also be considered. Two Greek novels will receive attention, again, because of similarity to Luke and Acts in terms of

---

[1] I wish to use the term Pagan as Raymond Brown has used it: in "a technical, nonpejorative sense to cover a religious belief that is not Jewish (or Christian)." Raymond Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 65, note 25.

[2]See again Phillips' recent article that states that "further narrowing of the categories [of genre is] unwarranted" ("Genre of Acts," 385). On this basis we will consider several different types of ancient literature, as mentioned above, based on the similarities their genres share with the New Testament gospels and the Book of Acts.

literary conventions. Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and Xenophon's *Ethiopian Tale* represent this group of works because their dates most closely coincide with the dating of the Lucan material. Finally, Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* provides an example of biography, another genre suggested for Luke's work. By choosing these pieces for examination, I do not intend to insist upon a genre for Luke or Acts, but to acknowledge historical, novel-istic, and biographical features of the Lucan material in order to reduce the unmanageable corpus of pagan literature to a more reasonable size and choose texts relevant to the discussion of Luke and Acts.

## *Examples from the Rhetoricians*

### *Aristotle*

*Omission.* We find the tool of omission being used in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Forbes Hill points out that "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* looks neater in most English translations than in the Greek original. Many of the Greek sentences are abbreviated and elliptical; clarifying phrases are often omitted. The translators usually fill in wherever good English is required."[3] Granted, *Rhetoric* is often thought to be Aristotle's lecture notes, published posthumously,[4] and one might suppose that if Aristotle had prepared the manuscript for publication, he might have finished more sentences and thoughts, leaving fewer omissions to be filled by his audience. Aristotle did not, however, for whatever reason, fix many of the omissions. The manner in which *Rhetoric* has been "finished" by

---

[3]Hill, "Rhetoric of Aristotle," 50.

[4]Hill, "Rhetoric of Aristotle," 50.

various audiences over the centuries bears witness to omission as a tool for encouraging audience participation.

*Open-ended comparisons.* Aristotle gives examples of the use of comparisons, another tool used to encourage audience participation, in the form of fable. In *Rhetoric*, Aristotle relates the story of Stesichorus' fable for the people of Himera. As the inhabitants of Himera are about to give their army commander, Phalaris, a bodyguard, Stesichorus tells them a fable

> of the horse who had a field all to himself. Presently there came a stag and began spoiling his pasturage. The horse, wishing to revenge himself on the stag, asked a man if he could help him to do so. The man said, "Yes, if you will let me bridle you and get onto your back with javelins in my hand." The horse agreed, and the man mounted; but instead of getting his revenge on the stag, the horse found himself the slave of the man (*Rhet.* 2.20.10-20).

The explanation for the comparison comes soon after the fable. The audience, however, as the fable is told, has a chance to work the comparison out for themselves. What is the meaning behind Stesichorus' story? Stesichorus explains that the Himerans should take care; they have already appointed Phalaris military dictator—they already have the bit in their mouths. If the people go further by giving Phalaris a personal bodyguard, they are like the horse that has been mounted and taken as a slave (*Rhet.* 2.20.20). Gert-Jan Van Dijk notes that in the case of this fable, verbal parallels enabled "the logical solution of other unknowns in the metaphorical equation by some intellectual activity on the part of the audience."[5]

In the same section of *Rhetoric*, Aristotle records an account of Aesop himself using a fable. Aesop, defending a leader being tried for his life, tells this story:

---

[5]Van Dijk, AINOI, 370.

> [a] fox, in crossing a river, was swept into a hole in the rocks; and, not being able to get out, suffered miseries for a long time through the swarms of fleas that fastened on her. A hedgehog, while roaming around, noticed the fox; and feeling sorry for her asked if he might remove the fleas. But the fox declined the offer; and when the hedgehog asked why, she replied, "These fleas are by this time full of me and not sucking much blood; if you take them away, others will come with fresh appetites and drink up all the blood I have left" (*Rhet.* 2.20.24-31).

Aesop makes his point to the audience—that his client should be acquitted—without offending the audience.[6] The audience would identify with the fox; wisely Aesop did not ask them to identify with the fleas. At the same time, Aesop catered to the audience's disgruntled feelings toward the leader by identifying *him* with the fleas. Aesop concludes the fable with an explanation: if the people put his client to death, they are simply replacing one problem with a worse problem. This ruler is rich and does not need to "suck the people dry," so to speak. Aesop warns that the rulers who would replace his client would not be rich, and "their peculations will empty your treasury completely" (*Rhet*. 2.20.30).

Van Dijk points out that the fable is atypical in that it does not

> depict metaphorically the inevitable consequences of the audience's proposed line of conduct. . . . This deviation from the typical fable scheme . . . has the advantage of having two implications. First Aesop refuses on principle to bring the demagogue to death, *even metaphorically*. Secondly, the Samians are thus invited to repent by quasi-spontaneously not implementing their plan.[7]

Aristotle does not record the reaction of the Samians to Aesop's argument, but the example of the fable serves to prove the point that ancient fable tellers—even Aesop himself—expected audience members actively to draw conclusions about fables in order

---

[6]Van Dijk, AINOI, 290.

[7]Van Dijk, AINOI, 290, emphasis mine.

first to complete the story started by the speaker and second to be morally formed by the comparison so that they decide on a wise course of action.

*Cicero*

*Omission.* Cicero's speeches, as they are recorded, often include omissions as well. Many of the great orator's speeches were written down after they were delivered; others were "recorded" although they were never actually given. Nevertheless, Martin Clarke believes that the extant speeches of Cicero are reasonably close to the speeches he would have delivered.[8] Clarke notes that much of the material in Cicero's forensic speeches was irrelevant to the case at hand. Cicero tended to "deal hastily with the actual counts of the indictment and fully with extraneous matter."[9] In part, this habit of omission may have been caused by a lack of evidence and by the political nature of the Roman court system,[10] but Cicero was probably also considering his audience. Cicero did not need to repeat information his audience already knew. The jurors or the senate, depending on the context, would most likely have already known the facts of the indictment and the charges brought before them. Cicero's task, then, was not to revisit familiar material, but to use his formidable rhetorical skills[11] to make his audience forget their setting and their logical reasoning—his aim was to catch the audience up in emotion and sway them to his view.[12] This swelling of emotion could not be achieved by

---

[8]Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, 62.

[9]Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, 64.

[10]Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, 64.

[11]Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, 62.

[12]See *Inst*. 8.3.4.

rehashing familiar, and therefore dull, material; Cicero taught that if the narration section of a speech did not benefit the point being made, the speaker should omit it (*De Or.* 2.330). In order to make wise use of his speaking time, Cicero often opted to omit material that the audience could easily supply. He relied on the audience—be it jurors, senators, or simply a crowd—to fill in the gaps and complete the story of the person in question.

*The Author of* On the Sublime

*Omission.* This author, traditionally identified as Longinus, exercised omission in a similar way when he wrote *On the Sublime* for his friend, Terentianus. Longinus needed to make good use of his time and writing space, and he did not wish to offend his intelligent recipient. Therefore, he tells his audience, in this case, Terentianus, that he is leaving out information that may be easily supplied: "writing for a man of such learning and culture as yourself, dear friend, I almost feel freed from the need of a lengthy preface. . . . But, as I say, my dear Terentianus, these and other such hints you with your experience could supply yourself" (*Eloc*. 1.3-1.4). In this case, not only did Longinus communicate by using only brief references in place of a full preface, but he also complimented Terentianus, making his audience more receptive by recognizing and honoring his intelligence.

*Conclusion*

Aristotle, Cicero, and the author of *On the Sublime* refer to the need and desire for audience participation, note rhetorical tools that encourage that participation (as explored in the previous chapter), and exhibit the use of such tools in their works—most often the

tool of omission. Having mentioned several of these examples in works by rhetoricians, we now turn to historians, novelists, and biographers of the ancient world.

## *Examples from Historians*

### *Herodotus*

Herodotus wrote his *Histories* in the fifth century BCE as a text, but most likely as a text that would be experienced by ancient audiences in the form of public readings.[13] Herodotus uses several techniques described in the preceding chapter as tools for keeping the audience's attention and encouraging their participation.[14]

*Privileged access to information.* The infamous Delphic oracle received by Croesus provides an example of the use of privileged access. Croesus seeks the oracle's advice on whether or not he should attack the Persian forces. The oracle's reply—that if Croesus should attack the Persians, he will destroy a great empire (*Hist.* 1.53)—appears to favor Croesus' plans for war. In the narrative, however, Herodotus tells the audience, "Croesus, *mistaking the meaning of the oracle*, invaded Cappadocia, thinking to destroy Cyrus and the Persian power" (*Hist.* 1.71, italics mine). The audience receives privileged information that Croesus' campaign, regardless of appearances, is doomed from the start. This information becomes important later in the narrative.

---

[13] Michael Grant, *Greek and Roman Historians: Information and Misinformation* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 61.

[14]Due to the length of *Histories*, we will not attempt to treat Herodotus' narrative in chronological order. The examples and discussion of the texts in this chapter are not meant to be exhaustive, but indicative of various methodologies found in the texts.

*Open-ended comparison.* Herodotus also recounts comparisons or fables used by his characters to convey a truth to the narrative audience. While these comparisons are not meant to result in moral formation (as are other later examples), they do help an inattentive audience to more effectively experience the points made by the characters in the text. When Cyrus, the aforementioned grandson of Astyages, tries to incite the Persians to revolt again the king, he illustrates his point in the following way. One day, Cyrus commands the Persians to work long hours at strenuous manual labor. The next day, Cyrus feeds the Persians a great feast. He compares the two days to what will happen if they do (or do not) join him in revolting against Astyages (1.126): if they join Cyrus, they will enjoy a good life; if they do not revolt, they will have lives of toil and suffering.

Cyrus later uses a fable to communicate with the Ionians and Aeolians, two groups that had refused to join in Cyrus' revolt. When the Ionians and Aeolians approached him seeking a treaty, Cyrus told them a story about a flutist who thought that if he played to fish in the sea, the fish would come onto the land. The fish did not come onto the land, and so the flutist threw a net out to catch them. The flutist saw that the netted fish were quivering, and he said to them, "Stop dancing since when I was playing the flute, you refused to come out dancing!" (1.141). The Ionians and Aeolians left Cyrus and began constructing defenses for their cities because they understood Cyrus' anger against them. The comparison through fable also allows Herodotus to communicate more than what he actually writes: Cyrus' anger and sense of betrayal, and the fact that the Ionians and Aeolians were, in a sense, soon to be caught in Cyrus' net.

In *Histories*, the Egyptian ruler Amasis also uses comparisons and fables. After the Egyptian people proclaimed Amasis co-ruler with Apries, Amasis illustrates his rise to power in the following way. Amasis and his guests were accustomed to washing their feet in a golden footbath. Amasis took the footbath and made it into an idol that he set up in the city. Egyptians came from all over to see the idol. Amasis told them, "So now . . . it has fared with me as with the foot-bath; once I was a common man, now I am your king; it is your duty to honour me and hold me in regard" (2.172). In the next section, Amasis again uses a comparison to express his opinion. His friends urge him, now as a ruler, to always remain aloof. Amasis demurred, saying,

> men that have bows bend them at need only; were bows kept forever bent they would break, and would be of no avail when they were needed. Such too is the nature of men. Were they to be ever at serious work nor permit themselves a fair share of sport they would go mad or silly ere they knew it; I am well aware of that, and give each of the two its turn (*Hist*. 2.173).

Comparisons appeal to the audience's imagination, allowing them to experience the fortunes (and misfortunes) of Herodotus' characters with more than their ears. Thus Herodotus retains the audience's attention by engaging their imaginations and memories as well as their physical capacity to hear the story. Comparisons also encourage audience participation by complimenting the audience's intelligence and by leaving the conclusion of the comparison as the audience's responsibility.[15] When Periander of Corinth sends to

---

[15]Heliodoros' novel, *Aethiopika*, offers many examples of riddles, but its late date (c. 350 CE) makes it less useful for this project. The opening words of *Aethiopika* contain a riddle, and as Tim Whitmarsh points out, "the opening words demand to be taken as a metaphor, a riddle—the very first, indeed, of the many interpretive conundra that dapple the text" (Tim Whitmarsh, "Heliodorus Smiles" in *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel* [ed. Stephen Harrison, Michael Pachalis, and Stavros Frangoulidis; Ancient Narrative Supplementum 4; Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing & Groningen University Library, 2005], 88). John R. Morgan's research reflects a similar conclusion. He writes that "it is characteristic of Heliodoros at every level of narration to withhold information, not simply to produce effects of shock and surprise, but to enlist the reader into an actively interpretive role" ("The *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros: Narrative as Riddle" in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* [ed. John R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman; New York: Routledge, 1994], 109). One example of a riddle in Heliodoros' material is found in

Thrasybulus of Miletus for advice on how to treat his subjects, the audience finds another comparison. Both men ruled as tyrants, and Periander valued Thrasybulus' opinion. Periander's messenger received an audience with Thrasybulus, and the two walked together through the ruler's cornfields. As they walked, Thrasybulus cut down the best and tallest stalks until the crop was ruined. He then sent the messenger back to Periander. The confused messenger told Periander what happened, and concluded that his master sent him to visit a mad man. At this point in the story, the meaning of the comparison has not yet been explained. No doubt, however, some in the audience have deciphered Thrasybulus' message, and those attentive listeners are rewarded with the satisfaction of solving the puzzle and comprehending more than the confused slave. Periander also understands Thrasybulus' message, and the audience is provided the answer to the riddle: "Thrasybulus advised the destruction of all the leading citizens" (*Hist.* 5.92).

*Hidden meaning.* Information sought from oracles also provided ample riddle material for Herodotus' narrative. The example of Croesus' answer from the oracle concerning his attack on the Persians may be construed as a riddle, as may be another oracle Croesus receives when he tests the authenticity of the oracles. In order to conduct this test, Croesus sends out several messengers to various oracles. One hundred days later, each messenger was to ask the oracles what Croesus is doing at that moment. The Delphic oracle sends back the correct answer:

---

10.27.1-4, in which Heliodoros gives a long description of a strange animal. Information is provided "at such a measured pace [that it] serves as a series of clues from which the animal can be identified. . . . The answer to the riddle of course is the name of the creature" (Morgan, 99). The mystery animal is finally identified as a giraffe. Morgan writes that "Heliodoros' whole novel demands an active interpretative response from his reader. . . . [I]t is pervaded at every level by the kind of self-conscious game-playing typified by the riddled giraffe" (Morgan, 100). This game-playing is "played directly between author and reader, bypassing the dramatic situation and even the narrative structure" (Morgan, 99).

> Grains of sand I reckon and measure the spaces of ocean,
> Hear when dumb men speak, and mark the speech of the silent.
> What is it now that I smell? 'tis a tortoise mightily armoured
> Sodden in vessel of bronze, with a lamb's flesh mingled together:
> Bronze thereunder is laid and a mantle of bronze is upon it. (*Hist.* 1.47-48)

Croesus had set about on that one-hundredth day to do something so random that only a true oracle would report accurately: he took a lamb and a tortoise, cut them up with his own hands, and boiled them together in a bronze cauldron covered by a bronze lid. The Delphic oracle spoke truthfully.

The first two lines of the oracle, however, are not addressed in this section. An attentive audience wonders about the meaning of the remainder of the oracle. The answer does not appear for quite some time.

In the meantime, Croesus sends another inquiry to the oracle regarding the length of his reign. The oracle prophesies that Croesus will reign until a mule rules the Medians. Croesus is pleased by this answer—surely a mule will never rule a nation. The audience is left to puzzle over this riddle until Herodotus reveals the answer in *Hist.* 1.91:

> [f]or that mule was in truth Cyrus; who was the son of two persons not of the same nation, of whom the mother was the nobler and the father of lesser estate; for she was a Median, daughter of Astyages king of the Medians[16]: but he was a Persian and under the rule of the Medians, and was wedded, albeit in all regards lower than she, to one that should be his sovereign lady.

The oracle alluded to the defeat of Croesus in the oracle from 1.47-48 as well. The first two lines of the prophesy, not addressed in that pericope, became clear on the day that the Persians, led by Cyrus the mule, defeated the king. Croesus' second son was deaf and dumb, as the audience had already learned. On the day of Croesus' defeat, however, as a Persian soldier is unknowingly about to kill the king, Croesus' son

---

[16]We will address how the Median princess came to marry a Persian later in the chapter.

miraculously speaks, calling out, "Man, do not kill Croesus!" (*Hist.* 1.85). Thus, the riddle of hearing when dumb men speak and marking the speech of the silent is solved in the downfall of unfortunate Croesus. The audience that held on to the riddle of *Hist*. 1.47 is rewarded with the answer to the puzzle.

*Allusion.* Allusions to elements in the text of the *Histories* provide material to an attentive audience that wishes to participate in the story. For example, the Lacedaemonians, like Croesus, ask the Delphic oracle about their destiny to conquer all Acadia, including the Tegeans. The oracle answers, "I will give thee to dance in Tegea, with noisy foot-fall, and with the measuring line mete out the glorious campaign" (*Hist.* 1.66). The Lacedaemonians immediately attack the Tegeans, carrying with them chains with which to bind the captives they are certain they will take. The riddle of the oracle is deceptive, however, and the Lacedaemonians are captured by the Acadians, and are made to "dance," so to speak, in their own chains, measuring lengths across the Tegean plain as they awaited execution. Croesus' question of the oracle and the cryptic answer given to him is reminiscent of the Lacedaemonians' inquiry and defeat. Audience members who were paying attention would appreciate this intratextual allusion that further assures them of the defeat of Croesus.

Another textual allusion from the *Histories* works in reverse order. In 1.107, the audience hears that Astyages, the Median king, has had a dream about his daughter, Mandane. The dream terrifies him to the point that he weds Mandane not to a Mede who would be her equal, but to a Persian named Cambyses. The audience does not know the content of the dream, nor does Herodotus reveal the interpretation of the dream. Thus, the audience, whose attention may have been wandering, is pulled back into the story,

wondering at this un-kingly action of mismatched marriage. The next section rewards the audience's attention. Astyages has a second dream about Mandane. This dream, too, is interpreted, but this time Herodotus reveals the interpretation: "the interpreters declared that the meaning of his dream was that his daughter's offspring should rule in his place" (*Hist*. 1.108). Astyages' motivation is now clear: he married his daughter to a Persian believing that this would thwart the dream that warned of a usurping grandson.[17]

*Conclusion.* The above examples of access to privileged information, hidden meaning, open-ended comparison, and allusion illustrate the ways in which Herodotus sought to keep his audience's attention. By setting audience members above the characters, recognizing and complimenting the audience's intelligence, and rewarding attentive listeners with puzzle solutions, Herodotus encouraged the audience to follow the narrative of the *Histories*.

Herodotus also encouraged his audience to creatively participate in his story, particularly as the story concluded. Carolyn Dewald points out that Herodotus' *Histories* ends strangely, especially given "the rules that his own text seems previously to have established for how a narrative works."[18] Unsettling, unsatisfying, and unclear endings encourage audience participation as the hearers seek closure for the account they have just heard. In the case of the *Histories*, Dewald proposes that modern re-*readers*—those who examine and re-read the text—may analyze Herodotus' ending satisfactorily by

---

[17]Together, the dreams of Astyages also provide additional information regarding the oracle's identification of Cyrus, son of Mandane and Cambyses, as a mule.

[18]Carolyn Dewald, "Herodotus' *Histories*" in *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (ed. Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 70. Dewald writes that "formal closure is a conspicuous part of Herodotus' narrative technique from the very beginning of the work. See for example *Hist*. 1.92.1, 1.94.7, 1.130, 1.169, 1.191.6, and 1.214.5 (Dewald, "Herodotus' *Histories*," 64).

revisiting the text and themes found throughout. First *hearers*, however, would come to the end of the *Histories* unprepared, with "no way of judging that it is really the end, except for the presence of a [silence] following the Cyrus episode."[19] Most importantly for this discussion, *Histories*' end does not tell the audience what to think. Instead,

> we are left as readers to interpret this aspect of the Cyrus episode for ourselves; the interpretation we will make will depend entirely on the kinds of connections we choose to draw between this anecdote and all that has gone before . . . . Herodotus sets it up so that we, the readers, must write the very end of the *Histories* ourselves.[20]

Dewald points out that every history continues beyond an account of that history, and so "the historical writer, imposing shape and coherence on his or her chosen subject, must intervene to make an end, and make what is in real life at best a momentary caesura into a lasting and significant literary silence."[21] Herodotus' history necessarily has an end. But the historian chose to end according to his own advice: "'look to the end' to understand meaning, and . . . resist speculating on meaning when the end is not yet clear."[22] The *Histories* end by leaving the audience with a task: watch history's pattern and conclude the story Herodotus began.

*Livy*

In his history of Rome, Livy, like Herodotus, works to attain and retain the audience's attention. Stephen Usher points out that Livy's narrative has to compete with the spectacle of the stage. In order to draw the attention of his audience, Livy

---

[19]Dewald, "Herodotus' *Histories*," 70.

[20]Dewald, "Herodotus' *Histories*," 73.

[21]Dewald, "Herodotus' *Histories*," 63.

[22]Dewald, "Herodotus' *Histories*," 81.

> replaced the missing element of spectacle (with which theatrical and other forms of mass entertainment were liberally endowed) by the infusion of emotive colouring into the narrative and the live speech, consisting of descriptive or rational material capable of arousing fear, pity, wonder or elation. Secondly, the material was so arranged as to achieve the maximum variety, both in subject matter and in dramatic content.[23]

Livy's stated intent was to morally form his audience in accordance with the virtues and vices evident in characters surrounding the founding of Rome. In order to experience this formation, Livy's audience had to pay attention to his narrative.

Unlike Herodotus, whose stated purpose for the *Histories* is simply to preserve the memory of the Greeks and foreigners and why they fought each other (1.1), Livy begins his history with an expressly moral purpose:

> The subjects to which I would ask each of my readers to devote his earnest attention are these—the life and morals of the community; the men and the qualities by which through domestic policy and foreign war dominion was won and extended. Then as the standard of morality gradually lowers, let him follow the decay of the national character, observing how at first it slowly sinks, then slips downward more and more rapidly, and finally begins to plunge into headlong ruin, until he reaches these days, in which we can bear neither our diseases nor their remedies. There is this exceptionally beneficial and fruitful advantage to be derived from the study of the past, that you see, set in the clear light of historical truth, examples of every possible type. From these you may select for yourself and your country what to imitate, and also what, as being mischievous in its inception and disastrous in its issues, you are to avoid (Preface, 9-10).[24]

The value of history lies in the lessons the audience can learn from it and the ways the audience might be formed by it. Patrick Walsh concludes that "the greater Roman historians showed complete unanimity in . . . ignoring the strictly scientific view [of history] of Thucydidies, [regarding] it as their duty to enshrine virtue before the eyes of

---

[23]Stephen Usher, *The Historians of Greece and Rome* (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1969), 181.

[24]Livy citations reference Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* (trans. B. O. Foster; 13 vols; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939).

future generations, and to deter men from the paths of vice."[25] Livy admitted his bias toward Rome—he believed Rome to be morally superior to all other cities—and he used that bias, along with training in rhetoric, to persuade his audience to his point of view.[26]

Even grammar reveals that Livy expected audience involvement in the story: Ruth Morello points out Livy's "slippage in the second-person."[27] In other words, at various points in the narrative, Livy addresses the audience directly.[28] Changing the narrative to the second person drew the audience into the story. Livy says to his audience, "*you* may select for yourself and your country what to imitate, and also what, as being mischievous in its inception and disastrous in its issues, *you* are to avoid (Preface, 10). In book 9, Livy asks his audience, "Why do *you* not compare men with a man, leaders with a leader, fortune with fortune?" (emphasis mine).

Livy expected the audience to take personal interest in the lessons to be learned from the history of Rome and to take an active role in discerning what to imitate and what to avoid. In fact, Usher finds Livy's level of optimism surprising: Livy seemed to believe that his audience could indeed responsibly choose to imitate or avoid vices and

---

[25]Patrick G. Walsh, "Livy's Preface and the Distortion of History" *AJP* 76:4 (1955): 369. While Walsh's point is relevant to this project, we must note that Walsh did not view this unanimous rejection of the scientific view of history as a positive development. He believes that Livy's bias and patriotism led him to distort history for the sake of a moral purpose, and thus we cannot attribute "to Livy the virtues of impartiality and intellectual integrity" (Walsh, "Livy's Preface," 383). Joseph Solodow does not condemn this tendency of Livy's, but instead accepts it as a characteristic of Livy's work: "Livy's main engagement is not so much with the records of the Roman past as with the mind of his reader" (Joseph B. Solodow, "Livy and the Story of Horatius, 1.24-26," *TAPA* 109 (1979): 259).

[26]Archibald W. Allen, "Livy as Literature," *CP* 51:4 (1956): 251.

[27]Ruth Morello, "Livy's Alexander Digression (9.17-19): Counterfactuals and Apologetics," *JRS* 92 (2002): 66.

[28]See the Preface and 9.18.11, for example.

virtues depicted in his story.[29] This belief motivated Livy to undertake the massive project of writing the history of Rome.

Although Livy's moral instruction is not stated outright but rather is conveyed by his narrative, the lessons he communicates are often explicit.[30] According to Joseph Solodow, however, in some instances Livy "dwells precisely on the absence of clarity and on the resulting complexity of moral judgment."[31] In these cases, Livy uses the tool of ambiguity to encourage audience members to draw their own conclusions by which they might be morally formed. Several Livian scholars have studied ambiguous sections in the text of *Ab Urbe condita* that encourage the audience to actively seek lessons for moral formation. We will consider particularly the story of Horatius (1.25-26), the Alexander digression (9.17-19), and the account of Marcellus weeping over conquered Syracuse (25.24). In order to preserve narrative integrity, the following discussion will be organized by episode rather than by rhetorical tool.

*Horatius.* The warrior Horatius is, at first glance, an idealized Roman hero. Horatius, the one surviving Roman triplet thrust into combat with a set of Curiati triplets, outlives his brothers, kills the three Curiatii single-handedly, and wins victory for the beleaguered Romans. In the next pericope, however, the audience encounters a different view of Horatius: he kills his own sister. Horatius is tried and found guilty of murder, but then is acquitted by the crowd. Solodow observes that Livy divided the story into two

---

[29]Usher, *Historians of Greece and Rome*, 167.

[30]See Allen, "Livy as Literature," 251-252, who writes that Livy expresses his own judgments implicitly through the structure of his work.

[31]Solodow, "Livy," 251.

distinct halves: "the duel abroad and the trial at home."[32] By using verbal echoes to create intratextual allusions, Livy ties the two acts of Horatius together:[33] Horatius is described as ferocious when he kills the Curiatii, and the same word is used to describe him when he kills his sister; the spectators in both instances experience dread (*horror in gens spectantes perstringit* 1.25.4; *lex horrendi carminis* 1.26.6); "with *defigit* (1.25.12) Horatius dispatches the last of the Curiatii, with *transfigit* (1.26.3) his own sister;"[34] and the fields on which Horatius' brothers fell and the place that his sister's body falls is depicted by the same word (*corruerunt* 1.25.5; *corruerat* 1.26.14). The echoes between the stories encourage the audience to compare the two. How should we reconcile these two images of Horatius? To help answer the question of comparison, Livy provides the audience with a piece of privileged information: the motivation of Horatius. The impetus behind both of Horatius' actions was the "subordination of himself to the public good, which may be considered the cardinal Roman virtue."[35]

This privileged information, however, does not alleviate the ambiguity surrounding the warrior. The judgments of Horatius by the government and by the people serve to increase the ambiguous nature of the account. The specially appointed *duumviri* find Horatius guilty, but Livy inserts the comment that they felt they had no

---

[32]Solodow, "Livy," 252. The division is not so clear in Dionysius' version of the incident, which includes long speeches and distanced action (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* [trans. Earnest Cary; 7 vols.; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937-1950], 3.21-22).

[33]The following echoes are pointed out in Solodow, "Livy," 252-254.

[34]Solodow, "Livy," 253.

[35]Solodow, "Livy," 254-255.

choice in the matter (1.26.6).[36] Horatius' father's speech reminds the audience that discernment is complicated in this case:

> [t]his man you saw but lately advancing decked with spoils and triumphing in his victory; can you bear, Quirites, to see him bound beneath a fork and scourged and tortured? . . . Go, lector, bind the hands which but now, with sword and shield, brought imperial power to the Roman People! Go, veil the head of the liberator of this city! Bind him to a barren tree! Scourge him within the pomerium, if you will—so it be amidst yonder spears and trophies of our enemies—or outside the poemerium—so it be amongst the graves of the Curiatii! For whither can you lead this youth where his own honours will not vindicate him from so foul a punishment? (1.26.10-12)

Both listening audiences were faced with a conundrum: is Horatius to be imitated? Or, perhaps more to the point, are Horatius' actions justified by his motivation? Is Horatius' motivation to be imitated?

The people decided to acquit Horatius, but even then, their judgment remained ambiguous. The offered exoneration was contingent upon an act of penance. The crowd required Horatius, the victorious warrior, to offer atoning sacrifices and then pass underneath a beam with his head covered, submitting before the people of Rome like a defeated enemy (1.26).

Solodow concludes that at the end of the story of Horatius "we, like the people of Rome, cannot be sure how to judge Horatius."[37] Livy exposed a moral problem rooted in motivation: "are the qualities important to war and empire compatible with civil society, with ordinary life?,"[38] and he transferred the question from the narrative to the listening

---

[36]Solodow, "Livy," 256.

[37]Solodow, "Livy," 257.

[38]Solodow, "Livy," 255.

audience.[39] Livy left the comparison of two worlds, war/empire and civil life, open-ended. By refusing to resolve the guilt or innocence of Horatius, Livy "lays before his [audience] a moral problem which they must resolve themselves."[40]

*Alexander digression.* Another example of Livy's expectation of audience participation may be found in Book 9.17-19, in the form of question and answer. Morello identifies this so-called Alexander Digression as an example of counterfactual history—a "what if" story.[41] Livy asks, "What would have been the results for Rome if she had been engaged in war with Alexander?" (9.17).

The very nature of the "what if" question encourages audience participation. Morello writes that

> Livy has so contextualized the digression that it prompts engagement in the kinds of historical reflections provoked by the Preface [etc.] . . . . The digression . . . has universal, generalizing power as a didactic instrument, instructing readers in the proper understanding of . . . the *remedia* of the Preface.[42]

Recall that in the preface, Livy expressed hope that the audience would attend to his account of history in order to select which actions should be imitated and which should be avoided. While Livy "may indeed lose something in historical precision" by including the Alexander digression—for the argument can be made that counterfactual history has no place in a historical account—Livy does accomplish something "nevertheless very substantial, as [the digression] is poised between contemplation of the past and

---

[39]Solodow, "Livy," 258.

[40]Solodow, "Livy," 260.

[41]Morello, "Alexander Digression," 62.

[42]Morello, "Alexander Digression," 83-84.

extrapolation from the past of lessons for the present and the future."[43] By asking his audience, "What if . . .?" and then developing a hypothetical answer, Livy gave his hearers information that he expected them to use as they decided which actions to take both individually and corporately.

*Marcellus' tears.* A final example of Livy's use of the tools discussed above appears in the form of cultural and literary allusion in the story of Marcellus' capture of Syracuse recorded in 25.24.11-14. After Marcellus defeated Syracuse, he looked upon the city and wept. This reaction was unusual, first of all, given Livy's other accounts of victorious Roman generals. The very fact that Marcellus' tears seem out of place, writes Andreola Rossi, "stimulates the reader to search for useful comparisons in order to decode the text and its meaning."[44] Audience members in Livy's time and context might have recalled various similar occurrences from literature and popular culture:[45] Antigonus Gonatas of Macedonia weeps when the head of Pyrrhus, his most powerful enemy is brought to him (Plutarch, *Pyrrh.* 34.4); Antiochus III the Great weeps when Achaeus, his enemy, is brought before him bound (Polybius, *Historiae* 8.20.10); Scipio Aemilianus sheds tears as he looks at Carthage about to be burned (Polybius, *Historiae* 38.22.1) and Achilles, of course, is moved to tears at the sight of Priam coming humbly into the Greek camp.[46] Livy used this device only once more in the extant narrative:

---

[43]Morello, "Alexander Digression," 84.

[44]Andreola Rossi, "The Tears of Marcellus: History of a Literary Motif in Livy" *GR* 2nd series 47:1 (2000): 58.

[45]These references found in Rossi, "Tears of Marcellus," 58-59.

[46]Another example from the Hebrew Bible occurs in 2 Samuel: David weeps over the fallen Saul, even though Saul's death moved David even closer to the kingship of Israel.

when three men brought Roman consul Paulus Aemilius a letter from the defeated Perseus, Paulus Aemilius "is said to have shed tears over the fate that befalls men" (*Ab Urbe Condita*, 45.4.2-3).

Rossi notes that traditionally, then, the tears of a victor mark the end of a cycle of rising and falling:

> [t]he fall of the enemy brings full awareness of the end of a historical era; a cycle of rise and fall has been completed. But the recognition of the completion of a cycle does not come without losses for the victor himself. . . . Rise and fall are thus linked and become part of an inescapable single process. The fall of the enemy foreshadows and anticipates the future fall of the victor that will inevitably follow.[47]

By employing cultural and literary allusion, Livy evokes memories of the rise and fall of great heroes and great civilizations through a minimum number of words. The tears of Marcellus call to mind other instances of the weeping victor, and so point to the eventual fall of Marcellus, and even of Rome herself.[48] In 45.4, Rome has grown; Rome has "risen one step further in that process of development which Livy sets out to describe in his work."[49] But the story does not end with the fall of Syracuse, as other stories did not end with the fall of Pyrrhus, Achaeus, Carthage, or Hector and Priam. Livy described this process of development in hopes that his hearers would learn that development "does not come without problems or a price."[50] Livy's depiction of the months and years to follow implied that with the fall of Syracuse, Romans, "who had come into close contact with the Greek culture, show a dangerous enthusiasm for Greek works of art, which will

---

[47]Rossi, "Tears of Marcellus," 60.

[48]Rossi, "Tears of Marcellus," 63.

[49]Rossi, "Tears of Marcellus," 61.

[50]Rossi, "Tears of Marcellus," 62.

lead, in turn, to religious decadence."[51] Rome's triumph over Syracuse took Rome one step closer to her own destruction.

In the story of Marcellus, Livy subtly invited the audience's participation in several ways. First, the audience had to remember. The comment that Marcellus wept over Syracuse may be passed over quickly and dismissed—incidentally, if the event remains unrealized as an allusion, Livy's narrative still makes sense. If, however, the audience drew on its network of knowledge, the account took on a broader and more timeless meaning. Secondly, Livy depended on the audience to recognize the account as "an important *exemplum* of . . . decline and loss of identity."[52] Once the audience connected the cultural allusions, it had to recognize the example for what it was. Thirdly, the audience, harkening back to the preface, had to decide what to do: would they weep with Marcellus and do all possible to recover the glorious Roman identity? Or would they, like many others in Livy's narrative, choose to ignore the passing of Rome's season of superiority, and embrace foreign values and ideas at the expense of their great city? Livy confronted his audience with a moral choice—one that he left in their hands.

*Conclusion*

Due largely to differences in purpose, Herodotus and Livy use rhetorical tools to encourage different kinds of audience participation. Herodotus, for the most part, uses these tools to retain his audience's attention. At the end of his *History*, however, he necessarily leaves it to the audience to create the rest of his story. Livy, on the other hand, writes with the purpose of moral and cultural formation. Thus the tools he uses in

---

[51]Rossi, "Tears of Marcellus," 62. See Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, 25.40.2-3.

[52]Rossi, "Tears of Marcellus," 62.

*Ab Urbe Condita* encourage the audience to participate not only by paying attention, but by drawing conclusions and acting upon the lessons presented in the history. The success of these two ancient historians' works depended upon audience participation; the tools of privileged access to information, riddles, allusions, comparisons, ambiguity, and question and (hypothetical) answer enable the historians to reach their goal.

### *Examples from Novelists*

The Greek novels were written primarily for entertainment purposes, not for moral formation, but their authors still worked to retain the audience's attention. The novels *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by Chariton (mid-first century CE) and *An Ephesian Tale* by Xenophon (early/mid-second century CE) are the novels closest to the time under consideration. Ronald Hock notes that the ancient novelists were experienced and familiar with Greco-Roman rhetoric. Thus, they may have employed the tools that concern this study.[53]

#### *Chariton*

Perhaps the most common tools used by Chariton are those of access to privileged information and literary or cultural allusions. Consistently throughout the story, the audience enjoys the omniscient status granted them by the narrator. A very cursory list of examples includes the following scenes. Callirhoe faints when she hears of her upcoming marriage. The audience knew that she fainted because she had already fallen in love with

---

[53]Ronald Hock, "The Educational Curriculum in Chariton's *Callirhoe*" in *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative* (SBLSymS 32; ed. Jo-Ann A. Brant, Charles W. Hedrick, and Chris Shea; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 33.

Chaereas, and she was afraid she would have to marry another man (23).[54] The characters in the story, however, believed the fainting spell to be evidence of Callirhoe's "maidenly modesty" (23). The narrator implies to the audience that, like at the wedding of Thetis and Pelion, Strife is about to enter the lives of Chaereas and Callirhoe (24). Later in the story, when Callirhoe asks the steward's wife, Plangon, what she should do about her unborn child, Plangon replies that she will make Dionysius swear to raise Callirhoe's child, and she leaves to "carry out her mission" (49). Callirhoe, of course, assumes that Plangon was going to carry out the mission that she was assigned, but the audience knows that earlier in the narrative, Dionysius has told Plangon to look after Callirhoe and make her well-disposed toward him (44). The mission Plangon leaves to carry out is not Callirhoe's, but Dionysius' mission to marry Callirhoe. When Plangon finally gains audience with her master, she tells him that Callirhoe will marry him—Plangon succeeds in granting Dionysius' wish (50). Plangon is involved again in an instance of privileged access when Dionysius demands to know Callirhoe's actual words about marriage without omission or addition. Plangon tells Dionysius what he wants to hear, omitting the fact that Callirhoe is already pregnant by Chaereas (50). The audience, Plangon, and Callirhoe, are the only ones with access to this information.

A third example of privileged access occurs as Mithradates and Dionysius prepare for a trial before the Great King (77). Mithradates, falsely accused by Dionysius of trying to woo Callirhoe away by assuming Chaereas' identity, comes to defend himself before the king. Mithradates convinces Chaereas to remain hidden until the trial, so that Mithradates can defeat Dionysius' prosecution (77). At the trial, Dionysius makes his

---

[54]The page numbers cited for *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and *An Ephesian Tale* will be from Bryan P. Reardon, ed., *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989).

case against Mithradates, accusing him of telling lies about a dead man (83). The audience enjoys their privileged access to the fact that, unbeknownst to Dionysius, Chaereas is alive. Mithradates gives Dionysius a final chance to withdraw his charge, telling him that if he persists, the Great King will find Dionysius, not Mithradates, to be the adulterer (84). Dionysius, of course, does not withdraw, and so Mithradates, with theatrical flourish, calls on Chaereas, very much alive, to appear before the assembly (85).

Finally, in order to keep the audience from becoming too concerned about the unfortunate lovers, and perhaps to reclaim any wandering attentions, Chariton inserts a transition, following the rhetorician's advice by "remind[ing] the hearer of what the speaker has said, and also prepar[ing] him for what is to come" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.26.35). Chariton takes time to parcel out the information that Aphrodite is going to have pity on the couple that she originally brought together. At the beginning of the final book, Chariton breaks the dramatic illusion to tell the readers that they will like the end of the story (110).

These examples of privileged access do not necessarily have the result of moral formation or the creation of story, but by giving the audience a wider view of the action, Chariton ensures their continued attention to the story. The listener has a significant collection in her network of narrative knowledge; she is an insider. Access to privileged information heightens the suspense in much the same way that the musical score can heighten suspense in a movie. Betrayal, deception, and various outcomes are anticipated, but not assured, and the audience tends to pay closer attention to see if their expectations are fulfilled.

Often ironic statements are made in reference to the narrative action of Chariton's story. For example, Chaereas, being separated from his new wife, wonders if perhaps the gods have killed beautiful Callirhoe in order to make her divine; the audience has just heard the Ionians cry out that "the bride [Callirhoe] is Aphrodite" (53). Later, when Callirhoe prepares to travel to Persia, she is distressed about leaving Miletus because she finds comfort in Chaereas' tomb (76), which has been erected, of course, in error. Callirhoe's grief at leaving the tomb is ironic because in fact, as the audience knows, she will be traveling toward the living Chaereas himself.

Because of Callirhoe's marriage to Dionysius, the lovers are not immediately reunited. Chaereas joins the Egyptians to fight against the Persian king, and he becomes an admiral in the Egyptian navy. Chaereas and Callirhoe, finally in the same location, have an unknowingly close encounter. Chaereas, having been victorious at sea, hears that one of the captured women has thrown herself on the ground and has begged for a sword to end her life. He says of the woman, "perhaps she is mourning a husband herself" (109). The woman is Callirhoe, and she is mourning a husband—the very man who speaks.

The tools of literary and cultural allusion permeate Chariton's novel. Chariton shows a particular, although expected, penchant for alluding to the Homeric epics.[55] Cultural allusions are also frequent in *Chaer.*: references to people groups (Athenians, 33; the barbarian Scythians, 47); places (Sybaris, a colony known for its luxury, that no longer existed when *Chaer.* was written, 35); famous figures (Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus, and Alcibiades, all the subjects of sculptors and painters, 22; Helen and

---

[55]See for instance, Chariton, *Chaer.*, 23, 26, 41, 44, 47, 58, 65, 66, 70, 80, 82, 88, 90, 94, 102, 103, and 112.

Menelaus, 44, 77, 82, 110; Zethus and Amphion, twin sons of Zeus, and Cyrus the Great of Persia, 47; Ariadne and Leda, 66; Protesilaus, a Greek killed in the Trojan war who was allowed to return to his grieving wife for a few hours, 87); and well-known customs and events (the Olympic games, 80; the Spartan stand at Thermopylae, 104).

Full appreciation of the literary and cultural allusions is not necessary for Chariton's story to make sense. Understanding many of the allusions, however, would have been second nature to his audience. Who would not know of the beautiful Helen? Who did not dream of competing in the Olympic games? These references to the literature, people, and events of common life served to connect the audience to the story—a helpful tactic when trying to secure an audience's sympathy and attention. The allusions also allowed Chariton to communicate more description or emotion than the mere words he penned; by tying his characters and plot to well-known and emotive events and figures, Chariton tapped into the vast repertoire of cultural knowledge possessed by his audiences.

Intratextual allusions provide additional rewards for the attentive listener. Chariton's intratextual allusions often used the audience's privileged access to information in order to make an ironic point. For instance, after Theron stole Callirhoe from her tomb, he planned to sell her to the highest bidder. The thief tells his captive, however, that she will be staying with friends. Callirhoe knows—and the audience knows that she knows—Theron's true intentions. She answers him, "May the gods grant all of you the rewards you deserve" (36). This ironic statement returns to the character of Theron time and again throughout the story. For instance, after Theron is saved from death at sea, the thief tells his rescuers that he survived because of his piety. The

audience knows that Theron's piety had nothing to do with his survival, and even more importantly, they know something hidden even from Theron: he survived not because of piety or cleverness, but because Providence had a better punishment for him than death from thirst. At this point, the audience should recall Callirhoe's ironic prayer that Theron would be granted just rewards. Chariton even helps the audience make the ironic intra-textual connection to Callirhoe's comment. He writes that "Providence was according him the proper prize for his efforts" (56).

As the novel nears its end, the audience is rewarded with the completion of the oracle's prophecy. Chaereas and Callirhoe are finally reunited (111), although they still have trials to overcome as they journey home. The listeners' attention is rewarded: all that the audience expected comes to pass.

*Xenophon*

In *An Ephesian Tale*, Xenophon uses privileged access in a similar way to gain and retain the audience's attention. The narrator tells the audience from the beginning of the story that Eros is jealous of Habrocomes, the hero of the story, and the god is going to plot the young man's misfortunes (129-130). In fact, an oracle outlines the story's main plot from beginning to end (132); the audience's attention is held, however, because the oracle does not give details of how the plot will work itself out. The audience has enough privileged information to hook its imagination, but detailed information is withheld to encourage prolonged attention. Interestingly, the novel ends with another oracle, this one quite clear, that announces how the story will end (161). Even at the time of this oracle, however, the danger is not completely past, and the final details of the story still provide an element of surprise for the audience. But, much like Chariton's word to the audience

at the beginning of his final chapter, Xenophon assures the audience that the lovers, Habrocomes and Anthia, will reunite in the end.

The two "bookends" that frame *An Ephesian Tale* also serve as intratextual allusions, one of which has already been mentioned. First, two oracles, one that announces the plot at the beginning of the novel and a second that assures the audience of a happy ending connect the beginning of the story with the end, rewarding the audience that has followed the adventures in between. Second, at both the beginning and end of the story, Xenophon includes comparisons of Anthia and Habrocomes' life together as one long festival. Here Xenophon crafts another set of "bookends" into the structure of his novel. When Anthia and Habrocomes are joyfully wedded at the beginning of the story, the narrator comments that "their whole life was a festival" (134). What follows, of course, is far from festive. At the end of the novel, however, after the reunion of virtually all positive characters, the narrator concludes that "the rest of their life together was one long festival" (169). The beginning that was derailed by Eros' jealousy is restored in the end. An attentive audience is rewarded by closing words and events that are similar to those that opened the story. The audience experiences the satisfaction of realizing their expectations. The hearers are able to completed intratextual allusions by gathering and using privileged information that granted them inside knowledge.

At several other points in the story, the audience is given inside information. For instance, when Manto claims that Habrocomes tried to rape her, the audience knows that she is lying (141-142). The audience also knows the jealous Manto lied about her orders for Anthia: Manto's note said that she ordered Anthia sold, and although this is what actually happened, Manto had originally ordered Anthia killed (145).

When Anthia receives information that makes her believe that Habrocomes has died, she decides to join her beloved in death. She shares her plan with Eudoxus—and at the same time, with the audience. The audience, however, also has access to Eudoxus' actions: Anthia thinks that Eudoxus has brought her a lethal potion as discussed, but Eudoxus has substituted a sleeping potion (150). Later in the narrative, Habrocomes, alive and well as the audience knows, comes to believe that Anthia has died. The audience, however, knows through access to privileged information that despite her best efforts, Anthia still lives (153).

Xenophon makes interesting use of privileged information through the geographical positioning of his characters. For instance, as Habrocomes leaves for Alexandria in pursuit of the pirates who stole Anthia, the audience knows that the pirates have given Anthia to a merchant in Alexandria, and that the lovers will once again be in the same location (153). This reunion is delayed, and the anticipation heightened, by Habrocomes' ship wreck en route (154). Eventually Habrocomes does finally arrive in Alexandria after he is framed by the lustful and ugly Kyno and arrested for Araxus' murder—another example of access to privileged information (154). While Habrocomes is in Alexandrian prison, however, Anthia and her Indian master leave the city for Ethiopia (156).

After further adventures, Anthia is sold to an Italian brothel by another man's jealous wife, and Habrocomes decides to resume his journey to Italy (162). The audience anticipates that the lovers might encounter one another, or, should Xenophon choose to build the suspense further, the two might just miss each other. Indeed, Anthia ends up being cared for as a sick woman at the brothelkeeper's house in Tarentum, and

Habrocomes searches in vain for her at Nuceria (163-164). Habrocomes takes work in the quarries in Nuceria, and Anthia meanwhile is bought by the newly wealthy ex-pirate, Hippothous. Toward the end of the novel, Habrocomes, on his way home to Ephesus, passes through Rhodes where his Ephesian slaves/companions are living, unbeknownst to him (166). Shortly thereafter, the audience learns that Hippothous and Anthia also go through Rhodes on their way to Ephesus (167). The characters' paths finally intersect on the island of Rhodes, and the audience, after watching the characters misidentify or completely miss seeing each other time after time at various locations (i.e., 156, 165), is finally rewarded with a mass reunion (168-169).

Access to privileged information, this time concerning the characters' geographic locations, entices the audience into the story. The audience holds its collective breath as characters conceal their identities from friends of friends; characters fail to recognize each other; characters express their doubts and fears through speeches and dreams, all the while crisscrossing complex paths, even geographic paths, before finally finding each other.

*Conclusion*

Novels provided entertainment for the ancient audience. To achieve this goal, Chariton and Xenophon had to retain the audience's attention and engage the audience with their stories. The authors accomplished their tasks, at least in part, by allowing the audience access to privileged information, enticing the audience with hidden meanings, and making literary, cultural, and intratextual allusions. Use of these rhetorical tools resulted in stories that captured the audience's emotions and imagination. By

encouraging audience participation Chariton and Xenophon reinforced their stories' success.

*Example of Plutarch the Biographer*

Plutarch's early life was filled with rhetorical schooling and travel; his later years found him studying philosophy, training as a diplomat, and teaching; and as an old man, Plutarch served as a Delphic priest.[56] Given these areas of interest and preparation, it is not surprising that Plutarch expected the audience of his writings to be active[57]—the rhetorician, philosopher, diplomat, teacher, and priest in him would have it no other way.

This section focuses on Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* based on their date and biographical nature. Plutarch impacts this study in two ways. First, the biographer was greatly concerned with his audience's moral formation, and he often wrote with that end in mind. Plutarch realized that he could not tell each member of his audience how to be virtuous, how to be moral, or how to achieve peace of mind, but he could provide "models of it and communicate vividly what it is like."[58] Audience members have tried to pick moral imperatives from Plutarch's essays, but Robert Lamberton scoffs that "Plutarch is too good a writer to sink into such dullness."[59] Instead, the *Lives* should be read in tension with one another, as illustrations of realistic human nature rather than clear-cut imperative statements about morality.

---

[56]Robert Lamberton, *Plutarch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 12.

[57]Lamberton, *Plutarch*, 50.

[58]Lamberton, *Plutarch*, 44.

[59]Lamberton, *Plutarch*, 44.

The second contribution Plutarch's biographies make to this study is in the employment of the rhetorical tools outlined above. The two contributions of Plutarch are connected because observations of his use of such tools will necessarily be colored by his concern with moral formation.

*Alllusion*.[60] Lamberton writes that the *Lives* are evidence of "rethinking the Greek past in terms of a contemporary reality dominated by the military, political, and cultural power of Rome," a practice that had been going on for centuries by the time Plutarch wrote.[61] In the *Lives*, Plutarch sets the biography of a Greek figure against the biography of a Roman figure, making general cultural allusions to the dominant cultures. Understanding of the cultural allusions are not necessary for understanding Plutarch's *Lives*, but connecting the reference points involves the audience more fully in the biographies.

*Open-ended comparison*. One of the clearest rhetorical tools used by Plutarch to encourage audience participation is open-ended comparisons. Most *Lives* end with a comparison of the two figures, although four do not include this third section. In the majority of the *Lives*, then, Plutarch uses comparison, or *synkrisis*, "not to demonstrate the superiority of one side of an equation over the other, but rather to explore the issues raised as a whole" by the biographies.[62] As becomes clear when reading the *Lives*,

---

[60]Because we will deal with various *Lives*, this section is arranged by rhetorical tool rather than by individual *Lives*.

[61]Lamberton, *Plutarch*, 65.

[62]Timothy Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*: Comparisons and Contradictions" in *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch. Acta of the IVth International Congress of the* International Plutarch Society *Leuven, July 3-6, 1996* (Collection D'Études Classiques 11; ed. L. van der Stockt; Louvain: Éditions Peeters, 2000), 141.

Plutarch does not compare two heroes in order to rank the men according to their morality; in fact the men are "juxtaposed in order to show the *equality* of Greece to Rome in terms of political military greatness."[63] The possibility of formation for Plutarch's audience comes through his invitation to explore common qualities and understand "the virtues and vices revealed by [the] two lives."[64] Plutarch leaves comparisons open not for the sake of the two characters being discussed, but for the sake of the character of his audience members.

The audience of the *Lives* must take action to achieve these goals of exploration and understanding. Duff concludes that Plutarch's *synkriseis* provide "provocative contrast [that] engages the reader."[65] Plutarch himself refers to the audience's participation at the beginning of the *Cimon*. After pointing out several similarities between Cimon and his Roman counterpart, Lucullus, Plutarch comments that he has probably omitted several resemblances between the two, but "it will not be hard to gather them directly from our story" (*Cimon*, 3.3). Both Plutarch and the audience are to be involved in the *Lives*, not only through mere observation but also by following and understanding the argument. Christopher Pelling writes that "the implication is certainly

---

[63]Michael W. Martin, "Judas the Secessionist: Reading Johannine Syncrisis in its Mediterranean Milieu" (Ph.D. diss.; Baylor University, 2005), 92, emphasis mine. Martin identifies the *Lives* as "a large, apologetic, genus syncrisis of colossal proportions" in which men from Greece and Rome represent empire respectively (92).

[64]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 146.

[65]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 142. Lamberton recognizes the necessity of the *synkrisies*, but is less impressed with them, commenting that the comparison sections are "generally unsatisfying. . . . Yet these comparisons are the glue, the equals sign in the equation. Factitious though they may be, they allow the massive juxtaposition to stand, asserting a parallelism that exists only as a function of Plutarch's idiosyncratic imagination" (Lamberton, *Plutarch*, 65). Despite this criticism, Lamberton does note that some pairs fit together well, for instance, *Phocion* and *Cato the Elder* (Lamberton, *Plutarch*, 65). Interestingly, this is one pair that does not conclude with a comparison section. Perhaps Plutarch felt comfortable leaving the comparison to his audience in this reasonably clear pair. We will discuss the missing comparisons in the following pages.

that the narratee has been pondering the line of argument critically, and is capable of making independent steps in the argument; he or she is not wholly a follower. . . . the assumption is that both [narrator and narratee] are engaged, weighing issues and putting the same sorts of questions."[66] In fact, Pelling suggests that the audience members might disagree with Plutarch, but if the hearers engaged in the exercise of deliberating morality,[67] Plutarch had accomplished his purpose.

Plutarch does not, as mentioned before, present his audience with pat answers. He recognizes the complexity of morality, especially for political leaders, and "he allows his readers to discover fundamental guidelines in the life histories of great men, and invites them to consider the implications of their stories for their own action in the contemporary world."[68] He painted pictures of great men, Greek and Roman, but in the end, left the fundamental evaluation of character and virtue up to the audience's discretion.[69] Duff specifically mentions the *Lysander-Sulla* in which "the reader has been encouraged . . . to make moral judgements, but no simple classification of actions and men as 'good' or 'bad' has emerged."[70] In the various *Lives* and their concluding comparisons, Duff observes a marked ambiguity of the moral nature of humans and their

---

[66]Christopher Pelling, *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd. and The Classical Press of Wales, 2002), 275.

[67]Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 361.

[68]Philip A. Stadter, "Plutarch's *Lives* and Their Roman Readers" in *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks: Studies in Cultural Interaction* (Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity III; ed. Erik Nis Ostenfeld; Oxford: Aarhus University Press, 2002), 132.

[69]See Christopher Pelling, "Is Death the End? Closure in Plutarch's *Lives*" in *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (ed. Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 244; and Donald R. Shipley, *A Commentary on Plutarch's* Life of Agesilaos*: Response to Sources in the Presentation of Character* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 22.

[70]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 182.

action.[71] Plutarch's biographies were not written to commend or condemn their subjects; their purpose was to "improve and correct the morals of his audience."[72] With this goal in mind, ambiguity served Plutarch well, for "the moral import [of the ambiguity] is more challenging and in many ways more satisfying than a simple paradigm."[73]

Plutarch often presented conflicting moral characteristics in a single person or in a pair. Achieving the goal of virtue required the audience to take some characteristics from a hero or heroes, and leave others behind—"if one is to be virtuous, one must imitate qualities incarnated separately by two distinct representatives who have (usually) similar general character."[74] Plutarch reveals an even higher complexity of the issue by portraying men whose "good moral traits have a bad effect on the hero's society, and vice versa."[75] The motivation and morality of an action must be tempered with lessons learned about the results of that action in the past.

Plutarch explicitly leaves judgment in the audience's hands at the ends of several *Lives* by using the tool of open-ended comparison. At the end of the comparison of Philopoemen and Flamininus, Plutarch writes,

> [b]ut since, after this examination, the difference between the two men is hard to define, I leave it to my reader to say whether, if we award to the Greek the crown for military experience and generalship, and to the Roman that for justice and goodness of heart, we shall not make a fair decision (*Comp. Phil. Flam.* 3.3).

---

[71]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 181.

[72]Simon C. R. Swain, "Hellenic Culture and the Roman Heroes of Plutarch" *JHS* 110 (1990): 145.

[73]Duff, " Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 182.

[74]Jacques Boulogne, "Les ΣΥΓΚΡΙΣΕΙΣ de Plutarque une Rhétorique de la ΣΥΝΚΡΑΣΙΣ" in *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch. Acta of the IVth International Congress of the* International Plutarch Society *Leuven, July 3-6, 1996* (ed. L. van der Stockt; Collection D'Études Classiques 11; Louvain: Éditions Peeters, 2000), 43.

[75]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 181.

The comparison of Lysander and Sulla ends with these words:

> [w]e may now consider whether we shall err very much from the truth in pronouncing our verdict that Sulla won the more successes, while Lysander had the fewer failings; and in giving to the one the preeminence in self-control and moderation, to the other, in generalship and valour (*Comp. Lys. Sull.* 5.5).

Duff points out that these closing comments may be more than rhetorical flourish. Plutarch's open-ended comparisons disrupted any sense of finality or closure the audience may have experienced, "complicating, rather than simplifying, the book of which it forms the final part."[76] The final words of the Alcibiades-Coriolanus comparison question how one should "rate 'purity' against affability [and] deception against stubbornness."[77] Other comparison conclusions also make Plutarch's final opinion rather unclear. The comparison of Nikais and Crassus ends with the note that it is "hard to draw a safe conclusion" about the most virtuous actions (*Comp. Nic. Crass.* 5.2). The last sections of the comparisons of Agesilaos and Pompey and of Demetrios and Antony vacillate between the men, never settling on one or the other as most worthy of imitation (*Comp. Ages. Pomp.* 5.1 and *Comp. Demetr. Ant.* 1-6). Duff writes that the uncertainty of what Plutarch "wants" his audience to think "forces the reader to assume a more active role in assessing the men . . . and the moral issues their *Lives* raise."[78] At first glance, the comparisons provide a sense of closure to most of the lives, if only by revisiting the two men together. This purpose, however, seems sabotaged by the inconclusive nature of the comparisons. Thus, Duff identifies a second, and perhaps more important purpose: "the *synkriseis* work against a strong ending to the Plutarchan

---

[76]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 149-150.

[77]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 160.

[78]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 160.

book. The dissonance between narrative and comparison, between life with its uncertainties and conflicts and the simple moral evaluations of the *synkrisis*, forces us to reassess all that we have read before."[79]

The audience must focus their attention and intelligence on following Plutarch's historical references[80]—as cultural allusion plays its part in the service of open-ended comparisons— as well as on understanding his comparisons and realizing his point. The moral code suggested by Plutarch, however, cannot end with the mental exercise. For Plutarch, the "contemplation of virtue implies a call to imitation."[81] He expected the audience to understand the tool of comparison that he was using for the purpose of examining character traits.[82] He expected his audience to work with him; in the end, he offered few answers and many questions.[83] Philip Stadter suggests that this tendency was a result of Plutarch's realization that

> each individual must work his way through his own decisions and his own life, and that for the individual his own viewpoint is the principal vantage point for considering his decisions. By focusing upon a single protagonist, Plutarch permitted the reader to make a direct comparison between the behavior and attitudes of the protagonist and his own. This strategy also gave primary

---

[79]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 160.

[80]U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Plutarch as Biographer" in *Essays on Plutarch's* Lives (ed. Barbara Scardigli; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 68.

[81]Aurelio Pérez Jimémez, "Exemplum: The Paradigmatic Education of the Ruler in the *Lives* of Plutarch" in *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98-117 A.D.)* (*Symolae* A.29; ed. Philip A. Stadter and Luc Van der Stockt; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 105.

[82]Philip A. Stadter, "The Rhetoric of Virtue in Plutarch's Lives" in *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch. Acta of the IVth International Congress of the* International Plutarch Society *Leuven, July 3-6, 1996* (Collection D'Études Classiques 11; ed. L. van der Stockt; Louvain: Éditions Peeters, 2000), 508.

[83]Timothy Duff, *Plutarch's* Lives*. Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 286.

> importance to the individual's decisions, and thus made those of the reader significant.[84]

Plutarch intended for his *Lives* to result in moral formation. The value of studying the past lay in the history's role as teacher. Plutarch emphasizes this view several times. In *Aemilius Paullus*, Plutarch begins the biography by giving a summary of the virtue exhibited by Aemilius Paulus and his ancestors. From the start, the audience knows that Aemilius Paullus is a man to be imitated: "in these virtues" of valor, justice, and trustworthiness, Plutarch writes, "he at once surpassed his contemporaries" (*Aem.* 1.4). Aemilius Paullus exemplifies the man who learns from this history and excels. The *Pericles* opens with Plutarch assuring his audience that it is within their power to contemplate morality and in turn be morally formed:

> in the exercise of his mind every man, if he pleases, has the natural power to turn himself away in every case, and to change, without the least difficulty, to that object upon which he himself determines. It is meet, therefore, that he pursue what is best, to the end that he may not merely regard it, but also be edified regarding it (*Per.* 1.3).

As he defends the inclusion of two negative lives (*Demetrius* and *Antony*), Plutarch writes, "I think we also shall be more eager to observe and imitate the better lives if we are not left without narratives of the blameworthy and the bad" (*Demetr.* 1.6).

Plutarch displays virtue as his art and so "acts directly upon the audience. . . . Biographical facts, so to say, are good and true and excite the wonder of the audience, which comprehends the purpose behind the action and is inspired to act similarly."[85] Plutarch assumed that his audience aspired to moral virtue, and so his purpose was to "stimulate his fellow-countrymen to a consciousness that they should take part in public

---

[84]Stadter, "Rhetoric of Virtue," 500.

[85]Alan Wardman, *Plutarch's* Lives (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 23-24.

life, even if this meant no more than the politics of the parish-pump."[86] The audience that heard the *Lives* was composed of real people, and so Plutarch wrote about real people, including both positive and negative traits. He expected his hearers to "accept them as models, not to imitate slavishly, but to approve and emulate what they have done well, to avoid what they have done badly."[87] An active audience, then, should participate in Plutarch's work and be morally formed by the accounts of the Greek and Roman heroes.

The morals suggested in the *Lives* are not new ideas. Plutarch's audience would most likely have known, for instance, that "contentiousness is dangerous and freedom is a delicate possession;"[88] morals such as these were in the audience's repertoire of knowledge. But by leaving it to the audience members to draw final conclusions about the morality or immorality of the heroes, Plutarch reinforced those values and introduced a more nuanced view of them. Pelling notes that allowing audience participation in the task of drawing conclusions from the *Lives* serves to "provoke thoughts rather than command a single unambiguous conclusion."[89] These thoughts would remain with the audience after the experience of hearing the *Lives* was complete. Philip Stadter uses the image of a mirror to describe the result Plutarch sought to achieve:

> he invites the reader, using the life he is reading as a mirror, to consider his own qualities, "am I acting in the same ambitious way that Marius did?" The introspection might go further: recognizing the modes of self-justification employed by Marius, as present in oneself—"after all, I deserve it." Again, the

---

[86]Wardman, *Plutarch's* Lives, 39-40. See also Stadtler, who writes that "moral development requires awareness of one's weaknesses and a desire to improve" ("Rhetoric of Virtue," 503).

[87]Stadtler, "Rhetoric of Virtue," 501.

[88]Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 247.

[89]Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 247.

> reader of the *Antony* might ask, "am I allowing myself to be swayed by smooth talking but pernicious flatterers?"[90]

Plutarch's mirrors were intended for the powerful, like Sosius Senecio, who was one of Trajan's trusted advisors and to whom the *Lives* are dedicated, but also for the common person—anyone who wished to achieve excellence in virtue and character.[91] Those who looked into Plutarch's mirrors included Plutarch himself. In the opening lines of the *Aemilius Paullus*, Plutarch writes:

> I began the writing of my "Lives" for the sake of others, but I find that I am continuing the work and delighting in it now for my own sake also, using history as a mirror and endeavouring in a manner to fashion and adorn my life in conformity with the virtues therein depicted. For the result is like nothing else than daily living and associating together, when I receive and welcome each subject of my history in turn as my guest, so to speak, and observe carefully "how large he was and of what mien," and select from his career what is most important and most beautiful to know (*Aem*. 1.1).

Plutarch expects each person who encounters these guests and mirrors first to contemplate the image and actions set before them and then to adopt what is worthy of imitation.[92]

*Omission*. Finally, a discussion about the missing comparisons at the end of four of Plutarch's *Lives* involves the tool of omission. In four *Lives*, a synkrisis section is simply not included; this omission creates a sort of non-ending. Alan Wardman notes that "it is an open question whether these comparisons are missing because they were not

---

[90]Stadter, "Rhetoric of Virtue," 505.

[91]Thomas G. Rosenmeyer, "Beginnings in Plutarch's *Lives*" in *Yale Classical Studies. Vol. XXIX Beginnings in Classical Literature* (ed. Francis M. Dunn and Thomas Cole; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 207. In reference to the powerful, Plutarch hoped that by "holding his mirror up to their soul, they could learn, in the midst of imperial politics, to live according to reason and humanity" (Stadter, "Rhetoric of Virtue," 510).

[92]Lamberton, *Plutarch*, 73.

transcribed or because the author for some reason, failed to write them."[93] Duff believes the most likely reason for the missing comparisons is that they have simply been lost, although he warns the audience not to expect Plutarch to slavishly adhere to habitual patterns: we should not assume that "in the case of the formal *synkrisis* Plutarch could not break out of the structure he himself had imposed."[94]

Others believe that for some reason or another, Plutarch never wrote comparison sections for *Themistocles-Camillus*, *Pyrrhus-Marius*, *Phocion-Cato Minor*, and *Alexander-Caesar*. Hartmut Erbse argues that Plutarch did not include comparisons because the four pairs presented special difficulty: in one case there were too many similarities, making the comparison redundant (*Phocion-Cato Minor*), and in three cases, the pairs were too different to make a valid comparison.[95] Pelling suggests a different reason for the omission: in these four cases, Plutarch's endings were simply too good, or too irregular, to cover with a synkrisis. Plutarch might have been "reluctant to compromise so fine an ending [as Cato's death] with a formal *synkrisis*, and preferred to leave it as it is, especially as the implicit comparison with the dying Phocion is so loud."[96] The *Marius*, Pelling observes, ends without sympathy—an irregularity—and the *Camillus* begins and ends with hardly anything and is irregular in its perfunctory nature.[97] *Alexander-Caesar*, however, presents another irregularly fine ending. Pelling writes,

---

[93]Wardman, *Plutarch's* Lives, 3, see also 236.

[94]Duff, "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*," 143-144, note 14.

[95]Hartmut Erbse, "Die Bedeutung der Synkrisis in der Parallelbiographien Plutarchs," *Hermes* 84 (1956): 398.

[96]Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 377.

[97]Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 378.

"Again, this is not the usual closing rhythm; again, a closing formal *synkrisis* could not have fulfilled its usual role; again, the implicit comparison with *Alexander* could have struck Plutarch as enough, and not to be compromised by a lamer, formal equivalent."[98]

Whatever the reason for the four missing comparisons, we may be assured that Plutarch has not abandoned his central purpose of moral formation. The absence of concluding *synkreseis* effectively leaves to the audience the completion of the biographical triad, requiring them to supply the material for a comparison themselves.

For example, an attempt at a comparison of Themistocles and Camillus may reveal lessons to be contemplated by Plutarch's audience. Both heroes suffered from vanity. Themistocles was "so carried away by his desire for reputation, and such an ambitious lover of great deeds" that when Miltiades won the battle at Marathon, Themistocles was highly distressed: "the trophy of Miltiades would not suffer him to sleep" (*Them*. 3.3-4). This tendency seems to have troubled Themistocles from the beginning of his life:

> [h]owever lowly his birth, it is agreed on all hands that while yet a boy he was impetuous, by nature sagacious, and by election enterprising and prone to public life. In times of relaxation and leisure, when absolved from his lessons, he would not play or indulge his ease, as the rest of the boys did, but would be found composing and rehearsing to himself mock speeches. . . . Wherefore his teacher was wont to say to him: "My boy, thou wilt be nothing insignificant, but something great, of a surety, either for good or evil." Moreover, when he was set to study, those branches which aimed at the formation of character, or ministered to any gratification or grace of a liberal sort, he would learn reluctantly and sluggishly; and to all that was said for the cultivation of sagacity or practical efficiency, he clearly showed an indifference far beyond his years, as though he put his confidence in his natural gifts alone (*Them*. 2.1-2).

Camillus, on the other hand, was humble at first—he declined the office of consul and "he so conducted himself that even when the authority rightly belonged to him alone, it

---

[98]Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 382.

was exercised in common with others" (*Cam*. 1.3). But later in his life, either because of his success in defeating the Veii, or because of the praise that he received for that success, "Camillus was lifted up to vanity, cherished thought far from becoming to a civil magistrate subject to the law, and celebrated a triumph with great pomp. . . . In this way, he incurred the enmity of the citizens, who were not accustomed to wanton extravagance" (*Cam*. 7.1-2).

Both men used deception or misdirection to manipulate their people. In *Them*. 10.1-4, "Themistocles, despairing of bringing the multitude over to his views by any human reasoning, set up machinery, as it were, to introduce the gods to them, as a theatrical manager would for a tragedy, and brought to bear upon them signs from heaven and oracles (*Them*. 10.1). By feeding lines to the priests at the Acropolis, Themistocles convinced the land-loving Hellenes that the gods wanted them to take their war with the barbarians to the sea. Plutarch tells the audience that "at last his opinion prevailed" (*Them*. 10.2).

Later in the account of the war between the Hellenes and the Persians, Themistocles realizes that the Hellenes are about to abandon a strong position in the straits and sail for home. To prevent this retreat, Themistocles sends a messenger to the Persian king, revealing the Hellenes' position. King Xerxes of course, immediately launches his ships and blocks the straits, closing off the Hellenes' escape route. As a result of Themistocles' deceit, Plutarch reports, "with a courage born of necessity the Hellenes set out to confront the danger" (*Them*. 12.7).

Camillus also was not above using deception to achieve his ends. Twice Plutarch mentions a proposal by the Roman tribunes to divide the city of Rome into two.

Camillus and the other senators believed that this action would not only divide, but also destroy Rome (*Cam*. 7.3). To prevent the division, Camillus engages in subtle misdirection. Camillus, "dreading the struggle, always contrived to keep the people busy with other matters, and so staved off the passage of the bill" (*Cam*. 7.4), and again in chapter 9, Camillus "wished to turn the thoughts of the citizens to other matters and keep them busy therein, that they might not be able to stay at home and become the prey of seditious leaders" (*Cam*. 9.2). Plutarch commends this misdirection: "this was a fitting and sovereign remedy which the Romans used, like good physicians, thereby expelling from the body politic its troublesome distempers" (*Cam*. 9.2).

Both Themistocles and Camillus were exiled from their homes. Themistocles lived honorably amongst the Persians for some time, but when the Persians demanded that he aid their fight against the Hellenes, Themistocles put "a fitting end to his life" by drinking poison (*Them*. 31.5). When Camillus, on the other hand, heard that Rome was being attacked by the Gauls, he rallied the men of Ardea to join the fight against the Gauls (*Cam*. 23.4-5). Plutarch suggests that Themistocles' actions were rewarded with a fitting end to his life; Camillus' actions were rewarded by the Roman people when the besieged Senate made him, once again, dictator of Rome (*Cam*. 24.3-25.4).

While this comparison of Themistocles and Camillus is amateurish, it does reveal the ease with which an attentive audience member might select episodes and actions from the two *Lives* for further moral reflection and formation. The omission of written comparisons at the end of four *Lives* does not mean that the benefits of *synkrisis* are lost. The responsibility simply falls more heavily on the audience members and their participation, for in order to draw instructive comparisons between these four pairs, in

order to comprehend the entire picture of these men, the audience must create the rest of the story.

*Conclusion*. Examples from Plutarch offer strong support for the proposal that authors encouraged audience participation. Not only does Plutarch succeed in retaining his audience members' attention, he also exhorts toward moral formation and grants them the privilege of completing some of the stories he started. The tools of cultural allusion, direct appeals to the audience's intelligence and participation, and, in particular, open-ended comparisons and omissions mark Plutarch's attempt at forming his audience. The *Lives* accomplish much more than remembrance of great Greek and Roman heroes; Plutarch's books show their audience illustrations of virtue and vice. Plutarch makes his point all the more forcefully by drawing the audience into the creation of the story.

## *Conclusion*

From the samples of pagan literature examined above, we may conclude that the audience, and particularly the participation of the audience, was important to those in the ancient world. Tools suggested by rhetoricians in handbooks and rhetorical treatises were put to use by authors and speakers in the works mentioned in this chapter. In response, the audience participated at various levels by paying attention, realizing moral and cultural formation, and creating a part of the story. Having observed that an interest in audience participation, and methods to encourage such participation, existed in pagan Greco-Roman literature, we will now move a step closer to Luke and Acts by examining ancient Hebrew and Jewish literature.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## Audience Participation in Hebrew and Jewish Literature

The selection of Hebrew and Jewish works and examples for this project pose problems similar to the task of selecting pagan texts for the previous chapter: the plethora of material, the complexity of identifying genre and provenance, and the abundance of examples of tools used to encourage audience participation in the story. The following examples were chosen from the Hebrew Bible, translations of the Hebrew Bible, and material from Middle Judaism based 1) on their similarity to the material found in Luke and Acts, the work with which this project will culminate; 2) on dates of composition/redaction that do not exceed early 2nd century CE; and 3) on pertinent examples they contain in relation to this project. My intent is to be illustrative, not exhaustive.[1] Much of what will be said in this section has been said before, but I wish to refocus these observations, comments, and conclusions to illuminate the element of audience participation in the creation of story.

We must first examine the validity of including the Hebrew Bible and Middle Judaism literature in the present discussion. The evidence presented in the first two chapters deals with ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric; what relationship does Jewish literature have with the rhetorical handbooks and theories?

---

[1]In addition, there are likely many examples of texts that *do not* make use of the tools delineated in our methodology. The purpose of this survey, however, is to demonstrate that there are a number of examples in which authors of ancient Hebrew and Jewish literature used various tools to encourage audience participation.

The writers of ancient rhetorical handbooks did not create the material they presented, although they did offer commentary and opinions on the practices they discussed. Quintilian writes that the rhetorical practices described in the handbooks are compilations of methods already in use (*Inst.*, 5.10.120). While we cannot argue that the authors and editors of the Hebrew Bible in particular wrote their narratives with structures of Greco-Roman rhetoric in mind, we can observe these texts to determine if similar rhetorical tools were used to encourage audience participation. Even without the direct influence of Greco-Roman rhetoric, the authors of the Hebrew Bible undeniably wished to communicate with their audience. We may find evidence that this culture, while minimally influenced by Hellenistic culture, shared a desire to involve audiences in moral formation and the creation of story.

When dealing with the LXX, we are on safer ground.[2] Hellenistic culture certainly influenced the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. John Lee notes that while some translators' methods were freer than others, "the Septuagint is characterized generally by faithfulness to the original."[3] Indeed, the Hebrew Bible and LXX texts of most of the examples included below do not differ significantly. At times, however, Greek translators and interpreters show evidence of responding as a very early audience of the Hebrew Bible. Those who translated the Hebrew Bible into Greek

---

[2]This even despite contested forms and dates for the LXX translation. For discussion on this issue, see Peter Katz, "Das Problem des Urtextes der Septuaginta" *TZ* 5 (1949): 1-24, and Peter Walters (previously Katz), *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation* (ed. David W. Gooding; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

[3]John A. L. Lee, "Translations of the Old Testament," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 BC – AD 400* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; New York: Brill, 1997), 775.

worked in Alexandria, "a cosmopolitan Hellenistic city," and had most certainly been exposed to "Greek education and the devices of Greek rhetoric."[4]

Variations between the Hebrew texts and the Greek translations reflect the "individual stamp" each translator left on his work.[5] In some instances, variations provide evidence that the Alexandrian translators felt obliged to fill in gaps left by the Hebrew text. Space allows only a brief mention of a few examples. The LXX Genesis account of Cain and Abel going out to the field fills a gap. In addition to, "And Cain spoke to Abel his brother," the LXX supplies *what* Cain spoke to his brother: "Let us go out to the field" (Gen 4:8). The prophets provide examples of this phenomenon as well. Nineteenth century exegete Eiji Asada suggests that some of the differences between versions of Zechariah 1-8 are due to translators who thought "the original to be too concise, too elliptical, too figurative, too obscure or too anthropomorphic," and who decided to "supply some words or phrases by way of explanation."[6] Gaylard Patterson reached similar conclusions in his 1891 study of the text of Hosea in the MT and LXX versions. He concludes that at some points, the translator's goal to produce a translation useful to the people of his time "allowed him to translate as he understood the Hebrew, and thus to interpretation a number of minor variations may be attributed."[7] This section does not include discussion of Zechariah or Hosea, but when the LXX translation offers a significant deviation from the MT, we will note it in the examples below.

---

[4]Lee, "Translations of the Old Testament," 776.

[5]Lee, "Translations of the Old Testament," 775.

[6]Eiji Asada, "The Hebrew Text of Zechariah 1-8 Compared with the Different Ancient Versions," *AJSL* 12 (1896): 173-196.

[7]Gaylard H. Patterson, "The Septuagint Text of Hosea Compared with the Massoretic Text," *Hebraica* 7 (1891): 190-221.

Likewise, the Jewish works considered in this section are slightly easier to connect to Greco-Roman rhetoric, although we still presume a certain distance between the two bodies of work. The dates of Judith, Tobit, and *Joseph and Aseneth* fall between 2nd century BCE and, perhaps, 2nd century CE. By this time, Hellenistic culture had spread throughout the Mediterranean world, touching virtually every aspect of life, Jewish and otherwise.

In particular, scholars have observed that some aspects of the book of Judith, most likely written in Hebrew by a Jewish author who lived in Palestine[8] between the second century BCE and the first century CE,[9] reveals the author's cultural literacy.[10] For instance, the tension between eroticism and chastity is characteristic of the Greek-Oriental and the Jewish-Hellenistic novel,[11] and in these novels, as in Judith, deceit is an acceptable and useful tool used to defeat enemies.[12] The author of Judith mentions the idea of preparing earth and water for surrender (Judith 2:7), a practice found in Herodotus' *History* in books four, five, and six.[13] The role of women provides another

---

[8]David A. DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2002), 90.

[9]Henry Wace, ed., *The Holy Bible, according to the authorized version (A.D. 1611), with an explanatory and critical commentary and a revision of the translation, by bishops and other clergy of the Anglican church* (2 vols; London: John Murray, 1888), 1:246-248; and Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith* (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 120.

[10]DeSilva, *Introduction to the Apocrypha*, 98.

[11]Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 80. Otzen points out that this tension also exists in Jewish literature: the stories of Jael and of Samson and Delilah, the rapes of Dinah and Tamar, and the stories of Susanna and Esther (see 110-113 for discussion).

[12]DeSilva, *Introduction to the Apocrypha*, 98.

[13]Otzen correctly observes that the connection carries some weight, but that this Persian idea was certainly known before Herodotus's history was written, and a Jewish author may just have easily traced it back to Nebuchadnezzar independently. (Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 80.) For connections between Judith and Herodotus, see also Mark Stephen Caponigro, "Judith, Holding the Tale of Herodotus" in *"No One Spoke Ill of Her": Essays on Judith* (Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 2; ed. James

link between Judith and Hellenistic literature. While, in general, women in Greek society were to be not seen *and* not heard,[14] Plutarch's *Bravery of Women* describes women who were the exception to the rule. Among these examples is Aretaphila, a woman who poisons her despot husband (19),[15] whose story is perhaps the closest to Judith's. After freeing herself and her people from tyrannical rulers, the beautiful Aretaphila chooses not to take a place of governmental leadership, but returns to her house, family, and loom. Judith demonstrates differences from Plutarch's women. She initiates contact with Holofernes, uses beauty to deceive, claims connection with God, and wields the weapon that cuts off Holofernes's head.[16] These examples show, however, that heroine stories were shared by the Jewish and non-Jewish Greco-Roman milieu.

Tobit also shows evidence of Hellenistic influence, which is not surprising as the book was probably written in the context of the Diaspora.[17] Benedikt Otzen identifies the story told in Tobit as one that stems from tales known in international folkloristic literature but at the same time contains significant Jewish elements.[18] Francis Glasson also finds a possible, though tenuous, connection between Tobit and the 2nd-century BCE

---

C. Vanderkam; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 47; DeSilva, *Introduction to the Apocrypha*, 98; and Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 79.

[14]Philip F. Esler, "Ludic History in the Book of Judith: The Reinvention of Israelite Identity?" *BibInt* 10 (2002), 125. The discussion of *Bravery of Women* is suggested in Esler's article.

[15]See also the Argive women who demonstrate violence from afar, throwing missiles onto the heads of their attackers (4); and Chiomara, Eryxo, and Xenocrite who lure men who had wronged them, setting up the men's deaths at the hands of other men (22, 25, 26 respectively).

[16]Esler, "Ludic History," 127-128.

[17]This despite the fact that Tobit certainly depends heavily on Hebrew Scriptures as well. Mark Bredin, "Introduction" to *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (ed. Mark Bredin; Library of Second Temple Studies 55; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 1.

[18]Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 2-3.

Greek author and grammarian, Apollodorus.[19] As Joseph Fitzmyer concludes, similarities between Tobit and international fables and folklore do not prove that the author of Tobit used such works as sources.[20] The similarities, however, are notable and show awareness of the context of the larger ancient narrative milieu.

Edith Humphrey concludes that the author of *Joseph and Aseneth* was most likely a Hellenistic Jew, writing for a Hellenistic Jewish audience.[21] Elements such as the non-Jewish identity of Aseneth, the allusions to bees and honey, and the apparent point of the story—acceptance of pagans into the Jewish community—support a connection between *Joseph and Aseneth* and Greco-Roman literature.

While such Hellenistic influences are present in Judith, Tobit, and *Joseph and Aseneth*, they are best understood as products of the cultural background. John Craghan notes that "while the historical evidence for the period is not to be disparaged, the metahistorical, phenomenological approach should be invoked" to resolve the geographical and historical inaccuracies of Judith;[22] this conclusion applies also to Tobit and *Joseph and Aseneth*.

### *Examples from Hebrew and Jewish Scripture*

The Hebrew Bible contains historiographical records of an ancient people. Certainly the primary purpose of writing, collecting, editing, and preserving these texts is

---

[19]Thomas F. Glasson, "The Main Source of Tobit," *ZAW* 71 (1959): 276-277.

[20]Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 40.

[21]Edith M. Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 14-15.

[22]John F. Craghan, "Judith Revisited," *BTB* 12 (1982): 51.

remembrance, but remembrance for what purpose? The authors and editors of the narratives in the Hebrew Bible use several tools discussed in previous chapters to encourage their audiences to actively remember and internalize the traditions in their history. Memory and internalization result in moral and cultural formation, which impact the lives of the audience. That audience lived out of these ancestral roots, completing the stories begun in the Hebrew Bible not only in their minds, but in their day-to-day lives. In this section, we will mention several examples from the Hebrew Bible that display rhetorical tools used to encourage audience participation.

*Judges*

*Samson.* Before considering the book of Judges as a whole, we will consider one judge, Samson, and the riddle he presented to the Philistines. This story contains one of the most noticeable riddles in the Hebrew Bible. Interestingly, however, although Samson's words in Judg 14:14 clearly compose a riddle, the answer to the riddle remains uncertain. Also, Samson's riddle and the narrative surrounding it employ other tools discussed above, such as allusions and question and answer.

Samson's riddle, like any other riddle, is "primarily an intellectual game that deals with the ability to recognize and scrutinize the coherence, symmetry, opposition and paradox of phenomena. The unraveling of the riddle's strategy is always a creative exercise, because the riddle directs and misleads by its inherent parallelism and paradox."[23] The audience of the Samson story inherits the author's invitation to creative exercise, an invitation that was accepted and then circumvented by the Philistines in the

[23]Philip J. Nel, "The Riddle of Samson (Judg. 14:14-18)," *Bib* 66:4 (1985): 540.

story. The surrounding narrative gives some clues to the riddle's answer, but it also "obscures the riddle's meaning and resists any attempt by the reader to locate an unambiguous solution and perform the final act of completion."[24]

Samson presents the Philistines with a riddle: "Out of the eater came something to eat. Out of the strong came something sweet" (Judg 14:14). After consulting with Samson's wife, the Philistines triumphantly present an answer to the riddle: "What is sweeter than honey? What is stronger than a lion?" (Judg 14:18). On the surface of the story, the answer works, and as Samson pays the reward, it seems the Philistines have given the correct solution. The intratextual allusion to Samson's encounter with the lion in 14:5-9 seems to give the audience the answer to the riddle, even before it was posed. But as Jeremy Schipper pointed out, the narrative surrounding the riddle leaves the audience unsure about this solution. For example, the audience does not know what Samson said to his wife in 14:17 (a conversation later brought into question by Samson's false words to Delilah in Judges 16), and the audience is never told what, exactly, Samson thinks of the Philistine's solution.[25] The Philistines themselves give their answer in the form of questions, questions for which the narrative provides no definite answers.

The questions posed by the Philistine's solution do not receive answers in the characters' dialogue, but answers may be provided by the narrative itself. First, the Philistines ask, in answer to the first clause of Samson's riddle, "What is sweeter than honey?" The audience must echo the question: what *is* sweeter than honey? Dennis Olson suggests that love is sweeter than honey, particularly in the Samson story: "love is

---

[24]Jeremy Schipper, "Narrative Obscurity of Samson's חידה in Judges 14.14 and 18," *JSOT* 27 (2003): 353.

[25]Schipper, "Narrative Obscurity," 348.

both incredibly strong and incredibly sweet for both Samson and his women, but more significantly for God and the people of Israel. God's . . . sweet love cannot let Israel go, no matter how disobedient they are."[26] This answer, more complicated than the Philistines' questioning answer of honey, "focuses the [audience's] attention on the complex themes of 'love' throughout the Samson story."[27]

The audience must echo the Philistines' second question as well: what *is* stronger than a lion? Only a few verses before, the answer was revealed: Samson is stronger than a lion. Therefore, Samson may be the answer to his own riddle. Schipper notes out that this solution would "certainly be in keeping with Samson's rash, brazen and boastful personality."[28] If the answer is Samson, the Philistines' question-without-answer encourages the audience to "further explore the complexities of [Samson's] personality."[29] Such explanation leads the audience to make moral observations and judgments about the story and character of Samson the judge.

*The Book of Judges.* As a whole, the stories of the judges of Israel may function simply as entertaining stories of traditional leaders of old, or the collection may, as Arthur Quinn suggests, "be seen as a moral test for its reader."[30] In order to realize the purpose proposed by Quinn, however, audience members must be attentive, and must

---

[26]Dennis Olson, "Judges" in *New Interpreter's Bible* (vol. 2; ed. Peter Miscall; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 850.

[27]Schipper, "Narrative Obscurity," 351.

[28]Schipper, "Narrative Obscurity," 352.

[29]Schipper, "Narrative Obscruity," 352.

[30]Arthur Quinn, "The Riddles of Samson: A Rhetorical Interpretation of Judges 14-16," *Pacific Coast Philology* 18 (1983): 87.

engage the stories of the judges with their own sense of morality and justice. Quinn writes that

> [t]hose who are like the sinning Israelites will simply enjoy the story of Deborah as a victory of "us" over "them"—and will be indifferent to the truth or to the sentiments of common humanity, as long as this indifference is to "our" advantage. Those, in contrast, who do see the ironies, see the parallel between the mother of Sisera and the daughter of Jephthah, the treachery of Jael and that of Delilah, will find Judges an excruciating experience, a wrenching call to humility and repentance.[31]

For evidence of excruciating stories, [32] we need only look to the disgusting details of Ehud's murder of King Eglon (Judges 3); Jael's murder of Sisera followed by Deborah's "exultant frenzy" of song[33] and the detail of Sisera's mother awaiting his return (Judges 4-5); Gideon's bid for king-like wealth and power and his decline into idolatry (Judges 8); Jephthah's rash vow and subsequent infanticide (Judges 11-12); Samson's character that is "stupid, willful, lustful, [and] unclean," and whose final triumph kills himself and others in service of his desire for revenge (Judges 13-16); and the shocking and gruesome actions of the Levite who, after pursuing his run-away concubine with tender words, abandoned her to rape and murder and then sent her dismembered body as a message (Judges 19-20).

Quinn writes that God sent judges that matched the people of Israel, "judges who embodied their own weakness and perversity."[34] In order to hear the message of Judges, the call to humility and repentance, the audience members had to listen closely for the

---

[31]Quinn, "Riddles of Samson," 87.

[32]Much of this discussion comes from Quinn, "Riddles of Samson," 84-87.

[33]Quinn, "Riddles of Samson," 86.

[34]Quinn, "Riddles of Samson," 87.

irony and the need for moral evaluation. Indeed the author depended on audience participation. Edwin Good notes that "the ironist depends on his hearer or reader for recognition, and therefore he risks misunderstanding."[35] Without a participating audience to help create the story of Judges, the stories remain merely entertainment for inactive, and therefore unchanged, listeners. The risk, however, becomes acceptable, for the listener who participates, who helps create the tragic story of Judges, may come away from the narrative morally formed.

*Succession Narrative*

*Nathan and David.* Perhaps the most famous comparison in this section of the Hebrew Bible is the story told by the prophet Nathan to expose David's culpability in the matter of Uriah and Bathsheba (2 Sam 12:1-7a).[36] Before coming to Nathan's parable, we will examine other tools used in the surrounding narrative to encourage audience participation. The character of David has been built up over the preceding chapters: he is a man after God's heart (1 Sam 13:14); he is the anointed king of Israel, chosen by God (1 Sam 16:12); even as a boy, he is the great warrior of the Israelites (1 Sam 17:50); he is a faithful friend to the son of his rival (1 Sam 18:1); he is the rallying point for the

---

[35]Edwin M. Good, *Irony in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 32.

[36]The exact genre of Nathan's comparison is debated: George Coats calls it a fable (George W. Coats, "Parable, Fable, and Anecdote. Storytelling in the Succession Narrative," *Int* 35 (1981): 376); Robert Polzin calls it a parable (Robert Polzin, *David and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History Part Three 2 Samuel* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 120). Regardless, the story is a comparison between the unnamed characters in the story and the larger narrative that surrounds it. For ease of reference, we will refer to the story as a parable.

distressed and discontent (1 Sam 22:2);[37] he spares the life of God's anointed king (1 Sam 24:11; 26:9); after Saul's death, the house of David grows stronger as Saul's grows weaker (2 Sam 3:1); he dances before God without regard for kingly dignity (2 Sam 6:14); he judges with equity and justice (2 Sam 8:15).

The author, however, has been practicing a bit of misdirection.[38] David is indeed a national hero, but in 2 Samuel 11 the positive image of David comes crashing down. The narrator describes David's sins against Bathsheba, Uriah, and God in no uncertain terms. The audience, whether or not they have noticed darker clues to David's character along the way, receives a "sudden flash of recognition."[39] David remains powerful, but with this story, the people know "that certain acts of the king can be recognized as ridiculous or absurd."[40] The king is, in a sense, knocked off his pedestal. Using surprise, the Uriah account demands the attention of any wandering listeners as the narrative turns toward what Robert Polzin calls the "hermeneutic center of the entire royal history."[41]

A surface interpretation of Nathan's parable serves to highlight David's guilt by tricking the king into self-condemnation.[42] David is the rich man in the parable, who

---

[37]Although Robert Polzin calls these men "malcontents," David's charisma clearly emerges (Robert Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History Part Two I Samuel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1989), 198).

[38]The audience experiences "a kind of fictitious discovery which depends on a false inference" based on misdirection (*Poet*. 16.10). In this case, the author sets the audience up for an idealized David but surprises them with his shocking sins.

[39]Polzin, *David and the Deuteronomist*, 119.

[40]Coats, "Parable, Fable, and Anecdote," 382.

[41]Polzin, *David and the Deuteronomist*, 120.

[42]Polzin comments on the audience's action at this point: "As Nathan tricks David into jumping to conclusions too precipitously, so a Deuteronomic voice tricks its audience into hastily condemning David—and paradoxically condemning themselves in the process" (*David and the Deuteronomist*, 120).

instead of taking a lamb from his numerous flocks, took the beloved lamb (Bathsheba) from a poor man (Uriah). A closer look at the vocabulary in the parable, suggests Polzin, reveals that an attentive audience would have understood this interpretation as only one of several meanings.[43] Nathan uses rare Hebrew words to identify the main elements of his parable: the ewe lamb is *kibesāh*, the traveler is *hēlek* and *'orēah*, the poor man is *ro'š* [poor], and the rich man is *cāšîr* [rich]. Toward the end of the parable, however, "each of the human players in the parable is finally called *hā'îš* [the man] by Nathan,"[44] making his accusation of David interesting indeed: "You are," Nathan says, "*hā'îš*." Strangely, it is after Nathan exposes the solution to his riddle that the unfolding of the riddle's meaning begins for both characters and audience: *which* man is David?

God's words to David in v. 7-12 provide the riddle's answer, for those who would hear. The Lord begins by reciting all David has received from God: "the basis for God's present displeasure with David is *what [God] has done for the man*: he took from Saul and gave to David."[45] In the list of blessings, God mentions that David received the wives of Saul *into his bosom*, the same language used in the parable—the poor man's lamb used to "lie in his bosom" (2 Sam 12:3). At this point, God is represented by the rich man. God took from Saul, the poor man in this interpretation, to give to David. Thus in the past, David was the traveler.

---

[43]This discussion of the interpretation of Nathan's Parable is largely taken from Polzin, *David and the Deuteronomist*, 121-126.

[44]Polzin, *David and the Deuteronomist*, 122. The LXX translation does not reserve ἀνήρ for Nathan's pronouncement in v. 7a. The noun is used to describe the two men (δύο ἄνδρες v. 1); the rich man (ἀνδρὶ . . . πλουσίῳ v. 4); the man traveling (ἀνδρὶ τῷ ἐλθόντι v. 4); the man David with whom David is angry (ἀνδρί and ἀνὴρ ὁ ποιήσας v. 5); and finally David himself (σὺ εἶ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ποιήσας τοῦτο v. 7a).

[45]Polzin, *David and the Deuteronomist*, 123. Emphasis original. The LXX does preserve the emphatic words of the Lord: *ἐγώ εἰμι* ἔχρισά σε εἰς βασιλέα ἐπὶ Ισραηλ καὶ *ἐγώ εἰμι* ἐρρυσάμην σε ἐκ χειρὸς Σαουλ (v. 7b).

In the present, the character of the rich man represents David, as in the most common interpretation of the parable. David is the man who took from the poor man his most prized possession—the lamb Bathsheba. As God's words turn toward the future, however, Polzin suggests that the identities in the parable change again.

God's judgment on David includes taking (*lāqah*□, the same word used for taking the poor man's lamb in the parable) David's wives. It is *David*'s beloved lamb(s) that will be taken away and given to others. God is again the rich man, but now David is the poor man who is taken from, and David's neighbor, who turns out to be his son Absalom, will receive what was once the king's.

The parable of Nathan, then, turns into a three-fold riddle, one that encompasses David's entire career from unknown shepherd boy to judged king. Returning to the idea that a quick-judging audience might inadvertently judge themselves, we might also understand an even wider interpretation of Nathan's parable: the audience may also be understood as *hā'îš*. Polzin writes that

> here as elsewhere in the History, there is a social dimension to the story: the fate of the house of David and that of the house of Israel are so intertwined that Nathan's parable, as interpreted by God and Nathan, may very well explain not only the complex history of David, but even that of Israel itself.[46]

The sense of the story, at least on the simplest level, does not require a great amount of audience participation. If, however, the hearers are listening carefully and are willing to help the author create deeper levels of the story, the linguistic links between the interpretations of the parable point to a meaning that has a more profound impact not only on David, but also on the character of the audience. An attentive audience may hear the lesson left implicit by the Deuteronomist: God's mercy and generosity are great, but

---

[46]Polzin, *David and the Deuteronomist*, 126.

sin does not go without judgment. Those who first create the story and then receive its message will, hopefully, be morally formed.

*Solomon's judgment.* Another riddle that engages both the characters and audience of the Succession Narrative is found in the account of Solomon judging the two women who bring him a lone surviving child (1 Kgs 3:16-28). André Jolles identifies the riddle found in this passage as a *Gerichtssitzung*—a "law-court riddle."[47] The characters posing the question already know the answer; the judge must determine the answer. If the judge cannot deduce the answer, he loses his identity as judge.[48] In his discussion of the riddle of the two mothers, Stuart Lasine describes riddles as "sayings which pose a question demanding an answer, sayings couched in terms which lead the aspiring riddle-solver toward the answer, and at the same time, mislead."[49] On the level of the story, the riddle is solved by Solomon's God-given wisdom. The king presents the women the option of giving up the child or having the child divided in half. The true mother said, "Please, my lord, give her the living boy; certainly do not kill him!" The mother of the dead child said, "It shall be neither mine nor yours; divide it" (1 Kgs 3:26). Solomon's judgment immediately follows: "Give *her* the living boy."

Lasine finds the social situation of Israel fundamentally important for the purpose of this story. He proposes that the people of Israel felt that their social order was becoming increasingly unstable, and that this story contained a message for those who

---

[47]André Jolles, *Einfache Formen. Legende/Sage/Mythe/Rätsel/Spruch/Kasus/Memorabile/ Märchen/Witz* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1958), 131-132.

[48]Jolles, *Einfache Formen*, 131-132.

[49]Stuart Lasine, "The Riddle of Solomon's Judgment and the Riddle of Human Nature in the Hebrew Bible," *JSOT* 45 (1989): 62.

would pay attention.[50] Given the source of Solomon's wisdom as communicated earlier in the same chapter,

> the citizens of ancient Israel who were convinced of their inability to detect deceit in the hearts of their fellows would have good reason to experience anxiety over this fact, not only in judicial situations, but in all phases of their social and economic lives. . . . The story of Solomon's judgment could have served an important social function as a response to such "epistemological anxiety" in urban Israel.[51]

The story of Solomon's wise judgment, then, becomes a comparison not with another element within the narrative, but with the "real" lives of the audience members. The solving of the riddle, and the comparison that is implied, forms the audience's view of discernment: "the inability of human beings to decipher the true characters of their fellows is opposed to God's immediate and infallible knowledge of the human heart."[52]

The riddle does not end, however, with Solomon's judgment. The text does not specify which woman receives the living child, although many modern translations fill the gap by indicating that Solomon gives the child to the woman who spoke first, pleading for the child's life.[53] Roughly translated, the text reads, "Give to *her* the living child . . . *she* is the mother" (1 Kgs 3:27). When Solomon passes judgment by solving his riddle, the riddle of the audience begins.[54] The text of 1 Kings does not resolve the riddle, and the hearers now wish they could see Solomon as he surely gestured to one woman or another in a kingly fashion. The audience members, then, are forced "to

---

[50]Lasine, "Riddle of Solomon's Judgment," 74.

[51]Lasine, "Riddle of Solomon's Judgment," 76.

[52]Lasine, "Riddle of Solomon's Judgment," 61.

[53]For example, the NIV, NRS, and RSV expound on the Hebrew, identifying the true mother as the "first woman."

[54]Lasine, "Riddle of Solomon's Judgment," 67.

complete the picture and make decisions about the women by *consciously* applying their understanding of human nature gained from the life-experience, as well as insights into human behavior gleaned from the Bible itself."[55] The text requires the hearers to finish creating the story, as they reflect on what they know about mothers and babies, and grief and pride. The riddle in 1 Kings 3 includes not only a puzzle for Solomon and the audience, but also uses the tool of cultural allusion to draw audience participation.

The LXX version of this narrative, found in 1 Kings' Greek counterpart, 3 Kingdoms, has been significantly rearranged. Percy van Keulen examines the differences between the two accounts and concludes that the LXX arrangement is likely secondary to the MT. His conclusion is based on evidence that "the LXX groups together thematically related materials which in MT appear scattered over the account, . . . where the presentation of events in MT is confused, the LXX exhibits a logical order of temporal sequence."[56] The LXX also exhibits a tendency to enhance the character of Solomon, increasing his status among other kings while muting his faults in regard to treatment of his subjects and his faithfulness to God.[57] This early audience member(s) filled in the gap left by the chronological order of events in the MT, responding to the intratextual allusions and making the sequence smoother. By enhancing the character of Solomon, the reviser may also have intended to strengthen the message proposed by Lasine, that Solomon was blessed with a knowledge of the human heart that came from God. The

---

[55]Lasine, "Riddle of Solomon's Judgment," 68.

[56]Percy S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11* (VTSup 104; Boston: Brill, 2005), 300.

[57]Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative*, 300.

account in 3 Kingdoms reveals evidence of an audience that paid attention, helped create the story of Solomon, and made record of that creation in the text of the LXX.[58]

*Esther*

The story of Esther and its characters have captured audiences' imaginations for centuries: "the beautiful orphan who makes good in the king's court, the proud and stubborn Jew who refuses to lower himself, the good-hearted king who never seems quite in control, and the egotistical and evil manipulator."[59] Aside from telling a good story, what purpose did the author have for relating the story of Esther? And what tools did the author use to encourage audience participation? Perhaps the most obvious tool used by Esther's author to encourage audience participation is the tool of omission. Do these omissions encourage audience participation?

The first omission we note is ambiguity: the narrative does not clearly portray heroes and villains. The king, the first character to appear in the story of Esther, banishes of his beautiful wife who refuses to parade in front of his drunken friends (Esther 1). From the beginning of the story, the audience begins to associate the king with negative character traits. The audience assumes that Esther, the main character of the story, will be the heroine (as she is), but a Jewish hearer would balk at some of her actions. Esther's first actions in the story are to enter the Persian king's court as a prospective wife and

---

[58]For examples of other studies that explore rearrangements in the LXX translations, see David W. Gooding, "The Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct," *VT* 15 (1965): 325-335; Gooding, "Text-Sequence and Translation-Revision in 3 Reigns IX 10 – X 33," *VT* 19 (1969): 448-463; and Robert P. Gordon, "The Second Septuagint Account of Jeroboam: History or Midrash?" *VT* 25 (1975): 368-393. See also Zipora Talshir, "The Reign of Solomon in the Making: Pseudo-Connections between 3 Kingdoms and Chronicles," *VT*50 (2000): 233-249, who argues that the differences between the three accounts of Solomon's reign are not results of an original, short version of Kings (248).

[59]Linda Day, *Three Faces of a Queen: Characterization in the Books of Esther* (JSOTSup 186; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 9.

live there for an extended time; she carefully prepares herself for a night with the king (Esther 2), with no guarantee that she will actually become his wife—certainly not the actions of a good Jewish girl. The audience is left uncertain about Esther's character. Later in the story, the king casually signs into law the persecutions of a vague "people" accused by Haman (Esther 3), an action not surprising to the conditioned audience.

The audience also expects that the character of the Jewish people will be positively portrayed. The impending crisis of genocide, however, reveals the ambiguity of the character of the Jews as well. Michael Fox supposes that in the face of coming disaster, the audience would "be expecting a statement that the Jews fasted and cried out *to God* . . . or a declaration of faith that deliverance is from the Lord."[60]

But any reference to God is omitted, a second type of omission found in the story of Esther. Instead, the narrator includes several near-mentions of God: in 4:14a Mordecai tells Esther that "if you are silent at the time, relief and deliverance will arise for the Jews *from another source*;" and with his comment, "Who knows if it was not just for a time like this that you reached royal station?" Mordecai implies that "even before events began sliding toward disaster, some force was preparing the way for deliverance."[61]

Esther decides to seek an audience with the king, risking her life for the deliverance of her people. The king responds positively to Esther (Esther 5), contributing to the ambiguity of his character. In Esther 1, the king callously banishes his wife; in Esther 3, the king rather nonchalantly sentences a people group to destruction; but in Esther 5, the king accepts Esther into his presence—the act of a compassionate monarch.

---

[60]Michael V. Fox, *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 246. Emphasis original.

[61]Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 245.

The narrative's omission of God continues with another near-mention of God on the lips of Haman's wife and friends. As Haman prepares to dine with Queen Esther, his wife and advisors imply that "there is something deep in history, some law, natural or divine, that makes Jewish victory unstoppable, at least once it is underway."[62] The omission of God is not, claims Fox, due to inadequate information or lack of interest in God, but because the author wanted to frustrate the expectations of the audience.[63]

The author uses the passive voice to contribute to the omission of God in the narrative. Fountain observes that the MT of Esther shows "a disproportionate number of passive/reflexive verbs compared with Biblical Hebrew in general" and even "shows considerable disparity with other books from the same or similar period."[64] The extensive use of passive voice provides a clue to members who are searching for the activity of God in the story of Esther. The author may have chosen to use the passive voice "as a subtle way of implying One outside of the text who is acting on the characters within the story."[65] Passive verbs, of course, do not require a subject. The acting subject, then, is left ambiguous—God may have acted; God may not have acted. The conclusion is left to the audience.

The audience finds other clues concerning the omission of God in allusions contained in the story of Esther. John Loader has connected Esther with several other accounts in the Hebrew Bible. First, Esther recalls the Exodus. Loader does not claim

---

[62]Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 245-246.

[63]Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 246.

[64]A. Kay Fountain, *Literary and Empirical Readings of the Books of Esther* (SBL 43. New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 152.

[65]Fountain, *Literary and Empirical Readings*, 160.

that Esther tells the story of a *new* Exodus that replaces the old but that the theme of God's deliverance from slavery/danger/exile is a motif that the two stories have in common. The idea of God's intervention is as present in Esther as in the Exodus, Loader writes, but it is veiled: "motifs that certainly suggest a religious quality are introduced, but they are made to function in such a way that any theological significance is immediately veiled again."[66] The allusion to the Exodus event, which may be considered both a cultural and literary allusion, also involves tools of suspense and surprise. Loader calls the element of surprise in the veiling of God a pervasive characteristic of the narrative.

Secondly, Esther bears a "basic resemblance" to the Joseph story.[67] Like the story of Joseph, the book of Esther presents the people of God in dire straights. In the former narrative, Joseph, along with God, works for the salvation of his people, providing a source of food during severe famine. In Esther, God's people are once again in trouble—this time, in exile—and Esther works for the salvation of her people. God, however, is not mentioned. This allusion allowed audience members, if they would draw the connection to the Joseph narrative, to infer God's presence and activity in the Esther story as well.

Finally, Esther alludes to other overarching themes present in the Hebrew Bible. Loader identifies the theme of the "reversal of relations between strong and weak, winners and losers, oppressors and oppressed" as one that is found both in Esther and the larger story of Hebrew scriptures. By making the connection between the themes, the

---

[66]John A. Loader, "Esther as a Novel with Different Levels of Meaning," *ZAW* 90:3 (1978): 418.

[67]Loader, "Esther as Novel," 420.

audience "hears" the veiled suggestion of God's intervention.[68] Kay Fountain finds in Esther the theme that law does not necessarily equal justice. She notes the fourteen scenes in Esther that directly involve a law and concludes that "*there is a lot of law in Esther, but not much justice*."[69] The same theme is found in the prophetic message of the Hebrew Bible, and like the prophets' words, the story of Esther "tells us that law and justice are not the same thing."[70] Drawing on this allusion, audience members find traditional authority for the message of Esther. Hearers of Esther may not enjoy a "neutral, value-free" understanding of the story. Fox writes that "the author of Esther, after all, is not merely telling an exciting story. He takes an ethical stance."[71] As the audience creates the story that lies between Esther and the prophets, they are faced with a moral choice between law and justice. They also find hope for justice in Esther[72]—that justice may be found, even in exile. In the prophets' message, God is the bearer of justice regardless of human law or lawlessness. Might the identity of the bringer of justice be the same in the story of Esther?

By surprising the audience, by not handing them what they expected, the author of Esther intrigues the audience, retaining their attention and encouraging them to solve the anomaly of the story. The attentive audience finds clues in the Esther story, pointing to the (veiled) presence of God. But why veil God in the first place? Surely the author

---

[68]Loader, "Esther as Novel," 419.

[69]Fountain, *Literary and Empirical Readings*, 139. Italics original.

[70]Fountain, *Literary and Empirical Readings*, 139.

[71]Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 220.

[72]As noted earlier, the "justice" the Jews take on their enemies is questionable. This ambiguity is yet another instance that requires the audience's moral judgment.

had more in mind than simply providing the audience with a seek-and-find puzzle. Loader suggests that the author veils God's presence in the narrative to show that when God delivers, God "does not inhibit human wisdom, planning and initiative. [Humans] do not become mere puppets."[73] This purpose extends not only to the characters in the narrative, but also to the audience. The audience is not a mere puppet, parroting back what the narrator feeds it. Instead, the audience must fill in God's actions/motivations in the story. A Jewish audience "steeped in Hebraic heritage" would have been alert to the clues and coincidences in the narrative that pointed to the hand of providence.[74] The audience must create a part of the story before this underlying message of Esther may be understood.

As the story continues, indeed Haman's advisors are correct—the Jew Mordecai will not be bested. The king, whose quality of character hangs in the balance, chooses to honor Mordecai. Eventually the Persian king disposes of the villain Haman and saves the Jewish people. This character that began the story in a negative light seems to have redeemed himself by the conclusion.

The closing chapters reveal further ambiguities concerning the character of the Jews. The author does not include "a report that the Jews gave thanks to God after their victory . . . or an exhortation to thank God in future Purim celebrations."[75] Rather than thanking God for their salvation, as one might expect—reflecting yet another omission of God—the Jews celebrate their victory by meting out a persecution of their own. Even

---

[73]Loader, "Esther as Novel," 420-421.

[74]W. Lee Humphreys, "The Story of Esther and Mordecai. An Early Jewish Novella" in *Saga Legend Tale Novella Fable: Narrative Forms in Old Testament Literature* (JSOTSup 35; ed. George W. Coats; Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1985), 111.

[75]Fox, *Character and Ideology*, 246. Emphasis original.

after their safety is assured by Esther and Mordecai's favored positions in the king's court, they kill over 75,000 people (Esther 9). The character of the Jews is left in question. They are the people of God, yet they do not acknowledge God in their words, and they act with the same callous disregard for life exhibited by the Persian king.

Fountain considers this ambiguity deliberate on the part of the author. She writes that the Masoretic text of Esther does not "give clear statements about who are the heroes and villains, [but instead uses] clues to help the reader identify them as the story proceeds."[76] The omission of explicit judgment of Esther and the king, then, is a tool used by the author to encourage audience attention and participation. Each audience member searches for the character that deserves to be championed by following clues left by the author in the narration.

Even with clues determining the good and bad characters is not an easy task; in fact, it may be intentionally impossible. Stan Goldman writes that "the very intention of Esther is . . . to test our moral judgment."[77] Fountain agrees, writing that "the Masoretic text presents a . . . thought-provoking and challenging set of ethical problems" and forces the audience to make mature moral judgments.[78] Right and wrong are not clearly defined in the story of Esther. The audience must constantly weigh actions and motivations, participating in the story by evaluating the moral fortitude of the characters.

---

[76]Fountain, *Literary and Empirical Readings*, 93. Fountain points out that the other extant versions of Esther attempt to remedy this ambiguity. We will discuss the other two versions later in this section.

[77]Stan Goldman, "Narrative and Ethical Ironies in Esther" *JSOT* 47 (1990): 25-26.

[78]Fountain, *Literary and Empirical Readings*, 4.

*Greek Additions as participation.* The story of Esther presents an excellent opportunity to see how ancient audiences attempted to participate in the narrative by editing or adding to the text. The MT of Esther, which is found in the Hebrew Bible, is only one of three extant versions. In addition to the MT, an Alpha Text,[79] existing now in four Greek manuscripts dating from the 11th-13th centuries, and the Septuagint (LXX) version remain extant. For this discussion, we will briefly consider the LXX Greek Additions to the book of Esther, which are made up of six sections labeled A-F by Jerome when he relegated them to an appendix at the end of the Vulgate translation of Esther.[80] George Nickelsburg gives a brief summary of the six passages:[81]

The Greek Additions "give evidence that the Jews themselves recognized the religious and moral problems of the book quite early and were attempting to offer solutions for them."[82] In this sense, they offer a valuable glimpse into the first century CE understanding of Esther. On the other hand, however, Joyce Baldwin believes that the Additions cloud the book's ability to involve the audience. She writes that the MT

---

[79]We will not examine the Alpha Text in this project, but for more information on how the AT relates to the MT and LXX versions, see Michael V. Fox, "The Redaction of the Greek Alpha-Text of Esther" in *"Sha'arei Talmon" Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov with Weston W. Fields; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 207-220; Kristin De Troyer, *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1-17, LXX 8:1-17, and AT 7:14-41* (SBLSCS 48; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000); and Karen Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

[80]George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), 172-173.

[81]Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 173.

[82]F. B. Huey, Jr., "Irony as the Key to Understanding the Book of Esther" *SwJT* 32 (1990): 36. See also David J. A. Clines who concludes that "the primary effect of the LXX expansions as a whole is . . . *to assimilate the book of Esther to a scriptural norm*" (*The Esther Scroll* (JSNOTSup 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), 169-170).

Table 1. Summary of the Greek Additions to Esther

| Sections from the MT | Contents of the Additions |
|---|---|
| | A. 11:2 – 12:6: Introduction, Mordecai's Dream, Transition |
| 1:1 – 3:13 | |
| | B. 13:1-7: Artaxerxes's Decree of Extermination |
| 3:14 – 4:17 | |
| | C. 13:8 – 14:19: Mordecai's Prayer, Esther's Prayer |
| 5:1-2 (omitted) | D. 15:1-16: Esther before the King |
| 5:3 – 8:12 | |
| | E. 16:1-24: Artaxerxes's Decree |
| 8:13 – 10:3 | |
| | F. 10:1 – 11:1: Interpretation of Dream, Conclusion; Colophon |

"permits the reader to see how the writer perceived events, the selection, both of incidents and of phraseology . . . leaving the reader to make his own deductions . . . . Subsequent generations have not done [it] justice."[83]The problems "solved" by the Additions include omissions, authority, and religious issues. Chapters A and F of the Additions provide information not included in the MT, concerning events of the story. In chapter A, Mordecai receives a premonitory dream, which is analyzed in chapter F. Jon Levenson notes that these Additions lend Esther to the "emerging scriptural tradition of apocalyptic literature" by transforming the story into a "cosmic conflict between God and the demonic forces that oppose him and afflict his chosen people."[84] Chapters B and E contain expanded versions of the king's decrees, documents that include recollections of other decrees found in Ezra 1 and 4 and Daniel 3-4.[85] The "official" sounding decrees

[83]Joyce G. Baldwin, *Esther: An Introduction and Commentary* (TOTC; ed. D. J. Wiseman; Oxford: Intervarsity, 1984) 32.

[84]Jon D. Levenson, *Esther: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 31.

[85]Levenson, *Esther*, 31.

increase the authority of the story. Chapters C and D make explicit the omitted references to God's presence and activity. The characters' prayers not only give the book a religious veneer, they also assimilate "Esther to the scriptural norm by Pentateuchal law"[86] and fulfill the audience's expectation that the oppressed Jews will cry out to God. Chapter D describes Esther approaching the king. In this addition, the king is at first angered by Esther's approach, just as she feared in her conversation with Mordecai. God intervenes to save Esther, however, when God "changes the king's spirit to gentleness" (v. 13-14). Each addition represents the activity of some ancient hearers of the book. Multiple extant versions of Esther provide an ancient petri dish in which we can observe an audience creating story.

*Conclusion*. The rhetorical tool of omission allows the author of Esther to draw the audience into creation of the story, sharpening blurred areas of ambiguity and the hidden—perhaps—presence of God. The practice of filling in such omissions forms hearers by conditioning them to "see" things that are not "there." Indeed, this activity can be observed in the Greek Additions to Esther. An ancient audience of the Esther narrative has left evidence of its activity, confirming that participating listeners recognized omissions and helped create the story.

*Conclusion*

By using the tools of riddle, allusion, irony, comparison, ambiguity, and omission, the authors and editors of the book of Judges, the Succession Narrative, and the book of Esther encourage their audiences to engage the narratives by paying attention, allowing

---

[86]Levenson, *Esther*, 31.

themselves to be formed, and, as seen particularly with the LXX variations and the Greek Additions of Esther, creating story. The evidence suggests that the Greco-Roman rhetoricians' concern with audience participation highlighted a concern felt in other circles as well. The texts of the Hebrew Bible, while only slightly influenced by Hellenistic rhetorical practices, shared with that culture the desire to involve listeners in moral formation and the creation of story.

## *Examples from Non-Canonical Jewish Texts*

### *Judith*

For this project, we will examine one section of Judith that provides a ready example of the tool of omission used to encourage audience participation: the speech of Achior to Holofernes.[87] The same "phenomenological" Hellenistic influence mentioned above may be seen when we examine the speeches in Judith. With Alexander's acquisition of Palestine in the fourth century BCE, the Jewish world came into constant contact with Hellenistic society. While biblical literature continued to exert a powerful force on Jewish literature of this time, we might expect to see influences of Hellenistic literary forms and structures.[88]

---

[87]A similar omission in a speech will be discussed in the section on the Book of Acts.

[88]David E. Aune, "Hellenistic World," in *Deuterocanonicals/Apocrypha* (ed. Watson E. Mills and Richard F. Wilson; Mercer Commentary on the Bible 5; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2002), xxx. This influence may be present even if the author of Judith did not formally study the material in the handbooks. Quintilian writes that "the discovery of arguments was not the result of the publication of text-books, but every kind of argument was put forward before any rules were laid down, and it was only later that writers of rhetoric noted them and collected them for publication" (*Inst.* 5.10.120). Certainly this is true for rhetorical practice.

Before turning to Achior's speech, a brief overview of the other major deliberative speeches in Judith will be helpful in determining whether or not the author is following guidelines similar to those outlined in the handbooks.

Table 2. Deliberative Speeches in Judith

| | Exordium[89] | Statement of Facts | Proof | Epilogue | Successful Speech |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Edomites & Moabites to Holofernes | 7:9 | 7:10 | 7:11-14 | 7:15 | Yes |
| Judith to Bethulia Leaders | 8:11b | 8:11c-13 | 8:14-23 | 8:24-27 | Yes |
| Judith to God | 9:2-6 | 9:7 | 9:8 | 9:11-14 | Unknown at the time |
| Judith to Holofernes | 11:5-8 | 11:9-10 | 11:11-19a | 11:19b | Yes |

As this chart shows, the deliberative speeches in Judith fall into categories laid out in the handbooks, and given the evidence presented above, we are not surprised to see similarities between the speeches in Judith and the instructions given for speeches by the ancient rhetoricians. As we will see, however, the speech of Achior does not conform to this pattern. This is especially striking given that the other deliberative speeches in Judith contain all elements recommended by Quintilian, including the all important proof or *probatio*.[90]

[89]An *exordium* is an introduction to a speech that usually "seeks to obtain the attention of the audience and goodwill or sympathy toward the speaker." Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 23-24.

[90]Quintilian writes that "of the five parts into which we divided judicial cases, any single one other than the proof may on occasion be dispensed with. But there can be no suit in which the proof is not absolutely necessary" (*Inst.*, 5.Pr.5). In the context of both forensic and deliberative speeches, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* instructs that "the entire hope of victory and the entire method of persuasion rest on proof and refutation" (*Rhet. Her.*, 1.10.18).

From Quintilian we learn that the main purpose of deliberative speeches is to persuade or dissuade an audience concerning an action. We also learn that while some elements of rhetorical speeches may be shortened or even omitted (the exordium and the statement of facts), the element that is absolutely necessary for persuasion is the proof or *probatio*. In the speech we will examine from Judith, Achior provides information and advice[91] to Holofernes. He attempts to persuade the commander to determine Israel's spiritual state before attacking the city of Bethulia.

The occasion for Achior's speech is political, as is the case for many deliberative speeches. He begins with a brief exordium (Jdt 5:5-6) in which he addresses Holofernes as "my lord" and refers to himself as Holofernes' servant. Achior promises that his account of the Israelites will be truthful, which it is, despite the fact that Holofernes rejects his advice. Achior continues to the longest section of his speech, a statement of facts. While Holofernes is well aware of the current military situation, he lacks knowledge of Israel's history—what is it that would compel them to stand against his army? Achior begins Israel's history with an account of their ancestry, and he describes their relationship with their God by telling Holofernes the story of the people from the time of their patriarchs through their return from exile. This practice is in accordance with Quintilian's advice that examples are of great value in deliberative speech. The listening audience hears a recollection of their own history and God's providential role in it. By using this cultural allusion, the author of Judith connects his audience with the people of Bethulia; the listening audience is further involved in the narrative.

---

[91]Roger A. Bullard and Howard A. Hatton, *A Handbook on Tobit and Judith* (New York: United Bible Societies, 2001), 308.

Achior's implied advice is that Holofernes should determine the spiritual state of Israel before attempting to take Bethulia[92] because of the close relationship between the Israelite people and their God.[93] He does not make any arguments for the honorable nature of this action, but he does point out that this action would be expedient. If the Israelites had sinned against God, Holofernes would win; if the Israelites had not sinned, Holofernes would become a laughing stock. The deliberative nature of Achior's speech is not explicit, but the reaction of the other warriors and Holofernes shows that at least the narrative audience thought Achior was trying to be persuasive.

Achior's speech is fairly simple, and the dignity of the speech is not unexpected from a leader.[94] Unfortunately, especially for Holofernes, Achior's speech fails to convince, and the spiritual state of Israel remains unknown.[95] His speech seems to fit within the guidelines of ancient rhetorical speeches, except for one crucial part. The author has omitted what Quintilian called the "entire hope of victory" for the deliberative speech: the *probatio*.

---

[92]It has been suggested that Achior is implying that the Israelites are stronger than Holofernes' army (see Bruce Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1957], 44). Holofernes may have heard this implication, especially given his reaction to Achior's speech, but in fact Achior says no such thing. Achior merely tells Holofernes that if Israel's God is with them they will win; if God is not with Israel, they will lose. (See Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 105). For this reason, then, Holofernes should inquire concerning Israel's spiritual state before making a plan of attack. (Cf. Ernst Haag, *Studien zum Buche Judith: Seine Theologische Bedeutung und Literarische Eigenart* [Trier: Paulinus, 1963], 32.) Regardless of how Achior's speech is interpreted, it is clear that he is giving advice. After he is finished speaking, Holofernes must decide what to do. (Bullard and Hatton, *Tobit and Judith*, 308; Adolfo D. Roitman, "'This People are Descendants of Chaldeans' (Judith 5:6): Its Literary Form and Historical Setting," *JBL* 113:2 (1994): 246.)

[93]Haag, *Studien zum Buche Judith*, 31.

[94]One might expect, however, that as a warrior, Achior might have been more bloodthirsty. Perhaps this is what Holofernes expected; he was left disappointed.

[95]Holofernes mockingly refers to Achior's speech as prophecy, but the irony is turned back on the Assyrian commander when Achior's speech is proven to be true.

Why would the author omit this vital element in Achior's speech? On the level of the story, Achior's speech serves at least two purposes. First, Holofernes must not be convinced to leave Bethulia in peace in order for the narrative to continue. Achior's speech also serves to set up Judith's deceptive speech to Holofernes: later, Judith tells the general that the people of Bethulia *have* sinned, and by giving permission for Bethulia's sin, Jerusalem—indeed the whole of Israel—is about to sin against their God.

At the level of the listening audience, the missing *probatio* in the speech by Achior is an invitation for audience participation. Certainly the speech of Achior fulfills its purpose in the story: the speech must not convince the audience (Holofernes) in order for the story to continue. Moving up one level to that of the actual audience, however, the speech serves the additional purpose of actively involving the audience.

The speech in question occurs in Judith 5, but the audience does not yet have information on the spiritual state of the Israelites from the preceding narrative. Have the Israelites of Bethulia sinned? Will God give them up to Holofernes? Or has Bethulia been faithful to God? And in that case, will God defeat Holofernes, making him the laughing stock of the world? By delaying the answers to these questions, the author builds the story's suspense.

This tension remains as the narrative continues. Even the people of Bethulia do not seem to know if God will save them or allow them to be defeated. In Jdt 7:25, the people declare to Uzziah that "God has sold us into their hands, to be strewn before them in thirst and exhaustion." When they urge Uzziah to surrender to the Assyrians, they call on their God, "the Lord of our ancestors, who punishes us for our sins and the sins of our

ancestors." The audience is left to wonder what sins will be revealed as the narrative unfolds.

Judith's actions in the story teeter breathtakingly close to carnal sin. Toni Craven remarks that Judith "dares much with Holofernes as a daughter of Israel feigning escape."[96] But the faithful, though unorthodox, heroine takes with her clean food and clean dishes as evidence that she will not sin against God. Instead, she "preserves the life of her community in [a] way suitable to [her] times;"[97] she delivers the Israelites from Holofernes and his army.

By the time the audience reaches the end of the story of Judith, they realize that the people of Israel had in fact not sinned against God—at least they were not about to be disciplined at the hands of the Assyrians for any sin. Thus, at the end of the narrative, the audience may insert the *probatio* that Achior's speech lacked. God delivered Bethulia, and therefore the Israelite nation. Holofernes would have been better off, indeed he would have kept his head, if he had heeded the advice of Achior and had determined the spiritual state of Israel before laying siege to the town.

By introducing an omission, if that can be said, in Judith 5, the author tantalizes the audience with a missing puzzle piece, thereby encouraging their attention for the rest of the story and their participation at the narrative's conclusion. Solving the puzzle of Achior's *probatio*, the audience's belief in God's justice is underscored. The audience that participates in the creation of story is more likely to remember and internalize the message of the narrative: God will deliver the righteous.

---

[96]Toni Craven, "Tradition and Convention in the Book of Judith," *Semeia* 28 (1983): 61.

[97]Craven, "Tradition and Convention," 60.

*Tobit*

The story of Tobit provides examples of the tools of privileged access and allusion, both literary and intratextual. Although the author of Tobit certainly makes use of other tools such as irony and surprise,[98] the tools of privileged access and allusion emphasize the audience's role in creating the story of Tobit.

As narrator, Tobit begins by emphasizing his faithfulness to God. He recalls, "All my kindred and our ancestral house of Naphtali sacrificed to the calf that King Jeroboam of Israel had erected in Dan and on all the mountains of Galilee. But I alone went often to Jerusalem for the festivals, as it is prescribed for all Israel by an everlasting decree" (Tob 1:5-6). Tobit also makes certain the audience knows he married a woman from his own family (Tob 1:9), alluding to an emphasis from the patriarchal period[99] on the importance of marriage within the circle of kinship.

The book contains a "shifting narrative point of view,"[100] so that while the story begins with Tobit as the narrator, an anonymous narrator begins speaking in Tob 3:7 and continues for the remainder of the book. In the second chapter, the unfortunate Tobit is blinded by bird droppings after faithfully burying a fellow Jew that had been killed in the marketplace. The scene is now set for Tobit's need, and the author continues to reference all aspects of Tobit's blindness throughout the narrative.

---

[98]Bullard and Hatton, *Tobit and Judith*, 1: Bullard and Hatton note that the author of Tobit is able to make extensive use of irony because 'there is no real suspense in the story, since the author tells us early on just what is going to happen." The details of the adventures of Tobit and Anna, Raphael, and Tobias and Sarah are not revealed, however, and so the audience is able to enjoy a certain element of surprise even after being assured of a happy ending.

[99]I. Abrahams, "Tobit and Genesis," *JQR* 5:2 (1893): 349, comments that "every one has noted the patriarchal character of the book, how the whole story is planned on patriarchal lines. It is needless to quote the coincidences; they are too numerous." Other allusions to the patriarchal period mentioned in this section can be found in Abrahams. See also, Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 35-36.

[100]David McCracken, "Narration and Comedy in the Book of Tobit," *JBL* 114 (1995): 403.

The second, third-person narrator grants the audience access to privileged information beyond Tobit's limited perspective.[101] For instance, a new female character unknown to Tobit, enters the story in chapter 3. Allusions to the partriarchal period continue in Tob 3:7-9 when the woman, named Sarah no less, is reproached by servants for having no children. After explaining Sarah's pitiful situation, the audience receives privileged information about a messenger from God, Raphael, whom God sends to answer the prayers of blind Tobit and cursed Sarah. This information, should the attentive audience retain it, will become useful later in the narrative.

The scene returns to Tobit, and his words provide the audience with yet another allusion to the partriarchal period: Tobit provides his son, Tobias, with nuggets of popular wisdom (Tobit 4). At the end of the chapter, Tobit sends Tobias to Media to collect a sum of money Tobit left there with a man named Gabael. The characters are now presented with a new problem—Tobias does not know how to get to Media, and once he arrives, he fears that Gabael will not know or trust him.

Raphael, whom the attentive audience previously met in Tob 3:17, conveniently appears in Tobias' path.[102] Raphael presents himself as a distant relative who knows both the way to Media and Gabael—Raphael can act as both guide and personal reference for Tobias (Tob 5:4-14).

The conversation with Raphael reveals, as David McCracken points out, that Tobit was at times an unreliable narrator. Tobit claimed that he alone from the house of Naphtali faithfully celebrated the festivals in Jerusalem while all his kindred sacrificed to

---

[101]See McCracken, "Narration and Comedy,"401.

[102]The motif of a disguised angel is also an allusion to the patriarchal period (i.e., Gen 18:2-19:26)

King Jeroboam's calf in Dan (Tob 1:5-6). After the third-person narrator has taken over, however, Tobit is delighted to find that he and Raphael are supposedly related. Tobit says, "I knew Hananiah and Nathan, the two sons of Shemeliah, and they used to go with me to Jerusalem and worshiped with me there, and were not led astray" (Tob 5:14). In his excitement, the character Tobit reveals the truth: Tobit was, indeed, faithful, but not as *uniquely* faithful as the narrator Tobit would have the audience believe.

The attentive audience used clues like this to increase their privileged knowledge of the narrative.[103] Recognizing the narrator Tobit's tendency to self-aggrandizement encourages the audience to participate in the story as an insider. Audience members are able to see beyond the information provided by Tobit about himself; they see things as they truly are.

Raphael agrees to accompany Tobias, and the men prepare to leave Tobit and his wife, Anna. At this point, the audience alone knows that Raphael is an angel of God, and so the hearers can enjoy the humor in Tobit's ironic statement as he sends Tobias and Raphael on their journey. Comforting his weeping wife, Tobit says, "Do not fear for them, my sister. For a good angel will accompany him [Tobias]; his journey will be successful, and he will come back in good health" (Tob 5:21-22). In addition, privileged knowledge allows the audience to "perceive a beneficent and joyous order" to events as they unfold.[104] The audience chuckles at the unintended truth of Tobit's statement to Anna, but the words also communicate "the author's belief in the real presence of God in

---

[103]McCracken makes the interesting observation that "in the case of the author of Tobit, the complexities of self-revelation by an ego-narrator might have been readily understood by hearers or readers self-trained in the art of hearing stories, while post-Jamesian, twentieth-century readers may misunderstand because of their presuppositions about, for example, irony, piety, or history" ("Narration and Comedy," 407-408.

[104]McCracken, "Narration and Comedy," 401.

his own time."[105] The audience observes the anxiety and tears of the characters (i.e., of Anna in Tob 5:18) but the "abundant assurance of a happy outcome precludes" the tears of the audience.[106] Access to privileged information accomplishes more than simple reassurance; the story of Tobit teaches that God is behind the seemingly coincidental events that lead to the restoration of Tobit's sight and the liberation of Sarah from the amorous demon.

The allusions to the patriarchal period continue as the story draws to an end. Unfortunate circumstances are understood to be tests from God (Tob 12:14), and the two final chapters of Tobit contain a particularly heavy cluster of Deuteronomic elements.[107] At the end of the story, the audience hears repeated references to the end of the Pentateuch. Weitzman writes that "Tobit's progressive echoing of Genesis and then Deuteronomy evokes the entirety of pentateuchal history—from the betrothals of the patriarchs to the final days of Moses—almost as if to enclose the experiences of Tobit within pentateuchal bookends."[108]

These clues within the text lay the foundation for a connection between Tobit's hymn and the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32.[109] Weitzman points out marked similarities between the two songs: both narratives include exhortations to praise God and to write a book (Tob 12:17-20; Deut 31:14-30); both include similar motifs such as God "speaking to an aged sage and his successor," culminating in the sage recording a song;

---

[105]Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 34.

[106]McCracken, "Narration and Comedy," 402.

[107]Steven Weitzman, "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit," *JBL* 115 (1996): 59.

[108]Weitzman, "Hymn of Tobit," 59.

[109]Weitzman, "Hymn of Tobit," 50.

both use similar phrases (Tob 13:2/Deut 32:39 and Tob 13:6/Deut 32:20); both songs end by looking toward the future (Tob 13:8-17 and Deut 32:10-14, 15-18, 19-42, 43).[110]

Establishing narrative similarities between the stories of Tobit and the patriarchs allowed the author not only to lend authority to his work, but also evoked similar conclusions from an attentive audience. In order for those conclusions to be reached, however, the audience had to participate in creating the story. As Moses' speech concludes Deuteronomy, the people of Israel are preparing to enter Canaan after years of wandering (and maturing) in the desert. At the end of Tobit, the author offers hope for an end to the current wandering—the Exile—and for a second entering into the land God prepared for the people. By setting Tobit's story in the traditional history of the patriarchs, the author "hints that Jews presently living in exile have reached a similar turning point in their history—that their sojourn in exile is almost over and their life in the land is about to resume. . . . The allusion to Deuteronomy 31-32 serves as literary surety for this promise."[111] The hints from Tobit's author remain just that—allusions to hope that remains unspoken until the audience uses their privileged information. The audience must connect the story of Tobit with the story of the patriarchs to hear the message that God has not forgotten them in exile.

*Joseph and Aseneth*

The story of Joseph and Aseneth is useful for our discussion in two ways. First, the book is a Jewish story (dated from the 2nd century BCE to 3rd/4th century CE) that offers examples similar to the works already considered. On another level, however,

---

[110]Weitzman, "Hymn of Tobit," 52-54.

[111]Weitzman, "Hymn of Tobit," 61.

*Joseph and Aseneth* is an example of one audience creating a story connected to the narrative of Genesis. While it is certainly arguable whether or not the "author" of Genesis intended for the story to be filled out in such a way, *Joseph and Aseneth* is evidence that an attentive audience perceived a gap in the text of Genesis 41:45, and sought to fill it. Susan Docherty identifies *Joseph and Aseneth* as an example of a "rewritten Bible" story.[112] One characteristic of such stories is that they interpret scripture in order to "fill in any perceived gaps in the scriptural narrative, or deal with contradictions in the biblical texts or passages which appeared incomprehensible or immoral to their contemporaries."[113] The gaps that the author of *Joseph and Aseneth* seeks to fill include the questions, "Who was Aseneth? [and] Why did Joseph marry this Gentile woman?"[114]

The author makes implicit connections not only to the canonical story of Joseph, but also to other narratives in the Hebrew Bible and other bodies of literature. Lawrence Wills understands *Joseph and Aseneth* to be a highly symbolic narrative that introduces "allegorical or mystical elements [that] at times break the bounds of the narrative, forcing the reader to look constantly beyond the story for external referents."[115] Finding the external referents is left to the audience; the author makes "no attempt to provide a key

---

[112]Susan Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?," *JSJ* 35 (2004): 29. The usefulness and/or validity of the category "rewritten Bible" is debated, but the observed characteristics of these texts speak to our topic, whether or not a distinct category is plausible.

[113]Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth,*" 29.

[114]Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*," 33.

[115]Lawrence M. Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1995), 171.

for the reader to interpret them."[116] To illustrate this point, we will briefly survey some of the "enigmatic symbols and motifs"[117] found in the first part of the book.

Aseneth's tower has ten rooms and is located within her family's court (2:1-2). The court can be accessed by four gates, each guarded by eighteen strong men (2:18). Aseneth herself is attended by seven virgins the same age as she (2:10-11). In this description, the numbers are symbolic, if only to indicate the special nature of Aseneth and her family's dwelling. Like Aseneth, Esther was also attended by seven maids (Esther 2:9), a similarity that emphasizes the author's portrayal of Aseneth who, though Egyptian, has much in common with Hebrew women (1:7). In the courtyard, there are many fresh trees, ripe with fruit, and fresh water flowed into the courtyard, into a cistern, and emptied into a stream that watered the trees of the courtyard (2:19-20). These images of the courtyard recall creation and the Garden of Eden.[118]

Gideon Bohak points out the symbolism found in Aseneth's wardrobe changes. In chapter 3, Aseneth prepares to greet her parents by donning rich robes that befit her status as princess (3:8-11). As the account of Aseneth's conversion begins, the princess goes back to her wardrobe and selects "a black and sombre tunic" (10:9). The audience perceives that she has entered a time of mourning. Aseneth is not finished changing clothes, but before the clothing symbolism can continue, Aseneth must become a new creation.

---

[116]Wills, *Jewish Novel*, 172.

[117]Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 82.

[118]Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*," 41-42.

The meal that Aseneth shares with her heavenly visitor is the topic of much discussion. Of particular interest are the three-fold elements of the meal (bread of life, the cup of immortality, and the ointment of incorruptibility), the replenished honeycomb, and the multicolored bees.

The three-step meal, Bohak proposes, "implies that she [Aseneth] has joined 'the chosen ones of God' and 'the sons of the Most High,' an inclusion which assures her supernatural strength and beauty, accompanied by immortal youth."[119] Oil seems a bit out of place in the context of the meal, but Randall Chesnutt points out that oil was understood to be one of God's greatest provisions and was particularly subject to impurities.[120] Mention of the oil in the triad served to emphasize the image of right food, drink, and oil versus wrong food, drink, and oil. This image was tied to distinguishing "the practice of worshipers of God from that of outsiders."[121] That Aseneth receives the bread, cup, and oil from the angel (at least in word if not in action), reflects the Jewish community's concern for impurity and contamination by idols, and underscores Aseneth's conversion to the pure Jewish way of life.[122]

The regenerating honeycomb and the colorful bees that fly out of it have literary and cultural referents from various contexts. First, some audience members have connected the honey in *Joseph and Aseneth* to the manna provided by God in Exod

---

[119]Gideon Bohak, Joseph and Aseneth *and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis* (SBLEJL 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 3. The three elements are also found in Joseph's comment about Aseneth's uncleanliness in 8:5.

[120]Randall D. Chesnutt, "Perceptions of Oil in Early Judaism and the Meal Formula in Joseph and Aseneth," *JSP* 14 (2005): 122.

[121]Chesnutt, "Perceptions of Oil," 123.

[122]Chesnutt, "Perceptions of Oil," 132.

16:31, which is said to have tasted like honey;[123] both have heavenly origins.[124] Another possible allusion is the honey that appears in Isa 7:15 as food given to newborns; this textual allusion emphasizes Aseneth's rebirth into God's people.

The bees and honey may also have other referents in Egyptian and Greco-Roman contexts. In the Egyptian milieu,[125] various goddesses were associated with bees; bees were born from the tears of Ra, the sun god; honey was considered sustenance that fell from heaven; the bee was associated with Pharaoh; and bees were considered guides for the dead as they journeyed to the next world. These cultural allusions coincide with motifs present in *Joseph and Aseneth*: "the solar connection, the motif of Pharaonic and divine royalty, the affinity with goddesses, and even the association with death."[126] Audience members familiar with the Egyptian context would have understood the bees and honey to be references to the divine, linked to both life and death. The honeycomb's position in *Joseph and Aseneth*—at the crux of Aseneth's conversion—highlights her death to idolatry and her birth as a new creation of God.

The Greco-Roman context provides slightly different allusions: bees were known for wisdom, virtue, chastity, sexual abstinence, cleanliness, dislike of unpleasant smells, and abstinence from meat; bees were thought to foretell the future (i.e., when flying indoors, bees were thought to foretell the coming of a stranger); bees were a symbol of

---

[123]Chesnutt, "Perceptions of Oil," 117-118. Note, however, Moyer V. Hubbard, "Honey for Aseneth; Interpreting a Religious Symbol," *JSP* 16 (1997): 97-110, who advises "greater restraint" when connecting *Joseph and Aseneth* 16 with Exodus 16 (110).

[124]Hubbard, "Honey for Aseneth," 110.

[125]Ross Shepard Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 167-168.

[126]Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph*, 168.

peace and of "the virtues of the proper woman: chastity, purity, and diligence."[127] As in the Egyptian context, Greco-Roman allusions support motifs found in *Joseph and Aseneth*: the cultural allusions are "remarkably consistent with the portrait of Joseph and with that of the transformed Aseneth, who was always chaste and is now wise, virtuous, clean, and even appears to abstain from meat."[128] Ross Kraemer also points out the similarity between the characteristics of the bees and those of angels: both are "asexual, pure, and perhaps immortal."[129] An attentive audience in the Greco-Roman context would, again, have understood the bees and honey to be of divine origin and, perhaps, nature. In addition, the new virtues of the converted Aseneth are embodied in these symbols.

By using bees and honey in the conversion scene, the author of *Joseph and Aseneth* drew on imagery laden with meaning in various contexts both inside and outside Jewish scripture. Before her conversion, Aseneth's mouth was "unkissable." Joseph said,

> [i]t is not right for a man who worships God, who with his mouth blesses the living God, and eats the blessed bread of life, and drinks the blessed cup of immortality, and is anointed with the blessed unction of incorruption, to kiss a strange woman, who with her mouth blesses dead and dumb idols, and eats of their table the bread of anguish, and drinks of their libations the cup of treachery, and is anointed with the unction of destruction" (8:5).

---

[127]Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph*, 168.

[128]Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph*, 168.

[129]Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph*, 168. Kraemer dates *Joseph and Aseneth* much later than other scholars, supposing a 3rd or even 4th century CE date. As a result of this dating, Kraemer is able to expand her survey of allusions to Rabbinic Judaism. She writes that this group also associated honey with wisdom and mystical experiences, and according to the Neoplatonist Porphyry, some Mithraic initiation rites used bees and honey to symbolize the transmutation of the soul. In *Joseph and Aseneth*, "honey is the food of the gods that prevents putrefaction and therefore conveys immortality. Bees symbolize the soul awaiting rebirth and, even more precisely," good souls that have completed their work and are now returning to the place from which they came (Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph*, 169).

After the divine visitation, and after the bees and honey have purified Aseneth's mouth, she becomes worthy of Joseph's kiss[130]:

> [a]nd when Joseph saw her, he said to her, "Come to me, pure virgin, for I have had good news about you from heaven, explaining everything about you." And Joseph stretched his hands out and embraced Aseneth, and Aseneth embraced Joseph, and they greeted each other for a long time and received new life in their spirit" (19:2-3).

Missing the allusions of bees and honey does not keep the narrative from making sense. Connecting the imagery with cultural and textual allusions, however, allows the audience to comprehend more completely the author's emphasis on the conversion of Aseneth.

After her conversion as Aseneth speaks with her angelic visitor, she is instructed to "change her mourning garments for a new and pure garment . . . [meaning] that Aseneth is a suppliant no more."[131] Finally, when Joseph arrives for the second time, Aseneth prepares to greet him by putting on a "robe that shone like lightning," a royal girdle of precious stones, gold bracelets, boots, and crown, and an expensive necklace. Aseneth is now not only an Egyptian princess; she has been transformed to match the solar imagery applied to Joesph in chapter 5. The changes in wardrobe illustrate Aseneth's evolution from arrogant, pagan princess to a transformed, converted, new creation.[132]

Joseph and Aseneth *as participation.* The allusions found in *Joseph and Aseneth* speak to the narrative's purpose. In addition to elements from the conversion section of *Joseph and Aseneth*, the overall narrative makes several other references to the Hebrew

---

[130]Michael Penn, "Identity Transformation and Authorial Identification in *Joseph and Aseneth*," *JSP* 13 (2002): 176.

[131]Bohak, *Heliopolis*, 8.

[132]See Bohak, *Heliopolis*, 3.

Bible, particularly, of course, to the story of Joseph found in Genesis.[133] Chesnutt concludes that the author expected the audience to be familiar with the Joseph narrative (see 1:1, 4:9-10, 22:1-5, and 24:1-9) and the other patriarchal narratives (1:5, 23:2, 14).[134] In fact, Chesnutt claims that recognizing the Joseph allusions is "central to the narrative and crucial for a full appreciation of it."[135] Docherty delineates several allusions to the Joseph story found in *Joseph and Aseneth*: the time of the narrative is linked to the seven years of plenty (*Jos. Asen.* 1:1; Gen 41:29); Joseph travels Egypt at Pharaoh's command (*Jos. Asen.* 1:2-3; Gen 41:42-43); Joseph marries Aseneth (Gen 41:45); Aseneth gives birth to Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen 41:50-52); seven years of famine begin (*Jos. Asen.* 22:1-2; Gen 41: 53-54); Joseph's brothers fall down before him in *Jos. Asen.* 22:5, fulfilling Joseph's dreams from Gen 42:6, 43:26, and 44:14; knowledge of Joseph's youth and years in Potiphar's house is presupposed although the author of *Joseph and Aseneth* does not narrate them explicitly: Aseneth knows Joseph is a shepherd from Canaan who had been sold, accused of sleeping with his mistress, imprisoned, and freed after interpreting dreams (*Jos. Asen.* 4:9-10, 6:2, 13:13).[136] The jealously of Pharaoh's son in the second part of *Joseph and Aseneth* could easily have been based on "speculation [that] may . . . have arisen about the reaction of Pharaoh's own sons to their father's exaltation of Joseph."[137]

---

[133]For the sake of space, in order to realize the device's full effect without recounting the entire story of Joseph and Aseneth, the allusions are here listed together.

[134]Randall D. Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in* Joseph and Aseneth (JSPSup 16; Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1995), 257-258.

[135]Chesnutt, *Death to Life*, 258.

[136]List of allusions to the Joseph narrative taken from Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*," 34-35.

[137]Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*," 36.

*Joseph and Aseneth* contains still other allusions to the biblical text: Aseneth's prayers and laments allude to several psalms;[138] the heavenly visitor's call and Aseneth's answer in 14:4-6 resembles Samuel's calling; the descriptive words of "fruit, doves, pomegranates, and Aseneth's neck and breasts" recall Song of Solomon; Benjamin's attack on Pharaoh's son with stones recalls David and Goliath.[139]

By repeatedly alluding to the biblical narrative, and by imitating that narrative in some ways (biblicizing phrases and structural anomalies such as doublets and seams of a Pentateuchal feel[140]), the author "induces a certain ethos" reminiscent of the patriarchal narratives. Giving *Joseph and Aseneth* the same "feel" as the ancient stories of Joseph and the other patriarchs allows the author to create a familiar background for the new story.

We will mention three scholars' views of that purpose in order to show the connection created by perceived allusions.[141] Howard Clark Kee believes that the central purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth* is to describe "the epiphanic experience of the God of light, whose presence illumines the faithful seeker and transforms the individual, so that he (Joseph) or she (Aseneth), whether of Jewish or pagan origins, shares in the divine life."[142] Kee claims that *Joseph and Aseneth* represents a step that Judaism took in the

---

[138]See also Howard Clark Kee, "The Socio-Cultural Setting of Joseph and Aseneth" *NTS* 29 (1983): 404.

[139]This list is from Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*," 41-42 unless otherwise noted.

[140]Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 92.

[141]Other suggestions for the purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth* include missionary propaganda intended to convert Gentiles to Judaism (Nickelsburg, *Jewish Novels*, 262) and justification for the establishment for a Jewish temple at Heliopolis (Bohak, *Heliopolis*, 90-94).

[142]Kee, "Socio-Cultural Setting," 410.

first century CE that was "neither nationalistic nor separatist in its outlook," a step that included outsiders after they received divine revelation.[143] The literary and cultural allusions support Kee's proposed purpose by basing the validation of the conversion and acceptance of Gentiles on the story of one of Jewish history's greatest characters: Joseph. The allusions to divine activity, found in Jewish, Egyptian, and Greco-Roman thought, emphasized God's involvement in and blessings upon Gentile conversion and acceptance.

Chesnutt agrees with Kee that *Joseph and Aseneth* was written primarily for Jews, but he proposes a different purpose: *Joseph and Aseneth* provides a midrashic solution to a Jewish problem—"the marriage of the patriarch Joseph to the daughter of a pagan priest."[144] While the story does "enhance the status of Gentile converts to the Jewish community,"[145] the narrative's main purpose was to answer troublesome questions much like those proposed by Docherty, "Who was Aseneth?" and "Why did Joseph marry this Gentile woman?"[146] Docherty comments that "the details of [Aseneth's] outstanding beauty and virginity, stressed continually throughout the text . . . serve to emphasise [sic] Aseneth's suitability to be the wife of Joseph."[147] *Joseph and Aseneth* provides evidence of audience participation in the narrative of the patriarch, Joseph.

Docherty proposes her own conclusion about the purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth*, one that does not preclude those mentioned above. She believes that the story had a didactic purpose and was intended to teach the message of the Hebrew Bible. The main

---

[143]Kee, "Socio-Cultural Setting," 411.

[144]Chesnutt, *Death to Life*, 258.

[145]Chesnutt, *Death to Life*, 264.

[146]Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*," 33.

[147]Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*," 37.

lessons of *Joseph and Aseneth*, according to Docherty, include "answering questions raised by the biblical text, filling in narrative lacunae, commenting on issues of relevance to [the] audience (e.g. the correct attitude to idolatry and to proselytes) . . . and [illustrating] the theme of not taking vengeance on enemies."[148] *Joseph and Aseneth* assumes an active audience that is willing to participate by connecting the dots between the narrative and literary and cultural allusions. The book also provides evidence of an active audience that participated in creating a continuing story of Joseph and Aseneth.[149]

*Conclusion*

The Jewish texts of Judith, Tobit, and *Joseph and Aseneth* provide examples of omission, intratextual allusion, access to privileged information, and complex and multi-layered cultural and literary allusions, particularly in *Joseph and Aseneth*. *Joseph and Aseneth* also provides another example of an ancient audience's participation through creation of story, this time in the Joseph narrative from Genesis 41. By use of various rhetorical tools, the Jewish texts also show a concern for audience participation. Not only do these devices entertain the audience and retain the audience's attention, but they also encourage the audience to make the story their own, even, at times, to the extent of creating part of the narrative.

---

[148]Docherty, "*Joseph and Aseneth*," 45.

[149]*Joseph and Aseneth* also leaves questions unanswered for *its* readers (see Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 100): Who exactly is the Visitor who is "the chief of the house of the Lord?" How is it that eating the honeycomb is the same thing as Aseneth receiving a blessed bread, cup, and anointing? Aseneth is said to be the mother to many—who is that, and in what sense is she mother? Humphrey comments that the narrative's ending leaves an open-endedness: "Joseph and his family continue to negotiate their place in a strange land. The reader knows what will happen after Joseph dies, and is perhaps reminded of the tentative nature of security prior to the final 'place of rest'" (Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 108).

*Conclusion*

This chapter contains only a few of the possible Hebrew and Jewish texts that could be examined for evidence of audience participation. The Wisdom literature from both traditions, for instance, provides ample material for further research due in large part to its purpose of moral formation. With this section, however, we only wished to establish the deliberate tendency to encourage audience participation at varying levels in this corpus of literature.

The texts chosen demonstrate that Hebrew and Jewish authors used tools such as access to privileged information, omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden and ambiguous meanings, and complex, multi-layered cultural, literary, and intratextual allusions to encourage audience participation. The writers and performers tailored their words to the audience, for in the audience lay the success of their endeavor. Without the participation of the audience, the narratives were merely entertainment. The hearers cooperated by paying attention and helping create the stories, a partnership that resulted in moral formation.

# CHAPTER FIVE

## Audience Participation in New Testament Narrative

This chapter will examine non-Lucan New Testament narrative for evidence of tools used to encourage audience participation. Previous chapters have demonstrated the uses of such tools in ancient pagan, Hebrew, and Jewish literature. Do the authors of New Testament narrative texts make similar use of these devices? We will discuss evidence from Mark, Matthew, and John before turning to the Lucan material in chapter six.

### *The Gospel According to Mark*

The gospel of Mark provides an excellent starting point for this survey. The author uses a wide range of rhetorical devices that prompt his listeners to work with him to create the "good news of Jesus Christ, Son of God" (Mark 1:1).[1]

The audience receives access to privileged information from the earliest verses of the gospel of Mark when the author identifies the gospel as "beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, son of God" (1:1). Characters within the gospel do not receive this explicit pronouncement, and so throughout the narrative the disciples, crowds, and religious leaders consistently fail to grasp the truth of Jesus' identity. The audience, faced with the failure of the story's characters, experiences "a tension and expectation that contribute to

[1]Despite the ambiguous genitive and variants of this verse that plague translators and interpreters, Mark invites his readers to partner with him to create the story of Jesus Christ.

the movement of the narrative."[2] This tension and expectation created by access to privileged information helps retain the audience's attention.

The privileged information that Jesus Christ is the son of God also encourages the audience's participation through moral formation as the narrative unfolds. Early in the gospel of Mark, the audience identifies with the disciples who are portrayed positively in 1:16-20; 3:13-18; 4:10-12; and 6:7-13.[3] Only after the audience, with privileged information in hand, has identified with the disciples does the author reveal the obtuseness of the disciples. Mary Ann Tolbert observes that when the author portrays "the *disciples* as failing foils to Jesus . . . [he] manipulates the [hearer] to respond by becoming a *better disciple*"[4] than those in the story. The disciples in the gospel of Mark were handpicked by Jesus; they listened to the words spoken by Jesus; they were first-hand witnesses to his actions. Yet the Markan disciples "utterly fail their master."[5] The audience observes this failure, being aware of the truth of Jesus' identity (1:1), and according to Tolbert, realizes that the "flaw upon which the disciples' originally eager spirits founder is their craving for self-enhancement."[6] Having recognized this flaw, the author uses access to privileged information, part of which the audience received in 1:1,

---

[2]Sharyn Dowd, *Reading Mark. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2000), 22.

[3]Robert C. Tannehill, "The Gospel of Mark as Narrative Christology" *Semeia* 16 (1979): 70. See also Geert Van Oyen, "Intercalation and Irony in the Gospel of Mark" in *The Four Gospels 1992 Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (3 vols.; ed. F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 2:961.

[4]Mary Ann Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel. Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 223-224. Italics original.

[5]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 224.

[6]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 226.

and a bit of misdirection to encourage moral formation and challenge complacency—the audience must take action in order to succeed where the disciples fail.

Mark makes early and frequent use of the tool of omission. Several important pieces of information are omitted from Mark's gospel; in fact, the tool of omission is present from the very beginning of the narrative. J. Lee Magness writes that "the abruptness of the ending [of Mark] is no more scandalous than the abruptness of the beginning."[7] The author does not begin with a birth story, a genealogy, or even a theological account of Jesus' origins. The first sentence of the gospel is not a full sentence but only a fragment. The audience bears the responsibility of gathering evidence about this Jesus who Mark claims is the Christ, the Son of God.

The tool of literary allusions to the Old Testament is relatively common in the gospel. In most cases, the audience is required to locate the allusion in their memory of the Old Testament. By applying a larger network of knowledge to the brief allusions, the audience helps the author of Mark create his story. In addition, the scriptures to which Mark alludes carry significant authority, at least for the Jewish hearers of Mark's gospel. Arguably, simply tying the story of Jesus to the prophetic tradition and the writings demanded a moral response from such listeners. The author of Mark claims that Jesus fulfilled and filled full the words of the Old Testament: the audience is faced with a choice to agree or disagree. Either decision results in moral formation.

The author may access entire Old Testament accounts with only a few words. Perhaps, as mentioned above, the most common use of OT allusions in Mark is that of lending authority to Jesus and the gospel narrative. The quotation from "Isaiah" in Mark

---

[7]J. Lee Magness, *Sense and Absence: Structure and Suspension in the Ending of Mark's Gospel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 89.

1:2-3 connects the account of Jesus Christ, Son of God, with not just the single phrase or even a single prophet, but with "a whole history of experience gathered around a pregnant text"[8]: the fall of Israel and Judah, the Exile, the restoration to the land. By recognizing the provenance of the prophetic quotation (regardless of Mark's inaccurate specific citation), the audience is prepared for future allusions to material common to both stories: "light, blindness, sight, deafness, hearing, and alienation of heart."[9] Likewise, making John the Baptizer a type of Elijah (Mark 1:4-6) communicates that John's "appearance fulfills OT prophecy, and that fact stands him—and Jesus as well!—squarely within the prophetic tradition."[10]

Mark's narrative is quick-moving, and it is well on its way by the second chapter. In Mark 2:15-22, the author uses a set of metaphors to help the audience learn "how metaphors were employed in Mark's discourse and how [listeners] are invited to take up the invitation to the dance that each metaphor offers."[11] The first metaphor, in which Jesus compares himself to a physician, is relatively clear on the surface, especially because Jesus immediately gives an interpretation of the metaphor in the narrative: "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; I have come to call not the righteous but sinners" (2:17). Fowler suggests, however, that the audience should perhaps hear yet another metaphor in the interpretation:

---

[8]Donald H. Juel, *The Gospel of Mark* (Interpreting Biblical Texts; ed. Charles B. Cousar; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 57.

[9]Dowd, *Reading Mark*, 10.

[10]Jerry Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony in Mark's Gospel. Text and Subtext* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 72; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 95.

[11]Robert Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 178.

> [d]o we detect a note of irony in [Jesus'] voice when he says he has nothing to do with the 'righteous'? Are his 'righteous' really righteous and his 'sinners' really sinners? . . . Granted that Jesus did not come to call the righteous but sinners, the question then arises, Who are the 'righteous,' and who are the 'sinners'? The offering of a metaphorical (and maybe ironic) interpretation of a metaphor in the story only begins an interpretive process that the [audience] is implicitly invited to take up and continue.[12]

Fowler's comment holds two implications for this study. First, already intratextual allusions have begun to indicate that the identity of the righteous/insiders and the sinners/outsiders is unclear. An attentive audience member might well hear the ironic metaphor Fowler suggests, and as the narrative continues, the irony will only intensify. Second, the hearer is left with a riddle that is not fully explained: who are the righteous and who are the sinners? The riddle is like a rock in the hearer's sandal. She will dwell on the puzzle as the story continues.

In the second metaphor of the section, Jesus says that wedding guests do not fast when the bridegroom is with them, but he predicts that "the days will come when the bridegroom is taken away from them, and then they will fast on that day" (2:19-20). Fowler writes that while the "referent of the metaphor [is] clear . . . the scope of the metaphor remains unclear."[13] The audience easily equates Jesus with the bridegroom, but how, when, and why the bridegroom is taken away, and what exactly the wedding guests will mourn in his absence is vague. The metaphor lingers in the audience's mind, hopefully until the end of the gospel, at which time, Fowler points out, reinterpreting the earlier forward-pointing intratextual allusion "becomes especially attractive."[14]

---

[12]Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 178.

[13]Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 179.

[14]Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 179.

The last two metaphors in this section do not have interpretations attached by Jesus, but by now an attentive audience has learned how to connect the metaphorical dots. After hearing Jesus interpret the first two metaphors, the audience is encouraged to "take [the metaphors] up as challenging riddles [as] both the narrator and his protagonist offer . . . clues and strategies for interpreting."[15] The uninterpreted metaphors draw the audience into a game with the author, retaining the listeners' attention and encouraging them to invest in the story by filling out details of Jesus' identity.[16]

Literary allusion appears again in Mark 2. More than just a rhetorical ornament, Ernest Best writes that knowledge of the Old Testament is "necessary [in many places] if the argument is to be understood."[17] In Mark 2:23-26, Jesus alludes to the story of David eating bread of the Presence (1 Sam 21:6). Even with the brief explanation Jesus gives, a full knowledge of the Davidic episode provides details that fill out the Markan narrative: Jesus compares himself to David, God's anointed one, who was on an important mission[18] when he and his followers needed food. Jesus implies that David "understood human welfare to be a higher standard than legal codes,"[19] as does he.

---

[15]Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 179.

[16]Birger Gerhardsson notes that such comparisons do not *force* the audience to make a decision, they "are calculated instead to call forth an existential insight which leads to action" (Birger Gerhardsson, "If We Do Not Cut the Parables Out of Their Frames," *NTS* 37 (1991): 332). In other words, the comparisons require audience participation that begins with mental comprehension and acquiescence, which in turn lead to action.

[17]Ernest Best, "Mark's Readers: A Profile" in *The Four Gospels 1992 Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. Van Segbroeck, et.al.; 3 vols.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 2:847.

[18]Dowd, *Reading Mark*, 27.

[19]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 134. Mikeal Parsons notes that the humanitarian versus legalistic understanding of Sabbath laws was an interJewish argument. Jesus was not challenging a monolithic Jewish understanding of the Sabbath; he was drawing on "a well-established tradition, grounded in the Jewish scriptures (see Exod 23:12; Deut 5:14)," Mikeal Parsons, "Mark 2:23-28," *Interp* 59 (2005): 58.

Parsons points out that the argument in Mark 2:27-28 also makes use of the tool of enthymeme. Jesus' major premise is that "the Sabbath was made for humans, and not humans for the Sabbath" (2:27). The conclusion follows immediately: "so the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath." The premise that was omitted, Parsons supposes, might have been "I am no ordinary human, but a figure like the Son of man, who came to serve and not to be served, and through that service will express my authority and Lordship."[20] As Lord of the Sabbath, the Son of Man, identified just moments earlier as Jesus himself (2:10), has the authority to allow his followers to break laws of the Sabbath.[21]

Mark's irony is another tool—one that has been widely discussed[22]—that helps lead the audience toward participation and moral formation. Rather than reviewing that extensive and fascinating discussion, however, we will deal specifically with how irony in Mark encourages audience participation.

---

[20]Parsons, "Mark 2:23-28," 59.

[21]Parsons, "Mark 2:23-28," 59.

[22]See for instance Kent Brower, "Elijah in the Markan Passion Narrative," *JSNT* (1983): 85-101; Richard Dormandy, "Jesus' Cutting Irony: Further Understanding of Mark 11:17," *ExpTim* 114 (2003): 333-334; Robert M. Fowler, "Irony and the Messianic Secret in the Gospel of Mark" in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society, Vol 1, 1981* ([S.I]: Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society, 1981), 26-36; Bruce Hollenbach, "Lest they should Turn and be Forgiven: Irony," *BT* 34 (1983): 312-321; Robert Hurley, "Allusion Et Traces d'Ironie Dans Un Texte De Marc," *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses* 30 (2001): 293-305; Carey A. Moore, "Mark 4:12: More Like the Irony of Micaiah than Isaiah" in *Light Unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers* (ed. Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim, and Carey A. Moore; Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974), 335-344; Geert van Oyen, "Irony as Propaganda in Mark 15:39?" in *Persuasion and Dissuasion in Early Christianity, Ancient Judaism, and Hellenism* (ed. Pieter W. van der Horst, et.al.; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 125-141; Norman R. Petersen, "'Literarkritik', the New Literary Criticism and the Gospel According to Mark" in *Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. Van Segbroeck, et.al.; Louvain: Peeters, 1992), 935-948; Tom Shepherd, "The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation," *NTS* 41 (1995): 522-40; Whitney Shiner, "The Ambiguous Pronouncement of the Centurion and the Shrouding of Meaning in Mark," *JSNT* (2000): 3-22; Dan O. Via, "Irony as Hope in Mark's Gospel: A Reply to Werner Kelber," *Semeia* (1988): 21-27.

If a hearer recognizes irony but does not acknowledge it, he or she becomes another victim of the narrative's irony and comes "under the implied condemnation of the story."[23] In this way, irony appears to force the audience into complicity with the author. As shown in chapter 2, such complicity and participation encourages the audience to take ownership of the story by helping create it.

Once audience members help create story by recognizing irony in the gospel, most realize that they, like the disciples and Jesus' opponents, "have been blind or obtuse [and] that the narrative is in its own way passing judgment on its readers."[24] Even after working with the author to complete the irony, the listener realizes that she is still in the dark in some areas and at least in part the listener is still an outsider. The challenge and lure to be "inside," to continue to explore and create the account of Jesus Christ, Son of God, is strengthened by lingering bits of hidden information, another tool recommended by ancient rhetoricians.

Ironically, one well-known example of hidden information in the narrative of Mark involves Jesus' comment about hidden information. Kermode remarks on the hidden elements in Mark:

> My present point is simple enough: Mark is a strong witness to the enigmatic and exclusive character of narrative, to its property of banishing interpreters from its secret places. He could say *hina* [referring to Mark 4:10-12], even though his ostensible purpose, as declared in the opening words of his book, was the proclamation of good news to all.[25]

---

[23]Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony*, 180.

[24]Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony*, 93.

[25]Kermode, *Genesis of Secrecy*, 34.

The author of Mark does not seem to think that the audience has an inalienable right to comprehension. In fact, instances like the ἵνα clause in Mark 4 may imply that full understanding is well nigh impossible. The disciples, Jesus says, have been given the secret of God (4:11). The audience searches back through their memory of the narrative—what is the secret? Did we miss it? Fowler suggests that Mark sometimes puts "not only characters but also the audience in the dark. . . . Sometimes I, the reader of the Gospel of Mark, stare blankly at a veil of opacity that keeps me from seeing or hearing correctly what characters in the story apparently do see or hear."[26] This is the first mention of "the secret of God;" the audience did not miss the secret, says Fowler, because "here is a moment of opacity in the discourse. . . . Mark 4:11 confronts us with our own blindness . . . a blindness to which most critics have been blind."[27] The secret may have been given to the disciples earlier, but this is not part of the audience's privileged information. Having received the gift of sight (1:1), the audience now sits in the seat of the blind.

Why hide meaning? What effect does this rhetorical tool have on the audience of the Gospel? The measure of frustrated curiosity that withheld information elicits from the audience prompts the listeners to search the continuing narrative and their lives. The audience listens for a clarifying phrase: "And answering, Jesus said to them, 'The secret of the Kingdom of God is this . . .'." But the words do not come. In this way, hidden meaning promotes audience attention and creation of story. The effectiveness of this tool

---

[26]Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 162.

[27]Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 169. If Fowler is correct, note again the double irony in the situation between audience and story.

may be seen by the continuing debate surrounding the secrets of Mark into the second millennium.

We see that the gospel's use of literary allusion to the OT continues in the fourth chapter as well. In this instance, the story of the listener himself comes into play as the audience members see themselves in some of the OT allusions. Camille Focant suggests that the informal allusion to Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:10-12 invites the listeners to see if their hearts have been hardened to the mystery that has been given to them.[28]

Questions and answers in Mark's gospel function in a similar manner. The gospel contains a surprising number of questions—over 100 by one count.[29] While these questions belong in the narrative, moving dialogue and action forward, audience members receive the questions as well from their position outside the narrative. Questions that remain unanswered especially encourage audience response and participation. In these instances, "the implied author poses the question for the [hearer]; if the [hearer] wishes to have an answer, he must supply his own."[30]

Even questions that do have answers that are spoken or implied by the narrative have an effect on the audience: With what can we compare the kingdom of God? (4:30); Who do you say that I am? (8:29); What were you arguing about on the way? (9:33); What do you want me to do for you? (10:36-51). These questions invite the audience to participate by formulating responses and evaluating them compared to the responses of

---

[28]Camille Focant, "La recontextualisation d'Is 6,9-10 en Mc 4,10-12, ou un example de non-citation" in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C.M. Tuckett; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 173-174.

[29]Kathryn Vitalis Hoffman and Mark Vitalis Hoffman, "Question Marks and Turning Points: Following the Gospel of Mark to Surprising Places," *WW* 26 (2006): 69.

[30]Robert Fowler, *Loaves and Fishes. The Function of the Feeding Stories in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 54; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981), 168. Fowler points specifically to 4:41; 11:28, 30.

the characters in Mark's gospel.[31] Any question, even a rhetorical question, demands an answer. Several possible scenarios may play out in the face of such queries, in any combination. The audience may actively participate by seeking answers in the surrounding narrative (4:30); the audience may connect the story of Mark with their own lives by providing a personal response (8:29); the audience may be morally formed by question and answer process (10:36-51).

Returning to the flow of Mark's narrative, we see that the author uses the tools of comparison (in the form of riddle) and surprise (in the form of misdirection) throughout the gospel. The story of the Syrophoenician woman in Mark 7:24-30 provides a helpful example of both. Before discussing the story of the Syrophoenician woman, we must recall the intratextual background Mark has painted for this particular tale. Mark has portrayed the supplicants in his gospel almost entirely in a positive light.[32] These are the people who are healed; these are the people with faith. As the story of the Syrophoenician woman begins in Mark 7:24, the audience has every reason to believe that this woman will follow the supplicant character-type set up by Mark. Drawing on the narrative they have heard thus far, the audience expects that the woman will make a request of Jesus, will show evidence of her faith in some manner, and as a result, Jesus will grant her request.

The audience has encountered characters in Mark's gospel that share aspects of the woman's physical character-type, and the narrative's treatment of these characters

---

[31]Vitalis Hoffman and Vitalis Hoffman, "Question Marks," 69. See also 70-76.

[32]Elizabeth Struthers Malbon identifies the supplicants as supporters of the Markan Jesus, while the disciples and the crowd are only categorized as "followers." Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "The Jewish Leaders in the Gospel of Mark: A Literary Study of Marcan Characterization," *JBL* 108 (1989), 277.

contribute to the audience's perception of the Syrophoenician woman. Obviously, the woman is female, and the text tells us she was Greek, Syrophoenician by race (Mark 7:26). So far in Mark, several female characters have been mentioned specifically as they encounter Jesus: Simon's mother-in-law (1:30), Jesus' mother (3:31), the hemorrhaging woman (5:25), and Jarius' daughter (5:41).[33] Of these women, three are portrayed in a positive light (1:30; 5:25; and 5:41). Since we assume Jesus' mother to be one of the relatives in 3:21 who believed Jesus had lost his senses, we usually read the reference to Jesus' mother in 3:31 negatively. Prior to Mark 7:24, then, three women—the three women who had needs—have been portrayed in a positive light. Only one woman is portrayed negatively.

The society in which Mark lived often recognized women only as they were related to men (as mothers, wives, or daughters).[34] Strangely, the Syrophoenician woman is not mentioned in connection with a man. She shares this characteristic with another woman already seen in the gospel—the hemorrhaging woman. These women may have been widows[35] or may have been separated from their families for other reasons. Regardless, a lack of male connections does not seem to preclude healing for these women in Mark. Thus, we may reasonably assume that this lone Syrophoenician woman who has a need will be treated positively in this pericope.

---

[33]Herodias (6:17) and Herodias' daughter (6:22) have also been mentioned. These women are portrayed negatively, but because they do not have contact with Jesus, we will not consider them for our purposes. One might also argue that the crowds and the larger group of disciples would have included women as well, but these women are not mentioned specifically.

[34]Winsome Munro, "Women Disciples in Mark?," *CBQ* 44 (1982), 226. See also David Rhoads, "Jesus and the Syrophoenician Woman in Mark: A Narrative-Critical Study," *JAAR* 62 (1994), 367.

[35]R. Alan Cole, *Mark* (TNTC 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 188.

The woman is also a Gentile, presumably from Tyre and Sidon where Jesus is staying when she approaches him. Tyre and Sidon have been mentioned once before in Mark 3:8. People from these areas are numbered among those who hear of Jesus and come to hear his teaching and/or experience healing. We encounter the next Gentile characters in Mark 5 when Jesus heals the Gerasene demoniac. Others from the region also approach Jesus in this story, but they are frightened and ask Jesus to leave the area (5:15, 17). The Gentiles who sought after Jesus have not been turned away. The one Gentile who approached Jesus with an explicit need was made whole. The only Gentiles who react in what some consider a negative way toward Jesus are the ones who did not have needs. Therefore, again we may assume that the Syrophoenician woman will be received positively based on the previous treatment of Gentiles in Mark's gospel.

Having determined that the woman herself will probably be accepted positively, we turn to another aspect of her character-type—that of a supplicant. The vocabulary used in the encounter between this woman and Jesus has occurred before in Mark.[36] The woman hears (ἀκούσασα) about Jesus, a common introduction for supplicants in the gospel (2:1; 3:8; 5:27; 6:55). This woman has a need—her daughter had an unclean spirit—just as others have had needs (1:30; 1:34; 1:40; 2:3; 3:1; 3:10; 5:2; 5:23; 5:25-26; 6:5; 6:34; 6:54). Driven by her need, the Syrophoenician woman comes (ἐλθοῦσα) to him, another action that supplicants have in common (1:40; 2:3; 2:13; 3:8; 3:20; 5:2; 5:22; 5:27; 6:33). Upon finding Jesus, the woman falls down at Jesus' feet (see 5:22, 33) and makes her request. After hearing her request, Jesus responds, as he has done before

[36]Of course this vocabulary is not used exclusively of supplicants. Most of these verbs are quite common in the gospel of Mark. Noticing that the Syrophoenician woman acts as the other supplicants act, however, is important to this discussion.

when supplicants approached him (1:41; 2:5; 3:5; 5:8; 5:30; 5:34; 5:39).[37] Like those healed before her, the audience expects this woman to be like the good soil in the parable of the seeds (4:8, 20).[38] Jesus' response, however, seems to conform more to the response expected by the culture of Mark's audience than to the response the hearers expect from the narrative of the gospel. Jesus responds to her request with a riddle,[39] denying her request on the basis of her Gentile heritage.[40]

At this point, the woman breaks free of her character-type. From the discussion of the progymnasmata and Aristotle, we remember that a character's speeches should be fitting.[41] When we expect the Syrophoenician woman to go away sad (see the rich man in 10:22), she responds with verbal sparring, not as a woman should act but as a man would act.[42] That said, not even men respond to Jesus in this manner in Mark's gospel.

---

[37]Note that the one character who has shared everything with the Syrophoenician woman (female gender, no male connections, arguably a societal outcast—one a Gentile, one a bleeding woman, hears of Jesus, has a need, comes to Jesus, falls at Jesus' feet, and receives a response from Jesus) is the hemorrhaging woman. Might these two characters be Jewish and Gentile counterparts as seen elsewhere in Mark (the two feedings, etc.)? Such seems likely.

[38]Mary Ann Tolbert, "How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character," *Int* 47 (1993), 351.

[39]This much-debated answer from Jesus is outside the scope of our examination. Is there a neat and tidy explanation, or might this be a point at which Jesus himself steps outside his character type? Also, see Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 185, for an author who believes Jesus' words actually are not focused on the woman's nationality.

[40]Joel F. Williams, "Discipleship and Minor Characters in Mark's Gospel," *BSac* 153 (1996), 338.

[41]Theon gives the example that "different ways of speaking would . . . be fitting by *nature* for a woman and for a man" (Theon, *The Exercises*, 48; emphasis Kennedy's). Aristotle also addresses this issue in terms of acceptability. He writes that while "it is possible for a person to be manly in terms of character… it is not appropriate for a woman to exhibit either this quality or the intellectual cleverness that is associated with men" (Aristotle, *Poetics*, 15.8-12). This idea will also figure into our later discussion of the Syrophoenician woman. In his commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics*, Butcher remarks that "the dialogue is not mere conversation"—that speech may be "equivalent to a deed" (Samuel Henry Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (New York: Dover Publications, 1951), 358). For Aristotle, an act "is none the less real because it consists not in outward doing" (Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory*, 358). Thus, we may consider the Syrophoenician woman's speech as part of her character.

[42]Pierre-Yves Brandt, "De l'usage de la frontière dans la rencontre entre Jésus et la Syrophénicienne (Mc 7/24-30)," *ETR* 74:2 (1999), 177. Cf. Joanna Dewey, "Jesus' Healings of Women:

This woman is the only character to confront Jesus verbally with a variation on his own words.[43] Her quick answer not only indicates that she understands the riddle proposed by Jesus,[44] but also speaks to her desperation.[45] Her clever, last-ditch answer thrusts her even further outside her character type. As a result of her challenge, Jesus appears to change his mind.[46]

Jesus says, "Because of this λόγος you go, the demon has left from your daughter" (7:29). The audience expects to hear that the woman's daughter was healed because of her faith (2:5; 5:34; 5:36; 6:5-6)—but the woman's faith is never mentioned.[47] In this instance, Jesus heals because of the active initiative of the woman's word.[48] Thus the Syrophoenician woman breaks outside her character type in a surprising manner, not because of her ethnicity or gender, but because of her response. She speaks in a manner not fitting for a woman, a Gentile, or a supplicant—and for that matter, she speaks in a way that is unprecedented for *any* character in Mark's gospel—and wins healing for her daughter.

---

Conformity and Non-Conformity to Dominant Cultural Values as Clues for Historical Reconstruction" *BTB* 24 (1994), 127.

[43]Rhoads, "Jesus and the Syrophoenician Woman," 347.

[44]Rhoads, "Jesus and the Syrophoenician Woman," 347. At the very least, this woman "solves the puzzle" of Jesus' riddle and so wins the prize she seeks. See Dowd, *Reading Mark*, 76.

[45]Hisako Kinukawa, "The Syrophoenician Woman: Mark 7.24-30" in *Voices from the Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World* (ed R.S. Sugirtharajah; Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 147.

[46]Brandt, "De l'usage de la frontière," 178-179.

[47]Rhoads, "Jesus and the Syrophoenician Woman," 346, 360. This fact is especially surprising after Jesus' miraculous powers seem to be hindered in 6:5-6 when the Nazareth listeners do not have faith. See Tolbert, "How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character," 355.

[48]Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark," *Semeia* 63 (1993), 37.

The audience experiences the tools of riddle and surprise in this pericope. The sequence of events Mark led his audience to expect was upset by the surprising account of the Syrophoenician woman. Aristotle approved of this sort of audience misdirection because "there is . . . a kind of fictitious discovery which depends on a false inference on the part of the audience" (*Poet*. 16.10). In the wake of this surprise and discovery, the attention of the audience members is caught once again and the hearers are reminded that all is not as it seems in the gospel of Mark.

Tom Thatcher discusses several riddles in Mark for which the narrative does not supply solutions. In Mark 8:15, Jesus makes the much-debated comment to the disciples about the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod: "Beware the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod." The disciples are clearly confused by the warning and to one another they say, "It is because we do not have bread" (8:16). Jesus then asks the disciples (and the audience, who incidentally is also scratching its collective head), "Do you still not perceive or understand?" (8:17). In an attempt to illuminate the disciples, Jesus "takes them once more, slowly, through the story of the Feedings . . . Well then, don't you see the point? Silence. . . . they do not find the answer."[49] Frank Kermode correctly observes that "although this passage has been subjected to the intense scrutiny of the commentators, no one, so far as I know, has improved the disciples' performance. The riddle remains dark."[50] If the reader is looking for a solution here, I do not have one to

---

[49]Frank Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy. On the Interpretation of Narrative* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 56.

[50]Kermode, *Genesis of Secrecy*, 47. See also John C. Meagher, *Clumsy Construction in Mark's Gospel. A Critique of Form- and Redaktionsgeschichte* (Toronto Studies in Theology 3; New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1979), 77, who also notes that like the "poor blockhead" disciples, the audience is also in the dark, "despite [the] post-resurrection advantage over the puzzled disciples." Meagher, however, believes that the persisting mystery of this saying is a result of clumsy repetition of an oral tradition and Mark's

offer, except to suggest that this comment annoys the audience like another persistent rock in one's sandal and that perhaps the gospel's author placed it here on purpose in order to retain the audience's attention.[51] He has succeeded, beyond the narrative audience of disciples and the initial audience of the first century; hearers today still debate the saying. If nothing else, the author communicates through this pericope that Jesus' riddles have solutions, and they are not always easy to see. The audience members are now prepared to work for their answers.

Thatcher notes two other riddles without narrated solutions that are a bit easier to grasp, at least in general. Jesus tells his disciples in Mark 9:35, "If you are wanting to be first, you will be last and servant of all." With this riddle, Jesus "reverses the normal social order but does not explain how one can be 'first/master' and 'last/servant' at the same time."[52] The disciples, and the audience, must discover for themselves what it looks like to be both first and last, master and servant. Again in Mark 10:14-15, Jesus upsets the established social order without defining the details of his words:[53] "Whoever does not welcome the kingdom of God like children will not enter it." How does one welcome the kingdom of God "like a child"? Jesus does not say; the hearers, inside and outside of the narrative, are drawn into the story to mull over possible solutions.

---

unwillingness to admit that he does not understand either. I would argue that Mark is intentionally using omission to encourage audience participation in the narrative.

[51]Recall Longinus' comment in *On the Sublime*: "what is truly great gives abundant food for thought: it is irksome, nay, impossible, to resist its effect: the memory of it is stubborn and indelible" (7.2-4).

[52]Tom Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 56.

[53]Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 56.

Mark does not let his listeners get too comfortable with the story as the narrative continues. In Mark 12:28-34, Jesus has a surprising encounter with a scribe. The religious leaders are one of the main character types in Mark.[54] Exactly who these leaders were we do not know, perhaps because even Mark did not know exactly who composed the groups and exactly how the groups functioned.[55] Michael Cook argues that by the time the gospel of Mark was composed, these Jewish religious groups would have had waning influence, if any at all.[56] Nonetheless, Mark uses this character type to continuously trouble Jesus (2:6-7; 2:16: 2:18; 2:24; 3:2; 3:6; 3:22; 3:30; 7:5; 8:11; 9:14; 10:2; 11:18; 11:27-28; 12:12; 12:13).

The religious leaders seem to be concerned about Jesus' challenge to traditions and Jesus' growing popularity with the crowds.[57] Jesus' rejection of the Jewish religious elite[58] caused them to unite continuously in opposition against him. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon notes that this continuous and active opposition against Jesus is unique to these characters in Mark's gospel.[59] While Cook considers the religious leaders to be "merely

---

[54]Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark – Traditions in Conflict,* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 20.

[55]Michael J. Cook, *Mark's Treatment of the Jewish Leaders* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 1.

[56]Cook, *Mark's Treatment*, 2.

[57]Malbon, "Jewish Leaders," 265.

[58]See Etienne Trocmé, "Jésus et les Lettrés," *Foi et Vie* 84 (1985), 41, who argues that the struggle between Jesus and the scribes was based on social order before being theological or exegetical in nature.

[59]Malbon, "Jewish Leaders," 265.

. . . a foil for Jesus,"[60] and even calls them throw-away characters, he does note that the repeated appearances of the scribes and the Pharisees warrant further attention.[61]

Harry Fleddermann counts 22 references in the gospel of Mark to the scribes as opposed to the other Jewish leaders who are mentioned less frequently.[62] The scribes are also mentioned first among those opposed to Jesus (Jesus teaches as one who has authority, not like the scribes in 1:22) and are the last opponents to be mentioned (as the chief priests and the scribes mock Jesus in 15:31).[63] Mark sets the scribes up against the type of the "good soil" characters, those who act according to God's will. They act "without authority and without understanding and act with pride and without compassion."[64] Tolbert likens the scribes and the rest of the religious leaders to the parabolic path where the seed takes no root (4:5, 15).[65] When Jesus refers to the eternal sin of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit, the party accused by the narrator is the group of scribes (3:28-30).

This dichotomy between the scribes and those who would follow Jesus is illustrated in the verses immediately preceding our pericope. Jesus warns the crowd

---

[60]Cook, *Mark's Treatment,* 79.

[61]Cook, *Mark's Treatment*, 81. While Cook's information is useful for defining the religious leaders' character type, note that Elizabeth Struthers Malbon warns that the danger of taking Cook's thesis (the Markan Jewish religious leaders as a polemic against the Jews of Mark's time) too far is that "one might fail to go on to consider the narrative effect of these differences for the Markan Gospel as a whole. One might substitute a theory of genesis for an interpretation of significance." See Malbon, "Jewish Leaders," 263.

[62]Harry Fleddermann, "A Warning about the Scribes (Mark 12:37b-40)," *CBQ* 44 (1982), 53. Fleddermann counts the other religious leader references as follows: high priests – 14; Pharisees – 12; elders – 5; Herodians – 2; Sadducees – 1.

[63]Fleddermann, "Warning," 53.

[64]Malbon, "Jewish Leaders," 270.

[65]Tolbert, "How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character," 351.

against the scribes who want to be prominent or first in everything. The crowds, the disciples, and the audience know that in order to follow Jesus, the first must become last.[66] The scribes and those following Jesus personify one of the main conflicts portrayed in the larger Gospel of Mark: the things of humans vs. the things of God.[67] Thus, we conclude that the scribes, acting as a predictable unit, were the "chief adversaries" working against Jesus in the Gospel of Mark.[68]

The audience first receives a clue that one of the scribes is acting outside his type when the scribe is introduced as a single scribe, rather than the group of scribes that appears every other time in the gospel.[69] Unlike the others, this scribe hears what Jesus says and responds positively.[70] The lone scribe asks Jesus which commandment is the first of all.[71] As opposed to the other questions religious leaders asked Jesus, this inquiry does not seem to have malicious motives.[72] Accordingly, Jesus answers him forthrightly. The narrative's lack of animosity toward the scribe is another clue that he is standing in contrast to the others within his typology.[73] Surprisingly, the scribe listens to Jesus. He

---

[66]See Fleddermann, "Warning," 61.

[67]Rhoads, "Jesus and the Syrophoenician Woman," 366.

[68]Fleddermann, "Warning," 53. Cf. Malbon, "Jewish Leaders," 263-264, and Tannehill, "Narrative Christology," 65. Thus far in Mark see 2:6-7; 2:16; 3:22; 3:30; and 9:14 for the scribes acting against Jesus alone. See 7:5; 11:18; 11:72-28; and 12:12 for the scribes acting against Jesus in concert with other religious leaders.

[69]Robert L. Mowery, "Pharisees and Scribes, Galilee and Jerusalem," *ZNW* 80:3/4 (1989), 267.

[70]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 254. Note echoes of the "hearing" motif that runs through Mark.

[71]This question about which *commandment* deserves first place is an interesting contrast to the scribes who seek for *themselves* the first place.

[72]John R. Donahue and Daniel J. Harrington *The Gospel of Mark* (SP 2; Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 357.

[73]Trocmé, "Jésus et les Lettrés," 40.

even commends Jesus, and shows by his response that he understands Jesus' answer.[74] Mark tells the audience that Jesus recognized the scribe's intelligence and bestowed upon this one who is more "follower than foe"[75] a most remarkable compliment: "You are not far from the kingdom of God" (12:34).[76]

As with the story of the Syrophoenician woman, Mark surprises the audience, waking sleepy listeners and upsetting their viewpoint. Certainly this is not what the audience expects from the typology of Jewish religious leaders that Mark laid out for them in preceding events. Yet with this character, Mark opens up the good news even for the Jewish religious leaders. The scribe has extended "the potential responses to Jesus in an open-ended way."[77] He has left his prescribed typology to become the exceptional scribe, a character in his own right, a character who at least takes the first steps toward following when he enters the "threshold"[78] of encounter with Jesus.

As Mark begins the passion narrative, he uses allusions to the OT to indicate to the audience that "what is to take place has 'been written.'"[79] Donald Juel writes that scriptural allusions contribute to the irony already noted in the passion because they help

---

[74]One can only hope that the disciples are taking notes at this point.

[75]Malbon, "Jewish Leaders," 276.

[76] Williams, "Discipleship and Minor Characters," 340-341.

[77]Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "The Major Importance of Minor Characters in Mark" in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight; JSNTSup 109, ed. Stanley E. Porter; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 61.

[78]The scribe is left, narratologically, in the threshold of encountering Jesus. Does he actually enter the kingdom of God to which he has come near? Mark does not say. See Cole, *Mark,* 268. See David McCracken, "Character in the Boundary: Bakhtin's Interdividuality in Biblical Narratives," *Semeia* 63 (1993), for discussion in characters' interaction within this threshold of encounter.

[79]Donald H. Juel, *A Master of Surprise. Mark Interpreted* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 134.

the audience "experience . . . the distance between the way things appear and the way they really are."[80]

The audience's access to privileged information continues to open the way for irony as Mark's narrative progresses into the passion. Perhaps the most important piece of privileged information[81] is the opening words of the gospel identifying it as an account of Jesus Christ, Son of God, as discussed earlier. For instance, in 15:18-32, Jesus' enemies mock him by calling him what he really is: "King of the Jews" and "Christ." Because the audience knows Jesus' identity from 1:1, dramatic irony occurs; the audience can see that Jesus' enemies actually accomplish Jesus' plans in their attempts to subdue him. Tannehill remarks that it "seems to be important to the author of Mark that unwitting confessions of Jesus appear in the very acts by which he is rejected."[82] The dramatic irony in the crucifixion account forces the audience to weigh the comments made by Jesus' opponents. The ironic statements of the opponents are to be taken, cleverly enough, as ironic. This double irony involves the listeners by requiring them to recognize that the statements point to a hidden truth.[83]

As the Gospel of Mark draws to an end, the audience finds more omissions. The story contains several promises that remain unfulfilled by the end of the narrative. John the Baptizer promises that Jesus will baptize with the Holy Spirit (1:8);[84] those wanting to be first would become last and the servants of all (9:35; 10:43); some disciples would

---

[80]Juel, *Master of Surprise*, 134.

[81]Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony*, 92.

[82]Tannehill, "Narrative Christology," 79. See for instance Mark 15:16-20, 29-32.

[83]Tannehill, "Narrative Christology," 79.

[84]See Juel, *Gospel of Mark*, 55.

follow Jesus to the death (10:39); some disciples would be beaten and put on trial because of Jesus (13:9, 11); and the gospel would be proclaimed to all nations (13:10).[85] None of these promises have been fulfilled by the close of Mark's gospel; the account of their fulfillment has been omitted. Sharyn Dowd points out that the audience has learned that Jesus is "a reliable predictor" and that these promises will eventually be realized.[86] As Mark ends, however, the characters in the gospel are finished acting and it is left to the audience to experience and participate in the fulfillment of the promises left dangling at the end of the gospel. By omitting accounts of the fulfillment of promises, the author encourages the audience to continue what began in the Gospel of Mark: the story of Jesus Christ, Son of God. The audience must create the rest of the story by participating in the fulfillment of the unrealized promises.

In Mark 16, audience members encounter the point at which their participation is especially crucial. Completing the frame of omission begun with scant information in the opening verses, the gospel closes with a shocking omission—the omission of any witness to the resurrection. When the audience is confronted with the silence of the women fleeing the empty tomb, they must use the information gained from the Gospel, privileged and otherwise, to "define the appropriate response and to give it. . . . The [listener] who responds writes the real ending of the Gospel."[87]

---

[85]Dowd, *Reading Mark*, 170.

[86]Dowd, *Reading Mark*, 170.

[87]G. Al Wright, "Markan Intercalations. A Study in the Plot of the Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1985), 243-244. We will return later to the ending of the gospel of Mark.

The ending of Mark is perhaps the most glaring omission in the gospel.[88] Tolbert writes that "indeed, the whole history of the later interpretation of Mark's Gospel from the early centuries to the present is littered with attempts to make the ending come out right, to make it satisfy the expectations it raises in its audience."[89] While the details of these attempts do not directly affect this discussion, Tolbert's comment about them is helpful: "every one of these sometimes clever, sometimes insightful, sometimes silly theories witnesses to the rhetorical power of the Markan epilogue."[90] An open-ended work like Mark's carries with it a strong compulsion to close the gap, and "the power that is generated from the phenomenon is fairly well focused: when readers supply the ending they participate in it and experience it more fully than if the writer supplied it to them."[91] The ending of the gospel is, in a sense, "in the expanding space of the [hearer's] mind" and so the conclusion's impact is infinitely increased and strengthened.[92]

Two ancient attempts at filling the omission left by Mark's ending are commonly referred to as the Longer Ending (Mark 16:9-20) and the Shorter Ending.[93] The Longer Ending refers to familiar characters and settings from the gospel in words that contain, in

---

[88]I follow the large majority of scholars who, based on manuscript evidence, now consider 16:8 to be the end of Mark's gospel. See James K. Elliott, "Text and Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel." *TZ* 27 (1971): 255-262.

[89]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 296. See also Donald Juel who comments that "the history of the Markan ending is perhaps ample testimony that this 'gospel' will not be easily dismissed" ("A Disquieting Silence: A Matter of the Ending" in *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God. Essays in Memory of Donald* H. *Juel* (ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Patrick D. Miller; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 12).

[90]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 296, note 50.

[91]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 47.

[92]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 23.

[93]"And all that had been commanded them they told briefly to those around Peter. And afterward Jesus himself sent out through them, from east to west, the sacred and imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation." (NRSV)

Bridget Gilfillan Upton's opinion, "a strong element of tellability, and add to the rhetorical power of this ending."[94] Through the Longer Ending, the audience "sees" the risen Christ, the women fulfilling their commission, some continued stubbornness from the disciples, and Jesus' ascension. The disciples, having been once more rebuked by Jesus and having witnessed his ascension, go out to proclaim the good news everywhere (recall the unfulfilled promise of 13:10), activity that is confirmed by Jesus and the signs that accompany the disciples. With this ending, the loose ends are tied up and the audience's need for closure is met.

The Shorter Ending contains much less detail, but does address the main concern with the 16:8 ending, that the women did not tell anyone anything because they were afraid. In the Shorter Ending, the women do "briefly" tell the message from the young man in white. Also, Jesus' presence is at least implied when he sends the disciples out to spread the proclamation of eternal salvation from east to west (again, recall 13:10). The Shorter Ending also closes the narrative nicely, and the audience "is left with the security and excitement of a completed story."[95]

Surely the author intended the audience to participate in some way in reaction to his abrupt and unexpected ending. The Longer and Shorter Endings are two recorded reactions that achieve a smoother and more comfortable ending to the gospel.[96] But in light of the evidence presented in chapter 2, the tools for encouraging audience

---

[94]Bridget Gilfillan Upton, *Hearing Mark's Ending. Listening to Ancient Popular Texts through Speech Act Theory* (Boston: Brill, 2006), 170.

[95]Upton, *Hearing Mark's Endings*, 195.

[96]Recall that Theon taught his advanced students to practice filling in perceived gaps through elaboration: "what is 'lacking' can be supplied by making clear what is obscure; by filling gaps in the language or content" (*Exercises*, 110 of Patillon's text).

participation seem to encourage the audience to pay attention, be morally formed, and help create the story. If the ending is not to be simply smoothed over, what sort of moral formation and creation of story result from the omission of a clean conclusion?

Tolbert calls the ending of Mark the "final irony of the Gospel,"[97] and Fowler calls it "the last and greatest of the interpretive challenges that confront the [audience]."[98] When at last Jesus' followers are told to tell, "going out, they fled from the tomb, for trembling and amazement held them and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid" (16:8). The audience expected something else to happen, most likely a proclamation, as followed the announcement of good news in 1:1-13,[99] but 16:8 is followed by only silence. The audience fills the silence first with questions: What has happened? What will happen?[100] "What can be the meaning of this crucified Messiah, this empty tomb? What can be meant by the prophecy of a meeting in Galilee, found on the lips of a strange young man? What is the appropriate response?"[101]

By eliciting such questions from the audience, the author encourages their participation in the narrative through moral formation and the creation of story. The unfulfilled expectation of the ending leaves the final actions to the audience: the audience members "are extended the opportunity of speaking with the women the good news which this Gospel has anticipated since the first verse and of seeing with the disciples the

---

[97]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 295. Other instances of irony in Mark as a tool to encourage audience participation will be discussed below.

[98]Robert Fowler, "Reading Matthew Reading Mark: Observing the First Steps toward Meaning-as-Reference in the Synoptic Gospels" *SBLSP* 25 (1986): 14.

[99]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 90.

[100]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 125.

[101]Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony*, 177.

reunion which is promised in the last verses."[102] The end of Mark does much more than highlight the disciples' failures; it "move[s] its hearers to respond [and] excite[s] their emotions on behalf of Jesus and the gospel message."[103] The focus is no longer on the past events told in the gospel, but on the present proclamation and responsibility that has passed from narrated disciples to listening audience.

Robert Tannehill asserts that it is "significant that the author stopped short of narrating the meeting of the risen Jesus with his disciples. Restoration of faithful discipleship [which the audience needs as much as the disciple characters] is opened . . . as a gracious possibility but it is not narrated as accomplished fact."[104] Indeed, the audience that hears 16:8 now has much to do. The end of the gospel is not contained in the previous narrative but must be found in the audience members themselves.[105] They must be affected, morally formed, in such a way that they are able to complete the story of the gospel, not with more text, as attempted by the Longer and Shorter Endings, but in their lives. In other words, even moral formation is not enough to satisfy the author of Mark.

Hearers who have been morally formed must go further by helping to finish the story of the gospel. J. David Hester goes as far to say that the end of Mark "*demands* the

---

[102]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 102.

[103]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 295-296.

[104]Tannehill, "Narrative Christology," 84. Norman Petersen writes that the author of Mark "leaves unfinished business for the reader to complete, thoughtfully and imaginatively" (Norman R. Petersen, "When is the End not the End? Literary Reflections on the Ending of Mark's Narrative," *Interp* 34 (1980): 153.)

[105]See Charles Homer Giblin, "The Beginning of the Ongoing Gospel (Mk 1,2-18,8)" in *The Four Gospels 1992 Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (3 vols., ed. F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheydenl; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 2:978.

[hearer's] involvement in rescuing the story."[106] The audience must participate, "search out clues to help them on the track towards fulfillment, and 'go to Galilee' to see the risen Jesus. . . . [they] must finish it in their own interpretive way."[107] This, after all, is the purpose of writing the gospel in the first place, "to let would-be disciples know that God is searching for them, to finish it. The emphasis is then on the [hearer]. Mark does not expect her to succeed, to achieve; Mark only wants her to follow. . . . It is not her success that will finish the aborted story; it is her following."[108] The experience of hearing the gospel story "should lead to action, and it is the desire to provoke this action that crafts the final scenes."[109] If the gospel of Mark ends open-endedly then another chapter must be written—not by the pen of the evangelist but by the lives of his audience.

*Conclusion*

The gospel of Mark provides intriguing examples of an ancient Christian author using rhetorical tools to encourage audience participation. Perhaps the length of the gospel impacts the wealth of examples; the evangelist left much work for his audience. If indeed audience participation caused the hearers to take ownership of the story, Mark's practice of leaving gaps—particularly by using tools of omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden meaning including misdirection and irony, question and answer, and allusion—may have been part of the genius of his rhetorical style.

---

[106]J. David Hester, "Dramatic Inconclusion: Irony and the Narrative Rhetoric of the Ending of Mark" *JSNT* 57 (1995): 62. Italics original.

[107]Hester, "Dramatic Inconclusion," 83.

[108]Brian K. Blount, "Is the Joke on Us? Mark's Irony, Mark's God, and Mark's Ending" in *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God. Essays in Memory of Donald* H. *Juel* (ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Patrick D. Miller; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005), 28.

[109]Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 288.

Much of what we observed in the gospel of Mark applies to Matthew and John as well, and so our discussion of these two gospels will be understandably shorter. We will look to each gospel in turn, however, to see if the use of rhetorical tools to encourage audience participation is found throughout this section of the New Testament.

*The Gospel According to Matthew*

The discussion of the Gospel of Matthew will begin with the author's use of Old Testament allusions to lend authority to Jesus and the gospel narrative. Like the author of Mark, the author uses allusions to connect to larger bodies of information available to audience members who are able to recognize such allusions.

Robert Brawley offers the example of the allusion in Matt 2:15 to Hos 11:1. In the context of Jesus' family's flight to Egypt, the author of the gospel invokes an earlier connection to Egypt: "This was to fulfill what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet, 'Out of Egypt I have called my son'" (Matt 2:15). By using the literary allusion to liken Jesus to Moses, the author encourages the audience to conjure more than the simple connection of single characters. There is more to the story. Brawley notes that when the audience plays Matthew's allusion off the Hosea text, they "identify Jesus as God's son, add the slaughter of the innocents to the parallels in plot that are already apparent . . . and construe Jesus as recapitulating Israel's exodus from Egypt."[110] Connecting allusions, however, does not involve one-to-one correspondence. Brawley points out that literary allusion

> accents a dynamic dialectic between the precursor and the successor in which each stands in degrees of both conflict and consonance with the other. . . .

---

[110]Robert L. Brawley, "Evocative Allusions in Matthew: Matthew 5:5 as a Test Case," *HvTSt* 59 (2003): 603.

> Confronted with allusions and citations, [audience members] may constantly shift perspective to see the successor from the point of view of the precursor or the precursor from the successor. . . . [The juxtaposition of texts] extends meaning beyond the mere sum of the two independent texts.[111]

Thus, for example, when the audience members hear that Jesus' family is going *to* Egypt rather than coming *from* Egypt, they are able to shift focus to the story of Jacob's travel to and sojourn in Egypt.[112]

Matthew also uses the tool of omission to encourage audience attention and participation. In Matt 4:18-22, Jesus convinces two brothers, Simon and Andrew, to leave their livelihood with only a few words and an ambiguous promise: "Follow me, and I will make you fish for people." Matthew does not record the words Jesus speaks to James and John, but two more fisherman leave their nets and their father after Jesus simply calls to them.

Warren Carter points out that "the audience is left with a double question about this exchange between Jesus and the fishermen: What right or authority does Jesus have to issue such a summons? Why do the fishermen find his call so instantly acceptable?"[113] Matthew does not explain; that task is left to the audience. Because this is the first time that the audience has encountered the four fishermen and the first time Jesus has called anyone in this way, the audience cannot compare other pericopes from the gospel. Instead, the audience must "utilize the gospel's point of view established in the opening

---

[111]Brawley, "Evocative Allusions," 604.

[112]Brawley, "Evocative Allusions," 603. The difficulty of the referents of this allusion is noted by Tracy Howard: "the difficulty of this problem is evidenced by the numerous solutions offered by evangelicals." Tracy Howard, "The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: An Alternative Solution," *BSac* 143 (1986): 314. Howard's solution is "analogical correspondence"—Matthew sees an analogy between the Messiah and the events described in Hosea (322).

[113]Warren Carter, "Matthew 4:18-22 and Matthean Discipleship: An Audience-Oriented Perspective," *CBQ* 59 (1997): 62.

chapters."[114] Unlike the Gospel of Mark, Matthew begins with a birth narrative, establishing Jesus' divinity. The audience automatically supplies the character Jesus as the main actor in these verses, and so interprets "Jesus' call to the fishermen as one consistent with his identity and mission defined by Matt 1:1-4:17 . . . . The audience knows Jesus has the authority to make this call"[115] because of the preceding narrative. This omission, though filled almost unconsciously by the audience, provides an example of listeners gathering and storing information early in the narrative (1:1-4:17) and using that information to fill a gap left by the author.

The calling of the four disciples uncovers another omission by Matthew. Jesus calls the four men away from their social and economic structures, a call that at first implies a lack of concern for the social order. On the other hand, the purpose behind the call, as expressed in Jesus' promise to make Simon and Andrew fish for people, seems to entail a mission that is expressly concerned with society. How should the audience understand these seemingly contradictory themes?[116]

Carter observes two sets of data. First, the gospel contains several contra-social tendencies: Jesus does not release a disciple to bury his father (8:21-22); God is the new father of Jesus' followers (5:9, 15; 6:1, 6, 9; 23:9); the disciples are said to have a new family (12:46-50); Jesus redefines household codes (ch. 19-20); the disciples are encouraged to leave behind possessions and wealth is discouraged (6:19-24, 25-34;

---

[114]Carter, "Matthean Discipleship," 63.

[115]Carter, "Matthean Discipleship," 64.

[116]Carter, "Matthean Discipleship," 69.

13:22; 19:16-30).[117] In other instances, however, the gospel seems to encourage continued ties to society: references are made to familial relationships (8:14; 10:2; 15:1-9; 19:3-12, 19; 20:20; 26:37; 27:56); service to society is an important part of the disciples' lives (5:13-16, 38-48; 6:2-4; 10:16-25; 25:31-46); and aspects of regular social life are mentioned and participation in that social life is assumed (5:25-26, 31-32; 13:3-9, 24-30, 31-32, 44-46; 19:3-12; 20:1-16; 25:1-13, 14-30).[118]

As Matthew's narrative continues, the audience gathers these bits of information in order to fill the omission left in the call of the four disciples. Evidence provided after 4:18-22 suggests that Jesus expects both "detachment *and* participation . . . detachment suggests a reorientation and realignment of priorities centered on Jesus; participation in economic and social structures continues, but it is redefined and contextualized by the new loyalty to Jesus as God's agent."[119] When the hearer reaches this conclusion by paying attention to the story, he is more receptive to the tension portrayed by the author of Matthew. To be detached and attached at first seems impossible; clues throughout the gospel, however, reveal the way of Matthean discipleship.

Another less involved omission encountered by the audience of Matthew is found in the Sermon on the Mount. Charles Talbert notes that Matthew 5-7 does not contain any divine titles for Jesus. Why omit these appropriate epithets? Talbert suggests that the author intended Jesus' own words and actions to be these chapters as indicators for Jesus' divinity. In this section Jesus "is the one who speaks God's authoritative word in

---

[117]Carter, "Matthean Discipleship," 69-70.

[118]Carter, "Matthean Discipleship," 70-71.

[119]Carter, "Matthean Discipleship," 72-73.

the here and now and will function as the eschatological judge on the Last Day. . . . In the Sermon, his activity alone speaks loudly about his identity."[120] In order for this device to be effective, the audience must participate by paying attention and creating their own epithets based on the narrative action of Matthew 5-7.

The author also uses rhetorical tools to encourage audience participation in smaller sections that comprise the Sermon on the Mount. For instance, Matt 5:5 contains at least two allusions. First, the beatitude of the meek culturally alludes to the blessing of Abraham—no direct literary reference is made, but the promise of inheriting the land would be ingrained at least in the Jewish audience. Brawley notes that "the beatitude picks up two prominent themes of the Abrahamic covenant: (1) the blessing in him of all the people of the earth (Gn 12:3) and (2) God's gift of the inheritance of land to his descendants ("seed") (Gn 12:7; 13:14-15)."[121] In order to hear the Abrahamic echo, the audience must pay attention to the wording used in v. 5 and recall the situation regarding the promise of inherited land in the Genesis account. Audience members who do not recognize this cultural allusion still understand the beatitude at its most basic level, but the underlying connection to the children of Abraham remains unrealized. The author uses the cultural allusion to communicate that (a) the meek will inherit the earth (this can be understood without recognizing the cultural allusion); (b) Abraham's children will inherit the earth (this premise is not stated but must be supplied by the audience members who recognize the allusion); (c) therefore "the meek are descendants of Abraham."[122]

---

[120]Charles H. Talbert, *Reading the Sermon on the Mount. Character Formation and Decision Making in Matthew 5-7* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004), 144.

[121]Brawley, "Evocative Allusions," 609.

[122]Brawley, "Evocative Allusions," 614.

Connecting Matt 5:5 with the Abrahamic promise of inheritance of the land allows audience members to complete the story that the author begins with the short statement, "blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the land."

Second, Matt 5:5 contains a literary allusion to Ps 36:11 LXX, which reads "the meek will inherit land." Audience members familiar with this reference recall the Abrahamic motifs in the psalm.[123] They also recall the actions of the wicked in Psalm 36 LXX, who "prosper by unjust behavior [and] one could be tempted to adopt their behavior in order to prosper like them;" they "oppress those who are . . . meek . . . by violence;" "they engage in economic abuse by borrowing and failing to repay . . . they use weapons to oppress violently and even to kill the poor and needy;" they "deprive [the poor] of ownership and access to land."[124] Those who inherit the land in Psalm 36 are the oppressed, poor, and needy. Brawley points out that such "economic, social, and political issues are reflected elsewhere in the context" of the Sermon on the Mount.[125] That these people inherit the land reverses common social structures, and the allusions to Genesis and the Psalms acquire the additional rhetorical force of surprise. The hearers are invited to accept "a new construct of reality."[126] As listeners supply the wider implications of the third beatitude, they construct a reality that is disorienting: the meek, not the powerful, will inherit the land. The author of Matthew uses allusions to the Abrahamic covenant and Psalm 36 LXX to recast the tradition in light of Jesus and his message of the Kingdom of God. Having helped create this recasting of tradition, the audience comes to

---

[123]Brawley, "Evocative Allusions," 612.

[124]Brawley, "Evocative Allusions," 612.

[125]Brawley, "Evocative Allusions," 612.

[126]Brawley, "Evocative Allusions," 616.

a point of choice: will hearers allow themselves to be morally formed, to become meek and so inherit the land?

As the Sermon on the Mount continues, the author of Matthew again makes use of surprise as a type of hidden or double meaning. He surprises his audience with humorous and sometimes absurd images in order to elicit a response. Wayne Sandifer writes that the Matthean Jesus "not only depicted obviously [and surprisingly] absurd images in his parables but . . . he did so deliberately as a way of forcing the hearers to a decision in response to the parable."[127] In other words, the author surprises the audience with images so ridiculous that it is absurd to disagree with the author's premise.

For example, the parable of the beam in the eye (Matt 7:3-4) is tragic, but also humourous. Of course someone with a plank of wood in his eye will not try to see a speck in the eye of another—the plank-eyed man would probably not be seeing anything at all. With this humor and absurdity, "Jesus calls up an image in the mind of the hearer which is so ludicrous as to startle by its impossibility."[128]

Comparisons in general and parables in particular encourage Matthew's audience to participate by recognizing allusions and drawing conclusions or lessons from the comparisons. In their book on the Matthean parables, Carter and John Paul Heil write that the parables do not merely illicit "cerebral understanding" but encourage interaction that leads to "understanding and activity."[129]

---

[127]D. Wayne Sandifer, "The Humor of the Absurd in the Parables of Jesus" *SBLSP* 30 (1991): 297.

[128]Sandifer, "Humor of the Absurd," 290.

[129]Warren Carter and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables. Audience-Oriented Perspectives* (The CBQMS 30; Washington DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998), 16.

Carter and Heil observe that "frequently parables are preceded by shorter comparisons which are not developed in a narrative as the parables are." The shorter comparisons in 7:13-23, however, seem to "make significant contributions to the audience's interaction with the parables."[130]

The audience hears a collection of metaphors in 7:13-23. The first begins with the verb εἰσέλθατε (to enter), which recalls Jesus' recent words about how to enter (εἰσέλθητε) the gate of heaven. This intratextual allusion cues the attentive audience members to fill in a piece of missing information. Jesus said in 5:20, "Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." In 7:13, the audience receives another piece of information about entering the kingdom of heaven: the entrance is a narrow gate, the "greater righteousness Jesus has presented in his sermon on the mount."[131]

In 7:15-23, Jesus presents another short comparison likening false prophets to wolves in sheep's clothing, followed by a longer discussion about good trees and fruit and bad trees and fruit. The rhetorical question in v. 16 elicits an answer from the audience: Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles? No. Jesus' point is all the more emphatic because the audience has participated in setting up the comparison that continues in v. 17-18: good trees bear good fruit; bad trees bear bad fruit. The audience is confronted with a choice in v. 21-23, but first they must connect the good trees and fruit to those who do the will of God in heaven. Then the author expects the audience to

---

[130]Carter and Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, 20. See also the shorter comparisons in Mat 24:23-44. The following discussion on these passages draws heavily on Carter and Heil.

[131]Carter and Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, 27-28.

> choose the way that leads to eternal life rather than into the destruction and fire not only by avoiding false prophets, the wolves, who are bad trees that produce only bad fruit, but by themselves becoming good trees that produce good fruit, the repentance and greater righteousness by which one enters into the reign of the heavens.[132]

Through this collection of metaphors, the author asks his audience to participate by being morally formed. The final parable brings both this section and the larger Sermon on the Mount to a climax. The comparisons of this section and the lessons of the extended sermon coalesce into this point: the audience must decide whether to be like the wise man who built his house on rock or like the foolish man who built his house on sand. The author brings the audience to the point of moral formation as the chapter ends. Cicero wrote that "when something that can scarcely be conveyed by the proper term is expressed metaphorically, the meaning we desire to convey is made clear by the resemblance of the thing we have expressed" (*De Or.* 3.38.155-156). The Matthean Jesus conveys his meaning by using metaphors—words that do not at first glance belong. His strategy was successful; the narrative crowds were astounded at the teachings of this man who spoke with such authority (7:28-29).

Matthew's use of absurd images to encourage audience participation continues with the image of a camel passing through the eye of a needle (Matt 19:24), a picture that conjures up a physical impossibility. Much discussion has surrounded the meaning of the eye of the needle, but Sandifer suggests that the literal image of the needle's eye supplies the intended absurdity.[133] The image causes the world to be "turned upside down with

---

[132]Carter and Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, 30.

[133]Sandifer, "Humor of the Absurd," 296.

Jesus' reversal of the ordinary expectation."[134] By using surprising reversals and absurdities like those mentioned in the section and elsewhere in the chapter, the author of Matthew teaches the attentive listener that "kingdom as Jesus' [sic] perceives it stands in opposition to world as his hearers perceive it."[135] The audience members who are first caught by the surprising statements of Jesus are then faced with a decision: will they allow themselves to be morally formed to the absurdity of the Kingdom of God?

Moving ahead in Matthew's narrative, the audience encounters the tools of allusion and surprise working in the parable of the hired workers in 20:1-6, which serve to increase its rhetorical impact. An active audience has been listening for more clues to the nature of "the kingdom of heaven" since 4:17.[136] The opening verse of chapter 20 would catch their attention: "For the kingdom of heaven is like . . . ." It is after realizing the intratextual allusion, however, that the audience members' real work begins. The landowner hiring laborers is an allusion to common culture, but there are some ambiguities in the parable. For instance, the landowner agrees to pay the first set of laborers the usual daily wage, but the second group of laborers will be paid "whatever is right" (20:4). The "right" amount is not specified, and the audience members who are engaged in the story will probably calculate their own "right" amount in their minds.[137] The issue is complicated as other groups of laborers are brought in as the work day progresses. Each group, expects the audience, will receive "whatever is right"—whatever that is.

---

[134]Sandifer, "Humor of the Absurd," 296.

[135]Sandifer, "Humor of the Absurd," 296.

[136]Carter and Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, 126.

[137]Carter and Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, 139-140.

When day's end arrives, and the workers-come-lately receive a full day's wage, those who began early in the morning (and the actual audience) most likely expect that they will be paid extra for their longer hours of labor. They are disappointed. In response to the disgruntled workers and the puzzled listeners, the landowner asks a series of questions. The questions, which remain unanswered in the narrative, invite anyone who defined "whatever is right" as "a payment proportional to work to re-examine their understanding of 'what is right' in the light of the householder's actions, to abandon their understanding, to gain a new perspective, and to participate in a new reality."[138] Again, after the listeners participate in the narrative by filling in gaps and answering questions, they are asked to allow themselves to be morally formed by Jesus' teaching. The normal social structures to which the parable alluded in the opening verses have been reversed, and the audience members, if they have done their part, have contributed to this reversal. The author of Matthew asks the hearers to change their lives accordingly, for the reversal is partly of their own making.

A final example of omission examined is found in Matt 21:33-45. Jesus omits the ending of the parable of the landowner who planted a vineyard. What, he asks at the end of the story, will the owner of the vineyard do to the tenants who did not receive his servants and killed his son? The audience must finish the story, and the narrative audience makes an attempt. The chief priests and elders have been paying attention, and they are able to create the end of the parable by supplying "the precise and proper ending which Jesus had intended and implied"[139] (21:41). Jesus uses their answer to expand

---

[138]Carter and Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, 143.

[139]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 76.

upon the parable in v. 42-44, surprising the learned listeners with his sharp point of application. The priests and elders are still paying attention—they are able to place "themselves into the parable Jesus told and the ending they had appended."[140] Magness notes that "the process of thinking and speaking the unnarrated ending motivated by Jesus' question aided if not caused their application of the parable to themselves and contributed to the extremity of their reaction (the desire to arrest Jesus, v. 46)."[141] This use of the parable to encourage participation from the audience is in line with evidence from Quintilian discussed in chapter 2:

> Quintilian considers fables useful not only as embellishments, but also as proofs in an argument (*Inst.* 5.11.5-6). Allowing the audience to infer similarities and connections, the speaker may "persuade the audience of the truth of the point which we are trying to make" (*Inst.* 5.11.6).

The author of Matthew has recorded in narrative form the very thesis of this project: a speaker uses rhetorical tools to encourage audience participation, which binds the audience more closely to the speaker's point.

The actual audience of course, has not left the scene, and they witness this interaction. The question posed to the narrative audience is also asked of the listeners: "What will he do to those tenants?" Jesus' parable is such that an attentive listener would probably create a similar conclusion to that found in v. 41. The hearers' reaction may mirror that of the narrative audience; Jesus' words pierce both sets of hearers. The authorial audience, however, has a chance to weigh their response against that of the priests and elders, to be morally formed by the story-within-a-story. Matthew's hearers

---

[140]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 76.

[141]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 76.

have the opportunity to accept the master's servants and son, recognize the cornerstone, and be a part of the people that produce the fruit of the kingdom.

*Conclusion*

Matthew's gospel provides several examples of rhetorical tools used to encourage audience participation, particularly omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden meaning, and allusion. At numerous points in the gospel, the audience is brought to a place of decision. The hearers must answer questions, complete allusions, and adjust their views of reality in response to the story Matthew tells. Their participation in the narrative involves moving outside the story; the hearers must respond with their lives in order to finish the story the gospel begins. Thus, the tools that encourage audience participation in Matthew's gospel result in the creation of story and moral formation.

## *The Gospel According to John*

As hearers of the Fourth Gospel follow the narrative, they experience "a deeper comprehension of Jesus and of the life Jesus wants to give them."[142] The very language used by the author helps "recreate the revelation experience"[143] for an express purpose: that the audience might "continue to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name" (John 20:31). The realization of this purpose depends on audience participation.

---

[142]René Kieffer, "The Implied Reader in John's Gospel" in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives*. *Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel in Århus 1997* (JSNTSup 182; ed. Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 52.

[143]Gail R. O'Day, "Narrative Mode and Theological Claim: A Study in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 105 (1986): 662.

The audience of the gospel of John is treated to a hymn of privileged information in the opening verses. Unlike Mark, which immediately proceeds to narrative action, or Matthew, which begins with genealogical and natal information about Jesus, the Fourth Gospel begins by firmly establishing the divinity and pre-existence of Jesus, the Word. This information guides audience members' perceptions of the rest of the narrative, capturing their attention with the remarkable idea that the Word became flesh. Jesus' divine identity as the Word becomes part of the audience's network of narrative knowledge.

The Prologue of John contains several allusions, including literary allusions to the Old Testament's creation accounts and wisdom literature, cultural allusions to the descending-ascending redeemer mythology,[144] and intratextual allusions that point forward to the rest of John's narrative. Literary allusions in the Prologue include the phrase ἐν ἀρχῇ, which recalls the language of Gen 1:1, emphasizing the cosmic origin of the Word;[145] and reference to the word God spoke in Genesis sets "the stage for all that follows, showing God and the hypostastized Word existing before creation."[146] Linking the Prologue back to the creation narrative calls to the listeners' minds themes of pre-existence and union with God. From the beginning of the gospel, the audience connects Jesus with the divinity of God and the time before time.

---

[144]We will not discuss these specific allusions in this section, but for a thorough and concise discussion of this mythology and its connections to the Gospel of John, see Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992), 265-284.

[145]William S. Kurz, "Intertextual Permutations of the Genesis Word in the Johannine Prologues" in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel. Investigations and Proposals* (JSNTSup 148; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 5; ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 180.

[146]Kurz, "Intertextual Permutations," 181.

The descending-ascending redeemer myth alluded to in the Prologue was a motif that permeated the ancient Mediterranean world. Talbert has collected evidence from Greco-Roman mythology (*Metamorphoses*, Tacitus' *Histories*, Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue*, and Horace's *Odes*);[147] ancient Jewish literature (Sirach 24; Baruch 3:27-4:4; Wisdom of Solomon; 2 Esdras; 2 Baruch; 1 Enoch; Tobit, *Joseph and Aseneth*; the Testament of Job; Apocalypse of Moses; the Testament of Abraham; Origen; and Philo);[148] and early Christian literature (Justin Martyr; Shepherd of Hermas; Sibylline Oracle 8; Tertullian; Odes of Solomon; the Pauline epistles; and the letter to the Hebrews).[149]

This allusion to the culture of the audience allows the hearers to fill in gaps left by the author. Audience members who at least subconsciously recognized this motif would fill in expectations for the divine man Jesus who descended to the world to redeem humanity. By using this structure for the story of Jesus, the author accesses an entire library of cultural allusions in the minds of his hearers, and requests a response that will recur throughout the gospel: Jesus is the *true* redeemer, as he is the *true* vine and the *good* shepherd. The audience is asked to recognize Jesus as the ultimate fulfillment of familiar structures.

The Prologue also points forward with intratextual allusions, preparing the audience for themes to come in later in the gospel. René Kieffer observes that themes such as "life, light and darkness, glory, testimony, the world, faith and disbelief, truth,

---

[147]Talbert, *Reading John*, 266-267.

[148]Talbert, *Reading John*, 267-272.

[149]Talbert, *Reading John*, 274-282.

Moses and the law, [and] Jesus and his Father"[150] will continue to appear in the narrative of John. As the audience hears and recognizes these recurring themes, recalling the Prologue will engage them even further in the story of the Word become flesh, who is the life and light of all people.

In addition to employing several types of allusion, the very topic of the Prologue encourages audience members to pay attention. The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* recommends promising to discuss matters that appertain to "the worship of the immortal gods" (*Rhet. Her.* 1.5.6) as one way to ensure the attention of one's hearers. By telling the listeners from the outset that his story pertains to the divine, John has made strides toward retaining the audience's attention.

The story of Nicodemus' visit to Jesus in John 3, particularly the dialogue between the two, provides an example of omission in the Fourth Gospel. As the chapter opens, Nicodemus approaches Jesus and initiates a conversation with him. The discussion continues through v. 9, but at that point Nicodemus fades from the scene and the dialogue becomes a monologue. The author omits Nicodemus' final response to Jesus. Magness believes that

> the effect which John seems to have desired by suspending the narrative ending of the incident (and the effect that has certainly been felt by a great many [hearers]) is the substitution of the [hearer] into the unfilled place of Nicodemus at the end of the narrative. The question "How did he respond" merges with "How would one respond" to become "How would I respond?"[151]

The audience cannot provide the omitted material at the level of the narrative. Even Nicodemus' subsequent appearances (7:50-52 and 19:39) do not definitively supply his

---

[150]Kieffer, "Implied Reader," 51.

[151]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 72.

answer to Jesus, although he does join Joseph of Arimathea, a disciple of Jesus, who buries Jesus after the crucifixion. Instead, the omitted response of Nicodemus invites the hearers to action—to fill the gaping question with an answer of their own.

As the story continues, the audience uses this and other pieces of privileged information to participate in the narrative, three instances of which we will mention here. In John 4, Jesus encounters a Samaritan woman at a well. Their ensuing discussion has drawn much attention, in part due to the abrupt change of topics in Jesus' words to the woman.[152] Jesus and the woman begin a conversation about water, during which Jesus claims to be the giver of living water. The woman, not understanding Jesus' reference, asks for the living water for physical reasons (thirst and the chore of walking to the well to draw more water). At this point, rather than explaining himself further, Jesus changes the subject: "Go, call your husband and come back" (4:16). Suddenly the conversation is no longer about water, common or living; the conversation is now about the woman's marital status.

At the narrative level, Jesus' abrupt change of topic requests that the woman to talk about something different. Implicitly, she agrees, because she replies along the lines of the new subject in v. 17. At the level of the actual audience, however, more is taking place. The audience must agree to make the subject change as well, but because of the audience's knowledge of Jesus, they are induced "to also provide a reason for the change in topic."[153] J. Eugene Botha proposes that the audience is "called upon by the implied

---

[152]J. Eugene Botha, "John 4:16a: A Difficult Text Speech Act Theoretically Revisited" in *The Gospel of John as Literature. An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspectives* (NTTS 17; ed. Mark W. G. Stibbe; New York: Brill, 1993), 183-184. See these pages for a list of various discussions.

[153]Botha, "Difficult Text," 189.

author to firmly establish the exact status of the dialogue so far, and interpret Jesus' words correctly, before the next, very significant part of the dialogue develops."[154] The audience assumes that Jesus will not let the conversation about his identity end with v. 15, so special attention is paid to the following narrative. The course of the conversation between Jesus and the woman indeed returns to the topic of Jesus' identity. In v. 26, Jesus plainly says to the woman, "I am he [the Messiah]." In this pericope, the audience was mildly surprised by Jesus' sudden change in topic and was pressed to determine what caused the abrupt change. The hearers' privileged information allowed them to understand Jesus' claim about living water and eternal life, but the woman's confusion served to capture the audience's attention so that they are listening when Jesus clearly states his identity.

The irony of the Gospel of John is so notable that Paul Duke calls its persistence "unique in early Christian expression."[155] The author invites the audience to search for significance that reaches beyond the surface meaning. In the process, the hearers

> may find themselves not only relieved and flattered [at the invitation], but also remarkably immersed in new depths of insight. . . . Perhaps it is in irony's silence that this power resides. For precisely in its restraint from dictation of a literal meaning . . . irony is able to move those minds to an intensely active state and to engage them in an open search for solid ground that will make them grateful when they find it.[156]

In other words, by allowing the audience to speak into the silence left by irony, the author allows the audience to create the gospel story with him. As mentioned before, taking part in this creative process carries great persuasive power. When the characters in the gospel

---

[154]Botha, "Difficult Text," 189-190.

[155]Paul D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 155.

[156]Duke, *Irony*, 36-37.

of John question Jesus' origins (1:46; 6:42; 7:26-27; 7:41b-42), the queries remain unanswered in the narrative. The attentive listener, however, has the answer and fills in the silence with the answer: "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God." The listener realizes that the answer differs from any "superficial, worldly knowledge,"[157] and in the process, realizes that he himself is in the process of undergoing a transformation. Alan Culpepper writes that "irony speaks to . . . those in process of changing."[158]

For a final example of irony at work in the narrative and in the audience, we return to the story of the Samaritan woman at the well. Gail O'Day writes that the author "constructs his texts in such a way as to allow his [listeners] to participate in the relevatory dynamic themselves. The [audience] does not observe the narrative but moves with it."[159] The conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman takes place on two levels—the woman's level and Jesus' level. The woman, in the first exchanges of their encounter, is talking about physical, natural water. Jesus, on the other hand, has not been talking about natural water for quite some time.

O'Day writes that "the clue given here by Jesus to his true identity is an invitation both to the woman and to the reader to grasp both levels of the conversation and their inherent contradictions and to move through the woman's level to Jesus'."[160] The audience has the opportunity to "hear" Jesus revealing himself to a character, and so they

---

[157]Kieffer, "Implied Reader," 61.

[158]R. Alan Culpepper, "Reading Johannine Irony" in *Exploring the Gospel of John. In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 205.

[159]O'Day, "Narrative Mode," 668.

[160]O'Day, "Narrative Mode," 667-668.

receive the revelation as well and have the chance to accept it as true. This experience, according to this study and to O'Day is key: "the incongruities and tension within irony draw the [audience] into the text and thereby into participation in this vision. . . . when the [hearer] finally understands, he or she becomes a member of the community that shares that vision."[161] Through the ironic tension of Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman at the well, the hearers are invited to pay attention to the two levels of story, understand the differences between the levels, and choose whether or not to be morally formed by the revelation they receive.

In the gospel of John, Jesus himself claims to speak in παροιμίαις or figures of speech (see 16:25), which fall into the category of innuendo or double meaning. Earlier, in 10:6, as Jesus talks to the Pharisees and the crowd around him, he uses a παροιμίας of the shepherd who calls to his sheep. The sheep that belong to the shepherd will respond to his voice; those that do not belong to the shepherd will run from him because he is a stranger. The Pharisees do not understand Jesus' innuendo, and so Jesus tries to explain the situation to them again. Unfortunately, the Pharisees still do not understand Jesus' meaning, and John writes that the Jews were "divided because of these words" (10:19).

The gospel's audience members, however, possessing privileged information from the Prologue and the preceding narrative, are able interpret the double meaning of Jesus' words. His words are not from a demon, as some of the Jews suppose, nor are they the words of a mad man (10:20). The Johannine Jesus speaks in double meanings to

---

[161]O'Day, "Narrative Mode," 664. Duke comments on the community that forms around irony: "Irony is a kind of fellowship into which author and sound reader or spectator enter in silence. Together they watch, wink, and smile, because together they share the perspective that blinded characters and perhaps less adept observers do not share. They form a community of superior knowledge" (Duke, *Irony*, 29).

give clues to his identity to hearers who are willing to interpret his innuendo and to confound the characters in the gospel who oppose him. The innuendo in John 10 (the sheep theme continues throughout the chapter) serves to further the narrative and to entice the listening audience into participation.

At times, the author of John breaks the dramatic illusion of the narrative in order to give the audience a piece of privileged information. In John 11, as the Jewish council meets to discuss what to do about Jesus, the high priest Caiaphas says that it is better for one man to die for the people than for the whole nation to be destroyed. The narrator steps in at this point and speaks directly to the audience: "He [Caiaphas] did not say this on his own, but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus was about to die for the nation" (11:51). The audience now knows that Caiaphas' words are not incidental or accidental, but are "hints and foreshadowings and testimonies and prophecies . . . each unwitting word has been a well-orchestrated note in a divinely directed symphony."[162] This privileged information helps ensure the hearers' attention as they listen for the fulfillment of Caiaphas' hints and prophecies.

Throughout the gospel, John describes Jesus (or has Jesus describe himself) through a series of metaphors: bread of life (6:35, 48); light of the world (8:12); gate for the sheep (10:7); good shepherd (10:11, 14); resurrection and the life (11:25); the way, the truth, and the life (14:6); and true vine (15:1). On one level, these metaphors provide helpful word pictures of Jesus and his purpose.[163] When the metaphors are filled out by

---

[162]Duke, *Irony*, 89.

[163]Kieffer, "Implied Reader," 53. As Cicero advised, John is "virtually placing within the range of our mental vision objects not actually visible to our sight" (*De Or.* 3.40.161). In other words, with these comparisons, John treats his audience to several object lessons.

the audience, however, the "concrete objects become signs or symbols of Jesus' high authority." As a result, audience members are encouraged to "abandon the simple starting-point and make a decision about their own relationship to Jesus."[164]

The emphasis of the metaphors is not on Jesus as a vine, shepherd, or way, but on Jesus *as compared to* others who might be considered a vine, shepherd, or way. For instance, in the Old Testament, the image of a vine was tied to Israel, the king, or the Messiah. John 15:1 declares Jesus to be the *true* vine, making a distinction between Jesus and all others that have been compared to vines.[165] Eduard Schweizer proposes that the metaphors are not meant to depict Jesus and his ministry as much as they are meant to "show that what we understand by these terms does not fulfill what the terms suggest."[166] In order to complete the image of Jesus as the vine in John 15, the audience must fill in the identity of "vines" from their previous experience—other figures that were perceived as vital to life and survival (cultural and/or literary allusion). The listeners must then evaluate Jesus' claim: do they accept Jesus as the *true* vine, the fulfillment of what a vine is supposed to be? For the attentive listener, it is "Jesus who helps us to understand what a vine is, or a shepherd, or water and bread, or way and truth and life."[167]

These metaphors, which are more than they first seem, ask the listener not only to creatively complete the comparison through their knowledge of the natural world, but also prompt the audience to make a decision about the nature of Jesus. If a listener does

---

[164]Kieffer, "Implied Reader," 53.

[165]Eduard Schweizer, "What about the Johannine 'Parables'?" in *Exploring the Gospel of John. In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 214-215.

[166]Schweizer, "Johannine 'Parables'?," 215.

[167]Schweizer, "Johannine 'Parables'?," 216.

accept Jesus' claim to be the true vine, the bread of life, and the resurrection and the life, she must be morally formed according to his teaching. The comparative nature of the metaphors moves the audience toward participation through moral formation.

Like other gospel writers before him, John uses literary allusions to the Old Testament to maintain that "the identity of Jesus and . . . the details of Jesus' life and especially his death on the cross fulfill Scripture. . . . The Old Testament with its observances and all its institutions is not negated; it is confirmed and completed."[168] The author's use of specific allusions in the Gospel of John lends the authority of the entire Old Testament to Jesus' life, ministry, and death. Bruce Schuchard writes that for the author of John, "Jesus . . . has fulfilled all of Scripture and is himself its ultimate significance."[169] For instance, John's allusions to Ezekiel communicate themes that are found throughout the Old Testament. Gary Manning cites the following examples: John 10/Ezekiel 34: pastoral imagery; John 11:52/Ezek 37:21; 28:25: covenant promise from Deut 30:3; John 14/Ezekiel 15, 17, 19: vine imagery; John 3, 4, 7/Ezek 26:25-27/Leviticus 14/Numbers 8, 19: water imagery.[170] These examples demonstrate that when the author of the fourth gospel employed a literary allusion, the audience's work was often just beginning. The vine imagery discussed above is an example of the extensive network of allusions that an attentive audience might reference. The author does not fully explain the thematic connections between the Old Testament passage and

---

[168]Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture Within Scripture. The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* (SBLDS 133; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 154.

[169]Schuchard, *Scripture Within Scripture*, 156.

[170]Gary T. Manning, Jr., *Echoes of a Prophet. The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period* (JSNTSup 270; New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 211.

the narrative in John, but he "expects the [audience] to know the OT passage and make the connections."[171] Audience members find in Jesus "their true significance and real continuity . . . [He] is the true vine, the true light, the true temple, the one of whom Moses wrote."[172] By involving the audience in creative activity, the author of the gospel maintains the hearers' attention and increases the persuasive power of his narrative.

Finally, by chapter 16, the audience has gathered quite of bit of information. The listeners are aware of the plot against Jesus and they know about Judas' involvement. In chapter 13, the narrator told the audience that Jesus knew he was about to return to his Father. Jesus tells his disciples in 16:16, "A little while, and you will no longer see me, and again a little while, and you will see me," and the disciples express their confusion through a series of questions. The disciples say, "We do not understand," but the audience, in possession of privileged information replies, "But we do!"[173] The audience members use the information they have gathered over the course of John's story to provide answers that the disciples cannot. The audience affirms the trajectory of the narrative by filling the gaps for the disciples and becomes a partner in the creation of Jesus' story.

John makes use of ambiguity to hold the audience's attention in John 19:36-37. Audience participation in completing and filling out allusions may inform the discussion surrounding the referents to these verses in the passion narrative. Verse 37 ("They will look on the one whom they have pierced") alludes to Zech 12:10, but the allusion in v. 36

---

[171]Manning, *Echoes of a Prophet*, 198.

[172]D. A. Carson, "John and the Johannine Epistles" in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture Essays in Honour of Barnabas lindars, SSF* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 256.

[173]Duke, *Irony*, 56

("None of his bones shall be broken") is not as clear. Maarten Menken notes the discussion surrounding this allusion: the verse may refer to Exod 12:46 (part of the lawcode for Passover includes instructions concerning the Passover lamb: "you shall not break any of its bones") or Num 9:12 (similarly, the instructions for the Passover lamb: "They shall leave none of it until morning, nor break a bone of it") or Ps 34:20 (in reference to the righteous, "He [the Lord] keeps all their bones; not one of them will be broken).[174]

Rather than choosing between literary allusions, Menken suggests a solution that is more in keeping with the manner in which the audience might have participated in completing the allusion. Menken proposes that the author drew on *both* the Pentateuchal and Psalms passages in order to invoke two images with one allusion. In the gospel, Jesus is indeed "the righteous sufferer and . . . the true paschal lamb." For the author of the fourth gospel, "various figure and types of the eschatological saviour, derived from various sources, coalesce in the person of Jesus."[175] Missing these allusions, once again, does not keep the passion narrative from making sense to the audience. The obvious reference to scripture, as the quotations are introduced, is enough to lend authority to the circumstances surrounding Jesus' death. An attentive and equipped audience member who successfully connects the allusions would, however, benefit from what Menken believes John was communicating about the dying savior: Jesus was the righteous sufferer and the true paschal lamb.

---

[174]Maarten J. J. Menken, "The Old Testament Quotation in Jn 19,36. Sources, Redaction, Background" in *The Four Gospels 1992 Festschrift Frans Neirynck*; (3 vols.; ed. F. Van Segbroeck, et. al.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 3:2101.

[175]Menken, "Old Testament Quotation in Jn 19,36," 2117-2118.

The ending of the gospel of John omits information included in the other gospels, specifically the ascension. Magness observes that "the gospel [of John]—at least in that aspect of the plot which leads from God to this world and looks back to reunion in a divine realm—is also an unfinished sentence."[176]

Perhaps the audience had information from the surrounding culture with which to fill this omission: the same descending-ascending redeemer myth found in the Prologue. Evidence of this structure in the wider knowledge of the audience of the fourth gospel suggests that the author used a familiar motif in which to couch the good news of Jesus. If the audience members were indeed familiar with this motif, they would have filled the gap at the end of John's narrative with the ascension of Jesus. From the beginning, the audience has possessed privileged information concerning the origin of Jesus: Jesus descended from God to become flesh. To complete the motif of the descending-ascending redeemer, the audience supplies the balancing conclusion: Jesus ascends back to God. By creating this conclusion to the gospel, the listeners become complicit in the witness of Jesus. They themselves provide evidence of Jesus' identity: based on their conclusions, Jesus is the Word become flesh who has now returned to God.[177]

---

[176]Magness, *Sense and Absence,* 82.

[177]The last verse of the gospel admits to conscious omission: "And there are also many other things that Jesus did; which things if they were to be written, each one, I suppose that not even the world itself could contain the books that would be written" (21:25). It may be that John is preemptively silencing the question, "Why did you not include *this* story?" By ending the gospel in this manner, John almost ensures that the audience will continue the story of Jesus as they talk among themselves. What are the "many other things Jesus did?" There are so many that the world cannot contain the books it would take to record them, and perhaps, a day does not contain the minutes needed to tell the rest of the stories. But I like to imagine that some audience members stayed after the reading of this narrative, sharing other stories of Jesus, creating more gospel with their words. Linda Bridges notes that while the story itself resolves, the audience does not hear how others in the story responded; it is left to the audience to respond (Linda McKinnish Bridges, "Flashes of Light in the Night: Reading the Aphorisms of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel" in *Perspectives on John: Method and Interpretation in the Fourth Gospel* (NABPR Special Studies Series 11; ed. Robert B. Sloan and Mikeal C. Parsons; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1993), 114.

*Conclusion*

Like the two synoptic gospels, the gospel of John uses tools identified by ancient rhetoricians to encourage audience participation in the narrative. In particular, we have noted the use of the following tools: privileged information, omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden meaning, and allusion. The survey of the Johannine gospel is important because it falls outside the Synoptic tradition. The appearance of these tools in the fourth gospel as well as the others demonstrates that the concern with audience participation extends to various types of NT literature.

## *Conclusion*

We have discovered that New Testament authors depended on audience participation as they sought to communicate their message. To this end, the three evangelists discussed above used the rhetorical tools of access to privileged information, omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden meaning, question and answer, and allusion. The narrative gaps left by these tools require audience action in order to be completed. The authors have left work for their hearers to do; an active audience paid attention to the narrative and helped create it, taking the story with them even after its conclusion.

# CHAPTER SIX

## Audience Participation in Lucan Material

The final chapter of this project will examine the New Testament material attributed to Luke, the third gospel and Acts, for evidence that Luke encouraged audience interaction by using tools such as access to privileged information, omissions, open-ended comparisons, double or hidden meanings, question and answer, and allusions. The Lucan material is unique among New Testament material due to the length of the narrative with a single author,[1] and provides numerous examples for this study.

### *Lucan Introductory Material*

Before turning to Luke's narratives, we must address a number of issues. First, how shall we judge Luke's ability as a rhetorician? Can we expect Luke make use of tools taught by ancient rhetoricians? Would he have known about and/or cared about such tools? Secondly, who is Luke's audience? What might we expect from the early hearers of Luke's narrative?

#### *The Question of Luke's Ability as a Rhetorician*

Henry Cadbury observed in 1933 that "in brevity, variety, appropriateness and force [Luke's speeches] compare favourably with the similar productions of contemporary writers, such as the interminable harangues of Dionysius of Halicarnassus,

[1]For discussion on the authorship and/or unity of Luke and Acts, see, among others, Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: Macmillan, 1927); Jozef Verheyden, ed., *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (Louvain: Peeters, 1999) and Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1990).

or the ill-placed moralizings or vapid Biblical paraphrases of Josephus, or the monotonous monologues in the gospel of John."[2]

Martin Dibelius differed from Cadbury in one respect in his work twenty years later. He noted that Luke's speeches share characteristics with other ancient historians' speeches, but he identified length as a difference between the two groups. One reason for this is that Luke's speeches lack "the deliberative element, the debating of the 'for' and 'against', and the epideictic element, the rhetorical elaboration of the ideas concerned."[3] This difference, however, does not necessarily mean that Luke was a poor speech writer. Dibelius went on to say that Luke excluded these elements on purpose. Luke did not include customary rhetorical elaboration because he did not wish to draw attention to himself; he wanted his audience to focus on the content of his narrative, not on the polish of his rhetorical style.[4]

Dibelius supported his argument for Luke's rhetorical skill with other portions of Luke and Acts, specifically the prologues. Luke intended his books to be read by a wide audience. As evidence for this claim, Dibelius said that many, if not most, common people would not have appreciated or understood the author's rhetorical style.[5] The mention, however, of Theophilus and his obligation to distribute the books indicates that

---

[2]Henry Cadbury, "The Speeches in Luke-Acts" in *The Beginnings of Christianity I: The Acts of the Apostles* (vol. 5; ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; London: Macmillan and Co., 1933), 403.

[3]Martin Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography" in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Heinrich Greeven; trans. Mary Ling; New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1956), 181-182. See also Eduard Norden who in his 1956 monograph also recognized Luke as a literary figure (*Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte Religiöser Rede* (Darmstat: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956), 1-30).

[4]Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 182. See also the above discussion in section 2.1.2.

[5]I disagree with this statement. This issue will be raised again later in the project.

Luke and Acts may have had "two market outlets: it was intended as a book to be read by the Christian community . . . but also at the same time, intended for the private reading of people of literary education."[6] Dibelius classified Luke as a sort of historian, although not a full-fledged one. Given his idiosyncratic use of Hellenistic rhetoric, "Luke did not completely become a historian;" in many ways, "he remained an evangelist."[7]

In his 1958 monograph, Cadbury concluded that Luke's materials were "incurably unliterary" in character.[8] Cadbury's litmus test for "literary" seems, however, to be based in modern expectations. He later remarks that Luke "conforms to the customs of his literary inheritance—customs often quite different from our own."[9] He maintained his conclusion that Luke's speeches were, like other ancient historians', "more or less successfully composed speeches suited to the speakers and occasions out of his own imagination."[10] Hans Conzelmann held a higher view of Luke's literary ability. He identifies Luke as "the first Christian author who consciously tries to conform to the standards of Hellenistic literature."[11]

---

[6]Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 147.

[7]Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 185.

[8]Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts*, 134.

[9]Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts*, 193.

[10]Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts*, 190. See the oft-cited Thucydides reference: "[w]ith reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said (*History of the Peloponnesian War* [trans. Charles Forster Smith; 4 vols.; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928-1935], 1.22.1).

[11]Hans Conzelmann, "Address of Paul on the Areopagus" in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 218.

Luke's ability to use Hellenistic rhetoric may not directly correlate with how closely he follows Greco-Roman handbooks' directions for composing speeches. The rules for speeches recorded in the handbooks provide students and teachers with material for the rhetorical classroom. While oratory had evolved in the years before Cicero into a "more polished and sophisticated style,"[12] in reality, speeches in antiquity may not have followed the rules and regulations of the classroom. The handbook authors themselves emphasize that "rules and suggestions for the development of speeches . . . must be tempered by good judgment in the orator."[13] Students were expected to follow the rules of the handbooks for classroom exercises, but when one became a full-fledged orator, strict adherence to the rules was no longer expected. William Long notes that "the orator . . . has rules to follow in comprising speeches, but flexibility in applying the rules is the mark of the master rhetorician."[14] Thus, we should not be surprised if all ancient rhetoric does not follow the prescriptions of the handbooks exactly.

Merle Dudley noted this caveat in his 1978 essay: "while it seems that Luke evidently both knew and at times used a good literary form of Greek, it must not be assumed that he would necessarily follow the speech composition forms of classical writers."[15] Fred Veltman, however, after studying speeches from ancient historiography and romance, concludes that Luke's speeches do "exhibit the same form, the same

---

[12]Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, 49.

[13]William R. Long, "The *Paulusbild* in the Trial of Paul," *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 93.

[14]Long, "*Paulusbild*," 93.

[15]Merle B. Dudley, "Speeches in Luke-Acts" *EvQ* 50 (1978): 154-155.

arrangement, and the same general elements which are characteristic of defense speeches in other narrative literature from ancient times."[16]

Kennedy understood Luke to be a decent rhetorician as well, writing that while "a classical rhetorician probably would have regarded all four Gospels as lacking literary merit . . . Augustine and other Christians came to see that such judgments result from a rather arbitrary definition of grammatical, rather than rhetorical, standards."[17] Kennedy concludes that with the third gospel, Luke "comes close to being a classical biographer, just as in Acts he comes close to being a classical historian."[18]

G. Horsely pointed out that Luke's use of the convention of rhetorical speeches indicates Luke's ability as a rhetorician.[19] Luke uses speeches in order to "lighten the narrative, and vivify it."[20] Clifton Black also noted the proper rhetorical form of the speeches in Acts. He examined Paul's speech in Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:13-41) and found that it did not differ significantly from Greco-Roman speeches. He writes that "on the contrary, to an impressive degree Paul's oration at Pisidian Antioch hews closely to those classical norms."[21] Thus, Black proposed that first-century Jewish and Christian sermons should be considered alongside other examples of Greco-Roman oratory.[22]

---

[16]Fred Veltman, "The Defense Speeches of Paul in Acts" in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed. Charles H. Talbert; Danville, Va.: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978), 256.

[17]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 108.

[18]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 98.

[19]G. H. R. Horsley, "Speeches and Dialogue in Acts" *NTS* 3 (1986): 609.

[20]Horsley, "Speeches and Dialogue," 613.

[21]Black, "Rhetorical Form," 10.

[22]Black, "Rhetorical Form," 15-16.

Dean Zweck agreed with Black's conclusion that Paul's speeches represent examples of Greco-Roman rhetoric, but he gave credit to the author of Acts rather than the apostle. He analyzed the parts of Paul's speech at the Areopagus, including the exordium, *probatio*, and epilogue, and finds that Paul is portrayed by Luke as "a rhetor giving an oration on the topic of religion."[23] Earle Hilgert concurred, writing that Luke's speeches, when compared with the rhetoric of other Hellenistic speeches, meet both the standard of appropriateness and the standard of being a speech representative of a genuine contest.[24]

Marion Soards continued the conversation in the mid-1990s. He recognized the connection that Luke's speeches have with Hellenistic rhetoric, but warned that a one-to-one correlation between the two categories does not exist. Specifically, while the form is similar, Soards noted that the contents of Luke's speeches differ significantly from the content of Hellenistic speeches.[25] Ben Witherington also wrote on the topic: "Luke's style suggests that he wishes to be heard as a serious Hellenistic historian [who] would be heard like a Polybius."[26] Witherington considered Luke accomplished enough to vary the

---

[23]Dean W. Zweck, "The Exordium of the Areopagus Speech, Acts 17:22, 23," *NTS* 35 (1989): 103.

[24]Earle Hilgert, "Speeches in Luke-Acts and Hellenistic Canons of Historiography and Rhetoric" in *Good News in History: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke* (ed. Ed. L. Miller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 107.

[25]Marion L. Soards, "The Speeches in Acts in Relation to Other Pertinent Ancient Literature," *ETL* 70 (1994): 76.

[26]Ben Witherington, "Finding Its Niche: The Historical and Rhetorical Species of Acts," *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 90.

style of his writing depending on the nature of his writing (i.e., a narrative or a speech) and the nature of his audience (i.e., Gentile or Jewish).[27]

In his 2003 study of the rhetoric of Acts, Tyson finds Luke to be "well educated and probably comfortable in elite society, familiar with the classics of Greek and Latin literature, and competent in producing persuasive narrative."[28] Likewise, Parsons recognizes that the character of Paul in Acts is "fully aware of and deftly employs" elements of good rhetorical form.[29]

Loveday Alexander, however, warns against exaggerating Luke's rhetorical abilities.[30] She concludes that while Acts does have characteristics of an apologetic, and at times qualifies as an *apologia* per se, "Luke's choice of vehicle brings him closer to the world of 'popular' narrative and pamphlet than to the 'higher' forms of rhetorical discourse which were adopted by the later apologists."[31]

In conclusion, we see that scholars disagree on Luke's level of education and rhetorical skill. Most, however, concur that Luke shows at least some level of skill in the tradition of Hellenistic rhetoric. Of course, the details of Luke's education and/or thoughts about rhetoric in general are lost. Evidence from Luke's extant writings, however, implies that he was proficient in Hellenistic rhetoric. I hope to add to a

---

[27]Witherington, "Finding Its Niche," 90.

[28]Tyson, "From History to Rhetoric and Back," 37. Tyson goes as far to surmise that "the author of Acts would probably have been welcome to attend a gathering of the best-known authors of his day, even if he might have been slightly uncomfortable" (38).

[29]Parsons, "Luke and the *Progymnasmata*," 58.

[30]Loveday Alexander, *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2005). See especially the chapter, "The Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text."

[31]Alexander, *Acts*, 206.

growing body of work on Lucan rhetoric by identifying some instances in which Luke intentionally used rhetorical strategies to encourage audience participation.

*The Question of Luke's Audience*

If Luke indeed wields rhetorical tools for the benefit of his audience, we must turn to the nature of that audience. Who were Luke's hearers? This question has vexed many students of Luke and Acts, and especially the issue of the ethnicity and religious affiliation of Luke's audience has been discussed by many scholars. The general possibilities are that Luke addressed a primarily Gentile audience in either a Gentile or Jewish setting,[32] a primarily Jewish audience,[33] or a mixed audience consisting of both Gentile and Jewish members.[34] As can be seen by the sources cited, this question often deals more widely with the purpose or theme of Luke and Acts. Ward Gasque has identified the state of the question quite clearly: he writes that the audience and intent of Luke's narratives remains "in the realm of critical speculation."[35]

For the purposes of this project, however, the most pertinent characteristics of Luke's purpose and audience lie elsewhere. If we consider Luke and Acts to be

---

[32]See for instance Ernst Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1964), 90-91; Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 173-174; Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans. Bernard Nobel and Gerald Shinn; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 49; Frank Stagg, "The Unhindered Gospel" *RevExp* 71 (1974); and Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

[33]See for instance Erwin R. Goodenough, "The Perspective of Acts" in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; London: SPCK, 1968): 51-59; Andrew J. Mattill, "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Reconsidered" in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday* (ed. W. Ward Gasque; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970): 108-122; and Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972).

[34]See for example Mary A. Moscato, "Current Theories Regarding the Audience of Luke-Acts," *CurTM* 3 (1976): 355-361.

[35]W. Ward Gasque, *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 303.

rhetorical works, the most basic underlying purpose is to persuade. The question we wish to answer is, would Luke's audience have understood and been persuaded by rhetorical structures and figures? We should consider two main characteristics of the audience in order to answer our question. First, we will explore the audience's level of education, which is linked to the social class of its members. Second, the fact that Luke's audience most likely heard the story rather than read the text of Luke and Acts is important to our discussion.

*Education and social class*. Obviously we cannot examine Luke's audience in reality, but one way to determine level of education and social class is to examine the works written to the audience. The work in question, then, is the narratives of Luke and Acts.[36]

Dibelius differentiated between the literary levels of the third gospel and Acts. He writes that the Gospel of Luke does not qualify as a literary piece, but that Acts is a different sort of composition that "was not intended only for the communities of people in humble circumstances, but *also* for another circle of higher social understanding."[37] The two works are, however, tied together by their prologues if nothing else. Dibelius concluded, then, that Luke and Acts had two intended audiences: the Christian community and people with higher literary education.[38] Craig Evans disagrees with

---

[36]Admittedly, this method of evaluation may be criticized as circular. It remains, however, that authors attempt to write in such a way that their audience's will understand their message. Luke is no different. Therefore, in the absence of a more appropriate method of evaluation, we must gather what information we can from the books of Luke and Acts.

[37]Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 146. Italics original.

[38]Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 147. This conclusion implies that the Christian community consisted of people with a somewhat lower level of education.

Dibelius, writing that Luke's audience should be understood as "the world outside the church," a group that Evans assumes would understand the conventions of ancient historical rhetoric.[39]

Richard Burridge has identified Luke's audience as a group in the middle of the social scale. He notes that "the language of the New Testament may be simpler than Plutarch's, but it still implies education and some rhetorical knowledge: Luke is clearly aware not just of conventions (like prefaces) but also of literary motifs from Homer onwards (like the storm-tossed travelers in Acts 27)."[40] Gregory Snyder does not believe Christians were "drawn from the bilges of society as was once believed," but "the rate of literacy among the average group of Christians would have been significantly lower than the literacy rate within a group of Stoics, Peripatetics, or Platonists."[41]

Higher levels of formal education were available to only the wealthy and influential in first-century Mediterranean society. Scholars tend to agree, however, that informal education, even among the illiterate, reached significant levels. Burton Mack recognizes that even though only the rich could attend rhetorical schools,

> techniques of rhetoric were tested in the public arena . . . . Speech and speeches were signs of the presence of Hellenistic culture. All people, whether formally trained or not, were fully schooled in the wily ways of the sophists, the eloquence required at civic festivals, the measured tones of the local teacher, and the heated debates where differences of opinion battled for the right to say what should be done. *To be engulfed in the culture of Hellenism meant to have ears trained for the rhetoric of speech.*[42]

---

[39]Evans, "Speeches in Acts," 302.

[40]Richard A. Burridge, "About People, By People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences" in *The Gospel for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (ed. Richard Bauckham; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998), 140.

[41]H. Gregory Snyder, *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World: Philosophers, Jews and Christians* (New York: Routledge Press, 2000), 211.

[42]Mack, *Rhetoric*, 31. Italics mine.

After all, as Mack pointed out, the great historians and poets of Hellenistic society did not come solely from the large cities that were centers of education. Great Greek poets, authors, and rhetoricians came from smaller, less privileged areas as well. Thus, Mack suggests that the institutions that taught rhetoric did not have an open-door policy, but did not have doors at all: essentially, "Greek culture (*paideia*) and public education (*paideia*) were one and the same."[43]

Early Christians, and Luke's audience whether Christian or not, lived in a thoroughly Hellenized world. For this reason, Kennedy proposes that even those without the privilege of higher education would have "necessarily developed cultural preconceptions about appropriate discourse."[44] Parsons concurs, assuming that Luke's audience "presumably also knew how to respond appropriately (if unconsciously) to the effects of persuasive rhetoric."[45] Recall Cicero's comments on this matter:

> everybody is able to discriminate between what is right and what wrong in matters of art and proportion by a sort of subconscious instinct, without having any theory of art of proportion of their own . . . because these are rooted deep in the general sensibility, and nature has decreed that nobody shall be entirely devoid of these faculties. . . . It is remarkable how little difference there is between the expert and the plain man as critics (*De Or.* 3.50.195, 197).

If the rubrics of rhetoric were indeed pervasive in Hellenistic society as Mack, Kennedy, and Parsons suggest, then regardless of formal educational training, Luke's audience would have responded to the structures and figures of rhetoric, if only on a subconscious level. Using rhetoric would have been an appropriate persuasive tool for the author of Luke and Acts.

---

[43]Mack, *Rhetoric*, 30.

[44]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 5.

[45]Parsons, "Luke and the *Progymnasmata*," 46.

*Aural receivers of narratives*. Luke's audience is far more likely to have heard stories than to have read actual texts. Unfortunately, as Moore points out, "in attempting to play out the roles of the audiences envisioned by the evangelists, exegetes have failed to give due weight to the fact that these audiences were listeners first and foremost."[46]

Literacy was on the rise during Luke's time, comparatively, but as Tomas Hägg reminds us, "we are still dealing only with a small proportion of the population."[47] Those who could read, often did so aloud for the education and entertainment of others who remained illiterate. Hägg suggests that "the ability to read, and read easily and for pleasure . . . no doubt carried with it the obligation to read aloud to members of the household, to a circle of friends, perhaps even to a wider audience."[48] Based on evidence such as repetition and "excessive clarity," Hägg's work in the ancient novels revealed that this type of literature was meant to be read aloud to audiences.[49]

Witherington applied this conclusion to New Testament narrative as well. He writes that "ancient historical works [such as Acts] were meant to be *heard* primarily and read only secondarily."[50] Burridge's research led him to the conclusion that "reading aloud was one of the main ways of 'publication' in the ancient world, often as entertainment after dinner."[51]

---

[46]Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels*, 86. Note that even if one was reading to oneself, one was probably reading aloud. Aristotle writes, "Generally speaking, that which is written should be easy to read or easy to utter, which is the same thing" (*Rhet.* 3.5.6).

[47]Tomas Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 90.

[48]Hägg, *Novel*, 93.

[49]Hägg, *Novel*, 93.

[50]Witherington, "Finding Its Niche," 87.

[51]Burridge, "About People," 141.

The aural nature of Luke's audience would have influenced how he wrote his narratives, because "considerable attention had to be given to the aural impression a work would leave on the audience."[52] The repetitions and attention to clarity noted by Hägg in the ancient novels support this conclusion.

Dialogue within narratives also takes on a particular role when literature is read aloud. Shiner pointed out that when a person reads a text silently, dialogue within the narrative takes place only within the world of the text. When a person hears dialogue within a narrative, however, the words of the dialogue are heard not only within the world of the narrative, but also within the listener's social world. Shiner proposes that "all dialogue in orally performed narrative is addressed at one and the same time to a character or group of characters in the story world and to listeners in the social world."[53] Later in this project, we will pay particular attention to several instances of dialogue within the narrative of Luke and Acts. Shiner's conclusion speaks to the audience's level of involvement in the case of speeches within the story.[54]

*Conclusion*

Luke's level of education and training in rhetoric cannot be conclusively determined. Many scholars, however, attribute to Luke a certain measure of skill in the tradition of Hellenistic rhetoric based on the nature of his writings. Likewise, the details of Luke's audience members' identity and level of education are in the end uncertain.

---

[52]Witherington, "Finding Its Niche," 87.

[53]Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel*, 171.

[54]Shiner claims that by the time Luke was writing, "dialogue framework is usually a flimsy excuse for the presentation of the author's ideas." He references dialogues by Cicero and Tacitus in which "it is clear that everyone is addressing the audience of the dialogue rather than other characters in the narrative world" (Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel*, 174-175).

Based in part on the character of Luke and Acts, however, we may cautiously assume audience members with some appreciation of rhetoric, even if they did not receive systemized training. We may more confidently assume that Luke's audience most often *heard* the narratives rather than read the texts.

*The Gospel According to Luke*

Luke uses literary, cultural, and intratextual allusions to encourage audience participation. In this section, we will deal with Luke's use of Hebrew Scriptures, the forward-looking allusions in Luke 1-2, and the intratextual allusions that connect Luke and Acts.

Literary allusions to the Hebrew Scriptures occupy a privileged position in Luke's narrative: "with few exceptions, the references to the fulfillment of scripture are the high points of the gospel plot. . . . The narrator of Luke reserves references to scripture fulfillment for the development of the main plot themes."[55] Parsons writes that one purpose of this strategy is to maintain the audience's interest in the story until "the last chapter of the gospel where prolepses become fulfilled analepses. In this way prophecy and fulfillment serve to bring the story of Jesus in Luke to closure."[56]

Another effect the allusions have is bolstering the authority with which the author (and his Jesus) speaks and acts. For example, Luke 4:16-21 (Jesus as the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy) and Acts 13:16-41 (Paul's speech in Antioch of Pisidia that references prophecy and psalms) "show Luke believed the career of Jesus fulfilled the prophecies of

---

[55]Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness," 214.

[56]Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness," 215.

Jewish scriptures."[57] Talbert provides evidence that in the first-century Mediterranean milieu of the Third Gospel there was a common understanding that "divine necessity control[led] human history," that history fulfilled written and oral oracles, and that sometimes oracles were misunderstood.[58] When prophecies (Christian, pagan, or otherwise) were fulfilled, Talbert observes, the effects might include: legitimizing an individual's religious or political status, legitimizing other things the prophet had said, rooting the tradition of the prophet in antiquity, and providing "evidence for the providence of God in human affairs."[59] When Luke demonstrated that Jesus fulfilled prophecies of Jewish scriptures, he brought together the "highly persuasive" combination of having traditional roots and establishing legitimate prophecy, a combination that "would contribute to the certainty the evangelist wants to give Theophilus (vs. 4)"[60] as well as others in his audience. Audience members able to complete the literary allusions to the Jewish scriptures created a foundation of authority upon which Luke's gospel could rest.

Luke 1-2 provides a helpful example of forward-looking intratextual allusions. Philip Shuler proposes that the first two chapters of the gospel prepare the audience for the portrait of Jesus presented in Luke and Acts.[61] Within this instance of intratextaul

---

[57]Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982), 234.

[58]Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 236, 238.

[59]Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 239-240.

[60]Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 240.

[61]Philip L. Shuler, "The Rhetorical Character of Luke 1-2" in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips; Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998), 173-190.

allusion, the author uses several other rhetorical tools to encourage the audience to participate in completing the allusion. First, the author uses omitted information to catch the audience's attention. The focus of Luke 1 is on Jesus, but Jesus' name has yet to be mentioned. The opening scene of Luke 1 concerns the priest Zechariah, his wife Elizabeth, and their as yet un-conceived son, John. The purpose of John's life, however, points to another character who has not been introduced: from the moment his birth is announced, the audience knows that John the Baptizer's purpose is to make God's people ready "for the Lord" (1:17). The angel Gabriel makes another visit, six months later, to a virgin named Mary. Again, the focus is on laying the narrative background for the announcement that comes in v. 31: "Behold, you will conceive in your womb and you will bear a son and you will call his name Jesus." Gabriel describes Jesus with several epithets, culminating at the end of v. 35: "the holy one who is born will be called the Son of God." The audience's attention is rewarded. Information omitted earlier in the chapter is provided when Gabriel visits Mary. The audience may now use information about the identity of Jesus to fill in the gap surrounding John's purpose. John the Baptizer reappears in the narrative, coming out to the wilderness in Luke 3, to make God's prepared people ready for Jesus' ministry.

Secondly, the author uses an encomiastic comparison of John the Baptizer and Jesus. Shuler observes that "the superiority of one character over another becomes increasingly clear to the [audience] as each unit unfolds."[62] Jesus is shown to be superior to other "good" characters in this section. For example, in Luke 2:41-52, "Luke demonstrates Jesus' excellence at a young age and prepares the [audience] for a career in

[62]Shuler, "Rhetorical Character," 177-187, quote from 179.

which Jesus will have numerous occasions to engage religious leaders, both friendly and hostile. Each time, Jesus will emerge unscathed."[63]

Through the opening chapters, Luke prepares the audience to understand Jesus as a unique man sent from God. Other themes that appear in the opening chapters of Luke will be continued throughout the gospel and Acts, including mercy that is shown to Elizabeth (1:58); being filled with the Holy Spirit (1:67); Israel's salvation (1:68); Jesus' future suffering (2:34-35); the mission to the Gentiles (2:32); and the temple (2:27, 37). In Shuler's opinion, the first two chapters of Luke "effectively prepared the [audience] for an adult career, death, and subsequent developments stemming from" the person of Jesus.[64] As the audience members hear the rest of the narrative concerning Jesus, they are able to apply new information to the allusions presented in chapters 1 and 2. The rhetorical tool of intratextual allusion retains the audience's attention and requires the audience's participation through the remainder of the story.

Luke also uses comparisons in the form of parable to engage the audience in his narrative. As David Stern traces the history of parable research, he notes that "[C.H.] Dodd and his successors conceive of the parables as virtual experiences in themselves, linguistic and poetic events that go beyond the merely discursive stretch of conventional metaphysics and theology."[65] The parables reach beyond the narrative as the familiarity of the parable's setting and action is

---

[63]Shuler, "Rhetorical Character," 186-187.

[64]Shuler, "Rhetorical Character," 185-186.

[65]David Stern, "Jesus' Parables from the Perspective of Rabbinic Literature: The Example of the Wicked Husbandmen" in *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Clemens Thoma and Michael Wyschogrod; New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 49.

> dislocated and rent from it usual context. . . . [T]he spectators have become participants, not because they want to necessarily or simply have 'gotten the point' but because they have for a moment, 'lost control' or as the new hermeneuts say, 'have been interpreted.'[66]

As the audience participates by engaging the parable, the parable engages the audience. A mere rhetorical construct has become "the Logos—a timeless, hermeneutically inexhaustible and rhetorically irresistible entity."[67] Paul Ricoeur writes that "metaphor is living by virtue of the fact that it introduces the spark of imagination."[68] In the case of parables, often the "first eye-catching detail"[69] is enough to begin the story; the rest automatically follows in the mind of the audience. The audience participates in the familiar course of the story. In addition, lessons clothed in parables are often more readily received. At times, stories communicate more effectively than "some abstract discursive statement."[70]

Some parables, as noted above, are coupled with the rhetorical tool of omission,[71] which in Luke's gospel functions similar to what we have seen previously. Tannehill notes that gospel pericopes are usually only briefly sketched—not all information is included in the evangelists' accounts—and so "much is left to the hearer . . . . Jesus' words, as reported in the gospels, are often aphoristic, metaphorical, and hyperbolic,

---

[66]Sallie TeSelle, *Speaking in Parables* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 78-79.

[67]Stern, "Jesus' Parables," 49.

[68]Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language* (London: Routledge, 2003), 358.

[69]Peter Michel, "Figurative Speech: Function, Form, Exegesis" in *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Clemens Thoma and Michael Wyschogrod; New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 144.

[70]Michel, "Figurative Speech," 144.

[71]In addition to the parables to follow, parables with omitted endings include Garments and Wineskins (Luke 5:36-39); Specks and Planks (Luke 6:41-42); Like a Man Building His House (Luke 6:46-49); and the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31).

appealing to the imagination. Thereby his words gain transformative power but renounce precise control. . . . The [hearer] has both freedom and responsibility."[72] The audience takes responsibility by participating in the narrative, filling the gaps, and completing the gospel writer's story.

Luke 7:36-50 contains the parable of the two debtors. The setting for the parable is Simon the Pharisee's dinner party, at which a sinful, we presume uninvited, woman appears. She weeps, bathes Jesus' feet with her tears, dries his feet with her hair, and anoints his feet with her ointment. Simon does not speak words of criticism to anyone but himself, but Jesus speaks up with a parable. Jesus sets the parable of the two debtors before Simon as a question: "Which of the debtors will love the forgiving creditor more?" Simon voices an answer to the question, but the audience does not know if Simon answered the parable by being morally formed. After Jesus gives the application of the parable, the hearer would like to know Simon's response. The narrative moves on to the others at the party and the sinful woman, however, and Simon is left sitting silently at the dinner table. Jan Lambrecht notes that the listening audience "almost spontaneously must have actualized the story, for both 'the woman-sinner' and 'the Pharisee' have not disappeared. They are still present in the Christians themselves."[73] Simon's response is left to the audience: the narrative may be finished positively or negatively. Allowing the listeners to provide Simon's response encourages a personal response of their own. No

---

[72]Robert C. Tannehill, "Freedom and Responsibility in Scripture Interpretation, with Application to Luke" in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips; Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998), 267-268.

[73]Jan Lambrecht, "A Note on Luke 15, 11-32" in *Luke and His Readers. Festchrift A. Denaux* (ed. R. Bieringer, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 303.

one wants to be the one who loves Jesus less; the lesson of the parable extends its power outside the narrative and into the listeners' lives.

Other omissions in Luke surround the characters. Tannehill observes that many gospel characters appear only once, and the audience learns just a small amount about that person. All that is omitted about each character creates a "thick penumbra of possibilities, making them open characters."[74] Two aspects of open characters affect the attentive audience. First, the audience should be careful when evaluating the gospel characters. In many cases, the narrative implies an evaluation, but Tannehill counsels that the audience should "be cautious of the conclusions that we draw [because] the evaluation concerns [the-character]-at-this-moment."[75] One way to exercise caution is to enter the world of the narrative. When a hearer becomes involved in the action of the story, he or she will be less likely to make superficial judgments and will be more likely to appreciate the complexity of the characters' situations.

This caution leads to the second way that open characters may affect an attentive audience: open characters often leave the task of closure to the audience. Tannehill writes that in Luke 9:57-62, for example, "Jesus addresses three would-be followers with challenging words. How did they respond? We don't know whether to view these persons as hopelessly naïve and shallow, or whether to assume that their encounter with Jesus changed them into radical disciples."[76] Did the disciple who wanted to follow Jesus accept that "foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man

---

[74]Tannehill, "Freedom and Responsibility," 271.

[75]Tannehill, "Freedom and Responsibility," 271.

[76]Tannehill, "Freedom and Responsibility," 269.

has nowhere to lay his head" (9:58)? Did the disciples who wanted to bury their dead and say goodbye to their families follow, or did they try to put their hand to the plow and look back (9:59-62)? The author chooses to omit the answers to these questions, leaving the audience to "make assumptions . . . [and] interpret particular scenes, thereby filling some of the gaps. In doing so, [the audience] may be cooperating with the narrator, who assumes that the audience would contribute in this way."[77] Open-ended characters leave the audience waiting for the other shoe to drop, so to speak. When the shoe does not drop in the narrative, the audience is compelled to take the next step themselves.

The parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-36) offers a comparison that is a response to a question posed in the narrative, but at the same time uses various rhetorical tools to illicit a response from the listening audience.[78] Luke uses the arrangement of the parable to draw the audience into the story: "each situation depicted in the parable affects the next—and affects audience reaction."[79] The listeners paying attention to the story witness the "dramatic arrival of the Samaritan. . . . The success of the parable as persuasive utterance rests on the fact that Jesus' hearers have already become immersed in the action and that, in spite of themselves, a world of new possibility is opening up."[80] The compassionate Samaritan character surprises the audience, standing in contrast to the

---

[77]Tannehill, "Freedom and Responsibility," 268.

[78]Michael P. Knowles, "What Was the Victim Wearing? Literary, Economic, and Social Contexts for the Parable of the Good Samaritan," *BibInt* 12 (2004): 147.

[79]J. Ian H. McDonald, "Rhetorical Issue and Rhetorical Strategy in Luke 10.25-37 and Acts 10.1-11.18" in *Rhetoric and the New Testament. Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (JSNTSup 90; ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 66.

[80]McDonald, "Rhetorical Issue and Rhetorical Strategy," 67.

common negative opinion of Samaritans held by Jews.[81] Jesus proposes a new standard for moral formation, one that is "determined neither in relation to the shared codes of social stratification, nor in relation to membership within a particular group, but solely on the basis of an internalized ethical orientation."[82]

The tool of allusion helps the author of this parable strengthen the authority of this new ethical standard. Several literary allusions have been suggested for the Good Samaritan, including 2 Chr 28:15 (the account of Samaritans caring for Judean victims of war).[83] The connection to 2 Chr 28:15 is not uncontested, but this final mention of the Samaritans in the Hebrew canon shows them involved in an act of mercy; Jesus' depiction of the Samaritan in the Lucan parable shows him involved in an act of mercy. Michael Knowles writes that this allusion emphasizes the point that "the ostensibly 'alien' Samaritan is as much, if not more of, an 'Israelite' (in both religious and geographical senses) than either the priest or the Levite, whose religious and ethnic lineages are not subject to question."[84] The author invites those in the audience who recognize the allusion to reevaluate their perception of Samaritans, and their ethical standards of moral formation, based on the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures.

---

[81]Knowles suggests that the character depicted is that of a traveling merchant and may have had a "familiar (and perhaps unpopular) social and economic role" (Knowles, "What Was the Victim Wearing?," 171).

[82]Knowles, "What Was the Victim Wearing?," 171.

[83]Other suggested allusions include the Good Shepherd image from Ezekiel 34 and the commandment given in Lev 18:19: "You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against any of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Birger Gerhardsson, *The Good Samaritan—The Good Shepherd?* (ConBNT 16; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1958), 13-15, 23-29).

[84]Knowles, "What Was the Victim Wearing?,"149.

Having heard the parable and having been asked to reevaluate their moral standards, the listeners are asked for a response. Jesus asks the lawyer (and the audience), "Which of these three, do you think, was a neighbor to the man who fell among robbers?" The verbal response of the lawyer in Luke 10:37 identifies the character in the parable who acted as neighbor, but the life-response required from the character and the hearers of the gospel is not delineated in the narrative.[85] What does it mean to "go and do likewise?" The audience is left, once again, with an open-ended comparison. The evangelist does not relate the future actions of the lawyer and so leaves the charge, "go and do likewise," in the hands of the hearers.

Luke continues to use the tool of omission to involve his audience in Luke 11. Vernon Robbins identifies an example of a cultural enthymeme with an implied premise in the Luke 11:1-13 account of the shorter Lord's Prayer. The incomplete syllogism occurs in v. 4: "And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive all who are sinning against us." The missing element to this syllogism is "if a person forgives others then that person will be forgiven." The audience heard the missing but implied element in 6:37b: "Forgive and you will be forgiven."[86] An attentive listener supplies the missing clause to complete the syllogism in the prayer. Following the phrase on forgiveness in 6:37, v. 38a deals with giving: "Give, and it will be given to you." Robbins suggests that intratextual allusions may continue in the Luke 11 prayer if the audience draws further connections between Luke 6 and 11. The phrase preceding the forgiveness enthymeme,

---

[85]McDonald, "Rhetorical Issue and Rhetorical Strategy," 71.

[86]Vernon K. Robbins, "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13" in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips; Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998), 195-196.

"Give to us each day our daily bread" (Luke 11:3), recalls the giving phrase in 6:38. Robbins concludes that "it would be natural to reason: 'Give us this day our daily bread, because we give bread to others who need it.'"[87]

Also in the narrative surrounding the Lord's prayer in Luke 11, we find an example of the rhetorical tool of question and answer used to encourage audience participation. After Luke's version of the prayer, Jesus presents his disciples with a series of rhetorical questions to which the implied answer is "no"[88] ("Which of you has a friend who . . .?, Who among you, if your child asks for a fish?, . . . for an egg?). As each question is asked, the hearer supplies an answer.

The story connected to the first question involves a host-friend who asks a sleeping-friend for bread at midnight so that he can feed a guest-friend who has come unexpectedly. The hearer supplies an answer to Jesus' question in the negative, but she is then surprised by Jesus' next words. According to ancient Mediterranean culture, writes Robbins, the sleeping-friend will give the host-friend bread based on their friendship. But Jesus comments in 11:8, "*Even though he will not get up to give him anything because he is his friend* . . . ." The hearer, having supplied the culturally correct answer now listens more closely to the story, having been surprised into attentiveness. The reason the sleeping-friend gives the host-friend bread is the host-friend's persistence or shamelessness[89] on behalf of the guest-friend. The parable is less about the obligations of friendship between the sleeping- and host-friends and more about the lengths that the

---

[87]Robbins, "Enthymeme to Theology," 196-197.

[88]Robbins, "Enthymeme to Theology," 201.

[89]Robbins, "Enthymeme to Theology," 205.

host-friend is willing to go to for the guest-friend. The host-friend obtains the needed bread "because he has been willing to be shameless by his request on behalf of his guest-friend's needs."[90]

The next two questions involve less complex narratives and are based on the relationship between parent and child. As the audience answers "no" to each of Jesus' rhetorical questions, the author sets up the "how much more" statement in v. 13. The audience has taken part in creating the argument that culminates in v. 13 by participating in a series of Questions and Answers. The author has skillfully led the listeners to the realization that their prayers or requests, as instructed in the prayer, reach God who gives the Holy Spirit to those who ask. This realization is strengthened by the participatory role the audience took leading up to the climax.

In this section, Luke again relies on open-ended comparisons also encourage audience participation. As we have seen, the third gospel contains riddles without answers and unfinished parables—comparisons between what is and what ought to be. In each instance below, the author leaves work to be done by an attentive audience.

Luke uses comparisons in the form of riddles to engage the audience. Thatcher's work on riddles examines several instances in the Third Gospel, and he notes that several riddles from Luke have answers that remain unstated or are only implied by the surrounding narrative. For example, in Luke 12:51-53, Jesus says, "You think I came to make peace on earth? No, I tell you, but rather division." This saying, writes Thatcher, "violates ancient Mediterranean family values generally and Exodus 20:12

---

[90]Robbins, "Enthymeme to Theology," 206.

specifically."[91] The statement also seems to contradict the angels' song about peace in Luke's birth narrative. Jesus does not explain this riddle. The audience is left to ponder the incongruencies raised between this statement and societal, literary, and religious expectations.

The parable of the man who had a fig tree (Luke 13:6-9) contains several allusions and uses the tool of omission. Bernard Brandon Scott observes that metaphors involving the fig tree are widespread, but the tree is generally associated with "the blessings of God [and] with the messianic age."[92] The vineyard might be understood as Israel, an allusion to Isa 5:1-7. In the Hebrew Bible the fig tree is often a metaphor for Israel or Judah (Jer 8:13, 24:1-10; Hos 9:10; Mic 7:1),[93] or the living tree may symbolize the blessing of the land (Deut 8:7-8; 1 Kgs 4:23) and the destruction of the tree may symbolize a curse on the land (Amos 4:9).[94] Apostasy may be depicted as fruitlessness as in Jer 8:13, 24:2 and Hos 9:16.[95] While we are not looking here for a one-to-one allegorical correspondence between the elements in the parable and the "real world," the literary and cultural allusions connected to the fig tree and its fruit alone would call to the audience's mind the ancient nations of Israel and Judah, God's blessing and curse, and the people's faithfulness and unfaithfulness. With these images in their minds, the listeners hear the parable.

---

[91]Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 58.

[92]Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear then the Parable. A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 334.

[93]Greg W. Forbes, *The God of Old. The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 198; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 90.

[94]Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 332.

[95]Forbes, *God of Old*, 91; Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 333.

The apocalyptic setting for the parable makes the audience even more anxious to understand its point, but the narrative does not provide an application or a response from the narrative audience. The preceding comments about the Galileans who were killed by Pilate and the eighteen killed by the tower of Siloam "build on the common assumption that punishment and sins are related."[96] But the parable in v. 6-9 seems to suggest that while there is judgment, there is mercy for those who repent in time. In the midst of this building tension, the audience is left with an omitted conclusion.

The ending remains open: the audience does not know what the keeper of the vineyard said to the vinedresser's request—did he receive permission to let the tree live? The audience does not know what happened to the tree—did the fertilization help? Did it bear fruit the next year? Did it survive, or was it dug up? Greg Forbes notes that the omission of an ending builds "an inner tension, allowing the [hearer] to ponder the possibility of change [and] it also alludes to the unlimited possibilities that fruitfulness will bring."[97] The audience is left with a gap to fill. Perhaps the listener (and the vinedresser), hoping for future fruit, will "keep on manuring. What else is there to do?"[98] Sandifer takes a less hopeful view of the conclusion: "for Jesus' hearers there would be no doubt about the outcome—the tree comes down."[99] If the audience reaches this conclusion, the author may have hoped for a reaction against the possibility of being dug up: the audience that concludes that the tree is destroyed would work to avoid being put in a similar situation.

---

[96]Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 335.

[97]Forbes, *God of Old*, 91.

[98]Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 338.

[99]Sandifer, "Humor of the Absurd," 293.

In Luke 14:3, 5, a man with dropsy stands before Jesus. Jesus asks the watching lawyers and Pharisees, "Is it permitted to heal on the Sabbath or not?" (14:3). Jesus asks the lawyers and Pharisees another question after the man is healed: "If one of you has a child or an ox that has fallen into a well, will you not immediately pull it out on a Sabbath day?" (14:5). The lawyers and Pharisees do not answer either question. The listening audience, however, can answer the questions if they pay attention to the story. Jesus' actions that follow the first question in v. 4 implies the question's answer. The audience can answer the questions: yes, healing on the Sabbath is permissible because Jesus has done so himself, just as yes, I would pull out a child or an ox that fell into a well on a Sabbath day. The audience creates Jesus' lesson by providing the omitted answers that complete Jesus' riddles.

The riddle in Luke 14:26 is not in the form of a question, but it presents a situation that seems impossible or at least improbable. Jesus tells the crowds traveling with him, "Whoever comes to me and does not hate father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and even life itself cannot be my disciple." The statement contradicts Jesus' own teaching on marriage, as well as various Old Testament teachings such as Gen 2:24; Exod 20:12; and Lev 19:18.[100] Jesus does not provide an explanation for this statement. Based on knowledge from the preceding narrative and their culture, listeners know that they are to love their parents, children, spouses, and siblings. The incongruence of Jesus' statement makes the audience pause, take notice, and begin to work on the puzzle the author has created to encourage audience participation. What

[100]Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 58.

does Jesus mean? Is he speaking literally or figuratively? A listener engaged in the narrative cannot help but ask these questions and attempt to solve the riddle.

Perhaps the most well known Lucan parable is found in 15:11-31, the parable of a man who had two sons or the Parable of the Prodigal Son. This parable is set in the presence of tax collectors, sinners, Pharisees, and scribes. It follows two similar parables about a man with a lost sheep and a woman with a lost coin. Forbes writes that "no matter what the precise tradition history of the three parables, in their present setting they are meant to be . . . a unit, with each parable informing and being informed by, the other two to some degree. The common features act as a reinforcement, while the differences are complementary."[101] The common features in the three parables are joy and celebration at the return/finding of the lost one.[102] One main difference between the three is that the God-character seeks the lost in the first two parables while the God-character waits for the lost to return in the third.[103]

In the final parable of this group, tools encouraging audience participation abound. The audience hears the younger son's inner thoughts, receiving access to privileged information as he contemplates his dire straights in the country far away. Literary allusions to stories from the Hebrew Bible would call to mind other times that fathers and sons acted unexpectedly. The Joseph story of Genesis 37-50 contains similar elements: a far country, a jealous older brother, ring/clothes/banquet, a famine,

---

[101]Forbes, *God of Old*, 113.

[102]The mention of feasting in all three parables connects the stories closely with the narrative context in which the religious leaders have grumbled about Jesus welcoming sinners and eating with them in Luke 15:2 (Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 102).

[103]Forbes, *God of Old*, 118-119.

reconciliation with a father. Forbes also notes similarities with God's acceptance of Ephraim in Jer 31:18-23; 1 Kgs 8:47-51; Hos 11:1-9; and Ps 103:13.[104]

The author uses the tool of surprise to keep the audience's attention and to encourage the audience's participation. The younger son's actions at the beginning of the story, Forbes says, and the father's reaction at the end of the story when the son returns home would have surprised the audience.[105] I agree that the younger son's actions would have been surprising, and the author may use the surprise to encourage the audience to pay attention to what happens to this audacious younger son. The father's reaction at the end of the parable, however, should not surprise those who paid attention to the parable of the man with a lost sheep and the woman with a lost coin. The joy and celebration at the return of what was lost is a common thread through the three stories. In addition, Scott proposes that the audience would be prepared for the type-story of the younger son: the younger son is a rogue who returns and is welcomed back to favored status. The type is found in various stories from the Hebrew tradition such as Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, and Jacob's favorite sons, Joseph and Benjamin.[106]

Perhaps we should look for the audience's surprise in another area. The character of the older brother in the final parable gives disgruntled listeners a voice with which to protest.[107] Even given the familiar type-story of the younger brother, surely some listeners privately thought the lavish celebration to be unfair to the hardworking elder brother. The elder brother's words, however, place him in the same position as his

---

[104]Forbes, *God of Old*, 130.

[105]Forbes, *God of Old*, 138.

[106]Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 112, 118-119.

[107]Forbes, *God of Old*, 141.

sibling: the older brother has "left" the father because even as he is "reminding his father that he has never violated his command . . . [the elder brother] has just shamed his father by refusing to enter the celebration."[108] But rather than rejecting or turning away from the elder son, the father "displays the same tenderness shown to the younger son."[109] According to Scott, the type-story of the younger son usually functioned to decide which son was favored or chosen. In the story of the man who had two sons, the father chooses *both* sons.[110]

Here is the surprise—the final outcome of the story is not left to the father, but to the eldest son. The eldest son's response is omitted, an ending that the audience must consider and then create. Does the son join the feast? Does he reconcile with his brother? With his father? If the audience members hear themselves in the parable, other questions may be added to the list: "Will they, as prodigals, repent? Will they mirror the love and compassion of the father to other prodigals? Will they adopt the spirit of the elder son?"[111] Parsons writes that the character of the elder son stands "at the crossroads where he . . . must make a decision about whether to join the feast or not."[112] He, like

---

[108]Forbes, *God of Old*, 142.

[109]Forbes, *God of Old*, 143; see also Mikeal C. Parsons, "The Prodigal's Elder Brother: The History and Ethics of Reading Luke 15:25-32," *PRS* 23 (1996): 171.

[110]Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 125. See Michael Wolter, "Lk 15 als Streitgespräch," *ETL* 78 (2002): 25-56 who argues that the parable is not open, but that the rejection of the elder son (who represents the Pharisees and scribes) is in the narrative and closes the story. Admittedly, the elder son did not act admirably, but the father's words in 15:31-32 appear to be more an invitation than a rejection.

[111]Forbes, *God of Old*, 144.

[112]Parsons, "The Prodigal's Elder Brother," 172.

audience members who identify with him, "stands at the threshold to choose whether or not to join the banquet."[113]

Each listener can play the part of each character: the prodigal younger son, the self-assured elder son,[114] the compassionate father. Should the hearer be a repentant younger son, he will "identify even more powerfully with the call to rejoice at the repentance of those lost and . . . [will] condemn those who do not so rejoice."[115] The listener that is an elder son "is confronted with a choice. The second part of the story does not let them go free until they take a stand."[116] Each character urges the listeners to re-examine themselves by challenging their views of God and people around them.[117] The author moves the attentive and active audience toward various kinds of moral formation by leaving open-ended comparisons in the parable and in the audience members' lives. Tannehill writes that when the author leaves work for the audience,

> the purpose of these words is not merely to guide behavior but to transform our imaginative perception of reality so that our behavior may change. The imagination is the door through which a new perception of reality may enter, transforming our commitments, values, and actions.[118]

The parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) may also be construed as a riddle. Thatcher writes that "the parable . . . defies conventional thinking by

---

[113]Parsons, "The Prodigal's Elder Brother," 173. Later Parsons notes that "the literary function and theological purpose of these narrative gaps is to invite [audience members] to finish the story for themselves. . . . Will you join the great banquet? . . . *We* must finish the story of the Elder Brother" (174).

[114]Lambrecht notes that the hearers of the parable are "at the same time sinners by weakness and sinners by pride" (Lambrecht, "A Note," 305).

[115]Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 103.

[116]Lambrecht, "A Note," 304.

[117]Forbes, *God of Old*, 150.

[118]Tannehill, "Freedom and Responsibility," 267.

equating poverty with eternal reward and wealth with eternal suffering."[119] The puzzle created by the riddle upsets cultural and societal expectations. The tension also touches on conventional wisdom from the Old Testament that teaches that those faithful to God are rewarded while the unfaithful are punished or cursed. According to conventional wisdom, the rich man who feasted (16:19) would be understood as faithful to God; the poor man covered with sores (16:20-21) would be understood as having displeased God. One might assume that the rewards/curses on earth would continue in eternity. Jesus' parabolic riddle reverses expectations by showing the rich man being tormented in Hades and the poor man resting in Abraham's bosom. In order to resolve the riddle, the audience must be willing to adjust their perceptions: the author asks the audience to be morally formed in the solving of the riddle in Luke 16.

Luke 18 contains a story in which a gap may have been created. All three synoptic gospels contain the account of the man who asks Jesus what he must do to inherit eternal life (Mat 19:16-22; Mark 10:17-22; Luke 18:18-25). The story as told by Matthew and Mark ends in a similar way. Jesus tells the man the one thing the man still lacks in his quest for eternal life: the man must sell what he has and give the money to the poor, thereby having treasures in heaven—the man must follow Jesus. Hearing this, the man goes away grieving, because he had many possessions (Mark adds the detail that the man was shocked by Jesus' words). Luke changes the end of the story, leaving a gap for the audience to fill. The Matthean and Markan man left grieving; the Lukan man, however, "became sad, for he was very rich," but *he does not leave the scene*. Unlike the account in Matthew and Mark, Luke's man receives the rest of Jesus' teaching: "How

---

[119]Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 59.

hard it is for those who have wealth to enter the kingdom of God! Indeed, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God" (Luke 18:24-25). The response of the man with many possessions is left open-ended. Does the man follow the audience's pattern of expectation, leaving the presence of Jesus, grieving that he cannot sell all he has? Or does the man see the truth of Jesus' words, break free of his typed response, and become the exception to the impossible (Luke 18:27)? The narrative leaves this gap for the audience to fill, not only with speculations but with the actions of their own lives.

Moving ahead in the story, Luke uses another enthymeme on forgiveness in Luke 23:34: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they are doing." Robbins identifies the elements of the enthymeme as follows: (Implied) Rule: The Father forgives people who do not know what they are doing; Case: They do not know what they are doing; Result: Father, forgive them.[120] Robbins believes that these verses on forgiveness (6:37; 11:4; 23:34) are interconnected. The attentive listener will learn each verse's lesson in turn and will expand it in light of the intratextual allusions. Robbins writes that

> the enthymeme about forgiveness in the Lord's prayer, then, is part of a Lukan enthymemic network of reasoning about forgiving others and about petitioning God to forgive oneself and others. . . . The rationales create enthymemic reasoning, and this reasoning both interconnects statements in different locations in the work and introduces new topics that branch out to other related topics of importance.[121]

In other words, the intratextual allusions in the gospel provide the audience with the material needed to complete the evangelist's message about forgiveness. Leaving the

---

[120]Robbins, "Enthymeme to Theology," 200.

[121]Robbins, "Enthymeme to Theology," 201.

task of completion to the audience requires audience participation and encourages the audience to take ownership of this important Lucan theme.

Kurz's work on enthymeme identifies two other enthymemes in the third gospel that provide Christological proof to the audience. After Luke's passion account, two disciples on the road to Emmaus encounter the risen Jesus. Kurz outlines the enthymeme as follows: a) the Christ must suffer these things and enter into his glory (24:26); b) Scripture says this (24:25); c) the Scriptures are referring to Jesus (24:27).[122] This enthymeme does not have an implied premise, but it does leave the solving of the equation up to the audience. If a, b, and c are true statements, then "the implied conclusion is that (C) Jesus is (A) the Christ who was supposed to suffer and enter his glory. . . . It is Scripture which removes the block to the disciples' being able to believe the evidence that Jesus is risen."[123] Kurz observes that a similar enthymeme with an implied conclusion is give to a larger group of disciples just a few verses later. In Luke 24:44-48, "there is a very similar scriptural *major premise*, a similar *minor premise*, which is supplied by the risen Jesus, that the Scriptures must be fulfilled in him, and the corresponding *implied conclusion*, that Jesus is the Christ whom the Scriptures predicted would suffer, rise and be preached."[124]

In addition to open-ended comparisons and characters, the ending of Luke itself remains open-ended. Towner identifies incomplete endings as a type of dramatic gap:

> dramatic gaps can be defined as places in a text in which major events or ideas have been omitted (or simply not specifically stated) for a dramatic purpose.

---

[122]Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric," 181.

[123]Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric," 181.

[124]Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric," 182.

> These gaps may be found anywhere in a text. For instance, one may appear at the end of a text, leaving the reader with a zero-end story for which they must construct an ending.[125]

In the case of the ending of Luke, the audience is not left completely alone with the task of constructing the ending; the Book of Acts continues the narrative begun in the Third Gospel.[126] At the end of the gospel, however, the audience is left with several loose ends. Kurz points to the promise of the "coming of the Spirit and Jesus as light to the Gentiles" as a gap at the end of Luke. This promise, emphasized by Jesus and a vital element to the comfort he gives to the disciples, has yet to be fulfilled.[127] The risen Jesus tells the disciples to wait in Jerusalem to be clothed with power from on high (24:49). The disciples return to Jerusalem, where they continually worship God in the temple, but Luke ends without an account of the promised power.

Some of the loose ends left as the gospel closes serve as links to the narrative of Acts. Parsons understands many of these gaps to be elements of "linkage [that are] used to connect the story of Jesus in the Gospel with the story of his followers in Acts. Major events and themes like Jesus' departure, the mandate to witness, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, among others, are interlaced between the two narratives."[128] Some omissions at the end of Luke encourage the audience to continue to pay attention as the author unfolds the story of Acts. The omissions act as a signal that the narrative is "to be continued."

---

[125]Towner, "Tip of the Iceberg," 46.

[126]Acts itself ends with gaps, some of which we will examine in the next section.

[127]Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 30.

[128]Mikeal C. Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel" *SBLSP* 25 (1986): 223.

Parsons also observes that some promises in Luke remain unfulfilled even at the end of Acts: the redemption of Israel, eschatological sayings, the capture of Jerusalem.[129] In these cases, "despite the strong sense of closure detected . . . it is possible to argue that narrative leaves 'unfinished business' which creates, in varying degrees, incomplete closure."[130] The unfinished business finds its way into the lives of the audience. As Parsons notes, the capture of Jerusalem had probably already taken place at the time Luke was penned.[131] In the narrative, however, that prophecy remains unfulfilled. The audience is able to use cultural knowledge, if not personal experience, to fill the gap left by the prophecy that the temple in Jerusalem would be destroyed. Other unfulfilled prophecies and promises will be fulfilled in audience's experiences: they will see the redemption of God's people and the fulfillment of eschatological sayings. Hearers must participate by continuing the story in their lives, filling the gaps left by Luke's omissions.

*Conclusion*

We find ample evidence of the use of ancient rhetorical tools to encourage audience participation in Luke's gospel. The author leaves gaps to be filled, connections to be made, and endings to be imagined, particularly by using the tools of omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden meaning, question and answer, and allusion. These sophisticated narrative characteristics are used to retain the listeners' attention so that they would be morally formed by Luke's narrative as a result of participating with him to create the story of the gospel.

---

[129]Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness," 221. See also Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 30.

[130]Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness," 221.

[131]Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness," 221.

*The Acts of the Apostles*

The story begun in the gospel of Luke continues in the book of Acts, presumably by the same author and intended for the same audience. We expect to see similar occurrences of tools used to encourage audience participation.

It is common place to acknowledge the book of Acts as a sequel to the Third Gospel. Narrative- and rhetorical-critical approaches allow "the stories in Luke (or Luke-Acts) [to] communicate not only as individual scenes but as parts of a larger whole."[132] Literary parallels between the two works help the audience maintain the sense of connection between the story of Jesus and the story of Jesus' followers. Talbert lists parallels between Luke and Acts including the preface to both books (Luke 1:1-4/Acts 1:1-5), prayer before baptism (Luke 3:21/Acts 1:14, 24); the Spirit descending and filling (Luke 3:22/Acts 2:1-13); opening a period of ministry with a sermon (Luke 4:16-30/Acts 2:14-40); the theme of fulfillment illustrated by preaching and healing (Luke 4:31-8:56) and prophesying and wonders (Acts 2:41-12:17); and the conclusion of both books, which end on the positive note of fulfillment of scripture (Luke 24/Acts 28).[133] Talbert proposes that when taken together, Luke and Acts combine to form a complete picture of *Heilsgeschicte* in stages: "the Law and the Prophets, Jesus, the church."[134]

The Christology of the two books is also complementary. Luke and Acts tie the passion and ascension of Jesus together; stress the "continuity between the one who works miracles and preaches in Galilee and the one who suffers and dies in Jerusalem;"

---

[132]Tannehill, "Freedom and Responsibility," 273.

[133]Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20; Missoula: Scholars Press University of Montana, 1974), 16-18.

[134]Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 106.

and insure a continuity between the one who works in Galilee and foresees his passion and the one who ascends in Jerusalem.[135] Talbert uses these parallels and complementary aspects of the narratives to support the theory that Luke and Acts represent an ancient biographical succession narrative.[136] Even putting aside the question of genre,[137] it remains that these parallels and complementary structures communicate to the audience that this is "where the true tradition is to be found in the present."[138] The author encourages the audience of Luke, and then of Acts, to connect the two works and see the uninterrupted flow of God's work through Jesus in Luke and then through the church in Acts. If Luke's hearers pay attention and accept the challenge to participate in creating this saga, they find that the story of Jesus is intimately connected to the world in which they live.

Several intratextual allusions, when interpreted by an attentive audience, connect the narratives of the God of the Hebrew Scriptures to Jesus and then in turn to Jesus' followers in the early church. Parsons points out that the referent of "signs and wonders" in Acts draws a connecting thread through time. He writes that signs and wonders "accompany the ministries of the leaders of God's community in unbroken succession, from Moses [7:36] to Jesus [2:22], to the Twelve [6:1-6], to Stephen [6:8] and Philip [8:6] the Hellenists, to Paul and Barnabas [14:3], the leaders of the Gentile mission."[139]

---

[135]Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 120.

[136]Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 125-140.

[137]See again Philips, "Genre of Acts," 365-396.

[138]Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 134.

[139]Mikeal C. Parsons, "Christian Origins and Narrative Openings: The Sense of a Beginning in Acts 1-5" *RevExp* 87 (1990)," 409. These connections will be examined more closely as they occur in Acts' narratological order.

With these allusions, Luke demonstrates that the early church is the group most "faithful to the traditions of Moses."[140] Tracing this lineage of tradition, of course, compares the Christians to other groups that claim to be faithful to the traditions of Moses, most notably other Jews of the first and second centuries.

Cadbury uses intratextual allusion to support his thesis that Luke is the author of a four-step salvation process found in Acts, supported by allusions to Hebrew scriptures.[141] He is impressed by the way that "one passage in Acts explains the line of argument which the very terseness of a speech elsewhere makes obscure through omission,"[142] and he observes that while "nowhere in Acts are all four steps given in a single passage . . . the scheme is clear."[143] Although he does not explicitly discuss audience participation (his concern lies in showing Luke to be the author of the speeches in Acts), Cadbury's observation relies on the fact that attentive hearers gathered the elements of the four-step process as the narrative progressed, finally resulting in a compilation of Luke's proposed elements.

As observed in the section on the Third Gospel, Luke uses omissions in order to encourage audience participation. Peter's speech at Pentecost (Acts 2), for example, contains "rather large gaps," according to Parsons.[144] The audience does not receive detailed information about the miracle of glossalalia—what did it sound like, would this

---

[140]Parsons, "Christian Origins and Narrative Beginnings," 409.

[141]The four-step scheme Cadbury proposes is as follows: "A) Scripture says thus and so. B) This must apply either to the speaker or to another. C) It can be proved not to apply to the speaker. D) Therefore, since it was fulfilled in Jesus, it may be applied to him" ("Speeches in Luke-Acts," 408).

[142]Cadbury, "Speeches in Luke-Acts," 407.

[143]Cadbury, "Speeches in Luke-Acts," 408. Cadbury goes on to trace

[144]Parsons, "Christian Origins and Narrative Openings," 407.

be a common occurrence, was the gift for all followers of Jesus or only those gathered together in Acts 2—and the "'correct' interpretation is perhaps finally undecidable. Such rich ambiguity may underscore "the multi-layered understanding which Luke himself had of this event."[145] It is true Luke may merely have wished not to limit the event of Acts 2, but by omitting further detail about the miracle, he leaves a hole for the audience to fill. What is the point of the story of Pentecost?[146]

Luke also relies on the audience's ability to complete literary, cultural, and intratextual allusions. This type of participation requires the hearer to engage the narrative with their "past experiences, . . . knowledge of the world, and even . . . knowledge of other texts."[147] The quotation from the prophet Joel in Acts 2 provides a good example of literary allusion. In his sermon, Peter breaks the quotation off abruptly. Brawley suggests that the audience hears the continuation of the Joel passage even though Peter does not finish it:

> Acts 2:39 is a verbal echo of the continuation after the missing line where Peter breaks off. . . . In the second place the plot and setting of Acts 2 play out the unspoken part of the text: In Mount Zion, in Jerusalem, some hear the good news proclaimed, call upon the name of the Lord, and are saved, namely those whom God calls through the agency of Peter and his companions.[148]

Involving the audience by encouraging them to complete allusions such as the Joel citation found in Peter's Acts 2 speech creates a connection between the audience and the author. Brawley observes that in Luke and Acts "explicit references frequently

---

[145]Parsons, "Christian Origins and Narrative Openings," 407.

[146]Parsons opts to fill the gap "with an emphasis on the patience of waiting disciples and a faithful God" (Parsons, "Christian Origins and Narrative Openings," 408).

[147]Towner, "Tip of the Iceberg," 13.

[148]Robert L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), 84-85.

serve as markers to larger contexts for readers who know the Septuagint."[149] Not all hearers, of course, will catch the literary allusions, but those that do perceive a "new vitality for the narrative."[150] They enter a shared world that "possesses . . . forceful potential for persuasion—the potential to create a new community"[151] made up of those who are able to see the entire picture roughly sketched by the allusions. The allusion in Peter's Pentecost sermon is completed by reference to Psalm 15 in Acts 2:25-28. The psalm allusion "forms the critical hinge by linking the 'pouring out of my [God's] Spirit' of 'the last days' to the 'Lord exalted at the right hand' of God such that 'everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord' and is 'baptized into the name of Jesus (the) Christ' 'shall be saved.'"[152] The authority of the Jewish scriptures provides the backdrop for Peter's sermon. In this way, Luke assures the audience that this new message is rooted in tradition[153] and invites the audience to help create Peter's sermon by completing literary allusions.

---

[149]Brawley, *Text to Text*, 125. Earle Hilgert observes this phenomenon again in Acts 13 when Paul quotes Hab 1:6 LXX. Hilgert proposes that the "deed you will never believe, if one declares it to you" (Acts 13:41) is "the awakening of the Gentiles across 'the breadth of the earth' to an inheritance that is not originally theirs. By climaxing Paul's sermon with the words of Hab 1:5, Luke leaves unspoken the real nature of the divine 'deed' and allows his [hearers'] minds to run on to the following verse and thus to grasp the true implication of the warning" (Hilgert, "Speeches in Luke-Acts," 107).

[150]Brawley, *Text to Text*, 130. Brawley comments that "the expectation of an author that readers will catch allusions is a . . . clue to the attempt at persuasion. In the overt citation of scripture the . . . author presupposes a common understanding of canon with the authorial audience. . . . The authorial audience holds the Septuagint in its cultural repertoire with enough familiarity to catch covert allusions. Of course, it is possible to read Luke-Acts on one level apart from recognition of intertexts. But such a reading strangles the significance of the narrative."

[151]Brawley, *Text to Text*, 130.

[152]David P. Moessner, "*Two* Lords 'at the Right Hand'? The Psalms and an Intertextual Reading of Peter's Pentecost Speech (Acts 2:14-36)" in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips; Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998), 232.

[153]Parsons points out the layers of the narration in this quotation: "The effect of these narrative layers—'Luke said that Peter said that Joel said that God said'—is to reinforce the utterly reliable and

In this speech, Luke also requires the audience to connect several allusions spanning the Third Gospel and Acts in order to solve a riddle. In Luke 20, Jesus presented the religious leaders with a riddle, after solving their riddle in v. 27-39. Jesus' riddle was this: "How can they say that the Messiah is David's son? For David himself says in the book of Psalms, 'The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool."' David thus calls him Lord; so how can he be his son?" (20:41-44). Talbert points out that David calls the Messiah "Lord." Assuming the mores of the ancient Mediterranean, "a son did not surpass his father. Given that assumption, how could the messiah be David's son (vs. 44)? David would not address his son as Lord."[154] The answer to the riddle is omitted, but the listeners have a clue to how David's son, Jesus, might be exalted over his ancestral father: there is something special about Jesus, something extraordinary. The final answer, however, is withheld until the end of Luke's gospel when the audience experiences the "resurrection-ascension-exaltation" of Jesus.[155]

Peter uses the same psalm allusion in the Pentecost sermon in Acts 2, but there is no longer a riddle to be solved if the audience paid attention to the first installment of Luke's story. The answer is now clear. Jesus has been resurrected, has ascended, and been exalted—this is why David calls his son "Lord." The psalm, a riddle that has already been solved, is used in Acts 2 as proof of Jesus' identity and exaltation.

---

authoritative character of the speech here. . . . This promise is fulfilled not only in the Pentecost event; Peter is fulfilling it himself in this very speech" ("Christian Origins and Narrative Openings," 409).

[154]Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 195.

[155]Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 196.

The church develops in the opening chapters of Acts, and like any young growing thing, the church encounters various problems. At this point, as a good story teller, Luke uses the rhetorical devices of irony and surprise to engage the audience's attention and encourage participation. In the story of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11), the audience receives privileged information. The audience listens and watches the action. Even before Ananias appears, the audience knows that he, along with his wife Sapphira, has sold a piece of land and have kept part of the proceeds for himself. Ananias' deceit, already known to the audience, is discerned by Peter, and Ananias falls dead, (beside his offering?) at the apostle's feet. Three hours later, Sapphira comes to see Peter, perhaps to find her husband. The audience knows what happened to Ananias, and Sapphira "compounds the conspiracy with a verbal lie." The audience knows that she is caught, and the knowledge separates the audience from the actions of Ananias and Sapphira in a "story [that] drips rich with irony."[156] Sapphira falls (again) at Peter's feet, just as the feet of those who buried her husband approach. Apparently bringing an unworthy offering to the apostle's feet required the offering of life from Ananias and Sapphira, also laid at the apostle's feet. The author entertains the audience with this clever story of feet, but privileged information and the irony that results drives the lesson home for the audience. The implied warning is that the Spirit of the Lord is not to be tested (5:9), and those who do so risk all.

Later in Acts 5, Peter and the other apostles are questioned by the high priest before the council of the Sanhedrin in a scene replete with irony. Gamaliel, a Pharisee, stands to advise the council on how to deal with the apostles who will not stop preaching:

---

[156]Parsons, "Christian Origins and Narrative Openings," 417.

"keep away from these men and let them alone; because if this plan or this undertaking is of human origin, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them—in that case you may even be found fighting against God!" (5:38-39). The council is convinced by Gamaliel's advice, and the dramatic irony is complete: "it is indeed strong irony that Gamaliel's words and their acceptance by the Sanhedrin do not save him or them. Thus Gamaliel is the victim of a dramatic irony in which he actually voices in his principle the beliefs of the narrator but is left behind because he refuses to follow."[157]

The third-century *Clementine Recognitions* provide an early response to this irony. The *Recognitions* refer to Gamaliel as "a chief among the people . . . who was secretly our brother in the faith, but by our advice remained among [the priests]."[158] Thus Gamaliel is recast as a secret Jewish Christian who stayed among the Sanhedrin at the apostles' advice. If Gamaliel was indeed a closet Christian, the Sanhedrin become the victims of the dramatic irony. The council remains unaware of the Christian in their midst, and they are "hoodwinked through their acceptance of his surface reasoning and thus give him what he is really after, the lives of the apostles."[159]

The irony in this pericope may be understood yet another way. Regardless of where Gamaliel's allegiance lies, his words contain verbal irony. Consciously or not, Gamaliel voices the "success through 'failure' of the Christian movement and the mess in which [his advice] leaves Gamaliel and the Sanhedrin demonstrates its clearly false

---

[157]William John Lyons, "The Words of Gamaliel (Acts 5:38-39) and the Irony of Indeterminacy," *JSNT* 68 (1997): 38.

[158]*The Clementine Recognitions* I.LXV (*ANF* VIII:185)

[159]Lyons, "Words of Gamaliel," 42.

assumptions."[160] The leader of this messianic movement has been killed, but its followers have not scattered and disappeared like the disciples of Theudas and Judas the Galilean. The followers of Jesus are claiming that Jesus was resurrected. They are persistently teaching and preaching, mysteriously escaping from prison, and cheekily standing up to the very council of the Sanhedrin. The verbal irony emphasizes for the audience the unique nature of Jesus and his followers. The audience's access to privileged information comes into play again, because "the only conclusion for the one who would identify with the narrator's point of view to draw is that the Sanhedrin has already been found opposing God."[161]

Acts also contains several cultural allusions that encourage the audience to participate in the narrative. For example, Luke draws connections between Jesus, the prophets of the Deuteronomic history, Stephen, and Paul. First, Moessner proposes that "Luke has woven the career of Jesus into the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's prophetic history" in Stephen's speech to his accusers. Jesus is "the fulfillment of the Exodus salvation in the *place* in the land of *promise* for the true worship of God; Jesus is the "consummator of this *Heilsgeschichte* precisely as the 'prophet like Moses,' whom Moses himself prophesied in Deut 18:15-18 at the *borders* of the promised land;" Jesus is "like all prophets before him in his rejection and 'murder' through a calloused, stubborn folk;" and Jesus is "one, who like Moses and all the prophets, brought the 'living oracles'

---

[160]Lyons, "Words of Gamaliel," 48.

[161]Parsons, "Christian Origins and Narrative Openings," 419.

of the voice (φονή) of God, only to be 'cast aside' as the people spurned the pleading of the prophets and disobeyed the Law of God (7:53)."[162]

Second, Stephen and Jesus are connected in the narrative of Acts 7. While Stephen's speech in Acts 7 will be examined later in the project with other speeches, at this point it suffices to say that Stephen's dying words of forgiveness (Acts 7:60) echo Jesus' words from the cross (Luke 23:34). Both men are characterized as being full of the Spirit, grace, power, and wisdom; both Stephen and Jesus worked wonders and signs; both are charged with blasphemy; and Stephen is linked with Jesus' threats to destroy the temple; both are confirmed by a heavenly vision involving a great light.[163]

Finally, Luke draws parallels between Paul and Jesus. Paul is called to suffer as Jesus was called to suffer; Paul's calling is also marked by a heavenly vision accompanied by a great light; Paul is sent on a journey that culminates in Jerusalem; the respective appearances of Paul and Jesus in the temple lead to their arrest; Jewish leaders and the crowds call for both men's deaths. The charges brought against Paul and Jesus are also similar. They are accused of teaching "against the Law (Moses), the people (nation), and the Temple . . . and in addition, against Caesar."[164]

Luke ties Jesus first to the prophets of the Deuteronomic history, then to the disciple and martyr Stephen, and finally to the apostle and preacher to the Gentiles, Paul. Those in the audience familiar with Jewish scriptures (literary and cultural familiarity) and the Gospel of Luke (intratextual familiarity, if we consider Acts to be the sequel to

---

[162]The above list is from David P. Moessner, "Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet like Moses in Acts," *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 206. Italics original.

[163]Moessner, "Prophet like Moses," 207. See also Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 105-106 for parallels between Jesus and Stephen.

[164]Quote and preceding list from Moessner, "Prophet like Moses," 210-211.

Luke) would hear these allusions and understand the progression Luke proposes. By creating these connections, the audience recognizes "the careers of Stephen and Paul as the culmination of Israel's rejection of Jesus, the *prophet like Moses*, whose fate brings the long history of Israel's obduracy to its fulfillment."[165] A story larger than the book of Acts is painted on Luke's canvas. He uses scenes and colors from the ancient days of Deuteronomic prophets, the recent tragedy and hope of Jesus' death and resurrection, and the present lives and deaths of faithful disciples to depict a plan from God that has been in place from the beginning.

Luke also uses suspense and irony to engage the audience in the Acts 12 account of Peter's miraculous escape from prison. This story follows the account of James' death at the hands of Herod Agrippa. When Herod saw that James' death pleased the Jews, he arrested Peter as well. Given the context, the audience waits in suspense—Peter's life is in grave danger. The narrative audience is in suspense as well, and they pray to God on behalf of Peter.[166] The next scene, though, contains surprise and a little humor. The angel appears (the audience has privileged knowledge of the visitor's identity but Peter does not until 12:11), and smacks Peter on the side to wake him up. After Peter's escape is made good and the angel vanishes (at which point Peter figures out what is happening), Peter goes to the house where the church is praying.

The servant girl Rhoda comes to investigate the noise Peter makes at the door, but in her excitement she forgets to open it, and "Peter remains there, frantically

---

[165]Moessner, "Prophet like Moses," 203. Italics original.

[166]Russell Morton, "Acts 12:1-19," *Int* 55 (2001): 68.

knocking."[167] The praying believers dismiss Rhoda's report of Peter at the door, telling her that she is out of her mind. Russell Morton suggests that attentive listeners would recall the disciples' disbelief of the women that came from the tomb with another true message in Luke 24:11.[168] When Herod finds Peter missing the next morning, those who would have put Peter to death are put to death themselves. This reversal, or "subversion of power continues, for in 12:20-23 we see the account of Herod's ignominious death."[169]

Irony, surprise, suspense, and humor combine in this narrative, capturing the audience's attention and emphasizing the fact that all is not as it seems among the followers of Jesus. Angels appear, faith doubts, certain death is avoided, the powerful are befuddled while a maid-servant carries the most important news—the action of the story twists and turns around the central message of Acts: the God of Israel, through Jesus, in the lives of a rag-tag band of disciples, is changing the world.

Luke uses the tool of omission in the speeches in Acts.[170] The evangelist omits a needed piece of information from a speech but provides the information in the surrounding narrative, either before or after the speech occurs. The attentive listener

---

[167]Morton, "Acts 12:1-19," 68.

[168]Morton, "Acts 12:1-19," 68.

[169]Morton, "Acts 12:1-19," 69.

[170]Of course the study of speeches in Acts is hardly a new enterprise. In addition to works already cited, see F.F. Bruce, *The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Tyndale Press, 1942) and "The Speeches in Acts—Thirty Years After" in *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology* (ed. Robert Banks; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974); Henry Cadbury, "Speeches in Luke-Acts"; Derek Hogan, "Paul's Defense: A Comparison of the Forensic Speeches in Acts, *Callirhoe*, and *Leucippe and Clitophon*," *PRS* 29 (2002): 73-87; Stanley Porter, "Thucydides 1.22.1 and Acts: Is There a Thucydidean View?," *NovT* 32 (1990): 121-142; Eduard Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts" in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; London: SPCK, 1968); Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994); Charles Talbert, *Reading Luke-Acts in its Mediterranean Milieu* (Boston: Brill, 2003); and Ulrich Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte : form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag d. Erziehungsvereins, 1974.

hears the gap left in the speech, gathers information from the surrounding narrative, and helps Luke create the story by supplying the missing information.

Before turning to omissions in Lucan speeches, we must note that ancient rhetoricians considered the *probatio*, or proof, to be the most important element of the forensic declamation. Quintilian writes that "of the five parts into which we divided judicial cases, any single one other than the proof may on occasion be dispensed with. But there can be no suit in which the proof is not absolutely necessary" (*Inst.* 5.Pr.5). Aristotle even saw fit to split all speeches into only two parts:

> you must state your case, and you must prove it. You cannot either state your case and omit to prove it, or prove it without having first stated it; since any proof must be a proof of something, and the only use of a preliminary statement is the proof that follows it (*Rhet.* 1414a30).[171]

The *probatio* usually begins with a proposition which is followed by proofs. Proofs may be of two types: inartificial ("decisions of previous courts, rumours [or common opinion], evidence extracted by torture, documents, oaths, and witnesses," *Inst*. 5.1.2) or artificial ("wholly the work of art and consist of matters specially adapted to produce belief," *Inst.* 5.10.95-96). Arguments in the *probatio* may be drawn not only from "admitted facts, but from fictitious suppositions . . . I mean the proposition of something which, if true, would either solve a problem or contribute to its solution, and secondly the demonstration of the similarity of our hypothesis to the case under consideration" (*Inst.* 5.10.95-96).

Quintilian also addresses deliberative speeches. Deliberative speeches should be as simple as possible (*Inst.*3.8.3). It is appropriate to appeal to the audience's emotions in

---

[171]Aristotle goes on to say that categorizing more particular parts of speech is absurd. Apparently this opinion did not do away with the numerous divisions.

deliberative speech, especially those of anger and pity (*Inst.* 3.8.12). When preparing a deliberative speech, the orator should consider not only the nature of those engaged in the discussion and the nature of the orator, but the nature of the subject under discussion as well (*Inst.* 3.8.15-18). The orator should determine if an action is practical and then may offer advice on either the action itself or on outside forces that might impact the action (*Inst.* 3.8.18).

The main purpose of deliberative speeches is to persuade or dissuade an audience concerning an action. We also learn that while some elements of rhetorical speeches may be shortened or even omitted (the exordium, *Inst.*3.8.6; and the statement of facts, *Inst.* 3.8.10-11), the element that is absolutely necessary for persuasion is the proof or *probatio*.

In the context of both forensic and deliberative speeches, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* instructs that "the entire hope of victory and the entire method of persuasion rest on proof and refutation" (*Rhet. Her.* 1.10.18). Without the *probatio*, the orator has no hope of persuading the audience to a particular point of view.

Some speeches examined here are missing the all-important speech element, the *probatio*; others are missing other pieces of a well constructed speech. Are these omissions a result of faulty composition on the part of Luke? Or do they serve another purpose? With these rhetorical guidelines in mind, we will examine several examples found in the book of Acts.

*Acts 7 – Stephen's speech*. Stephen's speech before the Council is replete with rhetorical figures. It also happens to be incomplete. Kennedy points out that it needs "either a return to the charge against Stephen, with an explicit rejection of the right of the

council to try him, or a deliberative epilogue calling for repentance, as in the speeches of Peter."[172] Instead of finishing the speech, however, Luke opts to include the needed information in the verses following the speech. Stephen's vision (7:56) provides the "explicit rejection of the right of the council to try him."[173] It is Jesus, standing as judge, who has the right to judge Stephen. By leaving the speech incomplete but providing the needed information soon thereafter, Luke draws his audience into the creative activity of his rhetoric. The attentive are able to supply the rejection of the council's judgment from the surrounding narrative.

*Acts 13:16-41 – Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch*. Luke's argument in Acts 13:35-37 is somewhat abbreviated because the quotation from Psalm 16 is so brief ("You will not allow your holy one to undergo decay"). John Townsend observes that the same psalm was referenced in Peter's speech in Acts 2:25-32. In ch. 13, Paul points out that Psalm 16 cannot refer to David because David's body had undergone decay. He connects the psalm to Jesus, who has been raised up by God (13:33). This explanation is needed if the audience recalled Peter's speech in ch. 2, in which he cites the passage in full, making the point that Psalm16 usually does refer to David, who is speaking in the first person.[174] Paul must continue to flesh out the identity of "the holy one," taking into account the earlier allusion in Acts that is carried over into this later chapter.[175]

---

[172]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 122.

[173]Mikeal C. Parsons, "Acts" in *Acts and Pauline Writings* (Mercer Commentary on the Bible 7; ed. Watson E. Mills and Richard F. Wilson; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995), 19.

[174]John T. Townsend, "The Speeches in Acts," *AThR* 42 (1960): 151-152.

[175]Justin Taylor, *Les Actes des Deux Apôtres* (6 vols.; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1994), 5:163.

Although Townsend's argument works well for non-Jewish members of the audience who would not have been as familiar with the psalms, he does not mention the possibility that seems most obvious. Is it possible that the audience would have made the connection between Psalm 16 and David because of familiarity with the psalms? Dodd presents this possibility, saying that Luke may have quoted only a part of an OT phrase for the purpose of pointing to the more complete citation. Dodd writes that

> we must no doubt allow for the possibility that in some places we have before us nothing more than the rhetorical device of literary allusion, still common enough, and even more common in the period when the New Testament was produced. Such an allusion may stimulate the fancy and give liveliness to an argument which threatens to drag.[176]

Thus, Luke's incomplete allusion to the psalm also requires audience participation.[177]

On one hand, the speeches in Acts "reveal an interdependence of thought" in that "an argument fully developed in one speech is only referred to in a second."[178] Members of Luke's audience who were not very familiar with the psalms may have participated in this speech by piecing together interdependent arguments. On the other hand, members

---

[176]C. H. Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New* (FBBS 3; ed. John Reumann; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), 4.

[177]A similar phenomenon is observed in Euripides' *Electra*. Euripides includes many parodies of Aeschylus in his works. In order to accomplish these parodies, Euripides must "insert clues into his text that are specific enough so as to recall the specific scene of the specific play that is being parodied. . . . In essence, the Euripidean scene must have a built-in footnote to its Aeschylean antecedent. Such a footnote consists of triggers that connect the immediate scene with its imitated predecessor" (Marshall, "Literary Awareness," 86.) By including only references to the Aeschylean scenes, Euripides expected his audience to fill in the information for the intended allusions. (Marshall, "Literary Awareness," 95.)

[178]Townsend, "Speeches in Acts," 151. Townsend gives another example of interdependence in the speeches of Acts 3:22 and Acts 7. Stephen's shorter reference to Deut 18:15 depends on the audience's recollection of Peter's earlier interpretation from Acts 3. This argument is used by Townsend and others to argue for Luke's hand in the speeches of Acts, but the evidence is also useful for the proposal in this paper. Cf. Robert C. Tannehill, "The Functions of Peter's Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts," *NTS* 37 (1991): 401.

of Luke's audience who were familiar with the psalms may have participated in a different way, filling in the literary allusion to Psalm 16 on their own accord.

*Acts 15:6-21 – [The absence of] Paul's speech at the Jerusalem Council*. According to the situation described in Acts 15:1-2, Peter's speech to the Jerusalem council seems a bit out of place. Paul and Barnabas were involved in the debate earlier in the chapter and were explicitly sent to Jerusalem to determine the requirements for pagan salvation. When the council convenes, however, Peter is the one who speaks. Next, Barnabas and Paul relate the signs and wonders God did through them among the Gentiles, but their words are not included. When James stands to deliver the ruling of the council, it is as if Barnabas and Paul had not spoken at all. Yet at the conclusion of the council in verse 22, Barnabas and Paul again are at the center of the activity, and the council's decision heavily impacts their future ministry.[179] Why this inconsistency? Surely Luke is careful enough to catch this discrepancy of forefronting Barnabas and Paul except in the recorded speeches of the council.

Perhaps the audience is expected to step in at this point. Barnabas and Paul have dominated the narrative in Acts 13-15. The audience does not need a rehearsal of their activities among the Gentiles—those events are fresh in the hearers' minds. Instead Luke uses the council dialogue to remind the audience of the more remote encounter with the Gentile Cornelius. Peter's speech serves to remind Luke's audience of Cornelius' conversion; excluding the words spoken by Barnabas and Paul[180] allows the audience to

---

[179]Taylor, *Les Actes*, 5:223.

[180]Paul's account of the Jerusalem Council in Galatians 2 indicates that had Paul's words been recorded, tensions between James, Peter, Barnabas, and Paul might have surfaced in the Acts 15 account. William Walker suggests that Luke omits words and actions that involved the inner conflict of early church

fill in another gap. The activities and experiences of Barnabas and Paul *are* included—by the audience.

*Acts 17:22-31 – Paul's Areopagus speech*. Paul's speech in Acts 17 is interrupted by a sneering crowd (v. 32). At the point of the interruption, Paul has just introduced the only explicitly Christian claim in the entire speech—Christ has been raised from the dead (17:31). Because of this interruption, Paul is not able to include proofs for this claim.[181]

On the level of the story, leaving some of the pagans sneering at Paul underlines the opposition Paul felt at the hands of the philosophers. Kennedy suggests that this opposition fits Luke's purpose of polarizing the situation between Paul and the philosophers.[182] On the level of the narrative and the actual audience, however, the absence of proof again invites audience participation. Certainly the audience can supply the proof from the preceding narrative. The audience might employ the proof of the apostles as witnesses, as used, for instance, in Peter's speech in Acts 10:41. Or the audience could draw upon the proof of Paul's own experience of the risen Jesus, related in Acts 9. Paul himself will use this as proof in later speeches (Acts 22 and 26).

Interestingly, while this speech is rhetorically incomplete, it does form a complete chiasm:

---

leadership. Walker believes that "the author's purpose is neither to exalt Peter nor to denigrate Paul but rather to 'rehabilitate' Paul in the minds of those Christians who, for whatever reason, look upon him with suspicion." See William O. Walker, "Acts and the Pauline Corpus Revisited: Peter's Speech at the Jerusalem Conference" in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips; Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998), 84-85. Here we find an example of a different type of gap—one that Luke may not have wanted the audience to fill.

[181]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 131. Even without proof, Paul's speech is moderately successful. Dionysius, Damaris, and others joined him and believed. With proof, however, one wonders if Paul's speech would have been more effective.

[182]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 131.

A: 23-24 – Introduction: evidence of the ignorance of pagan worship
B: 25-26 – The object of true worship is the one Creator God
C: 26-27 – Proper relationship between humanity and God
B': 28-29 – The objects of false worship are the idols of gold, silver, or stone
A': 30-31 – Conclusion: the time of ignorance is not over[183]

F. F. Bruce calls this speech a "well-constructed and self-contained speech."[184] Paul's Areopagus speech seems to be both complete and incomplete. Luke makes the point of the speech clear: the nature of the proper relationship between humanity and God. The missing proof at the end of the speech, however, gives the audience a task to perform.

*Acts 22:1-21 – Paul's defense in the temple*. Paul has been accused of two crimes in this scene. The Jews from Asia accuse him 1) of preaching against a) the Jews, b) the Law, and c) the Temple; and 2) of bringing a Gentile into the temple and defiling the holy place (Acts 21:27-28). When Paul receives permission to address the angry crowd, however, he only defends himself against the first charge.[185]

Veltman outlines Paul's proofs as follows. To refute the charge that he preaches against the Jews and the Law, Paul offers Ananias as a witness, "a devout man by the standard of the Law," who was "well spoken of by all the Jews who lived [in Damascus]" (22:12). As for the charge that Paul preaches against the Temple, he recalls going to the temple to pray and receiving a word from God in that place (22:17).[186] When Paul reaches the point in God's message that involves going to the Gentiles, however, the

---

[183]Parsons, "Acts," 43

[184]F. F. Bruce, "Speeches in Acts," 56.

[185]Cf. Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 159.

[186]Veltman, "Defense Speeches," 253-254.

crowd interrupts him with angry shouts. Thus, Paul's defense basically fails when he introduces his mission to the Gentiles.[187]

Missing from this speech are Paul's usual appeals to the authority of scripture.[188] Kennedy suggests that had Paul been allowed to continue, he "would presumably have cited evidence from Scripture. . . . he might even have hoped to conclude with an exhortation to repent and be baptized."[189] On the level of the story, the Jews at the temple must disbelieve Paul's speech. Their rejection of his defense leads to the danger that causes Paul to be retained in Roman custody and then moved to Caesarea. There Paul speaks before Felix and Festus and appeals to Caesar, necessitating his travel to Rome. On the level of the narrative and the actual audience, however, the scriptural proof for Paul's speech is not necessarily missing. The evidence from scripture has already been provided for the audience in Acts 13:47 and 15:16-18. The hearers are able to supply this proof for themselves.

Also omitted is a defense against the charge of bringing a Gentile into the temple and so defiling the holy place. Why does Paul not defend himself against this accusation? We might imagine that without interruption, Paul would have continued his speech, defending himself against the second charge brought by the Jews from Asia. In the audience's case, however, that defense is not needed. Acts 21:29 has already provided the listeners with the information to supply the proof for themselves: "for they

---

[187]Cf. Parsons, "Acts," 54.

[188]Of course the handbooks do not require this sort of proof, but including scripture references has been Paul's *modus operandi*, especially when addressing a Jewish audience. William Long also suggests that Paul's speech is missing an attack on his accusers in which Paul could have argued that his accusers brought him to trial with a motivation other than justice (Long, "*Paulusbild*," 102).

[189]Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 135.

had previously seen Trophimus the Ephesian in the city with him, and they *supposed* that Paul had brought him into the temple." The Jews had arrived at an incorrect conclusion.[190] Luke's audience does not need Paul's defense; they provide his defense themselves from information gleaned from the preceding narrative.

*Acts 24:2-8 – Tertullus' speech against Paul*. Luke identifies Tertullus specifically as a ῥήτορος, a rhetor or an attorney, leading the audience to expect a polished and formal speech on his lips. Tertullus, however, fails to include what Quintilian calls the most important element in a judicial speech: the proof.

Bruce Winter suggests that Tertullus' proof consists of "[he] even tried to desecrate the temple" (24:6a).[191] It is more likely, however, that v. 6a is a second accusation rather than evidence of Paul's wrongdoing.[192] Paul himself points out Tertullus' lack of witness or proof in his response (24:19-21).

Ernst Haenchen says that Luke does not allow Tertullus to make a full speech (i.e., include evidence or proof), because "Luke is much too clever to show the adroitness of the lawyer in the handling of the actual accusation."[193] Tertullus could have brought witnesses before Felix to provide proof, and indeed, as 24:9 indicates, there were Jews in attendance ready to provide testimony. Felix does not call them as witnesses, however, and their belated assertions are mentioned only after Tertullus is finished speaking.

---

[190]Cf. Taylor, *Les Actes*, 6:129.

[191]Winter, "Importance of the *captatio benevolentiae*," 519.

[192]See for instance, Taylor, *Les Actes*, 6:166; Long, "*Paulusbild*," 97-98; Veltman, "Defense Speeches," 254; and Harry W. Tajra, *The Trial of St. Paul* (WUNT 35; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1989), 123.

[193]Haenchen, *Acts*, 657.

Derek Hogan suggests that the missing *probatio* signals "the weakness of the case against Paul,"[194] and finally points to Paul's virtue and innocence.[195] I agree that the speech functions in this manner. But why let Paul win this unfair fight? It would be more impressive for Paul brilliantly to defeat a full fledged declamation against him.

What information should the audience supply in order to fill the gap left by Tertullus? What proof is there in the surrounding narrative that supports the charges of stirring up dissension among all the Jews throughout the world? In this case, the audience has no proof. Evidence gleaned from the surrounding narrative does not support Tertullus' accusation. The audience discovers for itself that Tertullus' claims against Paul are false.

The textual variant in Tertullus' speech is interesting. Acts 24:6b-8a is not included in $P^{74}$, **א**, or A, three of the most reliable extant Greek sources.[196] Some Byzantine texts (E, Ψ, and others), however, show evidence of the following Western[197] addition, marked by brackets:

> And he even tried to desecrate the temple; and then we arrested him. [We wanted to judge him according to our own Law. But Lysias the commander came along, and with much violence took him out of our hands, ordering his accusers to come before you.] By examining him yourself concerning all these matters you will be able to ascertain the things of which we accuse him. (Acts 24:6-8)

---

[194]Hogan, "Paul's Defense," 81.

[195]Hogan, "Paul's Defense," 87, especially when comparing Tertullus' incomplete speech and Paul's rhetorically correct speech. Cf. Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 203.

[196]Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 74-75.

[197]"The chief and most constant characteristic of the Western readings is a love of paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences were changed, omitted, and inserted with astonishing freedom, wherever it seemed that the meaning could be brought out with greater force and definiteness." Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 122.

As Dibelius reads the Western variant, Tertullus refers to the examination of *Lysias*, not Paul, in v. 8.[198] If this is the case, the variant "fixes" the missing proof in Tertullus' speech.[199] If, as Dibelius suggests, Lysias is offered as a witness within Tertullus' speech, Tertullus' proof is brief but present, and appropriate for the judge to whom he is appealing. Unfortunately for the Western-text-Tertullus, Lysias is not able to offer testimony—we learn that he has yet to arrive in Caesarea. Instead, the Jews offer their belated, and decidedly less authoritative, witness after Tertullus' speech concludes.

The Western text may show an early attempt at "fixing" the missing rhetorical element in Tertullus' speech. Jenny Read-Heimerdinger's study of Codex Bezae leads her to suggest that variants between the manuscripts of Acts are caused by "the narrator's purpose, his point of view, and, not least, his relationship with his audience, rather than difference in the usage of Greek."[200] By comparing the text of NA[27] and UBS with that of Codex Bezae, we are able to see an ancient audience at work, participating in and interpreting the narrative of Acts.

Returning to the narrative flow of Acts, we find Luke making use of omission, as he did in the gospel, by including enthymemes in which a premise is only implied. Kurz

---

[198]Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 151, n. 32.

[199]The evidence Lysias would have offered most likely relates to the charge of desecrating the temple. In 23:29, Lysias had written to Felix telling him that the Jewish Council had accused Paul "over questions about their Law." He did add that he found Paul innocent of any crime that would deserve death or imprisonment, suggesting that he might *not* have supported Tertullus' primary accusation that Paul "stirs up dissension among all the Jews throughout the world."

[200]Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis of Textual Criticism* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 347. Read-Heimerdinger uses the evidence from her study to claim primacy of the Bezan text over the Alexandrian texts (355). I am not ready to accept primacy of D, but her conclusions about the nature of the variants in D speak to our project. The editorial changes made in the Western text reflect an ancient audience member(s) making clear what he felt was unclear.

offers the example of Acts 17:2b-3.[201] In Luke's attempt to persuade his audience (and Paul's attempt to persuade his), an enthymeme is presented: 1) the Christ must suffer and rise from the dead (17:3);[202] 2) intermediary premise is omitted; 3) Jesus, the one Paul is proclaiming, is the Messiah (17:3). The audience can supply the omitted premise by recalling the events from the gospel of Luke: Jesus suffered and rose from the dead. Therefore, Jesus is the Messiah. The success of Luke's argument depends on the audience supplying the intermediary premise. Those who have paid attention to the story help Luke create the enthymeme that asserts Jesus' identity.

Luke's use of allusions appeals to different sections of his audience. For example, cultural allusions to the common theme of a sea voyage might have appealed to Luke's non-Jewish listeners in particular. Marguerat notes that "the Hellenistic novel makes the sea voyage into the classic locus of the identity quest of the heroes; here [in Acts 27-28] the quest operates by way of a rescue from the powers of evil."[203] Luke has offered ample evidence that Paul is the recipient of divine approval based on allusions linking him to Jesus and on literary allusions to Jewish scriptures. But some audience members may remain unconvinced.[204] In Acts 27-28, allusions to protection from evil

---

[201]Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric," 179.

[202]Kurz notes that the authority of the first premise assumes a "belief in the authority of the Scriptures and the possibility of resurrection" and that "this argument would not convince Aristotle himself" ("Hellenistic Rhetoric," 179). This is to be expected, however, as Paul's audience was Jewish and Luke's audience, at least in the person of Theophilus already acknowledged the authority of Jewish scriptures.

[203]Daniel Marguerat, "The End of Acts (28:16-31) and the Rhetoric of Silence" in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (JSNTSup 90; ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 82.

[204]Marguerat, "End of Acts," 83.

during the course of a sea voyage speak in terms that a non-Jewish audience understands.[205]

At this point, another intratextual allusion crosses between the narratives of Luke and Acts. In Luke 8:22-25, the audience hears about Jesus' authority over the sea and demonic powers. In Acts, God continues to demonstrate this power by protecting Paul on the sea (Acts 27), as well as by exhibiting power over demons (Acts 16:16-18; 19:13-20).[206] For the attentive listener who connects the power in these episodes in Luke and Acts, the allusion solidifies the connection between the man, Jesus, in Luke and the divine Lord of Acts.

Protection from the "peril of the waves is . . . a classic motif of the divine protection of the just."[207] Other signs of divine favor include Paul's survival of the viper bite (28:4); the people of Malta calling Paul a god, and Luke not correcting their assumption (28:6b); others on the island of Malta being healed (28:10); and Paul's ship sailing with the Dioscuri or Twin Brothers as its figurehead (28:11).[208] Audience members who heard these cultural allusions and took seriously the allusions to divine

---

[205]In addition to the elements mentioned below, see Talbert, "The Theology of Sea Storms" in *Reading Luke-Acts*, 175-195, for a catalog of Greek, Roman, Jewish and Christian sources that involve narratives of storms and shipwrecks; theological functions of shipwrecks; and implications of Paul's viper bite and survival.

[206]Talbert, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 192.

[207]Marguerat, "End of Acts," 83. See also D. Ladouceur, "Hellenistic Preconceptions of Shipwreck and Pollution as a Context for Acts 27-28" *HTR* 73 (1980): 435-449; Gary B. Miles and Garry Trompf, "Luke and Antiphon: The Theology of Acts 27-28 in the Light of Pagan Beliefs about Divine Retribution, Pollution, and Shipwreck," *HTR* 69 (1976): 259-267; and Garry Trompf, "On Why Luke Declined to Recount the Death of Paul: Acts 27-28 and Beyond," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*; ed. Charles H. Talbert; New York, 1984, 225-239.

[208]Marguerat, "End of Acts," 83-84. The Dioscuri are Castor and Polydeuces, twin sons of Leda and Zeus and the brothers of Helen of Troy. The twins were known as "the guardians of truth and the punishers of perjury" (Marguerat, "End of Acts," 84).

favor would have connected Paul to one who was blessed by the gods. In particular, given the preceding narrative of Luke and Acts, the audience concludes that Paul is blessed by a particular God, the father of Jesus the Christ. Leading the audience to identify Paul as a recipient of divine favor, the author encourages his hearers to participate by authenticating Paul's message about Jesus as one endorsed by God.

As Acts draws to a close, themes of surprise and reversal appear in 28:17-28. In the preceding chapters, Luke has built the audience's anticipation for Paul's trial, but when arriving at the final chapter, Luke reverses the roles in an unexpected depiction of a trial situation. Although Paul is the prisoner, "he is the one who summons others to his dwelling (28:17a). In the role of judges are the Jews from Rome, and they do not have any evidence against Paul. They ask to hear more from him (28:21-22)."[209] When Paul comes before the Jews, as requested, it is no longer the apostle who is on trial. Instead, the subject of the "trial" is the culpability of the Jews. Margeurat writes that the narrative "audience's split reaction before Paul's preaching is interpreted by the apostle by means of the word of judgment of Isa 6:9-10 (28:25-27). The role reversal is then completed. The accusers . . . have become the ones judged."[210] The audience members had been led by the author to expect a trial, but the nature of the trial reverses their expectations. The surprise generated by this reversal emphasizes that the important trial is not the one concerning Paul's guilt or innocence, but the one concerning Paul's mission to Israel, specifically, writes Marguerat, the failure of that mission.[211]

---

[209]Marguerat, "End of Acts," 84.

[210]Marguerat, "End of Acts," 84.

[211]Marguerat, "End of Acts," 86.

Using tools of double or hidden meanings such as irony, surprise, misdirection, suspense, and humor, Luke draws the audience into participation in the narrative of Acts. When the hearers are surprised, misdirected, or amused they become a part of the story of Peter, Paul, and the early church.

Luke's use of such tools continues to the very end of Acts. John Chrysostom writes that the author "leaves the hearer athirst for more: the heathen authors do the same (in their writings), for to know everything makes the reader dull and jaded."[212] Indeed even "pagan" authors in the 21st century leave their audiences "athirst for more." In a recent article in the SBL forum, Micah Kiel compares the ending of Acts to the end of the HBO series the *Sopranos*. Kiel writes that in the final scene of the series finale,

> Tony [the main character] and his family assemble at a diner, while the song "Don't Stop Believing" by Journey plays from the juke box. The screen goes dark in the middle of the scene, and the song cuts out with the words "don't stop." It is a very abrupt ending, and one that leaves many things unresolved, including an impending grand jury indictment and the contract that has been put on Tony's head by New York.[213]

Kiel offers three responses to this ending and the ending of Acts, which leaves Paul in a similar situation. First, some say the ending is bad, venting frustration and offering explanations for the ending that ought not be. Others say that the endings are fitting or appropriate. The *Sopranos* ends "by doing what made it continually good, offering a frank snapshot of forces that tug at life."[214] The ending of Acts, in its own way, does the

---

[212]*Hom. Act.* 55 (NPNF[1] 11:326). Or, Chrysostom goes on to say, the author omits information because he did not have "it in his power to exhibit it from his own personal knowledge." Chrysostom could not be sure of the author's intent, and neither can we, but evidence from ancient rhetoricians and other omissions in Luke's works make it a viable possibility that Luke leaves Acts open-ended to encourage audience participation.

[213]Micah Kiel, "Did Paul Get Whacked? The Endings of the Sopranos and the Acts of the Apostles," n.p. [cited 21 July 2007]. Online: http://sbl-site.org:80/Article.aspx? ArticleId=695.

[214]Kiel, "Did Paul Get Whacked?."

same thing. Kiel writes that "Acts, at its core, tells the story of God pushing the message of Jesus further into the world. Paul's doing this very thing in Rome is the zenith of this push, the perfect ending to a story that repeatedly narrates God's message crossing into new territory."[215] Finally, and most appropriately for this project, some in the audience feel the need to fill in gaps left by the endings. Fans of the *Sopranos* noted cultural allusions to the *Godfather* movies and an intratextual allusion to an earlier episode in which a character tells Tony, "At the end, you probably don't hear anything, everything just goes black." As a result, Kiel reports that "conspiracy theorists tie these things together and say that the moment the screen went black was the moment Tony dies."[216]

> Similarly, the audience thirsts for more at the end of Acts. The author methodically constructs an expectation in the [audience] which he finally fails to satisfy. Inadvertently? Out of forgetfulness? From shift in strategy? I rather think that Luke in chs. 27-28 organizes a concerted displacement of the [audience's] expectation which he has methodically built up to that point."[217]

When the hearers' expectations remain unfulfilled, it is left to them to complete the story. Norman Petersen writes that "the end of the text is not the end of the work when the narrator leaves material for [audience members] to complete from their imagination, rather than from the text."[218] Attentive listeners would be able to fill in some of the gaps based on the preceding narrative. For instance, Talbert supposes that if

---

[215]Kiel, "Did Paul Get Whacked?."

[216]Kiel, "Did Paul Get Whacked?." Kiel's article concludes the endings to the *Sopranos* and Acts are good endings in that they "ask new questions rather than answering old ones. In these two examples, it seems that the best ending is the one that calls forth an open future and makes you go back to the beginning and start all over again."

[217]Marguerat, "The End of Acts," 75.

[218]Petersen, "When is the End not the End?," 153.

> auditors of Acts complete the ending for themselves based on the plot offered earlier in the narrative [they might infer that] Paul stood before Caesar (cf. 25:12; 27:24); he was innocent (23:29; 25:18-19; 26:31-32); he met his death (20:25, 38); it was not due to Roman Jewry (28:21); it was likely due to corrupt Roman officials (24:26-27; 25:9) who would be following expediency rather than justice.[219]

Dibelius suggests that the ending of Acts may be supplied by Paul's earlier speech to the Ephesian elders:

> since the author does not intend to tell about his martyrdom, Luke does to some extent press the crown of martyrdom upon his [Paul's] head, giving a retrospect of his life and making him direct a warning to the whole Church. . . . As in classical historiological tradition, his intentions are to illuminate historical events by means of speeches and, by embellishing his narrative with them, to emphasise [sic] definite places and occasions.[220]

Conversely, Magness believes that based on the "positive, progressive conclusion of Acts" and the structural clue that the other two main sections of Acts concluded with "summary statements about the advance of the gospel," the audience would fill in "Paul's release and the removal of the Jewish threat would follow his arrest and imprisonment."[221]

But Luke does not end Acts with these conclusions. Instead, he "fails to include Paul's history after his two years' Roman house imprisonment,"[222] leaving the audience with a "rhetoric of silence [that leads listeners] to bring the narrative to completion."[223] Luke is careful to mention, though, that two whole years pass. Kurz remarks that the use of the aorist tense, `evne,meinen` (Paul *remained* in the house for two years), implies

---

[219]Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 235.

[220]Dibelius, "Speeches in Acts," 158.

[221]Magness, *Sense and Absence*, 85.

[222]Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 30.

[223]Marguerat, "End of Acts," 89.

that the narrator knows what happened after those two years, but "by choosing to withhold this knowledge from the audience he leaves an obvious deliberate gap in the plot at the climactic position of its conclusion [and invites the hearers] to fill them."[224] Ending the story of Acts with Paul's unhindered preaching "propels the narrative toward the future and the time of the intended [audience]."[225] The agenda of Paul and the Risen One, Marguerat writes, is now intertwined with that of the audience—"an agenda which is ever open-ended . . . which is waiting to be redrawn in the life of the [hearer]."[226]

*Conclusion*

In the book of Acts, the third evangelist continues to use rhetorical tools to encourage audience participation. He uses omission, as seen in several speeches and in the end of Acts; hidden meaning, specifically irony, misdirection, and surprise; and various types of allusion, often with an eye toward the identity of the listeners. Luke and Acts also share the unique position of being New Testament books by the same author. In Acts, some gaps left by the Gospel of Luke are filled. The audience must pay attention to the narrative in order to gather the information needed to complete the story. Not all gaps, however, are filled by the time Acts ends; Luke leaves the listeners with the responsibility of continuing the story of Jesus and his followers in their own lives.

---

[224]Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 35.

[225]Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 31.

[226]Marguerat, "End of Acts," 89.

*Conclusion*

The narratives of Luke and Acts show marked evidence that the author encouraged, and perhaps at some points even assumed, audience participation. The author makes use of the tools identified by ancient rhetoricians—privileged information, omissions, comparisons, hidden meanings, question and answer situations, and allusions—to encourage such participation. The use of these tools often serves to retain the audience's attention, encourage moral formation in the audience, and prompt the audience to help the author create the story

# CHAPTER SEVEN

## Conclusion

The impetus behind this project began with a seminar project on the missing *probatio* in Tertullus' speech in Acts 24. A cursory survey of ancient rhetoricians reveals that the *probatio* is the one element that must be included in a successful speech (*Inst.*, 5.Pr.5; *Rhet. Her.* 1.10.18). Thus it is striking that Luke omitted this element from Tertullus' speech. The case of the missing *probatio* led to a search for rhetorician comments on audience, an exploration that uncovered a surprising amount of information demonstrating that rhetoricians were quite concerned with the audience. Aristotle wrote that "the poets follow the wish of the spectators" (*Poet*. 8.10), and a happy audience is an engaged audience. Rhetoricians taught authors and orators to involve their audiences by leaving gaps for the audience to fill, describing an ancient, intentional, sophisticated method for encouraging audience participation. Audiences responded, paying attention to the rhetoricians' words, helping create the story, and in the process being morally formed.

To this end, rhetoricians described several tools used to create gaps for the audience. We have organized these tools, gleaned from ancient rhetorical handbooks and treatises, into a set of six, most with sub-categories: 1) access to privileged information; 2) omissions such as understood information and enthymeme; 3) open-ended comparisons such as metaphor, riddle, fable, and parable; 4) hidden or double meanings such as innuendo, irony, and surprise or misdirection; 5) question and answer; and 6) allusions, including cultural, literary, and intratextual references. In theory, rhetoricians

prescribed these methods, but it remained to be shown that the methods were put to practical use. Samples of pagan, Hebrew and Jewish, New Testament narrative, and Lucan literature were examined for evidence of the six tools suggested by rhetoricians to encourage audience participation.

The investigation showed that in many cases, the tools used to encourage audience participation worked together. For instance, irony is often assisted by privileged information; question and answer may be included in an open-ended metaphor; and allusions almost always make use of understood information. In fact, understood information is so integrally connected to the other rhetorical tools that I often did not treat it as a separate category in the main chapters. One can easily see, for example, understood information implied at the beginnings of Luke and Acts: Theophilus has already been taught things about Jesus that Luke is not going to include in his book.

The representatives of pagan literature (including histories, novels, and biographies) showed that these writers did use these tools. The way that the tools were used, however, differed from author to author. These authors, such as Herodotus and the Greco-Roman novelists, often used these tools to retain the hearers' attention by encouraging them to help create the stories. While the expectation for moral formation may seem low, the authors' success still depended on the attention of their audiences; who would remember if the stories were not heard? Other authors, such as Livy (*Ab Urbe Condita* Preface, 9-10) and Plutarch (*Per.* 1.3) expressed a moral purpose for their writings. In service of that purpose, Livy and Plutarch used these tools to encourage audience participation. Their listeners, having helped create the stories, were more strongly inclined to be morally formed by the lessons the texts contained.

Hebrew and Jewish literature also had a purpose beyond pure entertainment, although the element of entertainment was still certainly present. The authors and editors of the examined texts told stories in order to morally form their listeners. The canonical and extra-canonical works make use of all six tools, leaving gaps for their audiences to fill. The success of the narratives depends upon the activity of the audience. Without audience participation, the narratives remain merely entertainment; the higher purpose of the stories remains unfulfilled.

Turning to the New Testament, we found more evidence that ancient authors actively encouraged the audience to participate in their narratives. The Gospel of Mark shows that the evangelist used the tools of omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden meanings including misdirection and irony, question and answer, and allusion. By examining the gospel in light of these tools, the gaps left in Mark's rhetoric may be understood not as holes left by an inexperienced and uneducated writer, but as invitations to his audiences to join in the creation of the story of "the good news of Jesus Christ, Son of God" (1:1).

Matthew shows similar evidence, using omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden meaning, and allusion to engage the audience. The Sermon on the Mount makes particular use of these tools to encourage the audience's ethical formation, the primary purpose suggested by Talbert. Encouraging the hearers' participation in the narrative makes them more receptive to its lessons. As Plutarch wrote:

> when [the hearers'] intelligence has comprehended the main points [of a speech], they put the rest together *by their own efforts*, and use their memory as a guide in thinking for themselves, and, taking the discourse of another as a germ and seed, develop and expand it. For the mind does not require filling like a bottle, but rather, like wood, it only requires kindling to create in it an impulse to think independently and an ardent desire for truth (*Mor*. 1.48B-48C, emphasis mine).

Matthew's listeners work with the evangelist and through their efforts, their minds are kindled with "an impulse to think independently and an ardent desire for truth."

The Gospel of John, like the two synoptic gospels before it, makes use of these tools to encourage audience participation. The author used access to privileged information, omission, open-ended comparisons, hidden meaning, and allusion to draw the audience into his story. By attending to the comparisons in John, the audience discerns the identity of Jesus. An attentive audience understands that in comparison to other vines, shepherds, and lights, Jesus is the truest and greatest. Indeed, from the opening verse of the Prologue, John's audience knows of Jesus' divine identity and provenance. Drawing on the structure of the ascending/descending redeemer myth, the audience understands Jesus' divinity, but a new element is introduced when the evangelist writes that the Word *became* flesh. Having gained the audience's attention, John tells the story of this miracle, so that his hearers might "believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing might have life in his name" (20:31).

Finally, our investigation turned to the Gospel of Luke and Acts. Like the authors examined before him, Luke demonstrates a desire for his audience's participation. Evidence of the six rhetorical tools outlined in chapter 2 is particularly evident in the gospel's parables and several speeches in Acts.

The two books also have the distinction of being the only New Testament books to be written in conjunction with one another; Acts serves as the sequel to the gospel of Luke. This relationship provides us with an extended example of the tool of intratextual allusion. Issues left unrealized in Luke find their fulfillment in the book of Acts; rhetorical elements in Acts refer back to comments made in the story of Luke. The books

work together to tell the story of Jesus and those who followed him. All is not resolved, however, at the end of Acts. The narrative leaves the issue of Paul's trial unresolved, and even more importantly, the survival of Christianity is unknown as the book ends. This final omission leaves work in the hands of the listeners of the narrative. If indeed the gospel is to be taken to the ends of the earth, it will be by their feet and hands and mouths; the audience must complete the task begun by the apostles and the early church.

As noted in the introduction, Fowler has lamented the audience as an underrepresented factor in the rhetorical process.[1] This neglected element of rhetoric appears to have been a vital component for the creation of rhetorical communication. Without the audience's attention and without its active participation, authors and speakers failed at their task. As early as Homer, we begin to find evidence that the tellers of stories anticipated the needs and wishes of the audience, and authors and rhetors throughout the centuries have not ceased in their attempts to "engrave in the hearer's mind" (*Rhet. Her.*3.14.24).

During the course of this study, it has become clear that several modern methodologies, such as literary gap theory, as discussed by Sternberg and Iser, and, at least in part, reader-response and audience-oriented criticisms are not only modern constructions. These theories have roots in the most ancient records of rhetorical practice. Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and Theon, among others, recommended encouraging listeners to respond to a narrative by creating gaps for the audience to fill. Modern systematics and terminology, of course, are absent from the rhetorical treatises, but the concept is present and strong. Long before modern study of these methods

---

[1]Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 9.

developed, rhetoricians were already persuading audiences by allowing them to be co-workers and co-creators of the story.

It has also become clear that we have observed a very general methodology. Tools for encouraging audience participation appear on almost every page of a rhetorical piece, in varied measure and with varying levels of interpretative import. At times, recognizing these rhetorical tools at work in the narrative does not yield any additional hermenutical insight. In other instances, however, appreciating the methodology produces positive benefits for the interpreter. First, as members of the modern audience, we are made more aware of the necessity of paying attention. The narratives examined in this project have been dissected and in some cases venerated for thousands of years, and as a result they sometimes seem to have lost their persuasive capacity. Re-opening the gaps closed by years of scholarship reinvigorates the power of the narratives. Second, we recognize the responsibility that we share with the ancient audience to be co-workers with ancient authors, helping them create story. In our particular context as the people of God reading the Hebrew, Jewish, and Greek Scriptures, we are all the more likely to be persuaded by the argument we help complete, astonished by the pictures we help draw, and formed by the story we help create.

This project creates various avenues for future research, even within the relatively limited field of biblical studies. The wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible, with its purpose of moral formation, is an excellent place to search for further evidence of tools that encourage audience participation. Comparing the accounts of 1 and 2 Kings to the later texts of 1 and 2 Chronicles may provide an instructive view of how a very early audience interpreted the account of the monarchy. Further comparision of the Hebrew

Bible and its Greek translations may also reveal instances in which the ancient audience of translators participated in the biblical story by filling gaps left in the Hebrew text.

In the New Testament, further investigation into the differences between the Synoptic gospels, as well as differences found in textual variants will continue to provide information concerning the ancient audience's response to the stories of Jesus and the early church. An interesting correlary study might involve instances in which the author *does not* leave gaps. Assuming Markan priority in the case of the man who asked Jesus what he should do to inherit eternal life, Luke chooses to create a narrative gap; Matthew does not. Why is this, and what rhetorical purpose might Matthew's choice serve? The letters of Paul, with their sophisticated rhetorical features, were not dealt with in this project, but certainly contain evidence of the rhetorical tools identified in this project. In fact, work in this area has already begun.[2]

Beyond the texts of Scripture, modern rhetors should take to heart the lessons taught by the ancients. Those who proclaim the gospel would do well to invite the audience's participation. A passive audience may remain untouched, but active hearers who help the proclaimer create the story in their own minds come away from that encounter formed and changed, continuing to create the story in their own lives. How this invitation might be issued in modern settings is another area for further contemplation and research. The expectation of and dependence upon the listener's

---

[2]For example, the following works study Paul's use of enthymeme: Anthony J. Guerra, "Romans 4 as Apologetic Theology," *HTR* 81:3 (1988): 251-270; Paul A. Holloway, "The Enthymeme as an Element of Style in Paul," *JBL* 120:2 (2001): 329-339; John C. Poirier, "Romans 5:13-14 and the Universality of Law" *NovT* 38 (1996): 344-358; Marty L. Reid, *Augustinian and Pauline Rhetoric in Romans Five: A Study in Early Christian Rhetoric* (Mellen Biblical Press Series 30; Lewiston: Mellen Biblical Press, 1996); and Duane F. Watson, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and its Implications for the Unity Question" *NovT* 30:1 (1988): 57-88.

participation did not end with the passing of the ancient audience. The responsibility extends to people of all times and cultures who would come with ears to hear.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY


Abrahams, I. "Tobit and Genesis." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 5:2 (1893): 348-350.

Alexander, Loveday. *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Allen, Archibald W. "Livy as Literature." *Classical Philology* 51:4 (1956): 251-254.

Aratus. "*Phaenomena*." Pages 206-299 in *Callimachus: Hymns and Epigrams; Lycophron, with an English Translation by A. W. Mair; Aratus, with an English Translation by G. R. Mair*. Translated by G. R. Mair. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Aristotle. *Rhetorica*. Translated by John Henry Freese. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

_____. *Poetica*. Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

_____. "*Rhetoric.*" Pages 95-503 in *Poetics and Rhetoric* by Aristotle. Translated by S. H. Butcher and W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Barnes & Noble Classics, 2005.

Asada, Eiji. "The Hebrew Text of Zechariah 1-8 Compared with the Different Ancient Versions." *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* 12 (1896): 173-196.

Aune, David E. "Hellenistic World." Pages xxv-xxxii in *Deuterocanonicals/ Apocrypha*. Edited by Watson E. Mills and Richard F. Wilson. Mercer Commentary on the Bible 5. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2002.

_____. "The Use and Abuse of the Enthymeme in New Testament Scholarship." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 299-320.

Baldwin, Charles Sears. *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic*. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959.

Baldwin, Joyce G. *Esther: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Edited by D. J. Wiseman. Oxford: Intervarsity, 1984.

Bartsch, Shadi. *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Beach, Richard. *A Teacher's Introduction to Reader-Response Theories*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1993.

Beacham, Richard C. *The Roman Theater and Its Audience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Best, Ernest. "Mark's Readers: A Profile." Pages 838-858 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et.al. 3 vols. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited." Pages 141-155 in *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric*. Edited by Keith V. Erickson. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Black, C. Clifton. "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Response to Lawrence Wills." *Harvard Theological Review* 81 (1988): 1-18.

Black, Edwin. "Plato's View of Rhetoric." Pages 35-49 in *Exploring Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*. Edited by Christine L. Harold and Stephen H. Browne. Euclid, Ohio: Williams Custom Publishing, 2002.

Blackham, H. J. *The Fable as Literature*. New Hampshire: Athlone Press, 1985.

Blount, Brian K. "Is the Joke on Us? Mark's Irony, Mark's God, and Mark's Ending." Pages 16-32 in *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God: Essays in Memory of Donald Harrisville Juel*. Edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Patrick D. Miller. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005.

Bohak, Gideon. Joseph and Aseneth *and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Botha, J. Eugene. "John 4:16a: A Difficult Text Speech Act Theoretically Revisited." Pages 183-192 in *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspectives*. Edited by Mark W. G. Stibbe. New Testament Tools and Studies 17. New York: Brill, 1993.

Boulogne, Jacques. "Les ΣΥΓΚΡΙΣΕΙΣ de Plutarque une Rhétorique de la ΣΥΝΚΡΑΣΙΣ." Pages 33-44 in *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch: Acta of the IVth International Congress of the* International Plutarch Society *Leuven, July 3-6, 1996*. Edited by L. van der Stockt. Collection D'Études Classiques 11. Louvain: Éditions Peeters, 2000.

Brandt, Pierre-Yves. "De l'usage de la frontière dans la rencontre entre Jésus et la Syrophénicienne (Mc 7/24-30)." *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 74:2 (1999), 173-188.

Brawley, Robert L. "Evocative Allusions in Matthew: Matthew 5:5 as a Test Case." *Hervormde teologiese studies* 59 (2003): 597-619.

_____. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Bredin, Mark. "Introduction" to *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Edited by Mark Bredin. Library of Second Temple Studies 55. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

Bridges, Linda McKinnish. "Flashes of Light in the Night: Reading the Aphorisms of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 103-120 in *Perspectives on John: Method and Interpretation in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Robert B. Sloan and Mikeal C. Parsons. NABPR Special Studies Series 11. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1993.

Brower, Kent. "Elijah in the Markan Passion Narrative." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* (1983): 85-101.

Brown, Raymond. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Bruce, F. F. *The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles*. London: Tyndale Press, 1942.

_____. "The Speeches in Acts—Thirty Years After." Pages 53-68 in *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology*. Edited by Robert Banks. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Bullard, Roger A. and Howard A. Hatton. *A Handbook on Tobit and Judith*. New York: United Bible Societies, 2001.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Burnyeat, Myles F. "Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Rationality of Rhetoric." Pages 88-115 in *Essays on Aristotle's* Rhetoric. Edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996.

Burridge, Richard A. "About People, By People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences." Pages 113-145 in *The Gospel for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Butcher, Samuel Henry. *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art.* New York: Dover Publications, 1951.

Cadbury, Henry. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1958.

_____. "The Speeches in Luke-Acts." Pages 402-427 in *The Beginnings of Christianity I: The Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. 5. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Cahill, Michael. "Reader-Response Criticism and the Allegorizing Reader." *Theological Studies* 57 (1996): 89-96.

Camery-Hoggatt, Jerry. *Irony in Mark's Gospel: Text and Subtext*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Caponigro, Mark Stephen. "Judith, Holding the Tale of Herodotus." Pages 47-59 in *"No One Spoke Ill of Her": Essays on Judith*. Edited by James C. Vanderkam. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Carson, D. A. "John and the Johannine Epistles." Pages 245-264 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Carter, Warren. "Matthew 4:18-22 and Matthean Discipleship: An Audience-Oriented Perspective." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997): 58-75.

Carter, Warren and John Paul Heil. *Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 30. Washington DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998.

Chalmers, Walter R. "Plautus and his Audience." Pages 21-50 in *Roman Drama*. Edited by T. A. Dorey and Donald R. Dudley. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Chariton. *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Pages 17-124 in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Edited by B. P. Reardon. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.

Chesnutt, Randall D. *From Death to Life: Conversion in* Joseph and Aseneth. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement 16. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.

_____. "Perceptions of Oil in Early Judaism and the Meal Formula in Joseph and Aseneth." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14 (2005): 113-132.

Chrysostom, John. *Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles*. In vol. 11 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1. Edited by Philip Schaff. 1886-1889. 14 vols. Repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Cicero. *Brutus; Orator.* Vol. 5. Translated by G. L. Hendrickson and H. M. Hubbell. 28 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

_____. *De Oratore*. Translated by H. Rackham. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Clark, Donald Lemen. *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1957.

Clarke, Martin Lowther. *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey*. London: Cohen & West, 1953.

*Clementine Recognitions*. In vol. VIII of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 1885-1887. 10 vols. Repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.

Clines, David J. A. *The Esther Scroll*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 30. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984.

Coats, George W. "Parable, Fable, and Anecdote: Storytelling in the Succession Narrative." *Interpretation* 35 (1981): 368-382.

Cole, R. Alan. *Mark*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Conley, Thomas M. "The Enthymeme in Perspective" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984): 168-169.

Conzelmann, Hans. "Address of Paul on the Areopagus." Pages 217-230 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.

_____. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Cook, Michael J. *Mark's Treatment of the Jewish Leaders*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Craghan, John F. "Judith Revisited." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 12 (1982): 50-53.

Craven, Toni. "Tradition and Convention in the Book of Judith." *Semeia* 28 (1983): 49-61.

Culpepper, R. Alan. "Reading Johannine Irony." Pages 193-207 in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

Davis, Todd F. and Kenneth Womack. *Formalist Criticism and Reader-Response Theory*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Day, Linda. *Three Faces of a Queen: Characterization in the Books of Esther*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 186. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

De Troyer, Kristin. *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther. Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1-17, LXX 8:1-17, and AT 7:14-41*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 48. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

DeSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.

Demetrius. *On Style*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Detweiler, Robert. "What is a Sacred Text?" *Semeia* 31 (1985): 213-230.

Dewald, Carolyn. "Herodotus' *Histories*." Pages 62-82 in *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Edited by Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Dewey, Joanna. "Jesus' Healings of Women: Conformity and Non-Conformity to Dominant Cultural Values as Clues for Historical Reconstruction." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24 (1994), 122-131.

Dibelius, Martin. "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography." Pages 138-191 in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. Translated by Mary Ling. New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1956.

Dilts, Mervin R. and George A. Kennedy, eds. *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire: Introduction, Text, and Translation of the* Arts of Rhetoric *Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara*. New York: Brill, 1997.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Antiquitates Romanae*. Translated by Earnest Cary. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937-1950.

Docherty, Susan. "*Joseph and Aseneth*: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35 (2004): 27-48.

Dodd, C. H. *The Old Testament in the New*. Edited by John Reumann. Facet Books Biblical Series 3. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963

Donahue, John R. and Daniel J. Harrington. *The Gospel of Mark*. Sacra Pagina Series 2. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2002.

Dormandy, Richard. "Jesus' Cutting Irony: Further Understanding of Mark 11:17." *Expository Times* 114 (2003): 333-334.

Dowd, Sharyn. *Reading Mark: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2000.

Duckworth, George E. *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*. 2d ed. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952.

Dudley, Merle B. "Speeches in Luke-Acts." *Evangelical Quarterly* 50 (1978): 147-155.

Duff, Timothy. "Plutarchan *Synkrisis*: Comparisons and Contradictions." Pages 141-161 in *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch: Acta of the IVth International Congress of the* International Plutarch Society *Leuven, July 3-6, 1996*. Edited by L. van der Stockt. Collection D'Études Classiques 11. Louvain: Éditions Peeters, 2000.

_____. *Plutarch's* Lives*: Exploring Virtue and Vice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Duke, Paul D. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Eco, Umberto. "Between Author and Text." Pages 67-88 in *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Edited by Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

_____. "Interpretation and History." Pages 23-43 in *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Edited by Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

_____. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Elliott, James K. "Text and Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel." *Theologishce Zeitschrift* 27 (1971): 255-262.

Erasmo, Mario. *Roman Tragedy: Theatre to Theatricality*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.

Erbse, Hartmut. "Die Bedeutung der Synkrisis in der Parallelbiographien Plutarchs." *Hermes* 84 (1956): 389-424.

Erickson, Keith V. Introduction to *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric*. Edited by Keith V. Erickson. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Esler, Philip F. "Ludic History in the Book of Judith: The Reinvention of Israelite Identity?" *Biblical Interpretation* 10 (2002): 107-143.

Evans, C. F. "'Speeches' in Luke-Acts." Pages 287-302 in *Melanges Bibliques en homage au R. P. Beda Rigaux*. Edited by Albert Descamps and R. P. Andre de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.

Fewell, Danna. *Circle of Sovereignty: A Story of Stories in Daniel 1-6*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988.

_____. *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible.* Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.

Fewell, Danna and David M. Gunn. *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Tobit*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

Fleddermann, Harry. "A Warning about the Scribes (Mark 12:37b-40)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982), 52-67.

Focant, Camille. "La recontextualisation d'Is 6,9-10 en Mc 4,10-12, ou un example de non-citation." Pages 143-176 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C.M. Tuckett. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.

Fokkelman, Jan P., L. J. de Regt, and Jan de Waard eds. *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Forbes, Greg W. *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 198. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Fountain, A. Kay. *Literary and Empirical Readings of the Books of Esther*. Studies in Biblical Literature 43. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.

Fowler, Robert M. "Irony and the Messianic Secret in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 26-36 in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society: Vol 1, 1981*. [S.I]: Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society, 1981.

_____. *Let the Reader Understand*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

_____. *Loaves and Fishes. The Function of the Feeding Stories in the Gospel of Mark*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 54. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981.

_____. "Reading Matthew Reading Mark: Observing the First Steps toward Meaning-as-Reference in the Synoptic Gospels." Pages 1-16 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1986*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 25. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1986.

_____. "Using Literary Criticism on the Gospels." *Christian Century* 99 (1982): 626-629.

_____. "Who is 'The Reader' in Reader Response Criticism?" *Semeia* 31 (1985): 5-23.

Fox, Michael V. *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.

_____. "The Redaction of the Greek Alpha-Text of Esther." Pages 207-220 in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov with Weston W. Fields. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

Freese, John Henry, trans. *Rhetorica*, by Aristotle. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Funk, Robert W. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1988.

Fyfe, W. Hamilton, trans. *Poetics*, by Aristotle. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Garner, Richard. *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Gasque, W. Ward. *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Gerhardsson, Birger. "If We Do Not Cut the Parables Out of Their Frames." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 331-335.

_____. *The Good Samaritan—The Good Shepherd?* Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 16. Lund: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1958.

Giblin, Charles Homer. "The Beginning of the Ongoing Gospel (Mk 1,2-18,8)." Pages 975-985 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. 3 vols. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

Gibson, Bruce. "Ovid on Reading: Reading Ovid: Reception in Ovid, *Trista 2*." Pages 346-379 in *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism*. Edited by Andrew Laird. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Glasson, Thomas F. "The Main Source of Tobit" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 71 (1959): 275-277.

Goldman, Stan. "Narrative and Ethical Ironies in Esther." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 47 (1990): 25-26.

Good, Edwin M. *Irony in the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.

Goodenough, Erwin R. "The Perspective of Acts." Pages 51-59 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.

Gooding, David W. "Text-Sequence and Translation-Revision in 3 Reigns IX 10 - X 33." *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969): 448-463.

_____. "The Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct." *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965): 325-335.

Gordon, Paul. *The Critical Double: Figurative Meaning in Aesthetic Discourse*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995.

Gordon, Robert P. "The Second Septuagint Account of Jeroboam: History or Midrash?" *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 368-393.

Grant, Michael. *Greek and Roman Historians: Information and Misinformation*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Guerra, Anthony J. "Romans 4 as Apologetic Theology." *Harvard Theological Review* 81:3 (1988): 251-270.

Haag, Ernst. *Studien zum Buche Judith: Seine Theologische Bedeutung und Literarische Eigenart*. Trier: Paulinus, 1963.

Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by Bernard Nobel and Gerald Shinn. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Hägg, Tomas. *The Novel in Antiquity*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983.

Halliwell, Stephen. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle: Translation and Commentary*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Hardison, Jr., O. B. Commentary in *Aristotle's* Poetics*: A Translation and Commentary for Students of Literature*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Hemingway, Ernest. *Death in the Afternoon*. New York: Collier & Son, 1932.

Hermogenes. *The* Preliminary Exercises *Attributed to Hermogenes*. Pages 73-88 in *Progymnasmata Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric.* Translated by George A. Kennedy. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Herodotus. *History*. Translated by A. D. Godley. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1931.

Hester, J. David. "Dramatic Inconclusion: Irony and the Narrative Rhetoric of the Ending of Mark." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 57 (1995): 61-86.

Hilgert, Earle. "Speeches in Luke-Acts and Hellenistic Canons of Historiography and Rhetoric." Pages 83-109 in *Good News in History: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by Ed. L. Miller. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Hill, Forbes I. "Aristotle's Rhetorical Theory: With a Synopsis of Aristotle's Rhetoric." Pages 51-110 in *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*. 2n ed. Edited by James J. Murphy and Richard A. Katula. Davis, Calif.: Hermagoras Press, 1995.

_____. "The Rhetoric of Aristotle." Pages 50-87 in *Exploring Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*. Edited by Christine L. Harold and Stephen H. Browne. Euclid, Ohio: Williams Custom Publishing, 2002.

Hock, Ronald F. "The Educational Curriculum in Chariton's *Callirhoe*." Pages 15-36 in *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 32. Edited by Jo-Ann A. Brant, Charles W. Hedrick, and Chris Shea. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Hogan, Derek. "Paul's Defense: A Comparison of the Forensic Speeches in Acts, *Callirhoe*, and *Leucippe and Clitophon*." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 29 (2002): 73-87.

Hollenbach, Bruce. "Lest they should Turn and be Forgiven: Irony." *The Bible Translator* 34 (1983): 312-321.

Holloway, Paul A. "The Enthymeme as an Element of Style in Paul." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120:2 (2001): 329-339.

Horsley, G. H. R. "Speeches and Dialogue in Acts." *New Testament Studies* 3 (1986): 609-614.

Howard, Tracy. "The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: An Alternative Solution." *Bibliotheca sacra* 143 (1986): 314-328.

Hubbard, Moyer V. "Honey for Aseneth: Interpreting a Religious Symbol." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 16 (1997): 97-110.

Hudson, Hoyt H. "The Field of Rhetoric." Pages 3-15 in *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*. Edited by Raymond F. Howes. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961.

Huey, Jr., F. B. "Irony as the Key to Understanding the Book of Esther." *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 32 (1990): 36-39.

Humphrey, Edith M. *Joseph and Aseneth*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Humphreys, W. Lee. "The Story of Esther and Mordecai: An Early Jewish Novella." Pages 97-113 in *Saga Legend Tale Novella Fable: Narrative Forms in Old Testament Literature*. Edited by George W. Coats. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 35. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

Hunt, Everett Lee. "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians." Pages 19-70 in *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*. Edited by Raymond F. Howes. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961.

Hurley, Robert. "Allusion Et Traces d'Ironie Dans Un Texte De Marc." *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses* 30 (2001): 293-305.

Iersel, Bas M.F. van. *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary*. Translated by W.H. Bisscheroux. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 164. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Ingarden, Roman. *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*. Translated by Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olsen. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

_____. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

_____. "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach." *New Literary History* 3 (1972): 279-299.

Isocrates. "To Philip." Pages 247-339 in *Isocrates*. Edited and translated by George Norlin. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966-1968.

Jeffrey, David L. "John Wyclif and the Hermeneutic of Reader-Response." *Interpretation* 39 (1985): 272-287.

Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.

Jimémez, Aurelio Pérez. "Exemplum: The Paradigmatic Education of the Ruler in the *Lives* of Plutarch." Pages 105-114 in *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98-117 A.D.)*. Edited by Philip A. Stadter and Luc Van der Stockt. *Symolae* A.29. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.

Jobes, Karen. *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Jolles, André. *Einfache Formen: Legende/Sage/Mythe/Rätsel/Spruch/Kasus/ Memorabile/Märchen/Witz*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1958.

Juel, Donald H. "A Disquieting Silence: A Matter of the Ending." Pages 1-13 in *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God: Essays in Memory of Donald Harrisville Juel*. Edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Patrick D. Miller. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

_____. *A Master of Surprise: Mark Interpreted*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

_____. *The Gospel of Mark*. Interpreting Biblical Texts. Edited by Charles B. Cousar. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1964.

Katz, Peter. "Das Problem des Urtextes der Septuaginta." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 5 (1949): 1-24.

Kee, Howard Clark. "The Socio-Cultural Setting of Joseph and Aseneth." *New Testament Studies* 29 (1983): 394-413.

Kelly, Douglas. "Oral Xenophon." Pages 149-163 in *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*. Edited by Ian Worthington. New York: Brill, 1996.

Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

_____, trans. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

_____. *Quintilian*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969.

_____. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Kermode, Frank. *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Keulen, Percy S. F. van. *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquirí into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 104. Boston: Brill, 2005.

Kieffer, René. "The Implied Reader in John's Gospel." Pages 66-82 in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives: Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel in Århus 1997*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 182. Edited by Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Kiel, Micah. "Did Paul Get Whacked? The Endings of the Sopranos and the Acts of the Apostles." No pages. Cited 21 July 2007. Online: http://sbl-site.org:80/Article.aspx?ArticleId=695.

Kinukawa, Hisako. "The Syrophoenician Woman: Mark 7.24-30." Pages 138-155 in *Voices from the Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World*. Edited by R.S. Sugirtharajah. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995.

Knowles, Michael P. "What Was the Victim Wearing? Literary, Economic, and Social Contexts for the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *Biblical Interpretation* 12 (2004): 145-174.

Kraemer, Ross Shepard. *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Kurz, William S. "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42:2 (1980): 171-195.

_____. "Intertextual Permutations of the Genesis Word in the Johannine Prologues." Pages 179-190 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 5. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

_____. *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

Ladouceur, D. "Hellenistic Preconceptions of Shipwreck and Pollution as a Context for Acts 27-28." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 435-449.

Lamberton, Robert. *Plutarch*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Lambrecht, Jan. "A Note on Luke 15, 11-32." Pages 299-306 in *Luke and His Readers: Festchrift A. Denaux*. Edited by R. Bieringer, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.

Lasine, Stuart. "The Riddle of Solomon's Judgment and the Riddle of Human Nature in the Hebrew Bible." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 45 (1989): 61-86.

Lee, John A. L. "Translations of the Old Testament." Pages 775-783 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 BC – AD 400*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. New York: Brill, 1997.

Levenson, Jon D. *Esther: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita*. Translated by B. O. Foster. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Loader, John A. "Esther as a Novel with Different Levels of Meaning." *Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche wissenshaft* 90:3 (1978): 417-421.

Long, William R. "The *Paulusbild* in the Trial of Paul." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 22 (1983): 87-105.

"Longinus." *On the Sublime*. Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Lyons, William John. "The Words of Gamaliel (Acts 5:38-39) and the Irony of Indeterminacy." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 68 (1997): 23-49.

Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Magness, J. Lee. *Sense and Absence: Structure and Suspension in the Ending of Mark's Gospel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 29-48.

_____. "The Jewish Leaders in the Gospel of Mark: A Literary Study of Marcan Characterization." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 259-281.

_____. "The Major Importance of Minor Characters in Mark." Pages 58-86 in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Elizabeth Stuthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 109. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

_____. *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplemental Series 109. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Manning, Jr., Gary T. *Echoes of a Prophet. The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 270. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Marguerat, Daniel. "The End of Acts (28:16-31) and the Rhetoric of Silence." Pages 74-89 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Marshall, C. W. "Literary Awareness in Euripides and His Audience." Pages 81-98 in *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*. Edited by Ian Worthington. New York: Brill, 1996.

Martin, Michael W. "Judas the Secessionist: Reading Johannine Syncrisis in its Mediterranean Milieu." Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 2005.

Mattill, Andrew J. "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Reconsidered." Pages 108-122 in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque. Exeter,: Paternoster, 1970.

McBurney, James H. "The Place of the Enthymeme in Rhetorical Theory." Pages 117-140 in *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric*. Edited by Keith V. Erickson. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

McCracken, David. "Character in the Boundary: Bakhtin's Interdividuality in Biblical Narratives." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 3-42.

_____. "Narration and Comedy in the Book of Tobit." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995): 401-418.

McDonald, J. Ian H. "Rhetorical Issue and Rhetorical Strategy in Luke 10.25-37 and Acts 10.1-11.18." Pages 59-73 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Meagher, John C. *Clumsy Construction in Mark's Gospel: A Critique of Form- and Redaktionsgeschichte*. Toronto Studies in Theology 3. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1979.

Menken, Maarten J. J. "The Old Testament Quotation in Jn 19,36. Sources Redaction, Background." Pages 2101-2118 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et.al. 3 vols. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

Metzger, Bruce. *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Michel, Peter. "Figurative Speech: Function, Form, Exegesis." Pages 136-158 in *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Clemens Thoma and Michael Wyschogrod. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Miles, Gary B. and Garry Trompf. "Luke and Antiphon: The Theology of Acts 27-28 in the Light of Pagan Beliefs about Divine Retribution, Pollution, and Shipwreck." *Harvard Theological Review* 69 (1976): 259-267.

Moessner, David P. "Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet like Moses in Acts." Pages 203-212 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1983*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 22. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1983.

_____. "*Two* Lords 'at the Right Hand'? The Psalms and an Intertextual Reading of Peter's Pentecost Speech (Acts 2:14-36)." Pages 215-232 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998.

Moore, Carey A. "Mark 4:12: More Like the Irony of Micaiah than Isaiah." Pages 335-344 in *Light Unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers*. Edited by Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim, and Carey A. Moore. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974.

Moore, Stephen D. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1989.

Moore, Timothy J. *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.

Moran, Richard. "Metaphor, Artifice, and Persuasion in the *Rhetoric*." Pages 385-398 in *Essays on Aristotle's* Rhetoric. Edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996.

Morello, Ruth. "Livy's Alexander Digression (9.17-19): Counterfactuals and Apologetics." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 92 (2002): 62-85.

Morgan, John R. "The *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros: Narrative as Riddle." Pages 97-113 in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. Edited by John R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Morton, Russell. "Acts 12:1-19." *Interpretation* 55 (2001): 67-69.

Moscato, Mary A. "Current Theories Regarding the Audience of Luke-Acts" *Concordia Theological Monthly* 3 (1976): 355-361.

Mowery, Robert L. "Pharisees and Scribes, Galilee and Jerusalem." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 80:3/4 (1989): 266-268.

Munro, Winsome. "Women Disciples in Mark?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 225-241.

Naaman, Dorit. "Minding the Gap: Visual Perception and Cinematic Gap Filling." *Style* 36.1 (2002): 131-148.

Nel, Philip J. "The Riddle of Samson (Judg. 14:14-18)." *Biblica* 66:4 (1985): 534-545.

Newman, Sara Joanne. "Aristotle and Metaphor: His Theory and Its Practice." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1998.

Nicolaus. *The Preliminary Exercises of Nicolaus the Sophist*. Pages 129-172 in *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric.* Translated by George A. Kennedy. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

Nisbet, Robin G. M. "The Orator and the Reader." Pages 1-17 in *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*. Edited by Tony Woodman and Jonathan Powell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte Religiöser Rede*. Darmstat: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, *1956.*

O'Day, Gail R. "Narrative Mode and Theological Claim: A Study in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 657-668.

Olson, Dennis. "Judges." Pages 721-888 in *New Interpreter's Bible Vol. 2*. Edited by Peter Miscall. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.

Otzen, Benedikt. *Tobit and Judith*. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Ovid. *Tristia; Ex Ponto*. Translated by Arthur Leslie Wheeler. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Parsons, Mikeal C. "Acts." Pages 1-64 in *Acts and Pauline Writings*. Edited by Watson E. Mills and Richard F. Wilson. Mercer Commentary on the Bible 7. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995

_____. "Christian Origins and Narrative Openings: The Sense of a Beginning in Acts 1-5." *Review and Expositor* 87 (1990): 403-422.

_____. "Luke and the *Progymnasmata*." Pages 43-63 in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Edited by Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

_____. "Mark 2:23-28." *Interpretation* 59 (2005): 57-60.

_____. "Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel." Pages 201-223 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1986*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 25. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1986.

_____. "The Prodigal's Elder Brother: The History and Ethics of Reading Luke 15:25-32." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 23 (1996): 147-174.

Patrick, Dale. *The Rhetoric of Revelation in the Hebrew Bible.* Overtures to Biblical Theology. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

Patrick, Dale and Allen Scult. *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation.* Bible and Literature 26. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 82. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990.

Patterson, Gaylard H. "The Septuagint Text of Hosea Compared with the Massoretic Text." *Hebraica* 7 (1891): 190-221.

Pelling, Christopher. "Is Death the End? Closure in Plutarch's *Lives*. Pages 228-250 in *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Edited by Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

_____. *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Classical Press of Wales, 2002.

Pender, Elizabeth E. "Plato on Metaphors and Models." Pages 55-81 in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Edited by G. R. Boys-Stones. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Penn, Michael. "Identity Transformation and Authorial Identification in *Joseph and Aseneth*." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 (2002): 171-183.

Penner, Todd. "Civilizing Discourse: Acts, Declamation, and the Rhetoric of the *Polis*." Pages 65-104 in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Edited by Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

_____. "Contextualizing Acts." Pages 1-21 in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Edited by Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Perrin, Norman. "The Evangelist as Author: Reflections on Method in the Study and Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts." *Biblical Research* 17 (1972): 5-18.

Perry, Ben Edwin, trans. *Babrius and Phaedrus*. Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Petersen, Norman R. "'Literarkritik', the New Literary Criticism and the Gospel According to Mark." Pages 935-948 in *Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et.al. Louvain: Peeters, 1992.

_____. "When is the End not the End? Literary Reflections on the Ending of Mark's Narrative." *Interpretation* 34 (1980): 151-166.

Philips, Thomas. "The Genre of Acts: Moving Toward a Consensus?" *Currents in Biblical Research* 4 (2006): 365-396.

Plato. *Euthyphro; Apology Crito; Phaedo; Phaedrus.* Translated by Harold North Fowler. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Plutarch. *Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967-1975.

_____. *Moralia*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. 16 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956-1969.

Poirier, John C. "Romans 5:13-14 and the Universality of Law." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 344-358.

Polybius. *Historiae*. Translated by W. R. Paton. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972-1979.

Polzin, Robert. *David and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History: Part Three: 2 Samuel*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

_____. *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History: Part Two: I Samuel*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.

Porter, James E. *Audience and Rhetoric: An Archaeological Composition of the Discourse Community*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1992.

Porter, Stanley E. "Thucydides 1.22.1 and Acts: Is There a Thucydidean View?" *Novum Testamentum* 32 (1990): 121-142.

Porter, Stanley E. and Dennis L. Stamps. *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1977.

Price, Robert. "Some Antistrophes to the *Rhetoric*." Pages 72-89 in *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric*. Edited by Keith V. Erickson. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Prince, Gerald. *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*. Janua Linguarum Series Maior 108. New York: Mouton Publishers, 1982.

Ps-Cicero. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Quinn, Arthur. "The Riddles of Samson: A Rhetorical Interpretation of Judges 14-16." *Pacific Coast Philology* 18 (1983): 84-91.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratioria*. Translated by H. E. Butler. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Rabinowitz, Peter J. "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences." Pages 121-141 in *Narrative Theory.* Edited by David H. Richter. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman Publishers, 1996.

_____. "Whirl Without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism." Pages 81-100 in *Contemporary Literary Theory*. Edited by G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.

Ray, Jerry Lynn. *Narrative Irony in Luke-Acts: The Paradoxical Interaction of Prophetic Fulfillment and Jewish Rejection*. Mellen Biblical Press Series 28. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.

Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny. *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis of Textual Criticism*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Reardon, Bryan P., ed. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.

Reid, Marty L. *Augustinian and Pauline Rhetoric in Romans Five: A Study in Early Christian Rhetoric*. Mellen Biblical Press Series 30. Lewiston: Mellen Biblical Press, 1996.

Resseguie, James L. "Reader-Response Criticism and the Synoptic Gospels." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 52:2 (1984): 307-324.

Rhoads, David. "Jesus and the Syrophoenician Woman in Mark: A Narrative-Critical Study." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 62 (1994): 343-375.

Ricoeur, Paul. *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Robbins, Vernon K. "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13." Pages 191-214 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998.

Roberts, W. Rhys, trans. "*Rhetoric*." Pages 95-503 in *Poetics and Rhetoric* by Aristotle. Translated by S. H. Butcher and W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Barnes & Noble Classics, 2005.

Roitman, Adolfo D. "'This People are Descendants of Chaldeans' (Judith 5:6): Its Literary Form and Historical Setting." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113:2 (1994): 245-263.

Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. "Beginnings in Plutarch's *Lives*." Pages 205-230 in *Yale Classical Studies Vol. XXIX: Beginnings in Classical Literature*. Edited by Francis M. Dunn and Thomas Cole. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Ross, William D. *Aristotle's* Prior *and* Posterior Analytics. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Rossi, Andreola. "The Tears of Marcellus: History of a Literary Motif in Livy." *Greece & Rome* 2nd series 47:1 (2000): 56-66.

Sandifer, D. Wayne. "The Humor of the Absurd in the Parables of Jesus." Pages 287-297 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1991*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 30. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1991.

Schipper, Jeremy. "Narrative Obscurity of Samson's חידה in Judges 14.14 and 18." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (2003): 339-353.

Scholes, Robert and Robert Kellogg. *The Nature of Narrative*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture Within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 133. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Concerning the Speeches in Acts." Pages 208-216 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.

_____. "What about the Johannine 'Parables'?" Pages 208-219 in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

Scodel, Ruth. *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002.

Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Hear then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Shepherd, Tom. "The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 522-540.

Shiner, Whitney. *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark*. New York: Trinity Press, 2003.

_____. "The Ambiguous Pronouncement of the Centurion and the Shrouding of Meaning in Mark." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* (2000): 3-22.

Shipley, Donald R. *A Commentary on Plutarch's* Life of Agesilaos*: Response to Sources in the Presentation of Character*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Shuler, Philip L. "The Rhetorical Character of Luke 1-2." Pages 173-190 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998.

Silk, Michael. "Metaphor and Metonymy: Aristotle, Jakobson, Ricouer, and Others." Pages 115-147 in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Edited by G. R. Boys-Stones. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Slater, Niall W. *Reading Petronius*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Slatkin, Laura M. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the* Iliad. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Snyder, H. Gregory. *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World: Philosophers, Jews and Christians*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Soards, Marion L. *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.

_____. "The Speeches in Acts in Relation to Other Pertinent Ancient Literature." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 70 (1994): 65-90.

Solmsen, Friedrich. "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric." Pages 215-244 in *Landmark Essays on Aristotelian Rhetoric*. Edited by Richard Leo Enos and Lois Peters Agnew. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

Solodow, Joseph B. "Livy and the Story of Horatius, 1.24-26." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109 (1979): 251-268.

Stadter, Philip A. "Plutarch's *Lives* and Their Roman Readers." Pages 123-135 in *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks: Studies in Cultural Interaction*. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity III. Edited by Erik Nis Ostenfeld. Oxford: Aarhus University Press, 2002.

_____. "The Rhetoric of Virtue in Plutarch's Lives." Pages 493-510 in *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch: Acta of the IVth International Congress of the* International Plutarch Society *Leuven, July 3-6, 1996*. Edited by L. van der Stockt. Collection D'Études Classiques 11. Louvain: Éditions Peeters, 2000.

Stagg, Frank. "The Unhindered Gospel" *Review and Expositor* 71 (1974): 451-462.

Stern, David. "Jesus' Parables from the Perspective of Rabbinic Literature: The Example of the Wicked Husbandmen." Pages 42-80 in *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Clemens Thoma and Michael Wyschogrod. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Stewart, Mary. *Launching the Imagination*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2002.

Stock, Augustine. "Chiastic Awareness and Education in Antiquity." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 14 (1984): 23-27.

Swain, Simon C. R. "Hellenic Culture and the Roman Heroes of Plutarch." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 110 (1990): 126-145.

Tajra, Harry W. *The Trial of St. Paul*. Wissenshaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 35. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989.

Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 20. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.

_____. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2005.

_____. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*. New York: Crossroad, 1992.

_____. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.

_____. *Reading Luke-Acts in its Mediterranean Milieu*. Boston: Brill, 2003.

_____. *Reading the Sermon on the Mount: Character Formation and Decision Making in Matthew 5-7*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004.

_____. "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke." *Interpretation* 30 (1976): 381-395.

Talshir, Zipora. "The Reign of Solomon in the Making: Pseudo-Connections between 3 Kingdoms and Chronicles." *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000): 233-249.

Tannehill, Robert C. "Freedom and Responsibility in Scripture Interpretation, with Application to Luke." Pages 265-278 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998.

_____. "The Functions of Peter's Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 400-414.

_____. "The Gospel of Mark as Narrative Christology." *Semeia* 16 (1979): 57-95.

_____. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.

Tate, W. Randolph. *Reading Mark from the Outside: Eco and Iser Leave Their Marks*. San Francisco: International Scholars Publications, 1994.

_____. *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach*. Rev. ed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.

Taylor, Justin. *Les Actes des Deux Apôtres*. 6 vols. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1994.

TeSelle, Sallie. *Speaking in Parables*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Thatcher, Tom. *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

Theon, Aelius. *The Exercises of Aelius Theon*. Pages 3-72 in *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric.* Translated by George A. Kennedy. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Thomas, Carol. "'Wingy' Mysteries in Divinity." Pages 179-194 in *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*. Edited by Ian Worthington. New York: Brill, 1996.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Charles Forster Smith. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928-1935.

Toker, Leona. *Eloquent Reticence: Withholding Information in Fictional Narrative*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1993.

Tolbert, Mary Ann. "How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character." *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 347-357.

_____. *Sowing the Gospel. Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Towner, Emil B. *Beneath the Tip of the Iceberg: A Semiotic and Rhetorical Examination of Textual Gaps*. M.A. thesis, St. Cloud State University, 2004.

Townsend, John T. "The Speeches in Acts." *Anglican Theological Review* 42 (1960): 150-159.

Trocmé, Etienne. "Jésus et les Lettrés." *Foi et Vie* 84 (1985): 33-41.

Trompf, Garry. "On Why Luke Declined to Recount the Death of Paul: Acts 27-28 and Beyond." Pages 225-239 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroads, 1984.

Tyson, Joseph B. "From History to Rhetoric and Back: Assessing New Trends in Acts Studies." Pages 23-42 in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Edited by Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Upton, Bridget Gilfillan. *Hearing Mark's Ending: Listening to Ancient Popular Texts through Speech Act Theory*. Boston: Brill, 2006.

Usher, Stephen. *The Historians of Greece and Rome*. New York: Taplinger, 1969.

Van Dijk, Gert-Jan. *ΑΙΝΟΙ, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ: Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature, With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre*. Leide: Brill, 1997.

Van Oyen, Geert. "Intercalation and Irony in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 949-974 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. 3 vols. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

_____. "Irony as Propaganda in Mark 15:39?" Pages 125-141 in *Persuasion and Dissuasion in Early Christianity, Ancient Judaism, and Hellenism*. Edited by Pieter W. van der Horst, et.al. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Vansina, Jan. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Veltman, Fred. "The Defense Speeches of Paul in Acts." Pages 243-256 in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. Danville, Va.: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978.

Verheyden, Jozef, ed., *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Louvain: Peeters, 1999.

Via, Dan O. "Irony as Hope in Mark's Gospel: A Reply to Werner Kelber." *Semeia* (1988): 21-27.

Vitalis Hoffman, Kathryn and Mark Vitalis Hoffman. "Question Marks and Turning Points: Following the Gospel of Mark to Surprising Places." *Word and World* 26 (2006): 69-76.

Wace, Henry, ed. *The Holy Bible, according to the authorized version (A.D. 1611), with an explanatory and critical commentary and a revision of the translation, by bishops and other clergy of the Anglican church*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1888.

Walker, Jeffrey. Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Walker, William O. "Acts and the Pauline Corpus Revisited: Peter's Speech at the Jerusalem Conference." Pages 77-86 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1998.

Walsh, Patrick G. "Livy's Preface and the Distortion of History." *The American Journal of Philology* 76:4 (1955): 369-383.

Walters, Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation*. Edited by David W. Gooding. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Wardman, Alan. *Plutarch's* Lives. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Warner, Martin. *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Watson, Duane F. "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and its Implications for the Unity Question." *Novum Testamentum* 30:1 (1988): 57-88.

_____. "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders (Acts 20.17-38): Epideictic Rhetoric of Farewell." Pages 184-208 in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Edited by Duane F. Watson. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 50. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

_____. "The New Testament and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: A Bibliographical Update." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 33 (1990): 513-524.

Weeden, Theodore J. *Mark: Traditions in Conflict.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Weitzman, Steven. "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 49-61.

Westcott, Brooke F. and Fenton J. A. Hort. *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882. Repr., Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988.

Weullner, Wilhelm. "Biblical Exegesis in the Light of the History and Historicity of Rhetoric and the Nature of the Rhetoric of Religion." Pages 492-513 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Whitmarsh, Tim. "Heliodorus Smiles." Pages 87-105 in *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*. Edited by Stephen Harrison, Michael Pachalis, and Stavros Frangoulidis. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 4. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing & Groningen University Library, 2005.

Wichelns, Herbert A. "Some Differences between Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Criticism." Pages 217-224 in *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*. Edited by Raymond F. Howes. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1961.

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte : form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag d. Erziehungsvereins, 1974.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. "Plutarch as Biographer." Pages 47-74 in *Essays on Plutarch's* Lives. Edited by Barbara Scardigli. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Williams, Joel F. "Discipleship and Minor Characters in Mark's Gospel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (1996) 332-343.

Wills, Lawrence M. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Winter, Bruce W. "The Importance of the *captatio benevolentiae* in the Speeches of Tertullus and Paul in Luke-Acts 24:1-21." *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 505-531.

Winter, Bruce W. and Andrew D. Clarke, eds. *The Book of Luke-Acts in its First Century Setting*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Witherington, Ben. "Finding Its Niche: The Historical and Rhetorical Species of Acts." Pages 67-97 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1996*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 35. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1996.

Wolter, Michael. "Lk 15 als Streitgespräch." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 78 (2002): 25-56.

Woodman, Tony and Jonathan Powell. *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Wright, G. Al. "Markan Intercalations. A Study in the Plot of the Gospel." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1985.

Xenophon. *An Ephesian Tale*. Pages 125-169 in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Edited by Bryan P. Reardon. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.

Zafiropoulos, Christos A. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The* Augustana *Collection*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Zweck, Dean W. "The Exordium of the Areopagus Speech, Acts 17:22, 23." *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 94-103.