Winter 12-18-2020

PARECHESIS IN THE UNDISPUTED PAULINE EPISTLES DEFINITION, IDENTIFICATION, AND DISCOVERY

Kevin Gingrich
kevin.gingrich@gmail.com

PARECHESIS IN THE UNDISPUTED PAULINE EPISTLES
DEFINITION, IDENTIFICATION, AND DISCOVERY

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty of
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Kevin L. Gingrich
March, 2020

Approved by:	Dr. James W. Voelz	Dissertation Advisor
	Dr. Jeffrey A. Gibbs	Reader
	Dr. David R. Schmitt	Reader

To Dr. James Voelz, for his wise advice, scholarly example, scrupulous attention to detail, and unflagging enthusiasm for my project; and to Dr. Beth Hoeltke for her professionalism and essential aid in ensuring its completion; and to Dr. Kevin Armbrust, for his friendship and impeccable editing.

ὁ ἔχων ὦτα
ἀκουέτω.

“He who has ears,
let him hear.”

Matt 11:15

CONTENTS

TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of journals, monograph series, and standard reference works follow the standard designations from *The SBL Handbook of Style,* 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). For sources not listed in *The SBL Handbook of Style,* the following explanations are provided.

ABR	Australian Biblical Review
ACNT	Augsburg Commentaries on the New Testament
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
BCAW	Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
BDF	Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BibSem	The Biblical Seminar
BNTC	Black New Testament Commentary
BSac	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
ByzZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*

CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina
CHSC	Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia
CJ	*Classical Journal*
ClQ	*Classical Quarterly*
ConC	*Concordia Commentary*
CP	*Classical Philology*
CW	*Classical Weekly*
De or.	*De oratore* (Cicero)
DST	*De schematibus et tropis* (Bede)
EP	*Ekklesiastikos Pharos*
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
EuroJTh	*European Journal of Theology*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
FilNeot	*Filologia Neotestamentaria*
Gn	*Gnomon*
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
GTJ	*Grace Theological Journal*
HBIS	History of Biblical Interpretation Series
HelS	Hellenic Studies
Herm	*Hermanthena*
HSCP	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
Il.	*Iliad* (Homer)

Inst.	*Institutio oratoria* (Quintilian)
Int	*Interpretation*
JAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCSP	*Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JFR	*Journal of Folklore and Research*
JGRChJ	*Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KEK	Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
MBCBSup	*Mnemosyne*, Bibliotheca Classica Batava Supplement
MPG	Migne Patrologia Graeca
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NIBCNT	New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
Od.	*Odyssey* (Homer)

OJRS	*Ohio Journal of Religious Studies*
Op.	Hesiod, *Opera et dies* (*Εργα καὶ Ημέραι*, *Works and Days*)
PG	Patrologia Graeca [= Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca]
Phil	*Philologus*
PP	*Peri Pascha*
RB	*Revue biblique*
Rhet. Her.	*Rhetorica ad Herennium*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SD	Studies and Documents
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSM	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SRR	Studies in Rhetoric and Religion
Str-B	Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck
TAPA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
TBS	Tools for Biblical Study
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
UPE	Undisputed Pauline Epistles
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*

ABSTRACT

Gingrich, Kevin, L. Parechesis in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles: Definition, Identification, and Discovery. Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 2020. 291 pp.

Throughout the undisputed Pauline epistles, the author employs ancient rhetorical figures of soundplay. In particular, this dissertation focuses on a stylistic device known since Homer and, a century or so after Paul, labeled "parechesis." Parechesis refers to similar sounding words of different lexical roots that lie in some collocation. The device is so pervasive in Paul as to be deemed a defining characteristic of Pauline style.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION OF PARECHESIS

Aristotle's *Ars Rhetorica*: τὰ παρὰ γράμμα σκώμματα

The oldest extant writing from one of the Western world's longest standing academic disciplines is Aristotle's *Ars rhetorica*, from the middle of the fourth century before Christ. In this three-scroll treatise, the theorist divides rhetoric into three parts, the first two having to do with persuasion or argumentation.[1] Book 3 of the *Art of Rhetoric*, however, is devoted to an equally essential feature of rhetoric, namely, λέξις, or style.[2] "It is not enough to know what to say," Aristotle instructs his disciples, "but we must know *how* to say it"[3]

Such attention was apparently new to the rhetorical theorists of the fourth century. "The matter of style itself," Aristotle writes, "only lately came into notice" and "no treatise has yet been composed" on the matter.[4] With a didacticism that would typify the rhetorical τέχνη to follow, Aristotle proceeds to define elements of style, including what will come to be known as "figures of speech" and among these a particular literary subtlety effected by a slight difference—τὰ παρὰ γράμμα σκώμματα[5]—in collocated words.

Noting how "humorists make use of these slight changes [τὰ παρὰ γράμμα σκώμματα]"[6] in

---

[1] See Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, trans. J. H. Freese, 23 vols, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), Books I and II, 2–344. The three standard parts of rhetoric passed on even to our time are invention, arrangement, and style. Aristotle introduces these in the first sentence of the third book of *Ars rhetorica* with a line that bears resemblance to the first line in the Gospel of Luke: *Ἐπειδὴ* τρία ἐστὶν ἃ δεῖ *πραγματ*ευθῆναι περὶ τὸν λόγον ("There are three things that require special attention with regard to [rhetorical] speech.") (Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.1.1, [partly from Freese, LCL].). Compare *Ἐπειδήπερ* πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν *περὶ* τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν *πραγμά*των (Luke 1:1).

[2] See Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.1.1.

[3] Aristotle, *Rhet*., 3.1.2 (Freese, LCL). οὐ γὰρ ἀπόχρη τὸ ἔχειν ἃ δει λέγειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀνάγκη καὶ ταῦτα ὡς δεῖ εἰπεῖν.

[4] Aristotle, *Rhet*., 3.1.5 (Freese, LCL).

[5] Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.11.6.

[6] Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.11.6 (Freese, LCL).

oral presentations, Aristotle illustrates the figure with an example of proper name soundplay: one Theodorus says to a Thracian cithara player, θράττει, ostensibly, "You are troubled," which translators have suggested is a pun on Θρᾷττ᾽ εἶ, suggesting, "You are [no better than] a Thracian [slave-girl]."[7] Next, in one sentence Aristotle offers a precious second example that, though obscure in meaning, also suggests proper name soundplay, in this case on "Persians": καὶ τὸ "βούλει αὐτὸν πέρσαι," that is, "And this, 'You wish to destroy (πέρσαι) him.'"[8]

In addition to these rather elliptical proper name puns, Aristotle presents other examples and employs soundplay himself. If we read carefully, we can catch the master theorist at his own device throughout his treatment of style. In a third example involving what the Latin rhetoricians would later call "antanaclasis" (here, a play on two meanings of the word ἀρχὴν), Aristotle explains that the Athenians—Ἀθηναίοις—benefited—ὀνασθαι.[9] He begins one paragraph, ὄντων δ᾽ ὀνομάτων[10]—a slight difference in words. In criticizing "frigidity" of style, he pointedly observes that Alkidamas "uses epithets not as ἡδύσματι [seasonings] but as ἐδέσματι [meats]."[11] In analyzing periodic style, he selects a quote with obvious soundplay elements: πλεῦσαι/πεζεῦσαι/ζεύξας/διορύξας, that is, "To sail/to go by foot/to bridge/to dig,"[12] where the artistic differences among words make for soundplay. He displays examples of rhyme, φήμην δὲ

[7] See Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.11.6 (Freese, LCL), 410 na. The fact that Aristotle then felt compelled to explain certain proper name soundplay alerts us to the potential subtlety of the device. We wonder as well whether Aristotle had in mind κι*θαρ*ῳδόν as part of the soundplay, for it is otherwise an extraneous detail.

[8] Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.11.7. Freese suggests an obvious play on Πέρσαι, "Persians." (LCL, 410, n*b*).

[9] Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.11.7. The two words anagrammatically share every letter but one. The second lexeme has the same root as ὀναίμην in Phlm 1:20, one of the elements in alleged soundplay on the proper name Onesimus. See the final chapter of the dissertation for discussion.

[10] "Being nouns,"Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.2.5.

[11] Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.3.3 (my translation).

[12] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.9.7 (Freese, LCL).

καὶ μνήμην[13] and even metathetic or anagrammatic soundplay, τὰ ἀστεῖα τὰ πλεῖστα,[14] and the particularly informative example *ἀγρὸν γὰρ* ἔλαβεν *ἀργὸν* παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ, that is, "For he received *farmland* from him *unworked*."[15] All of these witticisms, some of them playful expressions, resemble collocations that the apostle Paul employs with great seriousness.[16]

Aristotle's *Ars rhetorica* defined this specific aspect of style, a type of soundplay, but unfortunately gave no name to it. The introduction of an appropriately precise technical term, *parechesis*, will have to await the second century after Christ and the greatest rhetor of his age.

Hermogenes

In the years between AD 160 and 180, Hermogenes of Tarsus, the precocious rhetorician from the same hometown as Paul, coins the term παρήχησις[17] and articulates a cleverly crafted definition. In a relatively brief paragraph, Hermogenes both defines and illustrates the figure: Παρήχησις δὲ ἐστι κάλλος ὁμοίων ὄνοματων ἐν διαφορῳ γνώσει ταὐτὸν ἠχοῦντων. "Parechesis is an ornament consisting of"—here the translation of George Kennedy conveys the etymology of the term—"similar words with different meanings, echoing the same sound."[18]

---

[13] "Oh, the fame and the name!"Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.7.11 (Freese, LCL).

[14] "… many well-bred sayings" Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.11.6 (my translation).

[15] Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.9.9 (my translation).

[16] R. Dean Anderson in *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, addresses "the question of Paul's unexpected use of word-play in serious emotional contexts" (R. Dean Anderson Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, rev. ed. [Leuven: Peters, 1999], 287).

[17] Hermogenes's definition is found in a work titled *Περι Ευρεσεως*, known in English as *On Invention*, in Book 4, Chapter 7. It was not until 2005 that the first English translation was published, this from the widely recognized progenitor of the New Testament rhetorical criticism movement himself, George Kennedy (Hermogenes, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*, ed. Hugo Rabe, trans. George A. Kennedy [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2005], 172–73). There are many questions surrounding the authorship of the five documents of the Hermogenic corpus. It is thought that at least three are authentic. *On Invention* is not considered genuine but possibly reflects a Hermogenean school located in Tarsus (Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, xxxiii–xiv). For purposes of this study, we will refer to the author who coined the term "parechesis" as Hermogenes.

[18] The Greek appears along with the first English translation in Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, 172–73.

Hermogenes is distinguishing between similar (sounding) words, ὁμοίων ὄνοματων, with different meanings, ἐν διαφορῳ γνώσει.[19] The critical distinction to bear in mind is that Hermogenes was defining words of *different* roots related only by sound. (For a possible confusion, see the next section.) For the first time in history, we have articulation of a distinct rhetorical phenomenon.[20]

Ingeniously, Hermogenes draws on the ἠχο-root to name the particular figure of speech and twice employs—very subtly, but no doubt consciously—parechesis in the very act of defining it:

ὁμοίων ὄνοματων

and

ἐν διαφορῳ γνώσει ταὐτὸν *ἠχοῦντων* …

διαφορον δὲ δήλωσιν *ἔχοντα*.

The terms *ἠχοῦντων* (from "to sound") and *ἔχοντα* (from "to have") satisfy the very definition of parechesis.

Hermogenes made it clear that the interplay of similar-sounding words with different meanings was recognized by the most eminent Greek writers and critics of old[21] and his unadulterated examples of parechesis from various ancient authors testify to the fact. Hinting at the prevalence of the figure, Hermogenes is able to find famous Greek verses replete with

[19] The basic distinction between sound and sense is evident in Aristotle's treatment, e.g., in 3.2.13, where he writes of ψόφος and σημαινομένος (Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.2.13).

[20] We note, however, that the Hermogenean author's definition is not perfect: parechesis is not always exactly the same—ταὐτὸν—sound, just as the name suggests—"para."

[21] According to Michelle Ballif and Michael G. Moran, eds., *Classical Rhetoric and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005), 195, Hermogenes "drew [his] examples from Demosthenes and from others whom Hermogenes called 'the ancients' [οἱ ἄρχοι] … including Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, Xenophon, Isocrates, and the writers of Greek tragedy and comedy." Quintilian, in his famous *Institutio oratio*, also attributes soundplay to both Greek and Latin predecessors: "The old orators were at great pains to achieve elegance in the use of words similar or opposite in sound. Gorgias carried the practice to an extravagant pitch, while Isocrates, at any rate in his early days, was much addicted to it. Even Cicero delighted in it, but showed some restraint in the employment of [the] device…." (Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.74 [Butler, LCL]). For one look at soundplay in Cicero, see John N. Hritzu, "Jerome the Christian Cicero," *CW* 37 (1943): 98–101.

parechesis, with "two or three or four" lexemes.[22] He selects an obvious example from Homer, noting that parechesis is seen "most clearly, in the *Il*. 6.201–202":

> ἤτοι ὃ κὰπ πεδίον τὸ *Ἀλήϊον* οἶος *ἀλᾶτο*
> ὃν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων *ἀλεείνων*: (*Il*. 6.201–202)[23]

Kennedy translates, "Then indeed he wandered (ἀλᾶτο) alone[24] over the Alēion Plain/ Devouring his spirit, shunning (ἀλεείνων) the path of men."[25] Here we see an *alpha-lambda* theme that includes proper name soundplay. Then comes Hermogene's careful explanation, here in translation: "Here *Alēion* and *alato* and *aleeinōn* are similar to each other in sound [ὅμοια … ἦχει] but the first is the name of a place, the Aleian Plain, and *alato* is an action, and *aleeinōn* is also an action but with a different signification [παρὰ τὸ σεσημασμένον]."[26] If there were any uncertainty in Hermogenes's illustrations, it is clarified by the definition.

Hermogenes offers examples of his newly coined term not only from Homer but from Xenophon, Thucydides, Plutarch, and Demosthenes as well. The first example is from Xenophon (*Hellenica* 7.1.41): "he persuades (πείθει) the Pithian." An indication of the figure's versatility, the next example includes the same verb alliterating with a different proper name, from Homer, *Od*. 24.465: Εὐπείθει πείθοντ', that is, "They were persuaded (πείθοντο) by Eu*peithes*."

Further, Hermogenes quotes pseudo-Plutarch, V*it. Hom*. 38, who offers two examples from the Iliad, δὴν ἦν (*Il*. 6.131) and Πρόθοος θοὸς (*Il*. 2.758), respectively, a rhyme and a proper name soundplay.[27] From Thucydides's *Peloponnesian War* 1.110, Hermogenes cites another

---

[22] Kennedy, *Invention and Method,* 173.

[23] Kennedy, *Invention and Method,* 173.

[24] Note Kennedy's own parechesis.

[25] Kennedy, *Invention and Method,* 173.

[26] Kennedy, *Invention and Method,* 173.

[27] Hermogenes includes the latter under "parechesis," though technically the words are from the same root. Eustathius will later follow suit, with many examples of proper name parechesis from Homer, the lexemes of some

triple parechesis: ἑλεῖν (capture)/ἕλους (marsh)/ἕλειοι (marshmen)[28]—so similar to Homer's Ἀλήϊον/ἀλᾶτο/ἀλεείνων—and again he almost didactically explains the difference in meaning of the words. Elsewhere in the Hermogenic corpus we have the following two examples of proper name soundplay: from Thucydides, Σαμιαν μίαν;[29] and from Demosthenes 19.248, "He bade a long farewell to the wise (σοφός) Sophocles."[30]

We note in the preceding examples how consistently Hermogenes distinguishes between sound and sense. These two factors, along with morphology, are the three axes of comparison for related word pairs: sound, sense, and spelling. That is, soundplay pairs are related along a continuum from same to similar to dissimilar within each of the three variables of phonology, semantics, and morphology.

In Hermogenes's triple parechesis from Homer, Ἀλήϊον/ἀλᾶτο ἀλεείνων, is the main example that will be passed down, though skipping many generations, through the ages.[31] Due to vicissitudes of history, Hermogenes's insights and definition of parechesis will go unbequeathed to Western Christianity until the *ad fontes* movement of the fifteenth century.

Possible Confusion: Paronomasia

For the purposes of this dissertation, we will distinguish paronomasia from parechesis by this logical and objective rule: parechesis involves words of *different etymology*; paronomasia,

word pairs sharing a common root.

[28] The second and third terms are cognates.

[29] This example is found in Johann Jacob Wettstein's great work, *Ἡ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ* of 1751 (see below).

[30] This proper name parechesis is a quote from Thucydides found in the undisputed Hermogenes's *On Style*, in a section titled "Beauty" (or perhaps better, "Ornament") actually illustrating the figure of *epanastrophe*. See *Hermogenes' On Types of Style*, trans. Cecil W. Wooten (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 59. As with Πρόθοος θοὸς, the terms are technically not of different roots.

[31] It is a wonder that Hermogenes, his treatment of the subject minimal, did not also note the bicolonic soundplay of κὰπ πεδίον/κατέδων.

words of the same etymology; φθόνου/φόνου (Rom 1:29) is a well-known New Testament example of the former, κατατομήν/περιτομή (Phil 3:2–3) a good example of the latter.[32] That is, we will refer to different prefix, same root soundplay as *paronomasia*,[33] and refer to different root soundplay as *parechesis*, the latter type also including proper name soundplay.[34]

The Latin handbooks relevant to the time of Paul, notably, *Ad Herennium* (c. 85 BC), Cicero's *De oratore* (c. 55 BC) and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (c. AD 95), use various terms—*adnominatio*, *paronomasia*, *traducio*[35]—without distinguishing same- from different-root soundplay. Without such distinctions, the Ciceronian theorists commit conflations of definition that for centuries have never been sorted out. The source of the problem can be pinpointed in history: Book 4 of the influential treatise *Ad Herennium*, which marks the beginning of a longstanding Latin tradition and holds the distinction as "one of the most influential books on speaking and writing ever produced in the Western world."[36] See the Addendum at the end of the dissertation for the details of this historic moment in the history of figures of speech.

---

[32] Paronomasia and parechesis are historically important and distinct terms. The figures have suffered various names over the centuries, an inconsistency that both affects understanding and reflects misunderstanding. Historian James Murphy describes "a medieval mélange of terms and classifications" (James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance*, [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974], 189), concluding that "the grammarians of the middle ages never did succeed in solving the problem of classification" (190). The problem persists to this day.

[33] Examples such as πνεύματος/πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ (1 Cor 2:13), involving mere cognates, are known in the Latin tradition as *figura etymologica.*

[34] Eponymous wordplay presents an interesting case of overlap. With folk etymologies, many examples of which are found in the Hebrew Old Testament, the alleged etymology can be reflected in a slight difference in spelling of the derived word that may be phonologically imitative rather than purely etymological. The name "Eve" in Gen 3:20 is a case in point: "Eve, for she is the mother of all living," חַוָּה כִּי הִוא הָיְתָה אֵם כָּל־חָי׃. See James J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 7. Moreover, some examples of proper name "parechesis" involve plays on the same root.

[35] For the historical introduction of these terms, see the next chapter.

[36] Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, 18.

The Thesis

This dissertation will demonstrate that Paul consciously employs parechesis as a common, if much overlooked, figure of speech. By parechesis (from παρὰ-ήχη, literally "sound next to/alongside of") we mean the literary device of similar-sounding but etymologically different collocated[37] lexemes, a definition that encompasses a range of devices from simple alliteration[38] to rhyme (δὴν ἦν) to metathesis (βαλὼν/λαβὼν) to sophisticated anagrams. Such soundplay is an opportunistic exploitation of language often used with proper names.[39] As such, parechesis in its various forms is to be found throughout the undisputed epistles of Paul, with such frequency, in fact, as to be considered a mark of style.[40]

---

[37] For the most part, the dissertation will restrict itself to words within the same verse or in consecutive verses, although, as we will see, if the author is employing a mnemonic function, some distance is not only permissible but required.

[38] Alliteration is generally considered a subcategory of parechesis, and its simplest form. See, for example, Chrys Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*, WUNT 167 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004. Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 461. We would not be out of place to abide by a reliable English definition: "Alliteration is the repetition of the sound of an initial consonant or consonant cluster in stressed syllables close enough to each other for the ear to be affected, perhaps unconsciously, by the repetition," submits Percy Adams, *Graces of Harmony: Alliteration, Assonance, and Consonance in Eighteenth-Century British Poetry* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1977), 3. By "alliteration" in the broader sense, we mean words of both initial and medial consonant(s) and initial and medial vowels, those soundplays involving vowels more specifically referred to as "assonance." The dissertation is excluding from its definition of parechesis related soundplay terms: *repetitio* (same word), *figura etymologica* (cognate words, e.g., πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικα [1 Cor 2:13]), and paronomasia/*adnominatio*/ *traductio* (narrowly defined as words of common root distinguished by prefixes). Parechesis includes proper name wordplay, a common type, and rhyme, but not homoteleuton (common ending sounds due to inflected language morphology). The term alliteration itself does not appear until the Italian poet Pontano in the fifteenth century, but the phenomenon is included alongside soundplay figures and amply illustrated in all the handbooks from Aristotle on. Alliteration is "most often Paromoeon to the grammarians," according to Harry Caplan (*Rhetorica Ad Herennium*, trans. Harry Caplan, LCL [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999], 271), but this is not to fully reckon with the confusion of terms and definitions that plague the history of rhetoric. Indeed, Donatus in his fourth century *Ars grammatica* distinguishes *Paronomasia*, under which he includes "amentium/amantium," from *Parhomoeon*; the latter *est, cum ab isdem litteris diversa verba sumuntur*, that is, "*Parhomoeon* happens when several words begin with the same letters," for which he gives the much overused example from Ennius. *Homoeopropheron* is another term used for initial letter repetitions.

[39] Many of the instances of proper name play involve words of ostensibly the same root, e.g., Πρόθοος θοὸς. Nonetheless, we will follow the Hermogenic and Eustathian tradition of including this special class under parechesis.

[40] The seven undisputed letters are as follows: 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, and Philemon. The assumption of the dissertation will be that Paul either *dictated* or wrote the epistles.

CHAPTER TWO

THE BROADER CONTEXT: A HISTORY OF FIGURES OF SOUNDPLAY IN NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS

Having carefully established the definition of parechesis, we turn to its identification throughout history in the letters of Paul.[1] We will ultimately situate the main question of this dissertation in the context of the late twentieth century movement known as New Testament rhetorical criticism. But our findings, it should be noted, are not beholden to the assumptions of rhetorical criticism, with its far from settled genre identifications and unestablished *partes orationes*.[2] Soundplay, after all, is a nearly universal phenomenon. As Ryan Schellenberg in his award-winning dissertation reminds us, the kinds of soundplay found in Paul are "among the most widely observed rhetorical features of human speech."[3] But, it must not be forgotten, it was the Greeks who gave to these phenomena names and definitions.

Introduction

In 1974, James Jerome Murphy, the leading authority on rhetoric from Augustine to the Renaissance, lamented the fact that "the history of the figurae remains unwritten,"[4] a project still

[1] The seven so-called genuine letters of Paul are the focus of this investigation: 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, and Philemon.

[2] The most sustained criticism of Hans Dieter Betz's approach comes from Philip Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an Approach to Paul's Epistles*, SNTSM 101 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), see esp. 120–66, who pointed out that at the height of the movement virtually every letter of Paul had been identified as deliberative, juridical, and epideictic by one scholar or another. Similarly, Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 167, who does allow that Galatians is amenable to rhetorical analysis, also accepts "the fact that Paul's letter cannot really be classified into any one of the three most popular rhetorical genres."

[3] Ryan S. Schellenberg, *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education: Comparative Rhetoric and 2 Corinthians 10–13,* SBL 10 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2013), 231. Schellenberg is summing up the view of many authorities on the subject. Frederick Ahl, one of the world's foremost experts on the matter, writes, "Indeed, various forms of soundplay go back to the very beginnings of European and Near Eastern literacy" (Frederick Ahl, *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and other Classical Poets* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985]), 19.

[4] Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, 184 n96. Not even Heinrich Lausberg's *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, 2 vols. (Munich: Max Hueber, 1960), told the complete story.

unaccomplished.[5] The brief historical sketch of rhetoric that follows will focus narrowly on that third aspect of rhetoric, which Aristotle called *lexis*, and within that essential subcategory of rhetoric, figures of speech related to parechesis.[6] In a sense, there is no history of parechesis per se in the Western church but, rather, as the following overview will show, a history of oversight and omission of this important figure of speech.

The Christian Era

The Assumptions of Modern New Testament Rhetorical Criticism

In 1987, barely a decade into the enterprise known as New Testament rhetorical criticism, Wilhelm Wuellner, one of the undoubted leaders of the movement,[7] declared it to be at a "crossroad."[8] Critiquing the history of rhetoric in biblical exegesis, Wuellner summed up its long trajectory as follows: "As early as St. Augustine's attempt at outlining a rhetorical approach to the interpretation of Scripture, we notice the tendency, so tenaciously enduring into our own

[5] In spite of George Kennedy's claim in *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963) "to have written the first detailed study of the history of Greek rhetoric" (Thomas H. Olbricht, "George Kennedy's Scholarship in the Context of North American Rhetorical Studies" in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*, SRR 8, ed. C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008], 24), the history of *figures* is a different matter and one which Kennedy, like so many others before and after him, have marginalized (see below).

[6] The following abbreviated history owes much to the works of James Jerome Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011) and *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (New York: Cambridge University Press: 2004); James A. Herrick, *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2016); and Thomas M. Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

[7] Wuellner, as Stanley Porter commends, "has done as much as anyone from the standpoint of New Testament studies to revive and encourage rhetorical study of the New Testament" (Stanley E. Porter, *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* [New York: Brill, 1997], 558). See also *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence*, eds. James D. Hester and J. David Hester (New York: T&T Clark, 2004). Similarly, Thomas Olbricht, *Rhetoric and the New Testament: 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanely E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, JSNTSup 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 17, writes, "Professor Wuellner has been more active in the international promotion of rhetorical analysis of Scripture than any other person." See also *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence*, ed. D. Hester and J. David Hester (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004).

[8] Wilhelm Wuellner, "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" *CBQ* 49 (1987): 453.

days, of listing and labeling the rhetorical figures of speech and figures of thought to be found in select parts of the Bible."[9] But, it must be asked, does this review of rhetoric in New Testament studies fairly depict the facts of history?[10]

The first known exegete to identify any figure of speech in Paul was Augustine, who, in the context of demonstrating Paul's *eloquentia,* notes κλίμαξ, or *gradatio,* in Rom 5:3–5, a figure of speech that Quintilian names and defines in *Institutio oratoria* 9.3.54–55 only a few sections before his discussion of *adnominatio.* Augustine, the professor of rhetoric turned Christian, notes only a few other figures discernible in a Latin translation (*kommata* and periods) but—an important point historically—seems to imply that many more rhetorical figures could be found.[11] As the following history of rhetorical figures will show, no serious student could conclude that Augustine had done enough. In fact, when it comes to figures having to do with soundplay, Augustine's lack of facility in Greek undoubtedly prevented him from discerning them in the Greek Bible.[12]

---

[9] Wuellner, "Rhetorical Criticism?" 450.

[10] Helpful summaries of the history of rhetorical criticism as it relates to New Testament scholarship into the twenty-first century are found in the following works: Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 13–28; Margaret D. Zulick, "The Recollection of Rhetoric: A Brief History," in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament,* SRR 8, ed. C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 7–19; and Thomas H. Olbricht, "George Kennedy's Scholarship in the Context of North American Rhetorical Studies," pages 21–40 in the same volume.

[11] After a brief expert dissection of Pauline clauses in 2 Cor 11, Augustine, the former professor of rhetoric, declines further comment: "It would be tedious to pursue the matter further, or to point out the same facts in regard to other passages of Holy Scripture," he writes. "Suppose I had taken the further trouble, at least in regard to the passages I have quoted from the apostle's writings, to point out figures of speech which are taught in the art of rhetoric. Is it not more likely that serious men would think I had gone too far, than that any of the studious would think I had done enough?" As to his otherwise valuable opinion as to Paul's formal training in rhetoric, Augustine's answer might be read as rhetorically non-commital: "As then I do not affirm that the apostle was guided by the rules of eloquence [i.e., rhetoric], so I do not deny that his wisdom naturally produced, and was accompanied by, eloquence" (Augustine, *Doctr. chr.*, 4.1.11).

[12] C. H. Milne, *A Reconstruction of the Old-Latin Text of the Gospels used by Saint Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926), ix, writes, "It is generally agreed that during the remaining thirty years of his life the Bishop of Hippo regularly used the revision of the Latin Gospels made by St. Jerome at the request of Pope Damasus and published in 383." E. A. Judge, one of the most astute New Testament scholars of his generation, points out one of the major shortcomings of this father of exegesis: "The daunting fact is, however, that Augustine is

Augustine did, in fact, know of the *concept* of parechesis, as is obvious from his own employment of it: "Ego autem iudices *ver*os et *ver*itate se*ver*os magis intuieor" (Aug. *Epistl*. 143:4).[13] It is important to note in this Latin example that "*verso*" and "se*ver*os" are likely from different roots.

If Augustine's intimation of further figures in the New Testament texts could be considered a programmatic call, that program has never been fulfilled in Pauline studies. Even in nearly two thousand years of exegesis and given the collective efforts of uncounted exegetes interested in rhetoric, the figures of speech in the Pauline epistles have not been sufficiently identified. In fact, crowning a long history of biblical scholarship's interest in rhetoric, the rhetorical-critical movement of which Wuellner was a key advocate has paid scant attention to figures of speech in Paul. A nearly exhaustive bibliography of New Testament rhetorical criticism gathered by Duane Watson and Alan Hauser in 1994 lists virtually no published works on figures of speech.[14] Rather, this most modern movement was decidedly devoted to only one aspect of rhetoric: argumentation.

Wuellner had assumed that the Church Fathers had explored the figures. In fact, not even the Greek Church Fathers, who themselves alliterate profusely, explicitly note soundplay in Paul. Only Origen gives an indication that he knows of the concept of parechesis, when in his letter to Africanus he acknowledges the puns of σχῖνον/σχίσει and πρῖνον/πρίσαι from Susannah.[15]

---

unable to say (*me fateor ignorare*) what the rhythmical properties of Paul's Greek were (*Doctr. chr.* 20. 40–41)" (E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century* (London: Tyndale, 1968).

[13] "But I look upon judges who are true and, because of their truth, severe." Galen O. Rowe, "Style," 132, explains the workings of the wordplay: "The pun, which defies translation, centers on se*veros* ('severe') which contains within itself the word *ver*sos ('true')."

[14] Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible. A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*, BibInt 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

[15] Origen, *Ep. Afr*., 1.

Others in the New Testament movement assumed that the Reformers had done it.[16] But as our history will show, even when figures and tropes were identified, they were neither sufficiently documented in the biblical texts nor well defined. The exegetically significant figure of speech known as parechesis has, in fact, been overlooked for centuries.

Duane Watson himself is representative of those who sweep through hundreds of years of rhetorical study with perhaps too broad a stroke:

> The style of the Pauline epistles has been the subject of both passing comment and concentrated study since they were written. Paul's use of style did not escape the notice of exegetes such as Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Melanchthon, and a host of others. These observations have ranged from discussion of individual figures and tropes to classification of the overall style of the epistles according to the Greco-Roman rhetorical tradition. However, the more complex use of style for argumentation and argumentative strategies is not as well studied.[17]

The assumption of most historians of New Testament rhetorical criticism is that the figures have been "well studied" in biblical exegesis. It is a major point of the argument of this dissertation that they have not been even adequately identified.

The Church Fathers

The Latin Church Fathers

The question of the Church Fathers' relation to classical Greek and Latin in general is more contradictory than complicated, the opinions of Augustine and Jerome a case in point, both of them trained in rhetoric. The one renounced, the other admired, Cicero.

The attitude of Augustine toward secular classics and toward Scripture will greatly affect

[16] Betz claims that seventeenth and eighteenth century German theologians "paid careful attention to the characteristics of Paul's rhetoric, in particular his grammar and style" (Betz, *Paulinische Studien*, 128). Yet, as our investigation will show, these now obscure works have very little to offer in identifying the plethora of figures of speech in Paul.

[17] Duane Watson, "The Role of Style in Pauline Epistles," in *Paul and Rhetoric*, ed. J. Paul. Sampley and Peter Lampe (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 119.

important figures in medieval Christianity, notably Cassiodorus and Bede, and English Christians interested in rhetoric, Richard Sherry and others (for example, Bullinger) through at least the nineteenth century.

The Greek Fathers

If the language barrier itself prevented the Latin Fathers from identifying soundplay in the New Testament, an even greater irony occurs among the Greek Fathers. As E. A. Judge notes, "Gregory of Nyssa (who was, after all, unlike Augustine, a Greek) says Paul ignored the *schemata*."[18] Augustine promised that many could be found but he himself did not find them due to limitations of language, and Greek-speaking Gregory of Nyssa, once a rhetorician himself, alleged that there were none. There is one scant but important piece of evidence that the Greek Fathers knew of soundplay in the Greek Bible, this from Origen.

To compound the irony, there is no doubt left in scholarship that the major Greek Fathers were attentive to sound. Their ignorance of soundplay figures is not a viable hypothesis. Gregory of Nazianzus, a paragon of Second Sophistic literary skill, spent six years in Athens studying rhetoric,[19] an education that shaped his preaching. One historian waxes eloquent in his appreciation of Nazianzus:

> Two currents issue from the crumbling ruins of the ancient world. One is of it, the dying effort of its spent intensity … dissipating its energy in smaller and ever-smaller rivulets. The other is the new force detaching itself from the dying agonies of the old Mediterranean 'universe,' Christianity, pioneer, careless of form, conscious of its infinite superiority in the wealth and depth of its thought-content. Gregory of

[18] Reported by Edwin A. Judge, "Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice," *AusBR* 16 (1968), 37–50.

[19] Apparently, a fourth century epitome based on the *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis* of Aquila Romanus and assembled by an anonymous Christian for use in Christian education contains examples of figures from Gregory of Nazianzus. I have not seen this work. Aquila's Latin treatise appropriates examples from the Greek rhetorician Alexander Numenius of the time of Hadrian. See Hugh Chisholm, ed. "Alexander" in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 1, 11th ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 564.

> Nazianzus represents the point of greatest perfection reached by the ancient world in the fusion of these two currents.[20]

Several studies in the first quarter of the twentieth century document alliteration in Chrysostom, especially Thomas Ameringer.[21] Chrys Caragounis has even noted Chrysostom's use of clever parechesis: χοίρων χείρους ("worse than swine").[22] More recently, Tsitsanoudis-Mallidis and Stergioulis identify related soundplay figures in the works of Chrysostom: "The use of figures of *homilia* and expressive means is quite impressive: of *etymologicon* … epanaphoras, parichisis [sic], and antithesis."[23] The authors further point out the Greek Fathers' knowledge of Hermogenes:

> The most important figures the Christian rhetoric, theology and philosophy in the 4th century have to show, are the Cappadocian Fathers, Basil of Caesarea (the Great), Gregory of Nazianzus dubbed Theologian, Gregory of Nyssa, and the native of Antioch John Chrysostom. All four of them emerged as excellent orators and contributed greatly to the shaping of classical rhetoric through Christianity using creatively the Ideas of Hermogenes.[24]

The recognition of figures by the Fathers is easy; an obvious question is enigmatic. One of the great ironies and mysteries in the history of figures is why the Greek Fathers, especially Chrysostom, who wrote more than 400 sermons on Pauline epistles and who himself alliterated

---

[20] M. Sprengling, "Guignet's Study of Gregory of Nazianzen," pages 434–36 in *The American Journal of Theology*, Vol. 17 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913), 435.

[21] Thomas Edward Ameringer, *The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom: A Study in Greek Rhetoric* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1921); William Anthony Maat, *A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1944).

[22] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 467, from Chrysostom, *Κατὰ Μαθθαῖον* 17:10–21 (*Homily* 57, *MPG* 58, 564, lines 5–7. We note that Luke's Parable of the Prodigal Son includes, as apparent mnemonic *leitmotif*, an inordinate number of chi-rho words, apparently placed for mnemonic purposes.

[23] Nikolleta Tsitsanoudis-Mallidis and Charalampos Stergioulis, "Rhetorical Texts of the 4th Century A.D. About Wealth and Its Loss," *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2 (2014): 961 n31. The authors further note, "Chrysostom also uses paromoiosis greatly," (960, n22) and insightfully explain that in interpreting the orations of the Fathers, "a rhetorical approach to the texts was necessary, to reveal the contribution of the rhetoric art in the best comprehension of meanings" (1). It is a wonder why the authors of the article, who report that the Greek Fathers knew Hermogenes, do not mention parechesis.

[24] N. Tsitsanoudis-Mallidis and Ch. Stergioulis, "Rhetorical Texts," 961 n31.

frequently, did not recognize the same in Paul. Major studies, in fact, have documented alliteration not only in Chrysostom but in Basil,[25] Gregory of Nazianzus,[26] and even Gregory of Nyssa.[27]

The only reasonable hypothesis, in view of Chrysostom's almost profligate tendency and Gregory of Nyssa's denial, is that the Fathers took alliterative soundplay for granted.[28] George Kennedy reached something of the same conclusion, surmising, "The rhetorical practice of Gregory of Nazianzus and John Chrysostom, and to a lesser extent Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, goes considerably beyond what they seem to tolerate in theory. The reason for this is partly their education; they were so thoroughly imbued in school exercises with the use of figures of speech and devices of comparison that these had become second nature to them."[29]

But even more than a theory of habituation, their view that the literature of Scripture is consecrated might explain their reticence. The opening of Reverend Benjamin Keach's 1855 *Tropologia* is a knowledgeable comparison of the Augustinian and Nazianzen view:

> Augustine says, That the Scriptures seemed rude, and unpolished to him, in comparison of Cicero's adorned style, because he did not then understand its *Interiora, i.e.,* inward beauty; but when his mind was illuminated to understand them, no writing appeared so wise or even eloquent. Gregory Nanzianzen, a man of prodigious wit and learning, when he came to take to the study of this sacred philosophy, vilifies all other ornaments of literature amongst the Greek philosophers. And not only Nanzianzen did so, but the learned Paul also. By the very precepts of

[25] James Campbell, *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1922).

[26] Gregory of Nazianzus, "Nativity Homily" in PG 43 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

[27] Anna M. Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

[28] Either that or they were so endued with the Second Sophistic tendency to alliterate that their own tendency overshadowed recognition of a lesser degree in Paul.

[29] George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Seculary Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, 2nd ed. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carlina, 1999), 166.

> Rhetoric, which may be one man's eloquence, may be another's folly, because the style must be suited to the various circumstances of persons and things.[30]

It is about as good an explanation of the Father's varying views on rhetoric that we could wish for. Scripture was seen as a separate and holy genre, whereas rhetoric depended on human prejudices. Although the Fathers may have spoken of Scripture with practiced eloquence, they did not train their focus on the figures of speech to be found in the inspired text.

Donatus and Jerome

The succession of otherwise minor secular treatises represented by P. Rutilius Lupus and Alexander Numenius, early in the first and second centuries, respectively, reaches an important intersection with Christianity in the fourth century with the influential grammar of Aelius Donatus (d. 355).[31] The teacher whom Jerome calls "praeceptor meus" and "Orator Urbis Romae"[32] and the most influential grammarian and rhetorical theorist of his age considers paronomasia to be of such importance that he includes it among the seventeen figures (*schematibus*) in Book 3 of his famous *Ars maior*.[33] Here, Donatus offers Terence's famous parechesis *amantium/amentium*[34] and the famous tautogram of Ennius, which he labels

---

[30] Benjamin Keach, *Tropologia: A Key to Open Scripture Metaphors in Four Books to which are Prefixed Arguments to Prove the Divine Authority of the Holy Bible together with Types of the Old Testament* (London: City Press, 1855), preface.

[31] John N. Hritzu notes many similarities between the letters of Cicero and those of St. Jerome, including their use of "Figures of Sound." See John N. Hritzu, "Jerome the Christian Cicero," in *The Classical Weekly*, 37 (1943): 98–101.

[32] In *Contra Rufinum* 1.16, Jerome identifies Donatus as his tutor.

[33] Though there are a multitude of figures, Donatus, *Ars Grammatica* (1543 edition), 117, has reduced the list to seventeen essential ones, including paronomasia and paroeom: "Quae cum multa sint, ex omnibus necessaria fere sunt decem et septem, quorum haec sunt nomina: prolepsis, zeugma, hypozeuxis, syllepsis, anadiplosis, anaphora, epanalepsis, epizeuxis, paronomasia, schesis onomaton, parhomoeon, homoeoptoton, homoeoteleuton, polyptoton, hirmos, polysyndeton, dialyton."

[34] From Donatus, *Ars maior*, Book 4: Nam inceptio est *amentium* haud *amantium* "for it is an undertaking worthy of those in their dotage, not of those who dote in love" (*amentium* "mad persons" and *mantium* "lovers" translation by J. Marchand), a clever line from Terence's second century BC Latin comedy *Andreia* (1.3.13), reprinted by Mosellanus and Melanchthon.

"paromoeon" and quotes without the usual disapprobation. But the instructor of Jerome includes in his monumental work no biblical texts. The neatly printed *Ars Grammtica* of 1543 proves the undying influence of Donatus in the Reformation period.[35]

The Medieval Authors

Diomedes (Late Fourth Century)

Following Donatus, is the late fourth century grammarian Diomedes who slightly expands the definition of Donatus, adding under paronomasia the "figura etymologia" of *fugam fugit, facinora fecit, gratas gratias, pugna pugnata est*.[36] Diomedes includes these examples along with "amentium/amantium," the parechesis from Terence and "si non *praetorem* te sed *praedonem* creavimus."[37] Reformation scholars will without qualification repeat this conflation.

Cassiodorus (AD 485–585)

Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator, founder of the famous Vivarium, is truly one of the greatest educators of antiquity. He regarded an understanding of rhetoric, among other disciplines, to be an essential aid to the study of Scripture and averred that figures of speech began not with the Greeks but in Scripture. He writes, "We can understand much in sacred literature as well as in the most learned interpreters through figures of speech."[38]

With Cassiodorus's *Expositio psalmorum* (AD 540–550) we find the first known Christian

[35] Isidorus Iunior treatise on the figures of speech written after the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville (d. 636) and no later than c. 670, uses Donatus's *Ars minor* but adds a range of biblical examples of figures, many of them borrowed from works by Augustine and Jerome, according to James E. G. Zetzel, *Critics, Compliers, and Commentators: An Introduction to Roman Philology 200 BCE to 800 CE* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 216.

[36] "Flight fly"; "Doing was doing"; "Grace welcome"; "The battle being fought."

[37] "Not a pretorium but a place for predators."

[38] Cassiodorus, *Institutione*, 2.27.1.

recognition of wordplay in the Old Testament: three instances of paronomasia (*denominatio*) in the Latin of Psalms, for example, Ps 102:8 "miserator et misericors"—but mere *figura etymologica*.[39] Nonetheless, Cassiodorus boasts at the conclusion of his *Expositio psalmorum*: "We have shown that the series of psalms is crammed with … figures."[40]

The Venerable Bede

The figures that Cassiodorus identified in his *Expositio Psalmorum* are more widely known from The Venerable Bede's early eighth century *De schematibus et tropis*. Along with selections from the Old Testament and from Vergil, Bede identifies various (seventeen) figures of speech in several New Testament books, including the first published example of paronomasia from the New Testament, from Paul, in fact.[41] Unfortunately, it is in Latin: Phil 3:2–3a, *concisionem*/*circumcisio*. Had Bede been working in Greek, he could have noted the original paronomasia: κατατομήν/περιτομή.

To his credit, Bede is keenly aware of the limitations due to departure from the original language and in his later work, *De orthographia*, will refer to the original Greek. Among other figures related to sound and sense found in the *DST* is πολύπτωτον (polyptoton), as in Rom 11:36, "cum diversis casibus," by which Bede means the "diverse cases" of the Vulgate's

[39] One translation is found in Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum*, ed. M. Adriaen, *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Expositio Psalmorum*, CCSL 97, 98 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1958).

[40] Senator Cassiodorus, *Cassiodorus: "Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning" and "One the Soul,"* trans. James W. Halporn, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004), 68. In *Etymologiarum sive originum Libri xx* of Isidore of Seville (AD 673–735), "perhaps the most widely used encyclopaedia of late antiquity [which] [i]ncludes a survey of the figures of speech," according to Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric*, 151, the author uses the favored term "paronomasia" for the collocation *Abire/obire*, as well as for this sibilant sequence from the *Aeneid* 1.295: *Saeva sedens super arma*. Isadora of Seville, *Etymologiarum* 1.36.12 (San Isidoro de Sevilla *Etimologias*, Biblioeca de autores Cristianos Madrid, MMIV), 324. For a recent English translation see *Isidore of Seville's Etymologies: The Complete English Translation of Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri xx*. Vol. 1. trans. Priscilla Throop (Charlotte, VT: MedievalMS, 2005).

[41] Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, 77, calculates that "Bede defines and exemplifies 17 *schemata* and a total of 28 *tropi*, using 122 Scriptural passages for his examples."

quoniam ex *ipso* et per *ipsum* et in *ipso* omnia *ipsi* gloria in saecula amen. He also repeats Donatus's example of "Paromoeon."

Bede draws on Donatus's list of figures of speech, but the content is more indebted to Isidorus Iunior and to Cassiodorus' *Expositio psalmorum*.[42] In essence, Bede Christianizes Donatus's *Ars Grammatica*, substituting examples from the Bible for those from the classical authors of Donatus. Thus, *DST* provides illustrations of figures from Psalms, Genesis, and many other Old Testament books and from the New Testament, Matthew, John, Galatians, Ephesians, 1 Corinthians, and Romans, but no parechesis in the New Testament.

Paronomasia is the eighth figure that Bede defines as nearly similar (*pene similis*) words with different meanings (*significatio diversa*). This definition is well suited to Hermogenic parechesis. But Bede fails to nuance the matter, offering two very different examples. The first is Psalm 26:6, *In te* con*sisi sunt et non sunt* con*fuse* ("They confided in you and were not confounded"), which involves mere common prefixes.[43] On the other hand, in the Old Testament, Bede explicitly cites the Hebrew *Vorlage* in commenting on what he calls the paronomasia at Isaiah 5:7: מִשְׁפָּט]לְ[and מִשְׁפָּח; צְדָקָה]לְ[and צְעָקָה: "The prophet Isaiah demonstrated this figure most elegantly in his own language," Bede observes, "when he said: 'I looked for him to do judgment, and behold iniquity, and looked for righteousness and behold a cry.'"[44] This soundplay from Isaiah is true parechesis, perhaps the most blatant example in the Old Testament.

[42] Zetzel, *Critics, Compliers, and Commentators*, 216–17.

[43] As one translator of *DST* observes, "Bede's complete revision of the fund of examples also provides an occasion to check the flow of terms and definitions as of the early eighth century…. Opacities in the definitions remain," Gussie Hecht Tanenhause, "Bede's De schematibus et tropis—a translation," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 48 (1962), 237–53, repr. in *Reading in Medieval Rhetoric*, ed. J. M. Miller et al. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1973), 96–122.

[44] Bede, *DST* 1.142–43, the translation Tanenhause, "Bede's De schematibus et tropis," 147–48, reflecting Bede's Latin.

Thus, we see in the historically important *DST* of Bede the long overdue recognition of centuries of neglect of the original languages, wherein figures of sound are all but lost, except for what is reflected coincidentally in translation. A second issue of language, the dilemma of the secular versus profane, Bede addresses by giving "pride of place" to the rhetoric of biblical literature:

> And indeed the Greeks boast that they were the discoverers of such figures and tropes. But so that you might know … that Holy Scripture holds pride of place over other writings, not only in authority, because it is divine, and in utility, because it leads to eternal life, but in antiquity and in its very circumstance of speaking, it has pleased me to show with examples collected from Scripture that the masters of secular eloquence can offer nothing in the way of schemes or tropes that did not appear first in it.[45]

Bede is echoing the claim for eloquence of the Scripture first made by Augustine in *De doctrina christiana*.

The question of Scripture's comparability to the classics will continue to evoke Christian responses in the centuries to follow, but the question of Scripture's relation to the discipline of rhetoric is now settled. During the Reformation both Protestant and Catholics will comprehend that rhetoric is a valuable exegetical tool.

East and West: Two Divergent Streams

Before opening rhetorical treatises on figures of speech from the Reformation period, we must retrace an important historical divergence. The appreciation of Greek rhetoric that we have seen in Cicero's own treatise represents, by the first century AD, a complete appropriation by Latin rhetoricians. But for centuries following, secular Greek and Latin rhetorical traditions

[45] Bede, *DST* 1.142–43, translated from the original Latin: *Et quidem gloriantur Graeci talium se figurarum siue troporum fuisse repertores. Sed ut cognoscas … quia sancta Scriptura ceteris omnibus scripturis non solum auctoritate, quia diuina est, uel utilitate, quia ad uitam ducit aeternam, sed et antiquitate et ipsa praeeminet positione dicendi, placuit mihi collectis de ipsa exemplis ostendere quia nihil huiusmodi schematum siue troporum ualent praetendere saecularis eloquentiae magistri, quod non in illa praecesserit*.

diverge along lines East and West. In the West, *Ad Herennium* and the Ciceronian tradition dominate; Hermogenes is known only in the East, relied on by Eustathius at the end of the twelfth century. Quintilian's *Institutes*, however, for reasons permanently lost to history, disappeared from the West until its timely rediscovery in the fifteenth century (see below).

The East

Hermogenes

The secular school of Hermogenes apparently operated in Tarsus at the end of the second century AD, a hundred years after Paul's death. The precocious rhetor Hermogenes, of whom it is said the emperor himself traveled from Rome to hear his orations, wrote treatises on rhetoric at a young age. It is out of this ostensible institution and one of these works that the term "parechesis" comes. It did not, however, come to the West until the fifteenth century.

Hermogenes's definition of parechesis is found in the brief treatise originally titled *Περι Ευρεσεως*, known in English today as *On Invention*. Hermogenes's illustrations from Homer are particularly important. They illustrate the truth that if the formal codification of rhetoric awaited Aristotle's sense of classification, the use of soundplay can be identified in the earliest Greek literature regardless, centuries prior to Aristotle and, what is more, that this scheme of writing and speaking Greek was known at the time of Paul.

Hermogenes's definition and examples, as we have shown, illustrate the particular phenomenon in a way that eluded the Ciceronians. The pure concept signified in the term parechesis survived not in Latin, which has no precise name for it, but in Greek. The classic definition of parechesis is denied the Western Church until the fifteenth century, when the Hermogenic treatises physically arrive on the shores of Italy. But for centuries, Hermogenes was unknown in the West.

And yet, Hermogenes had his rightful place in the East. "The corpus of five rhetorical works attributed to Hermogenes of Tarsus (fl. second century AD) was the most influential body of Greek rhetorical texts from the sixth to the fifteenth century," historian Peter Mack reports.[46] Hermogenes's *Art of Rhetoric* became "the standard text for teaching rhetoric in the Greek-speaking world of later antiquity," writes Janet B. Davis.[47]

Not until the fifteenth century would Hermogenes be introduced to Western Christianity,[48] yet with less than full appreciation. Here, Baliff and Moran sum up the historical awareness of Hermogenes, his all too brief emergence in European Christendom:

> Hermogenes' name and precepts of technical rhetoric began reaching the West before the fall of Constantinople in 1453…. As humanists in the West grew familiar with the work, it became a resource for scholars who were trying to forge rhetorics for Italian, French, and other vernaculars. Numerous editions and translations came out in the sixteenth century, and Renaissance theorists were especially interested in "On Style." … After the Renaissance, Hermogenes' *Art of Rhetoric* settled into relative obscurity until recently.[49]

Baliff and Moran's history came out in the same year as the first translation into English of Hermogene's full definition of parechesis; "until recently" means 2005. We note in their summary that "Renaissance theorists were especially interested in 'On Style'"—but the definition of parechesis was found in "On Invention" (*Περι Ευρεσεος*). Historian Thomas Conley's summary of East meets West includes mention of the two Greek authors whose works are most important to this dissertation:

> [An important] part of the story of new influence on Renaissance rhetoric is that of the infiltration of Greek rhetorics into the universities and studies of Western scholars. This, in turn, occurred in two stages, the first George of Trebizond's

---

[46] Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, 40–41.

[47] Janet B. Davis, "Hermogenes of Tarsus," pages 194–202 in *Classical Rhetoric and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources*, ed. Michelle Ballif and Michael G. Moran (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005), 195.

[48] Humanist George Trebizond is credited with introducing the Hermogenic corpus to Italy (see Thomas M. Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*, 114–18).

[49] Ballif and Moran, *Classical Rhetoric*, 201.

> *Rhetoricorum libri quinque* and the second the acquisition and eventual publication by Aldo Manuzio of manuscripts of the Greek authors themselves—in particular, of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and of the works of Hermogenes, both for the first time.[50]

The arrival again of Aristotle in the West excited new interest in rhetoric among some Reformation scholars, including Melanchthon, but Hermogenes had little impact on the Reformation understanding of Pauline style. The term parechesis will appear almost unpredictably in Reformation and post-Reformation history, including among biblical scholars, but almost always without the proper definition. It is a sad fact of history that the work of Hermogenes from which the term parechesis originates was not translated into English until the twenty-first century.

Eustathius (AD 1199)

After Aristotle and Hermogenes, the other Greek scholar and rhetorician most important to this dissertation is Eustathius, the Christian Archbishop of Thessalonica whose twelfth century scholia identified parechesis in Homer. However, the Archbishop did not apparently identify the same in the Bible.

Reputed to be the greatest scholar of his era,[51] Eustathius drew on the Hermogenic term and published over a hundred examples of parechesis found in Homer: Ἀλήϊον/ἀλᾶτο/ἀλεείνων[52]; ἐλεῖν/ἐλθεῖν; πόλεμον/πωλῆσαι; κοίμησε/κύματα; βαλὼν/λαβὼν; νάμα/μαννα, θυμὸς/μῦθος,[53]

[50] Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*, 114. George Kennedy has also observed that there are "a number of Byzantine works on figures of speech that show Hermogenes' influence," (Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 189).

[51] The Byzantine historian Nicetas Choniates, who wrote the definitive history of the Eastern Roman Empire and was himself a pupil of Eustathius, lauded his teacher as the most learned man of his age. He calls Eustathius ὁ πολὺς καὶ μέγας ἐν λόγοις in *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. Jan Louis van Dieten (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 216, further praising him at 307.

[52] This from Hermogenes.

[53] See Eustathius, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homerii Iliadem Pertinentes*, trans. Marchinus van der Valk, 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1971). The distinctly different meanings of the collocated

etc, including many examples of proper name soundplay. Eustathius also introduced the term ψευδοπαρήχησις to describe instances, as Caragounis puts it, "not quite attaining to the level of a proper parechesis,"[54] in the inimitable judgment of the scholiast.

The dates are important to keep in mind: at the very end of the twelfth century Eustathius drew on the nomenclature of Hermogenes of Tarsus of the second century to describe a phonological phenomenon evidenced in the eighth century BC., which Aristotle had abstrusely identified as a figure of speech in the fourth century BC. Chrys Caragounis makes an important though obvious point when he writes that Eustathius is "laying before us the long tradition in the occupation with the rhetorical aspects of texts" and that "these texts have not become paronomasiai and parecheseis all of a sudden in Eustathios' reading … but were often intended as such already by their authors and were read and heard as wordplays all along by the previous generations of Greeks."[55]

Over the centuries, classicists have noted the same figure of speech in a variety of ancient Greek genres, from proverbs and poetry to comedy and tragedy,[56] from mundane catalogue lists to histories and religious material.[57] Many of these collocations of similar-sounding words from different roots bear a marked resemblance to word pairs found in the epistles of Paul.

The West: The Reformation and the Convergence of Greek and Latin Streams

Among the many rebirths of the Reformation and Renaissance era is the rediscovery and

lexemes are, respectively, Alēion Palin/wandered/shunning; to wither/to come; war/to buy; sleep/waves; to throw/to receive; flowing water/manna; and anger/myth.

[54] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 458 n204.

[55] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 460.

[56] For a model study focusing on alliteration in the Greek tragedies, see Christian Riedel, *Alliteration bei den drei grossen griechischen Tragikern* (PhD diss., Erlangen, 1900).

[57] "These novelities occur in poetry as well as in prose," wrote Aristotle (Aristotle, *Rhet*., 3.11.6 [Freese, LCL]).

renewed interest in rhetoric in the West. With respect to figures of speech, there is a pattern of expansion and contraction of lists evident amid the proliferation of published manuals. No new work on rhetoric will dominate, however, as much as an old one rediscovered.

In 1416, the long-forgotten text of Quintilian's *Institutes* was rediscovered.[58] James Murphy notes the historical importance: the discovery of *Institutio oratoria* along with the "renewed popularity of Cicero's long-neglected *De oratore* is another hallmark of this fifteenth-century reorientation."[59] Now Reformation scholars, a century later, would have available to them the works of the triumvirate of Latin rhetoric: the author of *Ad Herennium*, Cicero, and Quintilian.

A second major discovery went less well-noticed.

George Trebizond (1395–1472) and the Reintroduction of Hermogenes

The same year as Quintilian's rediscovery, George Trebizond or Trapezentius of Crete, the "last important figure in Byzantine rhetoric," according to George Kennedy, arrived in Italy, bringing with him a rare commodity: "a knowledge of the Hermogenic tradition, unknown to the West."[60] In his own *Rhetorica libri V* of 1433–1434, first printed in Venice,[61] Trapezentius makes available to Latin readers the insights of Greek rhetoric, especially the corpus of five rhetorical works attributed to Hermogenes of Tarsus and including the concept of parechesis.

The Manuals: Pre-Reformation and Reformation

"The renaissance had brought with it a renewed interest in rhetorical theory among the

[58] For Poggio Bracciolini's rediscovery of the complete text see Remigio Sabbadini, *Le Scoperte dei Codici Latini e Greci ne' Secoli XIV e XV*, vol. 1, ed. G. C. Sansoni (Firenze, 1967), 78.

[59] Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, 89.

[60] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 195.

[61] Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*, 115.

scholars of the day," writes R. Dean Anderson,[62] but it is just as true to say the converse. Rhetoric itself was reintroduced as a major part of the mix of new and old ideas that came to be known as the Renaissance. With the invention of the printing press, some of these ancient rhetorical treatises were reissued—for example, the fourth century *De figuris lexeos* by Rufininus was published in Leipzig in 1521—and Reformation and Renaissance rhetoricians drew on and republished the lists of figures and tropes from Donatus[63] and from Bede's *De schematibus et tropis*.[64] The chain of rhetorical treatises dating back now at least to Cicero was now unbroken. But Renaissance and Reformation rhetoricians also wrote their own manuals of rhetoric, many which included tropes and figures based on these ancient models.[65] This crop of new treatises was brought forth by scholars many of whom, no mere coincidence, were major players in the Reformation.[66] Important to this dissertation, with the Reformation there is renewed interest in figures of speech by New Testament scholars.

True to the *ad fontes* spirit of the time, the manuals listed and defined figures, "sometimes giving both Greek and Latin names."[67] Although several rhetorical treatises, most of them

[62] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Leuven: Peters, 1999), 14.

[63] See J. Brennan, "The Epitome Troporum ac Schematum of Joannes Susenbrotus: Text, Translation and Commentary," Ph.D dissertation, University of Illinois, 1953, iii–vii; and H. Keil (ed) *Grammatici Latini*, I (Leipzig, 1867), iv 1864, n12.

[64] Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, 211.

[65] Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, 211. Mack has collected data on the craze of publications of manuals of rhetoric in the Gutenberg era. "Between 1460 and 1620," he calculates, "more than 800 editions of classical rhetoric texts were printed all over Europe" and "between 1489 and 1620, approximately 180 known editions of these specialized manuals of tropes and figures." (Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric,* 2)

[66] Also of interest is Judah Messer Leon's *The Book of the Honeycomb's Flow* (1475): "The first known work by a Jewish scholar on the rhetoric of the Hebrew Bible," its author "the first Jew to compare the language of the prophets and Psalmists with Cicero's," according to Wuellner, "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" 451. Leon applies examples from classical rhetoric to interpretation of the Old Testament.

[67] Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, 211.

derivatives of the Ciceronian tradition, were known in the Middle Ages[68] and intervening centuries, none of them had noted parechesis (or alliteration) in Paul. Now with the introduction of Hermogenes to Western Christianity, scholars for the first time had access to the famous Greek rhetorician's insight. But was parechesis raised to awareness among this resurgence of interest?

In spite of the steady outpouring of rhetorical treatises distributed to the academic institutions of Germany and surrounding European countries,[69] not a single instance of Hermogenic parechesis *from the New Testament* was published during the Reformation era. Only Abraham Fraunce's *Arkadian Rhetorika* of 1588 employs the term parechesis to singularly identify the different-root soundplay that Hermogenes had in mind, Fraunce's examples all from Homer and obviously derived from Eustathius. Agricola, Mancinelli, Erasmus, Mosellanus, and Melanchthon, relying heavily on the Latin tradition—and on each other—all fail to note parechesis in Paul.

Mancinelli (1493)

The "Tabula Figuram" of Mancinelli's fifty-seven page treatise lists 134 figures in alphabetical order, including paronomasia and paromoeon, and is directly related to Diomedes, whom he explicitly acknowledges in his paragraph on Paronomasia:[70] Mancinelli, in fact, repeats a version of Diomedes's "Et non *pretorem* te sed *predonem* dicimus"[71] (along with the misplaced *figura etymologica* of *fugam fugit; factu facit; and pugna pugnata est*).

[68] "Rutilius's *De figuris* is the earliest surviving example of a rhetorical genre that became very popular in the Renaissance," notes Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric*, 150.

[69] Peter Mack tabulates the number of editions of rhetorical treatises published during this era (Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric,* 31).

[70] Antonio Mancinelli, *Carmen de figuris & tropis*, 1493.

[71] "And not a *pretorium* but we say a place for *predators*."

Erasmus (1511)

Erasmus's *De Copia* (1511) describes only seventeen figures and offers no mention of either paronomasia or parechesis and offers no Biblical examples and no examples at all in Greek, though Homer is mentioned. *De Copia*'s influence is well known: It became one of the most important textbooks of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Erasmus did employ rhetorical analyses of 1 and 2 Corinthians in *Paraphrasis chias Epistolos Pauli ad Cornthios* but identified no figures or tropes there either. Erasmus is aware of Eustathius, however, for in *Sono Litterarum* he quotes Eustathius on Homer with respect to pronunciation.

Mosellanus (1516)

The first widely known mention of parechesis among Christians of the sixteenth century comes from Peter Mosellanus. His *Tabulae de schematibus et tropis* (Frankfurt, 1516)[72] sets an important precedent for the most popular rhetorical treatises of the Reformation and Renaissance era.[73] As the title indicates, *Tabulae* offers figures and tropes, more than 160 of them named in his "Index Figurarum," all written in Greek letters and including παρονομασία/agnominatio and, for perhaps the first time in history, παρήχησις.

Among Mosellanus's well-organized list of figures are several important soundplay devices in a row: paronomasia, parechesis, schesis onomaton, paroemion[74] (that is, alliteration), homoteleuton, homoeoptoton, and polyoptoton. Mosellanus is not listing the figures here

[72] Petrus Mosellanus, *Tabulae de schematibus et tropis, iam recens compluribus figuris locupletatae … illustratae, per Reinhardum Lorichium; Additum est Antonii Mancinelli Carmen de figuris & tropis* (Frankfurt, 1516).

[73] On his title page, Mosellanus credits Mancinelli's *Carmen de Figuris & Tropis* (1493).

[74] Italian poet Joannes Jovianes Pontanus of the fifteenth century is usually credited with the term "alliteration."

alphabetically but rather, it appears, congregating them according to their function: sound- and wordplay. Paronomasia and parechesis are found on page 11 of the treatise, among the forty some "Figures of Locutionis" that he defines and illustrates.

Unfortunately, the author makes almost every confusion possible between paronomasia and parechesis. He defines paronomasia (*agnominatio*) simply and non-technically: "Παρονομασία: *Agnominatio, cúm iucunda quaedam fit collusio vocum*" (paronomasia or agnominatio is "when there is a pleasant collusion of wordplay.") He illustrates the figure with four fine examples from classical authors: from Terrence, *Nam inception est <u>amentium</u>, haud <u>amantium</u>* (via Donatus); from Cicero via Diomedes, *Sicilia te non <u>Praetorem</u>, sed <u>praedonem</u> habuit* ("Sicily considers you not a praetor but a prisoner/prey")[75]; and the clever proverb, *Septem <u>convivium</u>, novem <u>convitium</u>* ("Seven for dinner, nine for noise"). Each of these clearly involves soundplay on words of different roots. Then, still under the heading Παρονομασία, come several proper name plays that follow a compound conjunction pattern of "not this but that," for example,

Non in <u>aula</u> natus es, sed in <u>caula</u> ("Not in a palace hall were you born, but in a sheepfold").

Lastly, Mosellanus offers a (disputed) Pauline example, from 2 Timothy: φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι—clearly an example of same-root wordplay.[76]

Immediately following the entries on Παρονομασία, Mosellanus makes what is very possibly sixteenth century Christendom's first published introduction to the term παρήχησις.[77] It is a historic reprisal of the long forgotten Hermogenic term,[78] Mosellanus here is on the verge of

[75] See the similar but superior example from Romanus: *Praetor iste, vel potius praedo sociorum.*

[76] The appending of a biblical, in fact New Testament, example follows Bede's presentation in *DST*.

[77] Mosellanus is not listing the figures alphabetically but according to function.

[78] University of Marburg professor Reinhard Lorich seems to be the source of Mosellanus's knowledge of parechesis.

an important historical Neufundland, but his entries only confuse the matter. Parechesis is only "slightly different from Paronomasia" (*Parùm à Paronomasia differ*), he attempts to explain, before illustrating the figure with Diomedes's run of *figura etymologica* copied from Mancinelli: *Fugam fugis, pugna pugnata est*, etc.[79]

Just at the point where Mosellanus might have made a distinction for the Reformation theologians, he fails to nuance the terms.

Then, quite inexplicably, Mosellanus appends an example that is of a completely different species than the *figura etymologicae*, and it is from Hermogenes himself (without attribution): Σαμία μία ναῦς. This example from the Hermogenic corpus clearly belongs in the prior section, which itself should have been titled Parechesis.

Thus, parechesis makes a brief, ambiguous, and unimpressive appearance in Reformation print. Mosellanus uses the Hermogenic term and one Hermogenic example but not Hermogenes's definition,[80] as the Latin tradition dominates his thinking. (Julianus Rufinias, Cicero, and Quintilain are all mentioned in the treatise.) Indeed, in his jumble of examples parchesis differs little from paronomasia—a common mistake in subsequent history as well.[81]

In sum, Mosellanus's treatise is important historically more for what it shades toward than what it sheds light on. He manages to properly include under "Παρονομασία" the same root wordplay of 2 Timothy, φιλήδονοι/φιλόθεοι and, under παρήχησις, Σαμία μία ναῦς ("Samia, my

[79] "Flight fly"; "The battle is fought."

[80] We can deduce that Reinhard Lorich whom Mosellanus credits in the title page for illustrations, a professor of theology and philosophy at the University of Marburg, apparently knew the Hermogenic corpus (see George Alexander Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric: Translated with Introduction and Notes by George A. Kennedy* [Boston: Brill, 2003], 89–90).

[81] For example, see Lightfoot, Blass, and A. T. Robertson below.

ship"),[82] the last example from Hermogenes's *On Style*. But no parechesis from Paul or the Bible is anywhere to be seen. Although he includes the term parechesis—and thereby we know that Reformation era theologians have access to the insights of Hermogenes—he does not appreciate the distinctive of this unique figure of speech. In fact, the Greek of Hermogenes is but a tendentious addition to Mosellanus's scholarship that will not hold to the main branch. In later editions of Mosellanus's work, the term parechesis will fall out (see below). Due to Mosellanus's influence on subsequent treatises, in particular on those of Melanchthon and Susenbrotus, Western Christendom and the Protestant Reformation missed an historic opportunity to unambiguously introduce the term and the concept of parechesis into biblical exegesis.

Mosellanus had no small influence on European education. According to *The Cambridge History of English and American Literature*, Mosellanus's figures were "commonly alluded to" in the sixteenth century English school curricula.[83] Richard Sherry, in the first English handbook of figures of speech will credit Mosellanus:

> Mosellanus hath in his tables showed a few figures of grammar, and so hathe confounded them together, that his second order called of Loquucion pertaineth rather to the rhetoricians then to his purpose.[84]

Indeed, Mosellanus has "confounded" the matter. The important figure of parechesis will not cross the English Channel. In the combined work of Mosellanus, Erasmus, and Melanchthon of 1533,[85] parechesis has disappeared from the list of figures. The 1540 edition of Mosellanus,

---

[82] "Flight fly; Doing was doing; Grace welcome; Greta decretali; The battle being fought; Samia, my ship." The last example is from Hermogenes.

[83] *The Cambridge History of English and American Literature in 18 Volumes* (1907–21), vol. 3, Renascence and Reformation XIX. English Universities, Schools and Scholarship in the Sixteenth Century. Section 7. (New York: Putnam, 1907–21).

[84] Richard Sherry, *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* (London: John Day, 1550).

[85] *Tabulae de schematibus & tropis Petri Mosellani. In rhetorica philippi Melanchthonis, in Erasmi Roter. Libellem de duplici copia*, Antuerpiae: Martinum Caesarem, 1533.

De schematibus et tropis tabulae (printed in Nuremberg) has no mention of parechesis at all. The phantom appearance of parechesis in the tabulae of 1516 made no impression to speak of on the Reformation.

Melanchthon (1519 and following)

This is not to say, however, that rhetoric in general had no effect. Following Agricola, Mancinelli, Erasmus, and Mosellanus, a particularly strong tradition of appreciation of rhetoric is evident within Lutheranism. Melanchthon, the *Praeceptor Germaniae*, makes his own contributions. The publication dates for Melanchthon's three treatises on rhetoric are strikingly consonant with historically important years of the Reformation: 1519, 1521, and 1531. *De rhetorica libri tres* (after Aristotle's *Ars rhetorica*) appeared in 1519 and was reprinted three more times in the crucial decade of the 1520s; *Institutiones rhetoricae* (a title apparently honoring Quintilian's work) was first printed in 1521 and was revised in 1531 and printed as *Elementorum rhetorices libri II*, which edition was often reprinted and revised again in 1542; and in 1523 *Encomium Eloquentiae* was published.[86]

Melanchthon wrote *De Rhetorica Libri Tres*—the three-book format modeled apparently after Aristotle's divisions[87]—and *Institutiones rhetoricae* based on lecture notes from his students at Wittenburg. In the latter, Melanchthon follows Mosellanus but with additions of his own.[88] *Institutiones rhetoricae* is a classical approach to rhetoric, showing clearly the influence direct or indirect of the Latin handbooks, featuring discussions of persuasion and the parts of an

[86] See Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory*, 14–15.

[87] At Wittenberg in 1519 Melanchthon edited Aristotle's *Ars Rhetorica.*

[88] See Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, 85.

oration before proceeding to figures of speech, among the Elementa Rhetorices.[89] The names of figures and tropes are offered in both Greek and Latin, with brief, handbook-like definitions. In *De rhetorica,* Melanchthon lists over 200 figures and tropes but with only cursory definitions and few Scriptural examples. As one scholar puts it, Melanchthon "skipped through the tropes with a brevity akin to terseness, giving examples only from classical literature."[90] Indeed, in Book 3 Melanchthon devotes barely a full page to "Schemata," with no mention of parechesis.

Among the seventy figures under "De Rhetoricis Schematibus" in *Institutiones rhetoricae,* Melanchthon does include "AGNOMINACIO," giving precedence to the Latin name over the Greek "paronomasia," terms that appear handwritten in Latin and Greek letters, respectively. From Donatus via Mosellanus he repeats *amentium/amantium* and the proper name soundplay *Oneri/honori,* and adds the long transmitted ex *oratore arator*, all examples of pure parechesis, a Greek term he does not employ, though he knows Mosellanus and he notes from Cicero the Greek-Latin connection with respect to soundplay, quoting *Graeci vocant* παρονομασία.[91]

A master of the Greek language and the Teacher of Germany, Melanchthon includes but one example from Paul, the obvious paronomasia of 2 Cor 4:8, ἀπορούμενοι ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι (and not Mosellanus's 2 Timothy). In *Elementorum Rhetorices Libri II*, Melanchthon adds a cognate example that, not without irony, has theologians in view: *ex theologo matelogus*.

The polymath Melanchthon was "a rhetorician in his own right like Augustine," Duane F.

[89] Clearly, Melanchthon is familiar with the history of rhetoric. His first book on the subject, *De Rhetorica Libri Tres* (the three-book model of Aristotle and his last, *Encomium Eloquentiae*, bears a title the first word boldly Gorgian, the second a synonym in the Latin handbooks for style.

[90] Richard Rex, *Reformation Rhetoric: Thomas Swynnerton's The Tropes and Figures of Scripture, Issue 1 of Renaissance Texts from Manuscript*, ed. Richard Rex (Cambridge: RTM, 1999), 34. Melanchthon does give one example of paronomasia from Paul. See below.

[91] "Greeks call paronomasia." Cicero, *De or.* 2.63.256.

Watson reminds us. "His rhetorical commentaries on Romans and Galatians use Greco-Roman conventions of invention, arrangement, and style."[92] But, it must be said, Melanchthon made no great contribution to our understanding of Pauline style. At the start of the Reformation, Melanchthon certainly has Hermogenes available to him but relies on the Latin precedents in penning his *Institutiones rhetoricae*.

The influence of Melanchthon in Protestant Germany and elsewhere in Europe is incalculable, but what he fails to transmit also has consequences. No known instances of Hermogenic parechesis from the New Testament are published during the Protestant Reformation.

If Melanchthon had "skipped through" a treatment of style, overlooking biblical examples, he nonetheless gave impetus to a long run of English manuals on style. The first part of *Institutiones rhetoricae*, on argumentation, was reprised in the first English treatise on rhetoric, *The Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke* (London, 1532) by Leonard Cox, a friend and disciple of Melanchthon at Tübingen.[93] Also inspired by Melanchthon, the Englishman Richard Sherry broke ground in England mid-century with the publication of his own *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* in 1550, as modern editor Herbert Hildebrandt enthusiastically remarks, "permitting the figures to march, for the first time, in English."[94]

---

[92] Duane Watson, "Rhetorical Criticism," in *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, 166. Watson, who has achieved one of the best modern rhetorical analyses of any New Testament book to date (Duane F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*, SBL [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988]), might have also mentioned Melanchthon's historical appreciation of figures of speech. Similarly, Calvin analyzes Romans rhetorically in his *omnes D. Pauli Novi Testamenti Epistolas, atque atia in Epistola ad Hebraeos commenaaria luculentissima*, noting some paronomasia.

[93] For more on the influence of these, see Rita Copeland, ed., *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature: Vol. 1: 800–1558* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 520.

[94] Herbert W. Hildebrandt, ed., *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* (Gainesville, FL: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1961), viii.

Susenbrotus (1540)

Protestants were by no means the only scholars interested in rhetoric. German humanist and Roman Catholic Joannes Susenbrotus (1484/1485–1542/1543), whose dates very closely parallel Luther's, wrote Christian poems and a Latin textbook, *Grammaticae artis institutio,* and one important rhetoric manual, his *Epitome troporum ac schematum* (1540), which borrows from Erasmus, Mosellanus, and the Reformation leader Melanchthon.[95] Susenbrotus also draws on the ancient Latin rhetoricians, *Ad Herennium*, Quintilian, Rutilius Lupus, and Aquila Romanus.[96] In presenting figures, Susenbrotus imitated Melanchthon's order but expanded Melanchthon's list from the year 1521. Included among this "exhaustive"[97] list of 132 figures and tropes are the synonymous terms "agnominatio," "prosonomasia," "paresia," and "paronomasia," with examples from ancient literature, but no "parechesis."[98]

In the preface of his broadly influential treatise, Susenbrotus admonishes his students and teachers to identify the tropes and figures in the texts they are reading. Ignorance of the tropes and figures will impede understanding.[99] In this respect he joins Augustine and Cassiodorus in explicitly commending figures of speech as exegetical aids.

"Many other texts on style were written in the sixteenth century," notes George Kennedy, who is one of the most important historians of rhetoric, especially for Christian exegetes. "Among handbooks of tropes and figures that had repeated printings and were used in schools

[95] See Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, 85.

[96] Mack, *History of Renaisannce Rhetoric*, 218.

[97] Mack, *History of Renaisannce Rhetoric*, 218, perhaps prematurely calls this list "exhaustive." Later English treatises will number around 300 figures.

[98] See J. Brennan, "The Epitome Troporum ac Schematum of Joannes Susenbrotus: Text, Translation and Commentary," Ph.D diss. (University of Illinois, 1953), iii–vii.

[99] Joannes Susenbrotus, *Epitome troporum ac schematum: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, trans. Joseph Xavier Brennan (Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953), 3.

over a long period of time and in many countries were [Mosellanus' and Susenbrotus']."[100] Susenbrotus's influence was indeed far and wide, to students all over Europe—including Shakespeare who draws on many of Susenbrotus's examples.[101]

Soarez (1562)

The most popular rhetorical treatise of the second half of the sixteenth century was from another Roman Catholic. Soarez's *De arte rhetorica libri tres* of 1562) was "the most successful rhetoric of the second half of the sixteenth century," according to Mack, a handbook that became "the textbook of choice in the Jesuit schools established across Europe and in the new worlds of America and Asia."[102] Its full title continues as *ex Aristotele, Cicerone & Quintiliano*, notably excluding Hermogenes. It, too, has no examples of parechesis.

Ramus, Talon (1548), Fraunce (1588)

Peter Ramus, the Protestant Reformation martyr in Paris, has been unfairly disparaged for his reorganization of Aristotlean-Ciceronian rhetoric, as one who "reduced" rhetoric to figures of speech. In truth, his protégées, Omer Talon and his English translator, poet Abraham Fraunce, made valuable contributions to that important aspect of rhetoric. Peter Mack asserts the importance of Talon: "After Susenbrotus, the next major contribution to the study of the tropes and figures was the publication of Omer Talon's *Rhetorica* (Paris, 1548), which enjoyed more than 100 editions before 1620."[103] Three quarters of the work was devoted to tropes and

[100] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 245.

[101] See Stefan Daniel Keller, *The Development of Shakespeare's Rhetoric: A Study of Nine Plays* (Tübingen: Verlag GmbH, 2009).

[102] Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, 9.

[103] Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, 221–22.

figures,[104] thus a skewed presentation of the ancient rhetoric according to Aristotle but one that kept alive an interest in style among French scholars.

Fraunce's rhetorical treatise,[105] written in Latin and English with examples from many languages, including Greek, includes what he calls "Paronomasia" among the twenty-two figures he defines. His definition of paronomasia, however, belongs to classic parechesis: Paronomasia, he suggests, is "the repetition of sounds." Fraunce goes on: "It followeth to speake of the repetition of sounds somewhat unlike, as paronomasia and polyptoton. Paronomasia, Agnominatio, allusion is when a word is changed in signification by changing of a letter or sillable."[106] This is the classic definition of Hermogenic parechesis.

Following his brief definition are ten or so examples from Homer, some of which are clear examples of parechesis that are relevant to Pauline studies. Fraunce's third example, from *Il*. 2.29, features nasal clusters: ἕνα μῆνα μένων ("One month remaining . . ."); the collocation is not unlike, for example, what we find in 1 Thessalonians: ὑμῶν μνείαν ποιούμενοι … ἡμῶν … μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν (1 Thess 1:2–3). Fraunce shows alliteration with θεός in *Od*.16.187–88a, οὔ τίς τοι θεός εἰμι: τί μ᾽ ἀθανάτοισιν ἐΐσκεις; as well as δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (*Od*. 16.187-188a); Paul frequently alliterates with the divine title (see Table 3). Fraunce's fourth example apparently calls attention to the rhyme of the aligned first words of a bicolon, *Il*. 2.485–486:

> *ὑμεῖς* γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε ἴστέ τε πάντα,
> *ἡμεῖς* δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν.[107]

[104] Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, 221–22.

[105] It is possible that Fraunce's *Arkadian Rhetorika* published in 1588 is a translation of Talon's work.

[106] Fraunce, *The Arcadian Rhetorike*, Book 1, Cap. 24.

[107] Aristotle called the similarity of sound at the beginning or end of clauses "paromoiosis," claiming, "At the beginning the similarity is always shown in entire words." (Aristotle, *Rhet*., 3.11.6 [Freese, LCL]).

Fraunce keenly juxtaposes two similar verses *Il.* 5.11 and 14.3 to illustrate two separate pairs of parechesis (italics mine):

*Φηγ*εὺς Ἰδαῖός τε *μάχ*ης εὖ εἰδότε πάσης. (*Il.* 5.11)

‘*φρά*ζεο δῖε *Μαχ*ᾶον ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα… (*Il.* 14.3)[108]

Further, he offers examples of parechesis from other languages, from French, *La loi non par Platon, ains par Pluton ecrite*; and Perde *repos* & *repas*.[109] The English poet Fraunce also adds some obvious examples of rhyme from his native tongue, for instance: “But *namelesse* hee, for *blamelesse* he shal bee.”

These few examples from four languages, especially the Greek from Homer, offer helpful insights into the definition of parechesis and might have served as a paradigm for Pauline soundplay. No one in the Reformation era made that connection.

Conclusion to Reformation Treatises

Unfortunately, few sixteenth century rhetors heeded the Hermogenic nomenclature, which George Trebizond is credited with bringing to European shores. Greek treatises were admired because they were Greek but perhaps for that very reason were never fully comprehended by the Latin tradition of scholarship. Among soundplay devices, the diffuse Ciceronian term “paronomasia” will dominate and the more interesting figure of parechesis will be lost among the rather mundane examples of different prefixed words in Paul. Where treatises did offer examples of different-root soundplay, they mislabeled them. In other words, in the Latin West, unclear definitions and mixed examples obscured the discovery and identification of different-root pairs in the Pauline text for centuries before and after the Reformation. Hence, little attention has been

[108] “Phegeus and Idaeus, both well-skilled in all manner of fighting….” (*Il.* 5.11). “Explain, good Machaon, what these works of warfare will be….” (*Il.* 14.3)

[109] “The law was written not by Plato but by Pluto,” and “Loss of rest and meals,” respectively.

paid to the Hermogenean phenomenon, though it abounds, as we will show, in the Pauline epistles. What is not well defined, the history of exegesis seems to prove, is not well seen.

To summarize, the term "parechesis" did not find its way to Italy and the West until the fifteenth century,[110] and not until Omer Talon (1548) or Abraham Fraunce (1588) was it used in the Hermogenic sense in European print.[111] Hermogenes, it appears, will little interest biblical scholars in the following centuries compared to their fascination with the Latin texts, and in the centuries that follow one is hard pressed to find the name Hermogenes or a technical use of parechesis in exegetical studies. In 1751, Wettstein cites Hermogenes (and Eustathius) at the parechesis of Rom 1:13, and Ernesti in his great lexicon of 1795 will include an historically important entry on parechesis (see just below). But other major works—Bengel's *Gnomon*, Winer's *Sprachidioms*, BDF, and A.T. Robertson's grammar, for instance—are fairly incautious or even negligent in the use of the term. At the end of the nineteenth century Bullinger will impute completely new meaning to the term and, a hundred years later, R. Dean Anderson will mention neither parechesis nor Hermogenes in his important lexicons at the start of the twenty-first century.[112] It will not be until 2005 that *On Invention* is even translated into English.

English Treatises: Reformation to the Twentieth Century

The lineage of rhetorical treatises from the first century to the Reformation era, Germany first and then on into England, seems to follow this transmission path: Rutilius Lupus (first

[110] Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*, 114–18, describes the transmission of Hermogenes from Constantinople to Italy and Europe.

[111] Abraham Fraunce, *The Arcadian Rhetorike: or The præcepts of rhetorike made plaine by examples Greeke, Latin, English, Italian, French, Spanish, out of Homers Ilias, and Odissea, Virgils Aeglogs, […] and Aeneis, Sir Philip Sydnieis Arcadia, songs and sonets* […]. (London: Thomas Orwin, 1588), gives ten examples from Homer under the term "Paronomasia," some of which are classic parechesis.

[112] R. Dean Anderson Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Leuven: Peters, 1999) and *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms* (Leuven: Peters, 2000).

century AD) to Alexander Numenius (second century AD) to Rufinianus (fourth century) to Donatus and Diomedes (fifth century) to Mancinelli to Mosellanus to Melanchthon (Reformation era) to Leonard Cox and Richard Sherry (English, sixteenth century).

Leonard Cox (1532)

Although Bede had brought rhetoric to the British Isles, he had brought it in Latin. In 1533, the first book of rhetoric in English was published, its title conspicuously mimicking Aristotle: *The Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke* by Leonard Cox, a work based on Melanchthon's rhetoric, also acknowledging Mosellanus. Again belying the argument that rhetoric was suffering a reduction into mere stylistic analysis, Cox's emphasis was on rhetoric as argumentation. In fact, Cox does not treat style at all.[113]

Richard Sherry (1550)

To address that aspect of rhetoric known as style came Richard Sherry of the same generation.[114] Sherry's work, also inspired by Melanchthon's, inaugurated a series of manuals of rhetoric in English devoted exclusively to style, which at the end of the nineteenth century would culminate in Bullinger's well-known *Figures of Speech,* a disappointing work in important respects but one which offers a few priceless examples of soundplay. These works all either omit or misuse the term "parechesis."

It is important to note that these treatises used Scripture at points to illustrate rhetorical figures and vice versa: rhetorical figures to interpret Scripture. England's Richard Sherry is one who will, like Cassiodorus, call upon exegetes to use figures to interpret Scripture.

[113] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 247.

[114] Richard Sherry, *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* (London: John Day, 1550).

Sherry's rhetoric of style is titled *Treatise of Schemes and Tropes, Gathered out of the Best Grammarians and Oratours*—by which he means Cicero and Quintilian of the ancients and Agricola, Mosellanus, Melanchthon, and, most obviously, Erasmus. Sherry includes 65 rhetorical figures, with both Greek and Latin names, *but no parechesis.* Sherry's notion of how the study of figures and tropes fits into a rhetorical curriculum owes much to Agricola and to Melanchthon's treatment of that subject in his *Institutiones,* notes historian Thomas Conley.[115] But the influence of Melanchthon is exaggerated. The two works are of entirely different focus, Melanchthon's scholarly, Sherry's encomiastic. What the English treatises seem to lack in erudition compared to the parallel continental works they make up for in reverence, their audience laymen and ministers. The question of Scripture's compatibility with the ancient classics, the profane versus the sacred, continued to be answered with uplifting praise for biblical literature. Sherry is one who will echo Augustine's early reverence for the New Testament and is keenly aware of the place of style in rhetoric, writing, "For thys dare I say, no eloquente wryter maye be perceived as he shulde be, wythoute the knowledge of them: for asmuche as al togethers they belonge to Eloquucion, whiche is the third and principal part of rhetoric." His endorsement of a matter of style as the third part of rhetoric is Aristotlean, whether he knows it or not. But he is explicitly cognizant of the benefit of figures in exegesis, for "also they greatelye profit us in the reading of holy scripture, where if you be ignoraunte in the fygurative speches and Tropes, you are lyke in manye greate doubtes to make but a slender solution."[116] It is a great weight given to figures of speech, but an appreciation that will wane considerably in the history of exegesis and Pauline studies.

[115] Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition,* 136.

[116] Sherry, *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes,* preface.

Sherry's work gave rise to a run of English treatises with mounting lists of rhetorical figures, notably from Thomas Wilson (1553),[117] Henry Pechum (1577),[118] Benjamin Keach (1682),[119] (John Holmes (1755),[120] who lists 250 figures, John Brown (1791),[121] and G. W. Hervey (1873),[122] whose treatise for the church defines 256 figures and tropes.[123] The attention to figures of speech reaches something of a climax—or anticlimax, as we will see—in E. W. Bullinger's 1899 *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*.[124] None of the English works except Bullinger's makes any real contribution to soundplay in Paul. Two others, however, are of some historical interest: the works of Keach and Hervey.

Thomas Swynnerton (c. 1537)

Also directly dependent on Melanchthon and of interest to Lutheran scholars is Thomas Swynnerton's *The Tropes and Figures of Scripture.*[125] Swynnerton, an Englishman, was a student

[117] Thomas Wilson, *The Art of Rhetorique, for the use of all such as are studious of Eloquence, set forth in English by Thomas Wilson* (London: Richard Grafton, 1553).

[118] Henry Pechum, *The Garden of Eloquence Conteyning Figures of Grammer and* Rhetorick (London: H. Jackson, 1577).

[119] Benjamin Keach, *Troposchēmalogia: Tropes and Figures, Or, A Treatise of the Metaphors, Allegories, and Express Similitudes, &c. Contained in the Bible of the Old and New Testament . . .; Philologia Sacra, The Second Part; Wherein the Scheme, Or Figures in Scripture, are Reduced Under Their Proper Heads, with a brief explication of each* . . . (London: John Darby, 1682).

[120] John Holmes, *The Art of Rhetoric Made Easy: Or, The Elements of Oratory Briefly stated, and fitted for the Practice of The Studious Youth of Great-Britain and Ireland* (London: C. Hitch and L. Hawes, 1755).

[121] John Brown, *Sacred Tropology or, A Brief View of the Figures and Explication of the Metaphors Contained in Scripture* (London: Berwick, 1791). Brown spends ten pages on "A general view of the FIGURES of Scripture-language," all in English, and over 400 pages on metaphors.

[122] George Winfred Hervey, *A System of Christian Rhetoric* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1873).

[123] Hervey, *A System of Christian Rhetoric*, 615, lists one example of "parechesis" which he calls "a kind of paronomasia, wherein two or more syllables, words or members of a sentence are pronounced with a similar sound": *Fortunatam natam*, from Cicero. He also lists Augustine's *Sanabilem non sanum* (616).

[124] E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (New York: E & J.B. Young, 1898).

[125] Thomas Swynnerton's *The Tropes and Figures of Scripture* (1554) reprinted in *Reformation Rhetoric: Thomas Swynnerton's The Tropes and Figures of Scripture*, ed. Richard Rex, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press/RTM, 1999.

at Wittenberg in 1526. Where the German Reformers had briefly propagated definitions of figures of speech, conveying the long Latin academic tradition, Swynnerton and Sherry dwelt on them as keys to understanding the Scripture—though few verses did they actually open an understanding of by this method. Swynnerton's text was never published until the end of the twentieth century.

Benjamin Keach (1682)

Though few English treatises offered any valuable insight into soundplay in Paul—many of them offering examples of figures only from *English* versions of the Bible—it was not for want of trying. Reverend Benjamin Keach's *Troposchēmalogia: Tropes and Figures, Or, A Treatise of the Metaphors, Allegories, and Express Similitudes, &c. Contained in the Bible of the Old and New Testament,*[126] first published in 1682 and last printed in 1855, informed English pastors and laymen for parts of three centuries.[127] Keach, who is clearly classically educated, pays his debts to Glassius[128] and discusses from the ancient handbooks many types of figures of speech found in Scripture, including paronomasia, the etymology of which he carefully explains for the reader: "ΠΑΡΟΝΟΜΑΣΙΑ. Paronomasia, with Agnominatio, or likeness of words, of παρα, which in composition signifies with alteration, and ονομα, a name, or from παρανομαζω to change, or allude to a name or word, is when by the change of one letter of a word, the signification thereof

[126] Benjamin Keach, *Troposchēmalogia: Tropes and Figures, Or, A Treatise of the Metaphors, Allegories, and Express Similitudes, &c. Contained in the Bible of the Old and New Testament . . .; Philologia Sacra, The Second Part; Wherein the Scheme, Or Figures in Scripture, are Reduced Under Their Proper Heads, with a brief explication of each* (London: John Darby, 1682).

[127] Benjamin Keach, *Tropologia: A Key to Open Scripture Metaphors in Four Books to which are Prefixed Arguments to Prove the Divine Authority of the Holy Bible together with Types of the Old Testament* (London: City Press, 1855).

[128] Glassius will be discussed in the next section, where we retrace the German lineage.

is also changed,"[129] a definition that, unknown to most exegetes, originates in Aristotle's *para gramma*. "There are many in the Hebrew, of the Old, and the Greek of the New Testmanent," Keach avers, writing of this paronomasia, "which the learned may find in Glassius."[130] Keach defers to the German work at the very point he might have translated valuable insights for English scholars. Keach's treatise, running to nearly 2,000 pages, expends no ink on examples from the New Testament except to expatiate on the Πέτρος/πέτρᾳ wordplay of Matt 16:18, his only reference to Greek in the section.[131] Instead, before deferring to Glassius, Keach offers a few examples of true parechesis from the common parlance of his day: "You are like to have a bare gain out of this bargain" and "Bolder in a buttery than in a battery."[132]

John Holmes (1755)

The listing of rhetorical figures and tropes continued with the modern sounding title of John Holmes's 1755 work *Rhetoric Made Easy*, in which the author lists 250 figures—but all non-biblical examples. This type of attempt at making matters accessible to laymen opened such treatises up to scorn from the more academic minded for alleged reductionism of rhetoric.[133]

G. W. Hervey (1873)

All of the English treatises from Sherrry (1550) to Bullinger (1899) either fail to use or

[129] Keach, *Tropologia*, 201.

[130] Keach, *Tropologia*, 201.

[131] Keach, *Tropologia*, 202.

[132] Keach, *Tropologia*, 201.

[133] It should be borne in mind that the explicit purpose of these treatises was not to provide the reader with a plenary treatment of rhetoric, as was the program of Quintilian. Rather, their titles tell their purpose: to provide a full list of figures and tropes, the empirical and student-friendly evidence of an important material that comprised Greek style. Thus, accusations of reductionism are often misplaced. The Christmas shop vendor who sells but bulbs should not be accused of reducing the holiday to ornament.

misuse the term parechesis. After Keach, two of the most thorough English works of this genre appear in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

The first of these is G. W. Hervey's 1873, *System of Christian Rhetoric*,[134] which purports to host the most figures of speech in history. In this ambitious tome, inspired by the many long works of rhetoric that preceded it, Hervey announces that he has "attempted to name and define all known rhetorical figures."[135] In his nearly exhaustive inventory, he defines 256 with 467 names. But the single largest compilation in history offers not a single example of parechesis from the undisputed (or disputed) Pauline epistles.

Yet another indication of just how inconsistent the definitions have become is found in the lexicon at the end of Hervey's work. Here he attempts to distinguish various types of soundplay, assembling the usual admixture of types and at "Parechesis" subsumes the figure under "paronomasia," thus for all practical purposes defining it out of existence. "Parechesis (parison, parisosis, paromeon)," he explains, "is a kind of paronomasia, wherein two or more syllables or words, or members of a sentence are pronounced with a similar sound."[136] He offers an example from *De oratore*: *O Fortunatam natam.*[137]

Under paronomasia he paraphrases from the Ciceronian treatises for his English readers: "Paronomasia (annominatio) is the use of two or more words which resemble each other in sound or form, but differ as to signification, for the sake of emphasis or antithesis or playful allusion,"[138] so far a definition no different than Hermogenes's parechesis. But then Hervey

---

[134] George Winfred Hervey, *A System of Christian Rhetoric for the Use of Preachers and Other Speakers.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1873.

[135] Hervey, *System of Christian Rhetoric*, 577.

[136] Hervey, *System of Christian Rhetoric*, 615.

[137] Hervey, *System of Christian Rhetoric*, 615.

[138] Hervey, *System of Christian Rhetoric*, 616.

submits this distinction, in spite of *De oratore*'s equating the two: "Annominatio differs from paronomasia," he alleges, "in this, that it comprehends reference both to the sound and to the meaning of words, and consequently, for the most part, it is a kind of antithesis."[139] He cites Matt 16:18 (Πέτρος/πέτρᾳ) and Acts 8:30 (γινώσκεις/ἀναγινώσκεις), clearly conflating two different species.[140] The source of Hervey's misunderstanding is clear; he shows that he has read *Ad Herennium*: "It was sometimes used to designate an alteration in the meaning of a word by interchanging, transposing, adding, or omitting one or more letters or syllables. Some rhetoricians misname this figure prosonomasia; others include in this figure antanaclasis, parechesis, and annominatio, and apply the last term in the sense of a *pun*."[141]

Thus, we see that the "err of *Ad Herennium*" still haunts definitions from the last great run of treatises that will inform twentieth century scholarship. Hervey's attempts at definition create more confusion than clarification, for he is broad when he should have been narrow and narrow where he should have been broad. We can find fault with Hervey's distinctions even within the Ciceronian tradition; historically, as we have shown, "adnominatio" is synonymous with "paronomasia," according to Cicero.[142]

The last quarter of the century witnessed a vigorous interest in figures of speech, indeed, but usually with more quantity than quality. Hervey's ambitious effort of 1873 with its record collection of figures and tropes has not a single example of parechesis from Scripture (properly labelled), except the standard observations from Luke 21:11 and Heb 5:8 and, under

[139] Hervey, *System of Christian Rhetoric*, 616.

[140] This dissertation will consider the first to be "proper name parechesis," owing to the different roots and the second "prefix paronomasia."

[141] Hervey, *System of Christian Rhetoric*, 616.

[142] Cicero, *De or.*, 2.63.256.

paronomasia as well this example from Acts 17:25: διδοὺς πᾶσι ζ*ωὴν* καὶ *πνοὴν* καὶ τὰ πάντα.[143] Far more impressive examples of parechetical rhyme can be found in the New Testament and in Paul, but the single largest compilation in history offers not a single example of Hermogenic parechesis from Paul. Unconscionably, Hervey even alludes to Hermogenes on the very same page where he defines parechesis, but under the definition of the figure of "Parenthesis."[144]

In addition to his appended lexicon, Hervey's work also includes a section titled "The Forms of Sermons as Determined by Method," which includes such sections as "Arrangement of Arguments." This indicates Hervey's plenary understanding of rhetoric as both persuasion and style. In spite of all its shortcomings, Hervey's *System of Christian Rhetoric*, attempting to employ the ancient discipline of Aristotle for the ministry, is a fine Christian effort at what will, in the twentieth century, become the lost art of rhetoric.

English Works from the Last Quarter of the Nineteenth Century

J. B. Lightfoot (1869)

Unlike the German linguist Wilke who in the same era said it was rare, the English philologist J. B. Lightfoot suggested that the sort of word- and soundplay that are relevant to this dissertation were "especially frequent in the Bible,"[145] his fillip the paronomasia of Phil 3:2–3, κατατομήν/περιτομή, which Bede had made widely known (in the Latin transliteration). Here, Lightfoot entirely misses the *kappa* alliteration that in part identifies the reason for *κύνας* in v. 2 and the *pi* alliteration that explains the sequence ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι in v. 3, focusing instead

[143] Hervey, *System of Christian Rhetoric*, 616. This observation is from Winer, noted in the next section on the German lineage.

[144] Hervey, *System of Christian Rhetoric*, 615.

[145] Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 144. We now have in history Augustine saying they abound, Nazianzus saying they do not; Winer saying they abound; Wilke saying they do not; Lightfoot saying they are frequent; Caragounis (2004) saying they abound, and few modern scholars engaged in the debate.

on semantics: κατατομήν, which in the OT is associated with idolatry, "carries out the idea of κύνας."[146]

Lightfoot's biblical training is that of a classical Greek scholar, but his understanding of soundplay is that of a Ciceronian, for in the same paragraph Lightfoot cites Rom 12:3, ὑπερφρονεῖν/φρονεῖν/σωφρονεῖν, mere cognate variance, followed by a citation of the famous example from Diogenes, σχολη χολη,[147] like so many before him, mixing same- and different-root word pair examples. He even presents without distinction two examples in English: "he had been sent not to Spain but to Pain" and "poor subjects were no better than abjects"[148]—the first parechesis, the second paronomasia. He does endorse wordplay at both v. 11 (the obvious paronomasia of ἄχρηστον/ εὔχρηστον) and v. 20 of Philemon, his opinion lining up with Winer against Blass. At 1 Cor 6:12, he acknowledges that "the subtle paronomasia of ἔξεστιν ἐξουσιασθήσομαι should be noticed."[149] The Christian classicist Lightfoot was obviously familiar with the concept of parechesis but did not employ the term himself, though it passed within his purview.[150]

William Farrar (1879)

William Farrar, one of the most impressive and well-read Pauline scholars of all time, in 1879 lists over fifty examples of thirty different types of figures of speech (climax, paronomasia,

[146] Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 144.

[147] Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 214.

[148] Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 144.

[149] Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 214. We note here a subtlety with respect to paronomasia and parechesis. Since the two lexemes of Lightfoot's notice share a common prefix, they may be seen as paronomasia, but because they also share vowel and sibilant and dental sounds, respectively, they should be recognized as more sophisticated parechesis. The likely etymology of the roots—both from the copulative—further complicates any distinction.

[150] As editor of the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, Lightfoot let this imprecision pass in an article on Aeschylus: "a sort of parechesis in the repetition of word," from J. W. Donaldson, "Notes on the Agammenon of Aeschylus" *JCSP* 3 (1857): 196.

etc), noting generally "the incessant assonances and balances of clauses and expressions (parechesis, parisosis, paromoiosis)" that he but alludes to in 2 Cor 6: 3–11. He mentions three "plays on names" in Paul: Phlm 11, ἄχρηστον/ εὔχρηστον (like Lightfoot, to whom he dedicated his first volume); the Phlm 20 pun on Onesimus (yet another endorsement); and an apparently original contribution at Phil 4:2–3, σύζυγε/Συντύχην.[151]

Joseph B. Mayor (1892)

In 1892, Joseph B. Mayor's *Epistle of St. James* [152] made two important observations in the general epistle that have obvious relevance for our dissertation: *mu* alliteration at James 3:5, *μ*ικρὸν *μ*έλος/*μ*εγάλα[153] and *delta* alliteration at James 3:8, τὴν *δ*ὲ γλῶσσαν οὐ*δ*εὶς *δ*αμάσαι *δ*ύναται.[154] In 1916, James Hardy Ropes would endorse these and included James 1:1–2, χαίρειν/χαρὰν, adding tentatively, "Perhaps the alliteration … is intentional."[155]

Bullinger (1899) and the End of the Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century ended on a seeming pinnacle with Bullinger's famous *Figures of Speech*. Bullinger's massive tome, running to more than a thousand pages and boasting hundreds of types of figures, must be mined carefully for its several insights into soundplay. As for "parechesis," Bullinger inexplicably defines it as "[t]he repetition of words similar in sound but

[151] F. W. Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, vol. 1 (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1880), 629.

[152] Joseph B. Mayor, *Epistle of St. James* (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, 1892).

[153] Mayor, *Epistle of St. James*, 108, calls the reader's attention to the alliteration: "Observe the use of alliteration in μ to point the contast of μικρὸν μέλος ἐστὶν μεγάλα αὐχεῖ, and compare that in δ below ver. 8." In 1916, James Hardy Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916), 232.

[154] Mayor, *Epistle of St. James*, 108.

[155] Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 232.

different in language."[156] Strangely, Bullinger defines parechesis as a subcategory of paronomasia: "Parechesis is a *Paronomasia*, when the repeated words of similar sound *are in another tongue*."[157] There is no early historical justification for Bullinger's odd restriction on the term. His collection, however, does contain within its many layers some treasures of true parechesis—but these he subsumes in a chapter titled "Paronomasia, or Rhyming-Words,"[158] subtitled, "The Repetition of Words similar in Sound, but not necessarily in Sense."[159] Here, Bullinger makes a few valuable observations among many instances of Old Testament etymological wordplay and ordinary paronomasia and *figura etymologica*. For instance, he includes along with the parecheses of Rom 1:29, 31, Heb 5:8, and 1 Tim 5:6, 9 (πορισμὸς/πειρασμὸν), the parechesis (he calls it "paronomasia") of Matt 22:3, ἤθελον ἐλθεῖν,[160] along with that of Rom 9:18, θέλει ἐλεεῖ.[161] At 1 Cor 9:17, ἑκὼν/ἔχω stands as Bullinger's best, and possibly original, contribution,[162] but he does not include *ἄκων* in 17b and the full parechetical scheme: εἰ γὰρ *ἑκὼν* τοῦτο πράσσω, μισθὸν *ἔχω*· εἰ δὲ *ἄκων οἰκ*ονομίαν, πεπίστευμαι.

Bullinger brilliantly discerns "a latent Paronomasia" in the disputed Pauline verse 1 Tim 4:3, where κωλυόντων suggests its parechetical counterpart, the omitted κελευόντων,[163] which

---

[156] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, xxv.

[157] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 321. We will find perhaps the most fascinating example of bilingual parechesis in 1 Cor 16:22.

[158] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 307–320. Bullinger's historical understanding is somewhat inverted—he claims that some rhetoricians include Paronomasia in Parechesis (307)—but at least he makes a clear distinction between sound and sense.

[159] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 307.

[160] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 319.

[161] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 319. (compare Wettstein's observation in Rom 1:13, in the next section.)

[162] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 319.

[163] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 319–20.

the New King James translates, sensing the absence: "forbidding to marry, *and commanding* (italics original) to abstain from foods."

Bullinger does offer some valuable contributions from verses elsewhere in the Bible. Under Old Testament "paronomasia," for example, he points out Gen 1:2 *tohu* and *bohu*.[164]

Bullinger's most adventurous hypothesis, however, is in discerning parechesis within an alleged Hebrew *Vorlage*. at 1 Cor 1:23 and 24: "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." "Here," Bullinger writes, "there is beautiful combination of words. By a simple change of letters, the words signify *cross, stumbling-block, foolishness, power,* and *wisdom*. …"[165] In these verses that include reference to both Jews and Greeks, Bullinger is discerning a Hebrew *Vorlage*. The theory is not without evidence, for the "simple change of letters" her refers to is wordage from the ancient handbooks, and in the Hebrew script the parallel terms show striking similarity: "So that the whole passage would sound in reading, thus: 'We preach Christ **maskal**, unto the Jews a **michshōl** and unto the Greeks **sekel**; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the **haschil** of God, and the **sechel** of God'"[166] The similarity of **sekel** (foolishness) and **sechel** (power) is particularly cogent.

Regardless of its faults, *Figures of Speech* offered the twentieth century an indication of the prevalence of this figure of sound and sense and its importance in exegesis: "The figure is very frequently used and is never to be disregarded."[167]

---

[164] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 308.

[165] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 323.

[166] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 323.

[167] Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 306.

Thus, with G. W. Hervey and E. W. Bullinger, the treatment of biblical figures of speech aspires to, if not achieves, something of a culmination of what had been since Sherry part of the traditional presentation of rhetoric in English. Indeed, The English tradition from the Reformation to the twentieth century might be summed up as follows: Melanchthon's work inspired the very first English rhetorical treatises, that of his friend Leonard Cox[168] as well as Sherry's *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* (1550),[169] which inaugurated a long run of similar English works that culminate at the end of the nineteenth century in E. W. Bullinger's well known *Figures of Speech*. These works all either omit or misuse the term "parechesis" and none offer examples of parechesis from Paul.

German Scholarship, on the other hand, was more impressive.

Post-Reformation German Treatises: 1625 to the Twentieth Century

A separate, though not completely unconnected, line of inquiry into figures of speech was conducted in German universities. "After the Reformation there are just a few works of note until Germany became the center of rhetorical analysis of the New Testament in the late eighteenth to early twentieth centuries," according to Duane Watson who has done as much as any leader of the modern New Testament movement to document studies.[170] Indeed, superior works of scholarship come from Germany.[171]

---

[168] Leonard Cox, *The Arte and Craft of Rhetoryke*, 1524. Cox's rhetoric is largely a translation of Melanchthon's *Institutiones rhetoricae*, but also reveals knowledge of the treatises of Trapenzius and Hermogenes, according to Frederick Ives Carpenter of the University of Chicago. (See https://archive.org/stream/jstor-2917751/2917751_djvu.txt.)

[169] Richard Sherry, *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* (London: John Day, 1550).

[170] Duane F. Watson, "Notes on History and Method," pages 101–20 in *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*, ed. Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, BibInt 4. Leiden: Brill, 1994), 103. Watson's is one of several brief histories of the antecedents of the modern day movement.

[171] A good list of German theologians of the Post-Reformation and Enlightenment period who dealt with rhetoric in the New Testament is found in Hans Dieter Betz, *Paulinische Studien* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 128.

Salomon Glassius (1625)

In the post-Reformation era, Salomon Glassius's *Philologia sacra,* 1625, may be the first recognition in print of what become the standard observations from the New Testament: πορνείᾳ,[172] πονηρίᾳ … φθόνου, φόνου (Rom 1:29); ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους (Rom 1:31), and Luke 21:11, λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ.[173] In addition to noting many Old Testament paronomasias, Glassius notes obvious *figura etymologica* and prefix paronomasias at the following New Testament loci: Rom 2:1, ὁ κρίνων/κρίνεις/κατακρίνεις (though an example from 1 Cor 11, the Lord's Supper pericope, might have been more theologically significant); Acts 8:30, γινώσκεις/ἀναγινώσκεις; Rom 5:19, παρακοῆς/ὑπακοῆς, and 12:3, ὑπερφρονεῖν/φρονεῖν/σωφρονεῖν; 2 Cor 4:8, ἀπορούμενοι ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι; 2 Thess 3:11, ἐργαζομένους/περιεργαζομένους; and the rich specimen of 1 Tim 1:9 (busy with *alpha* privatives and alliteration), εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται, ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις, ἀσεβέσι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς, ἀνοσίοις καὶ βεβήλοις, πατρολῴαις καὶ μητρολῴαις, ἀνδροφόνοις.

Glassius's achievement is even more impressively progressive in view of the Reformation's failure to note what this interpreter saw. The work of Glassius is followed by Ch. B. Michaelis's *De paronomasia sacra* (1737), which lists similar examples, both sources for Winer's nineteenth century *Sprachidioms*.[174]

[172] Found in Byzantine manuscripts.

[173] Salomon Glassius, Johann Gottfried Olearius, and Joannes Franciscus Buddeus, *Philologia sacra: qua totius SS. Veteris et Novi Testamenti Scripturae tum Stylus et Literatura, tum Sensus et Genuinae Interpretationis Ratio et Doctrina libris quinque Expenditur ac Traditur; qui Absolvuntur Philogia B. Auctori Speciatim sic Dicta, Grammatica et Rhetorica Sacra*. Lib. V (n.p. 1623; repr., Lipsiae: Apud Jo. Fridericum Gleditsch & Filium, 1713), 1996.

[174] J. F. Böttcher, *de paronomasia finitimisque et figuris Paulo Ap. Frequentatis* (Lipsiae: n.p., 1823), is another source.

Johann Bengel (1742, 1858)

"It is, in short, my intention, briefly to *point out*, or *indicate*, the full force of words and sentences, in the New Testament, which, though really and inherently belonging to them, is not always observed by all at first sight," wrote Johann Albrecht Bengel in explanation of the titular term, *gnomon.*[175] True to its name, Bengel's *Gnomon,* originally published in 1742, makes several original contributions in the later English versions, but not without confusion. The English edition of 1858 edition includes the following historically important examples of parechesis: 1 Cor 11:17, κρεῖσσον/ἧσσον[176]; 1 Tim 6:6, 9, πορισμὸς/πειρασμὸν, from disputed Pauline[177] but an original find and one notable for the distance between the parechetical terms—almost thirty words; and the paronomasia at Phil 3:2–3 κατατομή/περιτομή, as the editors work in the original language.[178]

The editors of the 1858 English translation provided an "Index of Technical Terms Occurring Throughout the Gnomon," perceptively noting that Bengel himself did not use the term parechesis. "PARONOMASIA," they write, "is, when the signification of a word is changed, one or two letters or syllables being either altered or transposed or added, or taken away,"[179] a definition drawn straight from *Ad Herennium*. Then, just on the verge of a critical distinction, the English *Gnomon* invites renewed confusion. Of paronomasia the editors write, "It hardly differs from PARECHESIS, when forms of diction that differ correspond to one another

[175] D. Johann Alberti Bengelii, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (Tübingae, sumtibus Ludov. Frid. Fues, 1855), 1:9.

[176] Compare pseudo-Plutarch's *Vit. Hom*. 38, δὴν ἦν, from Hermogenes.

[177] As we have seen, noted by Bullinger.

[178] John Albert Bengel, *The Gnomon of the New Testament*, ed. Andrew R. Fausset, trans. James Bandinel et al, 5 vols. (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1858), 419.

[179] Bengel, *Gnomon,* 5:419.

by some pleasant allusion, either in the letters or the syllables: for instance, Rom 1:29, 31."[180] Here the editors have included φθόνου/φόνου and, in spite of possible textual critical problems, ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους and πορνείᾳ, πονηρίᾳ, probably repeating the insights of Glassius.

Johann Wettstein (1751)

Next comes the exceptional work of Johann Jakob Wettstein, one of the most erudite works in the history of exegesis,. To be found in the dense commentary of his 1751 *Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus codicum* is a treasure at Rom 1:13. Here, Wettstein makes an original contribution, apparently noting in Rom 1:13 the parechesis of the *theta*-liquids: οὐ θέλω … προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν … ἔθνεσιν.[181]

Wettstein's observation here is indebted to the two great names of this dissertation whom he cites: Hermogenes and Eustathius. It is perhaps the last time in over 250 years that the names of these two Greek scholars, so instrumental in purveying the concept of parechesis, would be found together in a major work of biblical exegesis.

Three late eighteenth century German scholars also exhibit interest in New Testament rhetoric: Siegmund Jakob Baumgarten (1706–1757) and his student Johann Salamo Semler (1725–1791) and Karl Ludwig Bauer (1739–1799). Unavailable today in the U.S. is Bauer's "massive study of Paul's use of classical rhetorical techniques,"[182] titled *Logica Paullina* (1774)

[180] Bengel, *Gnomon*, 5:419–20. It is a slighting of distinction that undoubtedly influenced A. T. Robertson (see below).

[181] Johann Jacob Wettstein, *Ἡ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus codicum*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, Ex officina Dommeriana, 1751, 1752). Unfortunately, Wettstein is little known today. In 1898, Bullinger's *Figures of Speech* noted similar soundplay in Matt 22:3, ἤθελον ἐλθεῖν, as will Russell in 1920 (see below). In fact, the *theta epsilon lambda* theme has many parallels in secular Greek literature, including in Homer, as noted by a variety of classicists. At Rom 1:13, it is not clear whether Wettstein has taken into account the final ἔθνεσιν.

[182] Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible*, 103.

and *Rhetoricae Paullinae, vel, Quid oratorium sit in oration Paullii* (2 vols Halle, 1782).[183] Bauer was a Greek classicist who studied under Johann August Ernesti at Leipzig. J.C.G. Ernesti produced the pioneering *Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae* (Leipzig, 1795), a 400-page compilation of technical terms, listing and defining and illustrating from a rich variety of Greek writers hundreds of rhetorical terms from over the centuries in alphabetical order.[184] On page 249–50 he lists a brief but historical entry on parechesis, summarizing in Latin Hermogenes's words and offering Hermogenes's examples from Xenophon and Homer:

> Hermogeni περὶ εὐρ. Lib. IV. p. 198. Est verborum assonantia quaedam, I.e. cum duo aut plura membra propter similitudinem syllabarum similem sonum efficient ("There is a kind of assonance, i.e., when there are two or more members because of the kind of syllables and the sound effect.")
>
> Xenophon: πείθει τὸν Πείθει, aut Homer [E]ὐπείθει πείθοντο … vid. voc. Paronomasia.

According to Betz, the German forerunners Wettstein, Baumgarten, and Semler "paid careful attention to the characteristics of Paul's rhetoric, in particular his grammar and style."[185] Such a review of history, however, gives German scholarship too much credit. Betz, who himself stands self-consciously in that tradition, pays little attention himself to figures and tropes, concentrating almost exclusively on argumentation and the larger question of *partes orationes* and genre. His historical survey, not surprisingly, gives short shrift to those who made specific contributions to rhetorical understanding of Scripture in terms of identifying figures of speech.[186]

---

[183] Karl Ludwig Bauer, *Logica Paullina* (Halle: Magdeburg, 1774) and *Rhetoricae Paulinae*, 2 vols. (Halle: Impensis Ophanotrophae, 1782). I have not seen these works which are unavailable in American libraries, nor have I seen anyone quote from them. It may be safe to say that Bauer has had no influence on modern rhetorical criticism of the NT.

[184] Johann Christian Gottlieb Ernesti, *Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae* (Leipzig: Sumtibus Caspari Fritsch, 1795). R. Dean Anderson fancies his 1999 lexicon "a new 'Ernesti." But Anderson does not include the term parechesis.

[185] Betz, *Paulinische Studien*, 128.

[186] Betz's omission is all the more surprising since "style" has been a very technical matter since Aristotle and its particulars are reducible to, in the most famous handbooks, the hard evidence of figures and tropes.

Another leading member of New Testament rhetorical criticism, Thomas Olbricht, summarizes Germany's nineteenth century's interest in rhetoric thus: "After 1819 biblical studies began to draw on the new energies expended in Germany but … manifesting little interest in rhetoric."[187] But this is to ignore the particular contributions of Winer, Weiss, Heinrici, and Norden with respect to Pauline style (see below).

George Benedikt Winer (1821)

Sprachidioms[188] is the magnum opus of nineteenth century biblical Greek grammars. In a final chapter, Winer produced over twenty examples of wordplay along with parallels from classical literature,[189] including, though with the usual conflation, a few examples of true parechesis. Section 62, "Paronomasie und Wortspiel," begins auspiciously enough, identifying the soundplays in the three standards, Luke 21:11, Rom 1:29, 31, and Heb 5:8 (noted in Winer's 1825 edition), to which three he adds ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν (Acts 17:25), perhaps Winer's original contribution. He also notes "Dan 13:54, 55" (σχῖνον/σχίσει).[190] Unfortunately, his exhibition at this point devolves to examples of mere paronomasia, πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ, (1 Cor 2:13), etc. Of considerable historical importance for the understanding of Paul's briefest letter is Winer's endorsement of the wordplay of Philemon 20, ὀναίμην with the name Onesimus, a pun that Blass, later in the same century, will disregard.

Winer's list was unfortunately relegated to the final chapter of his great volume, but the priority he gives to wordplay among the figures of speech, listing paronomasia first among the

[187] Olbricht, "George Kennedy's Scholarship," 25.

[188] George Benedict Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese*, 2d ed. (Leipzig: Friedrich Christian Wilhelm Vogel, 1825).

[189] His section is based off the prior work of German linguists and exegetes.

[190] Winer, *Grammatik*, §62.

many literary devices, suggests a relative prominence (at least in Winer' view) of this stylistic element in Paul.

Winer's *Sprachidioms* made a significant contribution to understanding wordplay in the New Testament by identifying so many instances of paronomasia in Paul. The story of *Sprachidiom*'s belated translation into English is another matter. Winer's findings on paronomasia and soundplay disappear from the Moulton editions (beginning in 1906), and the entire project itself, put on hold during the Great War, was suspended when its editor, Moulton, was literally torpedoed on a post-war missionary trip to India. Not until 1976, with the fourth English volume, was there renewed publication of figures of speech in the volume, over a century and a half removed from the original appearance. But Nigel Turner's translation of Winer's section on paronomasia was a complete reinvention, yielding a far different product than the German original.[191]

Christian Gottlob Wilke (1843)

Twenty some years after the first publication of Winer's grammar appears Christian Gottlob Wilke's similar *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik, ein Seitenstück zur Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*.[192] After four hundred pages of his long work, Wilke turns to "Die Rhetorischen Figuren," on page 411, including the term παρηχήσεις.[193] Largely following the example of Glassius and his predecessors, Wilke unfortunately confuses terminology, using Hermogene's precise term too diffusely. Under Section 131, "Figuren der Anschallung," for example, he uses the term to subsume the consecutive examples εὐπείθει πείθονται from Homer

[191] Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: IV, Style* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976).

[192] Christian Gottlob Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik, ein Seitenstück zur Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (Dresden & Leipzig: Arnold, 1843).

[193] Wilke uses the plural form.

(mere cognates) and Σαμια μια from Thucydides (true proper name parechesis). The same failure of distinction is evident in his exhibition of New Testament examples when he immediately follows πορνείᾳ, πονηρίᾳ in Rom 1:29—certainly these two items in the Byzantine manuscript vice list are of different roots—with examples of mere prefix paronomasia from Ephesians, συνεζωοποίησεν συνήγειρεν συνεκάθισεν.[194] As did many before him, Wilke masks over the Hermogenic term with the Ciceronian. Under Paronomasia (παρονομασία), Wilke draws on the Ciceronian handbooks for examples: *temperare*/*obtemperare*; *lenones*/*leones*; *navo*/*vano*; even *facetiis*/*positis* from Cicero, who, Wilke perceives, employs paronomasias "sehr viele."[195] Wilke even adds some German examples for good measure, for example, *Saus und Braus*—clearly an example of different root rhyme. With this base, Wilke segues to the New Testament and here supplies, without using the term parechesis, several pure examples of it: λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ and πέτρος/πέτρᾳ from the Gospels, then ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν from Acts (after Winer).

Wilke's most important examples (we should call them parechesis) include those from Winer: φόνοι/φθόνοι; the textual critical uncertainty from Gal 5:21, πορνείᾳ/πονηρίᾳ; 1 Cor 11:17 κρεῖσσον ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τὸ ἧσσον (a finding seconded in the 1858 English edition of Bengel's *Gnomon*); and then a very unusual and valuable observation at Rom 16:18, κυρίῳ/κοιλίᾳ,[196] an observation discernible from the antithetical structure.

Moreover, in his look at the Letter to the Hebrews, Wilke publishes four important finds: Heb 5:14 καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, (which Turner, in 1976, will hand on) and a classical example at 13:14, μένουσαν/μέλλουσαν, as well as an important one from "11, 3 [sic]" (v. 37) that may

[194] Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik*, 411.

[195] Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik*, 413.

[196] Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik*, 413.

involve a weaker reading but is nonetheless informative: ἐπρίσθησαν, ἐπείρασθησαν,[197] the first term of the same root as the second term of Susanna 58–59, πρῖνον/πρίσαι. Wilke's well-researched treatise indeed includes the historically important examples from the Apocrypha (Susanna 54–55 and 58–59, respectively, σχῖνον/σχίσει and πρῖνον/πρίσαι). None of these examples, it is important to note, involve *same* root pairs.

Wilke's important nineteenth century work,[198] which included some mention of figures of speech in Paul, has elicited some comment from contemporary New Testament rhetorical critics. Betz himself seems to feel a certain ambivalence toward Wilke's effort, variously deprecating it as a "strange work"[199] and commending it as a work on rhetoric that should not be forgotten.[200] In the year 2000, Frank W. Hughes, one of the key scholars of the New Testament rhetorical criticism movement of the late twentieth century reflected on the history of the movement:

> In the early nineteenth century, the German lexicographer Christian Gottlob Wilke as a rhetorical critic was primarily concerned with the investigation of the smaller rhetorical forms, particles, and sentence structure. His pedantic *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik* concerned itself with the aesthetic form of New Testament discourse, attempting to investigate each "rhetorishes Moment" (rhetorical element).[201]

Wilke's achievement notwithstanding, his work is typical of how allegiance to the Latin tradition precludes discovery elsewhere in the New Testament—for when a thing is not defined, it is not seen, as the history of exegesis proves. Unfortunately, Wilke discouraged further investigation, asserting that Paul seldom employed the device: "Paronomasia dieser Art kommen

---

[197] "They have been sawed [or adopted]"/"They have been removed."

[198] Wilke, Christian Gottlob. *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik ein Seitenstück zur Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. Dresden and Leipzig: Arnoldische,1843.

[199] Betz, *Paulinische Studien,* 129.

[200] Hans Dieter Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9. A Critical & Historical Commentary on the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 129 n1.

[201] Frank W. Hughes "The Rhetoric of Letters," pages 194–240 in *The Thessalonian Debate: Methodological Discord or Methodological Synthesis?* ed. Karl P. Donfried and Johannes Beutler (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 201.

bei Paulus selten vor."[202] This dissertation will argue the opposite, that parechesis occurs *frequently* in Paul, and specimens of the very kind that the German classicists reiterated from classical writers will be presented. Likewise, Wilke claims that etymological soundplay is not found in the New Testament as it is in the Old.[203] This dissertation will attempt to show such proper name soundplay is common—and clever—in Paul.[204]

Wilke's mid-nineteenth century work has never been translated and remains available only in old German script. Unappreciated for decades, it nonetheless offers the best list, however brief, of parechesis from Paul ever published, perhaps ranks as the nineteenth century's single best contribution to figures of speech in the Bible. It has not always been appreciated by the advocates of modern New Testament rhetorical criticism. In preparation for his definitive work on figures of speech in Paul for the twenty-first century, R. Dean Anderson did not consult it.[205]

G. W. Hopf (1883)

One of the few works of exegesis to actually include the word alliteration in the title is G. W. Hopf's 1883 *Alliteration, Assonanz, Reim in der Bibel*.[206] Hopf adds βρῶσις καὶ πόσις (that form of alliteration known as parechesis) in Rom 14:17 to a centuries-long gradual accumulation of observations of parechesis in Paul. Like Hervey ten years earlier, he notes the soundplay of

[202] Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik*, 413. A.T. Robertson in the early 20th century will have something to say about the frequency. In 2004, Chrys Cargounis will say just the opposite (Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 460).

[203] Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik*, 414.

[204] As we will see, dismissive statements (Blass's on soundplay in Philemon, the famous classicist Walter Leaf's with respect to Homer) preclude investigation as much as poorly framed definitions occlude it.

[205] R. Dean Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, rev. ed. (Leuven: Peters, 1999).

[206] G. W. Hopf, *Alliteration, Assonanz, Reim in der Bibel: Ein neuer Beitrag zur Würdigung* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1883).

Acts 17:25.[207]

Friedrich Blass (1896–1961)

The height of erudition comes with arguably the greatest German philologist of the era, Friedrich Blass, whose dictates are felt in biblical exegesis to this day. Blass's advanced grammar uses the term "parechesis" and repeats some of the examples from Winer.[208] Blass is actually one of the few in history to attempt to distinguish the technical terms paronomasia and parechesis, but not without confusion. BDF fails to sort out Winer's conflation, including

[207] Historically, the second half of the nineteenth century was a time of marked skepticism toward alliteration in general in classical studies, a diffidence that undoubtedly affected attitudes among biblical scholars and their perception of parechesis in the biblical corpus. Skepticism about alliteration in Homer was expressed by several influential Homeric scholars in the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth, with a gradual evolution of thinking on the issue: "The examples of Simple Alliteration in Homer, and in Greek composition generally, are rare," concluded William Mure, *A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece*, 3 vols. (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1850), 113; "Greek poetry gives few instances," maintained Charles T. Cruttwell, *A History of Roman Literature: From the Earliest Period to the Death of Marcus Aurelius*. (London: Scribner, 1878), 238; "The poet seems to have looked with indifference on the similarity of sound in neighbouring words"—a view from Thomas Day Seymour, *Introduction to the Language of Homer* (Boston: Ginn, 1889), 15, almost diametrically contrary to the twelfth century observations of Eustathius; "Alliteration (as it has been called since early modern times) played a larger role in Latin than in Greek style," wrote Harry Caplan, Preface to *Ad Herennium*, 271, fn *h*; "In Greek, alliteration, like assonance and rhyme, plays no important part," agreed Harry Thurston Peck, ed., *Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities*, vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1898), 59; "In Greek poetry, unlike Latin, this phenomenon [alliteration] is sporadic and apparently accidental," calculated Walter Leaf, ed., *The Iliad*, 2 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1900–1902), quoted in Packard, "Sound-Patterns in Homer," 239–40; "[A]lliteration in Homer is unintentional," averred J.R. Sitlington Sterrett, ed, *Homer's Iliad: First Three Books and Selections* (New York: American Book Co., 1907), 186; "Homer rhymes and alliterates, but not according to any pattern," decided Samuel Eliot Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1938), 156. But in 1960, J. D. Denniston asserts a more positive view: "The early writers of Greek prose … hit upon alliteration and other forms of assonance…," J. D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 127; editor G. S. Kirk (1985–1993) allows that "assonance and alliteration sometimes fortuitous in Homer are often not," G.S. Kirk, ed., *The Iliad: A Commentary* (6 vols. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985–1993), and the volumes under his editorialship include several recognitions by different scholars of alliteration in Homer. In truth, the degree of alliteration in ancient Greek has been historically underestimated. Indeed, over the course of a century the classical world's view of alliteration has changed. Most recently, Oxford classicist Richard B. Rutherford in a final appendix of his 2012 work, titled "A note on alliteration and related phenomena," expresses a view almost opposite his peers of a century and a half ago: "Alliteration and related effects are frequent in Greek poetry, not least in tragedy." The objective numerical studies of Riedel in 1900 gave objective evidence that the Greek Tragedies contained much alliteration. In 1976, David W. Packard, "Sound-Patterns in Homer." *TAPA* 104 (1974): 239–60, would test the null hypothesis against hard data. Packard, himself a professor of the classics, not to mention scion of the founder of Hewlett-Packard, brought a measure of objectivity to the subject, tabulating initial letter alliteration in Homer. His calculations superscede the unsupported opinion of, for example, Leaf, a Westminister banker.

[208] BDF §488.

σχολὴν/χολὴν (Diog. L. 6.24) along with κατατομήν/περιτομή (Phil 3:2–3) under *Paronomasia*. Nonetheless, BDF includes *Parechesis,* "i.e, the assonance of different words,"[209] as a separate category immediately following Paronomasia. At *Parechesis* Blass offers the well-known examples from Luke 21:11, noting the precedent of Hesiod, and Heb 5:8 ἔμαθεν ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἔπαθεν, noting the parallel at Aeschyl. *Ag*. 164, πάθει μάθος. Blass properly calls LXX Sus 54/55 σχῖνον/σχίσει parechesis but does so in his section on paronomasia.[210] It is typical of the confusion and permeable categorization that, as we have shown, can be traced all the way to Aristotle.[211]

Johannes Weiss (1897)

In 1985, as Betz took on the task of applying rhetorical analysis to a second epistle of Paul (2 Corinthians), he credited Johannes Weiss's 82-page essay, "Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik," with establishing the fact that Paul "made use of small rhetorical forms."[212] Weiss's comment is an important prolegomenon:

> That Paul in his letters, which it is generally recognized he dictated and which are so expressed for public reading, laid down prominent oratorical features of the day, is not something new. The question is only how this rhetorical element should be explained and evaluated.[213]

Here, Betz is certainly asking the right question, but the answer could not come until the "small forms" were identified sufficiently. Weiss praised Paul's "symmetry, rhythm, flourish,

[209] BDF §258.

[210] BDF §258.

[211] See below for more on the impact of BDF in American theology.

[212] Hans Dieter Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9. A Critical & Historical Commentary on the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 129.

[213] D. Johannes Weiss, "Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik" in *Theologische Studien*, Festschrift B. Weiss (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1897), 165.

and sonority"[214] and was thus honing in on a basic fact of Pauline style. But there is a lack of specificity in his appraisal at the very point where figures of speech might have illuminated the discussion.

Rudolph Bultmann (1910)

Weiss's most famous student is Rudolph Bultmann. A long line of German inquiry into rhetoric in Paul, whose extent might be marked from Glassius to Bultmann and Norden's final works,[215] ends on almost a side note. Bultmann's dissertation focused narrowly on comparing the style of Romans to the Cynic-Stoic diatribe.[216] After the Great War, German theology emerged with different interests, and Bultmann's temporary focus on rhetoric paled in comparison to other works that brought him post-War fame.[217] No new German works applying rhetorical figures of speech to the Pauline epistles would be published until the final quarter of the century.

Heinrici and Norden (1887–1915)

Several other factors leading into the twentieth century had an adverse effect on attention to rhetorical devices in Pauline studies. The notorious disagreement between C. F. G. Heinrici and Eduard Norden—in particular Norden's imperious overreaction to Heinrici's claim that Paul exhibits certain Hellenistic qualities comparable to the classics—certainly may have had a

[214] Weiss, "Beiträge," 167.

[215] Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte Religioöser Rede* (Leipzig-Berlin: Verlag B. G. Teubner, 1913) and *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Leipzig-Berlin: Druck und Verlag B.G. Teubner, 1915).

[216] Rudolph Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe,* FRLANT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910).

[217] Stowers of the New Testament rhetorical criticism movement brought renewed interest to Bultmann's almost forgotten dissertation with his own, published as Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, SBLDS 57, (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1981).

demoralizing effect on further inquity into the matter.[218] Some consensus on the matter from two of Germany's greatest Christian classicists was not reached until Norden's qualified apology in 1915. In spite of his reaction against Heinrici over Pauline style, Norden generally agrees with him on *Wortspiel*. His 1898 *Die Antike Kunstprosa* addresses figures of speech early in its treatment (Winer and Blass relegate figures of speech to the very end of their works).[219] On page 16, Norden begins a learned discussion of "*Die gorgianischen Redefiguren*," with a handful of pages devoted to *Das Wortspiel*, (including *Wortspiel* along with another Gorgianic schemata, antithesis.[220] Norden lists three examples of rhyming parechesis from pseudo-Hippocrates: πᾶσαν ὥρην, πᾶσαν χώρην; ῥεῦμα/χεῦμα; and πλησθεῖσαι/πρησθεῖσαι.[221] He offers several pages on alliteration, which he equates with parechesis.[222] In his second volume, however, Norden devotes seventeen pages to the letters of Paul without noting any rhetorical figures in particular.[223] Thus, Norden clearly knew and studied the works of Eustathius but did not appropriate the term parechesis nor look for it *in the New Testament texts*.[224]

---

[218] Betz summarizes the history of this awkward conflict: "The harsh attack of Eduard Norden in his work *Die antike Kunstprosa* 2.474–75, 493ff, on George Heinrici had a disastrous effect. In his study *Das sweite Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus an die Korinther* (Berline: Hertz, 1887), Heinrici made full use of citations of parallels from classical literature. Norden's emotional and heavily biased attack was refuted by Heinrici in the appendix to his commentary ("Zum Hellenismus des Paulus," *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* [KEK 6: Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900] 436–58) and met with little approval in general, a fact which Norden was obliged to recognize (see the Nachtrage to the second volume of his work *Die antike Kunstprosa*, 3–4; further Paul Schmiedel, "Paulinische Briefe 1," ThrR 4 [1901] … Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978] 3–4)."

[219] Eduard Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Leipzig-Berlin: Druck und Verlag G.G. Teubern, 1915).

[220] Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* , 23–29.

[221] Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, 24.

[222] Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, 59 n1. From pages 23 to 29, Norden discusses the Gorgianic figure of *Wortspiel*, referencing Quintilian IX, and on page 59 defines alliteration with respect to Greek terms.

[223] Norden *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, 492–511.

[224] See, for instance, Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte Religioöser Rede* (Leipzig-Berlin:Verlag B. G. Teubner, 1913), 333.

Gustav Adolph Deissmann—*Licht vom Osten* (1908)[225]

Nothing had a greater effect on evaluation of the Pauline epistles than the discoveries of the domestic papyri in the sands of Oxyrhyncus and subsequent evaluations. These so-called non-literary documents offered invaluable insights into Paul's writing, when comparisons were made. Conventions of first century letter writing that Paul himself clearly abided by were now established. Not only paradigms for salutations but proof of a "Thanksgiving Formula," for instance, were part of every contemplation of Paul's periods. Negatively, however, Deissmann's illumination had the effect of deprecating time-honored if naïve views of the consecrated nature of Scripture. The sacred language that Augustine and Sherry held in high esteem was now seen in a new light. Paul could be read as the mundane parlance of a "non-literary" letter.[226]

Deissmann famously recast literary appraisal of Pauline epistles into the category of *Kuntsprosa* (or middle art). Largely owing to Deissmann's conclusions with respect to Paul and the papyri, scholarship was torn as to whether Paul's epistles were literary or non-literary. Betz summarizes the division: "German scholarship at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century was sharply divided on the question of how to classify Paul's letters, whether to classify them as literary or non-literary."[227] Gradations of quality were a common compromise view. Blass, for instance, would consider the letter to the Hebrews as superior Greek.[228] But all of these judgments proved premature, made without accounting for all the

---

[225] Adolph Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1905. Repr. From 1927 edition orginally published by George H. Doran.

[226] See Gustav Adoph Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten: Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1908), coming into English as *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament illustrated by recently discovered texts of the Graeco-Roman world*, trans. Lionel. R.M. Strachan (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910).

[227] Betz, "The Literary Composition," 353.

[228] BDF §485.

evidence. No complete assessment of the figures of speech that mark qualities of style from ancient times had been satisfactorily achieved. In spite of the many treatises in both England and Germany devoted to figures and tropes, their numbers are misleading. These treatises most often illustrate the device from a single Bible verse, often repeating the same examples from a predecessor. In spite of identifying hundreds of figures and tropes (and Ernesti hundreds more), the treatises leave hundreds of Bible verses undeclared. Had Deissmann recognized the soundplay of εἰδώλων δουλεύειν (1 Thess 1:9) and ἀνάθεμα Μαρὰνἀθά (1 Cor 16:22), would he have thought Paul so very ordinary? Comparisons with papyri show one major difference between Paul's epistles and these documents, namely, soundplay.

Conclusion to German Rhetoric in the Nineteenth to Twentieth Century

Works of superior scholarship appeared in the long history of German New Testament studies, those of Glassius, Michaelis, Karl Bauer, Wettstein, and, in the nineteenth century, Winer's famous *Sprachidioms.* Toward the end of the century, a line of German inquiry addressing the New Testament Koine's relation to classical Greek would begin to yield auspicious works of scholarship, only to be halted abruptly in the twentieth century by the disruption of the Great War. The centuries-long lineage of inquiry into the relationship of the classics to New Testament Greek, from Glassius to Wettstein to Winer to Heinrici and Norden and Bultmann's specific dissertation of 1910, emerged from the war in a new direction.

German works had made long awaited inroads and seemed to be on the verge of discoveries that might have launched a movement dedicated to inquiries into the identification of figures as exegetical objects. However, the entire landscape of Europe and of European theology

changed.[229]

Modern Authors

The Twentieth Century

Writing in the last decade of the twentieth century, Betz reflected on what he perceived as stagnation in the NT rhetorical movement: "In point of fact, the problems still stand today at the point that had been reached at the beginning of the century."[230] Betz's complaint about the progress of rhetorical criticism ironically assumed that the efforts up to the nineteenth century had exhaustively inventoried the figures of speech. The assumption may have been common at the time. In the first three-quarters of the twentieth century in Pauline studies, there was little attention to figures of speech, with the exception of Russell's 1920 dissertation and a few notable exceptions,[231] including several important studies on the Church Fathers emanating from American Catholic universities, especially Ameringer's and Maat's. It would not be until the start of the final quarter of the century, in 1975, that Betz's Galatians article, followed by his groundbreaking commentary,[232] launched one of the most clearly defined paradigm shifts in

[229] Meanwhile, in secular studies a few important works focusing on figures of speech in the classics were published. Two particularly impressive studies at the end of the nineteenth century were John C. Robertson's *Gorgianic Figures in Early Greek Prose* (Baltimore: Fiedenwald, 1893) and Christian Riedel's PhD dissertation, *Alliteration bei den drei grossen griechischen Tragikern* (Erlangen: E.T. Jacob, 1900). Other relevant studies, which also note parechesis, are William Wilson Baden's *The Principle Figures of Language and Figures of Thought in Isaeus and the Guardianship-Speeches of Demosthenes* (Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1892); Samuel Shipman Kingsbury's *A Rhetorical Study of the Style of Andocides* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company 1899); and Charles Alexander Robinson's *The Figures and Tropes of Isaeus: A Study of His Rhetorical Art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1901). During this period the so-called Gorgianic figures—among which, anachronistically, "parechesis" was sometimes considered—were well published. But never was the discovery extended to Pauline studies.

[230] Betz, *2 Corinthians*, 129.

[231] Thomas Duncan of Washington University and W. A. Jennich from Concordia Seminary, both of St. Louis, called for investigation into figures of speech in the epistles: Thomas Duncan, "The Style and Language of Saint Paul in His First Letter to the Corinthians," *BSac* (1926): 129–43; W.A. Jennrich, "Classical Rhetoric in the New Testament," *CJ* (1948–49): 30–32.

[232] Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1979).

modern theology. The New Testament rhetorical criticism movement that launched hundreds of studies having to do with rhetoric, unfortunately, focused almost exclusively on argumentation in Paul and neglected the figures.[233]

Though figures of speech actually faded from view in the twentieth century's survey of biblical features, major reference works included mention of them. A. T. Robertson's monumental *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* was one of them.[234]

A. T. Robertson (1914)

Winer's great nineteenth century grammar, in discussing figures, had focused almost exclusively on "paronomasia" but followed the Latin line of thinking and mixed together with same-root paronomasia examples of *figura etymologica* and even pun in section 49, under the heading "*Paronomasie und Wortspiel*." Winer's and Blass's grammars, written in the German language and suffering from problems of translation, were precedents for Robertson. Robertson's section on "Figures of Expression (σχήματα λέξεως)," 1199–1202, begins auspiciously enough. Here, Robertson concurs with Blass's educated distinction between "paronomasia" and "parechesis" and repeats the standard observations of Luke 21:11, Heb 5:8, and Rom 1:29 as examples of parechesis, simply, "different words of similar sound."[235] Immediately, however, he collapses the difference. Inexplicably, Robertson calls the reader's attention to the paronomasias of 2 Cor 10:12 and Rom 11:17 (ἐγκρῖναι/συγκρῖναι; κλάδων/ἐξεκλάσθησαν, respectively, prefix

[233] As we have noted, the exaustive bibliography of the first part of the era, by Watson and Hauser, proves the point.

[234] Archibald Thomas Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914; repr., Nashville: Broadman, 1934).

[235] Robertson, *Grammar,* 1201.

paronomasia and *figura etymologica*). "The point is a fine one and need not be pressed," he asserts.

Yet this is exactly the point this dissertation intends to press. At the very point where we need sharp distinction, Robertson has blunted the issue. He tries to explain: "But *annominatio* deals with the sense as well as the sound. Thus, Πέτρος and πέτρᾳ in Matt. 16:18."[236] Yet, certainly proper name pun cannot be relegated to the same category as common-root or prefix paronomasia (though the question is the subject of folk etymology studies) especially given the forty or so examples from Homer that Eustathius identifies. Focusing briefly on parechesis and paronomasia, Robertson then offers examples from Winer's *paronomasie* list, alleging that "there is a certain amount of overlapping in the two figures."[237] The result is that hundreds of examples of soundplay in Paul hidden in the marginalization will be overlooked in the twentieth century by those relying on his grammar for guidance.

Robertson is alert to note "initial alliteration" in the vice list of Rom 1 where others have for centuries only noted the parechesis (if by that name at all): πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ (Rom 1:29)[238] and ἀπειθεῖς, ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους ἀστόργους ἀνελεήμονας (Rom 1:30–31). But Robertson betrays no conviction that this is a pattern in Paul, failing further distinction: "it is hard to tell whether this is conscious or unconscious."[239] Robertson's noncommittal stance and great influence certainly disadvantaged NT discovery, which made no advances on the matter during the tenure of influence of his majestic grammar. Nonetheless, the one auspicious comment we have from the great grammarian on this issue is his final one. The ancient pun, he notes "was

[236] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1201.

[237] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1201.

[238] See similarly the textual variant at Gal 5:21. Robertson does not mention the *pi*'s of πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ that precede his finding.

[239] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1201.

very common."[240]

Elbert Russell (1920)

In 1920, in a dissertation out of the University of Chicago, Elbert Russell offers more original contributions to the cause of discovering soundplay in the New Testamet than any other person, with thirteen examples of "Alliteration" in Matthew and sixteen examples from Romans and the Corinthian letters:[241] His many examples might better have been labelled "parechesis":

> **Romans** 4:16 νόμου/μόνον[242]; 4:18 παρ᾽ ἐλπίδα ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν; 5:7 ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ **τ**ολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν; 8:33 τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; 9:30 διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην. **1 Corinthians** 3:8–9 ἐσμεν συνεργοί, θεοῦ γεώργιον; 5:6 Οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα; 10:3–4 καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα ἔφαγον καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα· ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας; 10:33 καθὼς κἀγὼ πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω; 13:1 γέγονα χαλκὸς ἠχῶν ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον; 13:13(b) τὰ τρία ταῦτα. **2 Corinthians** 3:9 πολλῷ μᾶλλον … *δ*ιακονία τῆς *δ*ικαιοσύνης *δ*όξῃ; 5:17 ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινά· (Russell fails to note Gal 6:15–16); 11:15 διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης.[243]

See Table 1 at the end of the dissertation for a list of Russell's alliterative pairs.

A long unproductive period of inattention to rhetoric in general and figures of speech in particular stretches across the middle of the twentieth century. In the 1960s at the initiation of George Kennedy[244] and, at the start of the final quarter of the century, with the pioneering work of Hans Dieter Betz, came renewed interest in rhetorical analysis of Pauline letters. But, as a fairly exhaustive bibliography of the major works of New Testament rhetorical criticism

---

[240] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1201.

[241] Elbert Russell, *Paronomasia and Kindred Phenomenon in the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1920).

[242] Compare Homer's νάμα/μαννα, a parechesis identified by Eustathius.

[243] Russell, *Paronomasia*, 10–11.

[244] Kennedy, who had anticipated the movement and spelled out a program of application of rhetorical analysis of New Testament writings, including the letters of Paul, barely touched upon figures of speech, though he acknowledges "style" as one of three basic parts of the rhetorical craft (see George Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism SR* [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984], 25).

shows,[245] few if any works included, let alone were devoted to, the one aspect of rhetoric that had always been essential: style and figures of speech. The assumption, expressed in so many ways by many of the leaders of the movement, was that someone else had already done that work.[246]

1960s—Lausberg and BDF: German to English

Two major reference works relating to Greek rhetoric were issued in the early 1960s, one secular, one sacred. The first of these was Heinrich Lausberg's *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* in 1960,[247] though it was not translated into English until 1989.[248] With the precedents of Ernesti's massive lexicon[249] and Richard Volkmann's 1874 *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht*, an "attempt at a comprehensive survey of the sources,"[250] Lausberg's modern version brought fresh insight and a new vocabulary along with a good summary of historical examples to that particular aspect of rhetoric known as style.[251] Two

[245] Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible*.

[246] Exegetes rather illogically suggested that what has really been an overestimate of the attention paid to figures of speech over the centuries had been the cause of a lack of attention to rhetoric in general. The solution of the New Testament rhetorical criticism was to right this perceived overemphasis by exclusion of figures from the discussion.

[247] Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, 2 vols. (Munich: Max Hueber, 1960).

[248] Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, ed. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson, trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

[249] Ernesti's dictionary of figures and tropes, *Lexica Technologica*, 1795–1797.

[250] Richard Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1874), from George Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition* ("Forward"), xix.

[251] R. Dean Anderson, "The Use and Abuse of Lausberg in Biblical Studies," pages 66–76 in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, ed. A. Eriksson, Thomas. H. Olbricht, and Walter Ũbelacker (Harrisburg, Penn: Trinity Press International, 2002), editor of the 1998 English translation, apologizes for some of the idiosyncracies of the nomenclature: "Lausberg himself was not in the first place a scholar of rhetoric, nor of classical studies, but a philologist of Romance languages," (66). Lausberg's was not a "historical rhetorical approach" (66). Anderson goes on to make several telling points: "By studying historical rhetorical theory and practice we attempt to attune our ears to those primarily of the educated class in antiquity in order to reflect, from their perspective, upon the literary and argumentative methods used in the New Testament writings" (68 n6). "We need to distinguish between historical theory and historical practice. An historical rhetorical approach needs to take into account the fact that theory and practice were

figures in some sense flanking the New Testament rhetorical criticism movement were connected with the English translation of Lausberg's work. George Kennedy was selected to write the forward to what he commended as "the reference work to which I first turn for technical information about rhetoric."[252] R. Dean Anderson, whose own important works on rhetoric appeared in 1999 and 2000, edited the English translation. Unfortunately, Lausberg's work, in spite of its attempt at comprehensive treatment, has no mention of the term "parechesis" in its index, only *paronomasae*/*annominatio* (pages 637–39) after the Latin tradition. The go-to lexicon of Kennedy, grandfather of the New Testament rhetorical criticism movement, excluded this key Greek term. The irony is compounded by the fact that Kennedy later became the twenty-first century's translator of Hermogenes.

Regardless of nomenclature, of which Lausberg was at least as innovative as historic,[253] his handbook contains perhaps the best concentration of examples of different root ("inorganic") soundplay in history. Unfortunately, Lausberg compounds the historic problem of definition by failing to consistently subdivide on the basis of etymology,[254] but nonetheless produces under annominatio the best collection of classical *Latin* parechesis (different root soundplay) of all the major works of rhetoric, many [examples] of which we have already seen: "*lucus … locus*," "*honori … oneri*," "*preator … prado*," "*amantium … amentium*," "*mobilitas*, non *nobilitas*,"

not always the same thing." 68 n6. "Aristotle's theory ought not to be considered to have been current in the school rhetoric of the first centuries of the common era…." (69 n7). "Lausberg's systematic summary of ancient rhetorical theory is, as he himself admits, eclectic, the general structure of the system follows Quintilian's *Ins. orat* fairly closely" (71).

[252] George Kennedy, forward to *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, by Heinrich Lausberg, ed. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson, trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton (Leiden: Brill, 1998), i–iii.

[253] But Lausberg also hands on historic confusion, not distinguishing the phenomena of soundplay on the basis of common roots.

[254] Annominatio is subdivided into "organic inflection" and "inorganic immmutatio," as Lausberg duplicates entries (an indication of the flaw of his divisions).

"bona *gens,* mala *mens* est," "*dividiae,* non *divitiae*," "tibi *villa favilla* est," "*Urbis orbis*," "non *Pisnum* sed *pistorum*," "ex *oratore arator*," "*puppesque* tuae *pubesque* tuorum," "non enim tam *spes* laudanda qum *res* est,"[255] "cum plurimos *caederent caderent* nonnulli…." "Cui libet, hoc licet"[256] In Lausberg we find the best, most concise list of parechesis, by any other name, ever assembled. As one knowledgeable reviewer concluded from the English translation: Lausberg's "treatment remains to this day the most exhaustive *catalogue raisonné* of stylistic terminology available in any language."[257]

Friedrich Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (BDF)—1896–1961

A year after the publication of Lausberg's *Handbuch* came the second major work from the 1960s, the English translation of the 9th and 10th edition of Blass-Debrunner-Funk/BDF.[258] The original grammar of Friedrich Blass, the famous professor of classical philology at Halle-Wittenberg, had informed serious German scholars through many editions since 1896. For generations now, Blass's dogmatic judgment of Pauline style and literary quality has been repeated:

> As artistic prose, in my opinion, none of the Pauline Epistles can be considered the equal of Hebrews; however, Romans and 1 Corinthins, with which the author has taken special pains in conformity with the type of persons he is addressing, approach it. In all the others there is at most only occasionally such an approximation to artistic prose.[259]

---

[255] These last four from Quintilian.

[256] Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, 288.

[257] Reviewed by John T. Kirby, Purdue University (corax@purdue.edu), *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 1998.07.08. http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/1998/1998–07–08.html

[258] Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Revision of the Ninth-Tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner*, rev. ed., trans. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

[259] BDF §459.

Elsewhere Blass concedes, "Paul exhibits good, sometimes even elegant, style of vulgar Greek."[260]

Ironically, perhaps no scholarly and popular work did more to actually *dissuade* the cause of identifying figures of speech in Paul than BDF. Blass, who by dint of his great reputation established his scholarly prejudices in print for generations of students, made several assertions that have had severe implications for the study of soundplay:

In a section devoted to "Figures of Speech," BDF notes the Γοργίεια σχήματα and suggests that "parechesis" is a form of "assonance," but maintains that excessive assonance died out in the fourth century BC.[261] "Gorgianic assonances used in an affected style are all the more foreign to the NT," BDF asserts, "since they were relatively unknown in the whole period."[262] Then follows one of the most discouraging of statements: "Chance, of course, produced some things of this sort and an author did not avoid any that the common language offered or that the train of thought or the mood of his discourse suggested."[263] That belief in the role of chance directly contradicts a major conclusion of this dissertation.

Blass's claim that assonance had faded out by the first century is belied by the accepted observation of parchesis in Luke (from Hesiod) and in Romans 1:29. Blass, in fact, had endorsed the oldest known parechesis in Greek and was one of the rare scholars to actually use the term parechesis, but his definition of parechesis is restrictive: BDF, *Grammatik*, §82.4, restricts "paronomasia" to common word-stems and "parechesis" to "the resemblance in sound between

[260] BDF §2.

[261] BDF §256. See *Ad Herennium*'s famous disapprobation of excessive alliteration at 4.12.18.

[262] BDF §488.

[263] BDF §256.

different contiguous words."[264]

In this same paragraph and context, Blass, inexplicably, makes this pointed denial: "Paul is not playing upon the name Onesimus."[265] Thus, the great Christian classicist Friedrich Blass dismisses, without argument, one of the most widely accepted proper name wordplays in the New Testament after Matt 16:18, even though he recognizes the *hapax legomenon* nature of the critical verb form, admitting, "although ὀναίμην he uses only here (Phlm 20)."[266] Blass goes out of his way to make the denial, and, as this dissertation will argue, he could not have been further from the truth. Ironically, Blass's dismissal is preceded by acknowledgment of the parechesis of Diogenes the Cynic: σχολὴν ἔλεγε χολήν.[267]

It has been traditional since Winer in the nineteenth century to relegate focus on style and phonetics to the final pages of a work on Greek literature.[268] In Blass we see attention to sound relegated to the very end, the final section (152) of *Grammatik*—"*Composition der Worte; Figuren.*" Blass had proceeded not from the particulars of sound to structure but in the opposite direction. It will be our proposal to put attention to sound at the beginning.[269]

1968—Detlev Fehling *Die Wiederholungsfiguren*

The year 1968 proved to be a pivotal year in the history of the study of figures of speech.

---

[264] Friedrich Wilhelm Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, rev. and enl. ed. (London: Macmillan, 1905), 298. The matter of "distance," as we will call it, is another factor limiting the ken of discovery.

[265] BDF §488. "Mit dem Namen des Sklaven Onesimos macht P[aul] kein Wortspeil, obwohl er ὀναίμην (heir allen) gebraucht Phlm 20" (Friedrich Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamenlichen Griechisch*, [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896], §82.4 or 292 n3).

[266] BDF §488. Blass gives but qualified endorsement to the explicit paronomasia in Philemon 10–11, "nahegelegte Wortspiel," an attenuation that would suggest that in Greek there existed degrees of soundplay.

[267] BDF §488.

[268] Aristotle's *Ars rhetorica* perhaps set the ancient precedent.

[269] This is a priority to be understood as first in the order of business if not first in importance.

An important but little known German work by Detlev Fehling offers major contributions to the study. In his massive, 300-page work, Detlev identifies figures of repetition in ancient Greek prose, including alliteration, homoiotelueton, paronomasia, and, treated separately, parechesis. Lausberg's contribution was mainly in Latin, Fehling's in Greek, including what appear to be original findings. On page 259 a section titled "Reimende Parechesen" ("rhyming parecheses"), Fehling includes "stark reimende Parechesen" ("strongly rhyming parechesis") from Aeschylus: γαῖα μαῖα (*Cho*. 44. midwife), νάιος γάιος (*Suppl.* 826), and δαῖου δαμίου (*Eum.* 44); πάθει μάθος θέντα (*Ag.* 177) (see *Hdt.* 1.201.1 πάθος μάθος); ὥρην χώρην (Hipp. *Aff*. 1.2); ῥεῦμα χεῦμα (Hipp. *De flat.* 3); and τόν τρόπον τόν τόπον (Gorgias, *Pal*. 22). The parechesis of φήμη — μνήμη (from *Hel.* 2) Fehling introduces as "in langeren Gliedern" ("in a longer clause"): τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ ἀνδρὸς λέξαι τε τὸ δέον ὀρθῶς καὶ ἐλέγξαι τοὺς μεμφομένους Ἑλένην, γυναῖκα περὶ ἧς ὁμόφωνος καὶ ὁμόψυχος γέγονεν ἥ τε τῶν ποιητῶν ἀκουσάντων πίστις ἥ τε τοῦ ὀνόματος *φήμη*, ὃ τῶν συμφορῶν *μνήμη* γέγονεν; εὐγένεια/εὐθένεια (Democr. 57); πολὺς πόντος (Aeschylus, *Suppl*. 1006); λαβοῦσα και οὐ λαθοῦσα (*Hel*. 4); ἴσχει και ἰσχύει (Anaxag. 12); and ἔπραξεν ὡς ἔκρανεν (Aeschylus, *Ag*. 369).[270]

Thus, Fehling becomes the first twentieth century classicist to cleanly distinguish paronomasia from parechesis and offer Greek examples of both.

Two other works from 1968 not only anticipated the New Testament rhetorical movement, but actually called for it.

The first call for a return to rhetorical analysis came from one of the most competent New Testament scholars of his era, E. A. Judge. In his 1968 *The Social Pattern of the Christian*

[270] Detlev Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969) 259–60.

Groups in the First Century, Judge presciently observed that "if New Testament scholars regard as essential the definitive handbooks of lexicography (e.g. Bauer/Arndt Gingrich) and of a grammar (for example, Blass/DeBrunner), they must equally demand a complete analysis of New Testament rhetoric ." Judge was exposing one of the greatest oversights of New Testament scholarship: "But in the field of rhetoric itself virtually nothing has been done."[271]

A direct call for renewed attention to rhetoric came from an unexpected quarter, an Old Testament scholar. Retired professor and President of the SBL James Muilenburg, who had studied under Gunkel as a student in the 1920s, introduced the term "rhetorical criticism" in his inaugural address to the SBL.[272] Muilenberg carefully defined his vision for the study of the Hebrew Bible, but his comments would prove prophetic for New Testament studies as well:

> What I am interested in, above all, is in understanding the nature of Hebrew literary composition, in exhibiting the structural patterns that are employed for the fashioning of a literary unit, whether in poetry or in prose, and in discerning the many and various devices by which the predications are formulated and ordered into a unified whole. Such an enterprise I should describe as rhetoric and the methodology as rhetorical criticism.[273]

For analysis of the Old Testament, Muilenburg set the agenda. The "many and various devices" included "various rhetorical devices,"[274] such as parallelism, chiasm, anaphora, meter, strophes, rhetorical question, and repetitions—but, unfortunately, Muilenburg did not explicitly mention parechesis. Muilenburg's proposal is as much an admission that the isolation of

---

[271] E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century* (London: Tyndale Press, 1968). To be clear, the lexicons of R. Dean Anderson since then have served a valuable purpose, reintroducing biblical exegesis to figures of speech, after the manner of the ancient tradition. E. A Judge was proposing something of the converse. To date, nothing has served that purpose.

[272] James Muilenburg's speech was published a year later. See James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," (*JBL* 88 [1969]: 1–18).

[273] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism," 10.

[274] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism," 10.

rhetorical devices in biblical studies had hardly begun.[275]

In envisioning an exegetical advancement beyond the state of the art in Old Testament studies, Muilenburg saw the limitations of form criticism, how it did not reckon with "the stylistic and rhetorical uniqueness of *various* examples of the same *Gattung*"[276] or literary unit. It is not far out of context to take Muilenburg's insight as pertinent to New Testament exegesis, especially where he complains that "unique features of the particular pericope are all but lost to view."[277] As R. Dean Anderson reports, Muilenburg's inspired method was for all biblical studies; it "eventually applied even to the letters of Paul, and Pauline scholars interested in this method continue to acknowledge the address of Muilenburg as programmatic for their discipline."[278] New Testament rhetorical critics would follow the lead of Betz and the methodology proposed by Kennedy,[279] which actually had little in common with Muilenberg's proposal. R. Dean Andersen's appraisal at the turn of the new century rather understates matters; "New Testament rhetorical criticism," he writes, "is slightly different from what Muilenburg himself envisaged. He saw it as dealing with stylistics, but NT scholars have tended to emphasize … argumentation."[280] New Testament rhetorical criticism, with few exceptions, did, in fact, focus on the one aspect of rhetoric almost to the complete exclusion of the other.

---

[275] Many works have noted alliteration in the Old Testament, from Bede's *DST* to Immanuel Casanowicz ("Paronomasia in the Old Testament." *JBL* 12 [1883]: 105–67) to the modern studies of Gary Rendsburg (see bibliography). It is clear, however, that much more work needs to be done, as well as in the LXX.

[276] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism," 10.

[277] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism," 10.

[278] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 18–19.

[279] George Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, SR (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984).

[280] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 19.

Nigel Turner (1976)

In 1976, over 150 years after the original German publication of Winer's *Sprachidioms*, Nigel Turner's translation of the section on paronomasia yielded a far different product than the German original.[281] The term *paronomasia[e]* occurs exactly twice in Turner,[282] the term "parechesis" once. Turner lists in parentheses Rom 1:29 followed by eighteen Pauline citations that are nothing but common-root paronomasia, without classical parallels.[283] Thus, Winer's list is reduced and relegated to a parenthesis, with the one distinct example of parechesis that Turner might have noted obscured by its grouping with examples of paronomasia.

Turner's inspection of the epistle of James and Hebrews is more instructive. Here, he becomes one of the few analyzers of epistolary style who actually *counts* the notes of alliteration, an objectivity missing in most assessments. "Play on words is often striking,"[284] Turner assesses, but he then offers the usual mix of paronomasia and mislabeled parechesis, in this order: Heb 3:13 παρακαλεῖτε/καλεῖται; 5:8 ἔμαθεν/ ἔπαθεν (parechesis, a standard observation); 5:14 καλοῦ τε καὶ κακου (true parechesis); and 12:1 περικείμενον ἡμῖν/προκείμενον ἡμῖν; 13:2 ἐπιλανθάνεσθε/ἔλαθόν, two examples of parechesis mixed in with three of same-root wordplay.[285] Of the wordplay, Turner remarks, with respect to an apparently non-Pauline text, "This was a Pauline characteristic."[286]

---

[281] Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: IV, Style* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976).

[282] Turner, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 84 and 117, the latter in his comments on the epistle to the Hebrews.

[283] Turner, *Grammar*, 84.

[284] Turner, *Grammar*, 107.

[285] One of the boldest statements of frequency comes from Harold Attridge who perceives that Hebrews is "replete with alliteration and assonance" (Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to Hebrews* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989]), 55.

[286] Turner, *Grammar*, 107.

In James, where Turner logically dismisses the hypothesis of a Semitic *Vorlage*, "for there are too many paronomasiae,"[287] he makes this singular observation of "parechesis" at 1:24 κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ *ἀπελήλυθεν* καὶ εὐθέως *ἐπελάθετο* ὁποῖος ἦν. In spite of the diminution of Winer's list, some of these examples (although in James) are apparently original contributions, valuable for our study of Paul.

Hans Dieter Betz (1975)

In April of 1975, *New Testament Studies* published Hans Dieter Betz's now famous rhetorical analysis of Galatians in a 26-page article, "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians."[288] Seeking a reliable way to outline the epistle, Betz, in his own words, "found that the letter to the Galatians can be analysed according to Graeco-Roman rhetoric and epistolography."[289] Betz himself adds a simple note on the historical precedence of his discovery: "Apparently, this has never been realized before…."[290]

Betz's approach was wholly concentrated on genre and *partes orationis*, duly noting parallels to the Galatians text from ancient secular Greek literature. Galatians, he decided, was an "apologetic letter." "The apologetic letter is by definiton a part of rhetoric and, for that reason, limits its writer to the devices of the 'art of persuasion.'" he reasoned.[291] But as for devices, Betz identified no figures of speech.

---

[287] Turner, *Grammar*, 117. In James, where Turner logically dismisses the hypothesis of a Semitic *Vorlage*, ("for there are too many paronomasiae") he makes this singular observation of "parechesis" at 1:24 κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ *ἀπελήλυθεν* καὶ εὐθέως *ἐπελάθετο* ὁποῖος ἦν. In spite of the diminution of Winer's list, some of these examples (although in James) are apparently original contributions, valuable for our study of Paul.

[288] Hans Dieter Betz, "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 21 (1975): 353–79.

[289] Betz, "Literary Composition," 353.

[290] Betz, "Literary Composition," 353.

[291] Betz, *Commentary*, 24.

Betz found inchoate precedents for his own groundbreaking work, in Joseph Barber Lightfoot's Galatians commentary,[292] which had alluded to "narrative" "argumentative" and "hortatory" sections of Paul's letter,[293] and in the lesser known commentary of C. Starcke, who in 1911 had proposed that Paul was influenced by Greek rhetoric,[294] and in similar suggestions by G. J. Bahr in 1968 and B. P. Stoviannou in 1971.[295] If the assessment of the past in terms of the rhetoric of genre identification and persuasion was accurate, the assessment in terms of style was complete overestimation. In fact, overestimations of a past focus on figures of speech were regularly published. For example, this summary of Frank Witt Hughes is representative of the assumptions that guided the movement:

> Those who survey what critics up to and including Judge have said about Paul's use of rhetoric will note that most of the discussion has been centered around examinations of style, and even for many contemporary classicists and New Testament scholars, there is an explicit or implicit equation of rhetoric with style and the smaller rhetorical figures. The kind of rhetorical criticism of Pauline literature that has appeared in the 1970s and since is of a markedly different sort, a rhetorical criticism no longer primarily concerned with the elucidation of style or the identification of small rhetorical figures or of a particular sentence structure. The works of Hans Dieter Betz, Wilhelm Wuellner, George A. Kennedy, Robert Jewett and others have focused on the understanding of whole documents as rhetorical discourses. … identification of traditional parts of a rhetorical discourse [*partes orations*] (as taught in various ancient rhetorical handbooks.[296]

To say that the new movement was "no longer primarily concerned with the elucidation of style or the identification of small rhetorical figures" was an understatement. The brand of New Testament rhetorical criticism pioneered by Betz had little regard for issues of style *at all.*

---

[292] Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London: Macmillan, 1865), 65–67.

[293] Betz, "Literary Composition," 353.

[294] C. Starcke, *Die Rhetorik des Apostels Paulus im Galaterbrief und die Gal 6:11*, 1911.

[295] Betz, "Literary Composition," 357. G. J. Bahr, "The Subscriptions in the Pauline Letters," *JBL* 87 (1968): 27–41.

[296] Hughes, "Rhetoric of Letters," 22.

Hughes's assessment, as accurate as it is, illustrates the problem: For 60 years, the majority of the twentieth century, no attention was paid to features of rhetoric at all Bengel's long-ago call was unheeded. Muilenberg's advice for study of the Old Testament was not followed in the analyses of the New.

A plethora of articles and books followed in the forty years following Betz's 1975 article on Galatians and subsequent commentary (1979). But as the major bibliographers of the era, Hauser and Watson attest that the articles and commentaries and books that followed were almost all exclusively devoted to only one aspect of rhetoric, namely, argument or persuasion, and this to the great neglect of the figures and tropes. The evidence that New Testament rhetorical criticism neglected figures of speech in its application of rhetorical principles to Pauline studies begins with Betz himself. In spite of the assumption of Wuellner and others that figures of speech had been properly identified, Betz mentions no figures of speech in his groundbreaking study of Galatians, a study allegedly dedicated to the unqualified rhetorical analysis of the text.[297] Betz makes clear elsewhere (for instance, in his 1992 *Paulinische Studien*) that he shares the assumption that figures of speech had been adequately studied. Betz's study and his attitude toward figures of speech set a precedent. Few if any well known works on figures of speech appeared during the first twenty years of the movement. Betz's approach had excited one of the most clearly defined paradigm shifts in modern theology, but one which ignored an important aspect of the very discipline it relied upon.[298]

---

[297] Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979).

[298] Perhaps no one was more qualified than Betz to comment on the history of New Testament rhetorical criticism. Ten years after the start of the movement he inspired, and having completed rhetorical analysis of a second epistle of Paul, he sums up the state of the art in Pauline studies:

> There is also no unanimity in scholarship with respect to the rhetoric of Paul, although one is more than ever inclined today to admit that the apostle made use of small rhetorical forms. This

George Kennedy (1954–2005)

If Hans Deiter Betz ushered in the movement known as New Testament rhetorical criticism, it was George Kennedy who had reintroduced American biblical scholars to ancient rhetoric and, once the movement had started, proposed a comprehensive methodology for study, one that included identification of stylistic elements. No one was more important in presaging modern biblical studies' embrace of rhetoric. Kennedy's books on matters having to do with ancient rhetoric would span six decades, starting with his Harvard dissertation on Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*.[299] In his 1963 *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, Kennedy "claimed to have written the first detailed study of the history of Greek rhetoric."[300] His 1984 book *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, written after the fact of Betz's commentary and a decade of subsequent attempts, laid out the methodological steps for rhetorical analysis.[301] Kennedy's proposed methodology involved identifying the parts of Aristotlean-Ciceronian

---

> concession is the result of important works from the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, among which the following especially deserve to be mentioned: Johannes Weiss, "Bieträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik" [pages 165–274 in Theologische Studien (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1897] … and the dissertation of his student Rudolf Butlmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Gottingen: Huth, 1910) (Hans Dieter Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9. A Critical & Historical Commentary on the Bible* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], 129).

Betz refers also to Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, SBLDS 57 (Chico, CA; Scholars, 1981). But Paul's use of rhetoric is not limited to the diatribe and other small forms.

Betz's concession, however, was a glance back rather than a look forward. The fact is New Testament rhetorical criticism following his great lead paid but scant attention to figures of speech in Paul.

[299] George Kennedy also authored *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, 2nd ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999). Some of the findings of Kennedy's dissertation were published in his book *Quintilian* (New York: Twayne, 1969). Other important works of George Kennedy are the following: *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963); *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, SR (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); and "The Ancient Dispute over Rhetoric in Homer," *AJP* 78 (1957): 23–35.

[300] So Olbricht, "Delivery and Memory," 24.

[301] *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, SR (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984).

rhetoric, including invention, arrangement, and style, along with identifying as Betz had done the *partes orationes* and, ultimately, the genre. We have already noted how Kennedy's student Duane Watson did a more thorough job than almost any other scholar of identifying figures of speech in 2 Peter and Jude.

But the truth of the matter is that Kennedy himself, who had anticipated the movement and spelled out a program of application of rhetorical analysis of New Testament writings, including the letters of Paul, barely touched upon figures of speech in his own works, though he acknowledges "style" as one of three basic parts of the rhetorical craft.[302] In fact, he somewhat deemphasized this aspect of rhetoric. In laying out his program for the use of rhetoric as "an additional tool of interpretation,"[303] in 1984, George Kennedy was acutely aware of historic reductionism. He begins his book with almost a forewarning:

> To many biblical scholars rhetoric probably means style, and they may envision in these pages discussion of figures of speech and metaphors not unlike that already to be found in many literary studies of the Scriptures.[304] The identification of rhetoric with style—a feature of what I have elsewhere called *letteraturizzazione*—is a common phenomenon in the history of the study of rhetoric, represents a limitation and to some extent a distortion of the discipline of rhetoric as understood and taught in antiquity and by some of the most creative theorists of subsequent periods … Choice … of words is] 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.[305]

It is a surprisingly skewed version of rhetoric from the man whose histories of the subject have been published in six consecutive decades. We see similar devaluations of style by other New Testament rhetorical critics who undoubtedly follow Kennedy's lead. Historian Margaret

---

[302] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 25.

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

[304] Perhaps Kennedy has in mind here the English lay treatises from Sherry or that from John Brown who in 1791 produced ten pages on figures and over 400 on metaphor.

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

Zulick unfairly claims that Aristotle, the father of rhetoric, "relegates style as an afterthought to the depths of book 3."[306] But Aristotle had written an entire book devoted to the third part of rhetoric. The position of style as the third part was by no means marginalization. Invention and arrangement, Aristotle as much as said, are "not enough."[307] In fact, In Book 3 of *Ars rhetorica,* Aristotle actually lists "style" (*lexis*) as second, after *pistis* or "the source of proofs." "Arrangement" is third.

It is, indeed, hard to justify the attitude of many modern rhetorical critics from either the work of Aristotle or the Latin tradition. In *Ad Herennium*, R. Dean Anderson reminds us, "The last and longest of the four books is devoted to the section on λέξις (style)."[308] Both Cicero and Quintilian devoted significant portions of their treatises to style. As any student of Quintilian knows (see Kennedy's 1954 dissertation and his 1969 book), the master of first century Roman rhetoric devoted entire books to the subject of style, notably Books 8 and 9 of his twelve book *Orator's Education*. It is true that style is often treated last in the handbooks, but there is a difference between relegation and order of presentation. It should be unimaginable to consider rhetoric apart from style. Historically, the marginalization of style was not widespread until recent times. Augustine, Cassiodorus, Bengel, Winer, and others have emphasized the identification of figures of speech.

Kennedy's enduring contribution to New Testament rhetorical criticism might be measured

---

[306] Margaret D. Zulick, "The Recollection of Rhetoric: A Brief History," pages 7–19 in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*, SRR 8, ed. C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 9.

[307] οὐ γὰρ ἀπόχρη τὸ ἔχειν ἃ δει λέγειν. Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 3.1.2.

[308] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 61. Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*, 33, also notes this emphasis. "The *Ad Herennium*," Quentin Skinner observes, "is distinguished by the large amount of space it devotes to *elocutio*, and especially the classification and explanation of the figures and tropes of speech" (Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric*, 33).

by two *Festschrift* collections in his honor, one in 1991 and the other in 2008.[309] But perhaps one of the most important of Kennedy's contributions has been the least noted: his translation of Hermogenes.[310] In 2005, he became the first to translate Hermogenes into English—thirty years after the movement had begun.

Duane F. Watson (1988)

Kennedy's methodological program was first carried out by his student at Duke, Duane F. Watson, whose 1988 dissertation articulated the three parts of rhetoric in its title, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*.[311] Watson followed Kennedy's procedure[312] step by step, recognizing that style includes "tropes and figures."[313] He helpfully included a "Glossary of Style," listing fifty figures and tropes including paronomasia (*adnominatio*).

As the title of his dissertation suggests, Watson inventoried style in the short letters of Jude and 2 Peter,[314] recognizing that rhetoric includes "tropes and figures," with due reference to the

[309] Duane F. Watson, ed., *Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991) and C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson, eds., *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*, SRR 8 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008).

[310] George A. Kennedy, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus. The Greek Text, Edited by Hugo Rabe, Translated with Introduction and Notes* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

[311] Duane F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*, SBL (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988). Watson himself writes of his endeavor: "The first full-scale rhetorical analysis of a New Testament book utilizing Kennedy's method was my own dissertation, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*," from "The Influence of George Kennedy on Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament," pages 41–57 in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*, SRR 8, ed. C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 43.

[312] First outlined in Kennedy's 1984 *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*.

[313] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*, 22.

[314] Watson himself recognizes the historical significance of his endeavor: "The first full-scale rhetorical analysis of a New Testament book utilizing Kennedy's method was my own dissertation, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*," from "The Influence of George Kennedy on Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament," pages 41–57 in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*, ed. C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson, SRR 8 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 43.

ancient Greek and Latin handbooks.[315] Watson even includes a "Glossary of Style" listing fifty figures and tropes including paronomasia (*adnominatio*), defining it as follows. *"Paronomasia* (*adnominatio*): a figure of speech, "… which by means of a modification of sound, or change of letters, a closer resemblance to a given verb or noun is produced, so that similar words express dissimilar things" (*Her*. 4.21.29) and 2) change of the preposition with which a verb is compounded (Quintilian [*Inst*.] 9.3.71)."[316] Thus, Watson has carefully sorted the subcategories of so-called paronomasia by proper distinction—but had to allude to two different handbooks to do so.

In actually perusing the letters and marking every *partes orationes* from *exordium* to *peroratio,* Watson lists every figure of speech he can find in both short epistles and even includes a helpful summary appendix:[317] he identifies, for example, "*regressio,* the wordplay using *reflexio*" in Jude 1:6,[318] plus the "wordplay" of antanaclasis in v. 6 and the paronomasia of v. 9: διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο (Jude 1:9).[319]

But Watson, too, is limited by the definitions he chooses and misses such classic examples of (what would later be called) parechesis:

δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς (Jude 1:1) and

ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, …

ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ τηρήσατε προσδεχόμενοι (Jude 1:20–21).

[315] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style,* 22.

[316] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style,* 201.

[317] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style,* 194–95.

[318] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style,* 52.

[319] "The example is adorned with paronomasia of the type in which words lack a close resemblance, but are not dissimilar," Watson explains, alluding to *Her*. 4.22.30 Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style,* 56).

Interestingly, Watson in his Appendix 3 rather anonymously lists "paronomasia in vv 20, 21" but does not specify in the course of his rhetorical analysis which words constitute this figure.

Similarly in Watson's "detailed consideration of 2 Peter's use of invention, arrangement, and style,"[320] he lists over a dozen instances of what he calls paronomasia, in 1:10, 1:12, 13, 15 and 1:19–21, and others. But it is often unclear, since he does not bother to include it in the text, rather only in the appendix, what he is referring to. In 2 Peter 1:10, for instance, he recognizes the *pi* alliteration: "*Homoeopropheron* characterizes vv 10–11 with its proliferation of :: … ποιεῖσθαι … ποιοῦντες … πταίσητέ ποτε … πλουσίως."[321]

The excellence of Watson's rhetorical analysis is evident in his proper use, for the most part, of technical terms. But it appears that in using the term paronomasia Watson is only identifying cognate words (*figura etymologica*) and prefix paronomasias.[322] In fairness to Watson, he has mostly limited himself to definitions known from handbooks available in the first century, none of which have a definitive name for alliteration. In the absence of a satisfactory or accepted term, Watson chooses to use a term from Bullinger: "Homoeopropheron," not widely known in the ancient handbooks. The book of 2 Peter is, at times, almost sing-song with alliteration and parechesis: for example, φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς. (2 Pet. 1:4b); … προφήτου παραφρονίαν. (2 Pet. 2:16).

While the vast majority of attempts at rhetorical criticism of Paul have forsaken Kennedy's method as far as identifying figures is concerned, Watson, in the first realization of Kennedy's method, is faithful.

[320] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*, 87.

[321] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*, 99.

[322] See, for example, Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*, 99.

Stanley Porter and the International Conferences—1993 and Following

But perhaps the best indication on a grand scale of the neglect of figures of speech or, put positively, the intense focus of the modern movement on argumentation, comes from the international conferences that have been the major purveyors of the findings of the New Testament rhetorical criticism.

Thomas Olbricht sums up the history that led to the international conferences:

> The publishing of Hans Dieter Betz's commentary on Galatians marked the rediscovery of rhetorical analysis of Scripture in America. Ancient rhetoric was rediscovered by English professors before World War I, resulting in a new association of professors specializing in speech, now designated the Speech Communication Association. Once again rhetoric was rediscovered by composition professors after World War II. Some interest in ancient rhetoric continued among classical scholars in America from the nineteenth century. With these developments and those elsewhere, internationally rhetoric has come to the forefront in various disciplines in the past two decades [the 1970s and 80s], and a number of associations with rhetoric in the title have been generated. In biblical studies a special interest in rhetorical analysis developed on the west coast of the USA because of the work and publications of Wilhelm Wuellner, Burton Mack, Hames Hester, Stanley Porter, Jeffrey Reed, Ronald Hock and myself.... In 1990 it occurred to me that … no international conferences of rhetorical specialists had convened.[323]

Thus, in the summer of 1992 the first international conference on rhetoric was held in Heidelberg, with Olbricht himself and Stanley Porter co-editors of the publication that followed. In spite of Porter's interest in style, however, the trend-setting conference publications barely touch on figures of speech. Of all the diverse topics devoted to rhetoric in the New Testament, very few of the many essays in the first ten years of publication have to do with figures of style. Only two of the many conference papers over a ten year period make a concerted effort to actually identify such figures. The first of these is the investigation of Lauri Thurén in *Rhetoric*,

[323] Thomas Olbricht, Preface 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, 1993), 9.

Scripture and Theology, from the 1994 Pretoria conference.[324] The second is John Fitzgerald's 1995 conference paper (published in 1997) on alliteration in Greek catalogue lists.[325] Both of these essays offer important applications for the study of rhetoric in the New Testament. The classically-trained Fitzgerald is one of the few scholars of the new rhetorical criticism movement to use the term parechesis as Hermogenes intended it, recalling Rom 1:29 and 31.[326]

Titles featuring the term "Argumention" predominate in the international conference publications, as though that were the whole of rhetoric. In fact, there are more international conference essays devoted to feminism than to rhetorical figures.

Stanley E. Porter (1997)

In Porter's own *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric* (1997), he does better. "With regards to ornamentation," he writes, "Paul clearly displays a number of the standard stylistic features."[327] Porter then lists about seventy figures and tropes with examples from Paul—but no mention of "parechesis."[328] Within Porter's volume is a rare article from modern day rhetorical criticism devoted to the third classical part of rhetoric, "Style" by Galen O. Rowe. "Of classical rhetoric's five duties, the one concerning style (lexis/elocution) has had an especially pervasive and lasting influence,"[329] Rowe maintains, though without a sense of irony that his is one of the very few

[324] Lauri Thurén, "Style Never Goes Out of Fashion: 2 Peter Re-Evaluated," in *Rhetoric, Scripture, and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*, eds. Stanley Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, JSNT 31 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academi, 1996), 329–48.

[325] John T. Fitzgerald, "The Catalogue in Ancient Greek Literature," pages 275–93 in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 287 n45.

[326] Fitzgerald, "Catalogue," 291–92.

[327] Stanley E. Porter, *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (New York: Brill, 1997), 578.

[328] Porter, *Handbook*, 580.

[329] Rowe, "Style," 132.

articles on the subject in modern rhetorical criticism. Rowe defines paronomasia and parechesis along with *annominatio,* the first two in Greek font: "Paronomasia is a pun, a play on words which sound nearly the same but have distinctly different meanings." He supplies one good example of parechesis, from no less a figure than Saint Augustine: "Ego autem iudices *ver*os et *ver*itate se*ver*os magis intuieor" (Aug. *Epistl*. 143:4),[330] and explains the workings of the wordplay: "The pun, which defies translation, centers on se*veros* ('severe') which contains within itself the word *ver*sos ('true')."[331] It is important to note in this Latin example that "*verso*" and "se*ver*os" are likely from different roots.

Watson and Hauser's Bibliography (1994)

The most convincing authoritative calculation of the percentage of works devoted to figures of speech comes from a count of titles. Duane Watson and Alan Hauser's *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method,* from 1994. The listings of this comprehensive bibliography belie any suggestion that matters of style have received due attention in the modern era, especially in the first nearly twenty years of the New Testament rhetorical criticism movement. A follow-up bibliography by Watson in 2006 shows no correction.[332]

1995 to 1999

The next year, 1995, proved to be the best in a hundred years for identification of figures in the Pauline text, and yet its contributions were slight. In 1995, Gordon Fee makes one of the best

[330] "But I look upon judges who are true and, because of their truth, severe."

[331] Rowe, "Style," 132.

[332] Duane F. Watson, *The Rhetoric of the New Testament: A Bibliographic Survey*, TBS 8, Blandford Forum (UK: Deo Publishing, 2006). Watson, who was responsible for the New Testament portion of the earlier volume, in this one lists relevant works of rhetoric from AD 1500 to its date of publication.

discoveries of classical parechesis to date, at Phil 1:21, but draws on no rhetorical term for it:[333]

ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν *Χριστὸς*

καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν *κέρδος*.

Stressing aurality, Fee comments on the pragmatics, that this verse "would have been even more striking to its original *hearers*, because of its alliteration and assonance."[334]

After Gordan Fee's observation at Phil 1:21, G. J. Steyn in the same year identifies "assonance" in the opening of Philemon and becomes one of the very few in the history of Pauline exegesis (see also Lauri Thurén, above, and R. Dean Anderson) to purposefully match Aristotle's Book 1 and 2 with Book 3,[335] as Watson (in 1988) had done in his commentary on Jude and 2 Peter. In particular, Steyn calls to our attention the assonance with which Paul opens the letter: τῷ ἀγαπητῷ καὶ συνεργῷ ἡμῶν καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ Ἀρχίππῳ τῷ συστρατιώτῃ ἡμῶν καὶ τῇ κατ᾽ οἶκόν σου ἐκκλησίᾳ (Phlm 1:1–2). Steyn recognizes repetition of the *omega* sound and posits this hypothesis: "This repetition of sound is the result of Paul's stylistic preference of the tautology of personal names and adjectives."[336] We will find reason in the dissertation to take a slightly different view of Paul's predilections, focusing on the consonantal sounds and parechesis.

Also in a 1995 conference paper (published in 1997), John Fitzgerald notes alliteration and assonance among other "frequent features"[337] in Greek catalogue lists. Fitzgerald uses the term

---

[333] Gordon Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* NIBCNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 140. Fee emphasizes, from the viewpoint of the Philippian audience, "The assonance between κέρδος and Χριστὸς could hardly have been missed," 140 n8.

[334] Fee, *Philippians*, 140 n8.

[335] G. J. Steyn, "Some Figures of Style in the Epistle to Philemon: Their Contribution Towards the Persuasive Nature of the Epistle," *EP* 77, (1995): 64–80.

[336] Steyn, "Philemon," 64.

[337] John T. Fitzgerald, "The Catalogue in Ancient Greek Literature," pages 275–93 in *The Rhetorical Analysis*

parechesis technically: "Note also the parechesis (assonance of different words) in Rom 1:29 (φθόνου φόνου) and 1:31 (ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους ἀστόργους—adds to the list)."[338] "Other frequent features [in addition to anaphora] of catalogues include chiasm, alliteration, assonance, similarity in forms, rhyme," Fitzgerald observes.[339] Fitzgerald's is a major observation with respect to a subgenre of Greek writing.

In the last year of the century, Casey Wayne Davis became one of the few exegetes involved in New Testament rhetorical criticism to focus on orality in Philippians. Without calling it by any handbook name, Davis finds that "instances of sound grouping include the uses of the prefix in 2.3–13: ὑπερέχοντας (2.3); ὑπάρχων (2.6); ὑπήκοος (2.8); ὑπερύψωσεν (2.9); ὑπὲρ (2.9); ὑπηκούσατε (2.12); ὑπὲρ (2.13).[340] This contribution to an understanding of the hymn of Philippians 2 must be considered a major find. Nonetheless, Davis left much to be discovered. For instance, in v. 4 the assonance with rough breathing[341] is unquestionable: μὴ τὰ *ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος* … τὰ *ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι*; and a remarkable triple parechesis drives v. 6: ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, which we will discuss in the final chapter of this dissertation.[342]

In 1999, Raymond Collins, *First Corinthians*, submits fifteen uses of the term "paronomasia" (along with other figures) but no mention of parechesis in what is otherwise the

of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 287 n45.

[338] Fitzgerald, "Catalogue," 291–92.

[339] Fitzgerald, "Catalogue," 287 n45.

[340] Casey Wayne Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism: The Influence of the Principles of Orality on the Literary Structure of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* JSNTSup 172 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1999), 82 n59.

[341] It should be noted that Chrys Caragounis, argues that aspiration had fallen out of the Greek language long before the New Testament period (e.g., Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 390).

[342] Davis also notes "possible instances of sound grouping" in the *zeta* words of v. 6 and 7, and 8, respectively, ζῆλος/ζημίαν/ἐζημιώθην, and cluster alliteration in v. 18 through 21, πολλοὶ/πολλάκις/πολίτευμα, as well as σωτῆρα/σῶμα/σώματι,[342] making him one of the most perceptive Pauline appraisers of style.

best complete rhetorical analysis of 1 Corinthians ever conducted.[343]

R. Dean Anderson Jr. (1999–2000)

Presiding over the twentieth century as perhaps the leading rhetorical theorist on Pauline figures, R. Dean Anderson, the editor of Lausberg's magisterial work,[344] was in a position to make a change for the new millenium. Anderson produced two important works relevant to our dissertation: *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (2nd edition 1999)[345]; and *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian* (2000).[346] His *Figures and Tropes* could not in any sense be regarded as a reduction of rhetoric but looked to be a valuable tool for discerning New Testament devices. The *termini* of Anaximines (d. 528) and Quintilian's *Institutes* (ca. AD 95, nearly a generation after Paul), though seemingly relevant, logical, and comprehensive in relation to New Testament biblical figures, unfortunately excludes from consideration Hermogenic parechesis from the second century AD. In explaining his end point, Anderson writes, "I attempt to show which sources may be considered most applicable to a Greek author such as Paul in the first century AD."[347] But the concept of parechesis is by no means anachronistic—as the ancient Greek examples of Hermogenes prove.

The limitation has consequences. In his widely consulted work on rhetorical terms,

---

[343] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington, Sacra Pagina 7 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 1999).

[344] Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, ed. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson, trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

[345] R. Dean Anderson Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Leuven: Peters, 1999).

[346] Anderson, R. Dean Jr., *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian* (Leuven: Peters, 2000). It is telling that Anderson, in delineating Kennedy's "rigorous methodology," subsumes the analysis of style under arrangement and argumentation, as though stylistics were merely an inclusion of argumentation (Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 24).

[347] Anderson, *Figures and Tropes*, 6.

Anderson draws on *Ad Herennium*, defining paronomasia/*adnominatio* as "the use of very similar words in close collocation that mean quite different things."[348] But these definitions fail an important distinction. Paronomasia is traditionally thought—since 85 BC at least—to include words of the *same root*, the prefixes attached to that lexical root producing a "quite different" meaning; whereas parechesis involves unrelated words of *different* roots, this according to the later Hermogenic definition. These two should not be construed as the same species; two words with the *same* lexical root do not comprise the same phenomenon as two words of *different* roots (the exception being proper name play). Thus, Anderson carries on the ancient conflation, making no name distinction between, for example, φθόνου φόνου (actual parechesis) in Rom 1:29 and ἀόρατα/καθορᾶται in 1:20, neither here nor in his companion work *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*.

The term parechesis is not in Anderson's lexicon, but two examples of it are. At Rom 5:2, without crediting Cosby (1991), Anderson pronounces ἐσχήκαμεν and ἑστήκαμεν in Rom 5:2 "[a]nother clear example of paronomasia."[349] This outstanding example of different root word pairs is, in a manner done for centuries, mislabeled and marginalized by association with the rather ordinary phenomenon. Anderson does squint at "a small example of word-play" in one of the deliberative declamations of fifth century BC Herodes Atticus: ταῦτα γὰρ ἐστιν ἐναντία τούτοις οἷς *λέγω ἐγὼ.*"[350] But he fails to observe that Paul, in a phrase of even greater alliteration,

[348] Anderson, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms,* 93, subsumes this definition under the heading "paronomasia."

[349] Anderson, *Figures and Tropes*, 204. Cosby had noted this example in 1991 (Cosby, "Paul's Persuasive Language in Romans 5," 213.

[350] "For these things are against those to whom I speak," recorded in Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* 286.

employs the exact same parechesis: T*οῖς* δὲ *λοιποῖς λέγω ἐγὼ* οὐχ ὁ κύριος (1 Cor 7:12a).[351] Hermogenes and Eustathius would both retrospectively call this sort of soundplay parechesis and illustrate it by numerous examples from the same ancient Greek literature that Anderson surveys. But as a term, parechesis falls outside Anderson's framework of not only time but definition. Yet the editor of Lausberg does not hesitate to employ, for example, the term "oxymoron," which, he writes, "does not appear to be attested before the fourth century AD."[352]

His oversights notwithstanding, Anderson makes one of the most valuable summaries of the history of rhetoric. But in connecting it to Paul, he misses an opportunity to highlight one of the most outstanding features of Pauline writing, namely, soundplay—by whatever name.

"Wordplay," however, *is* in Anderson's lexicon. In *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul,* Anderson addresses "the question of Paul's unexpected use of word-play in serious emotional contexts" over against the handbooks' restriction of the same to epideictic oratory.[353] Anderson insightfully notes that from the perspective of the handbooks "word-play is certainly not the figure of choice when dealing with important serious subjects, or when attempting to produce strong emotions," a recommendation that "is quite the opposite to Paul's usage."[354] Thus, Anderson rightly claims that "Paul departs from rhetorical theory in his use."[355] It is a valuable insight for our understanding of Paul's relationship to formal rhetorical education.[356]

---

[351] In Matt 5:26–44, a similar construction occurs five time, structuring the pericope. Nor does Anderson point out in the same quote the homoteleutonic parechesis of τούτ*οις οἷς*.

[352] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 203.

[353] Note that the example from Herodes Atticus is from deliberative oratory.

[354] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 287.

[355] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 283.

[356] A number of minor contributions in the late twentieth century should also be noted. In 1983, Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippian* WBC 43 (Waco, TX: Word, 1983), 123, acknowledges the *kappa* alliteration of Phil 3:2. In 1989, F. W. Danker, *II Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 125, infers at 2 Cor 8:7 "a play on the word χάρις." In 1990, Charles Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC

The Twenty-First Century

Year by year in the new century new additions have been made to the collection of soundplay observances in Paul. In 2000, Kieran O'Mahony notes parechesis in 2 Cor 8–9: πλοῦτος/ἁπλότητος,[357] Abraham Malherbe notes *pi* alliteration in the 1 Thess 1:2,[358] πάντοτε περὶ πάντων … ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν, ἀδιαλείπτως, and keenly notes Paul's "predilection for the alliterative use of labials (for example, 2 Cor 1:3–7; 9:8)."[359] Malherbe also cites πάσῃ παρρησίᾳ ὡς πάντοτε in Phil 1:20 and in 2 Cor 7:4 πολλή μοι παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πολλή μοι καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· πεπλήρωμαι τῇ παρακλήσει, ὑπερπερισσεύομαι τῇ χαρᾷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν, one of the highest frequencies of *pi* in Paul. These observations will become important pieces of evidence for parechesis in 1 Thessalonians.

In 2000, Georg Strecker and Friedrich Wilhelm Horn's more general study, Theology of the New Testament,[360] becomes one of the few theological textbooks to actually use the term "parechesis," but unfortunately the authors do not employ it in an exact Hermogenic sense: "Re Hebrews 1:1 parechesis or alliteration of the Greek text (1:1) … 'Parechesis' = phonetic echoes

(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 101, perceives assonances at 1 Thess 2:8 in "the alliterative phrase οὕτως ὁμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν. In 1991, Michael R. Cosby, "Paul's Persuasive Language in Romans 5" in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy* ed. Duane F. Watson; JSNTSup 50 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 213, notes the "repetition of sounds in *ἐσχήκαμεν/ἑστήκαμεν*" (Rom 5:2), a remarkable observation that somehow had escaped notice for centuries; Cosby, however, fails to call it parechesis (Michael R. Cosby, "Paul's Persuasive Language in Romans 5" in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy* ed. Duane F. Watson; JSNTSup 50 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991], 213. In 1993, Horst Balz's *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 131, includes "paronomasia" under a healthy discussion of πολὺς in 2 Cor 8:22, perhaps the most discussed alliterative verse in Paul.

[357] Kieran O'Mahony, "Pauline Persuasion: A Sounding in 2 Corinthians 8–9," JSNTSup 199 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 118.

[358] Abraham Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 91.

[359] Malherbe, *Letters to the Thessalonians*, 462.

[360] Georg Strecker and Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, *Theology of the New Testament*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000).

of different words. Alliteration = several words begin with the same letter."[361]

Complementing the Phil 1:21 observation of Fee (1995), Rollin Ramsaran in 2002 notes "a striking correspondence between the sounds within each clause, especially with respect to the Χ/κ and τ/δ of Χριστὸς and κέρδος and the long vowel sounds of ζῆν and ἀποθανεῖν.[362] In 2003, David Aune cites the interesting specimen in James 1:24, properly calling it "parechesis"[363]: ἀπελήλυθεν/ἐπελάθετο. In 2004, Will Deming notes in 1 Cor 7:32–34 that Paul uses words from the μερίμνα- stem five times in an elaborate wordplay, or "**paronomasia**," with the verb μεμέριζομαι, "to be divided" (v. 34a): ἀμερίμνους/μεριμνᾷ/μεριμνᾷ/μεμέρισται/ μεριμνᾷ/μεριμνᾷ.[364] This is parechesis, not paronomasia.

Chrys Caragounis (2004)

Not only the best collection of the new century but the best insight into ancient Greek principles of wordplay comes from Chrys Caragounis in 2004. Caragounis, a native Greek educator, refers often to Eustathius and other Greek authorities and properly distinguishes (for the most part) between paronomasia and parechesis. For instance, he properly identifies Diogenes' σχολὴν/χολὴν as "parechesis," which Blass, in spite of knowing both terms, had misclassified. But without noting the inconsistency, Caragounis passes on the error of *Ad Herennium* when he includes under "paronomasia" the "transposition" type, for which he gives

[361] Strecker and Horn's "phonetic echoes" are no more than an etymological translation of the term.

[362] Rollin A. Ramsaran, "Living and Dying, Living is Dying (Philippians 1:21): Paul's Maxim and Exemplary Argumentation in Philippians," in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference* Emory Studies in Early Christianity; ed. A. Eriksson et al (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 330.

[363] David E. Aune, ed. *Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 574.

[364] William Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 200.

the example περιβαλεῖν/περιλαβεῖν,[365] clearly words of different roots. In the very next sentence, however, is the proper distinction: "paronomasia is called an 'etymological schema' and is distinguished from parechesis, which is a 'parechetical schema' (that is, a figure based strictly on sound)."[366] It is the distinction between sound and sense that this dissertation has insisted upon.

Caragounis elsewhere carefully distinguishes paronomasia from parechesis, the latter involving words that are "etymologically unconnected."[367] Caragounis offers the best modern selection of examples from Hermogenes and Eustathius[368] and ancient Greek writers. His examples include the valuable gem from the church father Chrysostom: χοίρων χείρους ("worse than swine").[369] Caragounis cites Matt 24:30 for κόψονται … καὶ ὄψονται but underestimates it as mere "assonance" when in truth it rightfully rises to the level of parechesis or parechetical rhyme.

Of significance for our own dissertation, Caragounis affirms the set-subset relationship between parechesis and alliteration. As an example of alliteration, Caragounis notes the three consecutive *pi* initial words of Acts 17:31b, πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν, and Hebrew 1:1, "as the type of parechesis that is dependent on the first letter of two or more words, otherwise called alliteration."[370]

Caragounis's Chapter 7, "The Acoustic Dimension in Communication," contains the best

[365] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 454 n191. On p. 459, Caragounis lists lexemes from the same two roots, βαλὼν – λαβών, under Eustathian parechesis (Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 1, 193). Inexplicably, in his discussion of parechesis, 461 n224, he includes same root pairs from Paul, e.g., ἀόρατα … καθορᾶται (Rom 1:20).

[366] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 454.

[367] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 458.

[368] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 458–59.

[369] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 467, from Chrysostom, *Κατὰ Μαθθαῖον* 17:10–21 (*Homily* 57, *MPG* 58, 564, lines 5–7.

[370] Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 461.

assemblage of historical works on paronomasia and parechesis since Lausberg, but perhaps his most important contribution is simply in recognizing that the New Testament writers employ parechesis "at many points."[371]

2005–2013

L. L. Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ,* adds to the growing list of exegetes endorsing proper name parechesis on "Apollos" in 1 Cor 1:12 with ἀπολλυμένοις and ἀπολῶ in vv. 18 and 19.[372] D. Francois Tolmie makes seven original observations in Galatians, five instances of "consonance" and two of what he calls "alliteration" (rather, assonance). His observations at 5:13a and 5:16 underestimate the parechetical phenomena: ἐπ᾽ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί (5:13a); πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε (5:16). Tolmie does not name "parechesis" but does "paronomasia" and a number of "supportive rhetorical techniques."[373]

In 2007, Andrie Du Toit calls attention to μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ, at 1 Cor 6:9, observing, "We find this same phenomenon in the vice lists of Rom 1:29–31 and Gal 5:19–21."[374]

In 2008, Ernst R. Wendland, working in James, performed one of the best stylistic analyses ever on a New Testament epistle with great relevance to the UPE, noting that "[t]he phonological fabric, or 'sound print,' of the discourse was a vital factor in a text's

[371] Caragounis, *Development of Greek,* 460.

[372] L. L. Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians 1–4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 106.

[373] Tolmie, *Persuading the Galatians,* 187.

[374] Andrie, Du Toit, *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians,* ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and David S. du Toit, BZNW 151 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 283. Du Toit writes, "It is not clear why Paul mentions the μαλακοὶ first [before ἀρσενοκοῖται]. In terms of honor and shame it would have been more disgraceful for a man to play the female role. However, the vice list does not really show signs of a hierarchy. The reason for the precedence of the μαλακοὶ may simply have been stylistic, μοιχοὶ and | μαλακοὶ corresponding to the figure of parechesis (likeness of sound). We find this same phenomenon also in the vice lists of Rom 1:29–31 and Gal 5:19–21, one term suggesting and followed by a similarly sounding one." Few comments in Pauline studies accord more closely with our own view.

composition."[375] Devoting a section to "Sound play: rhythm, rhyme, paronomasia, assonance/alliteration," Wendland notes the "paronomasia" linking χαίρειν (v. 1) to χαρὰν (v. 2) and the alliteration of "πειρασμοῖς … περιπέσητε" in Jas 1:2 (inexplicably, however, he misses the third element: πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε *ποικίλοις*), and concludes that "this epistle abounds in appealing alliterative sequences."[376] But perhaps his most perceptive find is γενέσεως/γεέννης (3:6), a soundplay that Wendland would have done even better to call parechesis.

In 2010, Duane Watson's essay "Role of Style in the Pauline Epistles" in *Paul and Rhetoric* concludes that "within any section of a letter, Paul regularly employs tropes, figures, and styles."[377] In the 2010 *Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, Paul Hartog makes a similar comment with regard to one Pauline letter: "Wordplay, assonance, alliteration, chiasmus, and repetition are found throughout Philippians."[378] In the same volume, Paul A. Holloway expands upon the 120 year history of noting alliteration in the epistle of James, with fifteen identifications, at least one of which rises to the level of parechesis: οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται (James 3:8).[379]

Finally, in 2013, Ryan Schellenberg's *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education* [380] relies on Quintilian and seconds the observations of rhetorical devices in Paul made by Heinrici and Weiss a hundred years earlier, namely "Rhythm" and "*Klangfiguren*" in the so-called peristasis

---

[375] Ernst R. Wendland, *Finding and Translating the Oral-Aural Elements in Written Language: The Case of the New Testament Epistles* (Lewiston: Mellen, 2008), 95.

[376] Wendland, *Oral-Aural Elements*, 97.

[377] Duane Watson, "The Role of Style in the Pauline Epistles," in *Paul and Rhetoric*, ed. J. Paul Sampley and Peter Lampe, (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), ix.

[378] Paul Hartog, "Philippians," in *Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, ed. David E. Aune (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 478.

[379] Paul A. Holloway, "The Letter of James," in *Blackwell Companion Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, ed. David E. Aune Aune (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 574.

[380] Ryan Schellenberg, *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education: Comparative Rhetoric and 2 Corinthians 10–13* SBL 10 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2013).

catalogue of 2 Cor 11:23–28. Schellenberg identifies "anaphor, isocolon, repetition, and assonance or rhyming,"[381] noting that, "as has been observed at least since Johannes Weiss, Paul's list of hadships in 2 Cor 11 contains them all."[382]

Conclusion to History of Rhetoric

The common take on rhetorical analysis reflects an attitude, common among *literati* of many ages, that bemoans the reduction of rhetoric to style and the perfunctory tabulating of figures of speech.[383] One of the great ironies of the assumption of alleged reductionism, however, is that such a microscopic focus on style, had it occurred at all, overlooked almost entirely one very significant figure of speech in Paul, namely, parechesis. As we have shown, no such reductionism with respect to figures of speech has occurred in biblical studies, at least not in modern times. Rather, the focus in modern times has been almost exclusively on a single aspect of rhetoric, viz., argumentation. Yet no one has bemoaned the reduction of rhetoric to this single aspect.

In spite of a series of proclamations from some of the undoubted leaders of today's New Testament rhetorical criticism in which it is presumed that an adequate inventorying of figures of speech in the Pauline epistles has already taken place, no such undertaking has ever been accomplished. In the following chapters of the dissertation, we will attempt to identify parechesis

[381] Schellenberg, *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education*, 231.

[382] Schellenberg, *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education*, 138. Schellenberg is referring to Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 9th ed., KEK 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910).

[383] Wuellner "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" twice uses the phrase "the fateful reduction of rhetoric to stylistics," 451 and 457, a line from Gérard Genette's influential essay "Rhetoric Restrained," in *Figures of Literary Discourse* (New York: Columbia, 1982), 103–26. See also Wayne Booth, "Rhetorical Critics Old and New: The Case of Gérard Genette" in *Reconstructing Literature*, ed. Laurence Lerner (Totowa, NJ: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 123–41. The concern of reductionism of rhetoric to ornament is summed up in Genette's famous line "fatal reductionism."

in Paul’s seven undisputed epistles.

CHAPTER THREE

A CLOSE ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE: 1 THESSALONIANS

Introduction: The First Christian Letter

The oldest known Christian letter[1] is Paul's first epistle to the church at Thessalonica. The facts of its provenance place it at the midpoint of the century, its generally agreed upon "return address" Corinth, near the heart of Greek rhetoric. Like all of Paul's letters, 1 Thessalonians has been analyzed from a number of perspectives, including theological, thematic, and, epistolographic.[2] New Testament rhetorical criticism has found the letter amenable to rhetorical analysis, one of the best such attempts by Charles Wanamaker in 1990.[3]

These many exegetical approaches are not mutually exclusive. Clearly, in 1 Thessalonians Paul abides by certain first century conventions of letter writing, and, clearly, he commends and exhorts and persuades, all rhetorical strategies of one kind or another. The author, moreover, proves himself aware of the excesses of rhetoric, reminding his audience that he had not come to them λόγῳ κολακείας (1 Thess 2:5), that is, in discourse of sophistic flattery. Complementary to the above-mentioned approaches, this dissertation will make the case that one of the best ways to analyze 1 Thessalonians is on the basis of phonology. But quite apart from consideration of the as yet uncertain perimeters of *partes orationes*, the dissertation will attempt to establish pericopes based on the most primary but most objective feature of the language: the *sounds* of

[1] Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 172, reminds us that 1 Thessalonians is "only the earliest extant letter of Paul, not necessarily the earliest letter he had written—after a ministry of fifteen years or more…."

[2] An excellent summary of questions about and approaches to the Thessalonian correspondence(s) up to the beginning of the New Testament rhetorical criticism era can be found in Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 17–52.

[3] One of the earliest rhetorical analyses of 1 Thessalonians is, in fact, Wanamaker's commentary. Like many in the movement, Wanamaker maintains that "Greco-Roman letter writing theory … was closely connected with ancient rhetorical theory" (Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 46).

the words.

Wanamaker, before undertaking his rhetorical analysis, claims that exegesis of 1 Thessalonians had involved "careful linguistic analysis of the text."[4] This appraisal of prior scholarship is typical of the overly generous credit that rhetorical criticism has been giving to Pauline studies, when, in fact, little attention has been paid to that most fundamental aspect of linguistics: the sound of the words that Paul chooses. As the following *phono*logical analysis will show, 1 Thessalonians abounds in soundplay. The first widely recognized instance of soundplay comes in the opening lines of the letter, in verse 2. The case for parechesis in Paul begins here, with the notes leading up to it, that is, with the established groundwork of alliteration.[5]

1 Thessalonians 1

1 Thessalonians 1:2—Pi Alliteration

One of the most perceptive attempts at analysis of Paul's style in 1 Thessalonians comes from Abraham Malherbe in his 2004 commentary.[6] Attentive to aurality, Malherbe writes, "Paul's intention, that the letter be read to the church, is reflected stylistically in the alliterative *p* in 1:2 (see also 5:16–22)."[7] The alliteration of v. 2 is evident in the final eleven words, where seven *pi* syllables occur, the interior *pi*'s of the preposition ἐπὶ and of the final word, ἀδιαλείπτως, also included by Malherbe: πάντοτε περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν μνείαν[8] ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν

[4] Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, xii.

[5] Alliteration some regard as a "type of parechesis" (see, for example, Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 461). As such, alliteration would be its simplest form: as notes are to a chord, so alliteration is to parechesis. For the purposes of this dissertation, the prevalent alliteration in Paul will only be alluded to as circumstantial evidence for parechesis.

[6] Abraham Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 81–92.

[7] Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 90–91.

[8] For now we will only note in passing the interwoven nasal alliteration/parechesis of *ὑμῶν μνείαν*.

προσευχῶν ἡμῶν, ἀδιαλείπτως (1 Thess 1:2).[9]

The prospects of soundplay—even parechesis—in 1 Thessalonians, however, actually begin earlier, in the very first verse.

1 Thessalonians 1:1a—*Theta-Epsilon* and *Chi-Rho* Parechesis

In the first verse of this letter, two separate instances of alliteration occur, *theta-epsilon* and *chi*/guttural-*rho*, both involving proper name parechesis.

First of all, in the midst of v. 1, we find this collocation of *theta-epsilon*'s: Τιμό*θεος* … *Θεσσ*αλονικέων ἐν *θε*ῷ. Here, Τιμό*θεος* … *θε*ῷ. looks not far from, to make one comparison, the proper name parechesis cited by Hermogenes, found also in the second century AD *techne* of Ailios Herodianos and endorsed by Eustathius: Πρό*θοος θοὸς*.[10]

In spite of the seeming prerequisite of (co-)sender and addressee proper names, there are several reasons to suspect deliberate soundplay—including parechesis—here: (1) statistical

[9] In addition to examples of *pi* alliteration endorsed by scholars, there are statistical considerations to take into account. Probable instances of *pi* alliteration in the classics have received some statistical corroboration from professor of classics David W. Packard, son of one of the founders of Hewlett-Packard and an early promoter of digitizing ancient texts. In 1976, Packard brought objective criteria to the study of sound patterns in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, calculating the frequency of Greek letter occurrence in every verse in Homer (David W. Packard, "Sound-Patterns in Homer," *TAPA* 104 [1974], 239–60). He found, for instance, that in all of that great corpus only twenty-one poetic verses contain as many as six total *pi*'s (though epistolary lines are longer than those of narrative poetry). By comparison, there are seventy-two verses in the prose of Paul that contain six or more *pi* sounds. Perhaps the line comparing most favorably to 1 Thess 1:2 in this respect is *Il.* 20.217, for which Packard, "Sound-Patterns," 241–42, includes the internal *pi*'s in his count: ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο, πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, that is, "on the plain dwelt, a city of mortal men" (*Il.* 20.217). (Compare the typical Pauline *pi* alliteration in Rom 12:17b, προνοούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων·) At this Homeric line, the famous nineteenth century classicist Walter Leaf had conceded "strongly-marked alliteration" but was skeptical of "design" (Walter Leaf, ed., *The Iliad*, 2 vols. [New York: Macmillan, 1900–1902], 299). Although the Homeric lines that Packard studied are but half as long in word count as the average Pauline epistolary verse, within many of the dozens of verses in Paul with six or more *pi*'s there are concentrations (in a half verse) that rival those discovered in Homer. The string of eleven words in 1 Thess 1:2, seven of them with *pi* sounds, is thus not far from one of the most alliterative lines in ancient Greek literature.

[10] "Prothoos was quick [θοὸς] [to rule over them]," from Hermogenes and also, apparently, from Ailios Herodianos Περὶ σχημάτων, 95 in L. Spengel, ed. *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1856). Caragounis, *Development of Greek*, 454, subsumes this example under "paronomasia," with this claim: "Ancient authors used paronomasia very freely." Though technically neither Πρό*θοος θοὸς*. nor Τιμό*θεος* … *θε*ῷ are of different roots, they are subsumed under what the ancient Eastern rhetoricians Hermogenes and Eustathius called parechesis. Proper names appear to be a special class of word/soundplay. Eustathius supplies history with forty some similar examples, which he calls "parechesis."

probabilities, (2) the propensity of Greek (and other ancient languages) to alliterate on proper names, including Paul's own habit, and (3) the propensity of literary Greek to alliterate in opening lines, including evidence from other Pauline letters and elsewhere in the Greek Bible.

Reason 1: Statistical Occurrence of *θε* in the Greek Bible

Without an appreciation of the frequency of a certain letter in the Greek language of the first century, it may be difficult to recognize certain *im*probabilities. The requisite of (co)sender (Timothy) and recipient (the Thessalonicans) notwithstanding, only 3.7% of UPE words contain a *theta-epsilon*, and only 2.1% of UPE words begin with *theta-epsilon*. Thus, the probability of *three* such *theta* words in such close collocation is low, even given the high frequency of the divine name θεός, which name Paul references about 430 times in seven epistles. As we will see, the inclusion of θεός in a Pauline opening line is not as expected as one might think.

Similarly, an understanding of the frequency of *tau*-initial words in Paul is helpful. After controlling for the articles and demonstratives, fewer than 2% of UPE words *begin* with a *tau*. See Table 2 at the end of the dissertation for evidence of *theta* and *tau* alliteration in 1 Thessalonians and other undisputed Pauline epistles.

Reason 2: Proper Name Soundplay

Background

Well-established in scholarship is the fact of ancient Greek (and Latin) etymological wordplay. Classicist J. E. Powell observes that Greek authors "had delighted to pun on names ever since Homer."[11] James O'Hara, author of *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian*

[11] Powell, J.E. "Puns in Herodotus." *CR* 51 (1937): 103. Puns on the name Odysseus are easy observations: "Take these lines from the *Odyssey*," writes O'Hara, *True Names*, 9: ἀλλ᾽ ἑλέτω σε καὶ ὕπνος: ἀνίη καὶ τὸ

Tradition of Etymological Wordplay, attests over and over to the fact that "the phenomenon of etymological wordplay is so extensive and important in so many ancient authors," both Greek and Latin,[12] and to "the almost countless examples"[13] and, again, to "the long tradition of etymologizing in archaic and classical Greek literature."[14] Eustathius identified dozens of examples in Homer,[15] and the Latin love for it, still strong in the first century, is fruitfully expressive in such works as Ovid's *Metamorphosis* and Lucretius's *De rerum natura*. The crucial point here is that proper names were often attended by soundplay, whether

---

φυλάσσειν πάννυχον ἐγρήσσοντα, κακῶν δ᾽ ὑποδύσεαι ἤδη. (20. 52-53). The penultimate word in the two lines I quoted echoes the sound of our hero's name: hypODYSSEAI. Athena is identifying O. as the guy who will 'slip out from under' things." (http://languagehat.com/wilson-on-homeric-wordplay/ January 7, 2018). "A well-known example occurs in *Odyssey* 19 where Autolycus says that because he himself is 'hateful' or a 'source of pain' (ὀδυσσάμενος) to many, his grandson should be named Odysseus." The sound related words are separated by ten words:

> πολλοῖσιν γὰρ ἐγώ γε ὀδυσσάμενος τόδ᾽ ἱκάνω,
> ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναιξὶν ἀνὰ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν:
> τῷ δ᾽ Ὀδυσεὺς ὄνομ᾽ ἔστω ἐπώνυμον: αὐτὰρ ἐγώ γε … (*Od*. 19. 407–409)

NB: Some distance often exists between the proper name and the eponymous word in the explanation. See, e.g., O'Hara, *True Names*, 30 n130. Other subtleties should not go unnoticed. O'Hara points out a famous double entendre: "The Oedipus Tyrannus provides an explicit derivation of the king's name from the swelling (οἶδμα) of his foot … but also exploits the suggestion of 'knowing' (οἶδα) in his name…. The double meaning of Oedipus is to be found in the name itself in the opposition between the first two syllables and the third. Ὀἶδα: I know: this is one of the key words on the lips of Oedipus triumphant, of Oedipus the tyrant."

[12] O'Hara, *True Names*, vii. O'Hara explains the importance of this form of parechesis: "Recognizing and understanding etymological wordplay has considerable consequences for the study of Vergil's style, his place in the literary traditions of ancient Greece and Rome, and for the interpretation of numerous passages in the *Aeneid*, *Eclogues*, and *Georgics*" (vii).

[13] O'Hara, *True Names*, 2.

[14] O'Hara, *True Names*, 4. O'Hara's comments with regard to Greek soundplay are particularly enlightened, as he describes the range of possibilities of this device: "Homer and Hesiod offer many examples of wordplay of several kinds not always easily distinguished, ranging from assonance or the simple collocation of similar sounds, to paronomasia or wordplay based on similar sounds, to … etymological wordplay. Assonance, alliteration, or other considerations of euphony produce many collocations that might suggest etymological connections." (O'Hara, *True Names*, 7). That is, O'Hara (who unfortunately does not seem to know the term parechesis) distinguishes between the "euphonious" and the "etymological" (O'Hara, *True Names*, 8 n13). He adds that his "study will include a slightly broader range of wordplay, both to be more useful and because strenuous efforts to distinguish or separate etymological wordplay from 'related phenomena,' to use a phrase from the title of Rank's study of Homeric wordplay, are not worthwhile, and probably not true to the practice of the poets" (O'Hara, *True Names*, 3).

[15] In Homer, soundplay on proper names is at once so common and so clever that it appears hundreds of subtle examples of it have not even been noted by scholars.

etymologizing, real or imagined, or for the sake of euphony.[16]

In the New Testament, the most accepted proper name wordplay is Πέτρος/πέτρᾳ in Matt 16:18, an instance of Hermogenic parechesis, though rarely called by that name.[17] In the epistles of Paul, the two most famous soundplay possibilities of this kind are found in the first chapter of 1 Corinthians and in Philemon. Some speculation has attended the name Apollos in 1 Cor 1:12, Welborn being perhaps the most recent major commentator to recognize proper name parechesis here with ἀπολλυμένοις and ἀπολῶ in vv. 18 and 19.[18] In Philemon, ὀναίμην in Phlm 20 stands as a possible etymological play on the name Ὀνήσιμον some ten verses earlier. This possibility was peremptorily dismissed by the influential Blass in the nineteenth century, but most modern Philemon commentators, including Nordling, accept it.[19] In the final chapter of this dissertation, we will take up the question of Onesimus.

Other than those two Pauline examples, little attention has been paid to the same possibility in literally dozens of other names in the UPE. Given the common practice in both Greek and Latin classics, not to mention the well-known etymological wordplay on dozens of Old Testament (Hebrew) names, from Adam and Eve through the minor prophets, one thing is for sure: Paul would have been highly conscious of play on proper names as a serious literary device. Table 12 at the end of the dissertation lists possible examples of soundplay on proper names from the undisputed epistles of Paul.

---

[16] Nothing better illustrates the Greek interest in sound and sense than Plato's *Cratylus*, which parodies the zealous etymologizing.

[17] One of the best expositions of this verse is by Chrys Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock*, BZNWKAK 58. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990).

[18] Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*, 106.

[19] John G. Nordling, *Philemon* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2004), 277.

Proper Name Soundplay on Τιμόθεος

The name Timothy in particular is the subject of proper name soundplay in Paul. Two dozen times in the New Testament the name is used, eleven times in the UPE, including three mentions in 1 Thessalonians and four times in opening verses (seven times in openings if we were to count the first verse of 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, and 2 Timothy 1:2). In all three instances in 1 Thessalonians, "Timothy" is found in proximity to *theta* words. The proper name occurs, arguably, seven times in soundplay in the undisputed Pauline, including, for example, *Τιμ*όθεον, ὅς ἐστ*ίν* μου *τ*έκνον ἀγαπητ*ὸν* (1 Cor. 4:17). See Table 12 at the end of the dissertation for possible instances of proper name soundplay on the name Timothy.

It should be noted that the last syllable of the co-sender and the first syllable of the addressee are parechetical: Τιμό*θεος* … *Θεσσ*αλονικέων (1 Thess 1:1). Furthermore, Τιμό*θεος* … *θε*ῷ is akin to the examples of proper name soundplay in Hermogenes: not only Πρό*θοος θοὸς*.[20] from pseudo-Plutarch, but from Thucydides, Σα*μίαν μίαν*, and from Demosthenes, "*σοφός Sopho*cles;"[21] Eustathius supplies several other relevant examples from Homer: Αἰγαίων γαίων; ἵππηλάτα Πηλεύς; αἰνῶς Αἰνείαν,[22] etc, some sharing common roots, others of unrelated etymology, and many in which the endings of words are not involved in the parechesis.[23] Note that in the Pauline usage, the eponymous words are not consecutive and do not share the same inflected ending, which is also true of many Eustathian examples.

[20] From Ailios Herodianos and/or Hermogenes. See also Hayward, "Wordplay between *ΘΕΩ/ΘΟΟΣ* and *ΘΕΟΣ* in Homer," 215–18.

[21] This proper name parechesis is a quote from Thucydides from Hermogenes's *On Style*, in a section titled "Beauty" (or perhaps better, "Ornament") illustrating the figure of *epanastrophe*: *Hermogenes' On Types of Style*, trans. Cecil W. Wooten (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 59.

[22] From Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 2, 421, 452, and vol. 4, 3, respectively.

[23] For example, Μέλητος/μελιτόεσσαν in Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 1, 151 line 10.

Proper Name Soundplay on θεός

The third element in the *theta-epsilon* series of 1 Thess 1:1 has an impressive pedigree of phonological associations: θεός. Paul expresses the name θεός[24] about 430 times in the seven letters, nearly thirty-five times in 1 Thessalonians, and in many instances in collocation with another *theta* word, as Table 3 at the end of the dissertation displays. We have also to consider in this respect the tendency of ancient Greek in general to alliterate on the names and titles of deities.

Paul is not the only Greek writer to frequently alliterate with θεός and other divine names. Wordplay on divine names in ancient Greek literature, in fact, was a common practice. Observations from Homer are numerous and come from commentators from many different eras:

> *Il*. 18.182: Ἶρι *θεὰ* τίς γάρ σε *θεῶν* ἐμοὶ ἄγγελον ἦκε;[25] (Eustathius, 12th century)
>
> *Od*. 16.187–88: οὔ τίς τοι *θεός* εἰμι: τί μ᾽ *ἀθανάτοισιν* ἐΐσκεις;[26] (Fraunce, 16th century)
>
> *Od*. 16.197–198: ᾧ αὐτοῦ γε νόῳ, ὅτε μὴ *θεὸς* αὐτὸς *ἐπελθὼν*
> ῥηϊδίως *ἐθέλων θεί*η νέον ἠὲ γέροντα. (Bérard, 1933)[27]

Note that these acute observations come from three scholars from three different centuries all who use the term "parechesis" in its technical Hermogenic sense.

The above examples in which alliteration or parechesis has been identified all look

[24] It is strictly an editorial decision whether or not to capitalize θεός. Paul uses the name "Christ" almost 270 times and, as we will also see, often alliterates with that holy name as well. He also, as we will see, alliterates on the unholy name of Satan.

[25] "Goddess Iris, who of the gods sent you to me as a messenger?" This is actually *figura etymologica*.

[26] "I am not any god to you. Why do you liken me to the immortals?" Compare again this verse from 4 Maccabees: ἀλλ᾽ οἱ μὲν εὐγενῶς ἀπο*θαν*όντες ἐπλήρωσαν τὴν εἰς τὸν *θεὸν* εὐσέβειαν σὺ δὲ κακῶς οἰμώξεις τοὺς τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀγωνιστὰς ἀναιτίως ἀποκτεῖνας *ὅθεν* καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπο*θνή*σκειν.… (4 Macc 12:14–15). NB: the *alpha* assonance and distinct possibility of deliberate parechesis on θεὸν/ὅθεν.

[27] "[For no way could a mortal man contrive this] of his own wit, unless a god himself were to come to him, willing to readily make him young or old." Bérard, *Odyssée*, 44, writes of "les paréchèses at métathèses" of these verses.

remarkably similar to certain verses in Paul. For instance, Pauline phrases lexically and phonologically similar to *Od*. 16.187–88a, ‘οὔ τίς τοι θεός εἰμι: τί μ᾽ ἀθανάτοισιν ἐΐσκεις;[28] are found in Rom 1:32; 5:8, 10, 15; 6:10, 23; 7:4, 8:34, 1 Cor 4:9, 2 Cor 1:9, 7:10, Gal 2:19, 21; Phil 2:27; and 1 Thess 4:14.

Among the Greek playwrights, similar alliteration has been noted. Christian Riedel (1900) published the alliterative find θεοῦ — θέλοντος[29] from Sophocles, which happens to bear the exact same lexemes as Rom 9:16, ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ *θέλοντος* οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος *θεοῦ*. Riedel also knew and employed the term parechesis.

Although θεός, which occurs 427 times in Paul and nearly ten times that in the entire Greek Bible (over 4,000 times), is as ubiquitous as one might expect in the Scripture, it is not necessarily the expected deific term in the opening of an early Christian letter. “In Christ” would be the expected expression, and Wanamaker calls attention to this “unusual” attribution found in 1 Thess 1:1, albeit the first Christian letter. Why does Paul say “in God,” the exact phrase found only here and in Rom 2:17? “No definitive solution to this question can be offered on grammatical grounds,” Wanamaker assures us.[30] As we have seen, there is a solution on phonological grounds.

One of the first questions from the text of 1 Thessalonians that has piqued the interest of commentators has to do with the names and the order of the co-senders.[31] As Wanamaker puts it, “If in fact Paul is the real author of 1 Thessalonians, why has he included the names of his fellow

[28] “I am [no] god. Why do you liken me to the immortals?”

[29] Riedel, *Alliteration*, 414.

[30] Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 70.

[31] For example, Philip L. Tite discusses the omission of Timothy in the prescript of Paul’s letter to the Romans, in “How to Begin, And Why? Diverse Functions of the Pauline Prescript within a Greco-Roman Context.” pages 57–100 in ed. Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form* (Boston: Brill, 2010), 91–92.

workers Silvanus and Timothy in the salutation?"[32] Regardless of the complete answer to this question, the given order puts the name Timothy in line to alliterate with the other two *theta* terms. Thus, the parechesis of Τιμό*θεος* … *Θεσσ*αλονικέων ἐν *θε*ῷ, rarely if ever mentioned in commentaries, stands as not only the first of Paul's parechesis (and/or *paromoion*) but the first oversight in Pauline exegesis.[33]

Reason 3: The Opening Lines of Greek

But perhaps the most cogent evidence for Paul's conscious choice of soundplay in the opening of 1 Thessalonians comes from comparison with other New Testament epistolary opening lines. Note especially the consistency of dentals in Pauline (disputed and undisputed) parallels:

Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ (1 Thess 1:1 and 2 Thess 1:2)

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Σωσθένης … τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ (1 Cor 1:1–2)

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor 1:1)

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς (Col 1:1)

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ (Eph 1:1)

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ … Τιμοθέῳ ἀγαπητῷ τέκνῳ (2 Tim 1:1–2)

These parallels could easily be written off as one piece of evidence rather than seven, as redundant or imitative examples, but consider that in all the vast corpus of the Greek Bible, Old and New Testament, two consecutive *theta*-initial words, such as we see in θελήματος θεοῦ of four Pauline opening lines, occur in fewer than 120 verses. Thus again, the evidence of alliteration supports the theory of parechesis.

[32] Wanamaker, *Thessalonians,* 68.

[33] See also Παῦλος ἀπόστολος in Gal 1:1 and 2 Cor 1:1.

1 Thessalonians 1:1b—*χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη: Parechesis and the Christianized Blessing

The soundplay that we have hypothesized in the opening line of the oldest known Christian letter, indeed, anticipates further exploitation of Greek letter sounds in the epistle. The next instance of parechesis per se comes at the end of the first verse and involves the conjoined words *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη.

The alliterative scheme of which this is part begins with the rhythmic repetitions of *kappa* in v. 1, καὶ … καὶ … ἐκκλησίᾳ … καὶ, with a consistent guttural string that extends to the first word of v. 2, thus, *κ*αὶ *κ*υρίῳ Ἰησοῦ *Χρ*ιστῷ, *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη. Εὐ*χαρ*ιστοῦμεν (1 Thess 1:1–2). Only eleven verses in Paul have more initial *kappa*'s. The name "Christ," κύριος, and χάρις are frequently involved in such alliterative schemes in Paul; in fact, they are found in the same verse twenty-seven times in Paul, including in all seven of the opening salutations.

As many scholars have noted, at the start of all his letters Paul appears to replace the conventional secular Greek letter writing salutation "charein" with "charis" and adds to this the Jewish salutation of peace, thus, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, found within the first few verses of all seven undisputed epistles.[34] Thus, the salutary blessing χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη of the former Pharisee appears to combine a Christian theme word with the Jewish *shalom*. The addition of the latter, a Hebrew element, was the opinion already of Tertullian (AD 160–220), who refers to Paul's adding 'peace" to his opening greeting as "a formula which the Jews still use. For to this day they still salute each other with the greeting of 'peace.'"[35] As far as we know, Paul's χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη (1:1) in the first Christian letter is an orginal formulation, albeit apparently

[34] This was the view of second century Tertullian (*Against Marcion,* 5.5.1). The longstanding view is endorsed in the twenty-first century by, for example, Gordon Fee, *The First and Second Letter to the Thessalonians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 17. See also Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 95 and 100. Bruce, however, disagrees (F.F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, WBC 45 [Waco, TX: Word, 1982], 8).

[35] Tertullian, *Against Marcion.* 5.5.1. The longstanding view is reiterated, for example, by Gordon Fee, 2009, 17.

derived from the Hellenistic and Jewish sources. One Pauline scholar summarizes the prevailing opinion:

> Since neither Hellenistic nor Jewish letters provide an exact parallel to Paul's opening greeting formula 'Grace to you and peace,' it is difficult to determine with certainty the origin of the apostle's salutation. The explanation that seems most likely and has won the most support is that the apostle has taken the expected secular Greek greeting *chairein* and 'Christianized' it by using the similar sounding Greek word *charis*, which means 'grace.' Both words not only sound similar but are also linguistically linked.[36]

The author here is exactly describing, without using the term, parechesis. Sean Adams helpfully asserts, "This similarity is beyond chance and suggests that Paul was adapting his letter greeting from the traditional *chairein* form."[37]

The mutually complementary functions of sound and sense have been overlooked by most commentators, however. Among recent studies, Weima's observations come at least close to Paul's semantic-phonological intent, though he just misses the soundplay. "Paul's change," writes Weima of the *chairein* transformation, "may be slight in sound but is significant in sense, for the newly minted greeting of 'Grace' evokes the crucial role of the divine in the readers' salvation…. The apostle's combination of 'grace and peace,' then, demonstrates his skill in not merely borrowing from the epistolary conventions of his day but also cleveraly adapting these conventions."[38] Without saying as much, Weima, too, is noting the device of parechesis. The observations of "sound similar" and "beyond chance" and "slight [change] in sound" neatly summarize the two aspects of the definition of parechesis that is the focus of this dissertation.

If the profound theological reasons behind Paul's pairing of grace (χάρις) and peace

---

[36] Jeffrey A.D. Weima, *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016), 42.

[37] Sean Adams, "Paul's Letter Opening and Greek Epistolography: A Matter of Relationship," in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Sean Adams (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 47.

[38] Weima, *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer*, 42.

(εἰρήνη) have been the subject of delving analysis, the more superficial matter of sound has been treated only rarely. The evidence of Judeo-Christian usage sheds light on the intentions of soundplay.

Prior to Paul, the use of secular χαίρειν alone is found in at least three letters in the Greek Bible, from 1 Esdras and 2 Maccabees and from Acts and James, each instance in highly alliterative contexts:

> 1 Esdras 6:8, βασιλεῖ Δαρείῳ *χαίρειν* πάντα γνωστὰ ἔστω τῷ *κυρί*ῳ ἡμῶν τῷ βασιλεῖ ὅτι παραγενόμενοι εἰς τὴν *χώρ*αν….
>
> 2 Maccabees 1:1, τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς κατ᾽ Αἴγυπτον Ιουδαίοις *χαίρειν* οἱ ἀδελφοὶ οἱ ἐν Ιεροσολύμοις Ιουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῆς Ιουδαίας *εἰρήνην* ἀγαθήν. (Note well that the 2 Macc verse has both formulaic lexemes.)
>
> Acts 15:23, γράψαντες διὰ *χειρ*ὸς αὐτῶν· Οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν *χαίρ*ειν.
>
> Acts 23:25–26, letter τὸν τύπον τοῦτον on Paul's behalf: Κλαύδιος Λυσίας τῷ *κρατ*ίστῳ ἡγεμόνι Φήλικι *χαίρ*ειν.

After Paul, there is the significant parallel from James: Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ *καὶ κυρ*ίου Ἰησοῦ *Χρ*ιστοῦ *δ*οῦλος ταῖς *δ*ώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ *δ*ιασπορᾷ *χαίρ*ειν. Πᾶσαν *χαρ*ὰν (Jas 1:1–2a), albeit technically paronomasia.

Thus, in the Greek Bible both before and after Paul, several lexemes are parechetical with χαίρειν, beyond any hypothesis of chance:

> χαίρειν/κυρίῳ/χώραν … (1 Esdras 6:8)
>
> χαίρειν/χώρᾳ (2 Macc 1:1)
>
> χειρὸς/χαίρειν (Acts 15:23)
>
> Κλαύδιος/κρατίστῳ/χαίρειν (Acts 23:26)
>
> καὶ κυρίου/Χριστοῦ/χαίρειν/χαρὰν (Jas 1:1–2a)

But there is apparently more to the use of χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη in early Christian salutation, which profound analyses of meaning have all but passed over. Together the two terms

cooperate in a "bridge" parechesis: *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη, part of a pattern of no fewer than *five* guttural-rho sounds in eight consecutive words in the opening of 1 Thessalonians: *κυρί*ῳ Ἰησοῦ *Χρ*ιστῷ, *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη. Εὐ*χαρ*ιστοῦμεν (1 Thess 1:1–2). This pattern recurs in other Pauline epistles as well. (For a look at *chi-rho* alliteration in Paul with the name "Christ," see Table 4 at the end of the dissertation.)

"Bridge alliteration," whereby two or more words combine to create a soundplay echo (*καὶ εἰρ*ήνη with *χάρ*ις above) is not unheard of in ancient literature. Chrys Caragounis, whom we have already shown to be one of the most aware exegetes when it comes to *Koine* soundplay, notes the following "synechesis" (a variant of parechesis) from Diogenes of Laertius: ἄλειμμάτιον ἢ ἐπ᾽ ἀλλ᾽ ἱμάτιον, a two-word bridge: "The play being … 'for a little ungent (ἄλειμμάτιον) or for a new garment (ἀλλ᾽ ἱμάτιον)?'"[39]

From the second century, similar two-word soundplay is found in the *Peri Pascha*:

ἐσφραγισεν … "marked [the doors of the houses]"

εἰς φρουρὰν[40] … "to protect [the people]" (Melito, *PP*).

Further, in 1 Thessalonians we are arguing that the *chi*/guttural-*rho* alliteration segues to *pi* alliteration in v. 2. There is inter-New Testament evidence for this stylistic move as well. The epistle of James offers an example of the segue from *chi-rho* to *pi* alliteration in the opening verses of an early Christian letter: James 1:1 … χαίρειν. Πᾶσαν χαρὰν (Jas 1:1b–2a) with triple *pi* alliteration ending the second verse: πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις (Jas 1:2b). Here in the opening of James we find the *figura etymologica* of χαίρειν (v. 1) and χαρὰν (v. 2), a soundplay noted as early as 1916 by James Hardy Ropes who was careful to call χαίρειν/χαρὰν one of the

[39] Diogenes Laertius, VI 52, noted in Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock*, 48 n17.

[40] Melito, *PP*, 15.90 and 91. Nearly half of the biblical Greek uses of this word occur in Maccabees.

"plays on words" in James.[41] With respect to this pairing, Wendland writes, "Paronomasia links the opening salutation of 'greeting' (χαίρειν) with the initial topic of the letter's introduction 'All joy' (Πᾶσαν χαρὰν) in 1:1b–2a."[42] If the instincts of major James scholars is correct, at the time of Paul Christian leaders were already playing on the sound and meaning of key Christian terms.[43]

It is apparent from all the coincidences of sound in the most relevant Judeo-Christian epistolary greetings that Paul himself, with apparently more than theological reasons in mind, transforms the standard greetings of two distinct cultures in a way that is most appropriate to the new religion. The key part of the transformation is effected by parechesis: *κυρί*ῳ Ἰησοῦ *Χρ*ιστῷ, *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη. Εὐ*χαρ*ιστοῦμεν (1 Thess 1:1–2); in particular, *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη, we submit, is parechesis.

1 Thessalonians 1:2—From Prescript to Thanksgiving Period

The first word of the second verse of 1 Thessalonians, Εὐχαριστοῦμεν, which begins the Thanksgiving section, continues and corroborates the guttural and guttural-*rho* alliteration already established: *κ*αὶ *κυρί*ῳ Ἰησοῦ *Χρ*ιστῷ, *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη. Εὐ*χαρ*ιστοῦμεν (1 Thess 1:1–2). Evidence supporting a hypothesis of conscious collocation is found elsewhere in Romans. At Rom 7:25, Paul writes χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (Rom 7:25); and at Rom 15:13, Paul collocates not with χάρις but χαρᾶς—χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης (Rom 15:13) in a verse that, further, contains the parechesis πιστεύειν/περισσεύειν. In fact, guttural-*rho*

[41] Ropes, *James*, 27.

[42] Wendland, *Finding and Translating the Oral-Aural Elements*, 97.

[43] The other pillar of the Jerusalem church, Peter, in a presumably later letter, also replaced χαίρειν with χάρις: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη (1 Pet 1:2). We note here also the *pi* alliteration of Πέτρος ἀπόστολος … παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου … πρόγνωσιν … πατρὸς … πνεύματος … ὑπακοὴν (1 Pet 1:1–2). Thus, 1 Peter echoes what we have seen in 1 Thess 1:1 and 2.

cluster alliteration, tantamount to parechesis, is elsewhere evident within 1 Thessalonians itself: τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν (5:1).

A not unrelated parechesis is found in Epictetus (c. AD 55–135), with whom Paul has been compared (so Bultmann's dissertation[44]) on the basis of the so-called diatribe:

> From everything that happens in the universe it is easy for a man to find occasion to praise providence, if he has within himself these two qualities: the faculty of taking a comprehensive view of what has happened in each individual instance, and the sense of gratitude [εὐχάριστον]. Otherwise, one man will not see the usefulness [εὐχρηστίαν] of what has happened.… (*Diss.* 1.6.1–2).

In conclusion, we find that the first verse of the first letter of Paul is unquestionably alliterative—and links to the second—with both *theta-epsilon* and *kappa*/*chi* guttural(-*rho*) alliteration rising to the level of parechesis:

> … Τιμό*θεος* τῇ ἐ*κκλησί*ᾳ *Θεσσ*αλονικέων ἐν *θε*ῷ …[45] *κ*αὶ *κυρί*ῳ Ἰησοῦ *Χρ*ιστῷ, *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη. Εὐ*χαρ*ιστοῦμεν.… (1 Thess 1:1–2a)

1 Thessalonians 1:7 and 8

In 1968 under "*stark reimende Parechesen*" ("strong rhyming parechesis") Fehling includes the following example from Gorgias: τόν τρόπον τόν τόπον (Gorgias, *Pal*. 22).[46] There could hardly be a more well defined instance of parechesis than that which comes from the alleged father of the device. This and other examples[47] are helpful historical reference points for considering one of the most interesting possibilities of soundplay in 1 Thessalonians 1, where in v. 7 and 8 the two parechetical lexemes τύπον and τόπῳ are found.

In this chapter we have shown there to be a conscious strain of soundplay through the first

[44] Rudolph Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, FRLANT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910).

[45] Only the πατρὶ, elided above, is aberrant phonologically.

[46] Gorgias, *Pal.*, 22, cited in Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren*, 260.

[47] Other classical parallels of the same combination can be found, for example, Aesch. *Ctesiph*, sec 78: τρόπον/τόπον.

six verses. With v. 7 and v. 8 comes a possibility for parechesis that challenges the idea of collocation as a criterion: τύπον (v. 7) and τόπῳ (v. 8). The two words are separated by thirty-one words—the same distance separating *ἀδιαλείπτως* and *ἀδελφ*οί (twice in the letter, 1:2–4 and 2:13–14). On the basis of morphology alone, τύπον/τόπῳ constitute classical parechesis (of the type that Eustathius identified in Homer).[48] When we set the parechetical terms in their alliterative contexts, the phonological relationship is even more pronounced:

… τύπον πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν …

… παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ πίστις (1 Thess 1:7–8).

Clearly, the *pi* alliterative terms in each colon are matching lexemes. Each verse in and of itself is highly alliterative, with *pi*'s and *tau*'s and *sigma*'s. Together they constitute two parallel strings of sound.

Other explanations for the vague lexeme "place" have been proposed, for example, Helmut Koester's *TDNT* suggestion that τόποι refers specifically to churches ("Places of worship were described as topoi.)"[49] But this hypothesis invites problems of its own. In 2 Chr. 33:19, the only use of the plural in all of Scripture, the reference is to "high places." Nowhere in Paul's other six uses of τόπος is there but a remote possibility of such a lexical connection, certainly not in 1 Cor 14:16, nor in Rom 15:23, after which Paul immediately speaks of Spain (v. 24), where presumably there is no church. In 1 Thess 1:1 Paul has already used the term ἐκκλησία.

Malherbe rightly suggests that παντὶ τόπῳ is hyperbole[50] (itself a rhetorical device), but the

[48] Such distance between parechetical pairs is not uncommon in Paul, as we will see, and defies some of the restrictive definitions of parechesis that some scholars have assumed over the years. Just as Paul is capable of carrying semantic meaning across some distance—see how often he resumes a theme or picks up on a word after some long interval (e.g., "soma" in 1 Cor 10 and 11)—so, too, he is capable of recalling sound.

[49] See Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 123.

[50] Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 124.

most sensible explanation lies plainly on the surface, a topography of sound rather than geography: παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς … (1 Thess 1:8). Very likely, τύπον/τόπῳ is part of the pattern of parchesis already evident in 1 Thessalonians. The statistics alone suggest the pair is part of the clever play of words that Paul commonly employs.

One further point. The frequency of *tau*-initial words is deceptive (see Table 2 at the end of the dissertation). In any single chapter of Paul, no more than two or three *tau* initial words are to be found. In the first chapter of 1 Thessalonians, to use a prime instance, other than the definite articles, only three words—all of them suspicious of alliteration—begin with *tau*: Τιμόθεος (in v. 1) and τύπον and τόπῳ (in verses 7 and 8).[51] Thus, τύπον and τόπῳ look alike, sound alike, are in like contexts, and satisfy all the criteria of parechesis (except that their inflexional endings differ) and are two of only three significant words in the first chapter of 1 Thessalonians that begin with a *tau*. Moreover, in the subsequent chapters of 1 Thessalonians wherever *tau*-initial words occur, alliteration is often evident, for example, τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα (1 Thess 2:7). These considerations overcome the thirty-word distance between τύπον in v. 7 and τόπῳ in v. 8.

1 Thessalonians 1:7–8

Proper Name Parechesis: Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ

One of the most intriguing possibilities for soundplay in Paul is a kind for which there is much more and very specific classical precedent. In verses 7 and 8, two regional proper names are found: Macedonia and Achaia. As the key words in the verses, they inspire the alliteration that surrounds them. See Table 5 and Table 12 at the end of the dissertation for evidence of alliteration and parechesis on the proper names Macedonia and Achaia.

[51] We recall from Acts, the interesting example of alliteration involving both a definite article and demonstrative: γράψας ἐπιστολὴν ἔχουσαν *τὸν τύπον τοῦτον·* (Acts 23:25).

The Evidence for Parechesis on "Achaia"

The support for soundplay on the regional name Achaia is impressive and includes historical Greek precedents as old as the *Iliad* (see Table 5 at the end of the dissertation). The case for parechesis on "Achaia" begins with intertextual evidence. Paul explicitly names "Achaia" seven times in his epistles, and in each and every instance the regional name is involved in alliteration. Five instances suggest particularly complex alliteration: ἐξήχηται/Ἀχαΐᾳ (1 Thess 1:8); ἁγίοις/Ἀχαΐᾳ (2 Cor 1:1); ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας (1 Cor 16:15); καύχησις/Ἀχαΐας (2 Cor 11:10); and καυχῶμαι/Ἀχαΐα (2 Cor 9:2). Perhaps the most perfect example among the many clashing alliteratives associated with Achaia is the parechesis of καύχησις/Ἀχαΐας (2 Cor 11:10).

In 1 Thess 1, the first mention of Achaia in Paul, guttural alliteration of v. 8, Ἀχαΐᾳ literally echoes, via onomatapoietic parechesis, the message: … ἐξήχηται … Ἀχαΐᾳ, ἀλλ᾽ … θεὸν ἐξελήλυθεν … χρείαν ἔχειν … (1 Thess 1:7–8). Form follows function in this clever pun with guttural sounds. Significantly, v. 8 holds the distinction of being the only verse in Paul with four chi's in four distinct lexemes, two of them, χρείαν ἔχειν, previously identified by Russell (as "paronomasia"), in his 1920 dissertation.

Aligning the verbage of 1 Thess 1:8 and 2 Cor 11:10 is informative. If we decide against the textual critical option in the first passage, we find exactly the same distance between parechetical pairs:

> … ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ Ἀχαΐᾳ … (1 Thess 1:8)
>
> … καύχησις αὕτη οὐ φραγήσεται εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τοῖς κλίμασιν τῆς Ἀχαΐας. (2 Cor 11:10)

The occurrences at 1 Thess 1:7 and 2 Cor 9:2 include alliteration with "Macedonia"—Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ and καυχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν, respectively. 2 Cor 9:2 also evinces a second parechetical relationship: παρεσκεύασται ἀπὸ πέρυσι. The one mention in Romans

exhibits noticeable alliteration on both place names: εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν … (Rom 15:26).

Thus, the statistical and historical and intra- and intertextual evidence show that Achaia, known so at the time of Homer, supplies us with a rich source of soundplay on the very name. There can be little doubt that "Achaia" is repeatedly involved in soundplay in the Homeric epic, the closest literature to sacred text that the pagan Greeks had, and scholars from multiple generations have noted as much. Nor can we doubt, in light of such evidence, that the apostle Paul also played on this proper name, Achaia.

1 Thessalonians 1:9

Perhaps the most interesting and even beautiful instance of parechesis in the letter, and one of the most euphonic in all of Paul, is found in v. 9, though it has not always enjoyed that reputation among exegetes. Indeed, at 1 Thess 1:9, one of the major modern commentators, Wanamaker, has noticed something unusual, but he only disapproved of it, regarding the redundancy and syntax of this verse "clumsy."[52] Indeed, the non-consecutive order—one turns *from* something then *to* something else—and the repetition of "God" makes for a difficult justification on the basis of grammar and logic. But from a phonological point of view, the verse is one of the most impressive in Paul.[53] As we will show, it is a chiastic structure at the heart of

[52] Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 85.

[53] Typical of the over-analysis and redirected attention that a failure to attend to sound invites is much of the twentieth century's attempt at solving the exegetical puzzle that vv. 9 and 10 present. Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 118–19, whose commentary is one of the best ever written on 1 Thessalonians, sums up the main vein of speculation: "In recent years it has been argued that 1:9b–10 represents a scheme of preaching … that Paul had inherited and here applies to the Thessalonians. Alternatively, the verses have been thought to be a carefully structured piece of early Christian confessional tradition, perhaps a baptismal hymn of Gentile Christian origin.… That Paul uses language derived from the so-called Hellenistic Jewish mission has been demonstrated … but there have been only unconvincing attempts to outline a scheme that Jews used and early Christians, including Paul, reproduced. Paul does not here give an outline of a missionary sermon he had preached in Thessalonica; more precisely, he summarizes what his converts had accepted and in the process partly uses traditional Jewish

which is one of the most interesting examples of parechesis in Greek: εἰδώλων δουλεύειν.

The alliteration of 1:1–8 leads us to Paul's commendation of the Thessalonians in v. 9. Like the notes of a symphony that climax in a chord, the syllables of alliteration culminate in a stunning palindromic parechesis in v. 9, as Paul assembles a soundplay beyond even cluster alliteration.

Verse 9 begins with *pi* alliteration that needs no new argumentation to establish: … περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ὁποίαν … πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ…. Here, the eight *pi* sounds in fifteen words (compared to seven in v. 2) include two prepositions the choice of which is easily explained on the basis of the requirements of the art form.[54] The three words πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς also convey sibilance. In the midst of this *pi* scheme is the cluster alliteration or assonance of εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν, as alliterative as χρείαν ἔχειν in the previous verse. Moreover, the second, and deemed unnecessary, naming of "God" is typical of the type of *theta* alliteration that so frequently accompanies the divine name: *θεῷ* /ἀλη*θινῷ* is by ancient definition parechesis, sound and sense cooperating in the kind of euphonic phrase that becomes a liturgical tradition. The name θεός, in fact, is so frequently found in alliteration that further argument is unnecessary. In Paul, θεός is often in association with ἀλήθεια, two words that often inspire soundplay associations.

In fact, the root ἀληθ- occurs 28 times in the undisputed Pauline, several times in alliteration:[55]

---

formulations also used by other Christians…. These investigations have given insufficient attention to the Gentile recipients of the message…."

[54] See also 1 Thess 2:17 where eight *pi*'s occur in eighteen words.

[55] NB: The parechesis in the famous line from the Gospel of John:

καὶ γνώσεσθε τὴν *ἀλήθ*ειαν,

καὶ ἡ *ἀλήθ*εια *ἐλευθ*ερώσει ὑμᾶς. (John 8:32)

… εἰδώλων δουλεύειν [parechesis] θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ (1 Thess 1:9);

… οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθῶς λόγον θεοῦ (1 Thess 2:13);

τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν,

οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Gal 2:4–5)—note aspirant assonance of οἷς οὐδὲ … ὥραν … ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα…;… ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Gal 2:14);

… ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι; (Gal 5:7);

Ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ᾽ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν (Rom 1:18)—note *alpha* initials;

… μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ … ἐλάτρευσαν (Rom 1:25);

… ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσιν τῇ ἀλη*θείᾳ πειθ*ομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός. (Rom 2:8)—note the *theta*'s;

ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος (Rom 3:4)

ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 3:7);

Ἀλήθειαν λέγω (Rom 9:1);

ἀληθείας θεοῦ (Rom 15:8);

εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας (1 Cor 5:8);

ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας (2 Cor 6:7);

ἀλλ᾽ ὡς πάντα ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐλαλήσαμεν (2 Cor 7:14);

οὐ γὰρ δυνάμεθά τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας.

χαίρομεν γὰρ ὅταν ἡμεῖς ἀσθενῶμεν (2 Cor 13:8–9);

… *ἀλη*θείᾳ, Χριστὸς κατα*γγέλλε*ται (Phil 1:18)—note gutturals;

Τὸ λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ (Phil 4:8).

1 Thess 1:9 is not the last time that Paul will alliterate on the lexeme εἰδωλ-. With its unique collection of sounds and letters (including the long *omega*), the lexeme occurs in diverse alliterative contexts, for example, five times in 1 Corinthians:

ἢ εἰδωλολάτρης ἢ λοίδορος (1 Cor 5:11);

εἰδωλοθύτων, οἴδαμεν ὅτι … οἰκοδομεῖ· εἴ τις δοκει…. (1 Cor 8:1–2);

… εἰδωλοθύτων, οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἴδωλον … ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς. (1 Cor 8:4);

οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίειν; (1 Cor 8:10)[56];

Οἴδατε ὅτι ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε πρὸς τὰ εἴδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα (1 Cor 12:2).

Thus, contextual evidence strongly suggests alliterative intent. Moreover, for evidence of alliteration with the δουλ- lexeme in the undisputed Pauline literature, see Table 6 at the end of the dissertation.

Note that in Gal 4:9 we find a verse conspicuously parallel to 1 Thess 1:9 in both theme and phonology. Here, δουλεύειν is found in consonantal collocation of with θέλετε, whose *dental-lambda* constitutes cluster alliteration: δουλεύειν θέλετε (Gal 4:9). The two verses are closely parellel in thought and, as it happens, sound:

> αὐτοὶ γὰρ περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ὁποίαν εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ (1 Thess 1:9)
>
> νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε; (Gal 4:9).

Ironically, commentators have insisted on analyzing the two parechetical terms—εἰδώλων and δουλεύειν–separately. Wanamaker, who suggests that v. 9 and 10 "must be taken together,"[57] considers the clause πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων separately.[58] Best, on the other hand, picks up at δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινω and even questions the Pauline character of δουλεύειν, claiming that it is unusual for Paul to use "serve" with God instead of

[56] 1 Cor 8:4 is one of the highest *delta* verses in Paul, 8:10–13 one of the highest *delta* pericopes in Paul.

[57] Wanamaker, *Thessalonians,* 84.

[58] Wanamaker, *Thessalonians,* 85.

Christ (just as the phrase "in God" of v. 1 raises questions).[59] The verb "serve" is used with a variety of terms in Paul, Wanamaker correctly observes, but "God" is not one of them. The two terms go together phonologically, however, and this explanation solves a considerable logico-synactical problem: why Paul does not use a consecutive order, why he says "turn to God from idols" rather than an expression that reflects the chronological order of activity. In sum, the number of alliterative elements in 1 Thess 1:9 make it, far from awkward, one of the most euphonic of verses and, if the oversights of Thessalonian scholars are any indication, one of the subtlest examples of clever soundplay, at the heart of which is the three-syllable parechesis εἰδώλων δουλεύειν.

We conclude our discussion of 1 Thess 1:9 with the following observation: the nonconsecutive series of 1 Thess 1:9 is best seen (or heard) as a concatenation of sounds. Two terms are embedded at the heart of the verse, εἰδώλων δουλεύειν, at the heart, as it were, of a chiasm bounded by the two mentions of God's name:[60] θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων δουλεύειν θεῷ…. This is classic parechesis, one of the most superb examples in Paul and surely in all of classical Greek.[61] Paul opportunistically alliterates—and here manipulates word order—to effect parechesis.

As for the euphonics of εἰδώλων δουλεύειν (1 Thess 1:9), we might compare it to what is often regarded as the most beautiful verse in Homer. Several classical scholars have nominated

[59] Ernest Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, BNTC (London: Black, 1977), 85. ἐπεστρέφειν is also "often said to be unusual for Paul," Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 85).

[60] Bengel, *Gnomon,* identified chiasms in the New Testament.

[61] Although beauty is in the eye and ear of the beholder, one would be hard pressed to find an example in Eustathius's list that outrivals this specimen from Paul. It is not, however, as we will argue later, the greatest example from Paul.

for that honor *Il.* 18.576;[62] but none apparently has noted its parechesis: πὰρ ποταμὸν κελάδοντα, παρὰ ῥοδανὸν δονακῆα.

1 Thessalonians 2

1 Thessalonians 2:1–6

Having established a pattern and precedent for soundplay in the first chapter of 1 Thessalonians, the dissertation will now focus on clear instances of parechesis that follow. In Chapter 2 of 1 Thessalonians, the pattern of phonological soundplay continues, from the very first verse with several instances of parechesis or near parechesis following. In 2:3, παράκλησις/πλάνης (in the phrase παράκλησις ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης) is parechetical. In vv. 3 and 4, respectively, ἀκαθαρσίας and καρδίας are parechetical.[63] In v. 5 is the parechetical series Οὔτε … ποτε … οἴδατε, οὔτε (1 Thess 2:5).

1 Thessalonians 2:14—Proper Name Parechesis: ἰδίων/Ἰουδαίων

One of the cleverest proper name soundplays in Scripture, if indeed it is an intentional parechesis, occurs in v. 14 among the eleven *omega*'s in thirty-three words that make for the highest number in any verse in Paul. Here, the epistle preacher includes the rare ἰδίων—only thirty-one forms in Paul, here the only genitive plural form in Paul—in collocation with Ἰουδαίων. The words are logically and structurally parallel:

ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν *ἰδίων* συμφυλετῶν

[62] Stanford, *Sound of Greek*, 64, declares it "one of the most euphonious." Samuel Bassett eloquently seconds that opinion: "The pleasurable momentary experiences which stir Homer to melody have not received much attention. No one seems to have looked for his most beautiful verse. I propose for this honor a verse from the picture of the herd on the shield of Achilles, S 576 (18.576). The lowing cows were hurrying from the barnyard to their pasture, 'By the river murmuring ever, by the slender, waving reeds' (Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer*, 156).

[63] See other examples of the same lexemes in Psa 23:4; 51:10; 73:13; Prov 20:9; Matt 7:19, Heb 10:22, and especially the triple alliteration of Matt 5:8, μακάριοι οἱ *καθαρ*οὶ τῇ *καρ*δία (Matt. 5:8).

καθὼς καὶ

αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν *Ἰουδαίων* (1 Thess 2:14).

1 Thessalonians 2:16

First Thessalonians 2:16 features three lexemes that each share three consonants—*theta*, *sigma*, and *nun*—in common and in the same order, including the rare word ἔφθασεν, thus parechesis: ἔθνεσιν … σωθῶσιν … ἔφθασεν … (1 Thess 2:16). It should be noted with respect to this euphonious arrangement that the slight *differences* in sound are as much a part of the parechesis as the similarities.

1 Thessalonians 2:18

First Thessalonians 2:18 features the parechesis of ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν. (1 Thess 2:18).[64] See the discussion at Rom 1:13.

1 Thessalonians 3

1 Thessalonians 3:1 Proper Name Soundplay on "Athens"

First Thessalonians 3:1 includes a possible parechesis involving a proper name that was long before Paul the subject of historic soundplay, namely, Athens: καταλειφ*θῆναι*[65] ἐν Ἀ*θήναις*. (See 1 Thess 1:1, Τιμό*θεος* … *θεῷ*, 1 Thess 1:8, ἐξήχ*ηται* … *Ἀχαΐᾳ*, and 1 Thess 2:14, ἰδίων/ Ἰουδαίων.)

Not surprisingly, the most important city of ancient Greece was the subject of not a few

[64] Verbs of coming, in fact, are often found in soundplay in Paul's epistles. For example, the infinite ἐλθεῖν occurs eleven times in Paul, and the number of times that it is found in alliterative juxtapositions is remarkable, as the excerpts that follow suggest: ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου (1 Thess 3:6); ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν (1 Thess 2:18); θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν (Rom 1:10); οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν … καὶ ἐκωλύθην … ἔθνεσιν (Rom 1:13; see Wettstein); ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεῖν … ἐτῶν (Rom 15:23); ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος (1 Cor 16:10); ἐλθεῖν … προπεμφθῆναι (2 Cor 1:16).

[65] There is a second soundplay on the word καταλειφθῆναι. Verse 1 and 2 host the parechesis of καταλειφθῆναι/ἀδελφὸν. Paul commonly alliterates on ἀδελφός, especially exploiting the syntactical versatility of the vocative.

word- and/or soundplays. Classicists from Eustathius[66] to the modern times have noted this fact. In the best modern scholia on Homer, Richard Janko observes that the verses of *Il*. 14.175–7 "are full of alliteration and assonance, reinforced by word-play…."[67] Janko surely would have endorsed the bicolonic parechesis with Ἀθήνη in the next two lines:

καλοὺς ἀμβροσίους ἐκ κράατος *ἀθανά*τοιο. (line 177)

ἀμφὶ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀμβρόσιον ἐανὸν ἕσαθ᾽, ὅν οἱ *Ἀθήνη*…. (line 178).

Many other instances could be cited. At *Od*. 2.267 the juxtaposition ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη accords with our own findings in 1 Thessalonians 3; at *Il*. 11.757–58 is the triple soundalike (parechesis) of ἔνθα/ὅθεν/Ἀθήνη; and then there is the consecutive word parechesis of *Od*. 2.267, ὣς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ *ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη*.

In his work on Pindar's poems in 1879, classicist Fennell notes how the man whom Quintilian called the greatest lyric poet of ancient Greece also played on the name: *Ol*. 7.80 and 81 presents the obvious triple parechesis of ἀέθλοις/ἄνθεσι (80)/Ἀθάναις (81):[68]

Thus, there is historical evidence for alliteration and parechesis on the name "Athens," both long before and just after Paul. (See Table 12 at the end of the dissertation for further evidence of soundplay on the name Athens.)

1 Thessalonians 4

1 Thessalonians 4:1–5

The fourth chapter of 1 Thessalonians is also marked by soundplay. In vv. 11 and 12, cause

[66] Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 3, 389, line 15, TLG.

[67] Janko, *The Iliad,* 176.

[68] "of athletes … of flowers … Athens," in a verse rich with assonance. Fennell, *Pindar*, xxiv, has only noted the *kappa* alliteration of vv. 80 and 81 but allows that "[Pindar] alliterates with τ, δ, λ, ρ, μ, ν, and θ, and even with σ," (Fennell, *Pindar*, xxiii).

and effect parechesis is evident, where the result is expressed in one of Russell's alliterative pairs: χερσὶν ὑμῶν … ἵνα … μηδενὸς χρείαν ἔχητε; that is, "work with your hands . . . that you have no need." The parechesis χερσὶν/χρείαν is typical Pauline (which scheme includes the *chi* in the verb ἔχητε as well).

1 Thessalonians 4:13–15

Another example of parechesis occurs in v. 13 with μὴ *λυπ*ῆσθε καθὼς καὶ οἱ *λοιπ*οὶ, where the lexemes λυπῆσθε and λοιποὶ are, in fact, the only two λ*π- terms in Paul and, thus, their juxtaposition suggests deliberate collocation. It is important to emphasize once more that Paul, who also practices homoteleutonic figures (for example, πάντων τούτων in v. 6), does not always match endings. Verse 13 is a good example of that.

1 Thessalonians 5

1 Thessalonians 5:1–2

In the very first verse of 1 Thess 5 is yet another classical example of parechesis that explains two more terms with little practical semantic difference: τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν. These conjoined terms are similar to the frozen pair that Russell identified and reflect examples that Eustathius noted in Homer. Further, the parechetical terms inaugurate an impressive chain of cluster alliteration that extends through v. 2:

> τῶν *χρόνων* καὶ τῶν *καιρῶν*, ἀδελφοί, οὐ *χρείαν* ἔχετε ὑμῖν *γρ*άφεσθαι. αὐτοὶ *γὰρ* ἀ*κρι*βῶς οἴδατε ὅτι ἡμέρα *κυρ*ίου ὡς *κλέ*πτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως *ἔρχ*εται.

The first three guttural-*rho* words, χρόνων/καιρῶν/χρείαν, share three consonant sounds in order and must therefore be considered parechetical.

1 Thessalonians 5:5

First Thessalonians 5:5 within a context of ten rough breathings, is the parechesis of

ὑμεῖς/ἡμέρας.

1 Thessalonians 5:14–22

1 Thess 5:14 contains two examples of parechesis (supported by the paronomasia and alliteration): *Παρα*καλοῦμεν … *παρα*μυθεῖσθε … ἀντέ*χεσθε* τῶν *ἀσθε*νῶν, μακρο*θυμε*ῖτε πρὸς *π*άντας. The internal metathetic parechesis of παρα*μυθε*ῖσθε/μακρο*θυμε*ῖτε compares favorably to Eustathius's example of ψευδοπαρήχησιν from Homer: μῦθος καὶ θυμός.[69]

The culmination of the πᾶς theme in 1 Thessalonians is found in the final exhortation,[70] the so-called paraenesis section, 5:15–22, which might rightly be called the "πᾶς " (or παρακαλ-) pericope, a busy series of soundplay, including impressive parechesis. The paronomasia of ἀντέχεσθε (v. 14) and κατέχετε (v. 21) and ἀπέχεσθε (v. 22) is a clear indication of intentional wordplay,[71] but what is important for this dissertation is the fact that these are in parechetical relation with προσεύχεσθε in v. 17.

1 Thessalonians 5:24–25

In 1 Thess 5:24, near parechesis is evident in the collocation πιστὸς/ποιήσει, which terms form the extremes of a chiasm: πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ ποιήσει.

Conclusion to 1 Thessalonians

1 Thessalonians ends appropriately, with an exhortation to read the epistle *aloud* to the

[69] Eustathius called this collocation an anagram (τοῦ ἀναγραμματισμοῦ) (Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 1, 48, line 16).

[70] This is only to identify two sound motifs, where many other turns of alliteration are to be found.

[71] Only 184 total instances of *εχ* are found in Paul. Compare the *epsilon*-gutturals of 1 Cor 9:12, Εἰ ἄλλοι τῆς ὑμῶν ἐξουσίας μετέχουσιν…; ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐχρησάμεθα τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ….; or συνέρχησθε, ἕκαστος ψαλμὸν ἔχει, διδαχὴν ἔχει (1 Cor 14:26).

brothers, an exhortation expressed with no fewer than five *kappa*/*chi-rho* words:[72]

Ἐνο*ρκ*ίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν *κύρ*ιον ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.

Ἡ *χάρ*ις τοῦ *κυρ*ίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ *Χρ*ιστοῦ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν. (1 Thess 5:27–28)

Thus, from Τιμό*θε*ος … *Θε*σσαλονικέων ἐν *θε*ῷ (1:1) to *χάρ*ις τοῦ *κυρ*ίου … *Χρ*ιστοῦ (5:28), nearly every verse in this historic Christian letter features soundplay, including numerous instances of parechesis—data little appreciated in exegetical history. In fact, "Paul's earliest epistles —1 and 2 Thessalonians—show a surprising scarcity of paronomasias," concluded Elbert Russell in his 1920 dissertation,[73] by which he also includes the "kindred phenomena," of other soundplay. Russell, whose dissertation contributed more examples of soundplay in the NT than any other of the twentieth century, greatly underestimated the phonological elements in 1 Thessalonians. Had Russell known of the word "parechesis" and the concept underlying it, perhaps his focus and tabulations would have been different.

Unfortunately, the many instances of parechesis in 1 Thessalonians have been overlooked by Pauline exegetes for centuries. The oversight approaches irony when we consider that Eustathius, the great archbishop of the city that holds the distinction as the recipient of the first Christian letter from Paul, identified a hundred similar instances—in Homer.[74]

[72] In the midst of which is the highly alliterative ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσιν.

[73] Russell, *Paronomasia and Kindred Phenomena*, 45.

[74] Of particular interest, owing to its long history in Greek and Latin and Hebrew figures of speech, is the *proper name* soundplay that Paul so ingeniously employs. Recall that forty of Eustathius's examples from Homer involved proper names. In the twentieth century, Russell greatly underestimated Paul here, too, offering only three examples in the entire New Testament: Peter (Matt 16:18), Onesimus (Phlm 20), and Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας in 1 Cor 1:21 (Russell, *Paronomasia*, 32–33).

CHAPTER FOUR

GALATIANS

Introduction

Hans Deiter Betz

It is Paul's letter to the Galatians[1] that Hans Deiter Betz in the mid 1970s selected for his version of rhetorical analysis. But as our own history of rhetoric shows, New Testament rhetorical criticism almost wholly forsook the more objective features of Graeco-Roman rhetoric: viz., figures of speech. Watson and Hauser, whose exhaustive bibliography of the era proves by absences the neglect of figures of speech, understate the matter in noting that "Betz's work … does not exhaust all the features of Greco-Roman rhetoric that are present in Galatians, especially where style is concerned."[2] Betz, in fact, identified few if any figures in Galatians,[3] and the first generation of students of his method likewise gave short shrift to figures of speech, as we have shown, often operating under the assumption that these devices of style had already been identified.

"Galatians is one of the most rhetorical of all of Paul's communiques," concludes Ben Witherington, who proves himself well aware of the two parts of ancient rhetoric: "Gal 1.6–6.10 in the eyes and hands of any good rhetor would be seen as … a very effective speech full of *arguments and rhetorical devices* [italics mine]."[4] But, in fact, the assumed rhetorical devices

[1] Chronologically, Galatians may not be Paul's next letter. Andrew E. Steinmann (*From Abraham to Paul: A Biblical Chronology* [St. Louis: Concordia, 2011], 344) is typical of those who date Galatians between 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, although he notes the tentativeness of the hypothesis.

[2] Watson and Hauser, *A Comprehensive Bibliography*, 7.

[3] Betz himself only notes "allegory" in Galatians, a figure of thought in many handbooks, but he does not explicitly connect it with Greek rhetoric. See ἀλληγορούμενα (Gal 4:24). The same light but promising treatment that Augustine rendered two centuries earlier was given no new impetus.

[4] Ben Witherington, III, *Grace in Galatia: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdman's, 1998), 27.

have not been well inventoried in the epistle.[5]

Salient Examples of Parechesis in Galatians

In truth, there are many instances of parechesis and pseudo-parechetical pairs in Galatians, more than forty. The more salient instances of parechesis might be listed as follows:

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος (Gal 1:1)

κοιλίας/καὶ καλέσας (Gal 1:15)

ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως … προσανεθέμην/ἀνῆλθον … ἀπῆλθον (Gal 1:16–17)

Ἔπειτα μετὰ ἔτη τρία (Gal 1:18)[6]

---

[5] In the twenty-first century, Tolmie's 2005 commentary, whose title betrays his rhetorical focus, *Persuading the Galatians. A Text-Centered Rhetorical Analysis of a Pauline Letter*, does include what any rhetorical analysis of Paul should include, a list of paronomasia and other figures of speech, although these the author relegates to the appendix in much the same manner as Winer's great work saved paronomasia for the final chapter (Tolmie, *Persuading the Galatians*, 187, 253). Yet in spite of his acknowledgement of figures, the sum total of Tolmie's devices amounts to no more than two instances of alliteration (assonance) and five of consonance, along with ten pairs of paronomasia—at Gal 4:13, 5:3, 5:13, 5:16, 6:1, 6:2 and 6:7. There are, however, at least thirteen instances of paronomasia, involving at least three dozen different lexemes, binding together at least thirty verses in the relatively brief letter. Table 9 at the end of the dissertation lists all known instances of paronomasia in Galatians. These instances of paronomasia are important concomitants of parechesis: Where there is one, there tends to be the other.

The number of instances of paronomasia in the undisputed Pauline letters surely numbers more than a hundred. The short letter of 1 Thessalonians, for instance, has at least a dozen instances, counting also the *figura etymologica*. However, to our knowledge, no complete inventorying of the rather easy-to-ascertain paronomasia has ever been published. Historically, lists of paronomasia, as we have defined it, have been submitted by Salomon Glassius, *Philologia sacra*, 1625, and Winer's *Sprachidioms*, of the nineteenth century. But even these prove to be only partial lists.

Paul's exploitation of paronomasias is clearly more than an interest in the sense of the word, since in many instances the addition of a prefix makes no semantic contribution. For example, ἀρθῇ ἐκ in 1 Cor 5:2 versus ἐξάρατε in 5:13 is clearly making a pun on ἔξω. Rather, Paul's interest is often largely or at least partly in the *sound* of the words. If this is the case, then it is but a reasonable assumption that his interest in sound does not end with the attachment of a prefix. In actual practice, Paul exploits opportunities of soundplay at every turn. As we have shown, his primary means of doing so is alliteration and, as the opportunity presents itself in language, the figure of speech known as parechesis.

[6] Paul's use of prepositions has been often noted in exegesis. "Paul likes to play on prepositions," Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 113, has observed, "sometimes for the sake of variety." R. Dean Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 164, notes, "Paul is well known for favoring a varied use of prepositions, and to some extent constructions, without any variation of semantic nuance." Anderson offers as an example "*meta* with the accusative in [Gal] 1.18 and *dia* with the genitive in 2.1, both meaning 'after.'" But what Anderson fails to take note of is that in 1:8 *meta* is part of a quadruple alliterative series, Ἔπειτα μετὰ ἔτη τρία; and in 2:1, διὰ is collocated with δεκατεσσάρων. Thus, what has not been so keenly observed is apparently a major reason for Paul's flexibility with prepositions: alliteration. In the very verse that prompted Malherbe's speculation, the preposition is in near parechetical relation with its object: εἰς ὑμᾶς (1 Thess 1:5). In fact, one of the most remarkable proofs that Paul is

ἀνέβην/ἀνεθέμην/ἔθνεσιν (Gal 2:2)

ἐλευθερίαν/ἀλήθεια (Gal 2:4–5)

πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἀνθρώπου … προσανέθεντο (Gal 2:6)

Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς (Gal 2:7)

δοκοῦντες … δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν (Gal 2:9)

μόνον/μνημονεύωμεν (Gal 2:10)

Ἀντιόχειαν/ἀντέστην (Gal 2:11)

ἐλθεῖν/ἐθνῶν/ἦλθον (Gal 2:12)

ὅτε/ὅτι (Gal 2:14)

μόνον/νόμου (Gal 3:2)

εἰκῇ; εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῇ (Gal 3:4)

μεσίτης/ἔστιν (Gal 3:20)

χάριν/ἄχρις[7]/χειρὶ (Gal 3:19)

ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε (Gal 3:28)

χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος (Gal 4:1)

καρδίας/κρᾶζον (Gal 4:6)

ἀσθενῆ/ἄνωθεν (Gal 4:9)

μορφωθῇ/φωνήν (Gal 4:19 and 20)

ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε (Gal 5:15)

---

alliterating comes from an examination of his preposition usage. A high percentage of Pauline prepositions-object pairs share the same initial letter/sound or are otherwise part of an alliterative scheme. Since Paul, as we have seen, alliterates with practically all elements of the language, it should not be surprising that with the most flexible of elements, prepositions, he takes advantage of an opportunity. Prepositions, in fact, are readily exploited for phonetic purposes. It is estimated that over 350 instances of alliteration with nearly twenty different prepositions can be found in the undisputed Pauline epistles.

[7] For discussion of the possible history of this particular form, see Jeffrey Kloha, "The Development of the Greek Language and the Manuscripts of Paul's Letters," pages 120–21 in *The Press of the Text: Biblical Studies in Honor of James W. Voelz*, ed. Andrew H. Bartelt, Jeffrey Kloha, and Paul R. Raabe (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2017), 114–36.

ἔργα … ἔχθραι, ἔρις … ἐριθεῖαι … αἱρέσεις (Gal 5:19–21)

κῶμοι καὶ τὰ ὅμοια (Gal 5:21)

μόνον/νόμον (Gal 6:12–13)

καινὴ/κανόνι (Gal 6:15–16).

As we can see from this partial list of parechesis in Galatians, there are many salient instances of soundplay in Galatians, from the triple parechesis of ἀνέβην/ἀνεθέμην/ἔθνεσιν (2:2) and ἐλθεῖν/ἐθνῶν/ἦλθον (2:12), similar to Hermogenes's Ἀλήϊον/ἀλᾶτο/ἀλεείνων (*Il*. 6.201–202) and Eustathius's ἐλεῖν/ἐλθεῖν, to proper name soundplay to classical parechetical pairs κῶμοι καὶ τὰ ὅμοια (5:21; cf. 1 Cor 6:9), subtle internal-syllable play, for example, μορφωθῇ/φωνήν (4:19 and 20), and the metathetic parechesis of μόνον/νόμον (Gal 6:12–13), which compares with Eustathius's anagram, νάμα/μαννα.[8] Perhaps the most enlightening, but unfortunately overlooked, parechesis is the clever καινὴ/κανόνι of Gal 6:15–16.

Exegetical Analysis: Galatians 6:16—"Canon"

In Gal 6:16, the enigmatic dative κανόνι has been the subject of much scholarly speculation. The term seems to come out of the blue.[9] *The Canon Debate* (2002) contains perhaps the most definitive treatment of the word, an entire book examining the notion of canon from multiple angles, with articles focusing solely on semantical explanations. In the opening article, "The Notion and Definition of Canon," Eugene Ulrich admits there is no agreed upon meaning for Paul's usage, a fact that does not prevent him from weighing in on the usage in Gal 6:16 where, according to Ulrich, canon "is used in the general sense of 'measure of assessment,'

[8] Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 1, 193, line 28.

[9] The only other occurrences in Paul of the lexeme are in 2 Cor 10:13, 15, and 16.

'norm of one's own action,' 'norm of true Christianity.'"[10] More precisely what Paul is referring to "is not exactly clear,"[11] Ulrich admits.

In the keynote essay of the book, William Farmer begins as fundamentally as possible, with the etymology of the word, and then reflects on the wider context of v. 16, which he trusts is "the earliest use of kanōn in Christian literature."[12] Grammatically, Farmer identifies "a new creation," καινὴ κτίσις in v. 15, as the "immediate antecedent" of κανόνι, indicated by the demonstrative adjective, τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ (v. 16).[13] In so doing, he narrowly misses another kind of contextual clue, viz., sound. Clearly, καινὴ/κανόνι is parechesis.

In short, *The Canon Debate* misses the obvious figure of speech that goes a long way toward explaining word choice in Gal 6:16. The term κανών, in fact, occurs in a typical Pauline context of *kappa* alliteration, which begins in v. 13—

> σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται … μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι … κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ … κόσμος … κἀγὼ κόσμῳ … ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. καὶ … κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν (Gal 6:13–16)—

and culminates in a remarkable parechesis. The pairing of καινὴ (v. 15) and κανόνι (v. 16) meets all the requirements of classical parechesis, including proximity and similarity of sound. The surrounding context corroborates this analysis.

Broader contexts in Paul support our conclusion. Paul uses the word κανών only four times in his epistles, once in Galatians and three times in 2 Corinthians 10.[14] In the pericope 2 Cor

[10] Eugene Ulrich, "The Notion and Definition of Canon," in *The Canon Debate*, eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 21–35.

[11] Ulrich, "Notion and Definition of Canon," 23.

[12] William R. Farmer, "Reflections on Jesus and the New Testament Canon," in *The Canon Debate*, 234.

[13] Farmer, "Reflections on Jesus," 234.

[14] Similarly, Paul uses the contracted conjunction κἂν only twice; in both instances, it may be no coincidence, the lexeme καυχήσωμαι is also used. In 2 Cor 11:16 the *kappa* alliteration is most evident:

10:13–17, κανών is again found in *kappa* alliteration along with καυχάομαι (see καυχήσωνται Gal 6:13). In v. 13, we find significant *kappa* alliteration: … καυχησόμεθα ἀλλὰ κατὰ … κανόνος … ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι…. The verse includes the further corroboration of *figura etymologica* and parechetical pun—ἄμετρα/μέτρον/ἐμέρισεν μέτρον/ἐμέρισεν.[15] In vv.15–17, more *kappa* alliteration is found as Paul employs *repetitio* of several terms: … καυχώμενοι … κόποις … ἔχοντες αὐξανομένης … κατὰ τὸν κανόνα … ὑπερέκεινα … κανόνι … καυχήσασθαι. Verse 17 culminates in alliteration: Ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω· The prepositional phrase κατὰ τὸν κανόνα, twice in this pericope, is easily explained by alliteration.

Moreover, the consecutive collocation καινὴ κτίσις occurs one other time in Paul, amid the guttural alliteration of 2 Cor 5:17, where the same consecutive pair as in Gal 6:15 is found:

ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν *Χρ*ιστῷ, *καινὴ κτίσις*·

τὰ *ἀρχ*αῖα παρῆλθεν,

ἰδοὺ *γέγονεν καινά*. (2 Cor 5:17)

The lack of clarity of meaning that Ulrich concedes is completely understandable if Paul's choice of words is based on sound. The "unclear" term κανόνι is largely explained by its phonological function within a *kappa* alliterative context: καινὴ κτίσις. καὶ ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι (Gal 6:15–16), much as it is in 2 Corinthians.

There are dozens of verses in Paul with blatant *kappa* alliteration and parechesis on *kappa* words is not uncommon in ancient Greek literature.[16]

Πάλιν λέγω, μή τίς με δόξῃ ἄφρονα εἶναι·

εἰ δὲ μή γε, κἂν ὡς ἄφρονα δέξασθέ με, ἵνα κἀγὼ μικρόν τι καυχήσωμαι. (2 Cor 11:16). Note the parechesis of δόξῃ/δέξασθέ.

[15] In 1 Pet 5:7, we have a similar parechesis: μέριμναν … μέλει.

[16] See, e.g., κυνα/κοινα (*Il*. I. 193) (Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, vol 3, 643 line 6, TLG) and καὶ ἀτεκνίαν καινὴν (Melito, *Peri Pascha*, 20, 131a). Evidence from the Greek Old Testament can also be found. Here, the etymologically unrelated but phonologically akin term κανῷ (dative, "basket") occurs several times in the

We will now focus on the most impressive examples of parechesis in the epistles to the Corinthians.

Greek Bible, including in this highly parechetical verse from Genesis: ἐν δὲ τῷ κ*ανῷ* τῷ ἐπ*άνω ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν γενῶν ὧν* …. (Gen 40:17). (See also κρέα τοῦ κριοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κανῷ (Exod. 29:32), "meat of the ram and the bread that was in the basket") Similarly in the Apocrypha, parechesis similar to that in Gal 6 is found in Judith, with an abundance of *kappa*'s and *kappa*-liquids of several forms:

καὶ ἀπήλθοσαν πάντες ἐ*κ* προσώπου καὶ οὐδεὶς *κ*ατελείφθη ἐν τῷ *κ*οιτῶνι

ἀπὸ μι*κρ*οῦ ἕως μεγάλου καὶ στᾶσα Ιουδιθ παρα τὴν *κλ*ίνην αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ἐν τῇ *καρ*δίᾳ αὐτῆς *κύρ*ιε ὁ θεὸς πάσης δυνάμεως ἐπίβλεψον ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔ*ργα* τῶν *χειρ*ῶν μου εἰς ὕψωμα Ιερουσαλημ ὅτι νῦν *καιρ*ὸς ἀντιλαβέσθαι τῆς *κληρ*ονομίας σου

καὶ ποιῆσαι τὸ ἐπιτήδευμά μου εἰς θραῦσμα ἐ*χθρ*ῶν οἳ ἐπανέστησαν ἡμῖν καὶ προσελθοῦσα τῷ *κανόνι* τῆς *κλ*ίνης ὃς ἦν πρὸς *κ*εφαλῆς Ολοφέρνου *κ*αθεῖλεν τὸν *ἀκινάκην* αὐτοῦ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ *ἐγγ*ίσασα τῆς *κλ*ίνης ἐδράξατο τῆς *κ*όμης τῆς *κ*εφαλῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν *κρ*αταίωσόν με *κύρ*ιε ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ. (Jdt 13:4–7)[16]

Judith's heroic and gruesome act of beheading her enemy might be translated as follows: "And all went out and no one was left in the sleeping quarters, neither lowly nor great. Then Judith, standing by his bed, said in her heart, 'O Lord God of all power, look in this hour upon the works of my hands for the exaltation of Jerusalem. For now is the time to help Your inheritance, and to accomplish Your enterprises to the destruction of the enemies who have risen against us.' Then she came to the *pillar* of the bed, which was at Holofernes' head, and took down his *knife* from there and drew near his bed, and took hold of the hair of his head, and said, 'Strengthen me, O Lord God of Israel, on this day.'"

Here, κανόνι (pillar of the bed) and the hapax legomenon ἀκινάκην (sword?) in v. 6 appear to be parechetical. Our hypothesis based soley upon the sounds, there can be little doubt where Paul's tendency to alliterate comes from. The Greek Septuagint is undoubtedly replete with undiscovered parechesis.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE CORINTHIANS CORRESPONDENCES

1 Corinthians

Introduction: Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Corinthians

Corinth is located less than 50 miles by Roman road from Athens, the very heart of Greek rhetoric. It is a fact of history that the townsmen and women of Corinth themselves knew of rhetoric, for the history of rhetors, especially sophists, in Corinth is well known.[1] We could fairly assume, therefore, that no letter of Paul would be more amenable to rhetorical analysis.[2]

Numerous rhetorical analyses have been performed on 1 Corinthians, focusing almost exclusively on argumentation. With regard to 1 Corinthians, one of the major proponents of NT rhetorical analysis, A. H. Snyman, remarks, "The long history of research on Paul's style has neglected to a large extent the question of the (semiotic) meaning of the various rhetorical devices used in his letters."[3] Snyman's surmise represents the opposite error in rhetorical inquiry. Rather than focusing exclusively on argument as most of his colleagues in the movement have done, he moves on to the *meaning* of the various devices. Skipped over in the process has been the *identification* of those devices. "Instead of merely listing and classifying the rhetorical devices," Snyman writes (as though the task had already been done), "an attempt is made in the

[1] *The Discourse of Favorinus* (c. A.D. 80–150) offers insight into the importance of public speaking in Corinth at the time of Paul. Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation*, 141–46, 161 and 167, discusses the fame of the great Greek rhetors in Corinth. The ancient historian Philostratus writes that "even those in [Favorinus's] audience who did not understand the Greek language shared in the pleasure that he gave; for he fascinated even them by the tones of his voice, by his expressive glance and the rhythm of his speech." (Philostratus, *Lives*, 9, reported by Litfin, [*St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation*, 161] who argues, based in part on 2 Cor 11:6, that Paul in his public speaking and presence was not "in the same league" as the great Corinthian rhetors).

[2] If we are to believe the accounts in Acts, Paul orated in Athens (Acts 17:22–31) and had spent a year and a half in Ephesus, staying at the school of one Tyrannius (ἐν τῇ σχολῇ Τυράννου, Acts 19:10)—presumably a school of rhetoric.

[3] Snyman "Stylistic Parallelisms," 22.

present article to define their meanings."[4] But the effort is premature, for no exhaustive inventorying of stylistic devices in the Corinthians correspondences appeared during the years of the New Testament rhetorical criticism movement. Rather, many exegetes wrote atop an assumption that this fundamental groundwork was long ago laid.[5]

To be fair, Bullinger's encyclopedic-looking tome identified 61 different rhetorical devices from 1 Corinthians among his nearly 200 figures of speech and thought.[6] But the identification of figures is far different from an inventorying. Books such as Bullinger's have rarely been used to identify *all* instances in a given epistle, so that patterns might be discerned. As Thomas Duncan in 1926 informed biblical exegesis during a fairly dry period of rhetorical inquiry into Paul's letters, the following "Rhetorical Devices" had been identified in 1 and 2 Corinthians: antithesis, homoioteleuton, anaphora, synonymy, paronomasia, asyndeton, polysyndeton, parisosis, paromoiosis, cyclosis, epanastrophe, antistrophe, etymologica, objection, and rhetorical question.[7] Absent from this inchoate list is the figure of speech, vaguely insinuated in the broad term paronomasia, that Hermogenes had labelled parechesis."[8] The following section lists the most salient instances of parechesis in 1 Corinthians. The parechetical pattern of 1 Corinthians reaches a high point in the final chapter with one of the great anagrams of Greek literature.[9]

---

[4] Snyman, "Stylistic Parallelisms," 211, goes on to note "repetitions," calling them "the most important way in which cohesion is attained." He misses the main figure of speech that propagates all of Paul's communication, one that is no less salient in Paul's hymn-like elevations of style: alliteration.

[5] Standard observations in 1 Corinthians with respect to alliteration and parechesis were noted in Chapter Two.

[6] See discussion below at 1 Cor 1:23, 24.

[7] Duncan, "The Style and Language of Saint Paul," 139–143. Duncan, 141, maintains that paronomasia "occurs only in the most rhetorical passages, in the passages where, in keeping with his high theme, [Paul] employs what in secular poetry is called the dithyrhambic manner." He cites as paronomasia the following examples: φθαρτὸν … ἀφ*θαρσία*ν (in 1 Cor 15:53 and ἀσχήμονα … εὐσχημοσύνην (in 12:23). Duncan has greatly underestimated the matter with respect to paronomasia—Galatians, we have shown, is abundant in paronomasia..

[8] See the *Gnomon*'s one note of parechesis in 1 Corinthians.

[9] Previously unreported, it is believed.

Salient Examples of Parechesis in 1 Corinthians

Perhaps the most important of the soundplays in 1 Cor 1 are the similarities of sound in vv. 12, 18, and 19. Ἀπολλῶ, ἀπολλυμένοις, and ἀπολῶ look much like the proper name soundplay that riddles Homeric poetry.[10] The only factor arguing against the theory of soundplay is the *distance* separating the word pair, ninety-four (94) words separating Ἀπολλῶ from the echo of ἀπολω.[11] Regardless of the separation, there are good reasons to believe Paul is mindful of the name when he quotes the Old Testament in v. 19. Perhaps most convincingly, all seven mentions of the name Apollos in 1 Corinthians are found in alliterative contexts.

David Aune has drawn attention to the fact that in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*, lines 1080–82, "the name of the god Apollo is etymologically linked to the verb apollunai": [12]

Ἄπολλον/ἀγυιᾶτ᾽, ἀπόλλων ἐμός. /ἀπώλεσας γὰρ οὐ μόλις τὸ δεύτερον.[13]

In fact, as Aune notes, this type of wordplay "appears to reflect a widespread ancient view."[14] To prove the point, he cites Euripides *Phaethon* [frag. 781] lines 11–12]; Archilochus frag. 30D; Plato *Cratylus* 404D–E, 405E; Menander *Peric*. 440; and Marobius 1.17.9.

Not unexpectedly, there is also evidence from Homer that the name Apollos invites soundplay. For example, Richard Janko has pointed out the "significant sound-effect"[15] of *Il.* 16.794 and following, where the soundplay surely begins at least a verse earlier with the name Apollos:

---

[10] Most recently perhaps, Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*, 106, recognized the soundplay.

[11] By comparison, twenty-two words separate Ἥρη from ἥρει in *Il*. 4.20 and 23.

[12] David E. Aune, *Revelation 6–16*. WBC 52B, ed. Bruce M. Metzger (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998), 535.

[13] From O'Hara, *True Names*, 13 n44.

[14] Aune, *Revelation*, 535.

[15] Janko, *Iliad*, 332.

τοῦ δ᾽ ἀπὸ μὲν κρατὸς κυνέην βάλε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων:

ἢ δὲ κυλινδομένη καναχὴν ἔχε ποσσὶν ὑφ᾽ ἵππων.[16]

In 1 Cor 2:6, Paul effects a clever pun on words of different roots: *ἀρχ*όντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τῶν κατ*αργ*ουμένων. (See 1 Cor 15:24 and 25, καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν, paronomastic with v. 20's ἀπαρχὴ.) In v. 7, ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν is eloquent liquid parechesis, but it will be the passages that deal with speaking in tongues where Paul exploits the λαλ- verb to greatest effect (see 1 Cor 14). In v. 9, we note the triple diphthong assonance from the LXX, one obvious source of Paul's proclivities: *οὗς οὐ*κ ἤκ*ουσ*εν.

In 1 Cor 4:3, we find yet another example of ἀνθρωπος in parechetical relationship: ἀνακριθῶ … ἀνθρωπίνης. A strain of guttural-*rho* soundplay is found in v. 11, including the parechesis ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι, the rare preposition ἄχρι also found in soundplay in 1 Cor 15:23–27: … ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός … καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν … ἄχρι … ἐχθροὺς … ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται.… In fact, the preposition ἄχρι, only thirteen occurrences in Paul, is often in parechetical relationships. See Table 8 at the end of the dissertation.

Thus, a distinctive feature of 1 Corinthians 4 is the *kappa*/guttural *rho leitmotif* with no fewer than fifteen such words propagating the communication, from v. 3 to v. 12:

> … ἀνακριθῶ … ἀνακρίνω … ἀνακρίνων … κύριός … καιροῦ τι κρίνετε … κύριος … κρυπτὰ … καρδιῶν … γέγραπται … διακρίνει … κεκορεσμένοι … ἰσχυροί… ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι … χερσίν … παρακαλοῦμεν· ὡς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου … ἄρτι. (1 Cor 4:1–13).[17]

[16] Note in addition to the plentiful labial alliteration the play on ἀπὸ/ Ἀπόλλων, the parechesis with ἵππων, and the many other alliterative connections.

[17] V. 5 has eight (8) initial *kappa* words in a pericope that contains a suspicious number of guttural-*rho* words. A similar density occurs in Luke 15, the Parable of the Prodigal Son (vv. 11–32), which appears to be propagated by mnemonic *chi-rho* words, echoing the "joy" theme of the three parables (v. 5, 6, οὕτως χαρὰ v. 7, 9, etc). Most of the parable can be recited from the simple mnemonic of these words: … χαίρων … συγχάρητέ … χαρὰ … χρείαν ἔχουσιν … συγχάρητέ … χαρὰ … χώραν μακρὰν (v. 13)… ἰσχυρὰ κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην … χώρας ἐκείνης … ἀγροὺς … χοίρους… χορτασθῆναι ἐκ τῶν κερατίων … χοῖροι … μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος … καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη … τράχηλον … ἄξιος κληθῆναι … ταχὺ ἐξενέγκατε … χεῖρα … ἀγρῷ …

That some of the above collocations result in parechesis is no surprise, for parechesis, as the evidence suggests, is the fortuitous result of an ingenious facility for soundplay.

The entire fifth chapter of 1 Corinthians is bookended by parechesis, beginning with the lexeme πόρνος. The highly alliterative πνεύματί τε πραΰτητος (4:21) that concludes 1 Cor 4 segues to the new topic of 1 Cor 5: πορνεία (v. 1); the chapter then ends on the stern command to remove (ἐξάρατε) the πονηρὸν ("evil") (v. 13).[18] The parechesis of v. 8 and 9 is classic: πονηρίας/πόρνοις. Moreover, the pun on ἔξω and *ἐξ* cognates in v. 13 could not be more obvious and would not have been lost on the Corinthians.

Classic parechesis is found in 1 Cor 6:9 where the word pair μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ[19] is joined by a conjunction, the second term much explained by parechesis.[20] In v. 10, a second example of parechesis is evident. The terms κλέπται οὔτε πλεονέκται are anagrammically related, almost palindromic, with four consonant sounds and every letter but one in common. Verse 11 concludes with classic parechesis of ὀ*νόματι* and π*νεύματι*, which is more than homoteleuton. The relationship is here made more obvious by examination of the context, a well-structured bicolon:

χορῶν … μόσχον … ὠργίσθη … μόσχον … χαρῆναι. The number of guttural-rho words alone, including fairly rare koine words, is particularly impressive. Including the five thematic joy-root (χαρὰ) words, there are twenty-one: χαίρων … συγχάρητέ … χαρὰ … χρείαν … συγχάρητέ … χαρὰ … χώραν … ἰσχυρὰ … χώραν … χώρας … ἀγροὺς … χοίρους… χορτασθῆναι … κερατίων … χοῖροι … μακρὰν … χεῖρα … ἀγρῷ … χορῶν … ὠργίσθη … χαρῆναι. (Luke 15:5–32)

[18] The hypothesis of parechesis in 1 Cor 5 might easily be challenged by consideration of the distance between allegedly related pairs: πορνεία (v. 1) and πονηρὸν (v. 13). Yet the morphological relationship is much like that identified in the *Gnomon* of 1858 in 1 Tim 6:6 and 9, πορισμὸς (v. 6)/πειρασμὸν (v. 9), where twenty-nine words separate the pair. Moreover, within this brief, thirteen verse chapter, the repetition of the topical lexeme πορν- (v.1, 8, 10) reinforces Paul's indictment until finally he commands the Corinthians to remove the evil: ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. Leading up to Paul's final adjuration is a series of paronomastic repetitions of ἐξ punctuated by *kappa* alliteration … ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐ*ξ*ελθεῖν … ἔξω κρίνειν; οὐχὶ τοὺς ἔσω ὑμεῖς *κ*ρίνετε; τοὺς δὲ ἔξω ὁ θεὸς κρινεῖ. ἐ*ξ*άρατε τὸν πονηρὸν *ἐξ* ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. (1 Cor 5:10–13).

[19] In 2007, Du Toit, *Focusing on Paul*, 283, is possibly the first in history to note this.

[20] It is not necessary to pinpoint parechesis on the continuum of anciently recognized soundplay effects but only to distinguish it from other types (notably, paronomasia) and, helpfully, to recognize subtypes.

ἐν τῷ ὀ*νόματι* τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

καὶ ἐν τῷ *πνεύματι* τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

In 6:13, Paul alliterates with antithetical terms that are very nearly parechesis: κοιλίᾳ and κυρίῳ (κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κύριος). In the nineteenth century, Wilke had recognized the same pair at Rom 16:18.[21]

In 1 Cor 7:20–21, classic parechesis is again evident with μενέτω/μελέτω, especially apparent from the structure:

ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ κλήσει ᾗ ἐκλήθη, ἐν ταύτῃ μενέτω. (v. 20)

δοῦλος ἐκλήθης, μή σοι μελέτω·[22] (v. 21)

What follows in v. 29 through v. 33 is one of the most convincing strings of parechetical relations in Paul (typical of patterns elsewhere in Paul, for example, 1 Thess 5:15–22), with gutturals and guttural-liquids:

ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες *γ*υναῖκας

ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες ὦσιν

καὶ οἱ *κ*λαίοντες

ὡς μὴ *κ*λαίοντες

καὶ οἱ *χ*αίροντες

ὡς μὴ *χ*αίροντες

καὶ οἱ ἀ*γ*οράζοντες

ὡς μὴ *κ*ατέ*χ*οντες, [paronomasia with v. 29]

καὶ οἱ *χρ*ώμενοι τὸν κόσμον

ὡς μὴ κατα*χρ*ώμενοι [paronomastic]·

[21] Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik*, 413.

[22] The rare term μελέτω (only about 60 occurrences in the entire Greek Bible) is explained by parechesis.

παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα [paronmastic with v. 35] τοῦ *κ*όσμου τούτου.

In v. 34, yet another parechesis, similar to the *mu* parechesis of vv. 20 and 21, occurs: μεμέρισται μεριμνᾷ.[23] The relatively rare *mu* is again parechetical in 1 Cor 7: μόνον (v. 39) and μείνῃ … ἐμὴν (v. 40).

The food sacrificed to idols section of 1 Cor 8, whose beginning is signaled by the titular Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (1 Cor 8:1),[24] features soundplay based off the theme word. At 1 Thess 1:9, we will see the euphonic parechesis of εἰδώλων δουλεύειν, and here in 1 Cor 8:4, *delta* alliteration is evident, beginning with the εἰδωλ- lexeme: *εἰδωλοθύτων, οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἴδωλον* … ὅτι *οὐδεὶς θεὸς* εἰ μὴ εἷς, no fewer than nine prominent dentals in eleven words. All this makes 1 Cor 8:4 one of the most alliterative half verses in Paul.

Similarly in v. 7, the dental theme is pronounced, where six of seven words bear the sound: συνηθείᾳ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν συνείδησις ἀσθενὴς. At least two of the relationships might be considered parechesis: συνηθείᾳ/συνείδησις and ἐσθίουσιν/ἀσθενὴς.

One of the most interesting possibilities of proper name parechesis in Paul comes in 1 Cor 9:9 with the name Moses, the genitive Μωϋσέως. Five *mu*'s, three initial, make for fortuitous parechesis: *Μωϋσέως*/κη*μώσεις*.

First Corinthians 9:12–18 concentrates nine uses of εὐαγγέλιον in a highly alliterative pericope featuring gutturals and other sound-alike letters, some that attain the distinction of parechesis:

[23] See 7:20–21 and 1 Pet 5:7, the latter where μέριμναν and μέλει are easily confused as sharing the same root.

[24] The Περὶ formula was a common Greek title. The titles of most of Aristotle's works, for instance, begin with the preposition.

… ἐγκοπὴν/εὐαγγελίῳ …. οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργα[ζόμενοι] …
ἐσθίουσιν/θυσιαστηρίῳ [anagrammatic][25] … εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ
εὐαγγελίου … οὐδενὶ τούτων [diphthong and dentals] … καλὸν/*μ*οι *μ*ᾶλλον …
καύχημά μ*ου οὐ*δεὶς κενώσει … καύχημα· ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπίκειται [gutturals]….

To Bullinger's observation at 1 Cor 9:17, we add one term: ἑκὼν /ἔχω/ἄκων, triple parechesis.

Russell has noted *pi* alliteration in 10:7 features an interesting example of triple parechesis from the LXX: φαγεῖν/πεῖν/παίζειν, which compares favorably to the parechesis in 1 Cor 9:4 and 5.

Paul's admonition and advice to the Corinthians in v. 25 through 27 is framed in alliterative terms, including the parechesis of πωλούμενον/πλήρωμα, as the following structure reveals:

*Π*ᾶν τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ *πωλούμενον* …

τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ *πλήρωμα*…. (1 Cor 10:25–26)

Verse 31 features at least two examples of parechesis—Εἴτε/ἐσθίετε/πίνετε/ποιεῖτε. The preposition εἰς here is desirable for its assonance, offering one of seven such diphthongs in the verse: *Εἴ*τε οὖν ἐσθ*ίετε εἴ*τε πίνετε *εἴ*τε τι ποι*εῖ*τε, πάντα *εἰς* δόξαν θεοῦ ποι*εῖ*τε.

Chapter 11 of 1 Corinthians, which contains the Words of Institution, exhibits telling instances of parechesis. The chapter is entirely alliterative, with striking notes of soundplay. In v. 4, *pi* alliteration and *kappa* are so pronounced as to require no further comment and v. 6 is a particularly poignant display, exhibiting every guttural, within which *κείρ*ασθαι ἢ *ξυρ*ᾶσθαι is

[25] Verse 13, in fact, is one of the most cleverly alliterative in Paul. Its phonological components might be broken down into three consecutive parts:

Omicron (-dental): Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ

Epsilon rho: ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι

Anagram (*sigma, theta, iota, upsilon*): ἐσθίουσιν/θυσιαστηρίῳ.

typical Pauline parechesis.[26]

In v. 10 we hear the poetry of Paul in his rhetorical question, *ὀφείλει* ἡ γυνὴ *ἐξ*ουσίαν *ἔχειν ἐπὶ* τῆς *κεφαλῆς*, where the first and last terms, ὀφείλειν/κεφαλῆς, make for parechesis. Between the parechetical words lies ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, which Russell has recognized in 1920. In v. 17 is yet another historically-acknowledged example. The 1858 English edition of Bengel's *Gnomon* includes precisely this one example of parechesis: 1 Cor 11:17 κρεῖσσον/ἧσσον (which compares, for example to pseudo-Plutarch's *Vit. Hom*. 38, δὴν ἦν).

Evidence for parechesis and soundplay in the Words of Institution is by this time overwhelming: *ἐμὴν ἀνάμνη*σιν (v. 24) and ποιεῖτε/πίνητε are classic parechesis. Structured into brief cola, these Words of Institution clearly indicate poetic form:

ἐν τῷ *ἐμῷ αἵμ*ατι·

τοῦτο *ποιεῖτε*,

ὁσάκις ἐὰν *πίνητε*,

εἰς τὴν *ἐμὴν ἀνάμνη*σιν. (1 Cor 11:25).

In v. 27 is yet another example of parechesis, where the unusual words ἀναξίως, ἔνοχος are back to back; the juxtaposition makes their causal relationship obvious, as does the soundplay—now the fifth or sixth convincing instance of parechesis in the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinthians.

The Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν section of 1 Cor 12, as might now be expected, is abundant in soundplay, from the impressively parechetical string Οἴδατε ὅτι ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε (v. 2) to small units of alliteration throughout the entire chapter. In fact, hardly a moment in 1 Corinthians 12 can be found without soundplay.

[26] Note the similar gutturals in Acts 21:24, ξυρήσονται τὴν κεφαλήν, καὶ γνώσονται πάντες ὅτι ὧν κατήχηνται … στοιχεῖς… or, more pointedly, Acts 18:18, where proper name parechesis occurs when at Cenchrea (Κεγχρεαῖς) Paul had his head shaved (κειράμενος), along with the parechesis of εἶχεν/εὐχήν: κειράμενος ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς τὴν κεφαλήν, εἶχεν γὰρ εὐχήν.

One might expect that the love hymn, as it is known, of 1 Corinthians 13 would contain more euphony than any other chapter. But, as we have seen, it would be hard to fill a chapter with more soundplay than we have intimated the first twelve chapters contain, among which the quadruple parechesis of v. 8 should not be overlooked: οὐδέ*ποτε πίπτει· εἴτε* δὲ προ*φητεῖαι*.

If the hymn of Chapter 13 is neither more nor less euphonic than other chapters (though apparently of a different genre), the glossolalia-themed chapter that follows is appropriately filled with onomatopoetic soundplay. In 1 Cor 14:5–6, Paul's pragmatics match form with function with the most total *lambda*'s in his epistles and the parechesis of ἀδελ*φ*οί/ὠ*φ*ελήσω.

In 1 Cor 14:34 and 35 we find a fortuitous anagram of two terms: ἐπιτρέπετα/ ἐπερωτάτωσαν (see 1 Cor 16:22, Gal 4:19–20, 1 Thess 1:9). Are ἐπιτρέπεται and ἐπερωτάτωσαν a parechetical pair? The causal relationship between the two terms and the fact that they bear four letters in common, including three consonants, the significant beginning sound, ἐπ*, and the rarity of the words suggests conscious soundplay. The second term is found in Paul only here and in Rom 10:20 where it is defined by its parallelism with ζητοῦσιν. But here ἐπερωτάτωσαν is more problematic as a semantic element and seems to be chosen as much for its sound as for its sense.

The famous fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, as the church has recognized in incorporating Paul's words in liturgy, is thoroughly hymnic. A systematic search of the chapter for euphony does not disappoint expectations. Here, we point out only a few of the many salient instances of soundplay.

In v. 2 is εἰκῇ , which occurs in only four verses in Paul, each time in a highly alliterative short phrase, with *epsilon*'s and gutturals:

… εἰκῇ; εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῇ. (Gal 3:4)

… εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα (Gal 4:11)

… εἰκῇ τὴν μάχαιραν (Rom 13:4)

… εἰ κατέχετε, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστεύσατε. (1 Cor 15:2)

In v. 5, yet another soundplay on proper names is evident: ὤφθη Κηφᾷ (1 Cor 15:5), part of a larger scheme based off the aorist passive form:

καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς

καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα·

ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ…. (1 Cor 15:4–6)

In vv. 8 and 9, three terms, ἔσχατον (v. 8) and ἐλάχιστος (v. 9) are logically and phonologically related and may be considered parechetical.[27]

In v. 17 Paul departs from the *kappa* theme, replacing κενὸν (vv. 10 and 14) with the synonym ματαία. The substitution might be explained by parechesis of ματαία/ἁμαρτίαις**:**

… ματαία ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν,

… ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν….

In 1 Cor 15:2–26, the number of gutturals driving this chapter is almost overwhelming and includes key lexemes and several instances of parechesis or near parechesis, for example,

… κατ*αργ*ήσῃ πᾶσαν *ἀρχ*ὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν … *ἄχρ*ι … *ἐχθρ*οὺς … *ἔσχ*ατος *ἐχ*θρὸς κατ*αργ*εῖται…. (1 Cor 15:24–26)

Less obvious but no less classic is the parechesis of vv. 30 and 31: ὥραν/ἡμέραν. Moreover, subtle, intricate soundplay is not to be missed in vv. 32 and 33: ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριομάχησα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ… ὄφελος; (v. 32) and φθείρουσιν (v. 33). From v. 9 to v. 30, not a single *phi* occurs, in 327 words.[28]

[27] A similarly personal parechesis is found with reference to Judas, in Acts 1:17 and 18, two rare verbs involved: ἔλαχεν/ἐλάκησεν.

[28] Similarly, in vv. 49–54, a *phi* theme resumes after five verses (vv. 43–48) without any such letter and only one *phi* in the next nearly 200 words (until 1 Cor 16:8): ἐφορέσαμεν … φορέσομεν … φημι, ἀδελφοί … φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν … ὀφθαλμοῦ… ἄφθαρτοι … φθαρτὸν … ἀφθαρσίαν … φθαρτὸν … ἀφθαρσίαν (1 Cor 15:49–54).

In v. 39, we find two examples of parechesis: ἀλλὰ ἄλλη[29] and κτηνῶν/πτηνῶν:

… αὐτὴ σὰρξ ἀλλὰ ἄλλη μὲν ἀνθρώπων,

ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ κτηνῶν,

ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ πτηνῶν….

Soundplay continues in every verse, and Paul ends 1 Corinthians 15 with a flourish of *kappa*'s: ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν κενὸς ἐν κυρίῳ, previously identified by Zuck, the salient word κέντρον in v. 56 is not too distant to be considered parechetical with κενὸς (v. 58).

But the greatest of Paul's parechesis in 1 Corinthians is found in the final chapter.

Exegetical Analysis: 1 Corinthians 16:22—An Anagram: ἀνάθεμα. μαράνα θά!

The most impressive parechesis in 1 Corinthians, in fact, in all of Paul and no doubt one of the most intriguing examples of soundplay in ancient Greek literature, comes in 1 Cor 16:22. Here, we can assume Paul's awareness of distinct roots, for the words involved are from two different languages.[30] In this otherwise enigmatic postscript, Paul follows (the threat of) a curse with an invocation for the Lord's return: εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἤτω ἀνάθεμα. μαράνα θά. "If anyone does not love the Lord, let him be accursed. Our Lord, come!" (1 Cor 16:22)

No one has successfully explained the juxtaposition of the curse and the coming. Paul has apparently penned the words himself (see v. 21), but the Aramaic "Maranatha," as more than one commentator has noted, is most unusual. A few attempts at explanation, often as seemingly oblique as the words they seek to interpret, have been offered over the years. "The words

[29] Though these are etymologically cognates, that fact is by now a mute point compared to their phonological function.

[30] Bullinger had written on bilingual wordplay, using the term "parechesis": "But *Parechesis* properly describes the figure when one of the two words belongs to another language" (Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 178). Bullinger, whose thick volume gave the impression that figures of speech had been adequately inventoried, here has drawn his definition from sources other than the ancient Greek handbooks.

Maranatha add weight to the anathema,"[31] wrote Bengel, in one of the earliest such attempts. Clearly the *Gnomon*, notwithstanding its four recognitions of paronomasia,[32] was not reckoning with the phonological relationship of "Maranatha" and "anathema."

The only credible attempt at an explanation in more than a generation is that of C.F.D. Moule in a 1960 article, "A Reconsideration of the Context of Maranatha."[33] Exegetical perplexion over 1 Cor 16:22, however, caused Moule to preface his own conclusions. "In view of so many doubts," Moule revives a long forgotten 1926 hypothesis of one E. Peterson.[34] "Maranatha," Moule tentatively suggests, is "an element in the ban-formula."[35] Insinuating more of a hypothesis than a consensus, Moule writes, "It is widely held that the maranatha … is to be understood as an invocation of Christ to be present in the eucharist."[36] The one connection he is able to make in this sense is the occurrence of the term "maranatha" in post-Pauline *Didache* X.6, in a section associated at least in some way with the eucharist. Short of conceding the futility of the search for explanation, Moule admits that the 1926 attempt is "a less agreeable interpretation, but it is not to be lightly rejected."[37]

Peterson, in Moule's words, had attempted to show that maranatha "goes hand in hand with anathema."[38] But the exact meaning of the coupling is unclear. Moule, without new insight, endorses Peterson's 1926 view that "the maranatha (amen) is, in effect, part of the anathema—an

---

[31] Bengel, *Gnomon*, 3:347.

[32] Bengel, *Gnomon*, 3:347.

[33] C.D.F. Moule, "Reconsideration of the Context of Maranatha," *NTS* 6 (1960): 307–10.

[34] Erik Peterson, *Eis Theos: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Vol. 39–41 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), 130 and following.

[35] Moule, "Reconsideration of the Context of Maranatha," 307.

[36] Moule, "Reconsideration," 307.

[37] Moule, "Reconsideration," 307.

[38] Moule, "Reconsideration," 308.

element in the ban-formula."[39] But what part?

The eucharistic association invites several problems, not least of which is the anachronism. By all accounts, 1 Corinthians predates the *Didache*. A second objection is contextual. The *Didache* does, in fact, echo biblical language: "May grace come and may this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any man is holy, let him come; if any man is not, let him repent. Maran Atha. Amen." But in 1 Corinthians a eucharistic allusion is seemingly out of context in a Pauline postscript. Paul has not spoken of the Lord's Supper since 1 Cor 11, though he does end that chapter with mention of his own coming: τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ὡς ἂν ἔλθω διατάξομαι (v. 34).

More to the point, semantic exegesis has fallen short of a satisfactory explanation. As for the precise meaning of μαράνα θά in this context, Moulton and Milligan (*s.v.* ἀνάθεμα) concede that "the meaning of the Aramaic [μαράνα θά] [is] wholly unknown . . ."[40] and allude to the ingenious proposal that maranatha is an interpretation of anathema along the lines of analyzing the rabbinic word שְׁמַתָּא ('ban') as שְׁמ תָּא "The Name [of Yawheh] comes."[41] Unfortunately, the interpretation is wholly a guess and cannot be substantiated from rabbinic writings.[42]

Better is a strictly phonological interpretation, one that pays attention to the sounds of the words in the original language and yet still has a connection with the *Didache*—but in the correct direction chronologically. At 10.6, we find this alliteration in *mu* that cannot be overlooked: Μετανοιέτω Μαρὰν ἀθά. Ἀμήν (*Didache* 10.6). The three words have *mu* and *nu* in common, a fact that no exegete focused only on semantic interpretation has noted. Just as in the *Didache* 10.6, *mu* alliteration is obvious in the final 1 Corinthians verses: … ἀνάθεμα. μαράνα θά.… μεθ᾽

[39] Moule, "Reconsideration," 308.

[40] Moule, "Reconsideration," 308.

[41] Str-B in loc, III, 494.

[42] Moule, "Reconsideration," 308 n1.

ὑμῶν. … μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν … (vv. 22–24).

Interestingly, the Μετανοιέτω of the *Didache* parallels the imperative ἤτω of 1 Cor 16:22, which suggests, as do the presumed dates, that the *Didache* is drawing from 1 Cor 16:22 and not the other way around and, in fact, is amplifying the alliteration of the former. In other words, the *Didache* recognizes the soundplay of 1 Cor 16:22 and as such is the earliest interpretation of it.

A better parallel for the 1 Corinthian postscript, however, is found in Scripture, Rev 22:20, as Moule has noted,[43] and yet this ending of the Bible has no allusion to the Lord's Supper. Again the *sound* of the words is significant. Rev 22:20–21 is patently alliterative, with four *chi* words in the short span of eight: ἔρχομαι ταχύ. Ἀμήν, ἔρχου κύριε … χάρις τοῦ κυρίου (Rev. 22:20b–21a). The endings of Rev 22 and 1 Cor 16 are structurally and functionally alike, as a side by side comparison makes clear:

Λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα· ναί, ἔρχομαι ταχύ. Ἀμήν, *ἔρχου κύριε* Ἰησοῦ.

Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων. (Rev. 22:20–21)

εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἤτω ἀνάθεμα. *μαράνα θά*.

ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν.

ἡ ἀγάπη μου *μετὰ πάντων* ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. (1 Cor 16:22–24)

The two also have in common the Christian blessing, Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, and the ἔρχου κύριε of Rev 22:20 and the μαράνα θά of 1 Cor 16:22 are parallel in structure and thought. So, too, is the identical μετὰ πάντων.

The immediate contextual evidence of 1 Cor 16 further suggests soundplay. In 1 Cor 16:20 and 22 Paul's playfulness with cognates (*figura etymologica*) is evident. He bridges the two verses of his final greeting with the terms φιλήματι/φιλεῖ. Moreover, other parousia pericopes in

[43] Moule, "Reconsideration," 307.

Paul exhibit alliteration (see, e.g., 1 Thess 3).

Paul uses the term ἀνάθεμα only four other times (Rom 9:3, 1 Cor 12:3, and Gal 1:8 and 9) In Gal 1:8 we found the hidden parechesis effected by the middle ending: εὐηγγελισ*άμεθα*/*ἀνάθεμα*. Thus, two of the five uses of the term are coincidentally alliterative on at least three syllables.

The conclusion is straightforward: Alliteration explains word choice in both Revelation and in 1 Corinthians, not to mention the *Didache*.

Thus, the puzzling terms ἀνάθεμα and μαράνα θά have a relationship that must be acknowleged *prior* to any inquiry into meaning.[44] At this point, given a new template of understanding, the solution should be obvious. The words form a bilingual anagram: ἀνάθεμα. μαράνα θά.[45] The consecutive terms ἀνάθεμα and μαράνα θά share three consonants and three *alphas*, thus seven letters—a coincidence of sounds that is as improbable by the dictates of chance as a royal flush.[46] Among consonants, only the *rho* in μαράνα θά is aberrant, a single consonant deviation that is characteristic of parechesis in many classical examples.

Twentieth century exegetes, in contemplating a curse with eschatological (versus eucharistic) overtones, have attempted to delve beneath the superfice of the words for precise meaning and occasion. But the first meaning to be considered is the meaning of sound. The first order of business of the exegete is to note the similarity of sound of ἀνάθεμα and μαράνα θά and from there to ask, Why?

---

[44] Our exegetical contention is that attention to phonological elements is the priority of exegetical method, first in order of consideration, if not first in importance.

[45] In *Od* 3.108 we find the collocation μαρνάμεθ᾽: ἔνθα, and three succeeding lines begin with ἔνθα.

[46] Perhaps the only parechesis in Scripture to rival this collocation is the anagram found in the Hebrew of Exodus 23:11 "but the seventh year you shall let it rest and lie fallow— תִּשְׁמְטֶנָּה וּנְטַשְׁתָּה— "sallow and fallow" where no fewer than five consonants and the nasal along with similar vowel pointing make this an impossible coincidence.

Anagrams in Paul might be considered the fortuitous or inspired exploitation of an ear for soundplay. But they are far more than a mere Pauline idiosyncrasy. Anagrams in Greek literature are known at least as early as Pindar.[47] Eustathius isolated examples of metathesis (a category of parechesis) in Homer: μῦθος /θυμός[48]; βαλών καὶ λαβών; νᾶμα/μάννα**.** Whatever the origin, anagrams, from a phonological point of view, are simply the creative mixture of sounds that the language on rare occasions lends itself to in the use of a clever author. Perhaps the words of the linguist and philosopher Ferdinand de Saussure are instructive. He reminds us that "the functioning of the anagram presupposes both a poet capable of sophisticated operations on verbal material and a reader able to recognize the presence of the anagram[49]…."

2 Corinthians

Paul's next extant letter to the Corinthians continues the type of soundplay that we have now established as a mark of style. Below we list salient examples of parechesis.

In 2 Cor 1:21, Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας are blatantly parechetical. [50] It is worth noting that in precisely the same epistolary location in Philippians, Paul employs parechesis, this recognized by Gordon Fee[51]:

Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστὸς

[47] See Calvert Watkins, "Pindar's Rigveda," *JAOS* 122 (2002): 432–35.

[48] From *Od.* 15:171 and 172.

[49] Paraphrased in Roland Greene, et al., eds., ed. Steven Cushman, Clare Cavanagh, Jahan Ramazani, Paul Rouzer, editors, *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 4th ed., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012), 48. In the latter years of his life, Saussure investigated anagrams in Saturnian poetry, with precedents in Homeric poetry, where poets encoded the names of gods in their poetry. Fifty years after his death, eight cardboard boxes of Saussure's inconclusive notes on the matter were discovered.

[50] In 1920, Elbert Russell (*Paronomasia*, 32.) had rather tentatively hypothesized, "It is just possible there may be in 2 Cor 1:21 a play on the etymology of Χριστὸν." It is typical of the uncertain nature of claims with respect to style that have gained no traction in Pauline studies.

[51] An observation seconded by Rollin Ramsaran in 2002 (see above).

καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος. (Phil 1:21)

Further coincidence of sound is found in the parechetical terms of 2:11 and 12 where a hypothesis recognizing similar consonants is justified: ἀγνοοῦμεν/ἀνεῳγμένης. This parechesis is another example of Paul bridging sections by wordplay.

A most interesting example of sound echo is found in 2 Cor 2:15–17, the parechesis of ἐσμὲν/ὀσμὴ … ὀσμὴ /ἐσμεν.[52]

At 2 Cor 4:9 is found the triple parechesis of καταβ*αλλ*όμενοι *ἀλλ*᾽ οὐκ *ἀπολλ*ύμενοι, and at 4:10 a parechetical play on περιφέροντες (a Pauline hapax) and φανερωθῇ seems equally tenable.[53]

Parechesis of ἔξω and ἔσω in 4:16 is, again, even more evident upon examination of the structural context, a nearly perfect example of parallelism of sound involving ten consecutive letters across four words:

… ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος …

ἀλλ᾽ ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνακαινοῦται.… (2 Cor 4:16)

A notable instance of soundplay occurs in 5:8 where the obvious antithetical paronomasia of ἐκδημῆσαι and ἐνδημῆσαι is preceded by parechesis of εὐδοκοῦμεν with ἐκδημῆσαι, four consonants in common.

The soundplays of 2 Cor 5:16–17 involve virtually every letter and syllable, one of the most euphonic series one could ever expect in a prose epistle, within which is the parechesis of

---

[52] Paul uses the first person plural pronoun ἐσμεν only twenty-two times in the undisputed epistles.

[53] The logical relationship is cause and effect:

πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
ἐν τῷ σώματι *περιφέρ*οντες,
ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν *φανερ*ωθῇ. (2 Cor 4:9)

οὐδένα οἴδαμεν (5:16).

The consecutive terms ἀγνότητι. ἐν γνώσει in 2 Cor 6:6 are parechetical, and it is conceivable that ἀγνότητι (v. 6) and ἀνέῳγεν (v. 11) are deliberately so as well.

Second Corinthians 7:4 is an exceptional example of Paul's exploitation of *pi*-liquid clusters, with eight such specimens in one verse: πολλή μοι παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πολλή … ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· πεπλήρωμαι τῇ παρακλήσει, ὑπερπερισσεύομαι … ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν. (2 Cor 7:4). Whether or not any of these combinations actually rises to the level of parechesis is almost inconsequential, for the fact is that the urge of soundplay is driving the word choice.[54] In v. 6, παρουσίᾳ is found as one of fifteen *pi*-liquids in four verses (vv. 3–7), thus the parechesis παρρησία/παρουσίᾳ (similar to the parechesis at Phil 1:26: περισσεύῃ/παρουσίας). Though nearly fifty words separated, the two are part of a *pi-rho* scheme, seven such words intervening, including the thematic παρακαλῶ.[55]

Second Corinthians 8:2 contains an unmistakable example of classic parechesis: τὸ *πλοῦτος* τῆς *ἁπλότητος* (See 9:11). The parechesis recurs in 9:11, again in the course of *pi* alliteration: ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι εἰς πᾶσαν ἁπλότητα. In v. 10, the parechesis of συμφέρει and πέρυσι is a tenable hypothesis. The end of 8:23 and the beginning of v. 24 offer yet an example of parechesis: δόξα/ἔνδειξιν. In the LXX of Exod 33:18 is parechesis of the same two terms:

… *δεῖξόν* μοι τὴν σεαυτοῦ *δόξαν*. (Exod 33:18)

… *δόξα* Χριστοῦ. τὴν οὖν ἔν*δειξ*ιν … (2 Cor 8:23b–24a).

The most consistent pattern of soundplay in 2 Cor 9 is, again, the *pi*-liquid motif. The same cluster alliteration that we identified at 7:4, where eight *pi*-liquid words are found in one verse, is

[54] See the same at 2 Cor 11:23–24. We have already seen a similar ploy in 1 Thess 4:1 with παρακαλοῦμεν … παρελάβετε παρ᾽ … πῶς … περιπατεῖν … περιπατεῖτε, ἵνα περισσεύητε. See also 1 Thess 1:9 and 2:17.

[55] 2 Corinthians is particularly vested in *pi*-liquid clusters; the first sixteen verses, for instance, present 35 such combinations. The fifteen verses of Chapter 9 contain 26, as Paul again and again strikes the same note.

prominent here.[56] Comparison of v. 2 and v. 5 shows a consistency of structure with parechesis of the final words of the respective clauses: πλείονας/πλεονεξίαν.

Betz in his commentary on 2 Cor 8 and 9 confidently weighs in on the meaning of πλεονεξίαν. "Paul chose the term 'greediness' for several reasons," he explains, going on to explore the background of the word in Greek philosophy and "folk wisdom."[57] What he does not do is explore the phonological significance of this word choice. We do not doubt the "cultural value" of this word as it would have impinged on the consciences of the Corinthians, but we note first how it struck their ears.

Second Corinthians 9:13 features *delta* and *delta* cluster alliteration (parechesis): διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες. Compare 2 Cor 11:15–16, with διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης (v. 15) and the chiasm of v. 16:

δόξῃ ἄφρονα εἶναι·

εἰ δὲ μή γε,

κἂν ὡς ἄφρονα δέξασθέ…. (2 Cor 11:15–16)

In 2 Cor 10:6–17, *epsilon* assonance and *pi* and *kappa* alliteration drive the pericope as much as any semantical theme, in the midst of which we find the parechesis of μέτρον/ἐμέρισεν[58] (v. 13).

---

[56] Practically every Pauline epistle contains verses that exhibit high concentrations of *pi*-liquid words: 1 Thess 2:17, ἀδελφοί, ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας, προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ, περισσοτέρως ἐσπουδάσαμεν τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ; Gal 1:14, προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων; 1 Cor 16:6–7, πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχὸν παραμενῶ ἢ καὶ παραχειμάσω, ἵνα ὑμεῖς με προπέμψητε οὗ ἐὰν πορεύωμαι. οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἄρτι ἐν παρόδῳ….; in 2 Cor 7:4, πολλή μοι παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πολλή μοι καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· πεπλήρωμαι τῇ παρακλήσει, ὑπερπερισσεύομαι τῇ χαρᾷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ…. ; Romans 2:25, Περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾖς, ἡ περιτομή….; Phil 4:18, ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα καὶ περισσεύω· πεπλήρωμαι δεξάμενος παρὰ Ἐπαφροδίτου τὰ παρ᾽….

[57] Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, 96.

[58] "Measure/he divided." This parechesis is found in the midst of a *kappa* alliteration series that includes the term "canon," which we perused at Gal 1:15 and 16: μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος οὗ ἐμέρισεν (2 Cor 10:13).

Second Corinthians 11 features a similar example of parechesis, the two words in apposition: ἡμέραν, ἡ μέριμνα. But an equally impressive example of proper name parechesis occurs in 11:10, on what of the most important city names of ancient Greece.

Conclusion to 2 Corinthians

Parechesis is evident in 2 Corinthians to the very end of the letter. At 12:9 is the anagrammatic ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, similar to so many other Pauline collocations: χάρις … καὶ εἰρήνη; ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι (1 Cor 4:11); Κατὰ τὴν χάριν … ἀρχιτέκτων (1 Cor 3:10); ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός … καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν … ἄχρι … ἐχθροὺς … ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται (1 Cor 15:23–27); Ἀχαΐᾳ, χάρις (2 Cor 1:1–2); : Ἡ *χάρ*ις τοῦ *κυρ*ίου Ἰησοῦ *Χρ*ιστοῦ (2 Cor 13:13) and several other instances of soundplay on χάρις. At 2 Cor 13:9 and 10, parechesis is once again attained, with key lexemes: κατάρτισιν/καθαίρεσιν. Again the structure suggests the finding. The two feminine singular accusatives end their respective verses.

Much more could be pointed out in the Corinthian correspondences delivered to a congregation that, for all we know, was well attuned to the speech of rhetors. But the examples above have been highlighted in order to sufficiently represent a pervasive tendency of style in Paul. Our conclusion is more than tentative: parechesis is prominent among Paul's considerable repertoire of rhetorical skills

We now turn to the epistle to the Romans for further confirmation.

CHAPTER SIX

ROMANS

Introduction

No letter of Paul has been more scrutinized for its elements of argumentation nor so overlooked with respect to figures of speech than Paul's epistle to the Romans.[1] Rhetoric, as we have shown by historical evidence, is more than argumentation and persuasion, and the *style* of the letter to the Romans is part and parcel of the communication. Below we highlight a few examples of parechesis in the epistle that complement the persuasive powers of the communication.

The best known example of parechesis in Paul comes from Rom 1:29, φθόνου φόνου; in v. 31 of the same vice list is a second accepted example, ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους. But soundplay and parechesis in Romans begins much earlier in the letter, in the opening verse, indeed with the first two words: Παῦλος δοῦλος … ἀπόστολος (Rom 1:1). Both Paul's name and the two appositives that follow are found in many other alliterative contexts in the undisputed Pauline.

After the longest and least alliterative of all of Paul's prologues, Rom 1:13 features *theta-epsilon* parechesis: θέλω … προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν ἔθνεσιν.[2] This observation banks on some historical precedence. In 1751, in one of the best biblical studies of the eighteenth century, Wettstein's two volume *Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae*, Wettstein cites Hermogenes and Eustathius at this verse and is thus noting the parechesis.[3]

Rom 1:15 then echoes the consonants of v. 13's προεθέμην in πρόθυμον. This also is

[1] W. Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate over Romans," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 330–51, is one of many examples.

[2] There is good reason to also include in this scheme καὶ ἐκωλύθην (v. 13).

[3] Johann Jacob Wettstein, *Ἡ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus codicum*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: *Ex officina Dommeriana*, 1751, 1752), at Rom 1:13.

parechesis. The two words are from different roots and, though separated by one verse, are logically related: "Many times *I planned* (προεθέμην) to come to you … [for] *I am ready* (πρόθυμον) to preach the gospel to you in Rome. (Rom 1:13 and 15 NKJ)

It appears as well that the alliterative terms of v. 13 are part of a larger scheme of re-echoing sound—vowel-*lambda*—beginning at least in v. 12: ἀλλήλοις (v. 12) … θέλω … ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις … ἐλθεῖν ἔθνεσιν. (v. 13) Ἕλλησίν (v. 14) ὀφειλέτης …εὐαγγελίσασθαι (v. 15).[4] It seems fitting that the proper name Hellen ("Greek") should be part of this scheme. Thus, the consecutive words ἔθνεσιν/Ἕλλησίν (linking Rom 1:13 and 14) are yet another example of soundplay on proper names, of the species parechesis well-documented in Homer by Eustathius.

Second only to the example of λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοι in Luke 21:11, the parechesis of φθόνου φόνου in Rom 1:29 is the best known example in history. The standard observations of this list, like most observations regarding soundplay in the Pauline epistles, underrepresent the amount of soundplay that Paul has employed. In Rom 1:28 and 29, flanking the famous φθόνου φόνου example is an indisputable example of parechesis: καθήκοντα (v. 28)/κακοηθείας (v. 29).

There are many other examples of parechesis in Romans. Clever parechesis is found in 2:17 with ἐπονομάζῃ καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ (Rom 2:17), the otherwise difficult phrase "rest [ἐπαναπαύῃ] in the law," is explained by Paul's interest in sound. In the same verse, καυχᾶσαι is parechetical with κατηχούμενος in the next (v. 18). Parallel alignment of the two verses corroborates the relationship:

Εἰ δὲ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος *ἐπονομάζῃ καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ* νόμῳ καὶ *καυχᾶσαι* ἐν *θεῷ*

[4] This is the type of vowel-*lambda leitmotif* we have seen elsewhere in Paul. See also Rom 8:15 below.

καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ *θέ*λημα καὶ *δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα κατηχούμενος* ἐκ τοῦ νόμου (Rom 2:17–18).

Yet another parechesis, this one anagrammatic, occurs in Rom 2:20: ἀφρόνων/μόρφωσιν.

In Rom 3:1, paronomasia-parechesis of περισσὸν and περιτομῆς surely goes a long way toward explaining the former term, which otherwise is unexpected in this semantic context.

Amidst the *pi* alliteration so conspicuous in the opening verses of Romans 3—πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. πρῶτον … ἐπιστεύθησαν (Rom 3:2)—is the anagrammatic parechesis of the consecutive terms τρόπον πρῶτον.

The LXX quote in Rom 3:12 is conspicuously guttural— ἐξέκλιναν ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν … χρηστότητα—and includes the parechetical terms ἠχρεώθησαν/χρηστότητα (see 11:33).

In v. 27, diphthong assonance is pronounced, with six such sounds structuring the verse—Π*οῦ οὖ*ν … ποί*ου* νόμ*ου*;[5]—in the midst of which are the parechetical gutturals καύ*χησ*ις; ἐξεκ*λείσ*θη.

Verse 16 displays a metathetic nasal parechesis consecutive pair involving one of the key words of Romans, "law": νόμου μόνον.[6] Similar metathesis was noted by Eustathius in Homer: νᾶμα μάννα ("flowing water/manna").[7]

Clear examples of parechesis occur in Romans 5 as well. In v. 2, ἐσχήκαμεν and ἑστήκαμεν are clearly parechetical; the phrase ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν seems extraneous and might best be understood as Paul's completion of a soundplay. Not to be missed is the soundplay of καταισχύνει … ἐκκέχυται in v. 5, an opportunistic concentration of the forceful guttural sounds

[5] Similarly, in Rom 4:1 assonance is evidence for a textual critical question; the diphthong favors the subjunctive variant reading, *οὖ*ν ἐρο*ῦ*μεν εὑρηκέναι (Rom 4:1)

[6] See Gal 3:2. In 1920, Russell, *Paronomasia*, 10, identified this pair, unfortunately calling it "paronomasia."

[7] Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, {4083.001} vol. 1, 193, line 28, TLG. *Ad Herennium* supplies this comparable Latin example of "transposing" letters: *navo an vano* ("industrious or vainglorious") (*Rhet. Her.*, 4.21 [Caplan, LCL]).

of the verse as a whole: ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις.

If there was any doubt about parechesis in Romans thus far, the very next verse presents an indisputable, classical example: ἀσθενῶν/ἀσεβῶν (Rom 5:6). Again, parallelism supports the claim:

ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν

ἔτι κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν.[8]

Here, again, two rather nondescript terms are explained by parechesis.

In 5:16 is found the paronomasia and parechesis of κρίμα … κατάκριμα… χάρισμα, the paronomastic terms connected by the assonance string of ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς.

Romans 7, along with the typical Pauline alliteration, features two prime examples of parechesis. In vv. 4 and 5, the parechesis of ἐγερθέντι/ἐνηργεῖτο is evident by common structural position:

ἐγερθέντι, ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ (v. 4);

ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ· (v. 5).

In v. 18 assonance with οι diphthong is blatant: Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί (Rom 7:18); Οἶδα and ὅτι are parechesis.

Romans 8 is often accorded the honor as the greatest of Paul's literary texts.[9] In spite of this high regard, few of the actual virtues of soundplay have been publicized. We point out but a few salient instances of parechesis here. In Rom 8:12, there is ἀδελφοί, ὀφειλέται. In v. 15, there is a

[8] Not incidental to the sound effect of the verse is the preposition-object *kappa* alliteration of κατὰ καιρὸν; further, the second parechetical term is bound up in alliteration with the words flanking it: ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν.

[9] Douglas J. Moo in *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 467–68, sums up some of the praise: "The inner sanctuary within the cathedral of Christian faith; the tree of life in the midst of the Garden of Eden; the highest peak in a range of mountains—such are some of the metaphors used by interpreters who extol chap. 8 as the greatest passage within what so many consider to be the greatest book in Scripture."

particularly interesting example of *alpha*-consonant soundplay, where Paul again plays on an Aramaic word (see 1 Corinthians 16:22 and "Maranatha"):

οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον

ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν·

αββα ὁ πατήρ.

The antithetical parallelism exposes the smooth alliteration of ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε and the parechesis of ἀλλὰ/αββα. We find the strong adversative ἀλλὰ not infrequently in parechetical relationships, its thick *lambda*'s lending themselves to functional soundplay (for example, Rom 5:15, Ἀλλ᾽ … παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῷ μᾶλλον…). We have seen especially the use of this conjunction in 1 Corinthians pericopes on speaking in tongues.

Romans 8:25 features a clever anagrammatic consecutive pair: *βλέπ*ομεν *ἐλπί*ζομεν that is nearly parechesis. The lexeme ἐλπίζομεν, in fact, is often involved in alliteration, several times with the preposition (six times in Paul: Rom 4:18, 5:2, and 15:12; 1 Cor 9:10; 1 Cor 16:7; and 2 Cor 1:3).

Romans 8 climaxes in v. 39 with subtle *delta* alliteration (οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται) within which alliterative phrase is the subtle parechesis of τις κτίσις.

Romans 9:4 and 5 contain proper names, including the commonly alliterated upon "Christ." In the phrase Ἰσραηλῖται … δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθῆκαι … λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι (v. 4), the two terms Ἰσραηλῖται and λατρεία have three consonants in common. Both statistical evidence and Pauline habit suggest that the pairing of these two words, Ἰσραηλῖται/λατρεία, is a conscious parechetical play.[10]

[10] Only thirty verses in Paul have an λ*τ*ρ* order word; only twelve have *λ*ρ* τ*; only two have *τ*ρ* λ*; only three *τ*λ* ρ*; only eight have ρ* τ* λ*; and eighteen have *ρ*λ*τ*; that is, there are only 73 verses in Paul that contain a word with all three consonants.

Romans 9:10 hosts yet another example of proper name soundplay, this time of the historically linked names of Rebecca and Isaac, whose assonantal similarity Paul takes advantage of: καὶ Ῥεβέ*κκα ἐ*ξ ἑνὸς *κ*οίτην ἔ*χ*ουσα, Ἰσα*ὰκ*.

Bullinger had noted θέλει ἐλεεῖ at Rom 9:18, which compares to Wettstein's observation at Rom 1:13. The seemingly proverbial expression of Rom 9:18 could not be more alliterative, with two pairs of parechesis in a row: … οὗν ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ.

In 9:25, we find another example of proper name soundplay on an Old Testament name—*ὡς* καὶ ἐν τῷ *Ὡσ*ηὲ (see ὡς ὡραῖοι, Rom 10:15). "Hosea" then is the fifth proper name in Rom 9 occuring in a context of soundplay.

In Rom 10:7, the rare *beta*, which is found in alliteration in Rom 2:22–29, 6:17, and 8:25, is again involved in alliteration in v. 7, καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον.

A fascinating parechesis occurs in Rom 11:3 and 4, with two relatively rare and unrelated roots: κατέ*σκαψαν*/ἔ*καμψαν*.

Just as the rare *beta* is found collocated in Romans, the rare *phi* (only 204 initial *phi* words in Paul) is surely a marker of alliteration in Rom 11:20 and 21, where four distinct *phi*-initial lexemes occur: μὴ ὑψηλὰ *φ*ρόνει ἀλλὰ *φ*οβοῦ· εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ *φ*ύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐ*φ*είσατο, [μή πως] οὐδὲ σοῦ *φ*είσεται. Clearly, *phi* words are clustered together in many places in Romans, for example, Rom 13:14: … ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ· Such soundplay illustrates the continuum from alliteration to cluster alliteration to parechesis that is characteristic of Pauline epistles.

Romans 11:33 is a prime example of soundplay selection from Paul's quoting of the Old Testament and an important indication of the source of Paul's literary inspiration. Here, two very rare words (only eighteen occurrences combined in the Old Testament) share the double prefix (a

paronomastic relationship, to be precise):

ὡς ἀνεξεραύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ

καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ.[11]

The paraneitic list of Rom 12:7–10, includes obvious soundplay, for example, the guttural-*rho*'s of vv. 14 and 15: … καταρᾶσθε. χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. At times the alliteration rises to the subtle sophistication of parechesis: ἁπλότητι… ἐλεῶν ἐν ἱλαρότητι (v. 8) and ἀπο*στυγ*οῦντες (v. 9)/φιλό*στοργ*οι (v. 10). With respect to the latter pair, Paul again is using antithetical words with similar sounds in colonic structure. Similarly, in Rom 12:16–17, the etymologically unrelated terms φρονοῦντες/προνοούμενοι are parechetically aligned:

τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες, μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ *φρονοῦν*τες …

μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες, *προνοούμεν*οι … (Rom 12:16–17).[12]

In 13:7, there can be little question that Paul deliberately alternates parechetical and alliterative lexemes in φ and τ: … ὀφειλάς… φόρον τὸν φόρον, τῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος,[13] τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμήν. As we have pointed out, Paul in v. 7 alliterates so blatantly that this assemblage of sound would have met with the disapproval of the author of *Ad Herennium*, who expressed his disdain for the tautogram in Ennius.[14]

Parechesis in *gamma* (with *nu*'s) is clever in 13:11: ἐγερθῆ*ναι, νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερ*ον. In Rom

[11] In the LXX, the second term is usually collocated with another guttural, in Job, for instance, ἀνεξιχνίαστα ἔνδοξά (Job 5:9); ἀνεξιχνίαστα ἔνδοξά τε καὶ ἐξαίσια (Job 9:10); and ἀνεξιχνίαστα ἔνδοξά τε καὶ ἐξαίσια (Job 34:24).

[12] "Be of the same mind toward one another.…

Repay no one evil for evil. Have regard for …"

[13] ὀφειλάς and τέλος, it may be no coincidence, are parechetical rhymes.

[14] See *Rhet. Her.*, 4.12. Thus, Paul's advice to those in Quintilian's Rome might be considered one notably ironic example, with its parechesis and deliberately overbearing alliteration: ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον, τῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος, τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμήν (Rom 13:7).

14:2 and 4, parechesis similar to that of 1 Cor 8:7 and 10 plays out, preceded by typical Pauline *pi* alliteration: … πιστεύει *φ*αγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ *ἀ*σθενῶν … *ἐ*σθίει. ὁ *ἐ*σθίων τὸν μὴ *ἐ*σθίοντα μὴ *ἐ*ξουθενείτω. Another example of parechesis of distant terms is possible in vv. 10 and 15, βήματι/βρώματί in Rom 14:10 and 15. Though separated by nearly eighty words, the two terms certainly fall within the same pericope. A much more obvious example of parechesis is found in 15:13, with two objects of parallel prepositional phrases:

ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν,

εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν.

The parechesis of πιστεύειν/περισσεύειν might be seen as a culmination in the slightly wider context of *pi* alliteration in a verse of seven *pi* prominent words: … ἐλπίδος πληρώσαι … πάσης … ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν … ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι … πνεύματος ἁγίου (Rom 15:13).

Finally in Rom 15, proper name parechesis is evident in the result clause of 15:19b: καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ (Rom 15:19).

The final chapter of Romans is not lacking in soundplay, as even this longest of epistles is propagated throughout by a repertoire of rhetorical devices. More play on proper names is evident in the first verse with *phi*'s, Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν, and gutturals, τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς, (Rom 16:1), Paul again using ἐκκλησίας euphonically. The *kappa* alliteration is enticed by the highly guttural name Κεγχρεαῖς and continues throughout the second verse, in a scheme that comprehends the parechesis of ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων (Rom 16:2).[15]

In Rom 16:18 occurs an example of parechesis that Wilke in the nineteenth century had alluded to: κυρίῳ/κοιλίᾳ.[16] It is yet another of the dozens of examples in Paul discernible from

[15] See Mark 1:6 ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

[16] Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik*, 413. Compare 1 Cor 6:13.

the antithetical structure:

οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι τῷ κυρίῳ …

ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ.[17]

[17] In fact, a *kappa* theme is evident in the broader context of vv. 17 and 18:

καὶ ἐκκλίνετε ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν· … κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ … κοιλίᾳ, καὶ … χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας [paronomasia] ἐξαπατῶσιν τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων. (Rom 16:17b–18).

CHAPTER SEVEN

PHILIPPIANS

Introduction

"Wordplay, assonance, alliteration, chiasmus, and repetition are found throughout Philippians,"[1] claimed Paul Hartog in 2010, an assertion so obvious, it seems, that he availed himself of no space to cite any examples of it. Casey Wayne Davis some ten years earlier (1999) had become is one of the few exegetes involved in twentieth century New Testament rhetorical criticism to focus on orality in Philippians, noting "instances of sound grouping" in Philippians 2:3–13: ὑπερέχοντας (2.3); ὑπάρχων (2.6); ὑπήκοος (2.8); ὑπερύψωσεν (2.9); ὑπὲρ (2.9); ὑπηκούσατε (2.12); ὑπὲρ (2.13)[2] and "possible instances of sound grouping"[3] in the *zeta* words of 3:6, 7, and 8, respectively, ζῆλος/ζημίαν/ἐζημιώθην; and cluster alliteration in v. 18 through 21: πολλοὶ/πολλάκις/πολίτευμα; and σωτῆρα/σῶμα/σώματι."[4] Nonetheless, Davis left much to be discovered, as the summary in Table 9 at the end of the dissertation suggests.

In addition to, and in some sense culminating, the many instances of alliteration Phil 1 are the following examples of parechesis:

> δεήσει (v. 4) and δεσμοῖς (v. 7); δεσμοῖς (v. 17) and δεήσεως (v. 19); πεποιθὼς (v. 6) and ἐπιποθῶ (v. 8); εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν (v. 12); ἀπρόσκοποι (v. 10) and προκοπὴν (v. 12); Χριστὸς and κέρδος (v. 21, noted by Fee [see below]); and Χριστῷ and κρεῖσσον (v. 23). περισσεύῃ … παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς…. (v. 26); πιστεύειν πάσχειν (v. 29).[5]

---

[1] Paul Hartog, "Philippians," in *Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, ed. David E. Aune (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 478.

[2] Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism*, 82 n59. Unfortunately, Davis failed to take account of ὑπήκοος (v. 8) and ὑπηκούσατε (v. 12).

[3] Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism*, 82.

[4] Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism*, 82.

[5] We note that Paul's parechesis does not always include homoteleuton, yet Paul frequently exploits this figure of speech as well. Phil 1:27 is a prime example: ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς εἴτε ἀπὼν ἀκούω τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν.…

Some explication of the instances above is in order. Phil 1:12 is blatantly alliterative, including the consecutive pair εὐαγγελίου *ἐλήλ*υθεν. The perfect form is found only 37 times in the Greek Scriptures and only here in Paul. Its unusual placement—a main verb ending a Pauline clause—suggests syntactical creativity. Moreover, Paul alliterates occasionally on the technical term εὐαγγέλιον, which occurs 62 times in Paul. Subtle alliteration on the *epsilon-lambda* combination especially can be discerned in many instances.

These observations notwithstanding, throughout exegetical history there has basically been but one identification of parechesis in the quite poetical letter of Philippians, and that at v. 21. In 1994, Gordon Fee had made the finding explicit in his commentary, although he did not use the term parechesis: Χριστὸς and κέρδος. Again, antithetical parallelism makes the case clear:

To live is Χριστὸς

And to die is κέρδος.

The antithetical terms of "life" and "death" yield at the end of each colon a guttural-*rho*-dental combination that is classical parechesis.[6] We have already seen Russell's identification of a similar soundplay at 2 Cor 1:21, Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας (two words technically of the same stem), and another phonological similarity occurs just two verses later, in the parallel terms of Phil 1:23, Χριστῷ and κρεῖσσον. These two parechetical terms are preceded by the paronomasia of συνέχομαι … ἔχων and separated by the intervening parechesis of πολλῷ μᾶλλον: thus, Χριστῷ εἶναι, πολλῷ [γὰρ] μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον (Phil 1:23). See also κέρδη, ταῦτα ἥγημαι διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν (3:7) and Χριστὸν κερδήσω (3:8). And there is further internal evidence in the first chapter of Philippians. Verse 29 leaves little doubt as to Paul's intention with respect to sound: ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ **(**Phil 1:29). Clearly, there is a pattern here of juxtaposing guttural-*rho* words with

[6] Recall that Quintilian pointed out that when similar sounding words occur in parallel bicolonic structure, the Stoic Theon called it πάρισον (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.76).

the Χριστὸς lexeme. In fact, the vast majority (more than twenty) of the thirty-seven occurrences of the name "Christ" in Philippians are juxtaposed with a guttural, usually a guttural-*rho* cluster.

In Phil 1:29–30 is a superlative example of Paul's mastery of the bicolonic parechesis:

ὅτι ὑμῖν ἐ*χαρίσ*θη

τὸ ὑπὲρ *Χριστ*οῦ,

οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν *πιστεύειν*

ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ *πάσχειν,*

τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα *ἔχοντες,*

οἷον εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ νῦν *ἀκούετε*

ἐν ἐμοί.

Bridging Phil 1 and 2 is the parechesis of ἀγῶνα/ἀγάπην:

αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα (1:30)

αὐτὴν ἀγάπην (2:2).

A significant contribution to understanding the Christological issues of Phil 2:6 comes from an appreciation of the triple parechesis: ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο. This exegetical insight will be more fully examined at the end of this chapter.

Many other instances of parechetical soundplay in Philippians could withstand the test of statistical analysis. In Phil 2:27 is the fortuitous parechesis of παραπλήσιον/ἠλέησεν, a contrastive antithetical parechesis ("near death but God had mercy") situated in a *theta* scheme:

καὶ γὰρ ἠσθένησεν παραπλήσιον θανάτῳ·

ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς ἠλέησεν αὐτόν.… (Phil 2:27)

In the first verse of Phil 3 is the parechetical triplet ὑμῖν ἐμοὶ μὲν (Phil 3:1).[7]

[7] In v. 2, an understanding of alliteration illuminates yet another major exegetical question in Philippians, namely, the identity or referent of "dogs." The tricolonic alliteration goes a long way toward explaining the meaning

The paronomasia of κατατομήν/περιτομή in Phil 3:2–3 has been acknowledged in exegesis since at least Bede but not the parechesis of ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι (Phil 3:3). It is by now almost inconceivable that Paul, in such control of his craft, would accidentally dictate two consecutive nouns of such similar sound, but as evidence we find πνεύματι in alliteration in several verses: for example, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε (Gal 5:16); παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι (Gal 6:1); σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι (1 Cor 5:3); ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (1 Cor 6:11); πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι (Rom 2:29), etc.

Parechesis may help resolve a textual critical question at Phil 3:8: μενοῦνγε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι … versus the Byzantine μὲν[1] οὖν καὶ ἡγοῦμαι. The former includes the guttural-nasal cluster similar to ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο in 2:6.

Within the series of *kappa* alliteratives Phil 3:10–14, with five κατα paronomastic words, is the clever internal parechesis of v. 11, where Paul deliberately collocates κατ*αντήσ*ω εἰς τὴν ἐξ*ανάστ*ασιν. Here Paul departs from his usual expression for "resurrection" in order to effect a soundplay.

More parechesis is evident in the terms ἀδελφοί/κατειληφέναι in v. 13, the second term parechetical with a third: κατειληφέναι/ἐπιλανθανόμενος,[8] as Paul draws on four forms (*figura etymologica*) of λαμβάνω in vv. 12 and 13: ἔλαβον, καταλάβω, κατελήμφθην, and κατειληφέναι.

---

of "dog"—or limiting our explanation:

> Βλέπετε τοὺς *κύνας*,
>
> βλέπετε τοὺς *κακοὺς* ἐργάτας,
>
> βλέπετε τὴν *κατατομήν*. (Phil 3:2)

Recall, for example, the *kappa* alliteration of 1 Cor 15:58b, εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν κενὸς ἐν κυρίῳ, noted by Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation*, 161.

[8] See similar parechesis at James1:24, ἀπελήλυθεν καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο. Paul frequently alliterates *phi*'s with *theta*'s, it would appear.

Phillippians 4 presents both one of the most obvious proper name soundplays in Paul and one of the most subtle, respectively, with the names Συντύχην[9] and Εὐοδίαν. Although proper names themselves may seem obligatory inclusions in a text, they nonetheless may still motivate soundplay. That seems to be the case with both Εὐοδίαν and Συντύχην in verse 2. The second name, with its συν- prefix, is followed by a series of sibilant sounds: σέ, γνήσιε σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνου … συνήθλησάν … συνεργῶν … ζωῆς. a συν-theme evident not only to us but to the original hearers of the epistle, including Syntyche herself.[10] There are only thirty occurrences of σὺν in Paul, seven of them in Philippians. The prefix or preposition is surprisingly rare in Paul, with just over 200 occurrences (< 1%), but Paul concentrates four such words in v. 3, moments after articulating the proper name. Moreover, in v. 3: the poignant singular second person pronoun, which makes little sense in context,[11] is well explained by the sibilance.

Others have identified paronomastic play in Phil 4: 2–3. Davis notes how these verses "are set off as much by the four-fold use of the sun-prefix in v. 3, playing off Συντύχην (proper name, Syntyche) in v. 2."[12] Credit also belongs to T.R. Glover who in 1938 had noted the abundance.[13]

---

[9] Farrar, in 1879, had identified proper name soundplay at Phil 4:2–3, σύζυγε/Συντύχην (Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, 629). Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik*, 411, had noted similar paronomias in Ephesians: συνεζωοποίησεν συνήγειρεν συνεκάθισεν.

[10] Recall the onomatapoetic sibilance of Luke 22:31 where Jesus rhetorically hisses a warning to Peter—Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον—with the parechesis σατανᾶς/σῖτον.

[11] Paul commonly uses the second person singular with plural force, as a literary device—especially in Romans where since Bultmann it has been identified as a diatribic device, or as an epistolary address—but not when explicitly addressing more than one person, as here. By comparison, he uses the plural form well over 500 times. Of the eighty-four instances in Paul of the second person singular, twenty found in Philemon, too many of them alliterate to be passed off as chance collocations.

[12] Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism*, 82.

[13] Terrot R. Glover, *Paul of Tarsus* (New York: George H. Doran, 1925), 178–79. The συν theme appears to be part of a larger *sigma* theme that may mark a particular division in Paul's dictation of the letter. The *sigma* theme throughout Phil 3 and 4 might be highlighted as follows:

συμμορφιζόμενος (3:10) … σκοπὸν (3:14) … στοιχεῖν (3:16) Συμμιμηταί μου (3:17) … σταυροῦ (3:18) … σωτῆρα (3:20) … μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα (3:21) … σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι … στέφανός μου (4:1) , οὕτως στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ … Συντύχην (4:2) … σέ, γνήσιε σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνου … συνήθλησάν … συνεργῶν … ζωῆς. (4:3). By contrast, there are no *sigma* initals in 4:4–7.

But neither author properly called this ploy *paronomasia*. Properly speaking, this is classical prefix paronomasia, a device too obvious and the probabilities too low for this to be anything other than intentional.[14]

Συντύχην then is clearly one in the now long list of names in the Pauline epistles that is attended by soundplay. The question now is whether εὐωδίας in v. 18 is intentional parechesis with the other proper name in v. 2, Εὐοδίαν. Compared to the rare συν, there are even fewer εὐ words in Paul, only 170 total, 62 of these accounted for by εὐαγγέλιον, twenty-two (22) by εὐχαριστῶ. The rare εὐωδίας is found only here, in v. 18, and in 2 Cor 2 Cor 2:15–17 where we have suggested parechesis of ἐσμὲν/ὀσμὴ … ὀσμὴ /ἐσμεν. The term εὐωδίας by virtue of this rarity alone looks like a classic parechetical match for Εὐοδίαν. But is this a stretch of exegetical imagination? There are 270 words separating the two terms.[15] But in the same chapter, six εὐ words intervene to strengthen the connection, three of them rare: εὐαγγελίῳ (v. 3), εὐχαριστίας (v. 6), εὔφημα (v. 8) εὐαγγελίου (v. 15), and … [Ἐπαφροδίτου] … εὐωδίας … εὐάρεστον (v. 18). Just as with συν, this is the highest sustained concentration of the relatively rare prefix in Paul.[16] Both proper names in Phil 4:2, then, should be considered members of respective

[14] Adding to the point is the highly alliterative (sibilant and guttural) series γνήσιε σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνου (Phil 4:3).

[15] Recall that the parechesis we are claiming in 1 Thessalonians involved words separated by a similar distance: 15 words separating ἀδιαλείπτως and ἐλπίδος and 28 words between *ἀδιαλείπ*τως and *ἀδελφ*οί. Questions of distance will again confuscate matters with the important issue of proper name soundplay in the final letter of Paul, Philemon. There is some evidence from classical Greek as well that wordplay can span some distance. O'Hara calls on the "well-known example" of proper name play on "Odysseus" from *Odyssey* 19. Autolycus says of himself that he is a "source of pain' (ὀδυσσάμενος) to many; thus his grandson should be called Odysseus (O'Hara, *True Names*, 9). The distance of ten words is no impediment to soundplay connection:

> πολλοῖσιν γὰρ ἐγώ γε *ὀδυσσάμενος* τόδ᾽ ἱκάνω,
> ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναιξὶν ἀνὰ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν:
> τῷ δ᾽ *Ὀδυσεὺς* ὄνομ᾽ ἔστω ἐπώνυμον: αὐτὰρ ἐγώ γε,
> (*Od*. 19. 407–409)

Some distance often exists between the proper name and the eponymous word in the explanation. See, e.g., O'Hara, *True Names*, 30 n130.

[16] The first chapter of Galatians is dominated by the εὐαγγέλιον theme.

soundplay.[17]

In Phil 4:12, πεινᾶν καὶ περισσεύειν is yet another example of parechesis with the conjunction, the verse propagated in *pi* alliteration: …ταπεινοῦσθαι … περισσεύειν· ἐν παντὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν … πεινᾶν καὶ περισσεύειν…. (Phil 4:12).

Finally, the elliptical v. 15 is a masterful display of soundplay, practically every syllable involved. We see balanced clauses with aspirated *omega* parechesis, vowel-guttural and *lambda* alliteration and *mu* alliteration off of, predictably, the proper name:

οἴδατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππήσιοι,

ὅτι ἐν *ἀρχῇ* τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,

ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ *Μ*ακεδονίας,

*οὐδεμία μοι ἐκ*κλησία *ἐκ*οινώνησεν

εἰς *λ*όγον δό*σεως* καὶ *λ*ήμ*ψεως*

εἰ *μ*ὴ ὑ*μ*εῖς *μ*όνοι,

At the very least, οἴδατε … ὅτι … ὅτε … οὐδεμία in this verse must be considered parechetical.

In light of the above instances of parechesis in Philippians, we now turn to perhaps the most important exegetical question in the epistle.

[17] It is possible that a third proper name play can be brought to light, on the name Clement. *Mu* and nasal themes are evident in 4:3, which lead to the climactic "names in the Book of Life": ναὶ … συνήθλησάν μοι μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος … μου… ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς. (Phil 4:3). Consecutive *mu*'s occur only about thirty times in Paul, with four in Philippians, including μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε, (Phil 4:6) and the highly alliterative 2:12, … μὴ ὡς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου μόνον ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου, μετὰ …. The wordplay on Clement is easily missed if one pays no attention to the final syllables, but the initial letters are also a clue. *Kappa* alliteration extends to the next two verses: …καὶ Κλήμεντος …. Χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ πάντοτε· πάλιν ἐρῶ, χαίρετε. τὸ ἐπιεικὲς …. ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς (Phil 4:3–5).

Klement is not the only *kappa* initial name in Paul introduced with alliteration. In Philippians, in addition to Phil 4:3 we also have Phil 4:22–23, ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ … (Phil 4:22–23).

Exegetical Analysis: Philippians 2:6 and The Hymn of Humility

In spite of thorough and influential twentieth century studies such as R. P. Martin's *Carmen Christi*, there is still an unsettled state of affairs with regard to not only one of the most important but also one of the most difficult exegetical questions in Pauline theology, found in Phil 2:5–11. Regarding the pericope generally as a liturgical section, as a hymn, broadly understood, has the qualified consensus of scholars. The main reason for this attribution is the style of the section. Considering the third aspect of rhetoric, namely, the stylistic, and the aurality, Martin observed "a certain rhythmical lilt when the passages are read aloud, the presence of *parallelismus membrorum* (that is, an arrangement into units of parallel thoughts), the semblance of some metre, and the presence of rhetorical devices such as alliteration, chiasmus, and antithesis."[18] Martin's unelaborated observation of "alliteration" was an expression more of his ken than of any systematic analysis. Our own contribution to interpretation focuses specifically on the phonology of the hymn, which in turn reflects on the debated meaning of words.

History of Interpretation of ἁρπαγμός in Philippians 2:6

Scholars have puzzled over elements of the Christological theme of this pericope with its apparently hymnic language and rhythm. The Christological question centers largely on one key term in v. 6, the term ἁρπαγμός, at the center of the mystery. The term "has proved a sore trial to philologists and lexographers, and to those who rely on their work,"[19] N. T. Wright commiserates, reviewing the attempts of some of the best known theologians of the nineteenth and twentieth century. For centuries, the question has been whether ἁρπαγμός signifies "luck,

[18] R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi*, 12–13 n1.

[19] N. T. Wright, "ἁρπαγμὸς and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5–11'," *JTS* 37 (1986): 321.

fortune, godsend, windfall"[20] or "abduction/robbery," passive or active verbal ideas. The semantic dilemma, Hoover writes, "has dogged the interpretation of Phil 2:6 since the time of the Christological controversies of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries."[21] Plunder or usurpation, which is it? "Between these two explanations," Lightfoot, the nineteenth century's most important English commentator on Philippians, determines, "our choice must be made."[22] Yet the decision seems irreconcilable. Lightfoot concedes, "All attempts to mediate between the two opposite explanations fail in the same way and tend only to confuse the interpretation of the passage."[23] Others, following Lightfoot, have not been so pessimistic. Some progress, in fact, was made in the early twentieth century.

In 1915, Werner Jaeger, perusing the work of Wettstein,[24] searched for secular Greek parallels and made an interesting discovery: that ἁρπαγμός in both pre-and post-Pauline sources was often in collocation with certain words, in particular, ἕρμαιον and εὕρημα. (It should immediately be noted that these two words are parechetical.) Moreover, Jaeger reported, the

[20] Hoover, 114–115 uses this latter term, "godsend." "windfall" depending on context (Hoover, "Harpagmon," 114–15.

[21] Hoover, "Harpagmos," 118.

[22] Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 136.

[23] Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Philippians,* 137. In 1868, Lightfoot had reviewed the earliest opinions of the Greek and Latin church fathers as well as the prevailing opinions of his own day and noted "two principal interpretations of οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο depending on the different senses assigned to ἁρπαγμός. In one the prominent idea is the *assertion,* in the other the *surrender,* of privileges" (Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Philippians,* 133). In the end, Lightfoot was dissatisfied with both. "All attempts to mediate between the two opposite explanations fail in the same way and tend only to confuse the interpretation of the passage," he concludes (*Philippians,* 137). On the one hand, the interpretation of "robbery/plundering" and thus "usurpation" of the Latin fathers has problems. For one thing, "It neglects the foregoing words." Further, he writes, "this rendering fails entirely to explain the emphatic position of ἁρπαγμὸν (Phil 2:6)" (*Philippians,* 134). The interpretation of the Latin fathers, Lightfoot astutely points out, was made "without reference to the original [Greek]" (Lightfoot 134). In the end, the great commentator sides slightly with the view of ἁρπαγμὸν as something akin to "prize"—"This is the common and indeed almost universal interpretation of the Greek fathers," Lightfoot finds, (135) adding pointedly, "who would have the most lively sense of the requirements of the language" (*Philippians,* 135). The two interpretations that Lightfoot elucidates are "directly opposed" (Lightfoot, *Philippians,* 136).

[24] Jaeger's findings relied on Wettstein's two volume *Novum Testamentum Graecum* of 1751/52.

associated terms ἕρμαιον and εὕρεμα and ἁρπαγμὸν frequently occur with the same verb that we find in Phil 2:6, ἡγήσατο.[25] Jaeger came close but, with the evidence of four aspirated words in front of him, never noted the phonological similarities. Nor did subsequent commentators.

Perhaps the most thorough semantic treatment to date is by Roy W. Hoover who took on the challenge of the "much disputed phrase"[26] in a 1971 *Harvard Theological Review* article whose title summed up the continuing challenge: "The Harpagmos Enigma."[27] After reviewing the twentieth century's failed efforts from some of its most famous New Testament scholars, Hoover takes what he calls a "philological" approach,[28] reaffirming Jaeger's finding that in ancient texts *harpagmon* is often associated with certain words. Unfortunately, his solution re-focuses the discussion on the *meaning* rather than the sound of these words. Nonetheless, Hoover's valuable revistation of Jaeger's study offers all the evidence for a solution to the enigma, for the findings of Jaeger and others actually contribute to our thesis more than to their own.

A Phonological Solution: ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο

When we take a close look at Phil 2:6, we see three words in triple parechesis: ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο. In particular, the otherwise enigmatic terms ὑπάρχων and ἁρπαγμὸν

[25] Werner Jaeger, "*Eine stilgeschichtliche Studie zum Philipperbrief*," *Hermes* 50 (1915), 537–53, strove to precisely define *harpagmon* and argued that it is found elsewhere in ancient Greek meaning "good fortune" rather than "robbery."

[26] Roy W. Hoover, "The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution" *HTR* 64 (1971), 95.

[27] Hoover, "The Harpagmos Enigma," 95–96, argues that the matter requires "an awareness of the style-history of such idiomatic expressions" as the one in Phil 2:6.

[28] His findings are, Hoover is forced to admit ("Enigma," 118), not without at least one exception. To be specific, Hoover's so-called philological approach distinguished between syntactical contexts, when *harpagmos* was found in a double accusative construction (as in Phil 2:6) versus a single accusative or "predicate accusative." He concludes that *harpagmos* in secular contexts referred to an "abduction" (Hoover, "Enigma," 112–113). Ultimately, however, Hoover's focus too is on the semantics. It is based on this consideration that he translates the enigmatic phrase as follows: "He did not regard being equal with God as *something to take advantage of*" ("Harpagmos," 118).

share rough breathing, *pi, alpha, rho,* guttural, o sound, and *nun*—seven phonological elements. That commonality easily exceeds the definition of parechesis and far exceeds probability criteria. In fact, the coincidence constitutes an anagram, a commonality of letters and sounds that is a creatively conscious choice on the part of the author, in this case, if you will, the hymnist.

As Jaeger has shown with the objectivity of an exclusively semantic focus, ἁρπαγμὸν is frequently collocated with ἕρμαιον, εὕρημα, and ἡγήσατο, all rough breathing words, a fact that neither Jaeger nor Hoover noticed. Jaeger's prime specimen is from a time two to three hundred years after Paul, Heliodorus's ancient romance, *Aethiopica,* 7.20: οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν οὐδὲ ἕρμαιον ποιεῖται τὸ πρᾶγμα.[29] Here, clearly, is the parechesis of ἁρπαγμὸν/πρᾶγμα. Though *Aethiopica* is from the third or fourth century AD, it draws on Homeric literature and such phraseology involving the word ἁρπαγμὸν is actually found in numerous places in ancient Greek literature: in Thucydides, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Josephus, and others.[30] A second instance of the ancient novelist's use of the parechetical terms makes the case clear: οὐχ γάρ ἁρπαγμὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα (*Aeth*., 4.6),[31] again classic parechesis of the kind that Paul not infrequently employs. Yet a third use by Heliodorus is just as confirming: δὴ ἡ[32] … ἅρπαγμα καὶ ὥσπερ ἄγρας ἀρχήν (*Aeth*., 7.11), where the collocations of sound in this poetic romance, including ἅρπαγμα/ἄγρας ἀρχήν, can no longer be considered chance eventualities. Hoover reports all three uses and yet fails to note the soundplay.

In his concluding remarks, Hoover notes that the evidential term εὕρεμα occurs in Sirach

[29] "And does not make the matter *harpagmos* nor luck." In addition to the rough breathings, the initial *pi*'s should be considered in our interpretation.

[30] Jaeger, "*Eine stilgeschichtliche Studie zum Philipperbrief*," 537–53, reported in Hoover, "Harpagmos," 95 and 95 n3. Neither he nor Jaeger recognize the rhyme.

[31] "The matter is not harpagma" as Hoover, "Harpagmos," 112, noncommittally translates.

[32] Compare the parechesis from pseudo-Plutarch's *Vit. Hom.* 38, δὴν ἦν.

and in Jeremiah.[33] What he fails to note is the overwhelming evidence of assonance in most of the word's seven biblical occurrences:

> ἔστιν εὐοδία ἐν κακοῖς ἀνδρί καὶ ἔστιν εὕρεμα εἰς ἐλάττωσιν (Sir 20:9; six *epsilon*'s in ten words);
>
> πολλοὶ *ὡς εὕ*ρεμα *ἐ*νόμισαν … (Sir 29:4);
>
> ἐὰν ἰσχύσῃ μόλις κομίσεται τὸ ἥμισυ καὶ λογιεῖται αὐτὸ ὡς εὕρεμα (Sir 29:6; note the parechetical resemblance of ἰσχύσῃ/ἥμισυ/ὡς εὕρεμα);
>
> *ζήσεται* καὶ *ἔσται* ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς *εὕ*ρεμα καὶ ζήσεται *ὅτι οὕτως εἶ*πεν κύριος (Jer 45:2–3; parechesis of *ζήσεται* καὶ *ἔσται*);
>
> … καὶ ἔσται ἡ ψυχή σου *εἰς εὕρεμα ὅτι ἐ*πεποίθεις *ἐ*π᾽ *ἐ*μοί φησὶν κύριος (Jer 46:18).

In the long history of Greek literature, ἁρπαγμός is also involved in etymological wordplay. Secular scholar James O'Hara, quite apart from any interest in Philippians 2, notes that ἁρπαγμὸν is involved in etymological wordplay in Plautus's *Pseudolus* where "a character named Harpax says he is known for capturing (*rapio= harpazo*) the enemy alive."[34]

Perhaps Martin Dibelius, *An die Thessalonicher I, II. An die Philipper,* came closest to Paul's intent. Hoover ultimately joins with Dibelius's conclusion:

> The ἁρπαγμός remark cannot be interpreted on a narrow terminological basis, but must be understood as a poetic-hymnic expression.… In [Dibelius's] treatment of the text "poetic sensitivity" was made to furnish what philological data had not provided.[35]

Evidence from Scripture

Cognates of ἁρπαγμὸς occur thirty-six times in the entire Greek Bible, nine times in the New Testament, including four times in Paul (Phil 2:6, 1 Thess 4:17, 1 Cor 6:10, 2 Cor 12:2). Of

[33] Hoover, "Harpagmos," 119 notes occurrences of εὕρεμα in the OT but only looks at the meaning.

[34] O'Hara, *True Names*, 1. In another example, from a second-century AD astrological work by Vettius Valens, *harpagmos* is in parallel with Ἄρης, which looks to be proper name soundplay of the kind over and over to be found in Homer.

[35] Martin Dibelius, *An die Thessalonicher I, II. An die Philipper,* Band XI. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 11 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1925), 76, reported by Hoover, "Harpagmos," 100.

the nine New Testament uses, the two Matthean occurrences show evidence of sound interest: … *ἅρπαγες. ἀπ*ὸ τῶν κ*αρπ*ῶν (Matt 7:15–16); and in Matt 23:25 the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees are filled with ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, as should not be unexpected, there is assonantal soundplay: ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν (Heb 10:34).

Post-Pauline exegesis of Phil 2:6 is also enlightening. Gregory of Nazianzus, apparently referring to the passage, wrote with obvious alliteration, οὐχ ἅρπαγμα τύχης, ἀλλ᾽ ἀρετῆς ἄθλον.[36] Expositing the text of Phil 2:6, Isidore, Bishop of Pelusium (4th–5th century AD) was apparently keenly aware of the rough breathings as he imitatively writes, Εἰ ἕρμαιον ἡγήσατο … ἑαυτὸν ἐταπείνωσεν, ἵνα μὴ ὑπερισσεία … ἅτε ἅρπαγμα ἢ εὕρεμα τὴν ἀξίαν ἡγησάμενος….[37]

Table 10 at the end of the dissertation summarizes ancient Greek uses of the term ἁρπαγμός.

Evidence from biblical usage of the copulative ὑπάρχω, used in Phil 2:6, is even more convincing. The longer guttural copulative ὑπάρχω occurs twelve times in Paul and 179 times total in the Greek Bible. In all twelve instances in Paul it is found in alliterative verses, often with guttural/*chi* eminent words (recall that the statistical frequency of *chi* is only 4.5%), as Table 11 at the end of the dissertation displays.

The Evidence of Aspirated Lexemes in Philippians 2

The contextual evidence of Phil 2 supports a theory of intentional soundplay. The verses that are often regarded as hymnic are comprised of many instances of paronomasia and alliteration:

---

[36] "Not as the booty of fortune but the reward of virtue." Compare the *alphas* of *ἀλλ*᾽ οἱ μὲν εὐγενῶς ἀποθανόντες ἐπλήρωσαν τὴν εἰς τὸν *θεὸν* εὐσέβειαν σὺ δὲ κακῶς οἰμώξεις τοὺς τῆς *ἀρετῆς ἀγωνιστὰς ἀναιτίως ἀποκτεῖνας ὅθεν* καὶ αὐτὸς ἀ*ποθνήσ*κειν…. (4 Macc 12:14–15). NB: the distinct possibility of deliberate parechesis on *θεὸν/ὅθεν*.

[37] Isidore, Bishop of Pelusium, *Ep*. 4.22, MPG 78, 1072; reported in Hoover, "Harpagmon," 102.

παράκλησις … παραμύθιον (v. 1); paronomasia: φρονῆτε… φρονοῦντες (v. 2) … ταπεινοφροσύνη (v. 2); ἔχοντες (v. 2) and ὑπερέχοντας (v. 3); κατὰ κενοδοξίαν and ἀλλὰ … ἀλλήλους (v. 3) … ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοποῦντες (v. 4), *ἐ*πουρανίων καὶ *ἐ*πιγείων *κ*αὶ *κ*αταχθονίων (v. 10); *π*άντοτε ὑπηκούσατε … *π*αρουσίᾳ … ἀπουσίᾳ and *μ*ου *μόνον* ἀλλὰ *νῦν* πολλῷ μᾶλλον[38] (v. 12), etc.

Davis has shown that ὑπ[ερ]- paronomasia is prevalent in Phil 2, and, in fact, the rough breathings, some of which Davis has identified, are a key to appreciating the phonology of the hymn. In addition to the seven words Davis noted—ὑπερέχοντας (v. 3); ὑπάρχων (v. 6); ὑπήκοος (v. 8); ὑπερύψωσεν (v. 9); ὑπὲρ (v. 9); ὑπηκούσατε (v. 12); ὑπὲρ (v. 13)—we add ὑπήκοος (v. 8) and ὑπηκούσατε (v. 12). Rough breathings, it might be argued, demarcate a phonological motif that actually begins at the end of v. 3:[39]

… ἡγούμενοι[40] ὑπερέχοντας [See ἔχοντες v. 2] ἑαυτῶν (v. 3),

μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοποῦντες

ἀλλὰ [καὶ] τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι.… (v. 4)

ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο … (v. 6)

ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι … εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος (v. 7) … ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος (v. 8) … ὑπερύψωσεν … ὑπὲρ … (v. 9) ἵνα …. (v. 10).

Perhaps most interesting beyond the busy alliteration of ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο (v. 6) is the double, interwoven parechesis of v. 12. The euphonious μου μόνον ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῷ μᾶλλον weaves two overlapping plays on sound: *μ*ου *μόνον* … *νῦν* and ἀλλὰ … πολλῷ μᾶλλον. In fact, v. 12 holds the distinction of containing the most *mu* initial words in Paul, with seven.[41]

---

[38] I.e., the interweaving of *μ*ου *μόνον* … *νῦν* and ἀλλὰ … πολλῷ μᾶλλον.

[39] Melito's obviously hymnic *Peri Pascha* also exhibits the relative pronoun assonance.

[40] See the anagram at Philippians 3:8, μενοῦνγε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι.

[41] Ὥστε, ἀγαπητοί μου, καθὼς πάντοτε ὑπηκούσατε,
μὴ ὡς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου μόνον ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου,
μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε· (Phil 2:12) Note the paronomasia of παρουσίᾳ … ἀπουσίᾳ. A similar verse in Homer, *Od* 15:401, "est un nid de paréchèses," Bérard, *Odyssée*, 16,

Thus, when we consider the hymn from the perspective that seems most natural for the genre, the conclusion seems obvious. The hymnist is alliterating and choosing words partly on the basis of sound, including the use of ἁρπαγμός.

perceives, explicitly citing the alliteration of πο, πα, πο, πα and the *lambda*'s of λα, λα, λε [here he recognizes the synaptic sound], λη: and "l'assonance" of πάθη, ἐπαληθῇ, and μεταλλᾷς: (though even this perception is but partial recognition of the many elements of sound):

> κήδεσιν ἀλλήλων τερπώμεθα λευγαλέοισι,
> μνωομένω: μετὰ γάρ τε καὶ ἄλγεσι τέρπεται ἀνήρ,
> ὅς τις δὴ μάλα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ πόλλ᾽ ἐπαληθῇ.
> τοῦτο δέ τοι ἐρέω ὅ μ᾽ ἀνείρεαι ἠδὲ μεταλλᾷς. (Od. 15: 399-402)

CHAPTER EIGHT

PHILEMON

Introduction

Philemon has been subjected to rhetorical analysis, most notably by F. Forrester Church,[1] a helpful structural epistolographic analysis by John White,[2] and, more recently, the "multidimensional approach" of the SBL's Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity (RRA) series.[3] Church begins with a promising cliché, "What has Paul to do with Quintilian?" and promises "a rhetorical study of the letter to Philemon," hypothesizing that "Paul too employed basic tactics of persuasion taught and widely practice in his day." He identifies the letter as "deliberative," analyzes its parts, and quotes Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, but identifies no figures of speech.[4] This kind of oversight is typical of New Testament rhetorical criticism's analyses of all of Paul's letters.

Philemon is, in fact, alliterative from the first to the last verse, just as are all Paul's letters. The obvious alliteration with *phi* in v. 1–2, for example, ὁ ἀδελφὸς Φιλήμονι … καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ, has implications: There now stands the possibility that both the recipient—Philemon—and the potential beneficiary—Onesimus—are the subjects of soundplay. The fact of pervasive alliteration is the best inherent support for a theory of deliberate soundplay on the name of Onesimus, a question that has interested exegetes.

---

[1] F. Forrester Church, "Rhetorical Structure and Design in Paul's Letter to Philemon," *HTR* 71 (1978): 17–33.

[2] John White, "The Structural Analysis of Philemon: A Point of Departure in the Formal Analysis of the Pauline Letter," SBLASP (Missoula: Schoalrs Press, 1971), 1–47.

[3] Roy R. Jeal, *Exploring Philemon: Freedom, Brotherhood and Partnership in the New Society* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015). In spite of a great emphasis on both rhetoric and word*play* in the Preface, the commentary includes no mention of alliteration or parechesis.

[4] Church, "Rhetorical Structure and Design," 18.

Exegetical Analysis: Philemon—Soundplay on the name "Onesimus"

We are now in a better position to adjudicate the question of proper name soundplay in Philemon, namely, whether ὀναίμην in v. 20 is deliberate soundplay on the name of Onesimus or whether it represents one half of a mere coincidence.

The History of the Debate

With a dismissal that undoubtedly dissuaded NT exegesis for generations, BDF §488.1b denies that there is intentional soundplay: "Paul is not playing upon the name of the slave Onesimus, although he uses ὀναίμην only here ([Philemon] 20)." The most authoritative Christian classicist of the nineteenth century then rather begrudgingly allows that "at most the recipient could make the obvious word-play himself from [vv 1–11]." The comment is typical of an attitude toward soundplay and alliteration that has obscured discovery of important moments in Pauline rhetoric. Eduard Lohse, for example, writing in the same commentary series that would produce Betz's groundbreaking study of Galatians, finds it even unnecessary to argue that "a word-play on the name of Onesimus cannot be read out of ὀναίμην."[5]

To others, the matter is just as obvious in the other direction. Farrar in the nineteenth century recognizes the pun,[6] and in modern times John Nordling, for one, disagrees with those scholars "who, inexplicably, have failed to see the obvious wordplay between ὀναίμην, 'may I benefit' (v 20), and, Ὀνήσιμον, 'Onesiums' (v 10)."[7] Welborn, who was alert to wordplay in 1 Corinthians on the name of Apollos reasons that (though this could be a case of self-supporting

[5] Eduard Lohse, trans. Wiliam R. Poehlmann and Rober J. Karris, *Colossians and Philemon* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 205. Lohse's only argument is anachronistic: that the optative was "an expression that is almost a fixed formula" for which he can only cite the later Ignatius.

[6] Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, 629.

[7] John G. Nordling, *Philemon* ConC (St. Louis: Concordia, 2004), 277.

reasoning) "there is Paul's demonstrated tendency to employ paronomasia elsewhere, as in the epistle to Philemon, where Paul plays repeatedly with the name Onesimus."[8]

The primary argument against wordplay on Onesimus cites the distance separating the two terms.We have attempted to overcome this parameter of objection in 1 Thess 1 with the twenty-eight (28) words between *ἀδιαλείπτως* (v. 2) and *ἀδελφοί* (v. 4) and most recently in Phil 4 with *Εὐοδίαν*, v. 2, and *εὐωδίας*, v. 18.

Several layers of evidence, from the circumstantial to the direct, strongly suggest deliberate soundplay. Philemon, in spite of being a unique genre among the epistles, the product of a particularly focused occasion, is not lacking in soundplay. Again we see alliteration in an opening, this time in the rare letter phi: ὁ ἀδελφὸς Φιλήμονι … καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ Ἀρχίππῳ (Phlm 1:1–2).[9] Recall that Steyn (in 1995) had identified "assonance" in the same verse.[10] The evidence of alliteration in Pauline openings supports a theory of deliberate soundplay here and in other Pauline epistle openings, an argument that is far more cogent than the null hypothesis. The statistical improbability of Philemon's four *phi*'s in eleven words should, indeed, have seemed obvious to the recipients. The brother/sister title deliberately chosen, if not unusual, and the fact of three proper names involved in this highly alliterative series stands as evidence for the same possibility on the name of Onesimus. If the recipient, why not the subject of the letter?

Further, *phi* alliteration is evident in Phlm 19 and 20: προσοφείλεις. ναὶ ἀδελφέ…. The two

[8] Welborn, *Fool of Christ*, 106 n38. See the positive assessment of, for example, J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (repr. of 1879 edition; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976) 340, 344–45, and J. Knox, *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul* (New York: Harper, 1959) 12–13.

[9] See Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν (Rom 16:1); Although Paul did not choose to alliterate on his own name in the opening verse, he does in v. 9, Παῦλος πρεσβύτης.

[10] Steyn, "Philemon," 64.

instances of soundplay on *phi* in Philemon—a name that invites the play—are mutually corroborating. The latter is in the vicinity of the alleged soundplay on the name of Onesimus.

Evidence of Proper Name Soundplay in Paul

The evidence supporting a theory of soundplay on the name Onesimus is surprisingly plentiful, both internal and external relative to this brief epistle. Recall that forty of the hundred or so examples of parechesis discovered by Eustathius are proper name parechesis. Indeed, our final argument comes from the accumulated evidence surrounding proper names in Paul's six other undisputed letters. See Table 12 at the end of the dissertation. After all is said and done, there is no such thing as a pattern of coincidences. But before looking at summaries, there is the contextual evidence of Philemon itself.

Evidence for Soundplay in Philemon

There are many reasons from the brief epistle itself to suspect parechesis on the name of Onesimus, beginning with the one undubitable standard observation, published by Winer, namely, the paronomasia of v. 11, ἄχρηστον/εὔχρηστον.[11] The observation is reinforced by the antitheses of time, ποτέ/νυνὶ and, as has not been previously noted in the literature, the parechesis of the personal pronouns: σ*οι* ἄχρηστον … ἐμ*οὶ* εὔχρηστον.

Secondly, there is the consistent pattern of alliteration in Philemon, for instance, the *alpha*-guttural theme extends through much of the epistle, particularly noticeable in the parechetical words that follow:

> *χάρ*ις ὑμῖν *καὶ εἰρ*ήνη … καὶ κυρίου … Χριστοῦ (v. 3). Εὐχαριστῶ … (v. 4) ἀκούων … ἀγάπην (v. 5), χαρὰν γὰρ … ἀνῆκον (v. 8) ἄχρηστον … εὔχρηστον … (v. 11)

[11] In a popular work, Caird, for example, writes that "Paul puns on the name of Onesimus, once Useless but now Useful (Phlm 11)" (Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 45).

ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθόν (v. 14) Τάχα γὰρ … ἐχωρίσθη … (v. 15) ἀγαπητόν … καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ ἐν κυρίῳ (v. 16) … Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (v. 24).[12]

This scheme is interwoven with the not unexpected *pi* alliteration. In Phlm 1:4–10, there are seventeen initial *pi* words and three lexemes with ἐπι- :

πάντοτε μνείαν σου ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου (v. 4), … πίστιν … πρὸς … πάντας … (v. 5) … πίστεώς … ἐπιγνώσει παντὸς … (v. 6) … πολλὴν … παράκλησιν ἐπὶ … ἀναπέπαυται … (v. 7) … πολλὴν … παρρησίαν … ἐπιτάσσειν … (v. 8) … παρακαλῶ … Παῦλος πρεσβύτης …. (v. 9) παρακαλῶ σε περὶ (v. 10).

Several other brief moments of alliteration are found with instances of parechesis that have not been seriously entertained by exegetes. In v. 9 and v. 15, for instance, are two series of words that would be very difficult to explain away as chance: ὢν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης (v. 9) and ὥραν, ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχῃς (v. 15).

In v. 16, there is the *mu-lambda* alliteration of μάλιστα ἐμοί, πόσῳ δὲ μᾶλλον.[13] and δοῦλον, ἀδελφὸν,[14] which helps make the case for soundplay on the same lexeme in v. 20, προσοφείλεις/ ἀδελφέ (v. 19–20) (the superfluous addition of the prefix on the first term makes for paronomasia with ὀφείλει in v. 18). The name Παῦλος and προσοφείλεις, too, are very nearly parechetical.[15]

Next in v. 20 comes the word in question, ὀναίμην, and the matter of whether it is intentionally in play with Ὀνήσιμον from v. 10. Before considering that possibility, we look to more immediate clues, namely, those within the verse.

---

[12] In the above scheme, ἀνῆκον (v. 8) … ἀνάγκην (v. 14), at the very least are parechesis.

[13] There are only three distinct μαλ- lexemes in Paul: μᾶλλον (38 times); μάλιστα (three times, including here in Phlm 1:16); and μαλακοὶ (once), found in the parechetical μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ (1 Cor 6:9). The collocation of two separate such lexemes in v. 16 is the only time it occurs in Paul.

[14] The assonantal endearment ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπητόν is further corroboration.

[15] Moreover, recall that Paul mentions his own name nineteen times in the seven undisputed epistles. In virtually every single instance, he alliterates (as Table 15 at the end of the dissertation shows), including here in Philemon: παρακαλῶ … ὢν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης (Phlm 1:9); ἐγὼ Παῦλος … ἐγὼ ἀποτίσω· … προσοφείλεις. ναὶ ἀδελφέ, ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην … ἀνάπαυσόν … Πεποιθὼς τῇ ὑπακοῇ σου ἔγραψά σοι… ποιήσεις (Phlm 1:19–21).

Philemon 20—Parechesis on ὀναίμην

In Phil 1:20, Paul employs one final tactic of persuasion, after pledging his name and reputation in v. 19. He writes, ναὶ ἀδελφέ, ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην ἐν κυρίῳ· ἀνάπαυσόν μου τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐν Χριστῷ, "Yes, brother, may I benefit from you in the Lord," with ingratiating irony, given that Paul is writing soley on behalf of someone else. The optative is not the only rare word[16] in this phrase; ναί occurs in Paul only nine times and in the entire Greek Bible only forty (40) times.[17] Six of the nine uses are concentrated in four verses, 2 Cor 1:17–20. In 2 Cor 1:17, ἵνα/ναί is anagrammatic: ἵνα ᾖ παρ᾽ ἐμοὶ τὸ ναὶ ναὶ (2 Cor 1:17). In 2 Cor 1:19, *nu*'s dominate: *ἐν* ὑμῖ*ν* δι᾽ ἡμῶ*ν* … οὐκ ἐγέ*ν*ετο *ναὶ* … *ναὶ ἐν* αὐτῷ γέγο*νεν* (2 Cor 1:19). Other than the six rather enigmatic uses in 2 Corinthians, the particle occurs in Rom 3:29 along with six other *nu'*s in seven words: … μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν. It might be hard to appreciate the significance of this coincidence given the commonness of the *nu* in Greek endings, yet only 172 times in Paul does the sequence ν*ν occur.

Given the limited contexts of previous Pauline usage, the first thing to note in Philemon 1:20 is the first word: ναί. This rare word is undeniably parechetical with the verb ὀ*ναί*μην: *ναὶ* … *ὀν*αίμην, a fact never noted in Philemon research.[18] To give some frame of reference, other than one hundred or so infinitive forms,[19] and the oblique cases of γυνή,[20] only thirty-one words

[16] Most arguments for soundplay in v. 20 stress the hapax legomenon. But, as we have shown, Paul is just as likely to alliterate on common words as on rare. In fact, one-third of the lexemes of the New Testament are hapax legomena.

[17] One poignantly memorable occurrence: ναὶ ἰδοὺ Σαρρα ἡ γυνή σου (Gen 17:19).

[18] To our knowledge, this has never been noted before in commentaries. This play on ὀναίμην meets with the practice of Paul where he does not always rhyme on the ending of the words (homoteleuton). Corroborating the find is the fact that the verse is driven by *nu*-vowel combinations: *ναὶ* … ὀ*ναίμην ἐν* … ἀνάπαυσ*όν* … σπλάγχ*να ἐν* … (ναὶ … ναί-ην ἐν … ἀν-όν … να ἐν).

[19] See for example the parechesis of 1 Cor 3:18, εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι….

[20] This understanding of the statistical probabilities makes for an appreciation of the very few instances in Paul of such collocation: for instance, the homoteleuton in 2 Cor 3:3, πλαξὶν λιθί*ναις* ἀλλ᾽ ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις

in all of Paul contain a *ναί*. Rarely, and only here in Paul, does this combination of two ναί syllables occur in Greek. In the entire Greek translation of Genesis, for instance, only a few times (apart from repetition and the necessity of infinitive endings) does it occur in the same verse, and almost never with any suggestion of intentional proximity (see Gen 12:5; 24:37; 36:2; 39:9).

Several further instances of alliteration in the vicinity of v. 20 could be noted, especially the parechesis (or near parechesis) in v. 21 of Πεποιθὼς/ποιήσεις.

Soundplay, in fact, continues to the very end of the letter. In v. 22, the two *zetas* and one *xi* in four words are surely no accident—ἑτοίμαζέ μοι ξενίαν· ἐλπίζω—and the choice of χαρισθήσομαι is surely a less than subliminal pun, its root charged with so profound a theological meaning. In Philemon, the corroborating evidence of soundplay extends from the first to the last verse, where collocation of *μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος* might be considered parechesis.

Our conclusion, then, is obvious. The pair Ὀνήσιμον/ὀναίμην is and consistent with other instances in the epistle and decidedly parechetical, differing in only one consonant (*sigma*) and even including the nasals of the accusative ending and first person optative aorist middle, respectively. The complete match of sounds with but one consonant difference is classic parechesis by definition and goes beyond what even Paul, who often fails to play on the ultimate syllable, requires of soundplay. This is all to say that, entertaining the null hypothesis for the sake of argument, the absence of soundplay on the rare optative ὀναίμην in v. 20 would be a blatant departure from the style and tone and rhythm and sound of the entire rest of the letter, not to mention the rest of the Pauline corpus. The only remaining objection to this conclusion is the

σαρκί*ναις*. But even more impressive now is the parechesis of καταλειφθῆ*ναι ἐν* Ἀθή*ναις* (1 Thess 3:1). Phlm 1:20 and 1 Thess 3:1 then stand as two of the very few places in Scripture with two -ναι- syllables.

distance between words.

Distance

The distance separating the words remains as the single reasonable objection to a theory of wordplay in Phlm 1:20. Is Paul deliberately alluding to the name Onesimus, synapsing between two words nine verses and 127 words apart?[21] A consideration of the parameters of sound and sense might help us to answer the question. Many times in his epistles Paul resumes a conceptual or semantic theme after some graphical distance, even, we might assume, resuming dictation after a night's sleep (for it would be hard to imagine a work such as Romans being composed in a single day). For instance, the σῶμα theme in 1 Corinthians, the "body of Christ" introduced in 1 Cor 10:16, which takes an antanaclastic turn in v. 17, is resumed in the next chapter, at 11:24. Then there is another antanaclastic resumption in 12:12. If Paul can make playful semantic connections over some distance, can he not also resume phonological ones? Can echoes of sound travel ten verses in Paul's memory?

Such distance between parechetical pairs is not uncommon in Paul, whose parechetical reach often defies some of the restrictive definitions of parechesis that scholars have imposed. Some distance between words is no impediment to soundplay associations and parechesis in the aural medium of Pauline epistles any more than are distances separating semantic sections of his epistles. In fact, some distance is often necessary for mnemonic purposes: milestones are not set

[21] One further objection is inherent in the interpreter rather than the text. James O'Hara writes of the deprecated reputation of word play, of how "the notion prevails among scholars that puns are a low form of humor and hardly deserve the name of poetry, much less of serious poetry. It is all very well to detect and discuss puns in Plautus, but it is an altogether different matter to suggest they are present in, say, the *Aeneid*." O'Hara suggests this lack of appreciation has implications for interpretation: "Consequently, we rarely notice wordplays, much less look for them in 'serious' poetry. If we do see them, we often assume they are accidental. When a word or phrase seems susceptible of more than one meaning, we expect the scholar to decide which of the meanings is 'intended' and which 'unintended.' The idea that a 'serious' Greek or Roman poet might be creating a texture of wordplays, regularly intending more than one meaning, is dismissed as 'unthinkable'…. (O'Hara, *True Name*, 18). We recall here the attitude of Blass (see BDF §256 and 488).

every foot.

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION

Neither Aristotle nor the Latin theoreticians captured the essence of the phonological phenomenon called parechesis, with their abstruse definitions and mixed examples. In fact, a proper definition has eluded rhetorical theory for centuries. The conflation of parechesis and paronomasia is evident in the works of many Christian rhetorical theorists, including in the nineteenth century the great grammar of Winer. In the twentieth century, not even R. Dean Anderson, who had edited Lausberg's magisterial lexicon and given Pauline scholarship its best lexicon for modern times, supplied an adequate understanding.[1] As we have pointed out, these definitions fail an important distinction. Paronomasia traditionally includes words of the same root, but the prefixes attached to that lexical root produce a "quite different" meaning; in contrast, parechesis involves etymologically unrelated words, words of different roots. These should not be construed as the same species but as concomitant word- and soundplay devices. When the definition of parechesis is properly framed, many instances of this figure of speech in the undisputed Pauline epistles come into view. In fact, in the New Testament in general, not to mention the entire Greek Bible, instances of unrecognized soundplay are numerous.[2]

In the end, the best evidence for the existence of parechesis in the undisputed Pauline epistles is the number and consistency of examples that fill his letters and propagate his communication. It is practically impossible that these are chance occurrences. There is no such

[1] These lexicons should not be confused for what they do not purport to be: complete inventories of given figures of speech. Rather, they are lexicons that, after the ancient manner, illustrate the figure or trope with limited examples from a select body of literature.

[2] Examples of parechesis can be found in many places in the non-Pauline New Testament, for instance, *θέρος*/*θύραις*. (Matt 24:32–33); *ἀκρίδας*/*ἄγριον* (Mark 1:6); *ἀλήθεια*/*ἐλευθερώσει* (John 8:32); ἔλαχεν/ἐλάκησεν (Acts 1:17–18).

thing as a pattern of coincidences.

ADDENDUM

THE LATIN HANDBOOKS AND THE CICERONIAN LATIN TRADITION

Pre-Christian Era

The Ancient Handbooks: The First Century BC

Unfortunately, Aristotle had failed to provide a standard nomenclature for the phenomenon of parechesis that he himself employed. Technical terms related to parechesis are found in the first century BC, in Book 4 of *Ad Herennium*,[1] circa 85 BC. This treatise by an unknown author (once thought to be Cicero) stands as "the oldest systematic treatment of Style in Latin, indeed the oldest extant inquiry into the subject after Aristotle" as well as "the oldest extant formal study of figures"[2] and clearly "reflects Hellenistic rhetorical teaching."[3] *Ad Herennium* is not only the oldest but perhaps the most influential treatise on style in the history of Christianity.

In Book 4, the unknown author introduces the term *adnominatio*, which appears to be a translation of the earlier Greek term παρονομάσια, and defines it as a soundplay involving *commutatione vocum aut litterarum*, that is, "a change of sound or of letters"[4]—an idea clearly derived from Aristotle's παρὰ γράμμα. Though in Latin, examples of soundplay (*adnominatio*) from *Ad Herennium* will prove instructive for our thesis: *lenones*/*leones*[5] (brothel keepers/lions)

[1] Addressed to one Gaius Herennius, this work was long thought to be by Cicero. See *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, trans. Harry Caplan, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), vii–viii.

[2] *Rhet. Her.*, xx (Caplan, LCL). "By about 100 B.C. the Hellenistic formulations of 'figures of speech and thought' had been completed," historian James Jerome Murphy informs us, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, 187—although by the eighteenth century or so nearly 300 different figures of speech would be published in English handbooks. *Ad Herennium* will prove to be not only the oldest but, arguably, the most influential book on style in the history of Western culture.

[3] *Rhet. Her.*, vii (Caplan, LCL).

[4] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21 (Caplan, LCL).

[5] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21, my translation based on Caplan, LCL.

"*navo an vano"* ("industrious or vainglorious");[6] and "*Deligere*/*diligere*" ("choose/love)."[7]

Conflation with the Term παρονομασία

The supremely influential treatises of *Ad Herennium*, Cicero's *De oratore* (c. 55 BC), and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (AD 95) are the pillars of rhetoric in Western Christendom. Their examples of soundplay will be propagated throughout history and reintroduced in the Reformation Period. The authors each in turn provide valuable definitions and examples of soundplay, but not without confusion. Using various terms—*adnominatio, paronomasia, traducio*—each subsumes several relevant examples of same- and different-root soundplay under the same category, an unfortunate historical precedent. With untoward consequences for biblical exegesis, these three Latin rhetorical theorists fail to distinguish paronomasia from the σχῆμα that Hermogenes in the second century after Christ will identify with the term παρήχησις. The confusion of the more obvious and ordinary paronomasia with the more subtle, arguably more clever, parechesis has had the psychological effect of obscuring discovery of the latter, it would appear, all throughout history. Without proper distinctions, the Ciceronian theorists commit conflations of definition that for centuries have never been sorted out. The source of the problem can be pinpointed in history: Book 4 of *Ad Herennium*.

The Error of *Ad Herennium*

The historically critical error of conflation occurs in Book 4.21 with the delineation of eight ways in which *adnominatio* is accomplished.[8] Though the unknown author introduces this wordplay as a device whereby *res dissimiles similia verba adcommodentur*, "similar words

[6] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21 (Caplan, LCL).

[7] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21 (Caplan, LCL).

[8] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21.

express dissimilar things"[9] *Ad Herennium*'s approach is morphological rather than strictly etymological and the failure to distinguish sound from sense is obvious in the confusion. Types 1, 2, and 3 involve the "thinning or contracting" of letters and the lengthening versus shortening of vowels, respectively:

Type 1—*Hic qui se magnifice iactat atque ostentat, <u>venīt</u> antequam Romam <u>venĭt</u>* (that is, "That man who carries himself with a lofty bearing and makes a display of himself was *sold* [as a slave] before *coming* to Rome");

Type 2, the reverse: *Hic quos homines alea <u>vincĭt</u>, eos ferro statim <u>vincīt</u>*. ("Those men from whom he *wins* in dice he immediately *binds* in chains.");

Type 3, "Hinc *ăvium* dulcedo ducit ad *āvium*," ("The sweet *song of the birds* leads us from here into *pathless places*."[10]);

For Type 4, also involving the lengthening or shortening of the same vowel, the theoretician offers the simplistic proper name wordplay: *cūriam*/*Cŭriam*.[11]

These four subtly belong to a class of wordplay where different roots are involved, the vowels of the near homophones apparently heard as distinct.[12]

Type 5, however, reverts to common-root wordplay effected by *addendis litteris*, that is, "by adding letters." *Ad Herennium* illustrates Type 5 by the collocation

[9] *Rhet. Her*., 4.21 (Caplan, LCL).

[10] *Rhet. Her*., 4.21 (Caplan, LCL). The chiastic structure suggests that *dulcedo* and *ducit* are also parechetical.

[11] "Does this man, although he seems desirous of public honour, yet love the Curia [te Senate-house] as much as he loves Curia?" *Rhet. Her*., 4.21 (Caplan, LCL). Such wordplays can toggle between paronomastic and parechetical, depending on linguistic (rather than folk) etymology.

[12] Note how the example informs us of differences in Latin vowel pronunciation in this period. Quintilian will later decry this lengthening/shortening of a vowel in soundplay as a "poor trick," writing, "I am surprised that it should be included in the text-books: the instances which I quote are therefore given as examples for avoidance, not for imitation" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.69 [Butler, LCL]).

temperare/*obtemperare*[13]—a rather uncreative class of wordplay, involving *prefixes on a common root*.[14] This mere prefix paronomasia is materially different than the previous types.

If Type 5 involves the adding of letters, Type 6 is effected "by omitting letters."[15] But the subtraction results in a word of a *different* root, and the example the author provides is of a different species and would better be termed *parechesis*—in recognition of a distinction captured in the later nomenclature:[16] "Si *lenones* vitasset tamquam *leones*, vitae tradidisset se" (italics mine); that is, "If he had avoided *brothel keepers* as though they were *lions*, he would have devoted himself to life."[17] We paired words, *lenones*/*leones*, are both cleverly different and remarkably similar, the virtue of parechesis.

Type 7, involving "transposing" letters, is just as clever. Here, *Ad Herennium* supplies this example: *navo an vano* ("industrious or vainglorious").[18] Type 8 involves actual "changing" letters: *Deligere*/*diligere*," from, "You ought to *choose* such a one as you would wish to *love*" (from Theophrastus).[19]

Ad Herennium then sums up the figure. As he sees it, *Hae sunt adnominationes quae in litterarum brevi commutatione aut productione aut transiectione aut aliquo huiusmodi genere versantur* ("These are word-plays that depend on a slight change or lengthening or transposition

---

[13] From, *Hic sibi posset* temperare, *nissi amori mallet* obtemperare, i.e., "This man could rule himself, if only he did not submit to love," *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21 (Caplan, LCL). This is the type of figure, namely, paronomasia, that Winer in the nineteenth century's most dominant biblical Greek grammar will propagate as a stylistic device of Pauline epistles. As we will see, the proof that paronomasia and parechesis are not the same thing is not that Winer included them together (conflated) but that he missed the latter altogether.

[14] Types 1 and 2 involve the "thinning or contracting" of letters.

[15] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21.

[16] *Ad Herennium*'s approach seems to be morphological rather than etymological. Failure to heed the identity of roots and stems is at the heart of the conflation issue.

[17] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21, my translation based on Caplan, LCL.

[18] From *Videte, iudices, utrum homini navo an vano credere malitis*, i.e., "See, men of the jury, whether you prefer to trust an *industrious* man or a *vainglorious* one" (*Rhet. Her*., 4.21 [Caplan, LCL]).

[19] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21 (Caplan, LCL).

of letters, and the like.")[20] But this morphological perspective overlooks the matter of common versus different roots. Clearly, the vowels changes of Type 1, 2, and 3, and the more obvious differences among words in the fourth, sixth, seventh, and eighth ways of effecting so-called *adnominatio* signify a completely different phenomenon than the prefixed paronomasia of Type 5. Unfortunately, prefixed paronomasia is the type that will be associated with the term paronomasia throughout history. Unlike the common-root example, the others represent a much more subtle phenomenon—one that if undistinguished will often go unnoticed, as the history of biblical exegesis of Pauline epistles will show.[21]

Ad Herennium sums up the section on "word-plays that depend on a slight change or lengthening or transposition of letters, and the like,"[22] but in the next section badly fails distinctions. Here, he describes "others also in which the words lack so close a resemblance, and yet are not dissimilar,"[23] offering examples of paronomasia based on like case inflections (accidence) and mere *figura etymologica* (qui/quem/cui/quae), and, inexplicably, "[a]n example of another kind," *conscripti*/*circumscripti*.[24] This last is a reversion to Type 5 that reminds us of the obvious wordplay of Phil 3:2–3, κατατομήν/περιτομή, which Bede will present in Latin in his famous *De schematibus*: *concisionem*/*circumcisio*.[25]

Thereby, the author of the first and most influential treatise on Latin style so diffuses our understanding of *adnominatio* as to put ordinary prefix variations on par with, and thus

[20] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21 (Caplan, LCL).

[21] Winer's influential *Sprachidioms*, for example, famously presents "paronomasia" only of the fifth type.

[22] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.21 (Caplan, LCL).

[23] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.22 (Caplan, LCL).

[24] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.22 (Caplan, LCL), an example reiterated in Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.72.

[25] Bede, *De* schematibus. See, Gussie Hecht Tanenhause, "*De schematibus et tropis*: A Translation," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 48 (1962): 237–53.

indistinguishable from, parechesis. The failure to recognize different roots as the essence of one type of soundplay is a profound oversight in the book that will dominate Western Christianity's understanding of the matter for centuries to follow. Virtually no one in the next two thousand years following *Ad Herennium*'s definition will note parechesis in Paul.

Ad Herennium makes a second unwittingly negative contribution to the history of figures of speech in an opinionated section devoted to artistic composition. "We shall also avoid excessive recurrence of the same letter," the author advises and presents as a "blemish" a famous example of excessive alliteration from the original Latin poet Ennius: *O Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti*.[26] Clearly, the context indicates that Ennius's excessive alliteration, motivated by the name of the tyrant, is *deliberate*, a fact much unnoted in history. Nonetheless, *Ad Herennium*'s disapprobation will affect the attitude of future rhetoricians and exegetes toward alliteration.

Ad Herennium, with its conflations and prejudices, will exert no small effect on the history of rhetoric. The longest lasting scientific treatise of linguistics in history, the treatise "appeared, from Jerome's time on, as a work by Cicero (which) gave it a prestige which it enjoyed for over a thousand years."[27] According to historian of rhetoric James J. Murphy, this early first century BC handbook holds the distinction of being "one of the most influential books on speaking and writing ever produced in the Western world."[28]

---

[26] *Rhet. Her.*, 4.12 (Caplan, LCL), from Ennius, *Annals*, 109. E. H Warmington translates in recognition of the alliteration: "Thyself to thyself, Titus Tatius the tyrant, thou tookest those terrible troubles" (*Remains of Old Latin: Ennius and Caecilius*, trans. E. H. Warmington, LCL [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979], 37).

[27] See Cicero, *de Or.*, 4.21.29 (Caplan, LCL).

[28] Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, 18.

Cicero—*De oratore*

In the generation following *Ad Herennium*, the genuine Cicero *De oratore* also echoes Aristotle's τὰ παρὰ γράμμα σκώμματα in defining a figure of speech involving *parvam verbi immutationem*, "a small change in the [spelling of] the word."[29] The figure involves "the employment of words that rhyme or sound alike," he explains and then notes that "the Greeks call this figure παρονομασία."[30] This, from a Latin handbook, is perhaps the oldest extant use of the term but reflects much earlier, perhaps centuries earlier, Greek coinage. In a section on the subject of eloquence, Cicero illustrates the figure with a few examples that will be handed down for centuries: *Nobiliorem mobiliorem* ("Noble moving"), an apparently demeaning parechetical description (from Cato),[31] followed by the unimpressive common-root paronomasia of *adversus et aversus*.[32] A witty wordplay on dentals, however, stands the test of time:[33] Cato said to a certain man, "Let us go for a *de*ambulation," to which the man replied, "What need [do I have] of you [*te*]?"[34] Other examples from Cicero also exhibit true parechesis as we have defined it, for example, Scipio's proper name soundplay: "*Quid hoc* Naevio *ig*navius?"[35] slightly more subtle than his predecessor's *cūriam*/*Cŭriam*.[36]

Unlike the author of *Ad Herennium*, who used the transliterated term *adnominatio*, Cicero

---

[29] Cicero, *De or.*, 2.63.256. Cicero writes similarly of *paulum immutatum verbum atque deflexum*, i.e., "slightly changing and altering a word" (Cicero, *De or.*, 3.53.206 [Sutton, LCL]).

[30] Cicero, *De or.*, 2.63.256 (Sutton, LCL).

[31] Sutton suggests, "Cato was evidently attributing to him a vertain instability of character" (Cicero, *De or.*, 2.63.256 [Sutton, LCL]).

[32] Cicero, *De or.*, 2.63.256.

[33] The italics are mine, highlighting the soundplay.

[34] Cicero, *De or.*, 2.63.256 (Sutton, LCL).

[35] Sutton cleverly translates the context: "Is there an idler knave than this Navius?" (Cicero, *De or.*, 2.61.249 [Sutton, LCL]).

[36] *Rhet. Her*., 4.21.

employs no technical Latin name for the phenomenon other than *ambigua*,[37] which, as he abstrusely puts it, *in verba posita, non in re*, that is, "depends on language, not on facts."[38] Here, at least we can discern that Cicero is sensible of the necessary distinction—between sound and sense—and he offers a final, particularly hilarious example. One Titius, an iconoclast literally, was devoted to sports as well as to some nocturnal play: On one of his night outings, he was suspected of amputating the "signa sacra," presumably the marble statues of Hermae of Athens.[39] His teammate Vespa Ternetius covered for his absence from the next day's athletic practice: *eum brachium fregisse*, he explained to the coach. "He has a broken arm."[40] This type of punning will later be known as "antanaclasis" and is also found abundantly in Paul, albeit in decidedly more serious contexts (for example, in Rom 7:25b, νόμῳ θεοῦ … νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας, "the law of God … the 'law' of sin.")[41]

The Ciceronian Tradition through the Early Centuries AD

In the first century AD, the activity of more than one secular rhetorician coincides with important dates in the history of Christianity. The Roman rhetorician Publius Rutilius Lupus flourished during the reign of Tiberius Caesar (AD 14 to AD 37),[42] as did Quintilian, the greatest Roman rhetorician of the century, in the years shortly after Paul's imprisonment in Rome. Lupus

[37] This is yet another telling bit of evidence that Cicero was not the author of *Ad Herennium*, as had been claimed for centuries.

[38] Cicero, *De or.*, 2.61.253 (Sutton, LCL).

[39] This historical insight from Augustus S. Wilkins, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de oratore libri tres* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1892), 355 n17.

[40] Cicero, *De or.*, 2.61.253 (Sutton, LCL).

[41] Cf. Quintilian's "This law did not seem to be a law to private individuals" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.67 [Butler, LCL]).

[42] A rhetorician at the time of Jesus, from Genesaret, receives little to no mention in Christian commentaries.

authored a small treatise that had some early and indirect influence on Christian rhetoric.[43] *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis*, circa AD 20, is devoted solely to style and is the forerunner of a type of manual that would flourish in the Reformation era.[44] Among the twenty-one figures of speech[45] that Lupus republishes from Cicero are three examples of "paronomasia" (parechesis, according to this dissertation) will be transmitted for centuries:

Non enim decet hominem genere *nobilem, mobilem* videri;[46]

Nam cum *omnibus hominibus* …;[47]

… non *honori*, sed *oneri* esse existimavit."[48]

Quintilian—*Institutio oratoria*

Rome's greatest theoretician of rhetoric, Quintilian, studied and taught rhetoric in Rome near the time Paul was imprisoned there. In fact, Quintilian apparently left Rome just prior to Paul's arrival and returned not long after Paul's departure.[49] His writings thus shed light on the type of rhetoric known in the province of Paul's own evangelism. His twelve-volume *Institutio oratoria*, circa AD 95, is unquestionably the greatest rhetorical treatise of his time. "Of all the

[43] P. Rutilius Lupus's treatise is later given the name *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis*. This treatise on figures of speech, including Lupus's work, is preserved in the valuable 1768 edition of David Ruhnken, which includes the works of Aquila Roman and Julius Rufinian as well and, in its preface, a long history of rhetoricians: P. Rutilii Lupi, *de figuris sententiarum et elocutionis libri duo, accedunt Aquilae Romani et Julii Rufiniani de eodem argumento libri*, ed. David Ruhnken, Lugduni Batavorum, apud Samuelem et Joannem Luchtmans, 1768.

[44] Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 150.

[45] In fact, dozens of figures of speech are known in the first century, available to Christian authors. According to Galen O. Rowe, "there are names for more than 60 tropes and figures identified by rhetoricians from the fifth century BC through to the early Christian era" (Galen O. Rowe "Style," pages 121–57 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period*, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400, ed. Stanley E. Porter [New York: Brill, 1997], 132).

[46] "It is inappropriate for a man of *noble* birth to be seen *moving* about," similar to Cato's quip (see *Nobiliorem, mobiliorem* from Cicero, *De or.*, 2.63.256).

[47] "with all men."

[48] "… it is not an honor but a burden."

[49] According to accounts, the young Quintilian was sent to Rome to study rhetoric early in the reign of Nero, (whose inaugural date was October 13, AD 54) and left sometime after 59, only to return in 68 (George Kennedy, *Quintilian*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969), 16.

ancient rhetoricians, it was undoubtedly Quintilian who gave the fullest and most authoritative survey of the figures and tropes of speech," Quentin Skinner concludes.[50]

Beginning at Book 9.3.66 of *Institutio oratoria*, Quintilian uses the term παρονομάσια. "There is a … class of figures that attracts the ear of the audience and excites their attention by some resemblance, equality, or contrast of words," begins Quintilian's discussion of παρονομασία (which, the rhetoricians of his day, he informs us, called *adnominatio*).[51] He explains that this figure of speech involves "play upon verbal resemblances [*similium*]" where one word "is not very unlike [*non dissimile*] another."[52] He repeats some examples from his predecessors and contributes these two examples of proper name soundplay, what Hermogenes would later call parechesis: *Furia*/*furiam*;[53] *Non Pisonum, sed pistorum*.[54] He adds from the *Aeneid* (1.399) *puppesque tuae pubesque tuorum*,[55] then *fama*/*flamma, spes*/*res,*fama/flamma; spes/res;[56] and *quantum possis, in eo semper experire ut prosis*, possis/prosis[57]; and, finally, *matrimonium*/*patrimonium*.matrimonium/patrimonium.[58] Though in Latin, the examples are instructive for our evaluation of similar collocations in Paul.

But at section 72 in the third chapter of the ninth book of his treatise, Quintilian's presentation falls into brief confusion, unfortunately alternating same-root and different-root

---

[50] Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1:98.

[51] Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.67 (Butler, LCL).

[52] Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.75 (Butler, LCL).

[53] A "jest from Ovid," who is known for wordplay (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.70, [Butler, LCL]): *Cur ego non fdicam, Furia, te furiam*? i.e., "Why should I not tell, Fury? For you are furious [insane]."

[54] Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.72 (Butler, LCL): "Not of the Pisos, but of the bakers."

[55] "Of your ships and of your youth" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.75 [Butler, LCL).

[56] "fame/flame," "hope/thing," from Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.75.

[57] "As much as *you are able*, always try to *benefit*" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.76 [Butler, LCL]).

[58] Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.80: "Matrimony/patrimony." This last example is found in the connected discussion of isocolons.

examples. *Non emissus ex urbe, sed immissus in urbe* …"Non emissus ex urbe, *sed* immissus in urbem esse videatur"[59] is same-root paronomasia, but *Ex oratore arator*[60] employs different roots. Then comes *conscripti*/*circumscripti*, a tired example of same-root soundplay from *Ad Herennium*.[61] Modesty does not forbid Quintilian from next illustrating the figure with a favorite example from his own father: *non exigo ut immoriaris legationi: immorare*.[62] "For the sense is forcible," Quintilian adjudges, "and the sound of the two words, which are so very different in meaning, is pleasant, more especially since the assonance is not far fetched, but presents itself quite naturally…."[63] Quintilian then offers some further historically illuminating examples, explaining their form in terms very much like those of *Ad Herennium* before him and Hermogenes after.

In spite of the uneven presentation, Quintilian must be credited with bringing rhetoric to the verge of a better distinction. After belittling the mundaneness of the paronomastic clause *raro evenit, sed vehemeter venit,*[64] he finds greater virtue in a more sublte device. He suggests, "It does, however, sometimes happen that a bold and vigorous conception may derive a certain charm from the contrast between two words not dissimilar in sound."[65] He describes words "very

---

[59] "He was not *let out* of the city but *let into* the city…." Quintilian introduces the term *traductio* to describe this example of unimpressive paronomasia (*Inst.*, 9.3.71).

[60] *Ex oratore arator* ("Orator turned ploughman" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.72 [Butler, LCL]).

[61] This last example, in his opinion, is "the worst of all" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.72 [Butler, LCL]).

[62] From Cicero's *de Republica*, "I do not demand that you should *die* on your embassy: only *stay* there!" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.73 [Butler, LCL]).

[63] Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.73 ([Butler, LCL). It is with respect to this type of same-root soundplay that Quintilian gives us this invaluable historical perspective: "The old orators were at great pains to achieve elegance in the use of words similar or opposite in sound. Gorgias carried the practice to an extravagant pitch, while Isocrates, at any rate in his early days, was much addicted to it. Even Cicero delighted in it, but showed some restraint…" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.74 [Butler, LCL]).

[64] Butler concedes, "Meaning uncertain" (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.72 [Butler, LCL]).

[65] Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.72 (Butler, LCL) from *Sed contingit, ut aliqui sensus vehemen et acer venustatem aliquam non eadem ex voce non dissona accipiat*.

different in meaning" but "similar in sound"[66] and of "two words not dissimilar in sound" but "so very different in meaning."[67] These are definitions of parechesis.

Quintilian praises some soundplay and rejects others, but just as instructive as his commendations are his prejudices, neither of which he hesitates to deliver. *Ex oratore arator* he finds "trivial," for example,[68] but the example from his own father he praises. In spite of imperious sensibilities, the greatest rhetorical theorist of the first century after Christ fails to coin a term that will adequately nuance the matter. That term and consistent distinction would come a century later, from Hermogenes, a rhetorician from Tarsus.

"Of all the ancient rhetoricians, it was undoubtedly Quintilian who gave the fullest and most authoritative survey of the figures and tropes of speech," modern historian of rhetoric Quentin Skinner concludes.[69] Quintilian's order of treatment of figures of speech would be imitated by Melanchthon and then in England by Richard Sherry and others, by Bullinger at the end of the nineteenth and R. Dean Anderson at the end of the twentieth century. All this would happen, however, after a hiatus of a millennium and a half during which Quintilian is unknown to the West. In the meantime, the lists of figures will expand and contract over the centuries, especially during the Renaissance and Reformation periods and, later, in the hands of English authors of the late nineteenth century. But only *Ad Herennium* among the ultimately most important works—Cicero's, Quintilian's, Aristotle's, and Hermogenes's—exerted an influence in Western Christianity prior to the Reformation.

Unfortunately, his conflations would be passed on and imitated along with his distinctions.

---

[66] Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.73–74 (Butler, LCL).

[67] Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.73 (Butler, LCL).

[68] *Illa leviora* (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 9.3.72 [Butler, LCL]).

[69] Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 98.

Other Rhetorical Treatises of the Early Centuries

Other rhetorical treatises were known in the Mediterranean world of the early centuries AD, including the works of Hermogenes. Among the important Greek rhetoricians, according to the Souda, was Alexander, son of Numenius, who flourished during Hadrian's rule, in the first half of the second century, a generation before Hermogenes. Examples from his Περὶ τῶν τῆς διανοίας καὶ τῆς λέξεως σχημάτων come to us from the late third century Latin treatise of Aquila Romanus, *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis*.[70] Romanus's appropriated examples include "paronomasia," for which he offers three fine examples (apparently from Cicero) of what Hermogenes, a generation later, will call parechesis:[71]

1. *Praetor iste, vel potius praedo sociorum* ("He is a magistrate, or rather a robber of society," that is, *Praetor* (*magistrate*)/*praedo* (*robber*);
2. *Cui quod libet, hoc licet* ("For whom/him what he *likes* this he *allows*"), that is, *libet* (*like*)/*licet* (*allow*);
3. *Legem flagitas, quae tibi non decrat: erat enim diligentissime scripta* ("You demand of the law, which to you is not lacking: for it was most diligently written"), with *decrat* (lacking)/*erat* (it was).

These precious examples from Lupus and Romanus (the loss of Quintilian notwithstanding) will be passed on through Donatus and, centuries later, recovered in time for the Reformation when they will be republished in pamphlet form and disseminated throughout Europe.

[70] Julius Rufinianus (third/fourth century) explicitly states this in the opening page of his own treatise, which is a continuation of one by Aquila Romanus of the third century.

[71] The definitions in these handbooks are often brief and elliptical. Romanus ambiguously explains "paronomasia," as when occuring *nonnunquam littera immutata, diversa significet*, i.e., "sometimes a letter unchanged [?], signifies different things." According to Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric,* 151, "*Carmen de Figuris vel Schematibus*, a late Roman rhetorical treatise, discusses some sixty figures of speech."

APPENDIX

TABLES

The tables below contain corroborating evidence for our thesis: alliteration and contexts of soundplay in the undisputed Pauline epistles, with some comparisons from classical literature.

Table 1. "Conventional Alliterative Pairs" by Letter Theme

Chi	**ἀλλ- and λ**	**Pi**
ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν (see Rom 9:21, 1 Cor 7:37, 9:4, 5)	ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον (see Rom 14:13, 1 Cor 9:12, esp. 1 Cor 12:22, 2 Cor 7:7, Phil 2:12)	ταῦτα πάντα
κακῶς ἔχοντες	ἄλλο πολλὰ,	πλῆθος πολύ πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν
ἐσχάτως ἔχει (Mark 5:23)	πολλοὺς ἄλλους ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγεν	πολλῷ πλείους ὄχλοι πολλοὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν, πολλὰ πάθη
χώραν μακρὰν (Luke 15:13)	ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλο ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλο λόγον λαλεῖν	

Source: Adapted from Elbert Russell, *Paronomasia and Kindred Phenomenon in the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1920), 12–13.

Table 2. Initial *Theta* and *Tau* Words in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

Initial *Theta* and *Tau* Words in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

Statistical Considerations

Other than the ubiquitous definite article and certain pronouns, *tau*-initial words are surprisingly rare in Paul. Though approximately twenty percent (20%) of Paul's words contain at least one *tau*, only 1.7% *begin* with a *tau* (after controlling for the articles and demonstratives).

Initial *tau in*frequency is consistent throughout Paul. In Romans Chapter 1, aside from the definite article and pronouns, there is only one *tau* initial word, τετραπόδων (1:23). In Chapter 5 of Romans, to pick another representative instance, aside from definite articles and two demonstratives, there are only three total *tau* initials, two of them found in a collocation similar to that in 1 Thess 2:7: τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν (Rom 5:7), where the two *theta*'s are conspicuously included.

In the first Chapter of 1 Thessalonians, other than the requisite definite articles, only three words—all of them suspicious of alliteration—begin with *tau*: Τιμόθεος (v. 1), τύπον (v. 7), and τόπῳ (v. 8). The last two, as we have argued, are parechetical. If we include all initial dentals (*theta* initials), the overview of 1 Thessalonians is a remarkably stark soundscape:

1 Thessalonians

1 Thess 1

Τιμόθεος … Θεσσαλονικέων … θεῷ . . . (v. 1)
θεῷ … (v. 2) θεοῦ … (v. 3) θεοῦ … (v. 4) τύπον … (v. 7) τόπῳ … θεὸν (v. 8)
θεὸν … θεῷ (v. 9)

1 Thess 2

Fourteen "θεός" vv. 1–15.
τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα (v. 7)
τέκνα (v. 11)
τέλος (v. 16)

1 Thess 3

Five "θεός" and, aside from two mentions of Timothy (neither of which has eponymous alliteration, it must be admitted), *no tau*-initial words other than the articles

and demonstratives. However: ταῖς θλίψεσιν ταύταις (1 Thess 3:3)

1 Thess 4

Eight "θεός," including θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, (v. 3), θεοδίδακτοί (v. 9), and θέλομεν (4:13)

1 Thess 5

Two "θεός," including θέλημα θεοῦ (v. 18)
Only one *tau*-initial word: the verb τηρηθείη (v. 23)

***Tau*/*Theta* Initial Collocations in Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Philippians**

Θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε (Gal 1:6)

Ἔπειτα μετὰ ἔτη τρία (Gal 1:18)

ταῦτά τινες (1 Cor 6:11)

τοῦ σώματος τούτοις τιμὴν (1 Cor 12:23)

τὰ τρία ταῦτα· (1 Cor 13:13)

τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου (1 Cor 14:16)

εἰ τύχοι σίτου ἤ τινος τῶν λοιπῶν· (1 Cor 15:37)

τιθέτω θησαυρίζων ὅ τι ἐὰν εὐοδῶται (1 Cor 16:2)

τηλικούτου θανάτου (2 Cor 1:10)

τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν· (Rom 5:7)

τέκνα θεοῦ (Rom 8:16)

Τιμόθεον ταχέως (Phil 2:19)

and several others.

Table 3. Alliteration with θεός in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

Alliteration with θεός in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles
Statistical Consideration Approximately 8.3% of Paul's words contain a *theta*. **1 Thessalonians** Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ (1:1) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ (1:3) θεὸν ἐξελήλυθεν (1:8) δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Thess 2:4) θεοῦ ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθῶς λόγον θεου (2:13) δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ … ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ (3:9) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεου (3:13) θεῷ, καθὼς (1 Thess 4:1) θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ (4:3) See 1 Cor 1:1, etc πάθει ἐπιθυμίας καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν θεόν (1 Thess 4:5) θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσία … ἀθετῶν οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀθετεῖ ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν (1 Thess 4:7–8, six *theta* prominent words) θεὸς τοὺς κοιμηθέντας (4:14) ἔθετο ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς (5:9) θέλημα θεου (5:18) Outside of 1 Thessalonians, the name for God occurs nearly 400 times in the undisputed Pauline epistles and θεός is often closely associated with *theta* words: **Galatians** ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν θεόν (Gal 1:10) θεοῦ καὶ ἐπόρθουν (Gal 1:13) τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεός (Gal 3:8)

διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (Gal 3:17)

… γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ … ἀσθενῆ … ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε (Gal 4:8–9)

ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ (Gal 4:14)

… ἀγαθοῖς. Μὴ πλανᾶσθε, θεὸς … ἄνθρωπος, τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει (Gal 6:6–7)

Corinthians

… διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Σωσθένης (1 Cor 1:1)

Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, (1 Thess 4:3)

See θέλημα θεοῦ (1 Thess 5:18); θελήματος θεοῦ (Rom 15:32); διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ (1 Cor 1:1); διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος (2 Cor 1:1); διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ (2 Cor 8:5); τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ (Gal 1:4); θέλημα τοῦ θεου (Rom 12:2)

πιστὸς ὁ θεός, δι᾽ οὗ ἐκλήθητε (1 Cor 1:9)

τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα, (1 Cor 3:10)

τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός· (1 Cor 3:17)

… ὁ θεὸς … ἐπιθανατίους, ὅτι θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις. (1 Cor 4:9)

θέλω δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν· ἀλλ᾽ ἕκαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ, ὁ μὲν οὕτως, ὁ δὲ οὕτως. (1 Cor 7:7)

νυνὶ δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο τὰ μέλη (1 Cor 12:18)

Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς (1 Cor 12:28)

ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν (1 Cor 14:36)

ὁ δὲ θεὸς δίδωσιν αὐτῷ σῶμα καθὼς ἠθέλησεν (1 Cor 15:38)

θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ (2 Cor 1:1).

ὁ παρακαλῶν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς παρακαλεῖν τοὺς ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἧς παρακαλούμεθα αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. (2 Cor 1:4)

Ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν *θ*ησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν,
ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾖ τοῦ *θ*εοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν· (2 Cor 4:7)

… θεὸς … θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς. (2 Cor 5:19)

ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας … (2 Cor 6:7)

ἡ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη … λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται. (2 Cor 7:10)

θεὸν λυπηθῆναι (2 Cor 7:11; passive ending)

μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντος μου ταπεινώσῃ με ὁ θεός μου (2 Cor 12:21; with "coming")

εὐχόμεθα δὲ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν (2 Cor 13:7)

Romans

ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν (Rom 1:10)

ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ … φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Rom 1:23)

ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας, αἵ τε γὰρ θήλειαι (Rom 1:26)

τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν (Rom 2:2)

θεὸς ἀληθής (Rom 3:4)

προέθετο ὁ θεὸς (Rom 3:25)

ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε, κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ (Rom 4:17)

ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου (Rom 5:10)

δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ (Rom 6:22)

θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 6:23)

ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν (Rom 8:7)

ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ. (Rom 8:21)

τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν (Rom 8:28)

πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 9:11)

θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος θεοῦ. (Rom 9:16)

θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι (Rom 9:22)

τοῦ θεοῦ παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, (Rom 12:1)

θέλημα τοῦ θεου (Rom 12:2)

ὁ ἐσθίων τὸν μὴ ἐσθίοντα μὴ ἐξουθενείτω, ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐσθίων τὸν ἐσθίοντα μὴ κρινέτω, ὁ θεὸς (Rom 14:3, see v. 6)

διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 15:15)

Philippians

ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἐπιποθῶ (Phil 1:8)

θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν (Phil 2:13)

καὶ γὰρ ἠσθένησεν παραπλήσιον θανάτῳ· ἀλλ᾽ ὁ θεὸς ἠλέησεν αὐτόν, (Phil 2:27)

Table 4. Summary of Chi-Rho Alliteration on Χριστός, κύριος, and χάρις in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

Summary of *Chi-Rho* Alliteration on Χριστός, κύριος, and χάρις in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

Χριστός and κύριος in Alliteration

κύριος (κύρι-) occurs 194 times in Paul, the vast majority of the time in alliterative verses. It is, in fact, difficult to find a verse with κύριος that does not alliterate in gutturals. In the nearly fifty (50) uses of the lexeme in Romans, for example, virtually all have alliterative correspondences. The same is true for Χριστός. Russell has pointed out one example at 2 Cor 1:21 and Fee another at Phil 1:21. But there are many more, including occurrences in 1 Thessalonians.[1]

χάρις and *Chi-Rho* Alliteration in Paul

Similarly, the important Christan term χάρις itself occurs frequently in Paul in clever alliterative schemes. Meaning "grace" fifty-six (56) times in the undisputed Paul, χάρις, in fact, occurs the vast majority of the time in alliterative contexts. Twenty-seven times χάρις is found in the proximity of *chi-rho* words,[2] often in cluster alliteration with κυρ*, root for "the Lord," and several times in clever alliterative schemes, for example: *χάρ*ις … ἁμ*αρ*τίας ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ *καρ*δίας.… (Rom 6:17)

In 2 Cor 12:9, Paul quotes the unusual perfect tense form to convey the parechesis: εἴρηκέν /ἀρκεῖ whose sounds anticipate and are echoed in χάρις–in a highly alliterative clause: καὶ εἴρηκέν μοι· ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, ἡ γὰρ…. Here, χάρις stands in anagrammatic relation to ἀρκεῖ.

Instances from the OT Greek also corroborate the finding.[3]

Note further the following two illustrative Pauline examples:

[1] Compare Eph 4:32, with three initial *chi*'s, a conspicuous example: γίνεσθε [δὲ] εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί, εὔσπλαγχνοι, χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς, καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν.

[2] There are only 570 *chi*rho* words in Paul, fewer than three in one hundred (approximately 2%), 269 of these the word Χριστός Fifty times in Paul κύριος and Χριστός occur together, an expected collocation. But κύριος alliterates with the other approximately 300 non-Christ words many times. Is it by chance that three of the most important terms in Christianity have guttural rhos?

[3] Compare καὶ ἔσονται ὡς μαχηταὶ τοῦ Εφραιμ καὶ χαρήσεται ἡ καρδία … καὶ χαρεῖται ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ (Zech. 10:7), where the Greek seems to have gone out of the way in order to alliterate. The Hebrew employs synonymia, two different words for "rejoice": וְהָיוּ כְגִבּוֹר אֶפְרַיִם וְשָׂמַח לִבָּם כְּמוֹ־יָיִן וּבְנֵיהֶם יִרְאוּ וְשָׂמֵחוּ יָגֵל לִבָּם בַּיהוָה׃.

1. The antanaclastic (sense) and anagrammatic (sound) pun of Gal 3:19:
Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων *χάριν* προσετέθη, *ἄχρις*….

2. Χάρις and Χριστός in, for example, *χάρις* δὲ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ *Χριστοῦ* τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (Rom 7:25).

Table 5. Soundplay on the name "Achaia" in Ancient Greek

Soundplay on the name "Achaia" in Ancient Greek
Historical Evidence for "Achaia" in Soundplay Classical parallels further corroborate our hypothesis—although this is to work backwards from the historical record, for the name Achaia has long invited soundplay. The fortunes and misfortunes of history have made Achaia a central location in ancient Greek history and lore, and there are many instances from Homer where Achaia is named in an alliterative scheme. The very first lines of the *Iliad*, in fact, feature alliteration on the name: **The Opening Lines of *The Iliad*** μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω *Ἀ*χιλῆος οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί᾽ *Ἀ*χαιοῖς ἄλγε᾽ ἔθηκε (*Il*. 1.1–2) Note in the example above the parechesis of *Ἀ*χιλῆος/*Ἀ*χαιοῖς ("of Achilles"/"upon the Achaians"). In Greek history, Achilles, Achaia, and Macedonia apparently have more than geo-political associations. Among Eustathius's many examples of proper name soundplay in Homer is the parechesis of κλητούς … κλισίην Ἀχιλῆος,[4] which compares remarkably with τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας· (Gal 1:21) and καύχησις … κλίμασιν τῆς Ἀχαΐας (2 Cor 11:10). Indeed, no fewer than three instances of parechesis are found in the opening pericope of the *Iliad*, and we should perhaps then not doubt that Ἀχαιῶν ending line 12 and ἔχων in line 14 are also intentionally parechetical. End colon commonalities can, in fact, be found throughout the *Iliad*, which look to be mnemonic aids embedded in the long poem. For instance, lines 17–20 in Book 1 bear a vowel-*kappa*/*chi* theme: … ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί, … ἔχοντες ἐκπέρσαι … εὖ δ᾽ οἴκαδ᾽ ἱκέσθαι: … δέχεσθαι, (*Il*. 1.17–20) These end-colon similarities with the name "Achaia" are inconceivable as coincidence: Ἀχαιῶν (line 12)/ἔχων (line 14); *Ἀ*χαιοί/*ἔ*χοντες/*ἱκ*έσθαι/δ*έχ*εσθαι (lines 17–20). **Observations from Classicists** The name Achaia, in fact, is featured in one of the ten or so examples of parechesis. published

[4] Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 2, 690 line 29, TLG. Caragrounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, 460 n221 has this example from vol. 3, 193.

in the Reformation era. The English poet Fraunce (1588) offers this alliterative verse from *Il*. 2.235: ὦ πέπονες κάκ᾽ ἐλέγχε᾽ Ἀχαιΐδες οὐκέτ᾽ Ἀχαιοὶ.[5]

In the twentieth century, several new observations were published. In 1933, the French classicist Bérard, who also knew of parechesis proper, made the slight observation of assonantal *alphas* at *Od*. 21.324: μή ποτέ τις εἴπῃσι κακώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν.[6] But he might have noted the more impressive assonance and the parechesis achieved in the next line: *Od.* 21.325 ᾗ πολὺ χείρονες ἄνδρες ἀμύμονος ἀνδρὸς ἄκοιτιν, thus, Ἀχαιῶν/ἄκοιτιν. (It should further be noted that the following line features the parechesis of τόξον ἐΰξοον, *Od*. 21.324.)

In the most recent major Homeric commentary,[7] Achaia is alluded to in the context of alliteration, and by more than one commentator.

Both Stanford (1967) and Packard (1976) note the *chi* and *omega* euphony of Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων at *Od.*1.286,[8] similar to χαλκοκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ in *Il.* 7.40 and 41, near where classicist Mark Edwards has noted diphthong assonance, in *Il*. 7.39: οἰόθεν οἶος.[9] Lines 40 and 41 that follow feature words familiarly alliterative with "Achaia":

ἀντίβιον *μαχ*έσασθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτῆτι,
οἳ δέ κ᾽ *ἀγ*ασσάμενοι χαλκοκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ. (*Il*. 7.40 and 41)

Further, Edwards has identified proper name guttural alliteration at *Il*. 20.313–17n.,[10] which includes guttural alliteration on the proper name Achaia:
καιομένη, καίωσι δ᾽ ἀρήϊοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* 20.317).

What is of great interest to this dissertation is the poetically patterned *chi* and *kappa* gutturals beginning at line 11 that include the proper name of the Achaians in line 15, building up to the alliterative lines that Janko marks:

> χαλκῷ παμφαῖνον: ὃ δ᾽ ἔχ᾽ ἀσπίδα πατρὸς ἑοῖο.
> εἵλετο δ᾽ ἄλκιμον ἔγχος ἀκαχμένον ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ,
> στῆ δ᾽ ἐκτὸς κλισίης, τάχα δ᾽ εἴσιδεν ἔργον ἀεικὲς
> τοὺς μὲν ὀρινομένους, τοὺς δὲ κλονέοντας ὄπισθε
> Τρῶας ὑπερθύμους: ἐρέριπτο δὲ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν.

[5] See Fraunce, *The Arcadian Rhetorike*, Book 1, Cap. 24.

[6] Bérard, *Odyssey*, 25.

[7] "This project is the first large-scale commentary on the *Iliad* for nearly one hundred years," writes editor G.S. Kirk in the prefact to the fifth volume, "and takes special account of language, style and thematic structure. . . ." (Kirk, G.S., ed. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. 6 vols. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985–1993), preface.

[8] Stanford, *The Sound of Greek*, 1967 (noted in Packard, "Sound-Patterns," 245).

[9] Edwards, *The Iliad*, 145.

[10] Edwards, *The Iliad*, 173.

ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε πορφύρῃ πέλαγος μέγα κύματι κωφῷ
ὀσσόμενον λιγέων ἀνέμων λαιψηρὰ κέλευθα (*Il.* 14.11–17)[11]

Clearly, the onomapoietic clashing gutturals are designed, particularly evident in the colonic structure:

… ἄλκιμον ἔγχος ἀκαχμένον ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ,
… ἐκτὸς κλισίης, τάχα δ᾽ εἴσιδεν ἔργον ἀεικὲς

… τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν.
… κύματι κωφῷ
… κέλευθα

At moments the alliteration rises to the level of parechesis:

… ἔγχος/ἐκτὸς (lines 12 and 13)

ἀκαχμένον/χαλκῷ (line 12)

τάχα/τεῖχος (lines 13 and 15)

ἀεικὲς/Ἀχαιῶν (line 13 and 15)

The *kappa*/*chi* alliterative consistency bears resemblance to Achaia-containing verses in Paul, for example, 2 Cor 11:10, καύχησις αὕτη οὐ φραγήσεται εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τοῖς κλίμασιν τῆς Ἀχαΐας.

In Book 16, Janko notes at *Il*. 16.143 formulatic *pi* alliteration πατρὶ φίλῳ πόρε: "πόρε, which alliterates in p-," according to the editor (who also notes a textual problem here—for which alliteration may be a solution).[12] But again the line is preceded by an alliterative scheme featuring the word Achaians (line 141):

εἵλετο δ᾽ ἄλκιμα δοῦρε, τά οἱ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει.
ἔγχος δ᾽ οὐχ ἕλετ᾽ οἷον ἀμύμονος Αἰακίδαο
βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν: τὸ μὲν οὐ δύνατ᾽ ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν
πάλλειν, ἀλλά μιν οἷος ἐπίστατο πῆλαι Ἀχιλλεὺς
Πηλιάδα μελίην, τὴν πατρὶ φίλῳ πόρε Χείρων
Πηλίου ἐκ κορυφῆς, φόνον ἔμμεναι ἡρώεσσιν.
ἵππους δ᾽ Αὐτομέδοντα θοῶς ζευγνῦμεν ἄνωγε (line 140–143)

[11] gleaming with bronze; but [the son] had the shield of his father.

And he grasped a valorous spear, tipped with sharp bronze,

and took his stand outside the siege hut, and then saw a deed of shame--,

when the Achaeans in rout driving them

and the Trojans in high spirits and the wall of the Achaeans was broken down.

[12] Janko, *The Iliad*, 336.

Just as in *Il.* 14.15, the name "Achaians" falls in line as part of an alliterative tricolon: Αἰακίδαο (line 140), Ἀχαιῶν (line 141) and Ἀχιλλεὺς (line 142).

Similarly, in *Iliad* Book 7, in a pericope propagated by soundplay that would seem to defy Leaf's begrudging allowance from the nineteenth century, "Achaia" is again in highly alliterative collocation:

> ἤν τινά που Δαναῶν προκαλέσσεται οἰόθεν οἷος[13]
>
> ἀντίβιον μαχέσασθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτῆτι,
> οἳ δέ κ᾽ ἀγασσάμενοι χαλκοκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ (*Il.* 7.39–41)

In fact, we see Achaians often in word-end parechesis in Homer, for example, ἔχουσαι/Ἀχαιῶν:

> ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ᾽ ἔχουσαι,
> ὅππως δὴ πρῶτον πῦρ ἔμπεσε νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν. (*Il.* 16.112–113)[14]

Typical of the *chi* and guttural laden words to be found in contexts with cognates of Achaia is 13.41: ἄβρομοι αὐΐαχοι: ἔλποντο δὲ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.*13.41)

In line 41 "ἄβρομοι αὐΐαχοι ["with loud shouts and cries"] is a unique but old alliterative phrase," Janko assures us.[15] But the parechesis with the end-word Achaia is also obvious: αὐΐαχοι/ Ἀχαιῶν. In a nearby context is found ὦχετ᾽ Ἀχαιῶν. (*Il.* 13.38).
Many other examples could be sited, notably τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν. (*Il.* 14.15) and Even the famous cognomen/epithet "long-haired Achaians" κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ I (*Il.* 18.6) conveniently alliterative.
But perhaps seven lines from Book Seventeen, 261–267, which include a "simile famous in antiquity for its sound-effects,"[16] is the most convincing context of all. Here, seven of eight verses end in vowel-guttural alliteration:

> ὅσσοι δὴ μετόπισθε μάχην ἤγειραν Ἀχαιῶν;[17]
> Τρῶες δὲ προΰτυψαν ἀολλέες: ἦρχε δ' ἄρ' Ἕκτωρ.
> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ προχοῇσι διϊπετέος ποταμοῖο
> βέβρυχεν μέγα κῦμα ποτὶ ῥόον, ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄκραι
> ἠϊόνες βοόωσιν ἐρευγομένης ἁλὸς ἔξω,

[13] Edwards, *The Iliad,* 145, notes the parechesis.

[14] "Tell me now, Muses, who have dwellings on Olympus/how indeed first fire was flung upon the ships of the Achaeans." We note the *mu* alliteration (μοι Μοῦσαι) of line 112 and the *pi* alliteration of line 113.

[15] Janko, *Iliad,* 47.

[16] Kirk, *Iliad,* 88, had noted the soundplay of lines 263–266.

[17] Note how the parechesis of compares with Ἀχιλλεύς./μάχεσθαι.

τόσσῃ ἄρα Τρῶες ἰαχῇ ἴσαν. αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ
ἔστασαν ἀμφὶ Μενοιτιάδῃ ἕνα θυμὸν ἔχοντες. (*Il*. 17.261–267)

The coincidence of Ἀχαιῶν/Ἕκτωρ/ἄκραι/ἔξω/Ἀχαιοὶ/ἔχοντες and the parechesis of μάχην/Ἀχαιῶν (line 261) is obviously a well-planned poetic structuring device.

Conclusion

The many instances of alliteration and parechesis on proper names in Homer, including the historically significant topos "Achaia," recognized by a variety of classicists from different eras, presage Paul's tendency to alliterate on the names of places that have renewed historical importance in the Christian era.

Table 6. Alliteration with δοῦλος in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

Alliteration with δοῦλος in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles
(* δοῦλ* = 46 occurrences)

Statistical Considerations

The self-deprecatory term δοῦλος occurs 38 times in Paul. Initial *delta* words are relatively rare (only about 2.5% in Paul, after controlling for δέ and διά), and the term is often used quite technically, for example, in the extended analogy of Galatians, where no alliteration is in sight. But elsewhere alliteration with the lexeme is evident:

1 Thessalonians

εἰδώλων δουλεύειν (1 Thess 1:9)

Galatians

οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου (Gal 4:1)
δουλεύειν θέλετε (Gal 4:9)
δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις (Gal 5:13)

1 Corinthians

ἐγὼ τοίνυν οὕτως τρέχω ὡς οὐκ ἀ*δ*ήλως,
οὕτως πυκτεύω ὡς οὐκ ἀέρ*α δ*έρων·
ἀλλ᾽ ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ *δ*ουλαγωγῶ,
μή πως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς *ἀδ*όκιμος γένωμαι. (1 Cor 9:25–27)

εἴτε *δο*ῦλ*ο*ι εἴτε ἐλ*εύθ*ερ*ο*ι (1 Cor 12:13)

2 Corinthians

… Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κύριον, ἑαυτοὺς *δὲ δ*ούλους ὑμῶν *δι*ὰ Ἰησοῦν. (2 Cor 4:5)

Romans

Παῦλος δοῦλος … ἀπόστολος (Rom 1:1)

δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ (Rom 6:19)

ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ *δ*ουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ
καὶ *δ*όκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. (Rom 14:17–18)

Philippians

δούλου λαβών (Phil 2:7)

Philemon

δοῦλον, ἀδελφὸν … μάλιστα ἐμοί, πόσῳ δὲ *μᾶλλον …*
εἰ οὖν με ἔχεις κοινωνόν, προσλ*α*βοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ.
εἰ δέ τι ἠδίκησέν σε ἢ ὀ*φείλει*, τοῦτο ἐμοὶ *ἐλλόγα*. (Phlm 1:16–18)

Table 7. Paronomasia in Galatians

Paronomasia in Galatians
At least thirty-six (367) words in Galatians are paronomastic, involving at least fourteen (14) different prefixes or roots. **Galatians 1** **Μετα- and στρέψ-** μετατίθεσθε (v. 6) μεταστρέψαι (v. 7) ὑπέστρεψα (v. 17) **ἄγγελ-** ἄγγελος/εὐαγγελίζηται/εὐηγγελισάμεθα (v. 8) **Galatians 2** **παρ- + εισ** παρεισάκτους/παρεισῆλθον (v. 4) **προσ-** πρόσωπον (v. 6) κατὰ πρόσωπον (v. 11) ἔμπροσθεν (v. 14; pun 2:11, 14) **συν-** συνυπεκρίθησαν/συναπήχθη (v. 13) συνιστάνω (v. 18) συνεσταύρωμαι (v. 19) **Galatians 3** **προ-**

προεγράφη (v. 1)
προϊδοῦσα … προευηγγελίσατο (v. 8)
προκεκυρωμένην (v. 17)

ἐν- and ἐπι-

ἐναρξάμενοι … ἐπιτελεῖσθε (v. 3)
ἐπιχορηγῶν … ἐνεργῶν (v. 5)

Galatians 3–4

κλει-

συνέκλεισεν (3:22)
συγκλειόμενοι (3:23)
ἐκκλεῖσαι (4:17)

Galatians 4

ἐξ-

ἐξαγοράσῃ (v. 5)
ἐξαπέστειλεν (v. 6)
ἐξουθενήσατε (v. 14)
ἐξεπτύσατε (v. 14)
ἐξορύξαντες (v. 15)

Galatians 5

κοπ-

ἐνέκοψεν (v. 7) /ἀποκόψονται (v. 12) (προέκοπτον 1:14)

Galatians 5–6

προ-

προκαλούμενοι (5:26)
προλημφθῇ (6:1)

Table 8. Alliterative Contexts with ἄχρι in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

Alliterative Contexts with ἄχρι in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles
Statistical Considerations The relatively rare preposition ἄχρι occurs thirteen (13) times in the undisputed Pauline epistles, often in guttural alliteration. Six instances follow: … *ἄχρι* τῆς *ἄρτι* ὥρας (1 Cor 4:11; compare ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν, Rom 8:22) ὁσάκις *γὰρ* ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν *ἄρ*τον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ *κυρ*ίου κατ*αγγ*έλλετε *ἄχρ*ι οὗ ἔλθῃ. (1 Cor 11:26) … ἀπα*ρχ*ὴ Χριστός … κατ*αργ*ήσῃ πᾶσαν *ἀρχ*ὴν … *ἄχρ*ι … ἐ*χθρ*οὺς … ἔσχατος ἐ*χθρ*ὸς κατ*αργ*εῖται.… (1 Cor 15:23–27) … κατ*αργ*ουμένου … *ἄχρ*ι *γὰρ* … κατ*αργ*εῖται.… ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται … *καρ*δίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται …. *κύρ*ιον, περι*αιρ*εῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. (2 Cor 3:13–17) … καὶ ἐκωλύθην *ἄχρ*ι τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ *καρπ*ὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ … (Rom 1:13) … *ἄχρι* ἡμ*έρ*ας *Χρι*στου…. (Phil 1:6)

Table 9. Leitmotifs of Sound in Philippians

Leitmotifs of Sound in Philippians
Four Leitmotifs **1. ἐπι** A total of thirty-one (31) ἐπ- words are evenly distributed throughout the letter (by comparison, 1 Thessalonians has seventeen [17]). The first chapter consistently exhibits ten (10) of them: ἐπισκόποις (1:1); ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ (1:3); ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ (1:5); ἐπιτελέσει (1:6); ἐπιποθῶ (1:8); ἐπιγνώσει (1:9); ἔπαινον (1:11); ἐπιχορηγίας (1:19); ἐπιθυμίαν (1:23); and ἐπιμένειν (1:24).18 In addition to the insights of Casey Wayne Davis, note the following: Phil 2:25–28: Ἐπαφρόδιτον … (v. 25) ἐπειδὴ ἐπιποθῶν … (v. 26) … ἐπὶ … (v. 27) … ἔπεμψα (v. 28); in Phil 4:16–18: ἐπέμψατε (v. 16); … ἐπιζητῶ … ἐπιζητῶ …(v. 17); ἀπέχω … Ἐπαφροδίτου (v. 18). **2. Guttural-rho** Philippians 1 carries the guttural-rho theme (begun in v. 2) farther than in any other epistle, in fact, all the way to the end of the chapter, with many parechetical relationships. Paul hardly misses a beat in a guttural-rho series that includes several uses of the name Χριστός: Χριστοῦ … Χριστῷ … (v. 1) χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη … κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (v. 2). Εὐχαριστῶ (v. 3) … χαρᾶς (v. 4) … ἄχρι (v. 5) … ἐναρξάμενος ἐν ὑμῖν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν … ἄχρι ἡμέρας Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ· (v. 6) … καρδίᾳ … χάριτος … (v. 7) … σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. (v. 8) … Χριστοῦ (v. 10) … καρπὸν … Χριστοῦ (v. 11) … Χριστῷ (v. 13) … κυρίῳ (v. 14) … Χριστὸν κηρύσσουσιν (v. 15) … Χριστὸν (v. 17) … Χριστὸς … χαίρω … χαρήσομαι (v. 18) … ἐπιχορηγίας (v. 19), ἀποκαραδοκίαν … Χριστὸς (v. 20) … Χριστὸς κέρδος (v. 21) … καρπὸς (v. 22) … Χριστῷ … κρεῖσσον (v. 23) … χαρὰν (v. 25) … Χριστῷ (v. 26) … Χριστοῦ (v. 27) … ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ (v. 29). **3. ὑπ-**

[18] See, among other Pauline pericopes, Gal 3:3–16; 1 Cor 15:40; 2 Cor 7; Rom 11:22. See also Eph 4.

2.3–13: ὑπερέχοντας (2.3); ὑπάρχων (2.6); ὑπήκοος (2.8); ὑπερύψωσεν (2.9); ὑπὲρ (2.9); ὑπηκούσατε (2.12); ὑπὲρ (2.13).”[19]

4. συν

στέφανός μου, οὕτως στήκετε … Συντύχην παρακαλῶ τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν κυρίῳ.ναὶ ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ, γνήσιε σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνου αὐταῖς, αἵτινες ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ συνήθλησάν μοι μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν συνεργῶν…. (Phil 4:1–3.) Of Phil 4:2–3, Casey Wayne Davis notes how these verses “are set off … by the four-fold use of the σύν-prefix in v. 3, playing off Συντύχην (proper name, Syntyche) in v. 2.”[20] F. W Farrar had originally noted σύζυγε/Συντύχην.[21]

Only 2 Cor 10:12 has as high a concentration: Οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρῖναι ἢ συγκρῖναι ἑαυτούς τισιν τῶν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστανόντων, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς μετροῦντες καὶ συγκρίνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς οὐ συνιᾶσιν.).

[19] Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism*, 82 n59. Unfortunately, Davis failed to take account of ὑπήκοος (v. 8) and ὑπηκούσατε (v. 12).

[20] Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism*, 82.

[21] Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, 629.

Table 10. ἁρπαγμός in Ancient Greek Literature

ἁρπαγμός in Ancient Greek Literature
(as noted by Jaeger/Hoover)

The Bible (36)

Old Testament (27)

Of the twenty-six other uses of the term in the Greek Bible, several evince soundplay:[22]
In Lev 5:21, ἁμάρτῃ is found along with forms of ἁρπαγμός in a context of conspicuous *pi* and rough breathing alliteration soundplay, respectively:

ψυχὴ ἐὰν *ἁμάρτῃ* καὶ παριδὼν παρίδῃ … ψεύσηται τὰ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἐν παραθήκῃ ἢ περὶ …… περὶ *ἁρπαγῆς* … πλησίον (Lev 5:21).… ἡνίκα ἐὰν ἁμάρτῃ καὶ πλημμελήσῃ καὶ ἀποδῷ τὸ ἅρπαγμα ὃ ἥρπασεν (Lev 5:23).

… ἀποδώσει καὶ ἅρπαγμα οὐχ ἁρπᾶται τὸν ἄρτον (Ezek 18:7; *alpha-rho-tau*)

… ἀποδῷ καὶ ἅρπαγμα ἀποτείσῃ ἐν προστάγμασιν … οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ (Ezek 33:15; paronomasia on ἀπο)

Apocrypha

In the single occurrence in Judith, ἁρπαγμὸς occurs in a highly alliterative context that includes *phi* alliteration: ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας οὐ φείσεται ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοὺς [ου-diphthong assonance] εἰς φόνον καὶ ἁρπαγὴν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ σου (Jdt 2:11).

οὐκ ἐκφεύξεται ἐν *ἁ*ρπάγματι *ἁ*μαρτωλός καὶ οὐ μὴ καθυστερήσει *ὑ*πομονὴ εὐσεβοῦ … πάσῃ ἐλεημοσύνῃ ποιήσει τόπον (guttural phrase:) ἕκαστος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα.… (Sir 16:13–14).

New Testament (9)

… ἅρπαγες. ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν (Matt 7:15–16)

… ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας. (Matt 23:25).

[22] Yet in the vast majority of Old Testament Greek translation instances, it must be admitted, no soundplay on the lexemes of *harpagmon* is in view.

… ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν (Heb 10:34).

UPE (4)

ἔπειτα … περιλειπόμενοι ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς *ἀπάντησιν*
… *πάντοτε* σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα. (1 Thess 4:17)

… οὔτε *μοιχοὶ* οὔτε *μαλακοὶ*
οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται οὔτε *κλέπται* οὔτε *πλεονέκται*,
οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐ λοίδοροι, οὐχ ἅρπαγες βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν. (1 Cor 6:9–10)
NB: two instances of parechesis in this vice list.

… ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ. (2 Cor 12:2; no alliteration)

… *ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγ*ήσατο … (Phil 2:6)

In Secular Literature

ἁρπαγμός collocated with ἕρμαιον, εὕρημα, and ἡγήσατο:

Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* (3rd or 4th century AD)

οὐχ *ἁρπαγμ*ὸν οὐδὲ ἕρμαιον ποιεῖται τὸ *πρᾶγμα*. (Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 7.20)
NB: parechesis ἁρπαγμόν/πρᾶγμα.

Plutarch, treatise on Alexander (AD 46–120)

ἃ μέν νυν κάτω τῆς *Ἀσίης Ἅρπαγος ἀνάστατα* ἐποίεε….

The initial *alpha's* of Ἀσίης Ἅρπαγος ἀνάστατα make for deliberate assonance by one of the greatest writers of ancient Greece.

Valens (etymological wordplay)

ἐὰν Ἄρης …, *ἁρπαγμὸς γάμος* …(Hoover, "Harpagmon," 113, quotes Valens, second century AD, but totally misses the soundplay)

Isidore, Bishop of Pelusium (4th–5th century AD)

Expositing the text of Phil 2:6, Isidore is apparently keenly aware of the rough breathings as he imitatively writes with aspiration: Εἰ ἕρμαιον ἡγήσατο … ἑαυτὸν ἐταπείνωσεν, ἵνα μη ὑπερισσεία … ἅτε ἅρπαγμα ἢ εὕρεμα τὴν ἀξίαν ἡγησάμενος…. (*Ep.* 4.22, MPG 78, 1072; see Hoover, "Harpagmon," 102)

Table 11. The Twelve Occurrences of ὑπάρχω in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

The Twelve Occurrences of ὑπάρχω in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles
ὑπάρχοντα occurs fewer than 180 times in all the Greek Bible, and is often collocated with gutturals. In Paul's one dozen uses of the lexeme it is often collocated with other complex guttural words: ὑπάρχειν ἀναγκαῖά (1 Cor 12:22); κατεβάρησα ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ᾽ ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος (2 Cor 12:16); νενεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετής που ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν (Rom 4:19) and especially the parechesis of Phil 2:6, ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο. 1. … ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων (Gal 1:14; *pi* alliteration and homoteleuton) 2. ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς (Gal 2:14; guttural alliteration and homoteleuton) 3. … καλὸν ὑπάρχειν … ἀνάγκην (1 Cor 7:26; compare Phil 2:6 and 1 Cor 12:22) 4. … κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων· (1 Cor 11:7; guttural alliteration) 5. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω. (1 Cor 11:18; note three chi's) 6. ἀλλὰ πολλῷ μᾶλλον [parechesis] … μέλη [parechesis] … ὑπάρχειν ἀναγκαῖά …. (1 Cor 12:22) 7. … τὰ ὑπάρχοντά … ἵνα καυχήσωμαι, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω … (1 Cor 13:3) 8. … παράκλησιν ἐδέξατο … ὑπάρχων αὐθαίρετος ἐξῆλθεν … (2 Cor 8:17) 9. … ἀγαπῶ[ν], ἧσσον ἀγαπῶμαι; Ἔστω δέ, ἐγὼ οὐ κατεβάρησα ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ᾽ ὑπάρχων

πανοῦργος δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον. (2 Cor 12:15–16)

10. … κατενόησεν … νενεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετής που ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν … (Rom 4:19)

11. ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (Phil 2:6)

12. ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες. ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ὃς μετασχηματίσει (Phil 3:19–21)

NB: … ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντα. (Acts 17:27)

Table 12. Proper Name Soundplay in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles

Proper Name Soundplay in the Undisputed Pauline Epistles
(by Greek alphabetical order)

Ἀθῆναι/Athens
(1 occurrence in Paul)

… καταλειφ*θῆναι* ἐν Ἀ*θήναις* (1 Thess 3:1)—parechesis.
NB: The syllable ναι is extremely rare apart from the infinitive ending.

In the entire Greek Bible, there are only ten occurences of "Athens" lexemes. Most of them show evidence of alliteration and even parechesis (NB: passages concerning Paul in Athens):

Μετὰ ταῦτα χωρισ*θεὶς* ἐκ τῶν *Ἀθηνῶν ἦλθεν* εἰς Κόρ*ινθον*. (Acts 18:1)
Compare ἦλθεν Ἀθηνόβιος (1 Macc 15:32)

… Παῦλον ἤγαγον ἕως *Ἀθηνῶν*, καὶ λαβόντες ἐντολὴν πρὸς τὸν Σιλᾶν καὶ τὸν *Τιμόθεον* ἵνα ὡς *τάχιστα ἔλθωσιν* πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξῄεσαν. (Acts 17:15)

… *θέλει* ταῦτα *εἶναι*. *Ἀθη*ναῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ηὐκαίρουν ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ *ἀκούειν τι καιν*ότερον. Σταθεὶς δὲ [ὁ] Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου ἔφη· *ἄν*δρες *Ἀ*θηναῖοι…. (Acts 17:20–22)

… *θη*ρίοις *πάντας* αὐτ*οὺς* ἴσ*ους*
*Ἀθη*ναίοις *ποιήσ*ειν (2 Macc 9:15)

Antioch (1)

… *Ἀντιόχειαν*, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ *ἀντέστην* (Gal 2:11)

Parechesis: Ἀντιόχειαν/ἀντέστην (both words hapax legomena)

Apollos (6)

… Ἀπολλῶ … ἀπολλυμένοις … ἀπολῶ (1 Cor 1:12, 18–19)

ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου…
ἐγὼ Ἀπολλῶ,
οὐκ ἄνθρωποί ἐστε;
Τί οὖν ἐστιν Ἀπολλῶς;

τί δέ ἐστιν Παῦλος; …
ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα,
Ἀπολλῶς ἐπότισεν, (1 Cor 3:4–6)
NB: the parechesis of Ἀπολλῶς/Παῦλος (v. 5)

Περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, πολλὰ παρεκάλεσα … (1 Cor 16:12)
NB: the parechesis of Ἀπολλῶ/πολλὰ.

Apphia (1)

Philemon 1:1 … ὁ ἀδελφὸς Φιλήμονι τῷ ἀγαπητῷ … καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ (Phlm 1:1–2)

Arabia (2)

οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν (Gal 1:17—6 π's and *alpha* assonance)

… Ἁγ*ὰρ* Σινᾶ *ὄρ*ος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ *Ἀρ*αβίᾳ· (Gal 4:25)
NB: ὄρος is a hapax legomenon in Paul.

Aristarchos (1)

Μ*ᾶρκος*, Ἀρίστ*αρχος* (parechesis), Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ συν*εργ*οί (Phlm 1:24)

Asia (3)

Ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Ἀσίας. ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ πολλὰ Ἀκύλας (1 Cor 16:19)

… ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου, ὅς ἐστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀ*σίας εἰς* Χριστόν. (Rom 16:5) NB: initial *alpha* assonance and regnum noun-preposition parechesis.

Ἀχαΐα/Achaia (7)

… τύπον πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ. ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ [ἐν τῇ] Ἀχαΐᾳ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐξελήλυθεν, ὥστε μὴ χρείαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι. (1 Thess 1:7–8)

(NB: 1 Thess 1:8 is one of only eight verses in all of Paul with four or more *chi*'s in a single verse)

… ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας (1 Cor 16:15)

τοῖς *ἁγίοις* πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ *Ἀχαΐᾳ*, (2 Cor 1:1) or, as part of larger guttural scheme: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. (2 Cor 1:1–2)

… καυχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν, ὅτι Ἀχαΐα παρεσκεύασται ἀπὸ πέρυσι … (2 Cor 9:2)

ἡ καύχησις … κλίμασιν τῆς Ἀχαΐας. (2 Cor 11:10—parechesis: καύχησις / Ἀχαΐας)

See χαρὰ ἢ στέφανος καυχήσεως (1 Thess 2:19); and κλητοὺς οἳ ἔλθωσιν ἐς κλισίην Ἀχιλῆος, noted by Eustathius.

εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν … ἁγίων … (Rom 15:26)
(NB: *kappa*–guttural alliteration)

Barnabbas (4)

Galatians 2:1 Ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρναβᾶ συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον· ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν (Gal 2:1–2)—only 325 total *betas* in Paul. Barnabas is the only proper name in Paul that begins with a B other than Benjamin (Rom 11:1; Phil 3:5) and Belial (2 Cor 6:15), and the only other use of ἀνέβη in Paul is from an OT quote: ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη (1 Cor 2:9) where the Greek translation of [Hebrew] seems going out of the way. See Matt 12:27 Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω (Matt. 12:27).

NB: *Beta* is relatively rare in koine Greek—only 325 total *betas* in Paul.

Galatians (3)

Gal 1:2 ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας (Gal 1:2)

1 Cor 16:1 …διέταξα ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας;

The third use of "Galatians," the vocative in Gal 3:1, is followed by one of the most unalliterative phrases in Paul: Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν. But the last word of Chapter 2 is alliterative with the first noun of Chapter 3: … ἀπέθανεν. Ὦ ἀνόητοι, a typical Pauline collocation, imperfect parechesis yet nonetheless alliteration.

Ἕλλην/ Hellenes (12)

*ἀλλ᾽/Ἕλλ*ην ὤν/ … παρεισ*ῆλ*θον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν *ἐ*λευθερίαν … *ἀ*λήθεια … (Gal 2:3–5)

οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ *Ἕλλ*ην,
οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ *ἐ*λεύθερος,
οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θ*ῆλ*υ·
πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. (Gal 3:28)

NB: See Many examples in Homer of similar end colon parechesis. Further, ἔνι and Ἕλλην are parechetical. Moreover, the soundplay of ὑμεῖς εἷς at the end of the verse is just as much parechesis as any collocations.) … ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν [Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] (Gal 3:28)

γίνεσθε καὶ Ἕλλησιν καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (1 Cor 10:32)

εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες
εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι,
καὶ πάντες ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν. (1 Cor 12:13)

Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, … παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ *Ἕλληνι*. (Rom 1:16)

Ἐπαφρᾶς/Epaphras (1)

Ἀσπάζεταί σε Ἐπαφρᾶς … (Phlm 1:23)—although the name and euphony could be a fortuitous coincidence.

Ἐπαφρόδιτος/Epaphroditus (2)

… Ἐπα*φ*ρόδιτον τὸν ἀδελ*φ*ὸν καὶ συνεργὸν καὶ συστρατιώτην μου, … πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐπειδὴ ἐπιποθῶν … Ἐπα*φ*ρόδιτον (Phil 2:25–26)

This verse is yet another alliterative complement to ἀδελ*φ*ὸ–. The proper name is part of a paronomastic pun scheme with the ἐπ- terms: Ἐπα*φ*ρόδιτον … ἐπειδὴ ἐπιποθῶν. The cause-and-effect relationship between "Epaphroditus" and his "longing" to see the Philippians is represented in alliteration: Ἐπα*φ*ρόδιτον… ἐπιποθῶν. (Phil 2:25–26). Put differently, in Phil 2:25 proper name soundplay on Ἐπαφρόδιτον is part of an ἐπὶ scheme that is just one of the *leitmotifs* of the letter. Ten occurrences in the first chapter might be said to be spearheaded by ἐπισκόποις (Phil 1:1) But significant clusters of these occur around the two mentions of the name Ἐπαφρόδιτον: in Phil 2:25–28: Ἐπαφρόδιτον … (v. 25) ἐπειδὴ ἐπιποθῶν … (v. 26) … ἐπὶ … (v. 27) … ἔπεμψα (v. 28)

ἀπέχω … παρὰ Ἐπαφροδίτου (Phil 4:18). NB: The name is embedded in a heavy concentration of *pi*'s—one of the highest concentrations possible in the Greek language: ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα καὶ περισσεύω· πεπλήρωμαι … παρὰ Ἐπαφροδίτου τὰ παρ᾽ ὑμῶν and is in a verse that contains the complement to parechesis on Εὐοδίαν from 4:2, namely, εὐωδίας (4:18).

Context: Phil 4:16–18: ἐπέμψατε (v. 16); … ἐπιζητῶ … ἐπιζητῶ …(v. 17);
ἀπέχω … Ἐπαφροδίτου (v. 18).

Ephesus (2)

… ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριομάχησα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος; εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνῄσμεν (1 Cor 15:32):

a. εἰ κατὰ ἄν*θ*ρωπον ἐ*θ*ηριομάχησα *ἐν Ἐφ*έσῳ, τί μοι τὸ ὄ*φ*ελος; εἰ *νεκρ*οὶ οὐ*κ ἐγείρ*ονται,
b. *Ἐφ*έσῳ … ὄ*φ*ελος

ἐπιμενῶ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἕως … ἀφόβως (1 Cor 16:8–10)[23]

NB: Verses 6 through 8, exhibit *epsilon* prominence, obvious paronomasia (παραμενῶ … καὶ παραχειμάσω v. 6; ἐπιμεῖναι … ἐπιτρέψῃ v. 7) and *pi* alliteration along with more subtle proper name soundplay on the name "Ephesus." *Pi* alliteration is salient: [6] πρὸς … παραμενῶ … παραχειμάσω… προπέμψητε … πορεύωμαι [five *pi*-initial words in fifteen].
… παρόδῳ ἰδεῖν, ἐλπίζω … ἐπιμεῖναι πρὸς … ἐπιτρέψῃ.
ἐπιμενῶ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς· (1 Cor 16:6–8)

ἐπιμενῶ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς· *Epsilon*'s in v. 8 lead to "Ephesus":

… ἀσπάσασθε *Ἐ*παίνετον τὸν ἀγ*α*πητόν μου, ὅς ἐστιν *ἀ*παρχὴ … (Rom 16:5)

Seven other uses in the New Testament:

NB: Alliteration may shed light on the important textual critical question of Eph 1:1,
… διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι*ν* [*ἐν Ἐ*φέσῳ] (Eph. 1:1)

Compare: … τοῦ θεοῦ θέλοντος, ἀνήχθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφέσου…. (Acts 18:21)

Note how after the highly alliterative v. 18, where the undoubtedly alliterative play on the proper name occurs—κειράμενος ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς τὴν κεφαλήν, εἶχεν γὰρ εὐχήν (v. 18)
NB: In Acts 18:18–24, Ephesus is mentioned three times: … εἰς Ἔφεσον, κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν (v. 19) … τοῦ θεοῦ θέλοντος, ἀνήχθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφέσου (v. 21) … εἰς Ἔφεσον (v. 21)

[κατ]ελθεῖν εἰς Ἔφεσον καὶ εὑρεῖν (Acts 19:1)

ὅσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (2 Tim 1:18)

εἰς Ἔφεσον. (2 Tim 4:12)

But ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν (1 Tim 1:3)

ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις, εἰς Ἔφεσον (Rev 1:11)

ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας (Rev 2:1)

Εὔα/Eve (1)

φοβοῦμαι δὲ μή πως, ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὔαν ἐν…. (2 Cor 11:3)
Compare the only other NT use: … ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὔα. (1 Tim 2:13)

[23] There are 133 words between *phi's* vv. 15:58 to 16:8—then 12 *phi* words finish the chapter (*phi* = 2.9% frequency in Paul).

***Ἱεροσ*όλυμα/Jerusalem** (10)

*εἰς Ἱεροσ*όλυμα (Gal 1:17)

εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἱστορῆσαι (Gal 1:18)

*εἰς Ἱεροσ*όλυμα (Gal 2:1)

εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ (Rom 15:25)

εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ (Rom 15:31)

*Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστ*ίν (Gal 4:26)

εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ· … Ἐλεύσομαι (1 Cor 16:3–5)

NB: Ἔπειτα μετὰ ἔτη τρία [*tau* alliteration] … εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν καὶ ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε, (Gal 1:18) Gal 1:18 is a highly alliterative verse: Ἔπειτα μετὰ … ἐπέμεινα is parechesis.

Illyrikos (1)

καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ (Rom 15:19)

Ἰουδαῖος/Jew/Judea(n) (33)

… ἀδελφοί … θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ …
ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν *ἰδίων* …
καθὼς καὶ
αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν *Ἰουδαίων,* (1 Thess 2:14)

οὐκ ... *Ἰουδαῖος* οὐδὲ … δοῦλος (Gal 3:28)
NB: Gal 3:28 is one of the most highly alliterative verses in Paul:
*οὐ*κ *ἔ*νι Ἰ*ουδ*αῖος οὐδὲ *Ἕ*λλην,
*οὐ*κ ἔνι *δο*ῦλος *οὐδὲ ἐ*λεύθερος,
*οὐ*κ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ·
πάντες γὰρ *ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐ*ν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

Isaak (1) **and Rebecca** (1)

Rom 9:10, 12, 21

καὶ Ῥεβ*έκκα ἐξ* ἑνὸς *κ*οίτην *ἔχουσα, Ἰσαὰκ* (Rom 9:10)— *ἔχουσα, Ἰσαὰκ* is palindromic!
NB: Subsequent verses show similar *epsilon gamma* theme: οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων (Rom 9:12); and οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς (Rom 9:21).

(See *Od*. 14.126 ὃς δέ κ' ἀλητεύων Ἰθάκης ἐς δῆμον ἵκηται)

Israel (19)

ἔλεος καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσρα*ὴλ* (Gal 6:16)

οἵτινές *εἰσ*ιν *Ἰσ*ραηλῖται (Rom 9:4)

Καίσαρος/Caesar (1)

… ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *μετὰ* τοῦ πνεύ*ματος* ὑμῶν (Phil 4:22–23)

Κεγχρεαῖ/Cenchreae (1)

διάκονον τῆς *ἐκκ*λησίας τῆς ἐν *Κεγχρ*εαῖς, ἵνα αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ *ἀ*ξίως τῶν *ἁ*γίων καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν *χρ*ήζῃ … (Rom 16:1–2)—all four gutturals involved.

Note the parechesis of εἶχεν/εὐχήν at Acts 18:18, where Paul had his head shaved: κειράμενος ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς τὴν κεφαλήν, εἶχεν γὰρ εὐχήν.

Κηφᾶς/Kephas (8; see Peter)

εἴτε Παῦλος εἴτε Ἀπολλῶς
εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος
εἴτε ζωὴ εἴτε θάνατος,
εἴτε ἐνεστῶτα εἴτε μέλλοντα· πάντα ὑμῶν (1 Cor 3:22)

… οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν[24] … καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ Κηφᾶς; (1 Cor 9:5)

καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς
καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα·
ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ, (1 Cor 15:4–6)

Κλήμεντος/Clement (1)

συνήθλησάν μοι μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος (Phil 4:3)

Κορίνθ/Corinth[25] (4)

ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ *θ*εοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίν*θ*ῳ (1 Cor 1:2)

ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ *θ*εοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίν*θ*ῳ (2 Cor 1:1)

[24] See Russell, *Paronomasia*.

[25] Compare *Il.* 1.405 … Κρονίωνι καθέζετο κύδεϊ γαίων.

ἦλθον εἰς Κόρ*ινθον* οὐχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν (2 Cor 1:23–24)

*Κορ*ίνθιοι, ἡ *καρ*δία (2 Cor 6:11)

Macedonia (15)

Several occurrences involve alliteration, on at least three of the letters in the name (see Table 8 above):

ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπον πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ.
ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ [ἐν τῇ] Ἀχαΐᾳ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐξελήλυθεν, ὥστε μὴ χρείαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι. (1 Thess 1:7–9)

… ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ. Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, περισσεύειν μᾶλλον (1 Thess 4:10)

Μακεδονίαν *δ*ιέλθω· Μακε*δ*ονίαν γὰρ *δ*ιέρχομαι (1 Cor 16:5)

οὐ*κ* ἔσχηκα … ἀδελφόν μου, ἀλλὰ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἐξῆλθον εἰς Μακεδονίαν. (2 Cor 2:13, see Phil 4:15)

οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με Τίτον τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, ἀλλ᾽ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἐξῆλθον εἰς Μακεδονίαν. (2 Cor 2:13, five initial *mu* words)

… *Μακ*εδονίαν οὐδεμίαν … · ἔξωθεν *μάχ*αι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι. (2 Cor 7:5; wordplay explains the unusual synecdoche of μάχαι). Which itself is found with parallel parechesis:
ἔξωθεν μάχαι,
ἔσωθεν φόβοι.

… χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δεδομένην ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Μακεδονίας, ὅτι ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ…. (2 Cor 8:1–2)

οἴδατε δὲ … Μακεδονίας, οὐδεμία μοι … εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι (Phil 4:15—one of only two verses in Philippians with 5 *delta*'s; see 2 Cor 7:5). (See Eustathius's Δημολέοντα δάμασσεν.)

Mark (1)

Μ*ᾶρκος*, Ἀρίστ*αρχος* (parechesis), Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ συν*εργ*οί (Phlm 1:24)

Moses[26] (9)

[26] Note also the circumstantial parechesis and considerable *omega* assonance in the Greek rendering of the Song of Moses (Exodus 15:1): *ᾠδὴ* Μ*ωυσέως* ἐν τῇ *ἐξόδῳ ᾄσωμεν τῷ* κυρί*ῳ ἐνδόξως* γὰρ *δεδόξ*ασται … (Ode 1:1)

Two high-frequency *mu* verses, suggest soundplay: 1 Cor 9:9 and Rom 5:14.

ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μ*ωϋσέως* νόμῳ γέγραπται·
οὐ κη*μώσεις* βοῦν ἀλοῶντα. (1 Cor 9:9)

NB: The parechesis of *Μωϋσέως*/κη*μώσεις*.

… μέχρι Μωϋσέως … μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι … μέλλοντος. (Rom 5:14)

The broader context of Rom 5 substantiates the claim of *mu* alliteration, with its numerous alliterative associations highlighted as follows:

… *μ*ὴ ὄντος *νόμ*ου, *ἀλλ*᾽ ἐβ*ασίλ*ευσεν … ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως … *μ*ὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι … *μέλλ*οντος.… *πολλῷ* μᾶλλ*ον* … πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν … κρίμα … κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων…. πολλῷ μᾶλλον…. (Rom 5:13–17). Here, *μέλλ*οντος.… *πολλῷ* μᾶλλ*ον* are parechetical.

Initial *mu*'s, in fact, are so rare in Romans that not a single *mu* initial word occurs in the first seven verses—then there is a cluster of eight (8) such words, vv. 8–11, followed by 229 words before another. There are only two *mu*-initial words, other than one μὲν and several μή's, in all of Rom 3. One of these occurs in a highly nasal verse: *μόνον*; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθ*νῶν*; *ν*αὶ καὶ ἐθ*νῶν* (Rom 3:29)

Paul (19)

Παῦλος καὶ ἅπαξ (1 Thess 2:18; see ἀδελ*φ*οῖς ἐ*φ*άπαξ, 1 Cor 15:6)

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος (Gal 1:1)

Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (1 Cor 1:1)

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος (2 Cor 1:1)

ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε (Gal 5:2)

Ἀπολλῶς; τί δέ ἐστιν Παῦλος; (1 Cor 3:5)

Παῦλος εἴτε Ἀπολλῶς (1 Cor 3:22)

Παῦλος παρακαλω (2 Cor 10:1)

Παῦλος δοῦλος (Rom 1:1)

Παῦλος πρεσβύτης (Phlm 1:9); context: … παρακαλῶ, τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης.…)

Παῦλος/προσοφείλεις (Phlm 1:19)

Context: ἐγὼ Παῦλος … ἐγὼ ἀποτίσω· … προσοφείλεις. ναὶ ἀδελφέ, ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην … ἀνάπαυσόν….

Πεποιθὼς τῇ ὑπακοῇ σου ἔγραψά σοι… ποιήσεις. (Phlm 1:19–21)

Persida (1)

ἀσπάσασθε Τρύφαιναν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν κυρίῳ. *ἀσπάσασθε Περσίδα* τὴν ἀγαπητήν, ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν κυρίῳ. (Rom 16:12; NB: the *kappa* alliteration and the anagrammatic similarity of the consecutive words *ἀσπάσασθε Περσίδα*).

Peter (2)

… πεπίστευμαι … Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς, ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη (Gal 2:7–8)

Satan[27] (7)

ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς (1 Thess 2:18)
Broader Context: σατανᾶς … στέφανος … στέγοντες … συνεργὸν … στηρίξαι … σαίνεσθαι (1 Thess 2:18–3:3)

σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός (1 Cor 5:5)

πειράζῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς (1 Cor 7:5)

σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται (2 Cor 11:14)

σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί, ἄγγελος σατανα (2 Cor 12:7)

συντρίψει τὸν σατανᾶν (Rom 16:20)

Spain (2)

ὡς ἂν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν· ἐλπίζω γὰρ διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ ἐὰν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ (Rom 15:24, one of the highest densities of *pi* in Paul, with 7 *pi* prominent words)

Stephan (3)

Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί· οἴδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ, … χαίρω δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ παρουσίᾳ

[27] In the entire Greek Bible, the name Satan occurs thirty-nine times. Perhaps the most famous use in the New Testament is from Luke, an onamatapoetic verse in which Jesus rhetorically hisses a warning at Peter. The verse begins with a Hebraic double on a deliberately chosen cognomen: Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον· (Luke 22:31). Here σατανᾶς/σῖτον is a much overlooked parechesis in this undeniably sibilant verse.

Στεφανᾶ καὶ Φορτουνάτου καὶ Ἀχαϊκοῦ, ὅτι τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα οὗτοι ἀνεπλήρωσαν (1 Cor 16:15, 17)

φθαρτὸν στέφανον (1 Cor 9:25)

Συντύχην/Syntyche (1)

… *Συντύχην* … σέ, γνήσιε σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνου [one of only a dozen consecutive *sigma* pairs in Paule] αὐταῖς, αἵτινες ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ συνήθλησάν ... συνεργῶν μου … (Phil 4:2–3)
NB: paronomasia of συν-prefix on five words.

Timothy (11 occurrences)

… Τιμό*θεος* τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ *Θ*εσσαλονικέων ἐν *θε*ῷ … (1 Thess 1:1)

Τιμόθεον, τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Thess 3:2)

ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου (1 Thess 3:6a)

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Σωσθένης ὁ ἀδελφὸς (1 Cor 1:1)

Διὰ τοῦτο ἔπεμψα ὑμῖν Τιμόθεον, ὅς ἐστίν μου τέκνον … (1 Cor 4:17)

ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος (1 Cor 16:10)

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος (2 Cor 1:1)

(See also: διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς [Col 1:1])

Τιμόθεον ταχέως (Phil 2:19) (Compare Τιμόθεον ἵνα ὡς τάχιστα ἔλθωσιν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξῆεσαν [Acts 17:15])

NB: Only in Philemon, where *phi* theme is evident in the opening two verses, does Paul fail to alliterate on the name Timothy: Παῦλος δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Φιλήμονι τῷ ἀγαπητῷ καὶ συνεργῷ ἡμῶν καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ…. (Phlm 1:1–2)

Titus (11)

Καὶ γὰρ ἐλθόντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι· ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι.
ἀλλ᾽ ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινοὺς παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ Τίτου (2 Cor 7:3–6)

ἐπὶ τῇ χαρᾷ *Τίτου, ὅτι* ἀναπέπαυται τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πάντων ὑμῶν·
ὅτι εἴ τι αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν *κεκαύχ*ημαι, οὐ *κατησχ*ύνθην,
ἀλλ᾽ ὡς πάντα ἐν *ἀλ*ηθείᾳ ἐ*λαλ*ήσαμεν ὑμῖν,
οὕτως καὶ ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν ἡ ἐπὶ Τίτου ἀλήθεια ἐγενήθη. (2 Cor 7:13–14)—in a context of alliteration)

Τίτον… ἐπιτελέσῃ …τὴν … ταύτην. (2 Cor 8:6)—Note alliteration:
… *π*αρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον,
ἵνα καθὼς *π*ροενήρξατο οὕτως
καὶ ἐ*π*ιτελέσῃ *εἰς* ὑμᾶς
καὶ *τὴν* χάριν *ταύτην*. (2 Cor 8:6)

Τίτου, ὅτι τὴν (2 Cor 8:16–17)

Troas (1)

Τρῳάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θύρας (2 Cor 2:12)

Pharisee (1)

φυλῆς … Φαρισαῖος (Phil 3:5)

Pharoah (1)

ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραὼ (Rom 9:17)

ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος
ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος θεοῦ.
λέγει *γὰρ* ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φ*αραὼ*
ὅτι εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε
ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου
καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ.
ἄρα οὖν ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ…. (Rom 9:16–18)

Φιλήμων/Philemon (1)

… ὁ ἀδελφὸς Φιλήμονι τῷ ἀγαπητῷ … καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ (Phlm 1:1–2)

Philippi(ans) (3)

Αὐ*τοὶ* γὰρ *οἴδατε, ἀδελφοί, τὴν εἴσοδον* ἡμῶν τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὅτι οὐ *κενὴ γέγονεν*, ἀλλὰ προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες, καθὼς οἴδατε, ἐν Φιλίπποις ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα…. (1 Thess 2:1–2)[28]

[28] NB: one of the most highly alliterative verses in Paul, with omicron-iota diphthong, pi, guttural-epsilon-nun, etc).

ἐν Φιλίπποις σὺν ἐπισκόποις (Phil 1:1)

Phoebe (1)

Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν (Rom 16:1)—in a verse with another proper name soundplay:
… [καὶ] διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς, (Rom 16:1) See ἀδελφ- many times in alliterative contexts.

Χριστός/Christ (>260)

The name "Christ" occurs over 200 times in Paul and is frequently alliterated upon with poignant effect. See especially, Gal 3:13; 1 Cor 15:12, 14, 16, 57; 2 Cor 4:5; 5:14, 17; Rom 5:15, 7:25, 8:34–35; 16:18, 25; Phil 1:18, 2:16; 3:7; 4:19, 23; and Phlm 1:25. It would be particularly untenable to suggest that Paul, who has the name Χριστός on his mind continually, would *inadvertently* alliterate so frequently. Some of the more salient examples follow:

καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ *Χριστῷ*, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. Εὐχαριστοῦμεν (1 Thess 1:1–2; See Gal 1:3, 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Rom 1:7, Phil 1:2; Phlm 1:3)

εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας (2 Cor 1:21; see Russell, 1920)

Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν *Χριστὸς*
καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν *κέρδος* (Phil 1:21, parechesis; see Fee, 1995)

***Ὡσηὲ*/Hosea** (1)

ὡς καὶ ἐν *τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει·* καλέσω τὸν οὐ *λαόν* μου *λαόν* μου … (Rom 9:25)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Percy. *Graces of Harmony: Alliteration, Assonance, and Consonance in Eighteenth–Century British Poetry*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1977.

Adams, Sean. "Paul's Letter Opening and Greek Epistolography: A Matter of Relationship." Pages 33–55 in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean Adams. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Ahl, Frederick. *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and other Classical Poets*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Alexander, Loveday. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1*. SNTSMS 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Ameringer, Thomas Edward. *The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom: A Study in Greek Rhetoric*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1921.

Anderson, R. Dean and Anderson, R. Dean Jr. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian*. Leuven: Peters, 2000.

Anderson, R. Dean Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, Leuven: Peters, 1999.

———. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, Leuven: Peters, 2000.

Aristotle. *Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by J. H. Freese. 23 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to Hebrews*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*. Edited and translated by R. P. H Green. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

Aune, David E., *Revelation 6–16*. WBC 52B. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998.

———. *Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*. Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 2003.

Ausloos, Hans et al. “The Study of Aetiological Wordplay as a Content–Related Criterion in the Characterization of LXX Translation Technique.” Pages 273–94 in *Die Septuaginta–Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer et al. WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Austermann, Frank. “ἀνομία im Septuaginta–Psalter: Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Ü̈bersetzungsweise und Theologie,” Pages 99–138, in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. Edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2001.

Baden, William Wilson. *The Principle Figures of Language and Figures of Thought in Isaeus and the Guardianship-Speeches of Demosthenes*. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1892.

Ballif, Michelle and Michael G. Moran, eds. *Classical Rhetoric and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005.

Balz, Horst. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Bassett, Samuel Eliot. *The Poetry of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1938.

Bauer, Walter, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Baur, Karl Ludwig. *Rhetoricae Paullinae, vel, Quid oratorium sit in oratione Paulli*. 2 vols. Halae: Impensis Orphanotrophei, 1782.

———. *Logica Paullina*. Halle: Magdeburg, 1774.

Bengelii, D. Joh. Alberti. *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, Tübingae: sumtibus Ludov. Frid. Fues, 1855.

Bengel, John Albert. *The Gnomon of the New Testament*. Edited by Andrew R. Fausset. Translated by James Bandinel et al. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1858.

Bérard, Victor. *Introduction a l’Odyssée* Tome 1 and 2. Paris: Universites De France, 1933.

Best, Ernest. *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. BNTC. 7 London: Black, 1977.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians." *NTS* 21 (1975): 353–79.

———. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

———. *2 Corinthians 8 and 9. A Critical & Historical Commentary on the Bible.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

———. *Paulinische Studien*. Tübingen: Mohr Seibeck, 1994.

BibleWorks. *BibleWorks 10: Software for Biblical Research and Exegesis*. Ver. 10.0.6.109. Norfolk: BibleWorks, 2017.

Black, C. Clifton and Duane F. Watson, eds. *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*. SRR 8. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.

Black, D. A. "The Pauline Love Command: Structure, Style, and Ethics in Romans 12: 9–21," *FilNeot* 1 (1989): 3–21.

Blass, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Rev. and enl. ed. London: Macmillan, 1911.

Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Revision of the Ninth-Tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner*. Rev. ed. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bons, Eberhard. "Rhetorical Devices in the Septuagint Psalter." Pages 69–79 in *Et sapienter et eloquenter Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint*. FRLANT. Vol. 241. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Booth, Wayne. "Rhetorical Critics Old and New: The Case of Gérard Genette." Pages 123–41 in *Reconstructing Literature.* Edited by Laurence Lerner. Totowa, NJ: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

Böttcher, J.F. *de paronomasia finitimisque et figuris Paulo Ap. frequentatis*. Lipsiae: n.p., 1823.

Bruce, F.F. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. WBC 45. Waco, TX: Word, 1982.

Bullinger, E. W. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*, New York: E & J.B. Young, 1898.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*. FRLANT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1910.

Campbell, James. *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1922.

Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. WUNT 167. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004. Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.

———. *Peter and the Rock*. BZNWKAK 58. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990.

Cassiodorus. *Cassiodorus: "Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning" and "One the Soul."* Translated by James W. Halporn. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004.

———. *Expositio Psalmorum*. Edited by M. Adriaen, *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Expositio Psalmorum*, CCSL 97, 98 Turnhout: Brepols, 1958.

Choniates, Nicetas. *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*. Edited by Jan Louis van Dieten. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975.

Church, F. Forrester. "Rhetorical Structure and Design in Paul's Letter to Philemon." *HTR* 71 (1978): 17–33.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Oratore*. Translated by E. W. Sutton. 28 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Cicero (and Pseudo-C.), *Ad C. Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. 28 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians,* Sacra Pagina 7. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

Conley, Thomas M. *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Copeland, Rita, ed. *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature: Vol. 1: 800–1558*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Cosby, Michael R. "Paul's Persuasive Language in Romans 5." Pages 209–225 in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Edited by Duane F. Watson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.

Cruttwell, Charles T. *A History of Roman Literature: From the Earliest Period to the Death of Marcus Aurelius*. London: Scribner, 1878.

Currid, John D. "Genesis." Pages 24–51 in *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*. Edited by Miles V. Van Pelt. Wheaton, Il.: Crossway, 2016.

Danker, Frederick W. *II Corinthians*. ACNT. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

Davids, Peter H. *The Epistles of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Davis, Casey W. *Oral Biblical Criticism: The Influence of the Principles of Orality on the Literary Structure of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*. JSNTSup 172. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1999.

Davis, Janet B. "Hermogenes of Tarsus." Pages 194–202 in *Classical Rhetoric and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources*. Edited by Michelle Ballif and Michael G. Moran. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Light from Ancient Near East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco–Roman World*. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. 2nd ed. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.

Deming, William. *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Denniston, John D. *Greek Prose Style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Dibelius, Martin. *An die Thessalonicher I, II. An die Philipper*. Band XI. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1925.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *The Critical Essays*. Translated by Stephen Usher. 2 vols. LCL Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.

———. *Thucydides*. Translated by Stephen Usher. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Du Toit, Andrie. *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and David S. du Toit. BZNW 151. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Duncan, Thomas. "The Style and Language of Saint Paul in His First Letter to the Corinthians." *BSac* 83 (1926): 129–43.

Edwards, Mark W. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

———. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part I." *OT* 1 (1986): 171–230.

———. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part II." *OT* 3 (1988): 11–60.

———. *Sound, Sense, and Rhythm: Listening to Greek and Latin Poetry*. Martin Classical Lectures. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Ellinger, K. and W. Rudolph. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (*BHS*). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969. Repr. 1977.

Ennius. *Remains of Old Latin: Ennius and Caecilius*. Translated by E. H. Warmington. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronunciatione dialogus*. Basiliae: Frobernius, 1528.

Eustathius. *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes*. Translated by Marchinus van der Valk. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1971–1987.

Farmer, William R. "Reflections on Jesus and the New Testament Canon." Pages 321–40 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.

Farrar, William F. *The Life and Work of St. Paul*. Vol. 1. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1880.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First and Second Letter to the Thessalonians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

———. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. NIBCNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

———. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Fehling, Detlev. *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969.

Fennell, C.A.M. *Pindar: the Olympian and Pythian Odes*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1893.

Festugiére, A.-J. "L'Expérience Religieuse Du Médecin Thessalos." *RBi* 48 (1939): 45–77.

Fitzgerald, John T. "The Catalogue in Ancient Greek Literature." Pages 275–93 in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, eds. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Fraunce, Abraham. *The Arcadian Rhetorike: or The præcepts of rhetorike made plaine by examples Greeke, Latin, English, Italian, French, Spanish, out of Homers Ilias, and Odissea, Virgils Aeglogs,* […] *and Aeneis, Sir Philip Sydnieis Arcadia, songs and sonets* […]. London: Thomas Orwin, 1588.

Genette, Gérard. "Rhetoric Restrained" in *Figures of Literary Discourse.* New York: Columbia, 1982.

Glassius, Salomon, Olearius, Johann Gottfried, Buddeus, and Joannes Franciscus. *Philologia sacra: qua totius SS. Veteris et Novi Testamenti Scripturae tum Stylus et Literatura, tum Sensus et Genuinae Interpretationis Ratio et Doctrina libris quinque Expenditur ac Traditur; qui Absolvuntur Philogia B. Auctori Speciatim sic Dicta, Grammatica et Rhetorica Sacra*. n.p. 1623. Repr. Lipsiae: Apud Jo. Fridericum Gleditsch & Filium, 1713.

Glover, Terrot R., *Paul of Tarsus*. New York: George H. Doran, 1925.

Göttling, Karl Wilhelm. *The Poems of Hesiodus*. 1831. 3rd ed. Jay Flach, 1878. Gotha and Erfurt 1831, 2nd edition 1843; edition of Leipz. 1878 redesigned by Geoffroi Jacques Flach,

Gorgias. *Encomium of Helen*. Translated by Douglas M. MacDowell. Bristol: Bristol Classical, 1982.

———. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Translated by H. Diels. 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1952. Repr. Dublin, 1966.

Green, H. Benedict. *Matthew: Poet of the Beatitudes*. JSNTSup 203. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.

Greene, Roland, Steven Cushman, Clare Cavanagh, Jahan Ramazani, Paul Rouzer, eds. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 4th ed., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Gregory of Nazianzus. "Nativity Homily" in PG 43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Hall, Stuart G. "Melito, *Peri Pascha* 1 and 2: Text and Interpretation." Pages 238–48 in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*. Edited by Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann. Münster: Aschendorff, 1970.

Hartog, Paul in *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament.* Edited by David Aune. Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell, 2010.

Hawthorne, G. F. *Philippians*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.

Hayward Mark S. "Wordplay between *ΘΕΩ/ΘΟΟΣ* and *ΘΕΟΣ* in Homer." *PLLS* 4 (1983): 215–18.

Heinrici, Georg C. F. *Der erste Brief an die Korintherbrief*. 9th ed. KEK 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896.

———. *Das zweite Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinthier*, Berlin: Bessersche Buchhandling, 1887.

———. *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther*. 8th ed. MeyerK 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900.

Hermogenes. *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*. Edited by Hugo Rabe. Translated by George A. Kennedy. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2005.

———. *Hermogenes' On Types of Style*. Translated by Cecil W. Wooten. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

———. *On Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric*. Edited by Malcolm Heath. Translated by Malcolm Heath. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

Hermogenes (and Pseudo-H.). *Hermogenis opera*. Translated by H. Rabe. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. Repr. Stuttgart, 1969.

Herodianos, Ailios. Περὶ σχημάτων. L. Spengel, ed. *Rhetores Graeci*. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner, 1856.

Herrick, James A. *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction*. 5th ed. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Hervey, George Winfred. *A System of Christian Rhetoric for the Use of Preachers and Other Speakers.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1873.

Hesiod. *Εργα καὶ Ημέραι*. n.p.

Hester, James. “The Use and Influence of Rhetoric in Galatians 2:1–14.” *TZ* 42 (1986): 386–408.

Hildebrandt, Herbert W., ed. *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes*. Gainesville, FL: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1961.

Holloway, Paul A.” in *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*. Edited by Stephen Westerholm. Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell, 2010.

Holmes, John. *The Art of Rhetoric Made Easy: Or, The Elements of Oratory Briefly stated, and fitted for the Practice of The Studious Youth of Great-Britain and Ireland*. London: C. Hitch and L. Hawes, 1755.

Homer. *The Odyssey*. Translated by A. T. Murray. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Hoover, Roy W. “The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution,” *HTR* 64 (1971): 95–119.

Hopf, G. W. *Alliteration, Assonanz, Reim in the Bibel*. Erlangen: Deichert, 1883.

Hritzu, John N. “Jerome the Christian Cicero,” *CW* 37 (1943): 98–101.

Hughes, Frank W. “The Rhetoric of Letters.” Pages 194–240 in *The Thessalonian Debate: Methodological Discord or Methodological Synthesis?* Edited by Karl P. Donfried and Johannes Beutler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Hunt, Arthur S. and Edgar, Campbell C. *Select Papyri*. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Isidore of Pelusium, *Epistle*, MPG 78.

Isidore of Seville. *Isidore of Seville’s Etymologies: The Complete English Translation of Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri xx*. Vol. 1. Translated by Priscilla Throop. Charlotte, Vermont: MedievalMS, 2005.

Jaeger, Werner Wilhelm. “Eine stilgeschichtliche Studie zum Philippergrief,” *Hermes* 50 (1915): 537–53.

Janko, Richard. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4. Books 13–16. Edited by G. S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Jeal, Roy R. *Exploring Philemon: Freedom, Brotherhood and Partnership in the New Society*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.

Jennrich, W.A. “Classical Rhetoric in the New Testament,” *Concordia Journal* (1984–49): 30–32.

Judge, E. A. “Paul’s Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice.” *ABR* 16 (1968): 37–50.

———. *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century*. London: Tyndale, 1968.

———. “St. Paul and Classical Society.” *JAC* 11 (1972): 19–36.

Keach, Benjamin. *Troposchēmalogia: Tropes and Figures, Or, A Treatise of the Metaphors, Allegories, and Express Similitudes, &c. Contained in the Bible of the Old and New Testament . . .; Philologia Sacra, The Second Part; Wherein the Scheme, Or Figures in Scripture, are Reduced Under Their Proper Heads, with a brief explication of each . . .* London: John Darby, 1682.

———. *Tropologia: Tropologia: A Key to Open Scripture Metaphors in Four Books to which are Prefixed Arguments to Prove the Divine Authority of the Holy Bible together with Types of the Old Testament*. London: City Press, 1855.

Keller, Stefan Daniel. *The Development of Shakespeare’s Rhetoric: A Study of Nine Plays*. Tübingen: Verlag GmbH & Co., 2009.

Kennedy, George A. *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus.* The Greek text edited by Hugo Rabe. Leiden: Brill. 2005.

———. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. 2d ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

———. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. SR. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

———. *Quintilian*, New York: Twayne, 1969.

———. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963.

———. “The Ancient Dispute over Rhetoric in Homer.” *AJP* 78 (1957): 23–35.

Kern, Philip. *Galatians. Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an Approach to Paul’s Epistles*. SNTSMS 101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Kingsbury, Samuel Shipman. *A Rhetorical Study of the Style of Andocides*. Baltimore: John Murphy Company 1899.

Kirk, G.S., ed. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. 6 vols. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985–1993.

Kittle, G. and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Kloha, Jeffrey. “The Development of the Greek Language and the Manuscripts of Paul’s Letters.” Pages 114–36 in *The Press of the Text: Biblical Studies in Honor of James W. Voelz*. Edited by Andrew H. Bartelt, Jeffrey Kloha, and Paul R. Raabe. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2017.

Krausmüller, Dirk. “Theotokos-Diadochos.” Pages 35–54 in *Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23–25 March 2002*. Edited by Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday. Aldershot: University of Durham, 2006.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Edited by David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson. Translated by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, 2 vols. Munich: Max Hueber, 1960.

Leaf, Walter, ed. *The Iliad*. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1900–1902.

Lee, John A.L. “Translations of the Old Testament.” Pages 775–784 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 BC – AD 400*. Edited by S.E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Lee, Margaret E. “A Method for Sound Analysis in Hellenistic Greek: The Sermon on the Mount as a Test Case.” Th.D. diss., Melbourne College of Divinity, 2005.

Lee, Margaret Ellen and Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Sound Mapping the New Testament*. Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2009.

Leeman, Anton D. *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963.

Leff, Michael C. “The Latin Stylistic Rhetorics of Antiquity.” *SM* 40 (1973): 273–79.

Lentz, Tony M. *Orality and Literacy in Hellenic Greece*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989.

Lightfoot, Joseph B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*. London: Macmillan, 1869.

Litfin, Duane. *St. Paul’s Theology of Proclamation: Corinthians 1–4 and Roman-Greco Rhetoric*. SNTSMS 79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Lohse, Eduard. Trans. Wiliam R. Poehlmann and Rober J. Karris. *Colossians and Philemon*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Longenecker, Bruce W. *Rhetoric at the Boundaries: The Art and Theology of New Testament Chain–Link Transitions*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005.

Louw, Theo A. W. van der. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007.

Lupus, P. Rutilius. *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis libri duo, accedunt Aquilae Romani et Julii Rufiniani de eodem argumento libri*. Edited by David Ruhnken. Lugduni Batavorum, apud Samuelem et Joannem Luchtmans, 1768.

Maat, William Anthony. *A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1944.

Mack, Peter. *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice*, New York: Cambridge University Press: 2004.

Mackay, E. Anne, ed. *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*. MBCBSup 298. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. MBCBSup 188. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Malherbe, Abraham J. "Ancient Epistolary Theorists." *OJRS* 5, no. 2 (1977): 3–77.

———. *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Mancinelli, Antonio. *Carmen de figuris & tropis*. N.p. 1493.

Marcus, diaconus Gazensis. *The Life of Porphry, Bishop of Gaza*. Translated by George F. Hill. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.

Marrou, Henri I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George R. Lamb. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956.

Martin, Richard P. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Martin, Ralph P. *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Mayor, Joseph B. *Epistle of St. James*, Minneapolis: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1892.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Milligan, George. *Selections from the Greek Papyri: Edited with Translations and Notes*. Cambridge: University Press, 1910.

Milne, C.H. *A Reconstruction of the Old-Latin Text of the Gospels used by Saint Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926.

Mitchell, Margaret. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.

Moffat, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911.

———. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ICC. Edinburgh: Clark, 1924.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Moore, David S. and McCabe, George P. *Introduction to the Practice of Statistics*. 4th ed. New York: Freeman, 2003.

Mosellanus, Petrus. *Tabulae de schematibus et tropis, iam recens compluribus figuris locupletatae … illustratae, per Reinhardum Lorichium; Additum est Antonii Mancinelli Carmen de figuris & tropis* (Frankfurt, 1516).

Moule, C.D.F. "Reconsideration of the Context of Maranatha," *NTS* 6 (1960): 307–10.

Milligan, George and James Hope Moulton. *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.

Muraoka, T. "Literary Device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8 (1973): 20–30.

Murphy, James J. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

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

Mure, William. *A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Antient* [*sic*] *Greece*. 3 vols. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1850.

Norden, E. *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag B.G. Teubner, 1915.

Nordling, John. *Philemon*. ConC. St. Louis: Concordia, 2004.

O'Hara, James J. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Olbricht, Thomas H. "George Kennedy's Scholarship in the Context of North American Rhetorical Studies." In *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*. SRR 8. Edited by C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.

———. “Delivery and Memory.” Pages 159–70 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 BC–AD 400)*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. “Rhetorical Criticism in America.” Pages 88–102 in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, eds. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Olofsson, Staffan. *As a Deer Longs for Flowing Streams: A Study of the Septuagint Version of Ps 42–43 in Its Relation to the Hebrew Text*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011

O'Mahony, Kieran J. *Pauline Persuasion: A Sounding in 2 Corinthians 8–9*. JSNTSup 199. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

Opelt, Ilona. “Alliteration im Griechischen.” *Glotta* 37 (1958): 205–32.

Packard, David W. “Sound–Patterns in Homer.” *TAPA* 104 (1974): 239–60.

Pechum, Henry, *The Garden of Eloquence Conteyning Figures of Grammer and Rhetoric*k. London: H. Jackson, 1577.

Pennant, David F. “Alliteration in Some Texts of Genesis,” *Bib* 68 (1987): 390–92.

Perelman, Ch. and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958.

Perrin, Bernadotte and Thomas Day Seymour, *Homer’s Odyssey*. *Eight Books of Homer’s Odyssey*. Boston: Ginn, 1897.

Peterson, Erik. *Eis Theos:* Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtiliche Untersuchungen, Vol. 39–41. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.

Plato. *Lysis*. *Symposium*. *Gorgias*. Translated by W. R. M. Lamb. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1925.

Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Biblical Languages: Greek. Vol. 2. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994. Repr. 1999.

———. *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B*.C.*–A.D. 400*. New York: Brill, 1997.

Powell, J.E. “Puns in Herodotus.” *CR* 51 (1937): 103–5.

Quintilian. *Institutio oratoria*. Translated by D. A. Russell. 7 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Ramsaran, Rollin A. “Living and Dying, Living is Dying (Philippians 1:21): Paul’s Maxim and Exemplary Argumentation in Philippians,” in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity; ed. A. Eriksson, T. H. Olbricht, and Walter Ü̈belacker; Harrisburg, Penn: Trinity Press International, 2002.

Raymond, George. *Rhythm and Harmony in Poetry and Music Together with Music as a Representative Art: Two Essays in Comparative Aesthetics*. New York: Putnam, 1895.

Reicke, Bo. *Re-Examining Paul’s Letters. The History of the Pauline Correspondence*. Edited by David P. Moessner and Igalisa Reicke. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000.

Rendsburg, Gary A. “Alliteration in the Exodus Narrative,” in Chaim Cohen et al., eds., *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near East Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

———. “Bilingual Wordplay in the Bible.” *VT* 38, (1988): 354–57.

———. “Literary Devices in the Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor.” *JAOS* 120 (2000): 13–23.

———. “Psalm cx 3b,” *VT* 49 (1999) 548–53.

———. “Talpiyyôt (Song 4:4),” *JNSL* 20 (1994): 13–19.

Resseguie, James L. *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John*. *BibInt* 56. Boston: Brill, 2001.

Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence. Edited by James D. Hester and J. David Hester (Amador). New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Richardson, N. Volume VI Books 21–24 of *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Edited by G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Riedel Christian, *Alliteration bei den drei grossen griechischen Tragikern*. PhD diss., Erlangen, 1900.

Robertson, Archibald Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914. Repr. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.

Robertson, John C. *Gorgianic Figures in Early Greek Prose*. Baltimore: Fiedenwald, 1893.

Robinson, Charles Alexander. *The Figures and Tropes of Isaeus: A Study of His Rhetorical Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1901.

Ropes, James Hardy. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916.

Rowe, Galen O. “Style.” Pages 121–57 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C. –A.D. 400.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter. New York: Brill, 1997.

Russell, Elbert. *Paronomasia and Kindred Phenomena in the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1920.

Russo, J. “The Poetics of the Ancient Greek Proverb.” *JFR* 20 (1983): 121–30.

Sabbadini, Remigio. *Le Scoperte dei Codici Latini e Greci ne’ Secoli XIV e XV*. Vol. 1. Edited by G. C. Sansoni. Firenze: 1967.

Schellenberg, Ryan S., *Rethinking Paul’s Rhetorical Education: Comparative Rhetoric and 2 Corinthians 10–13*. SBL 10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2013.

Schubert, Paul. *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1939.

Seymour, Thomas D. *Introduction to the Language of Homer*. Boston: Ginn, 1889.

———. *Selected Odes of Pindar*. Boston, Ginn: 1882.

Sherry, Richard. *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes*. London: John Day, 1550.

Silvas, Anna M. *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters.* Supplements to *Vigilae Christianae*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Skehan, Patrick W. and Di Lella, Alexander A. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Skinner, Quentin. *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

———. *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Snyman, A. H. *A South African Perspective on the New Testament*. “Remarks on the Stylistic Parallelisms in 1 Cor 13.” Edited by H. Petzer and P. J. Hartin. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Sprengling, M. “Guignet’s Study of Gregory of Nazianzen.” Pages 434–36 in *The American Journal of Theology*. Vol. 17. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913.

Stanford, W.B. *The Sound of Greek: Studies in the Greek Theory and Practice of Euphony*. Sather Classical Lectures. Vol. 38. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

———. “Varieties of Sound-Effects in the Homeric Poems.” *ColLit* 3 (1976): 219–27.

Steinmann, Andrew E. *From Abraham to Paul: A Biblical Chronology*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2011.

Sterrett, J.R. Sitlington, ed. *Homer's Iliad: First Three Books and Selections*. New York: American Book, 1907.

Steyn, Gert J. "Some Figures of Style in the Epistle to Philemon: Their Contribution towards the Persuasive Nature of the Epistle." *EP* 77 (1995): 64–80.

Strecker, Georg and Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. Theology of the New Testament, German Edition Edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Horn. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.

Swynnerton, Thomas. *The Tropes and Figures of Scripture* (1554) reprinted in *Reformation Rhetoric: Thomas Swynnerton's The Tropes and Figures of Scripture*. Edited by Richard Rex, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press/RTM, 1999.

Tanenhause, Gussie Hecht. Translation of Bede *De schematibus et tropis* A Translation," trans. Gussie Hecht Tannenhause, *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 48 (1962) 237–53, also in *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*, eds. Joseph M. Miller et al. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1973, 96–122. *opis.* 1962.

Tite, Philip L. "How to Begin, And Why? Diverse Functions of the Pauline Prescript within a Greco-Roman Context." Pages 57–100 in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams. Boston: Brill, 2010.

Tolmie, D. Francois. *Persuading the Galatians*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Trebizond, George. *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*. Venice: n.p., 1433–34.

Tsitsanoudis-Mallidis, Nikolleta and Charalampos Stergioulis. "Rhetorical Texts of the 4th Century A.D. About Wealth and Its Loss." *AJER* 2 (2014): 955–62.

Turner, E. B. *Greek Papyri: An Introduction.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Turner, Nigel. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: IV, Style*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976.

Ulrich, Eugene. "The Notion and Definition of Canon." Pages 21–35 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.

Valiavitcharska, Vessela. *Rhetoric and Rhythm in Byzantium: Sound of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Van Unnick, W.C. *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth*. Translated by George Ogg. London: Epworth, 1962.

Volkmann, Richard. *Die Rhetoric der Römer in systematischer Übersicht*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1874

Wanamaker, Charles A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Watkins, Calvert. “Pindar’s Rigveda.” *JAOS* 122 (2002): 432–35.

Watson, Duane F. “The Role of Style in Pauline Epistles.” Pages 119–32 in *Paul and Rhetoric.* Edited by J. Paul. Sampley and Peter Lampe. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

———. “The Influence of George Kennedy on Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament.” Pages 41–57 in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy’s Rhetoric of the New Testament*. SRR 8. Edited by C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.

———. *The Rhetoric of the New Testament: A Bibliographic Survey*. TBS 8. Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2006.

———. “Paul’s Rhetorical Strategy in 1 Corinthians 15.” Pages 231–49 in Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, eds. *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

———. *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*. SBL (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

Watson, Duane F. and Alan J. Hauser. *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method,* BibInt 4. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Watson, Janet. *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*. MBCBSup 218. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Watson, Wilfred G. E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. JSOTSup 26; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.

Watt, Jonathan M. “From Puns of Steel to Alliterative Arrangements: Rhetoric and Conflict in Pauline Epistles.” Evangelical Theological Society, New Orleans, LA, conference paper, 1996.

Watts, James W. *Reading Law: The Rhetorical Shaping of the Pentateuch*. BibSem 59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Weima, Jeffrey A. D. *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016.

Weiss, Johannes. *Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik*. Göttingen: n.p., 1897.

———. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910.

Welborn, Laurence L. *Paul, the Fool of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians 1–4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Wendland, Ernst R. *Finding and Translating the Oral–Aural Elements in Written Language: The Case of the New Testament Epistles*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 2008.

Wettstein, Johann Jacob. *Ἡ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus codicum*. 2 vols. Amsterdam, Ex officina Dommeriana, 1751, 1752.

White, John L. *Light from Ancient Letters*. FFNT; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

———. *The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter: a Study of the Letter-Body in the Non-literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972.

Wifstrand, A. "The Homily of Melito on the Passion." Pages 201–23 in *Vigiliae Christianae: A Review of Early Christian Life and Language*. Vol. 2. Edited by Christine Mohrmann and G. Quispel. Amsterdam: North–Holland, 1948.

Wilke, Christian Gottlob. *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik, ein Seitenstück zur Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. Dresden und Leipzig: Arnoldische Buchhandlung, 1843.

Wilkins, Augustus S. *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Oratore libri tres*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1892.

Wilson, Thomas. *The Art of Rhetorique, for the use of all such as are studious of Eloquence, set forth in English by Thomas Wilson*. London: Richard Grafton, 1553.

Winer, Georg Benedict. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese*. Zweite berichtigte und sehr vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: Friedrich Christian Wilhelm Vogel, 1825.

Witherington III, Ben. *Grace in Galatia: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdman, 1998.

Wooten, Cecil W., ed. *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome: Essays in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. MBCBSup 225. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Wright, N.T. "ἁρπαγμὸς and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5–11." JTS 37 (1986): 321–52.

Wuellner, W. "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate over Romans." *CBQ* 38 (1976): 330–51.

———. "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" *CBQ* 49 (1987): 448–63.

Zetzel, James E. G. *Critics, Compliers, and Commentators: An Introduction to Roman Philology 200 BCE to 800 CE*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Zuck, Roy, *Basic Bible Interpretation: A Practical Guide to Discovering Biblical Truth*, Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 2002.

Zulick, Margaret D. "The Recollection of Rhetoric: A Brief History." Pages 7–19 in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*. SRR 8. Edited by C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.