ABSTRACT
The premise of this article is that the persuasive force of any text can only be determined when all three phases of the rhetorical process have been accounted for: inventio, dispositio and elocutio. Part of the inventio phase is the discovery of the so-called external and internal proofs. Aristotle distinguished three modes of internal proof, namely ethos, logos and pathos, while Kennedy regards the ways in which these three modes are employed as the main concern of rhetorical criticism. Although all three phases of the rhetorical process are considered in this article, the focus will be on the modes of internal proof used in Gal 6:7-10, thereby determining their persuasive force within the letter as a whole.

1 INTRODUCTION
In the past decade New Testament scholars have published numerous rhetorical analyses of the Pauline letters. Of these the first focused on Galatians, mainly because of the pioneering work of H D Betz (1975:353-379; 1979). Other contributions include articles by Hester (1984), Hübner (1984), Berchman (1987) and Hall (1987).

The emphasis in all these publications has been on the arrangement of material or the structure of the letter, the so-called dispositio. Questions often lacking were: What are the functions of the various parts, given that the text is structured as it is? Why does the text persuade? And especially: How does it persuade?

All these questions have been addressed in classical rhetorical theory, mainly under the heading inventio. Inventio, dispositio and elocutio are described as the most important stages in the act of composing a speech (Lausberg 1960:241-247, Corbett 1965:273-383, Brandt 1970:49-69, Kennedy 1984:23-25). Part of the inventio phase is the discovery of the so-called proofs, either external (for example, the evidence of witnesses or of documents), or internal (invented by the author himself). According to Aristotle, there are only three modes of artistic (internal) proof: ethos (the credibility that the author is able to establish in his writing, i.e. his authority), logos (the logical argument found in the discourse, especially inductive and deductive reasoning) and pathos (the emotional reactions of the audience) (Kennedy 1984:14-16). Although these constitute only one aspect of the first stage of the rhetorical process, one gets the impression that...
Kennedy regards the ways in which these three modes are employed as the main concern of rhetorical criticism. This impression is confirmed by the application of his proposal for rhetorical criticism to various New Testament passages (1984:39-156), as well as by his own remark in the last chapter of his book:

The Bible speaks through ethos, logos and pathos, and to understand these is the concern of rhetorical analysis (1984:159).

In this article, then, I want to focus on the three modes of persuasion employed in Gl 6:7-10, thereby addressing the questions mentioned above. In order to do so, the macrostructure of the letter as a whole will be outlined (dispositio), followed by a stylistic analysis of Gl 6:7-10 (elocutio). These preliminary steps will lead to the main aim of the article, which is an exposition of the ways in which ethos, logos and pathos are employed in the pericope under discussion.

2 MACROSTRUCTURAL RELATIONSHIPS IN GALATIANS

The following outline is an explication of the macrostructural relationships in Galatians, important for determining the position and function of Gl 6:7-10 in the letter as a whole (see Addendum)

A 1:1-5 Opening section of letter: The divine origin of Paul’s gospel.

B 1:6-9 Introductory section: Announcement of the basic premise: There is only one gospel - the one Paul has proclaimed.

C 1:10 - 5:12 First main part: Expositional section, arguing for the authenticity of Paul’s gospel and leading to an appeal that the Galatians remain faithful. C. consists of three subsections.

C1 (1:10-2:21) The first argument, proving the authenticity of Paul’s gospel: he has received his gospel and commission from God, not from man.

C2 (3:1-4:7) The second argument to prove the authenticity of his gospel: the Galatians have experienced the Spirit through believing the Gospel, not by doing the works of the law.
C3 (4:8-5:12) As an outcome of the foregoing arguments he now appeals to the Galatians to remain steadfast in their Christian freedom.

D 5:13-6:10 Second main part: Paraenetical section. Proceeding with the theme of Christian freedom, Paul enjoins the Galatians to utilise their freedom responsibly by serving one another in love.

E 6:11-17 Concluding remarks with strong implicit appeal, written in Paul’s own hand. The Galatians should not yield to the false teachers who boast in circumcision. He who believes, boasts in the cross, as Paul does.

F 6:18 Closing section: God bless you with his grace.

GI 6:7-10 thus comes at the end of the second main part of the letter, namely 5:13-6:10. This paraenetical section may further be divided into four pericopes (see Addendum):

5:13-15: Utilise your freedom correctly by serving one another in love.
5:16-26: Let the Spirit direct you into the true life of freedom.
6:1-6: Practise your freedom by helping one another.
6:7-10: Consider the outcome of both the correct and the wrong application of your freedom.

In GI 5:12 Paul ends the argumentative part of his letter. The second main part (5:13-6:10) is less argumentative, but consists of the paraenetic statements listed above. Within the broader context of the letter, especially 4:8-5:12 where — as an outcome of the preceding two arguments — Paul appeals to the Galatians to be steadfast in their Christian freedom, the ethical exhortations in 5:13-6:10 should be read within the framework of this freedom. Galatians 5:13-6:10 deals with what Borse (1984:188) calls ‘die Verwirklichung der durch Christus gewonnenen Freiheit’. At the end of these exhortations, that is in 6:7-10, Paul asks his readers to consider the correct and the wrong application of their freedom: while the
wrong use of Christian freedom (i.e. to plant in the field of the flesh) leads to destruction, the correct use (i.e. to plant in the field of the Spirit) will result in eternal life. He also asks them to apply their freedom in a responsible way by doing good to every one, especially to fellow-believers.

3 STYLISTIC FEATURES OF GALATIANS 6:7-10 (COLA 196-203; SEE ADDENDUM)

These four verses form a unity, mainly due to the proverbial saying in colon 198/6:7 and its application to the relation between σὰρξ and πνεῦμα in 199-200/6:8. The pericope ends with the two appeals in 201-202/6:9 and 203/6:10, which follow logically from the foregoing discussion.

It is difficult to determine the relation of this pericope to what immediately precedes. The contrast between σὰρξ and πνεῦμα, for example, is not at stake in the immediately preceding pericope (Gl 6:1-6). One way of solving the problem is to regard Gl 6:7-10 as the summative conclusion (enumeratio) of issues discussed in the preceding three pericopes, namely 5:13-15; 5:16-26 and 6:1-6. The contrast between σὰρξ and πνεῦμα was discussed in 5:16-26, while the two appeals to do good in cola 201-202/6:9 and 203/6:10 were the themes of 5:13-15 and 6:1-6. That our pericope is indeed a summary of themes discussed in the preceding three will become clearer in what follows.

Turning to Gl 6:7-10 in more detail, the semantic relations between the cola may be described as follows (cf Addendum for the colon division): Colon 197 provides the reason for the warning in 196, with 196 the result of 197: Because no one makes a fool of God, the Galatians must not deceive themselves. Colon 198 serves as motivation for 196-7: A person will reap exactly what he plants. This generic statement is made more specific by applying it to the contrast between σὰρξ (199) and πνεῦμα (200). The relation between 199-200 and 201 may be described as additive-different, with 201 the consequence of 199-200: As a consequence of what has just been said, let us not become tired of doing good. According to Nida (1983:103), a consequential relation suggests some kind of logical relation (cause - effect/reason - result), but it is not explicitly marked. Colon 202 gives a reason for the exhortation in 201: Let us not become tired of doing good; for if we do not give up, the time will come when we shall reap the harvest. The relation between 203 and 201-202 is additive-equivalent, because they are essentially saying the same thing: Let us do good. As such colon 203 is also consequential in relation to 199-200.

It is certainly possible to describe the semantic relations in more detail, but this brief exposition gives us an idea of the logical coherence of the pericope.

Since style can be described as all the linguistic choices an author has made in arguing his case, identification of the coherence devices noted above constitutes part of the stylistic analysis of the pericope. Other significant stylistic features
are:

(i) Proverbial sayings such as 'No one makes a fool of God' (197) and 'A person will reap exactly what he plants' (198).

(ii) Metaphors taken from the world of agriculture: 'Plant and reap' (198-200); 'reap' once more in 202 to describe the eschatological reward.

(iii) The parallel structure of 199 and 200:

199a: If he plants in the field of his natural desire (cause)
199b: from it he will gather the harvest of death (effect);
200a: If he plants in the field of the Spirit (cause)
200b: from the Spirit he will gather the harvest of eternal life (effect).

'Natural desire' (αἰρέσις) and 'Spirit' (πνεῦμα) are represented as two kinds of fields, yielding different harvests: death from the former, eternal life from the latter (Ariceha and Nida 1976:151);

(iv) Inverted parallelisms (chiasms) between 199a and b, as well as 200a and b:

199a-b: σπείρων - σάρκα - σαρκός - θερίσει
d199b.
200a-b: σπείρων - πνεύμα - πνεύματος - θερίσει.

Chiasms are also used to contrast the 'flesh' and the 'Spirit' in 175-177 (Gl 5:16-17):

175.1.1-176: πνεύματι - σαρκός - σάρξ - πνεύματος
176-177: σάρξ - πνεύματος - πνεύμα - σαρκός.

The use of the same stylistic technique whenever the same topic is discussed probably serves to strengthen the link between the two passages. Cola 199-200/6:8 can thus be seen as a recapitulation of the discussion in Gl 5:16-26. As the code words for the two modes of existence in the paraenesis, σάρξ and πνεῦμα also link the paraenesis with the theological argument of the letter as a whole (Lategan 1992).

(v) Inverted parallelisms are also prominent in 201-203/6:9-10, where they serve to strengthen the link between two exhortations with essentially the same meaning (Let us do good): τὸ καλὸν ποιοῦντες - καιρῶ - καιρῶν - ἐργαζόμεθα τὸ ἄγαθον.

Note also the chiasm between 201a and 203b, where different terms with similar
meanings are used:

τὸ καλὸν - πολούτες - ἐργαζώμεθα - τὸ ἀγαθὸν.

According to Betz (1988:527) and Borse (1984:217), the 'good' that must be done refers to the one fruit of the Spirit in 5:22 et seq: 'Das Gute, das wir vollbringen sollen, um vor Gott ernten zu können, geschieht unter der Leitung des Geistes' (Borse 1984:217). It can also refer to the very first exhortation in 5:13 ('serve one another through love'), as well as to the appeal in 6:1-6 to bear one another's burdens. If this is correct, cola 201-203/6:9-10 may be a recapitulation of another theme in 5:13-6:6, namely that of helping one another.

Finally, the exhortations to do good (6:9-10) and to serve one another in love (5:13) form an inclusio surrounding the paraenetic section. The nature of both exhortations also coincides with the idea of Christian freedom, which permeates the whole paraenesis. Because one is free, one must exercise this freedom (5:13) — especially in making ethical decisions. Instead of giving his readers a set of detailed instructions, spelling out how they should behave in every situation, Paul restricts himself to the bare minimum and describes the duties of believers in very general terms: Serve one another in love, do good to your fellow-believers! They must act as liberated people, in a responsible and independent way. By encouraging this, Paul is preparing his readers for his absence and for the future (Lategan 1992).

4 MODES OF PERSUASION IN GALATIANS 6:7-10

As is evident from the exposition of the macrostructure of Galatians, Gl 6:7-10 comes at the end of the second main part of the letter. It is also the last pericope in the body of the letter. One may therefore expect to find one or both functions of a peroration in this pericope. That it recapitulates the main themes of the preceding pericopes has already been argued. It also exhibits the second function of a peroration, namely pathos — as will become clear from the following discussion of the three modes of persuasion employed in the pericope.

Establishing one's ethos generally belongs to the beginning of a speech or letter and not to its conclusion. One therefore does not find this mode of persuasion in Gl 6:7-10.

Logical argument (logos), however, is a feature of our pericope. Except in a tightly reasoned argument, speakers or writers usually do not employ all three parts of an epicheireme or logical syllogism, namely a major premise, a minor premise and a conclusion. One of the parts is generally assumed or suppressed, thereby creating an enthymeme, which consists of a statement and a supporting reason. The word 'for' (γὰρ or ὅτι) is usually the indication of an enthymeme. Thus: behind every enthymeme stands a logical syllogism (Kennedy 1984:16-17). Cola 196-198/6:7 may serve as an illustration of this form of reasoning. With
the semantic relations spelled out, the verse literally reads:

‘Do not deceive yourselves; God will not be mocked; for what a person sows, that he will harvest as well.’

Behind this verse stand two syllogisms, both having the same major premise: What a person sows, that he will harvest as well. The meaning of the proverb may be defined as: Man is accountable for his deeds. Thus:

1 Major Premise: Man is accountable for his deeds.  
   Minor premise: Deceiving oneself is a deed of man.  
   Conclusion: Man is accountable for deceiving himself.

2 Major premise: Man is accountable for his deeds.  
   Minor premise: Mocking God is a deed of man.  
   Conclusion: Man is accountable for mocking God.

The logical structure of the verse thus hinges on this proverb. The basis of acceptance of the major premise is common human experience or observance: the kind of grain man sows is the kind of grain he will harvest. An analogy is thus created between the world of nature and the deeds of man in general. The major premise cannot be disputed, thereby strengthening the basis of the argument — not only in this verse, but also in the rest of the pericope: cola 199 and 200/6:8 are specifications of the general proverb, while the exhortations in 201-202/6:9 and 203/6:10 are both consequences of the application of the proverb to the contrast between ‘flesh’ and ‘Spirit’.

Apart from its logical coherence, the pericope is also characterised by other stylistic devices, contributing to its persuasive force. The various parallelisms (syntactic and especially semantic) establish a pattern in which each may be said to contribute to the acceptance of the whole. So do the inverted parallelisms between words and phrases outlined above. Figures of speech thus become functional devices of persuasion: they tie whole pericopes together. The striking metaphors (‘to plant in the field of the flesh’, ‘to gather the harvest of death’, etc) impart reality to the utterances — a point to which we shall return below.

The key to the persuasive power of the pericope, however, is its emotional appeals. Pathos is created by means of the following:

1 The future-orientated nature of the utterances in cola 198, 199, 200 and 202, which forms part of the deliberative nature of the pericope, as well as of Paul’s eschatological views. Pathos inheres in the readers, and its commonest form in the New Testament ‘is the promise of eternal life or the threat of damnation’
(Kennedy 1984:15). The reader wants to feel that there is some worthiness in him, something which will be rewarded in future. The content of what is said may thus in itself arouse emotion in the reader.

2 Pathos is also created by the metaphors used in cola 199, 200 and 202. These metaphors impart reality to the utterances, and Brandt (1970:224) is of the opinion that this is a significant means of creating pathos:

The first (way to make a pathetic appeal) is to lower the level of abstraction of one's discourse. Feeling originates in experience, and the more concrete writing is, the closer it is to experience, the more feeling is implicit in it...The tropes that appear at the end of major sections are designed to elicit from the reader a full human response to the point made by making its implications sensuous.

3 Brandt mentions yet another way in which pathos can be created, namely by identifying with the (implied) readers:

The speaker steps forward in a role that is ordinarily a modification of the one assumed to that point, and takes for himself a stance toward the subject which his audience will presumably assume with him (1970:224).

In contrast to earlier parts of the letter where the distance between Paul and his readers is underlined by, among other things, the use of the second person, the first person plural is prominent in the paraenetic section, and especially in our pericope (cola 201, 202, 203a and 203b).

4 The concluding exhortation in 6:10 (‘Let us work for the common good of all, but in particular for the good of fellow-believers’) forces the readers to fill in the details of their ethical conduct. Paul is aiming at the participation of his readers by leaving them with gaps and cryptic remarks, which require their co-operation and imagination (Lategan 1992). Their freedom must find expression in the way they apply the basic principle of doing good to one another. Because this technique of intentional gaps in a text implicitly involves the implied readers, one may safely regard it as a way of establishing pathos.

TO SUMMARISE:

The questions posed at the beginning were: What is the function of Gal 6:7-10 within the letter as a whole? How does it persuade? As to the first, it is evident from 2 and 3 above that Gal 6:7-10 comes at the end of the second main part of the letter. It is the final pericope in the paraenetic section, recapitulating the main themes discussed in it (pericopes 5:13-15, 5:16-26 and 6:1-6). In an attempt
to answer the second question, it was found that only two of the three modes of persuasion are at work in Gal 6:7-10, namely logos and pathos. Behind 6:7 stand two syllogisms, while functional stylistic devices are used as means of persuasion throughout the pericope. Pathos, on the other hand, is created by future-orientated utterances, by the use of metaphors, by Paul's identification with his readers and by the concluding exhortation in 6:10, in which he forces his readers to fill in the details of their ethical conduct.

5 CONCLUSION

Classical rhetoric with all its categories can be of help in understanding any written document, provided that it is not followed rigidly, but rather used as a frame of reference for empirical study. This is the way in which some of the rhetorical categories mentioned in the introduction have been used in this article. The various stages of the rhetorical process and the three modes of persuasion are universal concepts, as Kennedy argued so convincingly in the first chapter of his book (1984:10-11). This being the case, classical rhetorical theory must be employed as 'a fountainhead of insight, rather than as a controlled stream' (Olbricht 1989:33). In analysing any document, we need to draw upon whatever conventions and later rhetorical insights may be of help — provided that we do not force any rhetorical system upon a text; the more so, since a uniform or unified system of classical rhetoric has never existed, despite the efforts of many modern studies of classical rhetoric to present such a system: 'The existence of the rhetorical handbooks notwithstanding, it is well to remember that ancient rhetoric, in its rules as well as the manifestations of those rules, was extremely fluid' (Kraftchick 1990:61, see also Wuellner 1991:171 and Botha 1991:167).

By using rhetorical categories in this way, the student of the New Testament is able to appreciate the practical and powerful aspects of the text he is privileged to study.
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