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ABSTRACT
Rhetoric, the so-called 'art and technique of persuasion', has been systematically studied with reference to oral and written literary discourse since Greek and Roman Classical times. In recent years the principles and techniques (CR) of the early rhetoricians have been the object of a revival of scholarly interest and have been utilised, in one form or another, as the basis for analysing the various writings of the Greek Testament, the epistles in particular. One such application provides a starting point for the present study, namely, Watson's (1988) analysis of 'invention, arrangement, and style' in the Book of Jude. A summary of the results of Watson's classically-oriented investigation is compared with a new examination of this letter according to the methodology of what has been termed 'rhetorical criticism' (RC), an approach pioneered by James Mullenburg in the 1960s (e.g. 1969) and applied by his followers largely to Old Testament literature. The pros and cons of each analytical technique are discussed (with reference also to such important studies as Bauckham 1983, Stowers 1986, and Neyrey 1993) and a mutually complementary, more macrotext-oriented procedure is then proposed. This essay concludes with a brief overview of its implications for the ongoing structural-stylistic and rhetorical-critical investigation of biblical literary works, Old Testament as well as New Testament, in their diverse socio-religious settings, both ancient and modern.

1 INTRODUCTION: WILL THE REAL 'RHETORIC' PLEASE STAND UP?

Any thorough discussion, description, or analysis involving the popular concept of 'rhetoric' nowadays must necessarily begin with a careful definition of the term itself. As Martin Kessler observes:

The basic problem with rhetorical criticism is that English literary critics are by no means agreed as to what that well-worn term 'rhetoric' signifies or ought to signify. In the light of this it can hardly be deemed surprising if biblical critics wonder...
This problem presents itself because as the word has become more widespread and commonly used in the literary analysis of (specifically) biblical discourse (cf Hughes 1989:23), so it has also been utilised with an increasingly wider referential scope. Thus its signification may range from a strict application to the basic principles and terminology of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric (e.g., Watson 1988) to an all-embracing reference to virtually any type of meaningful 'social interaction' (e.g., prospectus of the ‘rhetoric and religion’ research group of the NTSSA).

In its classical Aristotelian sense, rhetoric is simply the art of argumentation, or ‘persuasion’ (ars rhetorica; Hughes 1989:24,30)—or to narrow the concept somewhat, ‘the art of persuasive communication’ (Duke 1990:30, original italics). The master’s own definition has the advantage of combining both the formal and the functional aspects of ‘rhetoric’: ‘the art of discovering the best possible means of persuasion in regard to any subject whatever’ (quoted from Winterowd 1968:14). The function of persuasion, in turn, may be factored into three distinct facets, namely, pragmatic processes that are ‘response-shaping’, ‘response-reinforcing’, or ‘response-changing’ in nature (Johanson 1987:35). Three distinct modes may also be distinguished, that is via an appeal to the rational intellect (logos), the source's credibility (ethos), and/or the positive or negative feelings of the audience (pathos). The practice of this particular ability, skill, craft, and/or technique (technee reetorikee), however, has been carried out over the years in diverse ways and with a number of important differences with regard to the particular purpose in mind. Consequently its definition has become manifold, even somewhat blurred, as various investigators have tended to focus their attention upon one or another of the primary components in the act of interpersonal communication of biblical literature (restricting our scope to this specific corpus): source, receptor, and message.

Ancient as well as contemporary proponents and practitioners of the discipline of ‘classical rhetoric’ (CR) place a decided emphasis upon the persuasive strategies and compositional techniques of the original source of communication, whether oral (an orator) or written (an author), in a specific setting of doubt, questioning, or uncertainty—the so-called ‘rhetorical situation’ (Kennedy 1984:34; not to be confused with the Sitz im Leben of form-criticism, Elliot 1990:95). In its classical sense, the notion of ‘persuasion’ appears to have had a somewhat broader referential domain than its meaning nowadays (Kennedy 1980:4), including the effects of discourse upon a person’s actions or behavior as well as one’s thoughts and emotions, that is the ‘imperative’ along with the ‘emotive’ and ‘informative’ functions of language (de Waard & Nida 1986:29-30). An elaborate taxonomy of forms and functions has been (long) established.
both to describe and to interpret the communicative event from this perspective (for a synopsis see Nida et al 1983:172-190; a semio-syntactic reorganisation is found in Plett 1985). A summary of Duane Watson's (1988) exposition of Jude will be used to illustrate the pros and cons of this influential approach and so it will not be defined any further here.

A modern offshoot of the CR method, known as 'New Rhetoric' (NR) pays special attention to the receptors (audience/readers) of verbal discourse. This development was popularised in particular by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's *Treatise on argumentation* (1969). However, as characterised by Margaret Mitchell (1992:7), this important work:

> does not claim to be a handbook of ancient rhetoric, but rather a revision and reappropriation of it to modern philosophical problems, particularly that of epistemology. Its intention is at basic points contrary to these [its disciples] New Testament scholars —it aims at expanding the realm of argumentation rather than classifying particular texts according to form or arrangement.

Mitchell claims that followers of 'the audience-based perspective of the New Rhetoric' tend to misconstrue the method's basic orientation and objectives, and hence they have confused the rhetorical analysis of NT literature through the application of terminology that has been subtly 'redefined' (1992:7; but cf Hansen 1993:824). This problem of definition presents difficulties for the whole rhetorical approach.

One thing is certain: the nature of such critical study has, at least for some practitioners, been significantly modified with a decided shift from the speaker-orientation of CR to the effects of rhetorical discourse upon an audience (Watson & Hauser 1993:113). Primary emphasis is thus being placed upon 'readers as active, creative, productive', their 'status' having been changed 'to that of judges and critics to that [sic] of validators' (Wuellner 1987:461). This sort of perspective, which has much in common with that of contemporary 'reader-response' criticism, also tends to deflect attention from the initial to the current setting of communication, sometimes with a consequent blurring (or merging) of the 'two-horizons' concept of interpretation (Thistleton 1992:499-508). The application of NR strategy-of-argumentation procedures to the analysis of NT epistolary discourse has thus far been comparatively limited (e.g Vorster 1990:120-125; 1992:298-299; Lategan 1992:257-258; Wuellner 1991), but this will undoubtedly change as the method becomes more widely known, practiced, and adapted to fit the biblical corpus.

James Muilenburg is the recognised pioneer of the whole rhetorical critical movement in modern times (cf Berry 1993:81; Patrick & Scult 1990:11; Mack 1990:12; Kennedy 1984:4; Lundbom 1975:1; Anderson 1974:ix). Dissatisfied
with the discourse-fragmenting procedures of both source- and form-criticism, Muilenburg made a revolutionary appeal to respect the integrity and literary artistry of the biblical as received (following conservative emendation, only if necessary). In his ground-breaking presidential address to the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in 1968 (published in 1969 and reprinted in Best 1984 and House 1992), Muilenburg argued that:

form and content are inextricably related. They form an integral whole. The two are one...It is the creative synthesis of the particular formulation of the pericope with the content that makes it the distinctive composition that it is (1992:54).

Convinced that much of biblical literature was 'skillfully wrought...with consummate skill and artistry' under the guiding influence of 'conventional rhetorical practices', Muilenburg went on to propose that:

Persistent and painstaking attention to the modes of Hebrew literary composition will reveal that the pericopes exhibit linguistic patterns, word formations ordered or arranged in particular ways, verbal sequences which move in fixed structures from beginning to end (1992:68-69).

The strong emphasis of RC upon the text itself as the principal object of investigation is evident from the preceding citations. This manner of analysis is characteristic also of the so-called 'New-Critical' or 'stylistic' school of literary study and is typical of all those who more or less followed the Muilenburgian directives. His 'concrete' concept of rhetoric is reflected in the treatment of Eugene Nida, for whom the term 'includes not merely stylistic flourishes but a highly important level of language structure and significance' (1982:324). A broader 'text-centered approach' also forms the basis for Bruce Johanson's comprehensive rhetorical study of 1 Ts (1987: 3-6). This issue of the relative prominence of the linguistic text in relation to its situational context will be considered further below during our examination of the rhetorical structure and function of Jude.

But to return to the query that began this section: does it make any difference precisely how 'rhetoric' is defined and subsequently applied? It would certainly seem so, judging from the diversity that is manifested by a number of equally-thorough studies of Jude's short epistle. One therefore has to make a choice, for example, to downplay the reader-response approach in the present analysis. This has been done due to its perceived over-emphasis upon the critical activity of contemporary receptors in the hermeneutical process. It is not that such interpretation is viewed as being without value, only that it is of a secondary nature, to be derived from and based upon the results of a complete examination of the original (primary) setting and event of communication—as nearly
as this may be determined using all of the analytical techniques at our disposal. But from another perspective, given the possibility of mutual correction and supplementation, one might conclude that the different methodologies are not isolated or antithetical at all. Rather, they complement one another to give one a more comprehensive and 'valid' (Johanson 1987:20) view of the manifold rhetorical and artistic complexities of biblical epistolary discourse.

That is the main aim of the present investigation as we first of all describe the approaches of RC and CR in somewhat greater detail and then critically evaluate the application of each in turn to the persuasive strategy adopted in Jude, arguably 'the most neglected book in the New Testament' (Charles 1991:106). The special focus of our attention will be the macrostructural organisation of this epistle and its rhetorical relevance. In a concluding section we will briefly consider some of the major implications of utilising a more flexible, inclusive modus operandi when conducting any study of the rhetorical nature of biblical composition, no matter what the genre, whether for exegetical purposes or when subsequently engaged in the transcultural transmission of its message to a contemporary audience and setting.

2 'FORM CRITICISM AND BEYOND': MUILENBURG'S EXTENSION INTO 'RHETORICAL CRITICISM'

In paying tribute to the scholarly insights to be derived from form-critical (FC) studies of the Hebrew Scriptures, Muilenburg noted three things in particular: the broad comparative nature upon which FC analyses were based (i.e. including all other literatures of the ancient Near East); their careful attention to matters pertaining to literary genres along with their formal features (structure and style); and a concern to reveal the social and religious functions which recognisable genres performed in specific cultural settings (1992:50-51). However, Muilenburg went on to point out several serious deficiencies that he felt needed correcting in the typical FC approach to analysis. Among the most crucial of these was its 'tendency to be too exclusive in its application of the method' with the result that it would 'lay such stress upon the typical and representative that the individual, personal, and unique features of the individual pericope were all but lost to view' (52-53). In order to counteract such undue emphasis upon the general and the traditional (or expected) in both oral and written texts Muilenburg proposed a more stylistic and aesthetic critical approach, however, one which would pay special attention also to the larger organisation of biblical discourse:

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 var-
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ous devices by which the predications are formulated and ordered into a unified whole (1992:57).

In order to accomplish these objectives, a basic two-step methodology was set forth, one that lays the foundation for any type of structural analysis in its attention to the delimitation of the essential units of a literary composition coupled with a description of their primary interrelationships, both to one another and to the whole which they comprise. In step one, therefore, the rhetorical critic will seek:

- to define the limits or scope of the literary unit, to recognize precisely where and how it begins and where and how it ends (1992:57).

Muilenburg carries out this externally-oriented aspect of his study by paying special attention to compositional techniques such as the inclusio, colonic or strophic arrangement (in poetry), and the stylistic marking of points of climax leading to a finale. This procedure overlaps with the second step, in which the analyst adopts an internal perspective on the discourse as demarcated, namely:

- to recognize the structure of a composition and to discern the configuration of its component parts, to delineate the warp and the woof out of which the literary fabric is woven, and to note the various rhetorical devices that are employed for marking, on the one hand, the sequence and movement of the pericope, and on the other, the shifts or breaks in the development of the writer’s thought (1992:59).

To this end an investigator must determine the frequency, distribution, collocation, and function of literary features such as repetition, parallel phrasing, figures of speech, transitional particles, vocatives, and rhetorical questions.

Muilenburg’s exercise of what he termed ‘rhetorical criticism’ (RC, 1992:57,69) is clearly very stylistic or form-centered in nature, albeit in a different sense from the methodology that he desired to move ‘beyond’ in the article cited above. For this reason he and the ‘Muilenburg School’ (Wuellner 1987:451; a misnomer according to Watson & Hauser 1993:3) have been somewhat severely criticised as being:

- victims of that ‘rhetoric restrained’, i.e., victims of the fateful reduction of rhetoric to stylistics, and of stylistics in turn to the rhetorical tropes or figures (Wuellner 1987:451).

This may be due in part to the fact that followers of Muilenburg’s approach have focused their attention on the writings of the Old Testament (cf the extensive bibliography in Watson & Hauser 1993; several exceptions being Muilen-
burg's own early study of John's gospel [1932] and Webster's follow-up in 1982). In the case of this literary corpus there are unfortunately no textbooks dealing with ancient Hebrew rhetoric to use as a critical guide, and the body of secular literature available for comparative purposes is considerably more limited than in Greek. Thus rhetorical models and literary standards must be derived largely from the biblical texts themselves, along with the religious and associated works available in related languages. It is not surprising then that the earlier practitioners of RC methodology tended to restrict themselves more to matters of a stylistic and artistic nature (Patrick & Scult 1990:12).

In recent years however, RC analysts have become cognizant of the need, first of all, to sensitise themselves to 'the oral orientation of ancient literary units', and secondly, to move 'beyond' Muilenburg, as it were, and considerations of literary style in order to 'articulate the impact of the literary unit on its audience' (Watson & Hauser 1993:12,14). Indeed, some have gone so far as to tailor their definition of RC with this focus in mind, for example:

'rhetoric'...[is] the means by which a text establishes and manages its relationship to its audience in order to achieve a particular effect (Patrick & Scult 1990:12, original italics).

However, this emphasis upon 'text' (sans author?) is in danger once again of moving too far in the direction of the 'receptor' side of the communication cycle, thus denying Muilenburg's expressed concern for probing the rhetorical intentions of the biblical 'source' (e.g. 1992:50,54). But how is the latter to be determined? Patrick and Scult suggest:

the form or shape of a discourse is the key to how it functions for an audience....Through the shape into which speakers cast their message they tell the audience how they mean it to be engaged and therefore to be understood (1990: 14-15).

Johanson provides a fuller account of this notion:

...authorial communicative intention...[is] something which arises from an organized interaction between empirical features in the text body (involving an interaction between the parts and the whole), various factors external to the text [i.e. in the situational context], and mental operations in the mind of the interpreter (1987:19).

Furthermore in rhetorical, or affective-persuasive, texts it should be noted that:

there will be practical, rhetorical constraints of communicative behavior which constrain the encoded/implied author and addressee from seriously diverging from the real author/addressee. Any serious divergence would obviously jeopardize the appro-
priateness and consequently the co-operation of the addressees in the persuasive process (1987:23).

Therefore in such pragmatically oriented discourse, a hypothetical reconstruction of the real author/addressee from the encoded author addressee is a legitimate exercise (assumed to have been done in the following analysis). Similarly, it is possible—and necessary—to differentiate between the two 'horizons' of interpretation: 'what a text meant' and 'what it means'. For many modern 'readers' of Scripture, however, this distinction does not apply, and therefore it is up to the present interpreter to:

synthesize the meanings a text has had into the meaning it has in order to understand it fully (Patrick & Scult 1990:19).

In my opinion, such a 'rhetorical re-enactment of the text's meaning' into some current ideal, 'the best text it can be' (1990:22,21), though laudable in its effort to adopt a genuine 'religious perspective' when interacting with the text being considered (1990:23), may nevertheless lead to a distortion of the twofold hermeneutical task, which is to make the attempt, at least, to distinguish what the biblical text meant 'then' from what it means 'now'—that is, to a specific audience or readership of today. Such will be the aim of a subsequent overview of several structural outlines of Jude's rhetorically-shaped message and an-application of his brief but bold letter of pastoral counsel to a contemporary constituency.

3 CLASSICAL RHETORICAL CRITICISM: FOLLOWING IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF ARISTOTLE (AND GEORGE KENNEDY)

It is not necessary to go into detail (although there is a lot of it!) with regard to classical Greco-Roman rhetorical criticism (CR) because its special domain has centered on the New Testament and related literature from the very beginning of its application to biblical discourse (see the extensive bibliography in Watson & Hauser 1993; a notable OT exception is that of Duke 1990). Much of a recent edition of the journal Neotestamentica (i.e. 26:2, 1992) was devoted to various discussions on the subject with respect to Paul's epistle to the Galatians. But for comparative purposes in relation to Muilenburg's RC approach just outlined, 'the first methodology proposed using [the] assumptions' of classical rhetoric (ibid:110), namely, that of George Kennedy is summarised below (1984:33-38; cf Watson 1988:8-28; Watson & Hauser 1993:110-111; for a popular presentation with specific reference to Jude, see Wolthuis 1989):

(a) First, the total scope of the pericope, or 'rhetorical unit', to be analysed is
delineated with respect to 'a discernable beginning and ending' (Kennedy 1984:34), whether a complete work or only a portion of one.

(b) Next the 'rhetorical situation', or contextual setting, of the pericope is described following the model of Lloyd Bitzer (1968:1-14). This rhetorical situation encompasses all of the relevant factors, personal and impersonal, which together occasion some issue, crisis, or stimulus (exigence) that calls for an appropriate human response in the form of a verbal discourse.

(c) The third preliminary matter to deal with is the specific problem, question, or issue (stasis) under consideration along with the particular manner (species) of rhetoric that has been chosen to present it: judicial (concerning accusation and/or defence with a past temporal orientation), deliberative (confirmation/refutation, future), or epideictic (celebration/condemnation, present).

(d) The text itself is then analysed in terms of invention, arrangement, and style. Invention (inventio) concerns the choice of various proofs and topics to best support the case being argued, whether according to ethos (character), pathos (emotions), or logos (modes of reasoning). Arrangement (dispositio) involves the compositional structure of the discourse in terms of ordered constituents, such as the exordium (introduction), narratio (initial statement of the case), probatio (main body of the argument), and peroratio (conclusion). Matters of style (elocutio) pertain to the specifics of how a particular speech is put together in a persuasive way through the use of devices such as distinctive diction, repetition, syntax, and figures of speech or thought.

e) A proper CR analysis concludes with a careful evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the rhetorical processes utilized in the text (d). How well do they succeed in meeting the major exigence (b) and what are the chief implications of the discourse, as delivered, for the audience (or readers)?

Many other distinctions, techniques, and modifications could be mentioned (see the sources cited above; also Hester 1991:284-285), but the preceding five steps give one a basic overview of the main procedures involved in the CR methodology, certainly as practiced by Kennedy and Watson. It may be noted that step (b) is the one that deals most directly with the rhetorical dynamics of any situation calling for persuasive argumentation of one sort or another. It points stylistic critics in the direction of making a more relevant and meaningful application of their analyses in terms of human interactive communication in contexts of
However, certain problems are encountered when one attempts to put into practice the other steps of the methodology. A typical application of the last step (e), for example, turns out to be the least helpful in the various analyses that I have read. Such an ‘evaluation of the rhetoric’ is generally very short (e.g. less than two pages in Watson 1988, 78-79), is highly concentrated in technical terminology, and is predominantly laudatory in nature, for example: ‘Jude’s rhetoric conforms to its [i.e. CR’s] best principles’ (78). Step (c) causes some serious difficulties on account of the great imprecision presented by the three so-called ‘species’ of rhetoric, which allow for too much leeway, and hence subjectivity, in one’s classification. There is also much arbitrariness involved in the attempt to categorise any complete text (of the Scriptures at any rate) with reference to a single time frame. Step (a) essentially corresponds to the first stage of a Muilenburg-type RC analysis (see above), and (d) amounts to a typical stylistic ‘close-reading’, clothed (or is it over-dressed?) in the jargon of classical rhetoric.

The chief divisions proposed do not differ that much from the characteristic ‘beginning-middle-ending’ of any well-formed discourse. Much more helpful in this regard is Mack’s outline of ‘the major moves of the rhetorical speech [or “thesis”] in terms of the major types of proof or argumentation’ (1990:42-46; cf Bailey & vander Broek 1992:63; for a more detailed form-functional typology, see Gammie 1990:47):

1. introduction (= exordium, e.g. a word of praise or commendation)
2. proposition (the case to be argued, injunction to be supported, or thesis to be defended, often stated in the form of a syllogism, maxim, proverb, anecdote [chreia], or traditional commonplace)
3. rationale (the reason for the proposition—why it is just, true, expedient, appealing, advantageous, etc)
4. opposite (any contrary perspective on the proposition, a demonstration of the truth or validity of its inverse; a dialectical argument of refutation)
5. analogy (general cases or universal principles taken from the world of experience, especially the natural sphere of the environment or that of everyday human activity)
6. example (familiar stories retold or alluded to from the arena of actual history or facts based upon recognised sociocultural, including literary, institutions)
7. citation (quotation from a recognised philosophical or literary authority who has come to a similar conclusion or has adopted the same stance with respect to the main proposition, including appropriate references to the virtues and vices of the gods)
8. conclusion (a final exhortation that returns the discourse in a memorable way
to its initial point of departure)

This sequence and its various transformations provides a useful way of summarising, albeit in very general terms, the mixed 'judicial-deliberative-epideictic' type of rhetoric that we find in Jude.

Other difficulties associated with an overly-strict application of the CR method of analysis are well-summarised by Watson himself (in Watson & Hauser 1993:111; cf also the various essays in Olbricht & Porter 1993). For example:

There is the question of the degree that rhetorical theory influenced the epistolary genre [cf also Du Toit 1992:280]...and if it is rightly used in analyzing Jewish texts, particularly those from a specifically Palestinian context...Greco-Roman rhetorical analysis may leave peculiar features of early Christian rhetoric unappreciated or undiscovered...There is the danger of glossing over the changes rhetoric must undergo in the transition from oral to written form or from one written genre to another [cf also Roberts 1992:330]...there is also the danger of a too rigid application of rhetorical categories to the biblical texts. Black [1989] notes 'a disquieting tendency to press oracles or letters into elaborate rhetorical schemes of organization (from proem to epilogos).'</p>

The final point noted above is especially problematic when depending upon the rhetorical theory of the handbooks alone in the analysis of an ancient text, without making a comparative, confirmatory study of actual contemporary speeches and letters (Mitchell 1992:9; cf Stowers 1986:25). Other criticisms of a general nature could be mentioned—for example, the imprecise (hence often debatable) use of the detailed technical categories and terminology, the frequent lack of any alternative perspective on the overall organisation of a given discourse, and an often indiscriminating application of the CR framework, with the result that one loses sight of the forest in the description of each and every one of its trees. But such critical observations perhaps ought to wait until a specific application of the method has been considered. This will enable one's evaluation to be made in a textually more concrete and cohesive manner.

4 WATSON'S ANALYSIS OF THE INVENTION, ARRANGEMENT, AND STYLE OF JUDE: A CASE OF RHETORIC GONE RATHER AWRY

Duane Watson's (1988) study of Jude was chosen to serve as the basis for our comparative examination of literary approaches because it was the 'first full-scale rhetorical analysis of a New Testament book utilising Kennedy's method' (Watson & Hauser 1993:111; followed by a number of similar studies, e.g. 1989, 1993). Though somewhat critical of his procedure, Margaret Mitchell
concludes that Watson 'carries Kennedy's methodology about as far as it can go' (1992:10). To be sure, it is essentially a sound presentation not only of CR analytical methods, but also of the meaning and purpose of the epistle itself. There are a number of features that commend this study, for example: the meticulous detailing of all of the standard rhetorical devices used, along with their Greco-Roman designation (and references to the handbooks); notation of the major intertextual citations and allusions, biblical as well as extra-biblical; a specification of the relationship between the compositional components of a deliberative speech and the basic formal units of a Hellenistic letter; and a generally good description of the linear movement of the discourse, that is, its principal structural segments and their various inter-connections. But it is in conjunction with the latter exercise that a rather serious problem develops in Watson's analysis with regard to the larger organisation of Jude's epistle. This will be critically considered in the next section, but first Watson's 'rhetorical outline of Jude' is reproduced for reference (77-78; unless noted otherwise, all page numbers indicated below are from Watson 1988):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Epistolary Prescript (Quasi-Exordium)</td>
<td>vv1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Exordium</td>
<td>v3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Narratio</td>
<td>v4. Main propositions: 1) the sectarians within the church are ungodly and subject to judgment; 2) the sectarians are the ungodly whose presence and judgment in the last days has been foretold.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Probatio</td>
<td>vv5-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A First Proof</td>
<td>'The sectarians within the church are ungodly and subject to judgment.' An artificial proof based on examples drawn from history. vv5-10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Three historical examples of sinners and their condemnation - vv5-7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Comparison with the sectarians - v8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Amplification by comparison - vv9-10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Second Proof</td>
<td>'The sectarians within the church are ungodly and subject to judgment.' An artificial (or inartificial) proof based on examples drawn from judgments of the subtype of supernatural oracle. vv11-13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The prophecy - v11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Application to the sectarians - vv12-13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Third Proof</td>
<td>'The sectarians are the ungodly whose presence and judgment in the last days has been foretold.' An artificial proof based on an...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
example drawn from a judgment of the subtype of supernatural oracle. vv14-16.
1 The prophecy of I Enoch 1:9 - vv14-15.
2 Application to the sectarians - v16.

V Peroratio - vv17-23
A Repeitio—'The sectarians are the ungodly scoffers of apostolic testimony.' An artificial proof based on an example drawn from a judgment of the subtype of supernatural oracle (vv17-19).

B Adfectus - vv20-23.

VI Doxology (Quasi-Peroratio) - vv24-25.

In his concluding 'evaluation of the rhetoric' (78-79) and throughout his study, Watson stresses 'the degree of Jude's adherence to conventional rhetorical principles of invention, arrangement, and style' (78). After such an impressive number of instances have been mustered, one actually does begin to wonder whether the 'New Testament writers sat down with rhetorical handbooks to compose their works' (Watson & Hauser 1993:112). Watson would of course deny this 'false impression' (:112), but his manner of analysis, or at least his presentation of results, would certainly support such speculation. In any case, Watson calls attention to one aspect of Jude's rhetoric that might be regarded as being 'deficient', namely, the absence of 'any attempt to counter the arguments posed by the sectarians' (:79). However he explains 'this lack of refutation' as an indication that 'Jude's response is conditioned by eschatological concerns...a conviction [that] makes the need to identify the sectarians primary' (:79; cf Harm 1987:159).

But such an interpretation may itself be 'conditioned' by the choice of the so-called 'species of rhetoric' with which the epistle had previously been characterised, namely, as 'deliberative' whose 'time referent is mainly future with the stress upon the future punishment of the sectarians' (:32; emphasis added). The problems involved in the adoption of this sort of monolithic temporal framework have already been pointed out (Watson himself hedges on the issue: 'the time referent is occasionally present', p32). At any rate, a more logical explanation for the omission would be that the heretics were so well-known and deviant with regard to both doctrine (i.e. apostasy) and practice (i.e. immorality) (v4) that a mere reference to the several biblical or extra-canonical examples and warnings that Jude cites is refutation enough. Besides, why give the errorists any more free PR by specifying, or even mentioning, their terrible aberrations?

A more serious question arises, however, with regard to Watson's conclu-
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sion—based on his rhetorical analysis—concerning the main message of Jude’s epistle, in terms of both theme and purpose. As the preceding outline clearly indicates, this would seem to be predominantly negative in nature and admonitory in intent. In other words:

To counter the sectarians’ word and deed, Jude must convince his audience that the sectarians are ungodly and heading for judgment, and are the ungodly whose presence and judgment were previously predicted (:79).

Thus in order to ‘meet the needs of the exigence’, Jude ‘ostensibly addresses his rhetoric to those still loyal to apostolic doctrine and practice’ (:79). To this end he employs a deliberative strategy of argumentation to dissuade them from following what will inevitably turn out to their harm (spiritual ruin). This is supported by an epideictic infrastructure that is intended ‘to decrease their ethos [i.e. that of the sectarians], and to elicit negative pathos’ (:79).

While not denying the validity of these conclusions, I wish to suggest that they do not tell the whole story—that an important aspect of Jude’s overall message has been either ignored or omitted. The reason for this error, now one of contemporary interpretation, is closely related to a misconstrual of the larger compositional structure of Jude’s letter—or if you will, a misreading of its rhetoric. Secondly, while I would certainly agree that it is helpful to analyse the epistle ‘in light of the conventions of Greco-Roman rhetoric’, I do not concur with the stipulation that it ‘must be interpreted’ (:79) only in this way, that is, through the sole use of a CR-style methodology. It is to these crucial issues pertaining to means-and-result that we now direct our attention by considering an alternative analytical approach.

5 A RHETORICAL-CRITICAL CORRECTIVE OF THE ‘OUTLINE OF JUDE’—THEMATIC-FUNCTIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DISCOURSE STRUCTURE

Although he does not specifically mention ‘rhetorical-criticism’ in his commentary, Richard Bauckham carries out an analysis of the sort that Muilenburg himself would be proud of. This is evident at the very beginning in his careful overview of matters that pertain to the literary genre of Jude (1983:3-5; cf Muilenburg 1992:55). There are no references at all to the conventions, terms, and techniques of classical rhetoric, for ‘the letter of Jude is a real letter’. It may be more precisely defined as an ‘epistolary sermon’—a homily ‘cast in letter form’ so that it might be delivered ‘at a distance’. Moreover, it is a letter whose form and content appear to fall much more under the influence of Hebrew-Semitic rhetorical technique than that of Greco-Roman speeches—in the opening, for example, ‘which conforms to the style of the ancient Jewish
letter', or the body which manifests a clear midrashic development. This involves the use of a series of topically related scriptural references or texts along with an associated contemporary commentary, a 'method...[that] bears some comparison with the pesher exegesis of Qumran' (cf Bailey & Vander Broek 1992:42-45). Then there is the 'doxology' which, rather uncharacteristically for letters, closes this work, one that clearly reflects a logos, to go along with an ethos, of 'the literature of Palestinian Judaism' (:7).

Muilenburg (e g 1992:67) would also be pleased with the attention that Bauckham gives to repetition in his analysis—lexical recursion (primarily) that serves to structure the text and to give it cohesion through such devices as 'catchwords', 'triple expressions', and chiastic or parallel patterning. As a result, the organisation of the discourse and the message that it conveys is different in certain significant respects from that proposed by Watson (given above). The following then is the 'outline of structure' that Bauckham sets forth for Jude (1983:5-6, slightly modified; cf Charles 1991:120):

1-2 Address and Greeting
3-4 Occasion and Theme of the Letter
   A The Appeal (summary, 3)
   B The Background to the Appeal (summary, 4)
5-19 B' The Background to the Appeal:
   A Midrash on the Prophecies of the Doom of the Ungodly
   5-7 (a) Three OT Types
   8-10 plus interpretation
   9 (a') Michael and the Devil
   11 (b) Three More OT Types
   12-13 plus interpretation
   14-15 (c) The Prophecy of Enoch
   16 plus interpretation
   17-18 (d) The Prophecy of the Apostles
   19 plus interpretation
20-23 A' The Appeal (reiterated)
24-25 Closing Doxology

A certain symmetry of arrangement is much more evident in this outline when compared to that of Watson. The question is, does such patterning have any basis in fact? Which schema is a more accurate reflection of the actual discourse structure of Jude and is there any thematic and/or pragmatic significance to this?

There are three major points of difference in this pair of structural proposals; they concern the organisation and function of vv3-4, 17-19, and 20-23. A lack of space prevents me from discussing these at any length, but the following
is a summary of my reasons for preferring Bauckham in every case:

(3-4): Watson recognises that these verses correspond to the 'body-opening of the Greek letter' (1988:47), which consists of 'three basic elements: background, petition verb, and desired action' (1988:48; cf White 1972:15-18; Doty 1973:34). But due to the constraints of his CR model, he must make a principal division of the text into the exordium (3) and narratio (4). The transitional conjunction gar would clearly suggest a closer linkage between these two verses, as would the 'marked alliteration of the "p" sound in vv3-4a' (Bauckham 1983:29). These stylistic features are supported by the discourse structure at large, for as Bauckham demonstrates (in considerable detail) 'v3, the appeal, is the statement of theme for the exhortatory section vv20-23, while v4, the background, forms a statement of theme for the midrash section, vv5-19' (:29). A chiastic AB-B'A' (shown in boldface on the diagram above), thesis-development pattern is thus formed to integrate the text topically in a symmetrical manner (a familiar form of Hebrew rhetorical technique).

The latter interpretation has some crucial semantic and pragmatic implications: For one, the ‘main propositions’ of the epistle cannot be limited to v4 as in Watson (e.g. p77), but must include the material in v3 as well, e.g. there is such a thing as a definite ‘body of faith which was once and for all delivered to the saints’. This is in fact the object of Jude’s ‘appeal’, without which the motivation supplied in v4 (or even the letter as a whole) would have no purpose. Thus v4 and its elaboration in vv5-19 is essentially ‘background’ material, a supporting sequence of Scriptural testimony as it were for the exhortations of vv3 and 20-23, and not primary as it seems to be in Watson’s scheme of things. Some additional consequences of Watson’s structural misconstrual are mentioned below.

But another error that arises in this particular segment needs to be pointed out, and that is the function of the so-called exordium (v3). Following his classical conventions, Watson sees one of the ‘three aims of the exordium’ as being ‘the desire to elicit goodwill through ethos, for...the ethos of the rhetor was considered the strongest influence in the case’ (1988:39). Thus he attempts to demonstrate, contrary to the plain sense of his text, that ‘Jude’s concentration falls upon himself as rhetor, that is, in establishing his ethos’ (1988:37). Now there may indeed be some effort at making the audience more amenable to his message here—perhaps even more approving of his own person. But this is certainly no ‘one-sided emphasis’ as Watson claims, a perception that appears to be yet another instance of where he has been pushed into a particular interpretation due to the ‘expectations’ of his (deliberative) rhetorical stance (:37).

(17-19): Both Bauckham and Watson recognise the major transitional function of the vocative óγαπητοι at the onset of v17—the question is: transition to what? For Bauckham it begins the last and the climactic in the series of biblical
'proof passages' that Jude has marshalled to bolster his description of the seriousness of the situation that his readers are in. There is a perhaps unexpected move to NT times and the 'predictions of the apostles'—men whom at least some receptors were most likely personally familiar with (I support Bauckham's arguments for an early date for this epistle, e.g. 1983:13, 103). Thus this is not a mere 'recapitulation (or repetitio)' of 'the main points of the probatio' intended to 'refresh [the] memory' of the audience (Watson 1988:69). Re-appearance of the vocative, a form of the key-word 'remind' (μνήσθε), plus a full personal pronoun ('you' pl) is an especially strong instance of structural anaphora (a marker of aperture, Wendland 1992:74), which would be an appropriate way of distinguishing this culminating reference to authoritative prophetic-apostolic witness, that is vv17-19. It serves to contextualise Jude's argument against the apostates in the 'here-and-now' of his receptors hearing. Indeed, the very same issues were at stake, namely, theological skepticism and bestial behavior (vv18-19), a point that is emphasised by a selective reiteration of vocabulary, e.g. ὄσεβ- 'ungodli-' (vv4, 15; for Watson's counter-opinion, see 1988:69).

(20-23): The logic of the preceding argument carries over into this unit with the need to specify its rhetorical function within the whole: Does the 'body-closing' of the epistle begin here with a distinct 'paraenetic section' (Bauckham 1983:3; cf Doty 1973:34), or do these verses constitute the second half of the peroratio (or body-closing) that was initiated at v17—a portion designated as the affectus, or emotional appeal (Watson 1988:67—or is it the conquestio [1988:73])? As already indicated above, my preference is for the former position since much more than pathos is being appealed to in this section. Indeed, the whole purpose of the epistle is being specified or elaborated upon: The charge to 'contend for the faith' that concerns your 'common salvation' (v3) made possible by 'the grace of our God' and 'our Lord Jesus Christ' (v4) is here echoed by a corresponding exhortation to 'build yourselves up in your most holy faith' by 'praying in the Holy Spirit' (v20), 'keep[ing] in the love of God', and 'waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ' (v21, following the topical pattern [based on the Trinity] instead of the syntax [the triad of present participles]).

Complementing this prominent lexical recursion is another demarcative instance of anaphora at the head of the unit: ὑμεῖς δὲ ἁγαπητοί (cf v17). That helps to emphasise the importance of this concise summary of 'the duties of the Christian life in the Christian community' which is 'the main purpose of [Jude's] letter' (Bauckham 1983:117). Though he recognises these 'four injunctions common to primitive Christian catechism and paterenesis' (:73), Watson downplays them in order to concentrate on the 'emotional appeal' (:71) of this segment, in particular, 'negative emotion: arousing fear' (:72). Once more the natural rhetoric of the discourse has been over-, if not wrongly-, interpreted:
While 'fear' may indeed play a part at the end of this pericope (v23), to allow it to permeate the whole appears to seriously distort the connotative force actually intended by the author with his quartet of hortatives.

Much more probably could, but will not, be said here about variations between Watson and Bauckham in their perception of Jude's message. The point has been to illustrate some of the differences in emphasis and method between the RC and the CR approaches, and how this affects one's understanding of the overall discourse structure and purpose in particular. I do not wish to sound too critical of Watson's results, for by and large his is a good analysis and provides many insights into the letter's rhetorical dynamics. In my judgment (which is of course also suspect until proven otherwise), Bauckham has a few minor analytical lapses of his own that could be resolved by another look at the patterned recursion of the whole, for example the (admittedly) difficult reading of vv22-23 where he prefers a shorter, two-clause text (1983:108-111) to a longer triple arrangement. The latter is supported, however, on the basis of a predominant stylistic characteristic, namely, the author's 'predilection for arranging his material in groups of three' (Metzger 1971:727-729; cf Osburn 1992:292 and the three-clause μέν...δέ...δέ construction of v8). Charles lists 'twenty sets of triplets' which display a density that 'is unparalleled anywhere else in Scripture' (1991:122). The communicative significance of this prominent stylistic trait in a Jewish contextual setting is that the writer thereby:

...exploits the method of a three-fold 'witness' [cf Deut 17:6] to condemn opponents while exhorting the faithful....In essence, the three represent one. A threefold concurrency yields completeness (:122).

6 ANOTHER STRUCTURAL PERSPECTIVE ON JUDE'S RHETORICAL ORGANISATION

In addition to the letter's obvious linear arrangement, which manifests 'a remarkably clear structure' that may also reflect some 'persistent oral techniques' (Neyrey 1992:23), we find a relatively convincing example (i.e. supported lexically as well as topically) of an extended chiasm, or 'introversion', that spans the entire text. This is not viewed as being antithetical to or as displacing the consecutively organised patterns presented above, but rather as constituting another—a complementary—level of rhetorically-shaped discourse organisation. Among other things, it helps to account for the anomalous v9 in Bauckham's proposed outline (i.e. [a']; 1983:6). The main pragmatic (or functional; cf Stowers 1986:15), lexical, and semantic elements that correspond to each other within the boundaries of this introversion are indicated in the format displayed below:
A Epistolary introduction—participants + a threefold characterisation of the 'receivers' [Rs]: 'to those who have been called, who are loved by God the Father and kept by Jesus Christ'—focus on divine agency (1: pragmatic purpose [PP] = commendation, encouragement [Rs])

B Salutation—a threefold benediction, God to Rs: 'mercy to you [Rs] and peace and love...' (2: PP = encouragement [of Rs])

C Purpose introduced—appeal: 'beloved...contend...for the faith...delivered to the holy ones' (3: PP = exhortation)

D Motivation, first mention—false teachers:
\[\text{τίνες ἀνθρωποι...ἀσεβεῖς} + 3 \text{ attributes: 'forewritten...perverting...repudiating'}\]
(4: PP = assertion + admonition/warning +/- informing [the same through v19])

E Reminder—warning from OT times [past]:
\[\delta θ + 'I want to remind you' + negative exemplification (5-7)\]

F Description—heretics:
\[\text{oὐτοί + 3 attributes: 'defile...flout...insult'} (8)\]

G Extracanonical example (ancient)—Michael: + 'may the Lord rebuke you!' - no blasphemy (9)

H Description—heretics:
\[\text{οὐτοί θ + 3 attributes: 'they blaspheme...like brute beasts...they are ruined'} (10)\]

< <I WOE oracle οὐκ αὐτοῖς! 3 archetypal instances of ungodliness from the OT: Cain, Balaam, and Korah
(11: PP = warning + condemnation)

H' Description—heretics:
\[\text{οὐτοί + 3X2 (6) attributes [all metaphors of futility] → 'they are kept for darkness' [= ruin] (12-13)}\]

G' Extracanonical prediction (ancient)—Enoch:
\[\delta θ + 'the Lord will come...to rebuke [convict] all the
ungodly’ for their ungodliness (3X) [including blasphemy] (14-15)

F’ Description—heretics:
oötōi + 3 attributes: ‘grumblers, complainers…followers after their own evil desires’ (16)

E’ Reminder—warning from NT times [present]:
δε: + ‘you must remember’ + negative prediction (17-18)

D’ Motivation, final mention—false teachers:
oötōi + 3 qualifiers: ‘separators…psychic…having not the Spirit’ (19)

C’ Purpose elaborated—appeal: ‘beloved…build yourselves up…in the faith…praying in the holy Spirit’ (20-21: PP = exhortation + edification)

B’ Commission—a threefold assignment, Rs to others:
‘mercy some…and save others…and mercy others…’ (22-23: PP = command, exhortation/admonition [to Rs])

A’ Epistolary conclusion—characterisation of (= doxology to) God:
‘to the One who is able to keep [guard] you…the only God our Savior…through Jesus Christ’ + a benediction stressing divine agency + a threefold temporal reference
(24-25, PP = commendation/praise [God], encouragement [Rs])

This concentric (paradigmatically arranged) structural pattern overlays/undergirds the linear and primary (syntagmatically arranged) ‘backbone’ of the rhetor’s argument. The forward-moving discourse progression, consisting of an alternating sequence of paired constituents involving Scriptural example and contemporary application (or thematically: crime-and-punishment) overtly moves the epistle forward in typical midrashic style (Bauckham 1983:4) from beginning to end. But this is complemented by a simultaneous, but less obvious, retrogression as previously introduced motifs, topics, illocutionary intentions, and epistolary elements are recursively recycled, as it were, but in a well-ordered way, to reinforce one another and the point and purpose of the message as a whole. This remarkably consistent and artistically shaped arrangement would seem to belie the occasionally alleged ‘hasty’ manner of the letter’s composition (cf v3; Arichea & Hatton 1993:12) and rather superficial critical char-
acterisations such as the following: His letter 'is not the work of a literary artist, but of a passionate Christian prophet' (—as if the two were mutually exclusive categories; Kistemaker 1987:356, citing D Guthrie).

A few other, more specific matters pertaining to the preceding structure may be noted in passing. It is important (for the credibility of the proposed introverted framework) to observe the unit-initial function words (conjunctions) that serve to formally mark the alternation as well as correspondences within the succession of chiastically ordered segments, namely, δέ 'and/but' and οὖτοι 'these (i.e. "fellows"—pejorative)' (cf also Kruger 1993:121-123). Only the epistolary beginning and ending of the text are excluded from this oscillating sequence, which leads off with the primary thematic agents of this letter: τινες ἁνθρώποι (4, also denigratory, i.e the troublemakers must not be dignified with a more precise personal identification; cf du Toit 1992:286). The single variation in this pattern occurs, significantly, at its emotive (both expressive and evocative) climax in the structural center, where there is first a double occurrence, οὖτοι δέ (i.e at H, v10; note: the order follows the expected sequence), and then a corresponding zero-realisation at the midpoint (I, v11; H' continues normally with οὐτοί).

This last constituent does not represent the thematic (conceptual) 'peak' of Jude (for that, see vv20-21 with its reiteration of the letter's principal appeal coupled with a trinitarian reference). Rather, it constitutes the work's affective apex (or connotative 'climax') as Jude for the only time other than in his opening words interjects himself overtly and personally into the discourse. He adopts the Old Testament prophetic role of a proclaimer of doom in the form of a divine judgment oracle, which typically contains four major structural components, namely: 'woe' + identification of the condemned parties + specification of sin/wickedness (i.e 'reason', introduced by διὰ 'because') + pronouncement of punishment ('result'). As Bauckham observes: 'the prophetic character of v11 is confirmed by the three aorist verbs, representing the Semitic use of a "prophetic perfect"' (1983:78). The poetic effect is enhanced by the parallelism in syntactic structure, that is a threefold pattern of ([art + N-Dat] + [art + N-Gen] + [V-Aor]). The rhetor-prophet heightens the pathos here by directly linking the current objects of his denunciation with a trio of perhaps the most infamous instances of impiety in the Hebrew Scriptures as well as Jewish religious tradition (Watson 1987:58-59). It is a classic case of vituperatio: 'Would anyone dare to identify with people who will be damned by God? Certainly not' (Du Toit 1992:286).

The structural-thematic introversion displayed above does not exhaust the
amazing inventory of significant recursive elements to be observed in Jude's epistle. It simply provides a convenient framework for organising them conceptually. Other prominent correspondences, primarily lexical but also illocutionary (i.e., pertaining to the letter's 'primary motive state [of] reaffirmation'—W R Fisher, cited by Wuellner 1991:117), are found on both the micro- as well as the macrostructure of the discourse. Among the former are such obvious instances of reiteration and wordplay as that involving the verb τηρέω at the beginning and ending of v6; βλασφημέω, the three occurrences of which join vv8-10 into a larger topical unit; and the key root ἀκρε- which pervades v15. As J D Charles observes: 'Jude's short but lively polemic is not lacking in "sound-structure"' (1991:114). Topically more significant is the extensive word parallelism (both synonymous and contrastive) that runs throughout the text—except for v11 (the chiastic core above; 1991:112-113). Also on the wider plane of textual organisation we have several more subtle linkages like 'mercy' in vv2 and 21-22 (the latter in verbal form), and the related cluster of terms: ‘{(people) written about beforehand} + ‘godless’ + ‘our Lord Jesus Christ’] in v4 // ‘(words) spoken beforehand’ + ‘our Lord Jesus Christ’ + ‘godlessness’] in vv17-18. The close of the discourse thus plainly resonates with its opening as the writer reinforces some of his central ideas in rounding out his intricately crafted, rhetorically motivated and effected work.

I have two concluding observations on the significance of Jude's structural organisation: The precise manner in which the linear and concentric macrostructures correspond with and complement one another would appear to be a (semi-)prosaic instance of Roman Jakobson's well-known 'poetic function' of literature which 'projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination' (1960:358). Various discourse-defining and integrating patterns of parallelism are thus formed as categories of static paradigmatic correspondence (similarity or contrast) develop and are superimposed, as it were, upon dynamic continuity as the text progressively unfolds syntagmatically. The more correspondences there are (along with sufficient diversity to maintain interest and impact), the more 'poetic' a given text sounds/appears—and the more meaningful connections that can be established. In works such as Jude where the cognitive categories are limited in number and clearly defined, the theme is thereby made prominent and emphatically expressed, that is the essential contrast of [SIN: {impiety} + {immorality}] → [POLLUTION] + [PUNISHMENT] \/
[FIDELITY: {remembrance} + {retention} + {resistance} + {renewal}] → [BLESSING: {salvation: (immediate) + (eschatological)}] (see also Harm's attempt to synopsise the content in syllogistic terms, 1987:152-153). In an interesting, if rather debatable, study of the 'strophical structure in St Jude's epistle', H D Cladder detects 54 parallel poetic lines in the text, all arranged into seven 'strophes' with v11 alone functioning as
the text’s structural midpoint (1903:592,594-597).

From a somewhat different perspective, the skillfully coordinated overall construction of this letter, coupled with the proliferation of triads and other interwoven recursions, manifests a certain perceptible continuity and regularity in terms of discourse design. This in turn suggests the notions of permanence and stability. Could it be then that the letter’s style and architecture represent an information-preserving ‘isomorphic equivalent’ of the essential message that is thereby being conveyed (De Waard & Nida 1986:63,68)? In other words, the various kinds of repetition, which form diverse patterns on all levels of composition (phonological, lexical, morpho-syntactic, semantic, and macro-structural), are a concrete reflection of the main point that the author wished to make, namely, that faithful constancy in opposition to the reactionary sort of changes being proposed by the errorists is a vital aspect of ‘contending for the faith once delivered to the saints’ (v3). A corresponding imperative involves the absolute necessity of having that same reliable basis or foundation [i.e objective faith] ‘upon which to build’ one’s own personal faith [here, subjective—a possible instance of ‘semantic density’; Wendland 1990] according to the Lord’s simple, but highly efficient, salvic plan (vv20-21). By way of contrast then we also note the high proportion of hapax legomena in Jude’s epistle, namely 14 (plus 3 more found only in 2 Peter). Could this perhaps be a subtle literary reflection of the ‘foreignness’ of the licentious teachings that were being foisted upon the letter’s addressees?

7 ON THE CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE OF ANCIENT AND MODERN STUDIES OF BIBLICAL RHETORIC AND THE EPISTOLARY HOMILY OF JUDE

Space prevents anything more than a mere touching upon the following possible rhetorical applications of and supplements to the analytical procedures that were outlined above and employed with reference to the epistle of Jude.

7.1 Concerning the message

Like many of the so-called minor prophets, for example Obadiah, certain of the ‘minor epistles’ are frequently overlooked as potential sources of religious inspiration and guidance in the modern age. All that ‘doom and gloom’—what’s the point and where’s the relevance? Besides it might just depress people more than they already are in these uncertain, unstable times. But as I have endeavored to show in this study, the letter of Jude is not as pessimistic as a superficial reading might at first suggest. Rather, it begins and ends on a strongly positive note, one that reflects a realistically optimistic viewpoint that is not only cognizant of the present dangers, but is certain of ultimate victory and also hopeful of a future glory that has already been guaranteed by the Father through the mediatorial
work of his Son and made accessible even now through the operation of the Holy Spirit (vv20-21).

Furthermore, when we really think about it, how different really are our times from the critical situation that 'Jude' found himself in? No matter what date we finally attach to this epistle, the religious circumstances (or rhetorical 'exigence') of its writing bear at least several significant resemblances (as well as many differences of course) to the theological scene as we find it in the present day. Thus we have a 'Christian' Church—whether in Africa, Asia, Australia, or America—that is by and large characterised by bitter factionalism, false teachings involving divinely established authority and revelation, a widespread tolerance for immorality, the consuming desire for personal gain, and many who appeal to extra-biblical, supernatural revelation, supposedly to supplement the written Word. The disastrous history of two recent 'prophetic' movements may be sufficient to illustrate this point: the ill-fated Lakwena military insurrection in Uganda and the holocaust resulting from the Branch Davidian affair in Waco, Texas. Thus Jude's persuasively fashioned exhortation to the faithful is most timely, but only for those who will take the time to really discover what he has to say—and how.

It is important for the analyst to seriously consider the theological 'message' of the particular text that he or she happens to be investigating, that is, to 'balance the roles of scholar and religious or spiritual human being in the process of interpretation' (Patrick & Scult 1990:23)—no matter what theoretical method is being followed. A rhetorical-critical perspective is especially helpful in leading a person to appreciate the fact that:

The Bible is not, after all, a philosophical text addressed to the scholar in his or her study, but a religious text addressing the reader [beginning with the analyst him/herself] as a member of a worshipping community (Patrick & Scult 1990:23; cf Charles 1991:107,118).

7.2 Concerning the method
A CR coupled with a discourse-based, genre-informed RC analysis (i.e. a 'rhetorical-structural' approach, RS) helps one to perceive and to interpret both the micro- and the macrolevels of literary composition, that is, to grasp the overall organisation of the author's argument and its progressive development as well as the function of certain problematic passages within the whole. The larger, artistically-shaped patterns of repetition thus help to lend credence in terms of greater probability with respect to one local or global interpretation as opposed to another.

One prominent instance of this concerns the initial debate over whether or
not the writer actually intended to pen a different letter, a treatise ‘concerning our common salvation’. Then due to a sudden crisis that arose in the church, one occasioned by the heretical ‘dreamers’ (v8), he was forced to compose a text that was substantially different from what he had originally planned (for an overview of the two positions, see Arichea & Hatton 1993:11-12). However, the elaborate arrangement of this epistle, as described above, would indicate that the author had only a single text in mind, one that he constructed as carefully and persuasively as he could. To be sure, the polemical motivation for writing is developed to a considerable degree, that is the introduction in v4 and its development in vv5-19. But the primary edificational purpose to urge his readers to fight for their faith (= salvation, v3) remains central throughout, and this is made explicit in the final quarter of the epistle (vv20-25) as ‘faith’ and ‘salvation’ once more come to the fore (including the recipients’ own saving activity in relation to their fallen fellow members, vv22-23). Could it be that the obvious step-up in tension manifested in v3 is simply a rhetorical device, intended to more fully capture the attention of the target (implied/encoded) audience?

An accurate conception of the author’s rhetorically-motivated argument structure also helps one to evaluate the many different alternative proposals presented in the literature, that is with respect to their respective strengths and weaknesses (for no single pattern is perfect). Charles, for example, tries to combine Watson’s outline with that of Bauckham (1991:120), but in the process he overlooks several crucial similarities and corresponding contrasts. Osburn’s more creative text-format is reproduced below as another example (1992: 309). The advantage of this scheme is its simplicity, but how credible is it in the light of our examination of the text’s total framework? Not very—for two major reasons: First, the internal, apparent ‘ring’ (A-B-A’) structure is less than helpful since ‘warnings’ characterise the entire section covering vv5-19, and v4, as argued earlier, relates to this whole unit as an opening summary. Verse 3 in turn sets forth the main message of the epistle, which is later developed in the corresponding paraenetic segment of vv20-23. Then, in common with all of the preceding linear arrangements, Osburn too misses the theme-supporting elements of the salutation and the benediction, a notion that stresses the divine preservation (i.e. ‘keep’—v1/‘guard’—v24) of all those who trust in Jesus Christ. These vital intratextual relationships need to be appropriately distinguished and highlighted much more clearly than in the diagram shown here:
The issue of discourse organisation is related in a very practical way to the manner in which modern translations format and indicate the arrangement of their text by means of titles, or 'section headings' (cf Louw & Wendland 1993:ch 3). An erroneous conception of the former will inevitably lead to a distorted realisation of the latter, as is illustrated by the rather misleading series of three main headings which the Good News Bible employs to outline Jude: ‘False Teachers’ (at v3), ‘Warnings and Instructions’ (v17), and ‘Prayer of Praise’ (v24) (cf similar titles at the corresponding verses of the new [fourth edition] UBS Greek text). Unfortunately, this triad would give the average reader an overly negative initial impression of the book and only a partial insight into the writer's principal message.

7.3 Concerning the model
The particular rhetorical-critical methodology that has been promoted in this essay may be extended in its application in several, quite diverse directions which pertain in particular to the interaction of participants with the rhetorical text and context—that is, the rhetor in relation to his receptor(s) on the one hand and the surrounding situational setting, both ancient and modern, on the other. Five potentially fruitful areas for such extension in terms of further research and testing are the following:

7.3.1 The influence of sociocultural situation
Within the past twenty years or so a new way of viewing and analysing the texts of Scripture (primarily the New Testament) has been steadily growing in influence, namely, the movement (if it may be so termed) commonly known as 'social-scientific criticism' (SSC; for an overview, see Elliot 1993). The particu-
lar focus of its practitioners is ‘the systematic application of the research, concepts, and theory of the social sciences to biblical exegesis’ (1993:17). A related, but perhaps more text-centered, comparative method called ‘socio-rhetorical criticism’ places a similar emphasis upon the ‘analysis of sociocultural patterns and conventions known to us from extant literature’ which help to create the various ‘webs of significance’ that permeate a given biblical text (Robbins 1984:6,17).

The preeminent SSC concern for ‘the social dimensions of the Bible and its environment’ (Elliot 1993:20) is clearly reflected and well executed in the recent commentary on Jude (and 2 Peter) by Jerome Neyrey, who employs ‘five distinctive social science models...[or] cultural perspectives’ in order to provide as it were ‘useful and necessary lenses through which to see [in the text] what would not be perceived without special cultural sensitivity’ (1993:3). These distinct, but interrelated, perspectives involve: the pivotal values of honor and shame, patron and client relationships, the symbolic universe involving aspects of purity and pollution, the metaphorical use of the physical body, and a decidedly group (as opposed to an individualistic) orientation (1993:3-19). Though rather over-extended and forced upon the concrete textual data at times, this model does have many useful insights to contribute to a more complete interpretation of the specific rhetorical dynamics of a given biblical composition or theme (for a topical analysis, see Van Eck & Van Aarde 1993; for a general socio-rhetorical typology, see Robbins 1990:263).

7.3.2 Argumentation analysis
As was noted earlier, the NR approach popularised by Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) and more recently by Wilhelm Wuefner (e.g. 1991) is becoming increasingly important as an analytical methodology, either on its own or in a supplementary capacity. To give just one application of this method, aimed at revealing the strategy (forms and functions) of argumentation, G W Hansen in an overview of current NR theory notes five prominent rhetorical techniques that may be useful in the study of the Pauline epistles (1993:824-825).

However, each of these principles seems to undergo a definite modification in usage, whether slight or significant, as realised in the letter of Jude. The ‘argument by authority’ is clearly more dependent upon the prestige, reputation, and works of previous biblical (and related!) writers than it is on the character of the current author, Jude himself (e.g. vv1,14,17). The ‘argument by definition’, as illustrated in Paul’s typical elaboration of certain key terms for example, is greatly superceded by what may be called an ‘argument by example’ (vv5-7). The ‘argument by dissociation of ideas’ is revealed not so much in an ‘explication of antithetical pairs’ as it is by stressing a fundamental perversion of the divinely established norm, that is ‘the grace of our God’ (v4; cf Vorster
1992: 298-299). The ‘argument of severance’ sets forth a principle that is to be applied only as a last resort and in terms of a relative degrees of potential pollution (vv22-23). Finally, the ‘argument by sacrifice’ appeals more to the value of the theological teaching and practical ethic which is to be sacrificed for now, rather than vice-versa (vv3-4, 20-21), that is a sacrifice ‘presented as evidence of the value of the thing for which the sacrifice is made’ (Hansen 1993:825). Thus no rhetorical model or method can be applied too rigidly or casually to biblical literature simply due to its familiarity. A thorough analysis will invariably reveal some new twists, surprises, and potentially fruitful insights.

7.3.3 The analysis of ‘prophetic rhetoric’

Though not necessarily composed in a pronounced form of so-called ‘Semitic Greek’ (Bauckham 1983:6; Turner 1976:139-140), Jude’s epistle does bear certain affinities in its rhetorical style to some of the Hebrew prophetic works (as noted, for example, in Salmond 1950:i). During the analysis above, we observed the crucial, centrally-placed...‘woe’ oracle of condemnation where Jude (the encoded author) steps into the role of a prophetic spokesman in pronouncing Yahweh’s judgment upon his apostate antagonists for their sinful beliefs and behavior (cf Miller 1982:1-6; Barton 1990:63). The letter also has a number of important affinities with second century (A.D. 200) Jewish apocalyptic writings, especially in the use of cosmic and solar imagery along with the themes of divine theophany and judgment as a way of reinforcing the antithesis between the righteous/faithful and the ungodly. In his helpful discussion of this association, Charles summarises its communicative significance as follows:

Past paradigms are prophetically linked with the present. They remind the audience of the divine ability to ‘keep’; God reserves the faithful for mercy while reserving the ungodly for certain judgment (1991:110).

In recent years, several literary analysts have attempted to extend the scope of classical Greco-Roman rhetoric to the less familiar domain of the Old Testament, the prophetic corpus in particular. As one of its leading exponents states:

The study of rhetoric enables the modern critic to reconstruct the didactic matrix in its historical-cultural circumstances. Rhetorical analysis provides the means of restoring the natural tone of biblical oratory, its logic of argumentation, and its emotional atmosphere. The systematic study of rhetoric opens the window for understanding the polemical nature of biblical literature, its argumentation, and its modes of effective communication (Gitay 1993:146; see also Gitay 1991a & b).

But one must exercise great caution in applying ‘the canons and principles of Greek and Latin rhetorical art’ to the literature of the Hebrew Scriptures and
even to the heavily Jewish-influenced writings of early Christianity (Wuellner 1991:113) lest one overlook some specific (emic) literary distinctions while imposing alien (etic) ones upon the text(s) under consideration. A related ‘cultural fallacy’ is set into operation when one ignores the influence of world view and the assumptions and beliefs about the nature and powers of words that were handed down and received in ancient Israel’ (I Rabinowitz, cited in Wuellner 1991:113).

Although he downplays Muilenburg’s approach to ‘rhetorical criticism’ as being overly ‘stylistic-formalist’ and ‘synchronic’ in nature (1993:136), Gitay does in fact produce a major study (i.e. 1991b) that is similar in certain important respects to those emanating from the ‘Muilenburgian [RC] school’. Thus in addition to the attempt to ‘reveal the mutual relationship of the author(s), the text, and the audience’, there is also a definite focus upon ‘the art of the final product, that is, the aesthetic dimension of the text’ (1993:136). I have recently prepared an exposition of the book of Obadiah along these same lines (1994b; cf also 1994c). In developing the potential of this new mode of analysis and field of study, the methodology of ‘new rhetoric’, being more generally applicable than that of CR, will no doubt play a major part. Furthermore, the helpful insights of form-criticism should not be overlooked or discounted, for from a broad perspective it too aims ‘to discover the function that the literary genre [of a given work] was designed to serve in the life of the community [and within a] precise social or cultural milieu’ (Muilenburg 1992:51; for a useful overview of the purpose and categories of ‘genre analysis’ in relation to paraenetic literature, see Gammie 1990; Stowers 1986:ch 10; Bailey & vander Broek 1992:62ff).

7.3.4 Contemporary Bible translation
How does the rhetoric of the Word turn out to sound in another language? For the readers and hearers of most Scripture translations, the answer is simple: it does not appear or is not audible at all. What effect does this lack or liquidation have in turn upon average receptors? They probably do not even notice—after all, ‘God doesn’t speak my language!’ And the loss in this respect is indeed great, as any student of the rhetoric of Scriptures will attest, for in this case, the linguistic form has a great deal to do with the meaning of the message that is ultimately conveyed. Any rendition that does not take this fact into serious consideration, taking the appropriate re-creative compensatory measures where possible—whether textually or extratextually (via annotation)—has left behind a vital part of the original text, and certainly stands all the poorer for it.

Thus any thorough study of the ‘hermeneutics’ of a given sociocultural context (cf 29th NTSSA Congress ‘theme’) must not fail to fully investigate both the broader as well as the more specific rhetorical facets and ramifications of its topic. The subject of Bible translation in particular needs to be carefully consid-
ered because that is where all interpretive reflection must begin for the vast majority of disciples, all those who do not have access to the original languages. How do we transform the rhetoric of the original into that of a Bantu language, for example, and what are the hermeneutical implications of such restructuring? Is such a goal even feasible in the first place, given the human resources at hand? A good place to begin is with an intensive search for suitable rhetorical 'models' in the language (and culture!) of the translation (or in a closely related language). What are the various genres available and how do (or did) they function sociologically in their typical settings of use? This important topic cannot be discussed further here (cf Wendland 1993:ch 4), but it is one that obviously cannot be ignored.

Such a study would be of special relevance to African societies in which a majority of the population have not yet lost their 'ears' for the rhetorical power of the oral word. In this instance one of the principal aims of any modern version must be to reproduce what was undoubtedly present in the biblical text, including its phonaesthetic dimension (Watson 1988:3; Wendland 1993:ch 7, 1994a; with specific reference to Jude, see Neyrey 1993: 24-25). This vital aspect of the original discourse is one that almost always was either greatly distorted or obliterated in an older 'missionary edition'. Many features of the Jude's compositional style would seem to make it an especially good candidate for any experimentation in this respect for, as an instance of (primarily) 'deliberative' rhetoric, it is characterised by such typical oral-aural shaped techniques as: a prominent hortatory appeal to what is advantageous (or expedient) for the audience; the use of an inductive method of argumentation, with a dependence upon proof by example and a basic reliance upon tradition; a controversial topic, that is dealing with the threat of corporate factionalism and spiritual pollution (cf Mitchell 1992:23; Mack 1990:42-43); pejorative characterisation in sharply contrastive and agonistically toned (but connotatively rather than denotatively oriented) terms of black and white (cf Johnson 1989:441); graphic, strongly sensual imagery; pervasive repetition; formulaic sayings; mnemonic patterns (e.g. rhythmic utterances, phonological play); and a predominantly concrete, experienced-based, highly emotive (rather than 'logical', abstract, or detached) line of reasoning (cf Ong 1982:ch 3). Needless to say, there is much room here for some serious research, innovation, and testing in our current efforts directed towards conveying the Word of God in a functionally equivalent manner (de Waard & Nida 1986:119), including the use of 'audio-Scriptures' (Sogaard 1991:1).

7.3.5 The rhetoric of Bantu homiletics
The book of Jude, according to Bauckham, may be best described as 'an epistolary sermon'—a 'homily...cast in letter form' (1983:3). Attridge suggests that
such a homiletical ‘word of exhortation’ (λόγος παρακλήσεως) follows the general ‘pattern of formal introduction, scriptural citation, exposition or thematic elaboration, and application’ (1990:216-217; cf Charles 1991:119-120). As a poor—but the only available—substitute for his personal presence, the author skillfully composed the discourse so that as it was being read, it would almost sound as if he were there delivering his pastoral appeal in person (Doty 1973: 27; cf White 1981:91; Stowers 1986:23)—‘one half of a dialogue’ (Bailey & vander Broek 1992:29). Again, the oral-aural factor looms large, and rightfully so (Bauckham 1983:17; Wuellner 1991:114-115), as we consider various strategies for communicating the biblical message more effectively today, particularly in cross-cultural settings and disparate linguistic situations where the actual doing—creating a functionally equivalent rhetorical reproduction—becomes significantly more difficult because both background and precedent are either unfamiliar or lacking.

Rhetorical argumentation in some form or another is undoubtedly a cultural universal. The problem is to identify and appropriately utilise the resources that are available within a different verbal code and inventory of literary types. On the other hand, a certain amount of formal adaptation is possible provided that the essential content and functional force of the original can be preserved. One example of particular relevance in Black Africa today is the Christian sermon. By and large it is a borrowed form, the closest ‘deliberative-epideictic’ equivalent probably being found ironically in the indigenous forum for ‘judicial’ rhetoric, namely, the legal, legislative, and political debates that would take place at the local chief’s traditional court (however without the dramatic interaction that would characterise such public performances). In any case, the important thing is that while the generic form and to some extent also the major purpose (i.e. religious proclamation for personal censure, admonition, exhortation, and/or edification) may be imported, the constituent stylistic features and rhetorical devices (including the mode of ‘arrangement’) employed in composition should be entirely natural or idiomatic in their specific selection, combination, and distribution. Unfortunately, this does not always happen as Western homiletical models and oratorical methods are often simply adopted in toto without considering their impact on, or appeal to, the target audience.

Indeed, much research needs to be done in this vital area of Christian intercultural communication. One promising avenue for such investigation would be radio preaching—‘delivering a sermon at a distance’ (Bauckham 1983:3)—in this case via the airwaves rather than in written form. Preliminary studies (i.e a tentative analysis of a number of Chichewa sermons preached by various individuals and broadcast over TransWorld Radio, Swaziland) indicate several important correspondences to the epistle of Jude with respect to stylistic or rhetorical form, among such typical features as these: a loose, synthetic, non-
analytical, and inductive form of organisation; pronounced continuities and shifts in rhythmic progression with much phonological modulation for connotative effect (e.g. tempo, pitch, stress, vowel elongation, utterance-final apocope); vivid, experience-related imagery and idiomatic language; extensive repetition on all levels of discourse structure; often intensified speech by means of vocatives, rhetorical questions, word plays, irony, exaggeration, ideophones, and exclamations; and periodic humorous insertions as well as appeals for participatory audience response (both verbal and non-verbal). For a comparison with Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian sermons, one may consult studies such as Wills (1984) and Black (1988).

We might also note a certain similarity in the use of intertextual material, which plays such a prominent role in the message of Jude, that is, especially the author's direct or indirect (presupposed) utilisation of extra-canonical literature and/or religious tradition (cf. Bauckham 1983:7; Osburn 1992:passim). Though certainly legitimate, the application this homiletical technique may to some minds be questionable, beginning with no less a scholar than the writer of 2 Pt who carefully expunged such references and allusions from his adapted work (e.g. mention of the Michael episode in v9 which produces some unclarity in 2 Pt 2:11; Bauckham 1983:142; Watson 1988:162). Perhaps a somewhat similar situation exists today as many African evangelists, in the creative search for a more indigenous homiletical style, make significant use of traditional oral materials in their sermons, for example proverbs, folk-narratives, songs, and even pre-Christian religious lore, which may or may not have a current influence among believers. At any rate, these popular preachers do have at least one prominent model and precursor in Jude, the brother of [the Lord]!

8 FIVE CONCLUDING CAVEATS CONCERNING RHETORICAL-CRITICAL ANALYSIS

(a) A 'rhetorical', interactively-oriented or dialogic RS approach is an essential aspect of the hermeneutical process, for most—if not all—biblical literature is motivated by an overt or an implicit rhetorical intent, which is to 'persuade' receptors, perhaps differentiated in terms of a 'primary' and a 'secondary' audience, to conform (under the operation of the Holy Spirit) to the perspective of the 'author', both human and divine, in terms of beliefs, attitudes, values, and goals.

(b) The preceding mode of engagement must be complemented by a 'discourse'-framed, holistic, comprehensive, and systematically executed method of analysis—one that incorporates a concern for the macro- as well as the microstructure of a text, for matters pertaining to function (speech acts/illocutionary forces) as well as to form and content, with sufficient attention also being paid to the biblical context of situation, including the sociocultural set-
ting and in particular the moral-religious conceptual environment (i.e. via 'social-scientific' and 'socio-rhetorical' criticism).

(c) The two ‘horizons of interpretation’ of interlingual communication need to be clearly recognised and distinguished during all phases of the analysis, with priority being given to the original biblical context in the sense that it must be thoroughly studied first so that it may serve as the basis for and give guidance (without the imposition of an alien, Western perspective) to both the exegesis and also the contemporary application of a given pericope in a current setting that may well require the utilisation of a rather different system of formal style, rhetorical strategy, and conceptual logic.

(d) No single method of investigation is sufficient unto itself to satisfactorily accomplish such a multifaceted task, but a selective (depending on the primary goals) and integrated approach is better able to discover a greater portion of the communicative significance of a certain text of Scripture and to accommodate or compensate for the respective strengths and weaknesses, the advantages and limitations, of the individual procedures which comprise it, for example in the present study: classical as well as modern (argumentative) rhetoric together with rhetorical (including epistolary) criticism, discourse (compositional) analysis, and speech-act (pragmatic) theory.

(e) Any exegetical-hermeneutical methodology and any given instance of such analysis (e.g. homiletics) is only as good as its practitioners in terms of producing results that are informative, insightful, interesting (with respect to situational relevance)—and which represent an accurate reflection of what is really going on in the original text-context, as nearly as this impossible objective may be accomplished by sinful human beings, laboring together under the corrective direction of the Spirit of God.
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